U. S. Congress

# CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

# THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

# SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

---

## VOLUME LI.

---

WASHINGTON
1914



VOLUME LI, PART V.

# CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

## SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 3, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thee to write all Thy laws in our hearts. In our minds do Thou put them. Then shall we be Thy people and Thou shall be our God. Give us a continual disposition toward obedience to Thy holy will. We pray for the ministry of Thy spirit to enlighten our intellect, to sanctify our will, to control and subdue all our hearts, and bring us into the highest relation to Thyself. May there be no disposition to disobedience or rebellion in any of us, but a very glad and willing submission to the will of God. Grant that through Thy ministry we may measure up to the responsibilities of this day and of this office. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### USELESS PAPERS IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, stating that there is in the Department of Commerce an accumulation of documents and files of papers which are not needed nor useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication will be referred to the Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Mr. SMOOT. Communications of that kind have gone to the Committee on Printing in the past. We have acted upon a great many of them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the disposition of useless papers?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the communication refer to the destruction of useless papers or the disposition of them?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a communication asking what disposition shall be made of them.

Mr. SMOOT. In several cases in the last few years the Joint Committee on Printing of the two Houses have acted on this matter. I suppose it should go to the Committee on Printing, although I myself do not care to which committee it is referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. In accordance with an understanding had yesterday, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 23 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MOON, Mr. FINLEY, and Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon;

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property; and

S. 3742. An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (34 Stat. L., 56).

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9671. An act to appropriate $5,000 to erect a suitable monument on the battle grounds at the Horse Shoe, on the Tallapoosa River, in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 11751. An act authorizing the sale of certain land to the county of San Diego, State of California, for public watering purposes;

H. R. 12806. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant the use of the Fort McHenry Military Reservation, in the State of Maryland, to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, a municipal corporation of the State of Maryland, making certain provisions in connection therewith, providing access to and from the site of the new immigration station heretofore set aside;

H. R. 13091. An act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes;

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.;

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land at or near Anniston, Ala., and 5,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Tullahoma, in the State of Tennessee, for the purpose of establishing maneuver camps, rifle and artillery ranges, etc.;

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make exhibits at Forest Products Expositions to be held in Chicago, Ill., and New York, N. Y.; and

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer Kroonland, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer Volturno in the north Atlantic Ocean.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Grand Rapids, and Jackson, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Yorktown Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Commodore John Barry Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Patrick Henry Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Paul Revere Branch, American Continental League, of Leominster, Mass.; of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Danbury, Conn.; of Andrew Jackson Branch, American Continental League, of Butte, Mont.; and of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the repeal of that part of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of Lincoln Court, No. 20, Guardians of Liberty, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Gen. Francis Marion Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Grace Congregational Church, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 179, Carriage, Wagon, and Automobile Workers, of Cleveland, Ohio, and a memorial of Local Union No. 38, Ladies' Tailors and Dressmakers' Union, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of the congregations of the Allegheny Seventh-Day Adventist Church, of Pittsburgh, and of the Gorman Seventh-Day Adventist Church, of Pittsburgh, and of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.



271314

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Glenshaw, Etna, Sharpsburg, Indiana, Hampton, Duquesne, and Butler; of Local Union No. 272, Brass Finishers' Union, of Pittsburgh; of Local Union No. 115, Bartenders' League, of Pittsburgh; and of Local Union No. 317, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Wilkes-Barre, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Council No. 162, Order of Independent Americans, of Steelton; of Council No. 127, Order of Independent Americans, of Philadelphia; of Verona True Blues, No. 33, of Verona; of Duquesne Council, No. 394, Order United American Mechanics, of Duquesne; of Codorus Council, No. 135, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of York; of Blair Council, No. 15, Order of Independent Americans, of Juniata; of Washington Camp, No. 163, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Reading; and of Castle No. 1, Knights of Luther, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a commission to have charge of patents, trade-marks, and copyright laws, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented memorials of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of the Robert Emmet Society, of Wilmerding; of Commodore John Barry Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of Yorktown Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; and of Patrick Henry Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Clay Center, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Parsons Lodge, No. 293, International Association of Machinists, of Parsons, Kans., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Liberty, Watrous, Bentley, and Spring Butte, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of the Title Insurance & Trust Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the income-tax law to provide a method of information at the source in lieu of the present method of collection at the source, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHILTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wellsburg, Reedsville, Clarksburg, Morgantown, Petersburg, Martinsburg, and Terra Alta, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Ministers' Association of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the chaplain service in the Army and the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Morrison & Thompson Co., of Kokomo, Ind., remonstrating against the inspection of grain in interstate commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 73, Bartenders' League, of Elkhart, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Miles City, Mont., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Helena, Mont., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a Federal trade commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to make the maintenance of insane immigrants a national charge and to provide for the mandatory exclusion of mentally defective aliens, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Aurora, Hammond, and La Fayette, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented memorials of sundry citizens of Escanaba; of Local Union No. 476, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Saginaw; and of the Federation of Labor, of Saginaw, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of John Tucker Post, No. 199, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ortonville; of Colonel E. H. Liscum Post, No. 343, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sault Ste. Marie; of Sedgwick Corps, No. 187, Women's Relief Corps, of Evart; of Peter A. Weber Post, No. 237, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rockford; of James F. Covell Post, No. 354, Grand Army of the Republic, of Palo, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of International Molders' Local Union No. 298, of Waterbury, Conn., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Palo Alto, Cal., praying for the suspension for one year of the naval programs of the great powers, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods, of Oakland, Cal., and a memorial of Local Union No. 673, Bartenders' League, of San Bernardino, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POMERENE presented sundry memorials of citizens of Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Youngstown, Zanesville, Akron, Lima, Canton, Portsmouth, Sandusky, Norwalk, Lorain, Lancaster, Ripley, Fremont, Port Clinton, Wapakoneta, Lynchburg, Pomeroy, Alliance, Chillicothe, Nelsonville, Medina, Swanton, Minster, and Eaton, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, Matick, Framingham, and Marlboro, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the

District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of Major Howe Post 47, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, of Haverhill, Mass., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, Worcester, Cambridge, Malden, Winthrop, Winchendon, and Revere, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cambridge, Boston, Somerville, Medford, Chelsea, Brookline, Hingham, and Newton, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the wearing of uniforms by the Boys' Brigade of America similar to those worn in the United States Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented resolutions adopted by Local Union No. 914, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Augusta, Me., favoring an investigation into conditions existing in the mining district of Michigan, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMOOT presented memorials of Salt Lake Lodge, No. 83, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; of Local Union No. 721, Bartenders' League; and of Local Union No. 815, Culinary Alliance, all of Salt Lake City, in the State of Utah, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Carpenter, Wyo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 820, Bartenders' League, of Sheridan, Wyo., and the memorial of H. O. Emery, of Douglas, Wyo., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Louisville, Ky., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preamble and resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Louisville Board of Trade at a meeting held February 25, 1914:

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives is now considering a bill designed for the purpose of prohibiting and preventing monopolies and restrictions in interstate trade, and amending and defining the meaning of the existing antitrust law, and the committee is now giving hearings to those who may desire to submit their views on the subject, and the bill, when in shape to suit the views of the committee, will be presented to Congress for enactment into law.

This board of trade represents large business interests engaged in interstate trade which will be affected and which will have to conform to every requirement of the law when enacted.

The directors of this board believe the great mass of the business men of Louisville and of all sections of the country sincerely desire to conduct and carry on their business fairly and in conformity to the laws, and they fully realize that the growth of the country and of business has made necessary the adoption of Federal statutes regulating and controlling interstate trade. They believe the laws passed should be not only just, and so that business, both big and little, when fairly and honestly conducted may prosper, but that they should be plain and explicit and leave no doubt as to what business can do and what business can not do.

The directors of this board know from both observation and experience that the greatest drawback and hindrance to the satisfactory and successful conduct of business is the uncertainty as to the meaning of the law.

We are strong believers in the wisdom of the President in what he said on this subject in his address to Congress January 20, 1914. He then said:

"The business of the country awaits also, has long awaited, and has suffered because it could not obtain further and more explicit legislative definition of the policy and meaning of the existing antitrust law. Nothing hampers business like uncertainty. Nothing daunts or discourages it like the necessity to take chances, to run the risk of failing under the condemnation of the law before it can make sure just what the law is. Surely we are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible—at any rate, up to the limits of what experience has disclosed. These practices being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain."

In our judgment the legislation proposed in tentative bill No. 2, now being considered by the Judiciary Committee of the House, is far from meeting the suggestions and the well-considered opinions of the President as set out in his address of January 20, 1914, to the Congress. The bill as it is now before the committee does not "explicitly and item by item state in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty" what the law itself means and the penalty. We believe a number of the most important sections of the bill are plainly susceptible of more than one construction, and they are susceptible of constructions that, if so construed, would cause a great injustice to honorable business people and would prevent the practical and proper carrying on of business. For the reasons here set out be it

*Resolved*, That the directors of the Louisville Board of Trade hereby most earnestly protest against the passage by Congress of tentative bill No. 2, now being considered by the Judiciary Committee of the House, for the reason that it is indefinite and does not plainly state what business may do and what it may not do without violation of law, and because important provisions in said bill are plainly susceptible of different constructions, both by business men and by the courts, and for the further reason that the passage of the bill as it now is would result in greater confusion and uncertainty as to what business can do and what it can not do than exists at present, with the consequent loss to business and to the country.

*Resolved further*, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Kentucky be respectfully requested to vote against said bill as it now is and until it is so altered and amended as to conform in letter and in spirit to the views and recommendations of the President as expressed in his address to the Congress January 20, 1914.

Mr. BRADLEY. I have delivered to the Chief Clerk of the Senate 12,500 individual memorials from citizens of the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a memorial of the Progressive Mutual Aid Society, of Covington, Ky., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Star Council, No. 56, Daughters of America, of Covington, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. POMERENE, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 387) relating to bills of lading, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 309) thereon.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 604) for the relief of Sarah A. Clinton and Marie Steinberg, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 307) thereon.

## THE PACIFIC CREOSOTING CO.

Mr. LANE. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 690) for the relief of the Pacific Creosoting Co., to report it adversely, and I submit a report (No. 308) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What disposition does the Senator from Oregon desire shall be made of the report?

Mr. LANE. I ask for the regular procedure—for the adoption of the committee's report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, does the Senator from Oregon move the indefinite postponement of the bill?

Mr. LANE. No; I do not so understand it.

Mr. BRYAN. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. LANE. I do not know what the custom has been in such cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Oregon has made an adverse report on the bill?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon move the indefinite postponement of the bill?

Mr. JONES. I hope the Senator will not make that motion, but will allow the bill to go to the calendar until I have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. LANE. I ask for the present that the bill be allowed to go to the calendar, in order that the Senator from Washington may have an opportunity to investigate the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill, together with the adverse report, will be placed on the calendar.

## HEIRS OF SIM HARRISON, DECEASED.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 20, during my absence, Senate resolution No. 276, to pay six months' salary to the heirs at law of a certain deceased employee of the Senate, was passed, and an error was made in the names of two of the beneficiaries. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the resolution was passed, and I do so for the purpose of correcting the names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, on account of the disorder in the Senate Chamber, I did not hear the request of the Senator from Mississippi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Mississippi is for a reconsideration of the vote by which Senate resolution 276 was passed, upon the ground that there was a mistake in the names of the persons to whom the allowance contained therein was proposed to be made. If there is no objection, the vote whereby the resolution was passed will be reconsidered, and the resolution is now before the Senate for amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I propose the amendments to the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, it is proposed to strike out the name "Richardson" and to insert the name "Harrison"; and, in line 5, to strike out the name "Annie S. Harrison" and to insert the name "Annie H. Richardson," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, to James S. Harrison, of Hattiesburg, and Sallie G. Harrison and Annie H. Richardson, of Belzoni, Miss., children and heirs at law of Sim Harrison, late messenger, acting assistant doorkeeper, of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4674) granting to the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Wolf Point, Mont., lots 1, 2, and 3, in block 24, town site of Wolf Point, State of Montana, at the appraised valuation thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4675) granting a pension to Thomas Ranahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4676) granting a pension to J. J. Peate; and

A bill (S. 4677) granting a pension to James F. Hargett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4678) to carry into effect the findings of the military board of officers in the case of George Ivers, administrator; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4679) authorizing school district No. 1 in the city and county of Denver and State of Colorado to sell and convey block No. 143 in the east division of the city of Denver, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4680) granting a pension to Catherine J. Hills; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4681) to amend section 162 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### USE OF WATERS OF RIO GRANDE, COLO.

Mr. THOMAS. I introduce a joint resolution, and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) to determine the rights of the State of Colorado and of its citizens in the beneficial uses of waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries within the boundaries of Colorado, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) to determine the rights of the State of Colorado and of its citizens in the beneficial uses of waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries within the boundaries of Colorado.

Whereas the constitution of the State of Colorado provides that the water of every natural stream not theretofore appropriated is the property of the public dedicated to the use of the people of the State, and that the right to divert such waters to beneficial uses shall never be denied; and

Whereas this dedication and ownership was confirmed by the Federal Government when it admitted the State into the Union, on the 1st day of August, A. D. 1876; and

Whereas the Rio Grande and many of its tributaries have their sources in the mountains of that State, whose waters are needed and can be utilized for the reclamation of more than 1,250,000 acres of land within its boundaries, which without such waters must remain arid and unproductive; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on December 5, 1896, in disregard of this vested right and without notice to the State of Colorado, directed the Commissioner of the General Land Office to suspend action on any and all rights of way through public lands for purpose of irrigation by using the waters of the Rio Grande or any of its tributaries in the State of Colorado until further instructed by that department, which order has since been and is now in force, by reason whereof the citizens of the State have been unlawfully prohibited from appropriating said waters and applying them to beneficial uses, to the great and lasting injury of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas since said departmental order became effective many efforts to so appropriate portions of said waters by compliance with the requirements of the State and Federal statutes relating thereto have been made and defeated by the refusal of the Interior Department to approve and file the maps, plats, and description thereof; and

Whereas all efforts to secure the rescision of said order or a judicial determination of the rights of those directly interested in the use of said waters have been unavailing through inability to bring suit against the Federal authorities for such purpose without their consent: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That authority is hereby conferred upon the State of Colorado in its own right and name, or in the right and name of any citizen or citizens directly interested, or both, as it may be advised, to institute and prosecute such action at law or in equity against the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of the General Land Office, or both, as it may be advised is necessary or expedient to determine its right and the right of its citizens to appropriate and apply to beneficial uses the waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries within its geographical boundaries. Such action may be instituted in any district court of the United States, and any judgment or decree therein shall be subject to review by writ of error or appeal, as provided by law in other cases.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the close of the morning business on Monday, the 16th instant, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the joint resolution, and I should like to have it lie over until that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $200,000 for the construction and equipment of a storehouse at Benicia Arsenal, Cal., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (for Mr. LIPPITT) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 for the construction of a lighthouse and keeper's dwelling at Great Salt Pond, R. I., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment authorizing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to pay out of the Creek tribal funds now on deposit in the United States Treasury and in the national and State banks of Oklahoma a sum sufficient to equalize the allotments of all persons enrolled under the original Creek agreement approved March 1, 1901, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### CREEK EQUALIZATION FUND.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have a memorial from R. C. Allen, national attorney of the Creek Nation of Indians with regard to the Creek equalization fund, giving the data and reasons why it should be disposed of by the Senate. I think the memorial ought to be printed as a Senate document for the information of the Senate. I do not know whether or no the Senate has adopted a rule requiring such matters to be referred to the Committee on Printing. If so, I should like to ask a reference of the memorial to the Committee on Printing and to request a prompt report on it, because the Indian appropriation bill is now before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills and joint resolution were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.;

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.; and

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno* in the north Atlantic Ocean.

The following bill and joint resolution were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 12806. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant the use of the Fort McHenry Military Reservation, in the State of Maryland, to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, a municipal corporation of the State of Maryland, making certain

provisions in connection therewith, providing access to and from the site of the new immigration station heretofore set aside; and

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land, at or near Anniston, Ala., and 5,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Tullahoma, in the State of Tennessee, for the purpose of establishing maneuver camps, rifle and artillery ranges, etc.

H. R. 11751. An act authorizing the sale of certain land to the county of San Diego, State of California, for public watering purposes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 13091. An act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.

H. R. 9671. An act to appropriate $5,000 to erect a suitable monument on the battle grounds at the Horse Shoe, on the Tallapoosa River, in the State of Alabama, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make exhibits at Forest Products Expositions to be held in Chicago, Ill., and New York, N. Y., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I gave notice yesterday that I would ask to have taken up the grain-inspection bill during the morning hour to-day, and I now ask that that bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely desire to ask the Senator a question. I presume the Senator does not intend to press for a vote on the measure this morning?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very important bill, on which there will be a great deal of debate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I expect that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I presume that at this time, as well as at any other, the bill might be read. I ask for the reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall organize in the Bureau of Plant Industry of his department a section of grain inspection and grading, and shall, according to the rules of the civil service, appoint such experts and other employees as may be deemed by him necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That said Secretary shall also appoint, in accordance with the rules of the civil service, at each of the following cities, to wit, Portland, Me.; Boston; New York; Philadelphia; Baltimore; Chicago; Minneapolis; Duluth; Superior; Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis; New Orleans; Seattle; Tacoma; and San Francisco, and at such other important centers of interstate trade and commerce in grain as he may consider necessary or proper for carrying out the provisions of this act, one chief grain inspector and such assistants as may be required to inspect and grade grains as herein provided: *Provided, however*, That said Secretary may appoint a chief or deputy inspector at such important point of intrastate grain trade as shall furnish sufficient inspection service to fully pay the expenses of maintaining an inspection at such point, when the said Secretary is assured that the grain-trade interests at such point are desirous of securing Federal inspection; but in no case shall such inspector inspect or grade such intrastate grain, except upon request of the owner thereof or his agent.

SEC. 3. That said inspectors shall be paid a salary or compensation to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, which shall correspond as nearly as possible to salaries and compensations paid other officers or employees of the Government performing similar duties.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make all needful rules and regulations governing the inspection and grading herein provided for.

SEC. 5. That said Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and required, as soon as may be after the enactment hereof, to determine and fix, according to such standards as he may provide, such classifications and grading of wheat, flax, corn, rye, oats, barley, and other grains, as in his judgment the usages of trade may warrant and permit. In the inauguration of the work herein provided he may, if in his judgment the best interests of trade and commerce in said grains require it, adopt the standards of classification and grades now recognized by commercial usages or established by the laws of any State or by boards of trade or chambers of commerce, and may modify or change such classifications or grades from time to time as in his judgment shall be for the best interests of interstate and export grain trade.

SEC. 6. That when such standards are fixed and the classification and grades determined upon the same shall be made matter of permanent record in the Agricultural Department, and public notice thereof shall be given in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, and thereafter such classification and grades shall be known as the United States standard.

SEC. 7. That from and after 30 days after such classifications and grades have been determined upon and fixed, and duly placed on record as hereinafter provided, such classification and grading shall be taken and held to be the standard in all interstate commerce in grain.

SEC. 8. That it shall be the duty of any railroad company, steamship company, or other firm or corporation or private individual engaged in the transportation of grain destined to any State, Territory, or country other than that in which it is received for inspection, or received from any other State, Territory, or country than that to which it is consigned, to notify the chief grain inspector at the place of destination of any consignment of grain, within 24 hours after its arrival, that a shipment, cargo, or load of grain is in its, their, or his hands and the place of destination of said grain.

That it shall be unlawful for any person herein named to willfully unload or otherwise discharge any load, cargo, or consignment of grain which has been at any time during the period of its transit an article of interstate commerce and which has not been inspected in accordance with the provisions of this act until the same has been inspected as provided herein.

Upon the receipt of such notice the said chief inspector shall cause the said grain to be inspected and graded in accordance with the classification and standards fixed by said Secretary, and to issue and deliver a certificate of inspection showing such grade and classification in such form as may be provided by rules prescribed by said Secretary.

SEC. 9. That it shall be the duty of said inspectors to inspect and grade all grain which at the time of inspecting and grading of the same has been shipped from any other State, Territory, or country than the State, Territory, or country in which the same is inspected, or is intended for shipment into any other State, Territory, or foreign country before the same is unloaded from the car, vessel, or other vehicle in which the same was or is being transported, and to charge and collect from the owner thereof such fees for the inspection of said grain as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall have the power to fix the rate of charges for the inspection of grain and the manner in which the same shall be collected, and which charges shall be regulated in such manner as will, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, produce sufficient revenue only to meet the necessary expenses of the inspection service, said fees to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts in the same manner as for other miscellaneous receipts: *Provided, however*, That such inspector, upon request of the owner or agent of any grain at the point or place where an inspector may be located, whether or not the grain has entered into interstate commerce, shall inspect the same and deliver his certificate therefor in the same manner as other inspections are made and for the same charge; and whenever the owner of grain at such place shall request and furnish facilities therefor, said inspector shall also weigh such grain and deliver to the owner or his agent his certificate showing the gross and net weight of such grain, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 10. That no inspector or deputy inspector of grain shall, during his term of service, be interested, directly or indirectly, in the handling, storing, shipping, purchasing, or selling of grain, nor shall he be in the employment of any person or corporation interested in the handling, storing, shipping, purchasing, or selling of grain.

SEC. 11. That any person interested in any consignment of grain inspected under the provisions of this act may appeal from an inspection made by any assistant inspector to the chief inspector at the point where such grain is inspected, and from said chief inspector to the Secretary of Agriculture. Said Secretary shall make all needful rules and regulations to govern appeals

SEC. 12. That when any grain which having been inspected and certificate of inspection issued hereunder is mixed with any other grain not inspected or with grain which has been inspected and certified at a different grade, the same shall not be shipped out of the State where such mixing is done without being reinspected and graded; any such person or corporation shipping such grain as aforesaid without reinspection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

SEC. 13. That the shipment or consignment of any grain aforesaid from any of the places mentioned herein to another State or foreign country without the same being inspected and graded as herein provided is hereby prohibited; but where grain has been once inspected hereunder, and remains unmixed with other grain, the same need not be reinspected at the place from which it is exported: *Provided, however*, That said Secretary may in his discretion reinspect any cargo of such grain before the same is exported.

SEC. 14. That it shall be the duty of the inspectors and assistants to investigate the handling and weighing of grain inspected by them, and to make such report thereon as the said Secretary may require; and it shall be the duty of every person or corporation weighing such grain to allow inspection of such weighing and handling by said inspectors.

It shall also be the duty of the inspectors and assistants to inspect and grade "samples" of grain and seeds when received for inspection and grading at any of the places named herein, and the inspector shall make a report specifying the grade and transmit the same to the owner or sender of such sample of grain.

SEC. 15. That any person or corporation who willfully does any act prohibited herein or who willfully refuses or neglects to do or perform the things required of him under the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine in a sum not to exceed $5,000.

SEC. 16. That for salaries and for all other expenses in the city of Washington or elsewhere deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $850,000.

SEC. 17. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after the 1st day of January, 1914.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to amend, at the end of the bill, by striking out the word "fourteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "fifteen," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 17. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after the 1st day of January, 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there are two important propositions in this bill, and only two. I wish to direct this statement to those who have letters in their pockets or in their desks from members of boards of trade and exchange, that they may understand the scope and purpose of the proposed measure.

The first proposition is for uniformity of grade. If I raise on a farm in my own State two carloads of a certain class of

grain and send one to Minneapolis and another to Chicago, I will necessarily receive two different grades and certificates of quality from those two places. And as the price of the product is fixed entirely upon the certificate, I will necessarily receive two different prices for the same kind of grain, irrespective of the influence of the freight charges in its transportation.

There are practically eight different species of grain raised in the United States in different sections of the country. Each one of those eight different species has its grades, such as Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4. This bill does not attempt to make one common grade apply to all these species of grain in any way, but seeks only to make specific grades for the same species of wheat in whatsoever market it may enter. I assume, therefore, that no honest man—no honest dealer—can find any objection to a uniform system of grading as thus explained. That is the first proposition in this bill.

The second proposition is to secure an honest grade, a dependable grade, a grade that can not be manipulated, a grade that will be certified exactly the same when the grain goes out of an elevator as it was certified when it went into the elevator.

I ask those who have received these messages of opposition from those who are dealing in grain to ask themselves the single question, "Can any injury follow in the wake of legitimate business because of an honest certificate honestly placed upon a grade of grain?" That is all that is asked in this bill—uniformity of grades, honesty of grades.

No dealer can object to either of those two propositions unless he expects to get something out of lack of uniformity or out of lack of honesty of grade. He gets it out of the lack of uniformity to-day by reason of being able to juggle the grades and to make his contracts upon that basis. He gets it out of the producer and out of the ultimate consumer by being able to secure certificates upon the grain which do not truly record its character.

In other words, to-day he can take a certain amount of grain which he buys in at a certain grade and can regrade it out of his elevator at a different and a higher grade. That is possible under the present system. I want to make it impossible.

I wish I could speak on this subject to every Senator and could bring the hearings to the attention of every Senator here. If I could do that, after we had gone through those hearings I can not imagine that there would be a single Member of this body who would be opposed to legislating these two great fundamental elements into our grain trade. If my method of securing them is not in accordance with your views, and you believe in uniformity and believe in honesty of grade as the best method of securing the confidence of every purchaser, not only in the United States but elsewhere, then I invite you to meet me and attempt to secure the beneficent results that would follow from the establishment of these two great propositions.

Mr. President, I shall boil down as carefully as I can a few of the fundamental principles bearing upon this proposed legislation before I go into the details of the bill. Then I purpose to take up the provisions of the bill itself, and follow those provisions with the testimony taken before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and show beyond any possible question the absolute necessity of some legislation of this kind.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator aware of the fact, if it is a fact, that the Agricultural Department and the various grain shippers or buyers of the country have been working to evolve some plan to accomplish the purposes which the Senator has in mind?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am thoroughly acquainted with that fact.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I speak about this because the Senator invited Senators to join him, and I was wondering if that work had assumed such a form as to have resulted in a report of any kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. It has not. After I first introduced this bill some years ago, and there was violent opposition on the part of boards of trade and exchanges that were dealing in grain, the matter was taken up by the department. It has been favorably reported on by the Agricultural Department. We have appropriated money for investigations along this line. The Department of Agriculture has reported that the plan is perfectly feasible.

There has been more or less of an honest attempt on the part of the several exchanges to get together upon uniformity of grades. The trouble has been that even when they have passed a rule and have had it in operation a little while it has had no binding force, and some one of the exchanges has broken loose whenever the conditions have been such in the movement of grain and in the speculative market as to make it possible for them to make more money by abandoning the arrangement. After making three or four ineffectual attempts, some of them have given up in despair, and others upon our seaboard have refused from the beginning to assist in the proposal.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize the earnest effort of the Senator from North Dakota to enact into law such a provision. I knew that was done when I was a Member of the House and a bill came before the committee of which I was a member.

I wish to say that I have a good deal of sympathy for the objects which the Senator has in mind. I have, however, of late been receiving a number of letters in opposition to this bill, which I have not been able to answer—first, because I have not gone into it carefully, and, secondly, because it was not then under consideration. I received a letter, which I handed to the Senator yesterday, which is typical of the letters which I have been receiving.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has the Senator any objection to my introducing that letter in order that he may answer it if he sees fit?

Mr. McCUMBER. Inasmuch as I shall be rather set in my address, I would rather proceed now for a little while and have the letter come in later, when I will discuss it. It will then be made a part of my own remarks on that subject.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I answer the Senator now by merely saying that the opposition has been based upon the assumption, first, that it would be impossible to obtain uniformity. Now, that is not true. There is no reason upon the face of the earth why Scotch fife, we will say, pure Scotch fife, raised in any State and sent to Minneapolis, should not grade and be called the same as it would be if it were sent to Chicago.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Many of those who have opposed this measure have had the idea that we want to obliterate the distinction between species of grain. There is nothing of that kind in the bill. On the contrary, by the provisions of the bill itself we should take our present commercial grades in every one of the centers, so that there will be no hiatus while the Secretary of Agriculture is establishing a uniform set of grades. In other words, the changes will be gradual and made as rapidly as prudence and full investigation would allow.

I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator if he has any information on the investigation made in the Department of Agriculture upon the grading of corn? For instance, that investigation, I believe, has been pursued at greater length and in more detail than any other of the seven or eight great Northwestern grains. I ask the Senator if the Department of Agriculture is not ready to report on a uniformity of grade for corn throughout the United States not later than the 1st day of July, 1914, and if grades for other grains, such as oats, wheat, flax, barley, rye, and the like, are not in course of investigation, so that ultimately there will be, as the result of it, by consent of the producers, the handlers, and the exchanges, a uniformity of grades?

Mr. McCUMBER. There would be no difficulty whatever in the Agricultural Department finding a uniform system of grades for corn. They have now no method of enforcing such system. I simply desire to answer the Senator now with the statement, first, that at present there is no method of enforcing it in any way, and, secondly, there can be no agreement as between the different sections of the country upon their grades. There is no reason why you can not have a uniformity of grade of every kind of corn as well as of wheat. But, remember, we are grading corn now. It is all sold by grades. If it is all sold by grades now, it can be sold by the same grades under Federal inspection. Each market now has its particular grades, and there is no reason why the same weight, the same dryness, the same characteristics that would give the corn a certain grade in Duluth should not give it exactly the same grade in Chicago and Baltimore. There could be no possibility of any ineffectual attempt to do that.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will permit me, Mr. President, the inquiry I was making is whether this investigation has not now produced that degree of information on which the Secretary of Agriculture or the department is prepared for uniformity in grades of corn, but is not prepared on other grains? This uniformity of grade made on investigation will extend over a period of something like seven years. When that definite information is had it is the basis for correct legislation. A bill is in process of being framed by the grain exchanges, by boards of trades, by farmers who are producers, and by elevator men in the country which will be a just bill and will not involve any radical losses in the State inspection, which prevails at all

points where there are not only primary markets but primary producers. I understand that the investigation has now reached the stage where legislation can be based upon ascertained conditions.

I quite agree with the Senator that some legislation will be necessary to establish a grade that will be uniform and will be obligatory at the same time. I will not engage in any controversy on that, but only say let this ascertained information be the basis of the legislation. The Department of Agriculture is not now ready to promulgate uniformity of grades because of the lack of knowledge. Of that I have information which I regard as trustworthy.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Secretary of Agriculture, after seven years of investigation by the department, can not arrive at a system of uniform grading, it is quite evident to me that he has given very little consideration to the subject.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. Is there any communication from the Department of Agriculture regarding this bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. A late communication?

Mr. ROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Nothing very recent, but we have had information. First, we had a recommendation of the bill a few years ago, and, second, at the last hearing, a member of the Agriculture Department appeared and testified before the Committee on Agriculture. He stated that Federal inspection was feasible and that the department could carry out its provisions.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask one other question, because really I want information?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. I have received a number of letters on this subject, some for and some against, most of them against the bill. I observe one statement in a letter from the Corn Exchange of Buffalo:

> The Department of Agriculture has already published standardized grades of corn effective July 1, 1914, and soon thereafter standards of all other grains will follow. In this regard practically a unanimous vote of approval has been rendered by the grain trade.

That carried to my mind the idea that the Department of Agriculture is proceeding in a practical way toward a remedy of the evils the Senator has referred to.

Mr. McCUMBER. How will the Department of Agriculture enforce those grades upon Buffalo, New York, Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, or any other place?

Mr. ROOT. May it not be that it would be unnecessary that the grade should be enforced, but that the grade may be accepted? The course of business will enforce a grade that is accepted and is made the basis of reference in the contracts through which the business is carried on.

Mr. McCUMBER. All right, Mr. President, I will meet the Senator right there. If the boards of trade are willing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall fix this standard and if they are willing to enforce it, what objection have they that the power to fix the grade shall also enforce it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, that is a very pertinent inquiry and I should like to inject there, with the permission of the Senator, the answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Wherever there is a primary grain market, as at St. Louis, Chicago, or Minneapolis, there exists already an inspection under the binding obligations of State laws. If it be said that these inspections are useless, either because of the inefficiency of the service or their dishonesty, then it is a wholesale indictment of every State in the Union that contains a primary grain market. I am not prepared to accept the truth of that charge. In the warehousing and inspection of grains in Chicago I believe there is an honest inspection. There are controversies——

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator wants an answer, I will answer him right now. I do not believe there is an honest inspection, and before I get through with my discussion I will show to the Senate that there is not an honest and reliable inspection there. There has never been an inspection agreeable either to producer or miller, and to-day your millers dare not buy your Chicago wheat on your inspection certificates, they so write to me, but they must send their private inspector to inspect every carload that they purchase for milling purposes.

If the Senator simply wants to make a defense of the Chicago Board of Trade, I would invite him to wait until at least I have preferred my charge. Then I will take issue with him. I will take my evidence from those who are members of that board and who have done business as such. I am not challenging at present the honesty of any of these boards or their good intentions, but I will show that there are gross abuses under the methods adopted in your city.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will not undertake to answer the inquiry the Senator propounded, because I take it he propounded it in order that he might answer it himself.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not propound it that I might answer it myself, neither did I propound it for a speech in my time, but for a real direct answer.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was——

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator wants to answer it, let him answer it. If his answer is that the Chicago Board of Trade is very honest and conscientious, that is no answer, and I will not accept it as such. That is merely a conclusion.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was purely on a fishing expedition to find out whether the Senator intended to answer his own query or permit me to do it. If he wanted me to do it, I did not want to pass it unchallenged.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will bring the Senator to the fishing grounds before I have finished.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is the same old controversy that has been had from time immemorial with the Chicago Board of Trade. Certain men and elements of the Northwest have been for 20 years entirely familiar with the controversy that exists. I do not challenge the honesty of those who insist that the grades are not properly made or are not trustworthy. I challenge the correctness of their information. I will wait until the proper time to be heard and then I wish to be heard at length.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will be heard. He will get the charges before I get through so that he can answer them specifically; but there is no use fishing now, at least, until we get to the water. Then I will give the Senator just as lively fishing as he desires.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator yield for an inquiry or two?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am seeking merely information and I am not designing to get into a controversy. I should like to know whether the Senator intends or contemplates that the system of grain inspection by the Federal Government shall supersede the grain inspection system now in force.

Mr. McCUMBER. Naturally.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is to supersede the State and the exchange inspections that are now in existence?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are not to operate together?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know whether the Senator has made any estimate of the amount of machinery which will be necessary to accomplish this object?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state about how many inspectors and what amount of machinery would be required?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think in the neighborhood of 500 inspectors would be required.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to make another inquiry on that point.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, I will answer one at a time.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator can answer both at once and save time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; if the Senator specially desires.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know how much it will cost to make a double inspection or derange the machinery of the existing inspection of some three or four of the largest States in the Union that now maintain an inspection service?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and every one of them has been thought out and worked out by the Department of Agriculture. I have the figures. If the Senator will read the hearings, possibly he will find the cost without asking me to go back and depend entirely on my memory in quoting them. I will say now there will be no double inspection.

Let us start out with the proposition that in the Federal inspection provided by the bill we will take the same force that we have at work now, with no changes at all. We will take the same inspection system to start with that we have now. There will be no hiatus; so that there will be no disarrangement of business. We can gradually make the changes to conform with the uniformity of grades. We will charge the same prices that are charged to-day for inspection at all the grain terminals, for, mark you, the farmer pays for all this inspection. It will not cost the Government one cent. The farmer at the present time pays the inspection at all the points, so much a carload, or it is charged back to him in his account with the commission man. There will be no change whatever in this respect. The charge for grading ranges from 35 cents a car to 75 cents a car. If we would make the charge 40 cents a car, or thereabout,

that 40 cents would more than pay the entire expense of carrying on the system.

Mr. President, I will read some of the testimony from some of the members of the Board of Trade of Chicago and other places before I get through, but I will undoubtedly not have time to do that this morning. At present I desire to declare some general principles and make an explanation of this bill and its necessity. Then I purpose to go into the details, and I will hold myself responsible to answer any legitimate criticism of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Following out my other inquiry, I should like to inquire what would then become of the various inspection systems which have been put into effect by the States of the Union in accordance with laws which they have enacted?

Mr. McCUMBER. They would all be very glad to have the Government do that work for them; and I am positive there would be no State inspections of grain any more than there are State inspections of meat. When we adopted a national system of meat inspection it did away with all other inspections. To-day the Government is inspecting interstate and intrastate meats, no matter where they are to go, and the meat concerns are very glad to have the Government certificate as to the character and quality of meat. When you introduce this system, you will not be able to get people, in my opinion, who would buy under any other system. They would all demand Federal inspection certificates because of their confidence in them, and if grading was done at other points than at terminals mentioned in the bill or fixed by the department, the Federal inspection rules would, without question, be adopted.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator estimates that 500 grain inspectors or other employees would be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. The same number we now have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was going to ask the Senator, Will 500 cover all the inspectors now employed by the various States?

Mr. McCUMBER. It will.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And also those employed at present by the various stock exchanges and otherwise in the inspection of grain all over the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes. The figures I present are those furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture some years ago. You might have to add to them a little now, but that would be no material difference. If more inspectors are needed, it will be because there is more grain, and because there is more grain there will be greater returns from the inspection. There are probably over 2,000,000 carloads of grain inspected each year.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator figures that this would be no expense to the Federal Government, because the charges for the inspection would cover all the expense of maintaining the system?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly, just exactly as there is no expense now to the exchanges, because the charges made for inspection by the exchanges cover their expenses.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. So the real change would be depriving the States, either with their consent or without their consent, of this function and depriving the grain exchanges of this privilege, which they now exercise, and adding it to the powers of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCUMBER. It would be Federal inspection not only for interstate grain between the States, but for grain for the export trade, which is a very important feature, as I will show.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was not able to hear the question propounded to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and possibly he covered the same ground; but I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether the same purpose could be attained by requiring the various inspectors of grain now in existence to conform to standards imposed by the Agricultural Department in order that the grain might be shipped in interstate traffic?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the first proposition in this bill—uniformity of grades.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Might not that be accomplished in that way without involving the transfer to the Federal Government of the employment of grain inspectors? It would simply be requiring the inspectors, whether of the State or of the local exchanges, to conform to the standards imposed by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand the question of the Senator; I understand the circular letters that have been sent out advising that instead of having national inspection we should have national supervision. The same boards just as ardently, and with a great deal more ferocity than now indicated, were opposed to national interference in any way, shape, or form only a few years ago. After I introduced this bill they had several of their national meetings, in which it was pressed by some of their members that unless they found some way under their present unsatisfactory method of dealing, or, as one of their members put it, unless they stopped being dishonest—because that is really what he meant—and did business in an honest manner Federal inspection was sure to come. So gradually they are approaching toward the idea of Federal inspection; but still the people who oppose this measure want to have some grip whereby they can carry on the present manipulations in the different grades. I can assert boldly that no honest dealer can complain that we have uniformity of grades; that no honest dealer can complain that the grades should be made certain, so that every purchaser will have confidence that the certificate truly represents the character of the grain. If the Senator from Nebraska would read over the methods by which the grain trade is manipulated to the advantage of those engaged in it and to the disadvantage of the miller and the buyer, and also to the disadvantage of the producer, he would then understand why these people do not wish to let their grip loosen upon the system under which they could continue to carry on the same character of manipulations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not know that the Senator from North Dakota fully understands my question. I want to say to him that I am approaching his bill with an open mind.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am certain of that, Mr. President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I want to ask him plainly the question, whether Government supervision of all grain permitted to go into interstate traffic could be made strong enough to accomplish the objects which he seeks?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; it could not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state why?

Mr. McCUMBER. I was just about to answer why.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Government imposed a standard and the inspectors failed to conform to the standard, and the Government then prohibited the shipment of the grain, why would not that be an effective restriction?

Mr. McCUMBER. It could be so done, Mr. President, if there were just as many Government agents as there were inspectors and persons engaged in the trade; in other words, if the Government employed one man to watch constantly the one man who was doing the work. The Government can just as well employ the inspector to do the work as to employ somebody else to see that the inspector makes his inspections correctly.

Again, the Government officials would be under civil service; they would owe no allegiance to any appointive power; they would have no interest in making wrong certificates; nor would the Government, which appointed them, unlike the dealer, be an interested party. When I deal with the testimony Senators will understand this better than many of them understand it at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Upon what does the Senator base his statement that these inspectors would be under the civil-service system?

Mr. McCUMBER. The bill so provides.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know it does; but there is no surety that the bill will be signed in that form. All the other bills which have created officials this year have exposed them to the spoils system. I do not know that we can have any assurance of the correctness of that statement. I think it is rather a reckless statement in view of what we have been passing through.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, Mr. President, if the bill passes in its present form, of course the employees will be under the civil-service regulations. I can not say to-day in what form the bill may pass. I can not answer that question until the Senate has given us an opportunity to discuss it and there is a vote taken upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator means to say that the provisions of this bill only contemplate that the employment be brought under the existing civil-service law, that necessarily means that the existing administration of those laws will be operative.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, I can not accuse the administration of entirely abandoning the civil-service rules and refusing to put them into operation. I think the President—I think the administration, upon the whole—is trying to carry out the

spirit and the policy of the civil-service law. There may be those in the departments who are attempting to evade them, but I must assume that the civil-service laws as a whole will not be overthrown.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not question the effort of the Chief Magistrate to do so, but it is the hiatus between the effort and the effect with which I am concerned. I want to make the further inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator from Illinois. Did he say that he did not question the Chief Magistrate's attitude on that question?

Mr. SHERMAN. His effort.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There have been more people put into the civil service by suspending the law during the last year than during any four years preceding since the civil-service law was enacted. It has been done recklessly and indifferently. I am not a civil-service advocate, particularly; I never have been; and it would have been much more appropriate if I had taken the course that seems to have been the recognized policy of the administration than that one who was committed absolutely to the merits of the civil-service system should do it. There never has been such disregard of the system.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am giving the Chief Executive the benefit of the doubt for the purposes of this inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the trouble; everybody gives him the benefit of the doubt. By and by that is all we will have—doubt.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to increasing the doubt as much as possible.

With the Senator's permission, I will proceed with the inquiry I was undertaking to make.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield to the Senator from New York in a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. In order to clear the way so that we may intelligently discuss this matter later on, I wish to inquire if the contemplation of this bill is an entire absorption of both the supervision and inspection now exercised by the several States of the Union?

Mr. McCUMBER. The idea is that all the inspection at the great terminal points shall be carried on by the Government; that the Government will do the weighing; that the Government will do the inspecting; and that the Government will fix the standards of grades. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. As I commenced, Mr. President, a question to the Senator from North Dakota, I should like to complete it by asking the Senator if in his further remarks upon this bill he will meet—and I have no doubt he will endeavor to meet it—this statement, which follows what I have heretofore read from the letter of the Buffalo Corn Exchange? This is the statement in the letter from the exchange:

> The grain trade, embodying practically all sectional, State, and National grain associations, farmers' associations, farmers' granges, and grain exchanges, as well as the individual grain interests of the United States, are agreed that Federal supervision of the standardized grain grades will result in a thorough and efficient uniformity of application.
>
> The grain interests of the Buffalo market approve of the plan of the Government in its determination to supervise the inspection of grain on standards determined by the Government. We submit that the physical inspection of grain should be operated under the present modus operandi, and that the correctness of the grades of grain determined upon Government standards should be subject to the supervision of the Government. We believe the attitude of the Government, through the Department of Agriculture, is correct in adhering to the policy of supervision rather than Government inspection, thereby placing all responsibility for correct grading of the grain upon others and reserving to the Government the right of criticism and determining whether such inspection has been properly done.

That points to the question, in my mind, regarding this measure, whether the system, which, apparently, is the system approved by our Department of Agriculture, of supervising the inspection and grading of grains is not the wise, and would not be the effective, system, instead of wiping out all the present practice and substituting for it a great Government machine under the bill of the Senator from North Dakota. That seems to me to be the clear line of distinction.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator, I am sure, is too good a lawyer to fail to see a very patent weakness in the assertion that is made in this letter.

> The grain interests of the Buffalo market approve of the plan of the Government in its determination to supervise the inspection of grain on standards determined by the Government.

They were just as bitterly opposed to that a few years ago and made their objections just as firmly against it as they do now against the other feature.

> We submit that the physical inspection of grain should be operated under the present modus operandi, and that the correctness of the grades of grain determined upon Government standards should be subject to the supervision of the Government.

Why, Mr. President, should the physical inspection of grain be operated under the present modus operandi? What reason is given in the communication for insisting that the physical inspection shall be done by the same agency that is doing it to-day, but that a Government inspector must stand by to see that the present agency does it right? If the Government is to superintend, what reason can you urge against the Government doing the thing which it superintends? Why is it necessary to have two men do the same thing? It is apparent to every one who understands the grain trade and the methods of operation why these men fear the Government doing the physical work. It will be done right, and the grain will be graded the same when it comes in as it is when it goes out. They can not influence the Government officials. They know that Government inspection carried to the extent of having the Government itself oversee every man who is doing the inspecting is an impossibility without doubling the corps of men. There is no straight, honest reason upon the face of the earth, if the Government employs an inspector who must be proficient, who must know how to inspect, how to weigh, and know when a grade is wrong and when it is right, why it can not itself do the same work that some one else is doing. But there is a valid reason why any man who wishes to manipulate a grade when an inspector is not there should have a man under him who will do the manipulation for him.

I say there is not a single reason on the face of the earth why they should make a division between the physical inspection and the physical presence of the individual who is to control the inspection.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I think I can see a difference between Federal supervision and Federal inspection. A Federal supervision simply would mean that the Federal Government would see that the grain was inspected according to the rules of a certain board of trade or according to the rules of a State, whereas Federal inspection, an inspection made by Federal inspectors, would mean uniformity. It would mean, first, the standardization of all sorts of grain, and then would follow a uniform inspection.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Would not efficient supervision itself involve seeing the grain inspected and graded?

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, certainly. You could not have supervision in any other way.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, this argument would destroy all supervision. It is not true that there can not be effective supervision without having the supervisor do the work over again. All the history of administration of government shows the contrary. Effective supervision is the most potent agency to secure good administration.

The proposal which the Department of Agriculture appears to favor, according to these statements, is that through Government supervision of inspection, based upon Government standards, this business shall be regulated, without undertaking to substitute the Government of the United States for the governments of all the States and all the private enterprises and associations in the conduct of this business.

It may be that the Department of Agriculture is wrong. It may be that the natural way of regulating commerce, which is by supervision, will not be effective. It may be that it is necessary that the Government of the United States here, as in a hundred other directions, shall step in and push aside all State government and all private enterprise and do the business itself; but the burden of proof is on those who undertake to establish the necessity for any such substitution of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. The same plea that is made by the Senator from New York was made by every one of our great meat packers against Federal inspection of meat—that it was interfering with States' rights; that it was interfering with the rights of individuals in carrying on their business; but notwithstanding their objections, we did provide for Federal inspection of our meats in interstate commerce and in the commerce of the world, and it gave to our meats a value and standing that increased our market threefold in the foreign countries of the world. It met every objection that had been made against our meats. That interference by the Government in those private affairs has been a mighty blessing, not only to the people them-

selves, not only to every purchaser and seller of meat, but to the great commerce of the world; and the meat packers who so ardently opposed it are to-day strongly in favor of it. Not one of them is now opposed to it.

The difference between this case and that, however, is that the meat dealers, the great packing houses, are able to filch out of the Government several million dollars a year by making the Government pay for the inspection, while the farmer will be mighty well satisfied to pay for it himself, out of his own pocket, if you will give him the opportunity to have the Government do for his grain just exactly what the Government is doing for the meat packers' meat. He has a right to demand the same thing. The Senator would not favor the repeal of the meat-inspection law.

Mr. ROOT. Certainly not, Mr. President; but it is no argument at all, it does not approach the character of an argument, to say that inspection by the Government of the United States as to the quality and healthfulness of meat is a reason why the Government of the United States shall take the place of State governments and individual enterprise in every field of activity in which some single interest or any number of interests may think they could find benefit through its doing so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Federal Government has authority over interstate commerce. Having that authority over interstate commerce, it fixes the rates that are to be charged for carrying grain from one State to another. It says that those rates shall be reasonable and fair. That is done in the interest of producer and consumer. On the same principle that the Federal Government fixes the rates, so that we may receive fair compensation for our product, it has authority to govern the method under which we deal in that product, so that we may not be defrauded of a single grade in our grain. It is just as important that I shall not be defrauded out of the honest grade to which my grain is entitled as that I shall not be defrauded in buying a barrel of pork through a false certification of its character or purity. The only difference in the world is that one is the meat packers' meat and the other is the farmers' grain.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I question the right of the Senator from North Dakota to attack the inspection under which all the corn and oats of my State, for instance, is produced. I represent just as many producers as the Senator from North Dakota does, and I question his right to criticize the system of inspection under which all the corn and oats produced in Illinois is now inspected and sold in a primary market.

The Senator attacks that inspection, and impliedly says that it is dishonest. I reply to that that the producers in Illinois are satisfied with that inspection, and that they have been for many years selling their product in the largest primary market of the Northwest without complaint from those same producers; and they are equal in number and in valuation of their product on the market to the constituency the Senator from North Dakota represents.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before I get through with this argument I will have read the resolutions of the Senator's own constituents, the farmers' cooperative organizations, vehemently condemning that very system.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am entirely familiar with them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, if the Senator is entirely familiar with them, he has no right to say that the producers in his State are thoroughly satisfied with the methods under which their grain is graded and sold.

I will meet all of these challenges one after the other. I have studied this subject for some time, and I think I am fairly well acquainted with every feature of it. And I know there is very serious and widespread dissatisfaction on the part of the farmers and independent grain dealers of his State with the Chicago and other State and board systems of grading.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator from North Dakota say that it is the duty of the Government to place an inspector at every furnace that makes pig iron, and every mine that mines coal, and every factory that makes shoes, and go through all the list with the purpose in view of causing a standard to be maintained, and requiring everything that is manufactured and sold to come up to the standard that they claim to be their standard when they put their goods on the market? If not, why not? Why should not that be done all along the line?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will answer the Senator right now. I have had the same argument put up to me before, and I am ready to answer any such suggestions that the Senator makes. If the man making shoes in his particular section wants State inspection, if it is necessary, he can have it under his State laws; but because inspection may not be necessary in producing a yard of calico or silk or a pair of shoes or a pig of iron is no reason why we should not have Federal inspection in great commodities sold under a certificate of inspection in the trade, and where the present system of certification has proven unworthy and unreliable. Let me say to the Senator, however, that 90 per cent of the wheat raised in the State represented by the Senator from Nebraska is not sold in Nebraska. It must have its market entirely out of the jurisdiction of that State. Ninety-five per cent of the wheat grown in my State is sold outside of the State. That is true of every great agricultural State in the Union. It is sold upon a grade. Its value in the terminal market, or in the markets of the world, in the great consuming centers of the world, depends upon that grade. The man who produces the wheat in Nebraska, or North Dakota, or Iowa, or Kansas has not the slightest thing to say as to how the grade shall be made when made out of his State.

He has no voice in it. He has no representative on his part. He must depend entirely upon the good will of a little clique of wheat buyers in Chicago or in Duluth or in Buffalo, who handle his grain, who fix the grades, and who determine the method of handling. If that system is unjust, he has no method of remedying it. If, however, the Federal Government has control over that subject, then, under his American citizenship, he has his representatives in the Congress of the United States. He will have a forum in which his complaints can be heard.

Why, every little town in the Senator's own State has public scales on which the farmer who comes in with his load of hay or oats or whatever it may be can have it weighed, and the man purchasing the load of hay or other product purchases it according to the certificate that is issued by the independent weigher. The party purchasing would not be satisfied if the farmer should say, "I weighed that hay at home, and it weighs so much." He would say, "I can not take your weight, because you are interested in it." The man in the city who buys our wheat, however, says to us, "You shall not see us inspect. You shall not have anything to do with our inspection. You shall not have your voice heard in the matter of the method under which the grades are made. We will weigh it and sell it and give you what we think is right. We will fix the dockage and deduct whatever we think is proper."

The Senator would agree that that is wrong; he would not submit to it in the case of a load of hay; and yet when we are disposing of 700,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and much more of other cereals he says that that system is all right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota further yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My experience in business is that nearly everything that is manufactured in this country is sold on grades, or something to take the place of grades. Sawmills doing a large business in a State and sending their products all over this country and Europe make their inspections and have their grades. It is supposed that the customer buys on those grades, and the merchant or manufacturer sells on those grades.

I do not know of anything that is manufactured in this country and goes into interstate commerce that does not go in on grades of some kind. Coal, pig iron, shoes, and every other article, so far as I have any knowledge, are sold by the manufacturer or producer on grades. All the States have inspection laws.

The Senator from North Dakota makes reference to Alabama. We have our inspection laws. We have our coal mines inspected; or we have the product inspected when it goes on the scales, when it is weighed for shipment into interstate commerce. The pig iron is all graded at the furnace. It is sold on grade. The inspector grades it. The merchant who buys it does so on that grade. Our laws require it. I can not understand, therefore, why there should be an exception in the case of wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is the Senator ready for an answer? I have only two minutes to make it in. Will the Senator give me an opportunity to answer his question in the next two minutes, before 2 o'clock?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will answer just in this way: You had your State inspections and your board-of-trade inspections of cotton. You had some 15 or 20 different kinds of grades. Your farmers were defrauded by reason of the ma-

nipulation in your many grades. To-day you have a Federal standardization. The grades have been reduced to four primary grades, if I remember rightly, and that has been the greatest blessing that has happened to the cotton-growing States of the Union for 25 years. Under a Government standard, reducing the many discordant kinds of grades that allowed the purchaser to manipulate them, you are or will be greatly benefited.

Now, Mr. President, we are reaching——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in the minute remaining, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that his suggestion that the cotton grower, the man who makes and sells cotton, is vastly benefited by the Government standardization is entirely a mistake. The Senator from North Dakota has not had much experience with cotton raising and cotton selling. The man who raises cotton and puts it on the market and sells it as a producer is not affected at all by the Government standardization. The Government standardization may be invoked when the cotton goes on the wholesale market somewhere in New York or New Orleans or in other places, but the man who raises 5 or 10 bales of cotton on his farm and hauls it to town and sells it from his wagon does not know any more about standardization than the Senator from North Dakota does—not a bit. It is never invoked. The merchant goes out and takes his knife and samples the cotton and says, "I will give you so much for this cotton," without reference to the Government standardization. Of course if it is of a very low grade anybody can see it, and the price is different from the price of a high grade.

Mr. McCUMBER. Without yielding further, I will have to disagree with the Senator from Alabama. I wish to say now, before 2 o'clock, that I shall wish to proceed with my real address on this measure as soon as we dispose of the unfinished business, and if we do not dispose of it to-day I will proceed in the morning after the close of the morning business.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate joint resolution No. 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it might be urged, in passing upon the question as to whether the two Houses of Congress should permit a constitutional amendment to be submitted for ratification by the requisite number of States, that the merits of the subject itself do not enter into the question whether or not the people should be allowed to vote upon it. But I realize that it is impossible to discuss the question of submitting a constitutional amendment without involving more or less a discussion of the real question to be submitted to the voters for their consideration, and therefore this morning I propose to submit some remarks upon the joint resolution from the viewpoint of the merit of the ultimate question itself.

The men who framed our Constitution were so fearful of the powers of the Nation that they finally took out of the draft of the proposed Constitution the word "nation" wherever it occurred; but they did leave in the body of the Constitution one of the elements of a proposed national existence, and that was that all the people of this country should have the right, so far as the organic law of the land is concerned, to pass upon amendments to that law, with one single exception, and that was with reference to the number of Senators which each State should have.

So the argument that this proposed amendment, if it should pass, might not meet the approval of any section of the Union, has no more force than if there were no State lines known to the Nation. The objection that a condition may be imposed by the constitutional amendment against the opposition of any portion of the Union has no more foundation in the spirit and theory of our Government than if it were proposed to pass a law for a State or to change a State constitution and it should be urged that some section of that State was almost solidly opposed to the proposed change.

Mr. President, I think that everyone will agree with me that human progress has developed just in proportion as activities and the right to participate in activities have developed with the rank and file of the people. In other words, democracy in its broader significance is synonymous with the term "human progress." If that be true—and I do not think anyone can gainsay it—then the final triumph of democracy must depend upon the final extension to its ultimate of the participation and the right of participation of all in the activities of government.

I think it will be agreed or conceded that taking humanity at any point in history according to the then standard of civilization an overwhelming majority have been in favor of the right and only a small minority in favor of the wrong. Yet, despite this condition, that numerically small minority has ever been able to retard the growth and development of progress as indicated by the attitude, the purposes, and activities of the many.

It would be interesting, if we had time, to consider the forces, the processes, and the instrumentalities with which at all times a small minority have been able to retard human progress; but it is so self-evident that it requires no discussion. Desirable, agreeable as liberty is, and appealing, as liberty always has, to mankind, nevertheless at every point, until the establishment of our Government, a small minority was able not only to retard its progress, but to cause the great, overwhelming majority of mankind in sympathy with the cause of progress to almost literally wade through seas of blood to establish free government.

My purpose in making this illustration is to show that in proportion as we can enlarge and broaden the activities of humanity we attain nearer and nearer to the final goal of democracy, which, by the way, we are still far from having attained. At every step there has been an element of humanity, good in itself, bearing all the attributes of respectability, that has ever stood in the way of this progress. Of all the causes, forces, and instrumentalities which the wrong, considered as an impersonal spirit, has been able to invoke against human progress there has been none so potent as the respectability of a small class of people who have ever stood in the way of progress, and behind whose respectability were the sinister forces, whatever they were, that were opposed to that particular step in progress and served as a shield to them in their struggle against progress itself.

The present situation is no exception to that rule. The effort to extend the suffrage to man was met at every step by the false cry of alarm raised by those who stood as the exponents of respectability itself, that it would not do to enlarge the suffrage. When this Government was founded, men who in their own character were the very type of the highest patriotism, men who had sacrificed upon the field of battle for free government, viewed with alarm the extension of the suffrage to the people generally, and they undertook to safeguard against that false alarm by preventing the American people from voting for President or for Senators, believing in their blindness that it was safer for the institutions of this country that the election of President and Senators should be filtered through a representative body first selected by the electorate itself, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that they were founding a government based upon the principle of free government, a government by the people, founding a government which was the outgrowth of a struggle of ages, that had proved at every step in that struggle that liberty expanded just in proportion as democracy expanded in the struggle between right and wrong.

I shall speak a little more of those two particular phases later in my remarks. If my analysis of democracy is correct, if it is true that the welfare of a people, if it is true that the cause of human liberty has depended upon the broader extension and expansion of human activity, then it follows as a fundamental principle that in free government, when it is proposed to extend or limit suffrage, the burden is upon those who are the advocates of free government to show that the persons of whom the inquiry is addressed ought not to be clothed with the power rather than to show or attempt to show that they should be clothed with the power. All human history throws upon those who would stand against the extension of suffrage the burden of showing that that extension is hostile to the best interests of those who compose the Government, where the proposition to extend the suffrage is made rather than the burden being upon those who, through the extension of suffrage, seek to participate in government itself.

This is so true that, as applied to male suffrage, every exception to the right where the right is withheld is based upon some natural, clearly defined law or rule. As the child, in the first instance, becomes by nature the ward of the parent, so the parent exercises the function of declaring at what age the child shall reach the point where it can join the ranks of those who hold the ballot in their hands. There are the insane and those who lose their reason and those who by their own criminal acts forfeit their right to participate. No man in the length and breadth of this land to-day would attempt to justify the exclusion of the suffrage from males except he could give some good reason not why they should be allowed to vote, but why they should not be allowed to vote. I do not believe that that point can be too much emphasized.

I say again, at the risk of repetition, that when the question arises as to the extension of suffrage, in the light of the history of

human progress, the burden is upon those who refuse the right rather than upon those who would seek to secure the right.

One phase of this discussion has come into the Senate here, and I propose to refer to it briefly. In the first place, in passing, let me say that the objections which have been suggested here to women having the right to vote would be amusing if it were not the subject itself that is so serious. On the one hand, it is urged that she ought not to have the right because she will vote with her husband, and consequently you will gain nothing. On the other hand, it is urged that she ought not to have the right because she will not agree with her husband politically, and consequently you have engendered domestic broils and difficulties.

The fact that two brothers growing up under the same roof and under the political teachings of the same father are inclined to belong to the same political party would never be urged as a reason why the right of suffrage should not be vested in both those brothers. The fact that those brothers might disagree no man would urge as a reason, on the other hand, why they should not each have the right of suffrage.

Free government is based upon the fundamental principle that no matter how kind, altruistic, and generous I may be, if you are going with me into the association which we call government, the only way in which you can be absolutely sure of your rights, your benefits, moral and material, which may flow from that association, is to be vested with the same power of participation and voice in the policies of that association that I am vested with. That is the fundamental difference in principle between the basis of democracy and the old theory of the king who was the trustee for all. Centuries of experience have demonstrated that no purely human man is good enough or safe enough to be the self-constituted, intellectual, political, or financial trustee of another.

Recognizing this basic principle, then the ballot being the only weapon known to free government in time of peace, the only way in which woman can be sure of her rights in the benefits, moral and material, that flow from free government, is to be equipped with that instrument, that weapon of free government. That is fundamental, and is not affected and can not be affected by the side questions as to what she will do with the ballot, whether she will agree or disagree with her husband.

In the first place, like all side issues, when you come to analyze them they do not meet the case at all, because the question whether a good husband will sufficiently guard the welfare of his wife is not involved in the case of women who have no husbands, who may have been bereft of their husbands, who may never have had husbands, and yet who are vitally interested in the question of their property rights as well as the broader question of morals, which I will now proceed to refer to.

We have been asked to show some specific gain that has come from the right of suffrage being accorded to women.

The questions we are discussing are fundamental or they are not worth discussing. One thing is certain, that womanhood, taken in its entirety, has more of good than bad within its ranks. We believe that it has immeasurably more of good than it has of bad. No man will be found to challenge that statement. If that, then, is true, we would bring into the electorate of this country a force that is conceded to include more of the good than of the bad. That we would gain thereby is so fundamentally right that it is a waste of time to ask for specific instances of the result of the bringing in of that force.

The moral force of this country never has and never can be measured in its fullness by specific acts of legislation, because back of legislation, in the twilight zone of the administration of law, lies the danger point in free government, and it is in that twilight zone that the moral force of the country, from community to nation, must be felt.

But we all agree that there has been a marked influence, a marked improvement, during the last few years. My good friend, the great-hearted, generous, whole-souled, genial Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] suggested yesterday that Congress had passed a red-light law for the District of Columbia, although women are not represented in Congress. But I would remind my good friend from New Jersey that no red-light law ever passed Congress until the women in several States of the Union participated in the election of those who represent those States in the American Congress. It never passed Congress until this movement for woman suffrage had become nation-wide in its influence and in its effect.

So while it is true that the red-light law passed Congress before there were women Senators or Representatives, it is equally true that it never did pass Congress until the influence of woman suffrage in the morals of the Nation began to be felt and experienced.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. CLAPP. Most cheerfully.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yesterday, while addressing the Senate, I referred to the fact that a number of laws had been passed the passage of which had been influenced by women in Colorado. After enumerating one I was interrupted by a colloquy with some other Senators and did not finish the list. I should like right here, as the Senator is talking upon that great subject, to give the list of laws that have been added to the statutes of the State of Colorado largely through the influence of women.

First. The establishment of a juvenile court and a code for the treatment of juvenile delinquents, and for the punishment of those who contribute to their delinquency, and for the redemption of offenders.

Second. The establishment of a State industrial school for girls.

Third. Of a State school for dependent children.

Fourth. Of a State home for mental defectives.

Fifth. Compulsory education for all children from 8 to 16 years of age.

Sixth. Preventing child labor during terms of school.

Seventh. Establishing parents as joint heirs of deceased children.

Eighth. Making it a misdemeanor for adult children to fail to support aged or infirm parents.

Ninth. Increasing the age of consent of girls and protecting them by criminal statutes. (The age of consent of girls in some States is as low as 12 years.)

Eleventh. Creating a State traveling library commission of women.

Twelfth. Establishing a pure-food bureau and providing for the enforcement of laws as to pure food.

Thirteenth. Preventing husbands from mortgaging household goods without signature of the wife.

Fourteenth. Providing for examination of teeth, eyes, and ears of school children.

Fifteenth. Creating a bureau for prevention of cruelty to dumb animals.

Sixteenth. Abolishing the sweat box in getting confessions from prisoners.

Seventeenth. Authorizing punishment for prisoners so that by good conduct and work they can obtain their liberty in much shorter time.

Eighteenth. Establishing a board of charities for the supervision of all public prisons and eleemosynary institutions, and prohibiting men from taking any earnings of immoral women.

I want to say right here that every moral law or movement has had the support of the women. It was the Interparliamentary Union which declared that Colorado has "the sanest, most humane, most progressive, most scientific laws relating to the child to be found on any statute books in the world."

Of course, the legislature during this period has always had some women in its bodies, but the influence of women has been very largely by reason of the fact that they are voters and by reason of the fact that, being voters, legislators listen to them when they appeal for the passage of such laws.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I also would like to supplement what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has said by pointing out that the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], in his memorial submitted yesterday in the RECORD, at page 4437, gave a long list of humane statutes affecting the welfare of women and children and public purpose of a similar nature, which may be considered also as an evidence of the service they are rendering in bringing about the passage of desirable laws.

Mr. CLAPP. It is very agreeable to me to have both these suggestions made at this time, although, without lessening the value of the suggestions, to be candid about it, I never argue a fundamental cause where I have to depend upon specific instances. Either the broad fundamental principle is right, either the force behind it is right, or it is wrong. There is not a human being in this land to-day who will not admit that during the last few years there has been a wonderful change in our political system and in the broad, humane spirit of our laws, and that system has been accompanied by a very broadening influence of womanhood, partially in having the electorate granted to her, partially in the discussion of the effort to extend the right, and partially in the influence of both upon the entire moral tone of this country. It stands to reason that the very moment you admit that, taking womanhood as an entirety, the good overwhelmingly predominates over the evil, that moment you admit that the closer contact of womanhood, the closer the participation of womanhood, in our political and legislative policies, the better will be the result of it. It is because of that recognized fact we find so many sinister forces arrayed against it.

Take the question with reference to girlhood. There was a time when a girl could not dispose of the simplest piece of property until she had reached the age of 18, and yet there was a time when she could barter her soul to the devil when she had just passed the age of 10. In other countries and in this

country in those States where woman has received the right to vote, where the agitation has been the strongest, the age of consent has constantly been raised until now in many States it is above the age at which she could barter her personal property. It is not necessary even to rely upon that as a specific fact.

Again, I say the concession that in any vast body of persons to whom it is proposed to grant the electorate the good overwhelmingly predominates over the evil there can be but one result, and, in the main, that a good result.

I spoke a few moments ago of the fact that a minority in all ages has been able to retard the progressive forward tendency of the majority. They have used divers and sundry weapons and instrumentalities. One is the fact that the wrong is always ready to subordinate every consideration to the one thought of interest, due to the fact that it never separates and divides its forces, while the right, never seeking that to which it is not entitled, feels no such allegiance to a purpose, and its forces are ofttimes divided; but, as I said before, the most potent instrumentality the spirit of Toryism in all the ages has employed has been to use the respectable element opposed to progress as the cloak and shield behind which the sinister forces mask themselves. There are to-day in this country unnumbered thousands of good women, true and Christian women, who are opposed to woman suffrage. They live in surroundings where the love—I might almost say the homage—of husbands and sons shields them not only from danger but even from a knowledge of the dangers that sometimes beset others. In that home and with that environment they stand opposed to woman suffrage. They would scorn an alliance with the forces underneath the surface which without a positive alliance are all arrayed in hostility to woman suffrage.

You take a man who is adding to his millions the millions that he can not count, see, feel, nor use, but simply seeks the possession of more, and adding to that on the toil of childhood, poisoned morally and physically by its surroundings, and that man, as a rule, is opposed to woman suffrage, and well he may be. The man who is opposed to shorter hours of woman labor is opposed to woman suffrage. If there is a vital question that confronts the American people it is this question of its childhood, of overworked women. True to the instinct of maternity that ever dominates a true woman's nature, she is bringing into existence children unfitted to be a part and parcel of a great and vigorous citizenship. If there is a man thriving upon the toil of overworked women, you will find, almost without exception, a man opposed to woman suffrage. The man who thrives by the white-slave traffic is opposed to woman suffrage, and well he may be; the man who thrives through the prostitution and the pollution of the very sources of American political activities is opposed to woman suffrage, and well he may be; the man who thrives upon a traffic that drags down manhood and destroys it is opposed to woman suffrage, and well he may be; and yet these forces are all moving to the same purpose to which these good people move, namely, opposition to woman suffrage.

As I said before, these good people would scorn the suggestion of alliance with these classes; they would scorn the very presence of these classes; and yet they can not escape the eternal fact that every sinister force in this country is opposed to woman suffrage; and well it may be, because without any hair-splitting discussion, without any inquiry as to what specific legislation woman suffrage has brought, every sinister influence and force in this country recognizes that in the womanhood of this country is the overwhelming preponderance of good, and they dread the bringing in of that force as a part of the electorate of this Republic.

I want to say this to these good people: It is to be regretted that the better the man or woman is who stands against human progress the more thoroughly he or she stands, unintentional though it be, as a foil for the evil forces that always have been against progress.

One thought more and then I will yield the floor. I want to say to those who are interested in the passage of this resolution providing for the submission to the States of a constitutional amendment, that while at one time I thought it might be passed by the requisite majority, I am now inclined to think that it can not secure the requisite majority; but on that account they should not lose hope; they should remember that there is a law operating upon human nature as resistless as the law under which Niagara's flood plunges over Niagara's crest, and that is that despite every attempt at checks and balances, despite every effort to thwart or abate or sidetrack the cause of free government, in its last analysis it is bound to be popular government, and sooner or later it will embrace the entire population of our country without reference to sex.

Even though this joint resolution be defeated to-day—that is, though it fail to receive the requisite number of votes—there are fewer opponents to this joint resolution now than there were, when I entered the Chamber, to the joint resolution to amend the Constitution so as to provide for the direct election of United States Senators by the people. Our forefathers, wise in their day and generation, feared the people, and they sought to set up certain barriers, certain checks and balances; they decreed that the American people should not vote directly for their Senators; but under this resistless law of human purpose, that sooner or later breaks down every barrier in free government that stands against the final and ultimate triumph of the people, the final making of free government as absolutely a democracy as is possible to exist in a dense population and an extended area, that barrier had to give way; and even before we amended the Constitution many of the States of this Union had made provision whereby Senators, for all practical purposes, were elected by the people.

Again, our forefathers refused to concede to you and to me the privilege and the capacity to vote directly for a President of the United States. So they conceived the filtering process by which we might vote for presidential electors, and they, in turn, as absolutely independent as we in the inception, vote for whomsoever they saw fit for President; but here was another effort to dam the current that flows eternally on until it reaches the last analysis of free government, which is popular government. So, without changing a line in our Constitution to-day, we practically vote as absolutely directly for President as though there were no presidential electors on our ballots.

So I want to say to those who have been interested in this cause, who have spent much time here in the effort to secure the favorable recognition of this joint resolution, even though it fails of the requisite majority of the Senate, there is no occasion for being discouraged or disheartened. By the eternal logic of sequence, which through 19 centuries worked its way to the form of free government, the same resistless force, the same logic of sequence, will in time make free government in form free government in fact.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota takes his seat, I will say that I have been interested, as I know the Senate has been, in the line of argument of the Senator; and, so far as the principle of woman suffrage is concerned, I am in thorough accord with what the Senator has said; but the Senator has argued that the question of extending democracy must go on and on and be enlarged from time to time, and the power of the Government be distributed more generally among the people. Does the Senator believe that if this amendment is passed it will have the effect of giving suffrage to the colored women of the South? Will it be in force for an entire race now disfranchised?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know; but I know one thing—that if my argument is right, it is right to give suffrage to women. With the sequence I have no concern or interest in connection with the right itself. The sequence is a matter for later consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the proposition is this—and I raise this question in all sincerity, because I feel very earnest about it—I do not believe in putting into the Constitution of the United States another hypocritical clause to be disobeyed. Fifty years ago we gave to the negro the right to vote. Now, instead of democracy increasing it has been decreasing and receding ever since the hour when we did that thing. The negro is to-day a disfranchised man under the American flag—disfranchised by one portion of the country, and his disfranchisement connived at and consented to by another portion of the country. Does the Senator believe therefore that we are living up to our teaching of popular government and of democracy when we as a people consent to that disfranchisement without ever raising our voice in the negro's behalf, except with a little lip service? I feel that whatever we put into the Constitution ought to be observed, and it ought not to be put in unless we are prepared to enforce it.

Mr. CLAPP. That is another question.

Mr. BORAH. It is a pretty big question.

Mr. CLAPP. I can answer that very promptly, no; but because we fall short in one respect, because those who went before us fell short or those who come after us may fall short, is no reason why we should fall short in the discharge of our duty.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, we are going to do just precisely what our forbears did. They gave to the negroes the right to vote, but the right has not been delivered to them. We are going to give to the southern woman the right to vote, but we are not going to enforce that proposition; we are simply going to write it into the Constitution, there to demoralize a

whole race by tantalizing it with an ideal which it will never be able to realize.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I would differ from the Senator from Idaho in this: I do not think it can be said that we give the right of suffrage; we merely, if this amendment should be adopted by the requisite number of States, prohibit the withholding of suffrage in any State simply upon the ground of sex. We did the same with reference to color. I do not know—I would not concede, quite so far as the Senator does, the disfranchising of the negro. I have received letters of late from men throughout the South who say that a great many white men are disqualified, because some of the statutes in those States aim to prevent voting by, as I understand, imposing educational requirements. If the right of suffrage is granted, as we say, although, in fact, it is simply a prohibition against its being withheld on account of sex, what they may do with reference to the degree of education requisite to vote in a State still remains a question for each State to decide for itself.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not raising or discussing at this time any other proposition than that we are putting into the Constitution something that we do not propose to enforce. I am not at this time quarreling with the South as to the position which it has taken with reference to negro suffrage. but I am saying that we are proposing to insert an amendment into the Constitution when we know it will have precisely the same effect as the other amendment to the Constitution to which I have referred, and that it will be equally ineffective. Would it not be wiser, therefore, to proceed through the States?

Mr. CLAPP. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Let me read here an extract from the constitution of Oklahoma. and I will ask the Senator if he thinks it has any other purpose or effect than to evade the clause of the Constitution guaranteeing the right of suffrage, without discrimination on account of color:

> No person shall be registered as an elector of this State, or be allowed to vote in any election herein, unless he be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the State of Oklahoma.

Now, there it stops. If that were universal, no one could complain, but it proceeds:

> But no person who was on January 1, 1866, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under any form of government, or who at that time resided in some foreign nation, and no lineal descendant of such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote because of his inability to so read and write sections of such constitution.

Everybody knows that that is an evasion of the constitutional amendment which we adopted some 50 years ago, and everyone knows that the same provision will go into the constitutions of those States with reference to the proposed constitutional amendment now before the Senate and cut out the same race of people. This provision of the Oklahoma constitution is before the courts, and I do not care to discuss it, but I feel that it is not improper to say that, whatever may be its legal effect, its prime object was and is to disfranchise the negro.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, Mr. President, I may be a little slow of comprehension this morning——

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so.

Mr. CLAPP. But I can not see what that has to do with the question of giving the women of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois the right to protect their homes, their property, and, so far as law can be a protection, to protect the children in their homes; and, so far as law can be the adjunct of moral force, to develop the moral force of their States. Either it is wrong or it is right, and that is all there is to the argument.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. CLAPP. The fact that some people in some portions of this country may negative the right is no reason, to my mind, why I should withhold the right.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, that is not the proposition.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, I do not know what the proposition before the Senate is.

Mr. BORAH. If the people of a certain portion of this country negative the constitutional provision by our consent or by our connivance, then we are a party to the transaction. When you establish the vote for the woman in Ohio and deliver it to her, you are under the same obligation, if you establish that vote for the woman of Mississippi, to deliver it to her.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, that does not follow at all. I am not responsible for what is done in one of those States. The fact that I am powerless to give a fair interpretation to a law in every part of this country is no reason why I should withhold my support of a law that in itself is right. I can not understand the attitude of the Senator from Idaho on that subject.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, possibly I can make myself a little plainer. The Senator was advocating the proposed constitutional amendment for the reason that it would carry to the voters of the country more power; that it would give a wider scope to the action of democracy and would treat all alike, giving all an equal opportunity to enjoy the franchise; and yet we simply grant it to those who now have it or can have it without the constitutional provision. Ohio can adopt woman suffrage if they wish it; Illinois can adopt it if they wish it; but as to those who will not be permitted to adopt it and can not adopt it we are not undertaking to enforce the provision of the Constitution at all, and, therefore, our hope is perfectly vain, because those States where they may adopt it may do so without this constitutional provision, while in those States where they can not the constitutional provision will do them no good.

Mr. CLAPP. Still, Mr. President, I do not see the force of the argument. Will not the Senator admit that there is more democracy in this country than if we had no suffrage at all? Will he not admit that there is more democracy in this country than if we only had the suffrage limited to a self-selected and self-constituted trusteeship of the political activities of the country? Suppose it is true that certain people in certain States have been disfranchised; it is also true that that same race in other States have the franchise. It was either right or wrong to give it to them, and those men who passed upon the concrete question of whether it was right or wrong discharged their duty as to that question when they made their decision upon it. If they, in turn, themselves be responsible for the subsequent failure as the result of that decision, then the blame is upon them in their subsequent inability or lack of purpose to carry forward the spirit of the first decision; but that can not affect the righteousness or the unrighteousness of the first decision. You can not measure this by the mere fact that it may be said that, if you finally prohibit the exclusion of suffrage to women throughout the country, there will be States where the women will not vote, and if they do not vote you have not enlarged the sphere of democracy. That will not be our fault. The question is whether in the spirit of democrocy, in the analysis of the growth of democracy, it is not true at all times that in proportion as participation in political activity is expanded there is more progress. If that is true, then there is no answer to the proposition that democracy in the last analysis rests upon government by the people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not arguing that question with the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, that is what I am arguing.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator perfectly upon that proposition; but I do not agree with him that we have discharged our duty when we give the mere shell of the principle, and as a people do not undertake to see that the proposed beneficiaries enjoy the right which we profess or pretend to give them.

Mr. CLAPP. I did not say we had discharged our whole duty.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I wanted the Senator's opinion upon.

Mr. CLAPP. What I said was that, in deciding one question, if we decided it right, we discharged our duty as to that question. If that involves as a sequence other questions and we do not discharge our duty as to the other questions, then we fall short upon these other questions; but it can not affect the fundamental question of whether in the inception the one thing was right or wrong.

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED in the chair). Has the Senator from Minnesota concluded?

Mr. CLAPP. I have concluded, unless the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Florida desires to ask a question.

Mr. BRYAN. No; I desire to secure the floor in my own right, and I thought I had done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I supposed, and that is why I retained the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Minnesota if it would not be as logical to abandon the extension of suffrage proposed by the pending joint resolution because in certain States there are gross frauds in the election? There is an investigation going on in the city of Chicago now through which it has been disclosed that some ten or twelve thousand ballots had been inserted in a box in a way unknown to our election laws. I inquire whether, because of that failure in that particular, whereby ten or twelve thousand voters have been disfranchised by having that many fraudulent votes balanced against their lawful votes, it would not be just as sensible to abandon

the struggle against popular government because of the opinion in certain States as to the right of suffrage which we do not approve?

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, if we are going to rest our judgment upon the weakness and not the strength of humanity then I for one am ready to throw up my hands and quit the struggle for better things. It is in this broad equation of humanity that embraces the best and the worst that we have to find the solution for our problems.

That reminds me, Mr. President, that we often hear it said that those of us who advocate the extension of the instrumentalities of the Government want for the evils of democracy more democracy. That is not true. The evils that exist in spite of democracy can only be cured by democracy. You might as well say that because men are profane in spite of the church the cure for the evils of the church is more church. Profanity is not an evil of the church, it is an evil in spite of the church. In proportion as the spirit that moves the church increases and develops profanity will cease naturally; and the evils that exist in this country, although we have in form, but not yet in fact, a government by the people, exist in spite of democracy and are not evils of democracy. Of course the cure for the evils that exist in spite of democracy must be more democracy.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that the privilege of voting ought to be controlled by each State. This is a big country of diversified interests, composed of people of very different ideals and conditions. I believe it is wholly wrong for Arizona to say to Maine who her voters shall be; for Massachusetts to impose upon Idaho her peculiar beliefs and doctrines; for Florida to say to Oregon, "We believe only in manhood suffrage, and, therefore, we want to take away from you the right to grant women the privilege to vote"; for Georgia to say to Wyoming, "We, 3,000 miles away, without any familiarity with the conditions that confront you, propose, with not a single voter of our State ever having known of the conditions in your remote State, undertake to lay down the rules by which your people in Wyoming should govern themselves"; for Virginia, on the Atlantic coast, to say to Washington, on the Pacific coast, what treatment ought to be accorded to the Asiatics in the matter of voting; for Tennessee to say to Colorado what people ought to be allowed to vote for Representatives in Colorado.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] says that we ought not to take away a right which Ohio wants, because negroes are not allowed to vote in Mississippi. That is not the proposition the Senator from Minnesota is advocating here to-day. Ohio has said that she does not want women to vote, and the Senator from Minnesota wants to force woman suffrage upon that great State against her will.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at that point, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, I think his remarks might perhaps be misleading to those who are not thoroughly familiar with the conditions under which alone the Constitution can be amended. This limitation against the restriction of suffrage could not be forced upon Ohio unless three-fourths of the States in the Union said so. Of course, the Senator understands that and so does the Senate, but I wanted it in the argument.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, that does not make it right. Of course, I realize that, under our system of adopting constitutional amendments, three-fourths of the States govern; but three-fourths of the States could pass this amendment over the will of the majority of the people of this country, and yet the Senator from Minnesota calls that democracy!

Every now and then some statesman arises who, in his own modest opinion, could vastly improve upon the Constitution under which we have lived for more than 100 years, and under whose beneficent provisions this has risen to be the greatest Government ever known among men. Senators speak as if the doctrine should be accepted that whatever a majority wants is right—"the greatest good to the greatest number." Our Constitution was not framed upon any such theory as that. It undertook to give, so far as human machinery could do so, equal and exact justice to all men.

At the risk of being tedious, I propose to read from Baron de Montesquieu's work, "Spirit of Laws," of which Maine, in his "Popular Government," said:

> Neither the institution of a Supreme Court nor the entire structure of the Constitution of the United States were the least likely to occur to anybody's mind before the publication of the "Spirit of Laws."
>
> If a Republic be small, it is destroyed by a foreign force; if it be large, it is ruined by an internal imperfection.
>
> To this twofold inconvenience democracies and aristocracies are equally liable, whether they be good or bad. The evil is in the very thing itself, and no form can redress it.
>
> It is therefore very probable that mankind would have been at length obliged to live constantly under the government of a single person had they not contrived a kind of constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a confederate Republic.
>
> This form of government is a convention by which several petty States agree to become members of a larger one which they intend to establish. It is a kind of assemblage of societies that constitute a new one capable of increasing by means of further associations, till they arrive at such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the whole body.
>
> The associations of cities were formerly more necessary than in our times. A weak, defenseless town was exposed to greater danger. By conquest it was deprived not only of the executive and legislative power, as at present, but, moreover, of all human property.
>
> A Republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruption; the form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences.
>
> If a single member should attempt to usurp the supreme power, he could not be supposed to have an equal authority and credit in all the confederate States. Were he to have too great an influence over one, this would alarm the rest; were he to subdue a part, that which would still remain free might oppose him with forces independent of those which he had usurped, and overpower him before he could be settled in his usurpation.
>
> Should a popular insurrection happen in one of the confederate States, the others are able to quell. Should abuses creep into one part, they are reformed by those that remain sound. The State may be destroyed on one side, and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved, and the confederates preserve their sovereignty.
>
> As this Government is composed of petty republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with regard to its external situation, by means of the association, it possesses all the advantages of large monarchies.

The Senator from Minnesota speaks of popular rule. The system outlined by Montesquieu was written into our Federal Constitution, and there were thrown around it two devices, admirably defined and illustrated by Mr. Tucker in his work on the Constitution. I ask leave to insert, without taking the time to read, what Mr. Tucker has to say upon this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> In all cases where power is in the hands of any class or interest which is antagonistic to others, whether the others have a minority representation or none, the result is tyranny. History is full of this truth, speaking by numberless examples.
>
> How, then, is this most difficult problem in political science to be solved? Representation protects constituencies from false representatives; but how shall we protect the minority constituency from a majority constituency, which, acting in legislative body, are represented in proportion to their numbers? Our representative principle may save the majority from the domination of the few, but how shall we save a minority from the tyranny of a majority? Two devices may be suggested:
>
> First, in the machinery of the Government, give to each class or order a separate and distinct organism through which its will may be voiced and require a concurrence of each to all action. Thus each will check the hostile action of the others, and all must concur in order to any action.
>
> This device is often called "the checks and balances in government," or by Mr. Calhoun, in his acute analysis of the science of government, in his Disquisition on Government, "A Government of concurrent majorities." The substance of his view is this: So organize your Government that each interest shall act independently of the other, and instead of allowing that one which has a preponderance of numbers to govern that which has the minority, require a majority of each to concur in the political measures proposed, and thus give to neither any power over the other but by that other's consent, and allow no action in either unless both concur in the consent. Power and right are thus wedded and tyranny is prevented.
>
> Government under this device represents each and every interest. It voices not a numerical majority of the whole, but the concurrent majority of each and all its members. Each is thus potential for his own defense against others, but impotent for offense to others. It prevents injustice to any and enforces justice to all. Out of the conflict of these distinct orders liberty emerges and is secured. In their unification under mere numerical majority liberty dies and tyranny is inevitable.
>
> Second. The second device which may be adopted is this: Let any peculiar and distinct interest be regulated and controlled exclusively by that order or class in society which holds it—by them alone—excluding other heterogeneous elements entirely from any vote in respect to them, and letting all regulate homogeneous interests together in one government. Under this each order of society, under a separate governmental organism, would regulate its own distinct interests with which other orders, having nothing in common, would have nothing to do in the way of regulating them.
>
> The mode in which these two devices have been applied in the history of the race will be now explained, and but for these two devices, which have saved liberty in all the ages, political history would be a dreary rehearsal of unbridled despotism as the destroyer of man-right. In illustration of these two devices some striking examples may be cited:
>
> (a) In the first stages of the Republic of Rome, in the *comitia centuriata*, where suffrage was based on property, patricians and plebeians were admitted to its deliberations, but the patricians had a majority, and the oppression of the plebeian minority gave rise to the celebrated secession of the plebs to the sacred hill, as their only protection from the government, which had become an exclusive aristocracy. The patricians used every means to persuade them to return. A treaty was made between them as between two distinct nations, and resulted in the establishment of the office of tribunes, who were the representatives of the plebeians alone, by the plebeians with the power of veto upon the action of the patricians. This tribunitian power, which was exclusively in the hands of the plebeians, was a check upon patrician power, and was maintained throughout all the subsequent history of the Roman Republic. In other words, no law or act could be passed to the detriment of the plebeians to which their concurrent majority did not consent; and, on the contrary, the plebeians could exercise no power against the patricians without the concurrence of the patricians. Rude and imperfect as this device was, it was effectual in the protection of each order from the oppressive action of the other. The doctrine of concurrent majorities saved the liberty of the members of each order from destruction by the other.

(b) In the history of the English Revolution a great contest arose during the reign of the Stuarts as to the power of the King to take a subject's property without his consent, expressed through a vote of the House of Commons. Taxation had previously been held by the people of England to be unlawful, unless with the popular assent in the House of Commons. If the King could tax the people without the assent of the House of Commons, power would have been alien to right. The great case of the ship money exacted by the King of John Hampden in 1636, decided against him by a venal judiciary, for the time divorced the power of taxation from the right of the taxpayer. English freemen did not tamely submit. The Revolution was the result, and resulted in the constitutional monarchy of 1688–89, by which the power of taxation was secured to those who paid the tax. This wedded power to right, which the house of Stuart had attempted to divorce.

(c) The American Revolution of 1776 turned upon the same pivotal issue. Parliament had in a preamble asserted the right of taxation of the Colonies by the Parliament of England, in which the Colonies were not represented at all, and in which, if they had been represented in proportion to their numbers, the representation would have been a mockery, because their representation would have been a minority only, subject to be overborne by the majority of English representatives. This called forth the splendid eloquence of Edmund Burke in his speech on "American taxation," in which he used this language:

"Could anything be a subject of more just alarm to America than to see you go out of the plain high road of finance and give up your most certain revenues and your clearest interest merely for the sake of insulting your colonies? No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of 3 pence; but no commodity will bear 3 pence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated and two millions of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the Colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the payment of 20 shillings. Would 20 shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No; but the payment of half 20 shillings on the principle it was demanded would have made him a slave. It is the weight of that preamble, of which you are so fond, and not the weight of the duty, that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear."

A statement of the grounds of this revolutionary conflict will not be out of place. Each Colony had substantially conceded that Parliament might properly legislate for the general welfare of the Empire of which each was a part. The Colony did not even make a point of its representation in the Parliament as to matters which concerned the whole Empire. As to these, it was content that, as the welfare of all was the interest of all, the power might safely be vested in the general council, acting for the general welfare of all and the common defense of each and every part.

But when the local interests of each Colony, when its internal policy, its home rights, were to be regulated, its people felt that these interests and rights and this internal polity could only be safe when under the exclusive control of the political power which represented the people of the Colony, who held these interests and rights and were concerned in this polity. This was self-government. The admission of any other influence was to allow their rights to be controlled by aliens. This exclusive power was wedded to the personal right. If any alien to the right was to participate, it *pro tanto* divorced political power from personal right, destroyed real self-government, and subjected personal and home right to the influence and government of real aliens.

In vain did British sophistry plead that the English voter was a fellow subject of the colonist and not an alien. The colonist replied, *quoad hoc:* As to my home interest, my home right, my internal polity, you know nothing and care less; your interest is not mine—nay, may be antagonistic to mine—and to allow you an equal voice with me—or worse, a major voice to mine—in your Parliament would be to give up my personal liberty to the control of real aliens and make my condition one of servitude to your mastery.

And hence, when some suggested colonial representation in Parliament, the fathers answered that it was a delusion and a snare to subject internal polity to a Parliament of 500 members in which the Colonies would have 50 and England 450 votes. The hands which wield the power must be the hands that hold the interest; home rule is essential to home liberty and the safety of home rights and the integrity of home polity. The home rule they needed was a real, not formal, representation; an absolute authority and not a barren scepter.

In the case of the Colonies the evil of domination was aggravated by its sectional character; Great Britain, the government, was 3,000 miles away from the interest to be regulated. The worst form in which this alien government can be presented is when the rights and interests are in diverse localities, separated by a geographical line, and the growth of social conditions in the section separated by that line. Sectional tyranny is unmitigated by presence and sympathy. Class over class may be so mitigated. In the one case the oppressor never hears, and hence never heeds the cry of the oppressed. In the latter he may do so.

Government by one man often fails to understand the government, but it usually defers. Government by a foreign people neither understands nor defers; it has no adaptation to the wants or temper of the governed. It is therefore about the worst government that can be imagined.

The government of a localized minority by a localized majority is, in substance, the government of one people by another people—by a foreign people. The alien hand of power governs the distant right without sympathy and unalleviated by the presence of its victims. Alien tyranny is not only an intolerable foe to human liberty, but the destroyer of human happiness. The sectional majority is an alien despot.

(e) In the Federal system of our Union both of these devices are finely illustrated. In the construction of the legislative department of the Federal Government we have a bicameral Congress, composed of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Senate is composed of two Senators from each State without regard to population. The House of Representatives is composed of Members elected by the voters of each State in the main in proportion to numbers. The Senate represents the equipollency of States; the House mainly the power of States according to numbers.

If the numerical majority of the whole country in the House of Representatives should seek to invade the statehood of the Members of the Union, it could only be done by the concurrence of a majority of the States in the Senate. On the other hand, if the States should attempt to invade the rights of the populations of the country, it could not be done but with the concurrence of the House, which represents the populations. The concurrent majority of the two Houses is thus essential to all legislation.

But, lest this concurrence should be brought about to the injury of any interest or right of the people, the veto power in a qualified form is vested in the President, who is elected on a basis which combines both the equality of the States and numbers in each of the States. His veto may be overcome by a two-thirds vote in each of the Houses concurring. Thus all legislation is dependent upon the concurrence of the majorities of population, of States, and of population and States combined in the election of the President.

And if this threefold concurrence were obtained in any legislation which violated the Constitution of the United States, the judicial power is armed with authority to declare such legislation in effect to be null and void. So that in order to any legislation having full effect under our Federal system, it must have the concurrent sanction of the two Houses of Congress, of the President, and of the judiciary. The legislative power of the Federal Government is, however, by the terms of the Constitution limited to such matters as are delegated to it by the Constitution, and all legislative power not so delegated is reserved to the States. If, therefore, the legislative department of the General Government should undertake to exercise the function of lawmaking upon any subject thus reserved to the States, such action would be wholly null and void and would be so declared and enforced by the judicial power of the United States.

The respective States, as to their reserved legislative power, have vested this power in bicameral legislatures, without whose concurrence no law can be passed, and very often with a grant of veto power to the governor. And, in the State systems of government, the same power in their judiciary to declare void any legislation which is contrary to the State constitution is fully recognized; so that no State law can be effectual which has not the concurrent sanction of both houses of the legislature, the governor, and the judiciary.

It will be seen that in this Federal system, embracing the Federal Government and the various State governments, the device of the concurrent majorities is in full force, and the second device is brought into operation by leaving to each State, without any interference in its legislation by any other State, the exclusive lawmaking power as to all interests which exclusively belong to that State.

This wonderful combination of these two devices presents an example in which the guards to the personal rights and liberties of the people are better defined and more effectual than under any system of government known among men. The full explanation of the principles of this system will be reserved for future consideration.

How majestic is this essential unity of the people's will and purpose through diverse and independent agencies for their expression! How true a unity is obtained by not taking the will of the whole without reference to the parts, but the will of each distinct part in order to attain the will of the whole! How superior this to a government based on the majority of numbers! The government of the numerical majority is the mechanism of brute force; ours is the resultant of the moral forces of intelligent popular will over brutal selfishness.

Mr. BRYAN. The first of these devices is that of giving to each class in the machinery of government a separate and distinct organization through which its will may be voiced, and requiring the concurrence of each in all action. This is called by John C. Calhoun a government of concurrent majorities. The second device is where local interests only are affected, where the interests are homogeneous, to let those people decide the questions for themselves.

Mr. President, this constitutional amendment is not needed to enable any State or every State to have woman suffrage, but it is desired in order to force upon unwilling States the arbitrary opinion of a few States.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] seems to believe Congress should propose any amendment and let the people settle it, no matter how vitally it may affect the right of a homogeneous people, with their interests identical, to govern their own affairs. I wonder if the Senator from Arizona, who desires to place Arizona's election laws in the Federal Constitution, would vote for an amendment to limit the right or the privilege of suffrage to men, and let the people decide that? I apprehend he would not, nor should he, because if Arizona desires to have women vote, it is her privilege. If other States do not, why do Senators who have what they want in their own States assume a greater familiarity with the States that have not woman suffrage, and undertake to impose upon Congress and upon those States their ipse dixit as to who shall constitute a voter?

The United States have no voters. The voters are the voters of the States. The reference made by the Senator from Idaho in his question to the Senator from Minnesota develops the inability of Congress to force upon an unwilling people a provision adopted at a time when men's passions were aroused, and a provision many times regretted by men of all parties and of all sections. California has no more right to say to Georgia that negro women shall vote than Georgia has to say to California that the Asiatics shall vote.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. LANE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that the Asiatic, if he be native born, does vote.

Mr. BRYAN. I was aware of that. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. President, nine States have full woman suffrage. Wyoming adopted it in 1869, Colorado in 1893, Idaho and Utah in 1896, Washington in 1910, California in 1911, Oregon, Kansas, and Arizona in 1912. More than one election has been held only by people in States in which the total population was 2,621,000 in 1910; and yet that 2 per cent of the people of this

country think that the other 98 per cent ought to accept their will because they have found it to work fairly well for 1 or 4 or 10 or 18 or 20 years.

Mr. President, I do not like to discuss the negro question, and I shall not do so any more than is necessary to present the thought expressed by the Senator from Idaho. The Senators from the Pacific coast are experts as to what should be done with the negro in the South. There are nine suffrage States put together, including those which have adopted full suffrage. In 1912 they contained 100,717 negroes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that Senators from the Pacific coast were experts as to what should be done with the negro vote. I wish to state to the Senator from Florida that the Senators from the Pacific coast have offered no suggestion on that point, so far as I know.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not refer to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to state further to the Senator from Florida that the only reason why I hesitate to vote for this resolution is because of the condition which confronts the people of the South. If the southern people feel that they want this amendment, and it will not accentuate the present condition of affairs there, and will be lived up to, it will have very much to do with the Senator from Idaho in casting his vote.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator from Idaho did not understand that I referred to him, for I did not.

In those nine States, then, there are 100,717 negroes in a total population of 7,831,541. The city of Washington has 94,000 negro citizens, within 6,000 of as many as these nine States put together. Of the 100,000 total negro population of suffrage States, Kansas has 54,000, leaving the other eight States only 46,000. In Dallas County, Ala., there are 43,511. In Jefferson County, Ala., there are 90,617. In four counties in Florida there are 86,000. In two counties in Georgia there are 101,000—more than in the whole nine suffrage States put together.

In the nine Western States that have woman suffrage there are 115,040 Asiatics. California has 36,248 Chinese and 41,356 Japanese. Yet California would plunge this country into a war before she would concede the right of this Government to regulate her own internal affairs.

I ask leave to incorporate into the RECORD, without reading, some of the tables I have here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

| States. | Total population. | White. | Negro. | Chinese. | Japanese. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kansas | 1,690,949 | 1,634,352 | 54,030 | 16 | 107 |
| Idaho | 325,594 | 319,221 | 851 | 859 | 1,363 |
| Wyoming | 145,965 | 140,318 | 2,235 | 246 | 1,596 |
| Colorado | 799,024 | 783,415 | 11,453 | 373 | 2,300 |
| Arizona | 204,354 | 171,468 | 2,009 | 1,305 | 371 |
| Utah | 373,351 | 366,583 | 1,144 | 371 | 2,110 |
| Washington | 1,141,990 | 1,109,111 | 6,058 | 2,709 | 12,929 |
| Oregon | 672,765 | 655,090 | 1,492 | 7,363 | 3,418 |
| California | 2,377,549 | 2,259,672 | 21,645 | 36,248 | 41,356 |
| Total | 7,831,541 | 7,439,230 | 100,717 | 49,490 | 65,550 |

*Negroes.*

ALABAMA.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dallas County | 43,511 |
| Jefferson County | 90,617 |
| Montgomery County | 56,867 |
| | 190,995 |

ARKANSAS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Jefferson County | 37,692 |
| Pulaski County | 35,462 |
| | 73,154 |

MISSISSIPPI.

| | |
|---|---|
| Bolivar County | 42,763 |
| Hinds County | 45,407 |
| Washington County | 41,600 |
| | 129,770 |

GEORGIA.

| | |
|---|---|
| Fulton County | 57,985 |
| Chatham County | 43,981 |
| | 101,966 |

SOUTH CAROLINA.

| | |
|---|---|
| Charleston County | 56,033 |
| Orangeburg County | 36,794 |
| Richland County | 29,533 |
| | 122,360 |

TENNESSEE.

| | |
|---|---|
| Davidson County | 46,710 |
| Hamilton County | 26,126 |
| Fayette County | 23,702 |
| | 96,538 |

VIRGINIA.

| | |
|---|---|
| Henrico County | 53,570 |
| Norfolk County | 68,447 |
| Pittsylvania County | 26,370 |
| | 148,387 |

NEGRO POPULATION IN CITIES.

| | |
|---|---|
| Washington, D. C. | 94,446 |
| New Orleans | 89,262 |
| Baltimore | 84,749 |
| Memphis | 52,441 |
| Birmingham | 52,305 |
| Atlanta | 51,902 |
| Savannah | 33,246 |
| Charleston | 31,056 |
| Jacksonville | 29,293 |
| | 518,700 |

| States. | Number of whites in jail. | 1 white to each figure below. | Number per 1,000 of population. | Number of negroes in jail. | 1 negro to each figure below. | Number per 1,000 of population. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New England | 9,970 | 650 | 1.5 | 433 | 106 | 9 |
| Middle Atlantic | 19,837 | 962 | 1 | 3,101 | 134 | 7 |
| East North Central | 13,601 | 1,390 | .7 | 2,535 | 114 | 8 |
| West North Central | 7,006 | 1,621 | .6 | 2,095 | 116 | 8 |
| South Atlantic | 4,121 | 1,958 | .5 | 13,710 | 202 | 3 |
| East South Central | 2,611 | 2,204 | .4 | 8,698 | 305 | 3 |
| West South Central | 3,310 | 2,030 | .5 | 6,081 | 326 | 3 |
| Mountain | 3,992 | 631 | 1.6 | 336 | 64 | 15 |
| Pacific | 5,532 | 714 | 1.4 | 289 | 101 | 10 |

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the race question is one we shall have to face. It is not true, as has been suggested here, that in all of the Southern States the negroes are defrauded of their votes. In my own State, for instance, if they can vote an Australian ballot they have as easy access to the polls as the white men. In Mississippi they have practically the same constitutional provision as that read by the Senator from Idaho from the constitution of Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the senator is very much mistaken. Mississippi never had the "grandfather clause" at all.

Mr. BRYAN. It was Alabama.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; Mississippi never had it.

Mr. BRYAN. I meant Alabama.

It makes no difference where a man is born, Mr. President. In one way or another the white man will rule in the South, in the East, in the West, and in the North; and you can no more stop him than you can change the immutable laws of God Almighty.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Assuming that statement to be correct, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Florida wherein the proposed amendment in any way menaces, as he so much fears, this institution?

Mr. BRYAN. It adds to the difficulty of dealing with the situation; that is all. It just increases it. I have no more idea that the white women of the South would go to the polls alongside of the black women of the South than I have that they would do so in Colorado, if the numbers were equal or approximately so.

Mr. President, there visited this country in 1830 or thereabouts a gentleman who had no interest in this question and who wrote a work that has become a classic. I read from De Tocqueville on "Democracy in America" upon this question.

> The danger of a conflict between the white and the black inhabitants of the Southern States of the Union—a danger which, however remote it may be, is inevitable—perpetually haunts the imagination of the Americans. The inhabitants of the North make it a common topic of conversation, although they have no direct injury to fear from the struggle; but they vainly endeavor to devise some means of obviating the misfortunes which they foresee. In the Southern States the subject is not discussed; the planter does not allude to the future in conversing with strangers; the citizen does not communicate his apprehensions to his friends; he seeks to conceal them from himself; but there is something more alarming in the tacit forebodings of the South than in the clamorous fears of the Northern States.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The negro race will never leave those shores of the American continent to which it was brought by the passions and the vices of Europeans, and it will not disappear from the New World as long as it continues to exist. The inhabitants of the United States may retard the calamities which they apprehend, but they can not now destroy their efficient cause.
>
> I am obliged to confess that I do not regard the abolition of slavery as a means of warding off the struggle of the two races in the United States. The negroes may long remain slaves without complaining, but

If they are once raised to the level of free men they will soon revolt at being deprived of all their civil rights, and as they can not become the equals of the whites they will speedily declare themselves as enemies. In the North everything contributed to facilitate the emancipation of the slaves, and slavery was abolished without placing the free negroes in a position which could become formidable, since their number was too small for them ever to claim the exercise of their rights. But such is not the case in the South. The question of slavery was a question of commerce and manufacture for the slave owners in the North; for those of the South it is a question of life and death. God forbid that I should seek to justify the principle of negro slavery, as has been done by some American writers. But I only observe that all the countries which formerly adopted that execrable principle are not equally able to abandon it at the present time.

In conclusion of that chapter the writer says:

If it be impossible to anticipate a period at which the Americans of the South will mingle their blood with that of the negroes, can they allow their slaves to become free without compromising their own security? And if they are obliged to keep that race in bondage in order to save their own families, may they not be excused for availing themselves of the means best adapted to that end? The events which are taking place in the Southern States of the Union appear to me to be at once the most horrible and the most natural results of slavery. When I see the order of nature overthrown, and when I hear the cry of humanity in its vain struggle against the laws, my indignation does not light upon the men of our own time who are the instruments of these outrages, but I reserve my execration for those who, after a thousand years of freedom, brought back slavery into the world once more.

Whatever may be the efforts of the Americans in the South to maintain slavery, they will not always succeed. Slavery, which is now confined to a single tract of the civilized earth, which is attacked by Christianity as unjust and by political economy as prejudicial, and which is now contrasted with democratic liberties and the information of our age, can not survive. By the choice of the master or by the will of the slave it will cease, and in either case great calamities may be expected to ensue. If liberty be refused to the negroes of the South, they will in the end seize it for themselves by force; if it be given, they will abuse it ere long.

Not all of these dire prophecies have come true. The southern people are working out that problem to the benefit of the race formerly in slavery. I dare say that the people as a whole get along with the negroes of the South better than American citizens in other portions of the country get along with the aliens that come to their shores. They have lived together so long that they understand each other pretty well.

Mr. President, somebody who confounded civil rights with political rights undertook to confer upon this class of people just out of slavery the privilege of voting. Why should these people, with no civilization behind them, suddenly become the political equals of the white man, with thousands of years of civilization? Why have they, without any civilization behind them, become fitted to exercise the privilege to vote, while the Asiatics, with thousands of years of civilization behind them, would not be permitted to vote by the white people of California, nor even to own land? The answer, it seems to me, is to be found in the history in the case both of the negro and of the Asiatic. The Asiatic is bright, educated, intelligent, industrious; the negro, good-natured, lazy, without much ambition. They have one element in common, and that is they have loose morals in the home. They do not know what home life is as we understand it. The suffragettes may be able to abolish the home and home conditions in America and substitute something better. Nobody else has ever been able to do it. American civilization is what the American home has made it.

Mr. President, this movement for woman suffrage is pushed forward in every section of the country. Resolutions to submit it to the people of the various States are presented. If under that demand a State adopts it and it proves satisfactory and beneficial, the State would undoubtedly maintain it. If, upon the other hand, it should prove greatly to their disadvantage, if it should injure some of the very classes of people to whom it is sought here to give the right of suffrage, the State would have the power to repeal it. But under this resolution the States would be powerless. It would be a condition thrust upon millions of people of great sovereign States of this Union against their will. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] may call that democracy, but if that is not forcing an institution upon a free people without its consent I do not know how to describe it or in what it would consist.

The South is not the only part of the country that has its troubles. In the chief city of the Nation hordes of aliens are being brought in, put into the hopper to be turned out as American citizens. Will the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] by his resolution say that he knows better the conditions obtaining in New York than the people of that State? Each part of this country has its own provincialisms, its own methods of doing things. I can very easily understand how it is in a State like Idaho, that has a white population of 319,221, a negro population of only 651, Chinese to the number of only 859, and Japanese to the number of only 1,363. There the undesirable vote is a negligible quantity; it is not of enough importance to be given consideration. But when you take 100,000 as against 8,000,000 people, then I appeal to the Senators from the West to consider the difference.

You call it the "yellow" peril on the Pacific coast. What would you say of the people of the rest of the country if they should undertake to tell those coast States what they should do about the ownership of land, much less the right to administer the governmental affairs of a great people?

Mr. President, these reasons are sufficient for me not to vote to enter into the internal affairs of sections or States. But, sir, because nobody else has been so foolhardy as to discuss the proposition upon its merits, I believe I will venture for only a few moments to do it. It is most appropriate, if this privilege of suffrage is to be forced upon unwilling people, it should be done in the identical language in which it was undertaken to make voters out of slaves or people who had just been freed. The arguments proceed as if these women were slaves. They call themselves the slave half of humankind.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] spoke of the extended hearings given by the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and said that every member of the committee was in favor of submitting the amendment, and he spoke of the great discussion and consideration given to the question. I have examined the hearings, and I see that nobody came along to question the propriety of doing a thing like that. I find in the printed hearings that there were brought to convince the committee in favor of the resolution only those who favored it themselves. So the women actually convinced the committee, who already believed with them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure the Senator does not desire to state what the record does not bear out. As a matter of fact the hearings were extended so as to cover both sides of the question, and as much time was given to the opponents as to the proponents.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator show me where anybody appeared against the proposition?

Mr. THOMAS. I will not undertake to show anything from the document which the Senator hands me, it bearing date April 19, 1910.

Mr. BRYAN. I have another document here.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will take the report of the proceedings of the committee which were held early in April, as I remember, 1913, he will find that what I state is correct. Full hearings were given to both sides.

Mr. BRYAN. Did anybody appear in opposition?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly; they had a full day of very interesting discussion.

Mr. BRYAN. Was that report printed?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRYAN. I have not been able to obtain it.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very sorry, but I will furnish the Senator with a copy.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] lays down the proposition that every citizen has a right to vote. Mr. President, the right of suffrage is a misnomer. Only those people have a right to vote or ought to be permitted to vote who are intelligent, who are interested, and who will exercise the power.

If a man can not control himself, why should he be permitted any power to govern the State?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. LANE. I ask the Senator right here who is going to decide that? Who is going to set himself up in judgment, in other words, upon it?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Oregon, I suppose, would like to set himself up in judgment over the capabilities and qualifications of the people who exercise the privilege of the elective franchise three or four thousand miles away, about whom he knows absolutely nothing.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I would like to state that I do not set myself up in judgment on any body or any thing. I do not feel particularly well qualified in this case to do that, and I do not pretend to be. I am not opposing the Senator. I presume he has down in his part of the country a problem which I little understand. But when he sets up the theory that a man, woman, or child shall not do a thing until the person becomes qualified to do it, becomes intelligent enough, then I want to know who is to set himself up in judgment to determine that.

Mr. BRYAN. The State in which the citizen lives; the people of the State who know something about it.

The best argument in behalf of woman suffrage is supposed to have been written by John Stuart Mill. The occasion of his

writing upon the subject was that the property rights were not then extended to women in England. But on the question whether suffrage for woman is right he said:

I forego any advantage which could be derived to my argument from the idea of the abstract right as a thing independent of utility. I regard utility as the ultimate appeal for all ethical questions. There must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interest of man as a progressive being.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If some State now were to say, "We want to elect our United States Senators by the legislature," would it have been right for a constitutional amendment to impose upon that State that they should elect their representatives to this body in accordance with what Congress should say? Is not that parallel with the position the Senator takes with respect to forcing, as he may term it, woman suffrage upon a State?

Mr. BRYAN. It may be, Mr. President, but I do not think so. I think I can point out to the Senator why it is not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to hear the Senator on that point.

Mr. BRYAN. It is because Senators here are voting upon the interests of the whole country. While a Senator is elected from a particular State, his vote affects the interests of the entire country. The voters are best qualified to vote for the election of an officer, such as a Senator or Representative to Congress, who has shown his fitness by his ability to select men to run the affairs of the State government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That electorate also would have the right to determine who should be the President of the United States, who has an influence upon the legislation of the entire United States.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator is entering upon an argument that I do not see has anything to do with this question, because there are no national voters.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but there is a national vote in effect for President and Vice President.

Mr. BRYAN. Not at all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me to be as much in point as the distinction the Senator tried to make and the illustration he gave.

Mr. BRYAN. I have found people in certain sections of the country who answer one question by asking another. Let me ask the Senator would he vote to submit a resolution to the people of the United States to limit suffrage to men only?

Mr. SHAFROTH. If I believed in the proposition, I unquestionably would, but I do not believe in it, and consequently I believe that the division in the Senate is not on the question that the Senator has selected, namely, as to forcing that upon a State, will determine whether each individual Senator believes in equal suffrage or not. That is the reason that I think ought to control his action. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator believe that a constitutional amendment should not force upon a people prohibition on the ground that a State has the right to determine what laws should control its people?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, let us take up one question at a time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the ground of the objection which the Senator is making is not upon the question of equal suffrage, but as to the right of the National Government to adopt a constitutional amendment which would determine questions which he says the State alone ought to determine. Consequently, it is just as much in point, it seems to me, as to forcing prohibition upon each of the States of the Union as it would be in forcing, as he terms it, equal suffrage upon them.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I think it is better to discuss one question at a time.

Of course there are many arguments; I am not undertaking to touch upon them all, but the next argument is that not to allow women to vote is taxation without representation, and therefore it is tyranny. That slogan has been used by the proponents of this measure in an attempt to show that there was an injustice being done if a woman should pay taxes and had no right to vote.

Let it be remembered that when the Colonies raised that question with the mother country it was not taxation without votes, but without representation; and that point went further. It meant that in so far as the internal affairs of the Colonies were concerned they were entitled to be supreme. They were willing to concede to the British Government the right to pass laws that affected the Colonies along with the other British possessions, but they were not willing to concede the government of their local affairs by a foreign power without some representation.

As to representation, Great Britain offered to let them have 56 out of 500 in Parliament. If the application of the principle here contended for was good, that would have been satisfactory. The Colonies would not accept that.

If it is taxation without representation not to allow a woman to vote who owns property, why is it not as to minors or as to nonresidents, as to unnaturalized persons, as to aliens, or as to people who own property in several States?

The argument here and the literature of these people is based upon taxation without representation. Let us test it. They want to vote, but they would not be willing to limit the privilege of voting to those only who pay taxes. So that branch of this argument, that shibboleth, disappears.

Again, if by the declaration that taxation without representation is tyranny our forefathers meant that women who own property, and there were, of course, women in this country then who owned property, should be entitled to vote, they, by their acts, would have shown themselves to be insincere in that declaration, because in the Virginia Bill of Rights adopted June 12, 1776, the declaration was made that all men should be entitled to vote, and in the constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, it was provided that every male person being 21 years of age should be permitted to vote.

But, again, in every State there is uniformity of taxation. Every time a piece of property owned by a woman is taxed a piece of property owned by a man is also taxed; and it is so arranged that a man could not do injustice to the property of women by taxation.

Mr. President, there is a difference between civil rights and political rights. The deprivation of a civil right is unjust, but the nonpossession of a political right may be a benefit.

I was much interested to read in some of this literature that the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] had proposed that unless women voted a fine should be assessed against them. I do not know whether he said it or not. It is published in some of these hearings. In Belgium they impose penalties for a failure to vote. The trouble in this country is not that we have too few voters, but that the voters we already have do not take enough interest in their Government. Too often a voter wants to be carried to the polls. Too often he thinks to vote is not to exercise the bounden duty he owes to the Government, but to confer a favor upon the candidate.

Mr. President, the third argument is that women will improve the laws. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] upon yesterday attributed to women a list of laws which to-day he has repeated. When I asked him if he attributed the adoption of the juvenile courts to women he was ready enough to say he did. Then, when some Senator asked him whether some other desirable legislation had not been defeated, and appealed to the Senator from Colorado, I think it was the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], who said, "Oh, well, there were more men in the legislature than there were women." Yes, and of course the men beat that, and the same men passed the juvenile court law that beat the other law.

It was said that Judge Lindsay was the product of the votes of women. Does he say, then, that they improve all laws? No, Mr. President; he recognizes that human nature is pretty much the same; that it runs through women and men alike. I give my authority as Mr. Hinman, chairman of the assembly judiciary committee of the New York Legislature, in the following quotation from a letter from Judge Lindsay:

I have found that women in politics are no better and no worse than men. Do not forget that when a question narrows itself down to the bread line and selfish interests both sexes follow the same line of action. They look out for No. 1. If a woman wants to get a political job, she will stand for any ticket. If she is afraid of losing her job, she will do the same thing.

In what respect is it claimed that the participation by women in voting will improve laws? In the first place, it is said they will get their property rights.

Mr. President, I think it ought to be admitted in all fairness that at least at this day the restrictions upon the separate property of married women is in favor of the women. The constitution of my State, for example, will not recognize a married woman's contract as to the disposition of her property unless it be executed with all the solemnity of a deed, and if the material is furnished the man who furnishes it can not rely upon her agreement to pay, but he must be able to prove that it benefited her separate estate.

But concede now that they ought to own their own property, it is almost universal that they do, in woman suffrage States and in States in which they do not vote.

The next proposition is that wages will be increased by law, and the hours of labor fixed. Mr. President, men vote and nobody increases their wages because of that fact. Inasmuch as Mr. Mill is cited as a great advocate of woman suffrage, and that that argument may not continue to be made, I desire to read a paragraph from him upon that point. He says:

It would be possible for the State to guarantee employment at ample wages to all who are born. But if it does this it is bound in self-protection, and for the sake of every purpose for which government exists, to provide that no person shall be born without its consent. If the ordinary and spontaneous motives to self-restraint are removed, others must be substituted. Restrictions on marriage, at least, equivalent to those existing in some of the German States, or severe penalties on those who have children when unable to support them, would then be indispensable. Society can feed the necessitous, if it takes their multiplication under its control, or (if destitute of all moral feeling for the wretched offspring) it can leave the last to their discretion, abandoning the first to their own care. But it can not with impunity take the feeding upon itself and leave the multiplying free.

Again, he says in another place, that of course the question of wages is governed by the law of supply and demand.

Mr. President, it is said under this branch of this question that the child-labor laws as passed by the woman suffrage States are better than those in other States; but upon that subject I ask to insert, without reading, the argument and the contention that no such condition in reality exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WOMAN-SUFFRAGE AND CHILD-LABOR LEGISLATION.

The question of child labor, from the standpoint of the State, is not a question of sentiment, but one of racial deterioration and industrial effectiveness.

A free government demands an intelligent citizenship for its support, and its industrial and commercial superiority depends upon the mental, physical, and moral worth of its people. It is the province, therefore, of the State to enact laws to protect children from the demoralizing effects of premature labor and insure to them that physical, mental, and moral development which is required to produce the efficient adult citizen.

During the last 20 years nearly all of the States of the United States have taken practical measures for the protection of minors who are wage earners. Where it was found that labor interfered with the mental development of the child the State passed laws to insure that child his right to the educational advantages which the State furnishes as its safeguard from illiteracy and ignorance. When it was found that labor stunted the physical development of the child the State interfered on the broad principle of the physical welfare of the race and passed laws restricting the age at which children could be employed as wage earners. Compulsory education laws have been passed in every State but 12, and in 3 of these States certain counties and cities are subject to compulsory school-attendance laws. Child-labor laws have been passed in every State of the United States but two.

These laws were in the beginning meager and but slightly protective, but wherever the general public became awakened to the fact that child labor existed here in America, that young children were to be found in our coal mines, in glass factories, cotton mills, etc., public opinion demanded better and more efficient laws for their protection, and each year has seen the tide rising. States hitherto indifferent are constantly joining the ranks, and the laws are gradually becoming more inclusive and stringent. Last year shows the most remarkable progress in our history. Among 41 States which held legislative sessions in 1911, 30 enacted child-labor laws and 59 bills bearing on child labor (some of these compulsory education laws) were passed.

It has been claimed by those who see in the enfranchisement of women the solution of all the ills of our body politic that legislation for the protection of children would be more easily secured if women had the franchise. On the other hand, those of us who oppose woman suffrage believe that women can and have accomplished more along this line by creating public opinion against injustice to the child and influencing legislation toward the conservation of the race than if they worked through the ballot as men do.

The ballot can do nothing. The organization in all States of child-labor committees, with the sole object of promoting remedial legislation for the children who work, the fact that these committees are composed not only of women but of men who vote answers conclusively the claim. These committees have done more to promote child-labor legislation than all other influences combined, and the women members have influenced the result as much as the men, and the fact that the latter had the ballot has not increased either their influence or their effectiveness.

Moreover, a study of the laws for children which exist in suffrage and nonsuffrage States further refutes the theory, for the best child-labor laws are found not in States where women vote, but in those States where men only have the franchise.

In the following comparison of laws California and Washington are not included as suffrage States, because no child-labor legislation has been enacted in either since women have had the ballot. On the other hand, since the labor laws of these States were passed under manhood suffrage, they are included in what we term "nonsuffrage" States.

Reference to child-labor laws discloses, first, that the ages below which child labor is prohibited varies from 12 to 18 years. Second, that the number of employments varies greatly from all work to mine work only. Obviously, the States which prohibit labor in several occupations have more effective legislation than those which prohibit work in only one or two, even though the age limit is the same. Wyoming and Utah prohibit work in mines only, while the neighboring States of North Dakota, Oregon, and Nebraska, with practically identical conditions, prohibit the employment of children in 29 specified employments and all children under 14 years, without exception, during school hours.

In reference to night work, 25 States set an early closing hour for children under 16, New York leading all the rest by setting that hour at 5 p. m.; but none are later than 8 p. m. Children have no positive immunity from night work unless the hours are explicitly stated between which it is unlawful to employ them. Colorado and Idaho are the only suffrage States in the 25, and in Colorado no prohibition of night work for children was enacted until the winter of 1911, although women have voted for 19 years in that State, and Wyoming, where women have voted for over 40 years, sets no time limit whatever for the work of children of any age.

Then, again, no child-labor laws are effective unless placed in the charge of public officials clothed with adequate authority to enforce them. At present there are seven States having no department intrusted with this duty, and Utah and Wyoming are two of them. In Idaho the enforcement of the law is in the hands of the truant officer (if there be one), whose obligations terminate with school hours and apply only to children of compulsory school age.

During the winter of 1911 the Legislature of Utah strengthened the child-labor laws of that State somewhat by prohibiting certain dangerous occupations to children under 14, but these restrictions were practically nullified, since a child of any age may be employed by presenting a school certificate from the school authorities stating that he has attended school 100 days the previous year and can read and write. (Utah child-labor act of 1911, secs. 23 and 24.)

Previous to the winter of 1911 Colorado, where women have voted for 19 years, had practically no child-labor legislation, but during the winter of that year an entire new child-labor law was enacted. The best feature was the 8-hour provision for children; yet an 8-hour law had been in force for years in 11 male suffrage States. Moreover, under the Colorado law girls of 10 and over may engage in any street trade, and children of any age may be employed in any concert or theatrical exhibition, though the male suffrage States of Massachusetts, Illinois, Louisiana, Ohio, and Oregon have banished children from the stage. (Colorado child-labor laws of 1911, c. 95, in effect Aug. 28, 1911.)

Much has been said of the report of the Inter-Parliamentary Union that Colorado had the sanest and most progressive children's law in the world. This statement has reference to the juvenile court law of Colorado and referred especially to the provision which makes a parent responsible for the delinquency of a child. But there are 19 States where women do not vote which make the parent responsible for the child and the penalty is equal if not greater than in Colorado. The only difference is a difference of method with the advantage against Colorado. In the latter State a boy must be pronounced delinquent and get into court before the parent is obligated, while in the 19 States mentioned the parent is held responsible if the child is sent to work before he is of legal age. It is true this constitutes delinquency in the Colorado law, but unfortunately in the latter State no proof of age is required other than the affidavit of the parent or guardian, though 25 male suffrage States require documentary proof in the form of birth or baptismal certificates.

Mr. Owen Lovejoy, secretary of the national child-labor committee, in his report of the proceedings at Birmingham, Ala., in March, 1911, says:

"The States which do not require proof of the child's age, or at least any proof worthy the name, are Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Wisconsin, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

"Our agents have frequently found 8, 9, and 10 year old boys applying for work in these States upon affidavits certifying them to be 14 or 16 years of age.

"When we lay upon the greedy parent the temptation to deceive in order to secure employment for a child, we are guilty of placing the burden upon the weak, where it does not belong, and promoting perjury by process of law."

It will be noticed that the four equal-suffrage States are all in Mr. Lovejoy's list. The truth is that the suffrage States, far from being in the van of remedial legislation for children, have been laggards in the work. Not one of them has been a pioneer in the movement, but they have always followed the lead of other States in child-labor laws and usually long after these laws have been incorporated in the statutes of adjoining States.

The juvenile court law of Colorado is deservedly famous, but it was not the first court of its kind established in the United States. The law establishing a juvenile court in Illinois was passed some time before the Colorado law, and its features were practically the same. It was the juvenile court law of Illinois that formed the basis for the Colorado law, and Chicago had a juvenile court some years before the Denver court was established.

The national child-labor committee has prepared a model child-labor law for uniform legislation. It has followed the principle of embodying in the text the best provisions contained in the laws of the various States. The bill contains 49 sections, and the following table shows the number of these model provisions already enacted in the suffrage States, and those of similar locality and conditions. Of 49 provisions of this model law we find the law of Wyoming contains none, Idaho contains none, Colorado contains 7, Utah contains 8, California contains 12, Oregon contains 14, Oklahoma contains 15, North Dakota contains 15, Minnesota contains 20, Nebraska contains 25, and Wisconsin contains 27.

These facts are not given with any intention of disparaging the work of the four equal-suffrage States, but merely to disprove the claim of the suffragists that if women were given the ballot they would bring about better laws for the protection of children than exist under male suffrage. Neither can they claim that the inadequacies of the law are due solely to the conditions of life and labor in a western and chiefly agricultural community, for we find Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, and Oklahoma with better provisions and more inclusive laws.

Mrs. Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League, says:

"It is perhaps not surprising that the State with the most sweeping provision that no child below the age of 16 years shall be employed in any gainful occupation is Montana, which has no occasion for employing children except as telegraph or messenger boys, and is subject, therefore, to less temptation than the rest of us," and she adds, "next best perhaps after Montana comes a great industrial State."

"In Ohio after 6 o'clock at night no girl under 18 years old and no boy under 16 can be employed in gainful occupation. If we take down the receiver of a telephone in Cleveland or Cincinnati at night it is not a young girl's voice that answers any more than it would be in New Orleans. Louisiana and Ohio share, I believe, alone the honor due to their humane provision that all night work to which elsewhere we are so cruelly accustomed shall be done not by young girls, not by any young person—a boy under 16 or a girl under 18 years old—but by older people, who do not suffer so cruelly from loss of sleep." Would women with the ballot have accomplished more for child labor in these States than they have accomplished without it? The experience of equal-suffrage States disproves it.

Judge Lindsay says that inadequate labor laws in Colorado no more prove that women should not vote than that men should not vote. Perhaps that is true, but Judge Lindsay utterly mistakes the purpose of their citation, which is to show that women have not bettered things in these respects where they have had the opportunity to vote; that the ballot has had no influence whatever upon child-labor legislation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the authority to which the Senator refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. By whom is the paper to which the Senator refers issued?

Mr. BRYAN. It is issued by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Mr. OWEN. Who is the author?

Mr. BRYAN. I say it is printed under the auspices of that association.

Mr. President, it is hardly necessary to be argued that you can not by law control the wages which men shall receive in their private affairs, but those who say that wages will be increased, and that the law will do this and that, until finally it will support all of us, are mild in comparison with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] when he reported this joint resolution. He then said:

Mr. President, a contest to be met in the future, indeed one of the greatest constructive works remaining to be accomplished, is the abolition of poverty. This will not be done by force or violence, but by that progressive and forward-moving spirit which has always animated the American people.

Proceeding, he said:

I realize, of course, that there are many profound thinkers who believe that poverty is a thing inseparable from mortal life and human destiny; that it is an insolvable problem; and that the abolition of poverty is Utopian or phantasmagorial; but just so surely as at midnight there is busy a centrifugal force which in due time will whirl the world into the gladsome presence of the morning, just that surely in the fullness of time will poverty be abolished. Sweatshops, crowded slums, and starving children will some day be only a horrid memory. The extension of the ballot to women will be a helpful influence in assisting to solve this great problem of the future.

Here is how we are going to do it now:

Let the United States Government annually acquire, by purchase, if necessary, 50,000 small farms throughout the various States—

I presume that would be necessary, for I do not suppose anyone would give 50,000 farms to the United States—

as may be most suitable and practicable, build commodious dwelling houses thereon, and each year place 50,000 citizens, without any expense or cost to such citizens, into actual possession of these farms, carefully providing that these "home-reserve farm lands" shall not be alienated, hypothecated in any way, or transferred under any pretext by the citizen inducted therein. It would be necessary carefully to provide that the citizen installed in to such tract of land and home could not be divested thereof under any pretext or pretense whatever, but would hold the same for his or her lifetime, and upon his or her death the same would revert to the Government home-reserve lands, again to be utilized for like home-reserve purposes.

Mr. President, the politicians who promised the negroes of the South, immediately after the war, that they, each one, should have 40 acres and a mule were pikers alongside the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. [Laughter.] All that is to be done without any labor, without any trouble, if this great movement succeeds; and, sir, not only are all the mistaken laws written upon the statute books by man to be corrected, but it no longer can be said to be true that by the sweat of your brow shall you earn your daily bread.

Extravagant as are those statements, Mr. President, much support has been given to this movement because people have actually believed that the Government will fix the wage they shall receive; that the independent, upstanding citizen, who has heretofore relied upon his own intelligence and brawn and muscle, and asked no favors of the Government or of anybody else, will pass away, and, instead, the State will support everybody and will fix the wages by law!

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Who will support the State?

Mr. BRYAN. I do not know. These abolitionists of poverty will doubtless provide for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice that in this provision to abolish poverty the Government is to give the man the land.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But they do not give him any mule, and they do not give him any meat to eat while he is working it.

Mr. BRYAN. All that will come later, I suppose. Of course we have to proceed with these things gradually.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] said that the people opposed to good government are fighting this joint resolution. I think, sir, that that is a cruel charge to make against the woman who yet believes that the home and the child are her sphere and that politics and business are the sphere of man.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator's interpretation or criticism is not warranted by anything that I said. I said that there were thousands of good people who were opposed to this movement. I then said that the sinister forces of the country were opposed to it. I do not believe that the Senator will seriously challenge the latter statement.

Mr. BRYAN. If the Senator from Minnesota said that——

Mr. CLAPP. I did.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not deny that the Senator did say that the people opposed to the enforcement of laws that would provide a better government were opposed to this movement. I do not know about that. I will now read from the House hearings a statement by Mrs. Frank Goodwin, of the District of Columbia, before the Committee on Rules, in which she says:

One promise held out to many conscientious women was this: "Give the ballot to women and in six months they will wipe out the liquor traffic." Many of you remember that. Believing before proof was possible, many adherents to equal suffrage were won upon this point alone. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union gave its indorsement as an organization solely because it welcomed any legitimate aid toward its desired end—the abolition of the liquor traffic. It is quite fair to ask what has been done by the ballot in the hands of women to modify, control, or abolish the sale of intoxicants, now costing the American people over $1,000,000,000 a year?

The suffragists charge openly and by written word that the antisuffragists are in league with the liquor interests. We recognize that some of the liquor publications and organizations are opposed to woman suffrage. That neither throws them into our camp nor constitutes us their allies. Their opposition is rapidly dying out. They no longer fear that which has proven itself harmless to them. The United Brewers' Association, in a letter to the Plainfield (N. J.) Courier-News, signed by Hugh Fox, secretary, states that the antisuffragists have never received nor asked for contributions from them, although, he adds, "We have had appeals from the other side."

Then she says:

The Equal Franchise League of Denver, Colo., so feared an infringement of this "personal liberty" that it protested in March, 1913, to the council of the city and the county of Denver against the passage of a bill known as the "O'Driscoll bill," making it a misdemeanor to sell liquor to a woman. The fact that this form of legislation was designed primarily for the protection of the child failed of apprehension by the league. The secretary of the Knights of the Royal Arch, a Pacific coast liquor organization, stated in the San Francisco Examiner:

"We long ago made a thorough investigation in the States where woman suffrage has been tried and we learned that the liquor business has not been hurt in the least by the women's vote."

In November, 1912, prohibition was submitted to the voters of Colorado. The Denver Post stated that the most ardent workers for the saloons were women. The saloon won by a large majority.

In Boise City, Idaho, in June, 1912, local option was voted on, and the saloon won by 2,800.

In 1912, in 156 elections on local option in California, 57 were in incorporated cities, and of these 37 voted for the saloon.

In Los Angeles the vote in favor of the saloon was three to one in some districts where registered women voters were in the majority.

Wyoming, the oldest equal-suffrage State, had then not even local option.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I ought to say as to the State of Wyoming that, while the laws in relation to liquor have been made very stringent, it is true that State-wide, absolute prohibition does not prevail. It is also true, however, that no saloon is permitted to exist outside of an organized corporate city or town, in which proper police force, and so forth, are provided; and the saloons are there restricted to a small number in certain locations, and subject to very high license and strict rules, which system, of course, is a very great improvement over that prevailing in earlier times, when everything was unrestricted and wide open.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I will state that the purpose I had in reading from that testimony was not to criticize the laws of any State, but, inasmuch as the charge was made, I thought it was only fair that a woman who undertook to meet that charge should have read into the RECORD out of the hearings her side of the case.

I have not yet seen it claimed anywhere that the divorce evil would be lessened if women were given an equal opportunity to vote with men. In the 20 years from 1887 to 1906 there were 12,832,044 marriages. In the same period of time there were 945,625 divorces. The compiler of the census says:

The divorce rate based on total population was almost three (or, more accurately, two and five-eighths) times as great in 1905 as it was in 1870. The contrast may perhaps be more effectively presented as follows: If the number of divorces in proportion to population had been the same in 1905 as it was in 1870 the absolute number of divorces reported in 1905 would have been only 24,000, whereas it was, in fact, 67,791. In 1906 the actual number was 72,062, while the ratio of 1870 would have resulted in only 24,398.

* * * * * * *

The divorce rate in 1900 was 200 per 100,000 married population, or 2 per 1,000 married population. It may be assumed that 1,000 married

people represent approximately 500 married couples. If there were no absentee husbands or wives, they would represent exactly that number. The divorce rate per 1,000 married couples, therefore, is approximately 4; that is to say, 4 married couples out of every 1,000 were being divorced annually at the period represented by the figures for the year 1900. Ten years before that the divorce rate was 148 per 100,000 married population, or approximately 3 per 1,000 married couples. In 1880 the rate was 107 per 100,000 (estimated) married population, or about 2 per 1,000 married couples; in 1870 it was only 81 per 1,000 (estimated) married population, which is equivalent to about 1½ divorces per 1,000 married couples.

* * * * * * *

Almost exactly two-thirds—66.6 per cent—of the total number of divorces granted in the period covered by this investigation were granted to the wife. In other words, the divorces obtained by the wife are twice as numerous as those obtained by the husband.

* * * * * * *

The range of variation for the Northern and Western States extends from a percentage of 59 for North Dakota to a percentage of 78.2 for Rhode Island. For the Southern States, exclusive of the District of Columbia, the percentages range from 41.6 for Mississippi to 66.4 for Tennessee. The percentage is higher than that for Tennessee in every Northern and Western State except Missouri (65.6), New York (65.4), New Jersey (63.4), South Dakota (60.9), and North Dakota (59). The percentage is lower than that for North Dakota in every Southern State except Texas (60.3), Indian Territory (61.4), Oklahoma (63), Maryland (63.4), Delaware (64.9), Tennessee (66.4), and District of Columbia (72.8).

* * * * * * *

The most common single ground for divorce is desertion. This accounts for 38.9 per cent of all divorces (period 1887 to 1906); 49.4 per cent, or almost one-half, of those granted to the husband, and 33.6 per cent, or one-third, of those granted to the wife.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the document which the Senator has in his hand give the summary by States of the percentage of divorce?

Mr. BRYAN. It does.

Mr. CLAPP. Would the Senator have any objection to inserting that in the RECORD as a part of his remarks?

Mr. BRYAN. No. I was coming to that in a few moments.

Only 15.4 per cent of the divorces granted (1887 to 1906) were returned as contested, and probably in many of these cases the contesting was hardly more than a formality, perhaps not extending beyond the filing of an answer, which often has the effect of expediting the process of obtaining the divorce.

Mr. President, I am trying to find the table asked for by the Senator from Minnesota. I ask permission at this point to insert Tables 10, 11, and 12 from Census Bulletin No. 96, on this subject, which, I think, will give the data he desires.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The tables referred to are as follows:

TABLE 10.—*Divorces classified by cause and by party to which granted: 1887 to 1906.*

| State or Territory. | Divorces, 1887 to 1906. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | For all causes. | | | For adultery. | | | For cruelty. | | | For desertion. | | |
| | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. |
| Continental United States | 945,625 | 316,149 | 629,476 | 153,759 | 90,890 | 62,869 | 206,225 | 33,178 | 173,047 | 367,502 | 156,283 | 211,219 |
| North Atlantic division | 142,920 | 44,640 | 98,280 | 45,360 | 20,591 | 24,769 | 25,362 | 2,428 | 22,934 | 54,316 | 19,622 | 34,694 |
| Maine | 14,194 | 3,804 | 10,390 | 1,795 | 1,074 | 721 | 4,844 | 895 | 3,949 | 4,163 | 1,650 | 2,513 |
| New Hampshire | 8,617 | 2,785 | 5,832 | 1,649 | 985 | 664 | 2,594 | 342 | 2,252 | 3,028 | 1,207 | 1,821 |
| Vermont | 4,740 | 1,338 | 3,402 | 692 | 403 | 289 | 1,436 | 128 | 1,308 | 1,729 | 787 | 942 |
| Massachusetts | 22,940 | 6,732 | 16,208 | 4,220 | 2,130 | 2,090 | 3,739 | 108 | 3,631 | 10,730 | 3,967 | 6,763 |
| Rhode Island | 6,953 | 1,517 | 5,436 | 877 | 559 | 318 | 687 | 68 | 619 | 1,403 | 664 | 739 |
| Connecticut | 9,224 | 2,730 | 6,494 | 1,610 | 836 | 774 | 1,353 | 69 | 1,284 | 4,311 | 1,596 | 2,715 |
| New York | 29,125 | 10,081 | 19,044 | 26,707 | 9,838 | 16,869 | 1,408 | 59 | 1,349 | 554 | 139 | 415 |
| New Jersey | 7,441 | 2,720 | 4,721 | 2,194 | 1,146 | 1,048 | 93 | 4 | 89 | 5,144 | 1,565 | 3,579 |
| Pennsylvania | 39,686 | 12,933 | 26,753 | 5,616 | 3,620 | 1,996 | 9,208 | 755 | 8,453 | 23,254 | 8,047 | 15,207 |
| South Atlantic division | 58,603 | 27,458 | 31,145 | 18,074 | 11,206 | 6,868 | 4,555 | 735 | 3,820 | 26,949 | 11,962 | 14,987 |
| Delaware | 887 | 311 | 576 | 121 | 78 | 43 | 67 | 7 | 60 | 230 | 65 | 165 |
| Maryland | 7,920 | 2,896 | 5,024 | 2,685 | 1,180 | 1,505 | 147 | 12 | 135 | 3,936 | 1,318 | 2,618 |
| District of Columbia | 2,325 | 633 | 1,692 | 540 | 232 | 308 | 291 | 15 | 276 | 1,198 | 335 | 863 |
| Virginia | 12,129 | 6,318 | 5,811 | 4,450 | 2,868 | 1,582 | 275 | 11 | 264 | 6,093 | 2,874 | 3,219 |
| West Virginia | 10,308 | 4,731 | 5,577 | 4,696 | 2,616 | 2,080 | 283 | 36 | 247 | 3,847 | 1,495 | 2,352 |
| North Carolina | 7,047 | 4,103 | 2,944 | 3,348 | 2,375 | 973 | 104 | 10 | 94 | 2,908 | 1,420 | 1,578 |
| South Carolina | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Georgia | 10,401 | 4,759 | 5,642 | 1,543 | 1,287 | 256 | 2,790 | 570 | 2,220 | 4,082 | 2,123 | 1,959 |
| Florida | 7,586 | 3,707 | 3,879 | 691 | 570 | 121 | 598 | 74 | 524 | 4,565 | 2,332 | 2,233 |
| North Central Division | 434,476 | 122,790 | 311,686 | 44,852 | 26,081 | 18,771 | 113,704 | 19,952 | 93,752 | 153,029 | 60,577 | 92,452 |
| Ohio | 63,982 | 17,260 | 46,722 | 7,244 | 4,397 | 2,847 | 11,329 | 783 | 10,546 | 15,980 | 5,923 | 10,057 |
| Indiana | 60,721 | 16,360 | 44,361 | 6,328 | 4,015 | 2,313 | 21,688 | 4,790 | 16,898 | 14,801 | 5,935 | 8,866 |
| Illinois | 82,209 | 22,474 | 59,735 | 13,968 | 7,150 | 6,818 | 17,750 | 1,177 | 16,573 | 36,987 | 12,783 | 24,204 |
| Michigan | 42,371 | 11,547 | 30,824 | 1,226 | 913 | 313 | 12,347 | 4,167 | 8,180 | 9,875 | 5,355 | 4,520 |
| Wisconsin | 22,867 | 5,931 | 16,936 | 773 | 524 | 249 | 7,560 | 1,032 | 6,528 | 8,507 | 3,700 | 4,807 |
| Minnesota | 15,646 | 4,192 | 11,454 | 1,413 | 797 | 616 | 4,633 | 360 | 4,273 | 7,726 | 2,813 | 4,913 |
| Iowa | 34,874 | 8,490 | 26,384 | 4,477 | 2,374 | 2,103 | 11,416 | 1,102 | 10,254 | 12,827 | 4,285 | 8,542 |
| Missouri | 54,766 | 18,815 | 35,951 | 5,936 | 3,659 | 2,277 | 14,682 | 4,118 | 10,564 | 23,065 | 9,442 | 13,623 |
| North Dakota | 4,317 | 1,772 | 2,545 | 191 | 137 | 54 | 887 | 330 | 557 | 1,963 | 1,129 | 834 |
| South Dakota | 7,108 | 2,782 | 4,326 | 246 | 181 | 65 | 1,567 | 459 | 1,108 | 3,200 | 1,887 | 1,313 |
| Nebraska | 16,711 | 4,623 | 12,088 | 1,436 | 928 | 508 | 4,147 | 825 | 3,322 | 5,677 | 2,492 | 3,185 |
| Kansas | 28,904 | 8,544 | 20,360 | 1,614 | 1,006 | 608 | 5,698 | 749 | 4,949 | 12,421 | 4,833 | 7,588 |
| South Central division | 220,289 | 96,516 | 123,773 | 41,161 | 30,234 | 10,927 | 43,743 | 6,814 | 36,929 | 97,766 | 47,726 | 50,040 |
| Kentucky | 30,641 | 12,559 | 18,082 | 3,720 | 3,103 | 617 | 3,763 | 104 | 3,659 | 16,489 | 7,106 | 9,381 |
| Tennessee | 30,447 | 10,220 | 20,227 | 5,661 | 3,911 | 1,750 | 4,302 | 188 | 4,114 | 10,133 | 4,348 | 5,785 |
| Alabama | 22,807 | 13,093 | 9,714 | 4,824 | 3,960 | 864 | 1,883 | 44 | 1,839 | 14,587 | 8,530 | 6,057 |
| Mississippi | 19,993 | 11,674 | 8,319 | 5,466 | 4,439 | 1,027 | 2,639 | 444 | 2,195 | 9,072 | 5,277 | 3,795 |
| Louisiana | 9,785 | 4,702 | 5,083 | 7,584 | 3,965 | 3,619 | 606 | 103 | 503 | 933 | 401 | 532 |
| Arkansas | 29,541 | 13,934 | 15,607 | 3,140 | 2,375 | 765 | 5,504 | 1,523 | 3,981 | 17,858 | 8,842 | 9,016 |
| Indian Territory [1] | 6,751 | 2,605 | 4,146 | 474 | 339 | 135 | 1,340 | 271 | 1,069 | 3,676 | 1,618 | 2,058 |
| Oklahoma | 7,069 | 2,834 | 4,235 | 369 | 268 | 101 | 1,242 | 267 | 975 | 3,184 | 1,599 | 1,585 |
| Texas | 62,655 | 24,895 | 37,760 | 9,923 | 7,874 | 2,049 | 22,464 | 3,870 | 18,594 | 21,834 | 10,003 | 11,831 |
| Western division | 89,337 | 24,745 | 64,592 | 4,312 | 2,778 | 1,534 | 18,861 | 3,249 | 15,612 | 35,442 | 16,396 | 19,046 |
| Montana | 6,454 | 1,698 | 4,756 | 394 | 256 | 138 | 1,176 | 94 | 1,082 | 2,690 | 1,183 | 1,507 |
| Idaho | 3,205 | 956 | 2,249 | 158 | 112 | 46 | 565 | 75 | 490 | 1,658 | 690 | 968 |
| Wyoming | 1,772 | 568 | 1,204 | 85 | 59 | 26 | 260 | 69 | 191 | 608 | 367 | 331 |
| Colorado | 15,844 | 4,493 | 11,351 | 708 | 421 | 287 | 2,717 | 689 | 2,028 | 3,917 | 2,683 | 1,234 |
| New Mexico | 2,437 | 798 | 1,639 | 168 | 141 | 27 | 265 | 22 | 243 | 1,224 | 568 | 656 |
| Arizona | 2,380 | 795 | 1,585 | 194 | 143 | 51 | 373 | 47 | 326 | 1,197 | 571 | 626 |
| Utah | 4,670 | 1,050 | 3,620 | 141 | 95 | 46 | 555 | 108 | 447 | 1,106 | 709 | 397 |
| Nevada | 1,045 | 274 | 771 | 53 | 32 | 21 | 244 | 38 | 206 | 367 | 181 | 176 |
| Washington | 16,215 | 4,571 | 11,644 | 631 | 438 | 193 | 3,822 | 770 | 3,052 | 6,072 | 2,787 | 3,285 |
| Oregon | 10,145 | 3,143 | 7,002 | 373 | 249 | 124 | 2,195 | 602 | 2,593 | 5,587 | 2,144 | 3,443 |
| California | 25,170 | 6,409 | 18,761 | 1,407 | 832 | 575 | 5,689 | 735 | 4,954 | 10,936 | 4,513 | 6,423 |

TABLE 10.—*Divorces classified by cause and by party to which granted: 1887 to 1906*—Continued.

| State or Territory. | Divorces: 1887 to 1906—Continued. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | For drunkenness. | | | Neglect to provide.[1] | Combinations of preceding causes, etc. | | | All other specified causes. | | | Cause unknown. | | |
| | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Total. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. |
| Continental United States | 36,516 | 3,436 | 33,080 | 34,670 | 88,349 | 14,330 | 74,519 | 38,129 | 9,825 | 28,304 | 19,975 | 8,201 | 11,774 |
| North Atlantic division | 7,097 | 974 | 6,123 | 4,622 | 4,831 | 647 | 4,184 | 637 | 144 | 493 | 695 | 234 | 461 |
| Maine | 1,882 | 126 | 1,756 | 649 | 832 | 52 | 780 | 25 | 7 | 18 | 4 | ..... | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 571 | 52 | 519 | ..... | 709 | 186 | 523 | 66 | 13 | 53 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Vermont | ..... | ..... | ..... | 598 | 236 | 17 | 219 | 46 | 3 | 43 | 3 | ..... | 3 |
| Massachusetts | 2,837 | 450 | 2,378 | 685 | 596 | 54 | 543 | 130 | 11 | 119 | 3 | 3 | ..... |
| Rhode Island | 325 | 137 | 188 | 2,650 | 966 | 64 | 902 | 40 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Connecticut | 1,471 | 192 | 1,279 | ..... | 438 | 26 | 412 | 41 | 11 | 30 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| New York | 11 | 8 | 3 | 40 | 341 | 19 | 322 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 64 | 18 | 46 |
| New Jersey | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 711 | 228 | 483 | 286 | 73 | 213 | 611 | 210 | 401 |
| South Atlantic division | 501 | 67 | 524 | 15 | 4,811 | 1,796 | 3,015 | 1,269 | 606 | 663 | 2,339 | 1,086 | 1,253 |
| Delaware | 11 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 75 | 15 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 349 | 141 | 208 |
| Maryland | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 806 | 245 | 561 | 55 | 32 | 23 | 291 | 109 | 182 |
| District of Columbia | 114 | 15 | 99 | ..... | 148 | 22 | 126 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 22 | 6 | 16 |
| Virginia | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 927 | 419 | 508 | 271 | 79 | 192 | 113 | 67 | 46 |
| West Virginia | 15 | 2 | 13 | ..... | 1,044 | 421 | 623 | 139 | 42 | 147 | 234 | 119 | 115 |
| North Carolina | 25 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 354 | 159 | 195 | 60 | 50 | 10 | 154 | 84 | 70 |
| South Carolina | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Georgia | 244 | 26 | 218 | ..... | 710 | 229 | 481 | 187 | 107 | 80 | 845 | 417 | 428 |
| Florida | 182 | 16 | 166 | ..... | 747 | 286 | 461 | 402 | 296 | 206 | 311 | 143 | 168 |
| North Central division | 23,157 | 1,610 | 21,547 | 16,926 | 47,063 | 5,727 | 41,316 | 20,975 | 7,019 | 22,956 | 5,799 | 1,824 | 3,966 |
| Ohio | 2,723 | 187 | 2,536 | ..... | 5,889 | 901 | 4,988 | 20,500 | 4,987 | 15,513 | 317 | 82 | 235 |
| Indiana | 2,989 | 167 | 2,822 | 5,153 | 7,318 | 859 | 6,459 | 855 | 126 | 729 | 1,589 | 468 | 1,121 |
| Illinois | 8,615 | 623 | 7,993 | 97 | 3,143 | 453 | 2,690 | 1,362 | 185 | 1,177 | 287 | 104 | 183 |
| Michigan | 572 | 87 | 485 | 4,577 | 13,363 | 937 | 12,426 | 250 | 20 | 230 | 161 | 68 | 93 |
| Wisconsin | 752 | 100 | 652 | 2,054 | 2,294 | 173 | 2,121 | 671 | 322 | 349 | 256 | 80 | 176 |
| Minnesota | 533 | 36 | 497 | 9 | 1,044 | 138 | 906 | 188 | 16 | 172 | 100 | 32 | 68 |
| Iowa | 2,831 | 112 | 2,719 | ..... | 2,059 | 289 | 1,770 | 474 | 71 | 403 | 790 | 197 | 593 |
| Missouri | 2,611 | 177 | 2,434 | 1,647 | 3,671 | 631 | 3,040 | 1,694 | 289 | 1,405 | 1,460 | 499 | 961 |
| North Dakota | 93 | 16 | 77 | 273 | 795 | 126 | 669 | 47 | 13 | 34 | 68 | 21 | 47 |
| South Dakota | 154 | 21 | 133 | 627 | 1,134 | 167 | 967 | 47 | ..... | 47 | 133 | 67 | 66 |
| Nebraska | 623 | 54 | 569 | 2,489 | 2,044 | 221 | 1,823 | 86 | 21 | 65 | 209 | 82 | 127 |
| Kansas | 661 | 31 | 630 | ..... | 4,289 | 832 | 3,457 | 3,801 | 969 | 2,832 | 420 | 124 | 296 |
| South Central division | 3,110 | 417 | 2,693 | 1,163 | 18,097 | 4,797 | 13,300 | 4,840 | 1,687 | 3,153 | 10,409 | 4,841 | 5,568 |
| Kentucky | 735 | 64 | 671 | 111 | 3,726 | 1,198 | 2,618 | 1,137 | 688 | 449 | 960 | 394 | 576 |
| Tennessee | 547 | 100 | 447 | 847 | 6,623 | 749 | 5,874 | 709 | 316 | 493 | 1,535 | 608 | 927 |
| Alabama | 546 | 60 | 486 | ..... | 459 | 173 | 286 | 202 | 153 | 49 | 306 | 173 | 133 |
| Mississippi | 279 | 61 | 218 | ..... | 560 | 258 | 302 | 306 | 159 | 147 | 1,671 | 1,036 | 635 |
| Louisiana | 199 | 62 | 130 | ..... | 247 | 101 | 146 | 87 | 6 | 81 | 136 | 64 | 72 |
| Arkansas | 305 | 28 | 277 | ..... | 865 | 326 | 539 | 443 | 81 | 362 | 1,426 | 759 | 667 |
| Indian Territory | 163 | 8 | 155 | 76 | 654 | 251 | 403 | 197 | 26 | 171 | 171 | 92 | 79 |
| Oklahoma | 170 | 9 | 161 | 129 | 1,542 | 329 | 1,213 | 694 | 218 | 476 | 339 | 144 | 195 |
| Texas | 173 | 25 | 148 | ..... | 3,421 | 1,502 | 1,919 | 975 | 40 | 935 | 3,865 | 1,581 | 2,284 |
| Western division | 2,561 | 368 | 2,193 | 11,944 | 14,067 | 1,363 | 12,704 | 1,408 | 369 | 1,039 | 742 | 216 | 526 |
| Montana | 143 | 28 | 115 | 581 | 1,329 | 106 | 1,217 | 77 | 4 | 73 | 70 | 17 | 53 |
| Idaho | 89 | 13 | 70 | 371 | 209 | 36 | 224 | 51 | 14 | 37 | 59 | 16 | 43 |
| Wyoming | 41 | 9 | 32 | 224 | 419 | 51 | 367 | 30 | 6 | 24 | 16 | 7 | 9 |
| Colorado | 135 | 36 | 99 | 2,401 | 5,776 | 625 | 5,151 | 148 | 28 | 120 | 43 | 11 | 31 |
| New Mexico | 53 | 10 | 43 | 116 | 571 | 50 | 521 | 18 | 1 | 17 | 23 | 6 | 17 |
| Arizona | 86 | 14 | 72 | 381 | 99 | 11 | 81 | 35 | 2 | 33 | 29 | 7 | 15 |
| Utah | 99 | 16 | 83 | 970 | 1,677 | 84 | 1,593 | 53 | 11 | 41 | 70 | 21 | 49 |
| Nevada | 29 | 9 | 20 | 183 | 154 | 9 | 145 | 19 | 2 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Washington | 640 | 74 | 566 | 2,956 | 1,199 | 151 | 1,048 | 623 | 281 | 342 | 242 | 70 | 172 |
| Oregon | 347 | 21 | 326 | ..... | 460 | 91 | 369 | 110 | 15 | 95 | 73 | 21 | 52 |
| California | 906 | 138 | 768 | 3,731 | 2,137 | 149 | 1,988 | 245 | 5 | 240 | 119 | 37 | 82 |

[1] All granted to wife, except 6 in Utah.

TABLE 11.—*Divorces—Per cent distribution, by cause of (1) divorces granted to the husband, and (2) divorces granted to the wife: 1887 to 1906.*

| State or Territory. | Divorces granted to husband, 1887 to 1906. | | | | | | | | | Divorces granted to wife, 1887 to 1906. | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number. | Per cent granted for— | | | | | | | | Total number. | Per cent granted for— | | | | | | | |
| | | Adultery. | Cruelty. | Desertion. | Drunkenness. | Neglect to provide. | Combinations of preceding causes, etc. | All other specified causes. | Cause unknown. | | Adultery. | Cruelty. | Desertion. | Drunkenness. | Neglect to provide. | Combinations of preceding causes, etc. | All other specified causes. | Cause unknown. |
| Continental United States | 316,141 | 23.7 | 10.5 | 49.4 | 1.1 | (1) | 4.5 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 629,476 | 10.0 | 27.5 | 33.6 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 11.8 | 4.5 | 1.9 |
| North Atlantic division | 44,640 | 46.1 | 5.4 | 44.0 | 2.2 | ..... | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 98,280 | 25.2 | 23.3 | 35.3 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Maine | 3,804 | 28.2 | 23.5 | 43.4 | 3.3 | ..... | 1.4 | 0.2 | ..... | 10,300 | 6.9 | 38.0 | 24.2 | 16.9 | 6.2 | 7.5 | 0.2 | (1) |
| New Hampshire | 2,785 | 35.4 | 12.3 | 43.3 | 1.9 | ..... | 0.7 | 0.5 | ..... | 5,832 | 11.4 | 38.6 | 31.2 | 8.9 | ..... | 9.0 | 0.9 | ..... |
| Vermont | 1,338 | 30.1 | 9.6 | 58.8 | ..... | ..... | 1.3 | 0.2 | ..... | 3,402 | 8.5 | 38.4 | 27.7 | ..... | 17.6 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Massachusetts | 6,732 | 31.6 | 1.6 | 58.9 | 0.8 | ..... | 0.8 | 0.2 | (1) | 16,208 | 12.9 | 22.4 | 41.7 | 14.7 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 0.7 | ..... |
| Rhode Island | 1,547 | 34.8 | 4.5 | 43.8 | 9.0 | ..... | 4.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 5,436 | 5.8 | 11.4 | 13.6 | 3.5 | 43.7 | 16.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 |

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TABLE 11.—*Divorces—Per cent distribution, by cause of (1) divorces granted to the husband, and (2) divorces granted to the wife: 1887 to 1906*—Continued.

| State or Territory. | Divorces granted to husband, 1887 to 1906. | | | | | | | | | Divorces granted to wife, 1887 to 1906. | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total number. | Per cent granted for— | | | | | | | | Total number. | Per cent granted for— | | | | | | | |
| | | Adultery. | Cruelty. | Desertion. | Drunkenness. | Neglect to provide. | Combinations of preceding causes, etc. | All other specified causes. | Cause unknown. | | Adultery. | Cruelty. | Desertion. | Drunkenness. | Neglect to provide. | Combinations of preceding causes, etc. | All other specified causes. | Cause unknown. |
| North Atlantic division—Contd. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Connecticut | 2,730 | 30.6 | 2.5 | 58.5 | 7.0 | ..... | 1.0 | 0.4 | ..... | 6,494 | 11.9 | 19.8 | 41.8 | 19.7 | ..... | 6.3 | 0.5 | ..... |
| New York | 10,081 | 97.6 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.1 | ..... | 0.2 | ..... | 0.2 | 19,044 | 88.6 | 7.1 | 2.2 | (1) | 0.2 | 1.7 | ..... | 0.2 |
| New Jersey | 2,720 | 42.1 | 0.1 | 57.5 | ..... | ..... | (1) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 4,721 | 22.2 | 1.9 | 75.8 | ..... | ..... | (1) | (1) | 0.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 12,933 | 28.0 | 5.8 | 62.2 | ..... | ..... | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 26,753 | 7.5 | 31.6 | 56.8 | ..... | ..... | 1.8 | 0.8 | 1.5 |
| South Atlantic division | 27,458 | 40.8 | 2.7 | 43.6 | 0.2 | ..... | 6.5 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 31,145 | 22.1 | 12.3 | 48.1 | 1.7 | (1) | 9.7 | 2.1 | 4.0 |
| Delaware | 311 | 25.1 | 2.3 | 20.9 | 1.0 | ..... | 4.8 | 0.6 | 45.3 | 576 | 7.5 | 10.4 | 28.6 | 1.4 | 1.09 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 39.6 |
| Maryland | 2,896 | 40.7 | 0.4 | 45.5 | ..... | ..... | 8.5 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 5,024 | 30.0 | 2.7 | 52.1 | ..... | ..... | 11.2 | 0.5 | 3.6 |
| District of Columbia | 633 | 36.7 | 2.4 | 52.9 | 2.4 | ..... | 3.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1,692 | 18.2 | 16.3 | 51.0 | 5.9 | ..... | 7.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 |
| Virginia | 6,318 | 45.4 | 0.2 | 45.5 | ..... | ..... | 6.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 5,811 | 27.2 | 4.5 | 55.4 | ..... | ..... | 8.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 |
| West Virginia | 4,731 | 55.3 | 0.8 | 31.6 | (1) | ..... | 8.9 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 5,577 | 37.3 | 4.4 | 42.2 | 0.2 | ..... | 11.2 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| North Carolina | 4,103 | 57.9 | 0.2 | 34.6 | 0.1 | ..... | 3.9 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 2,944 | 33.1 | 3.2 | 53.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 6.6 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| South Carolina | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Georgia | 4,759 | 27.0 | 12.0 | 44.6 | 0.5 | ..... | 4.8 | 2.2 | 8.8 | 5,642 | 4.5 | 39.3 | 34.7 | 3.9 | ..... | 8.5 | 1.4 | 7.6 |
| Florida | 3,707 | 15.4 | 2.0 | 62.9 | 0.4 | ..... | 7.7 | 7.7 | 3.9 | 3,879 | 3.1 | 13.5 | 57.6 | 4.3 | ..... | 11.9 | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| North Central division | 122,790 | 21.2 | 16.2 | 49.3 | 1.3 | ..... | 4.7 | 5.7 | 1.5 | 311,686 | 6.0 | 30.1 | 29.7 | 6.9 | 5.4 | 13.3 | 7.4 | 1.3 |
| Ohio | 17,260 | 25.5 | 4.5 | 34.3 | 1.1 | ..... | 5.2 | 28.9 | 0.5 | 46,722 | 6.1 | 22.6 | 21.5 | 5.4 | ..... | 10.7 | 33.2 | 0.5 |
| Indiana | 16,360 | 24.5 | 29.3 | 36.3 | 1.0 | ..... | 5.3 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 44,361 | 5.2 | 38.1 | 20.0 | 6.4 | 11.6 | 14.6 | 1.6 | 2.5 |
| Illinois | 22,474 | 31.8 | 5.2 | 56.9 | 2.8 | ..... | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 59,735 | 11.4 | 27.7 | 40.5 | 13.4 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 0.3 |
| Michigan | 11,547 | 7.9 | 36.1 | 46.4 | 0.8 | ..... | 8.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 30,824 | 1.0 | 26.5 | 14.7 | 1.6 | 14.8 | 40.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Wisconsin | 5,931 | 8.8 | 17.4 | 62.4 | 1.7 | ..... | 2.9 | 5.4 | 1.3 | 16,936 | 1.5 | 38.5 | 28.4 | 3.8 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 2.1 | 1.0 |
| Minnesota | 4,192 | 19.0 | 8.6 | 67.1 | 0.9 | ..... | 3.3 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 11,454 | 5.4 | 37.3 | 42.9 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 0.6 |
| Iowa | 8,490 | 28.0 | 13.7 | 50.5 | 1.3 | ..... | 3.4 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 26,384 | 8.0 | 38.9 | 32.4 | 10.3 | ..... | 6.7 | 1.5 | 2.2 |
| Missouri | 18,815 | 19.4 | 21.9 | 50.2 | 0.9 | ..... | 3.4 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 35,951 | 6.3 | 29.4 | 37.9 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 8.5 | 3.9 | 2.7 |
| North Dakota | 1,772 | 7.7 | 18.6 | 63.7 | 0.9 | ..... | 7.1 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 2,545 | 2.1 | 21.9 | 32.8 | 3.0 | 10.7 | 26.3 | 1.3 | 1.8 |
| South Dakota | 2,782 | 6.5 | 16.5 | 67.8 | 0.8 | ..... | 6.0 | ..... | 2.4 | 4,326 | 1.5 | 25.6 | 30.4 | 3.1 | 14.5 | 22.4 | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Nebraska | 4,623 | 20.1 | 17.8 | 53.9 | 1.2 | ..... | 4.8 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 12,088 | 4.2 | 27.5 | 26.3 | 4.7 | 20.6 | 15.1 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Kansas | 8,544 | 11.8 | 8.8 | 56.6 | 0.4 | ..... | 9.7 | 11.3 | 1.5 | 20,360 | 3.0 | 24.3 | 37.3 | 3.1 | ..... | 17.0 | 13.9 | 1.5 |
| South Central division | 96,516 | 31.3 | 7. | 49.4 | 0.4 | ..... | 5.0 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 123,773 | 8.8 | 29. | 40.4 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 10.7 | 2.5 | 4.5 |
| Kentucky | 12,559 | 24.7 | 0.8 | 56.6 | 0.5 | ..... | 8.8 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 18,082 | 3.4 | 20.2 | 51.9 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 14.5 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| Tennessee | 10,220 | 38.3 | 1.8 | 42.5 | 1.0 | ..... | 7.3 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 20,227 | 8.7 | 20.3 | 28.6 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 29.0 | 2.4 | 4.6 |
| Alabama | 13,093 | 30.2 | 0.3 | 65.1 | 0.5 | ..... | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 9,714 | 8.9 | 18.9 | 62.4 | 5.0 | ..... | 2.9 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Mississippi | 11,674 | 38.0 | 3.8 | 45.2 | 0.5 | ..... | 2.2 | 1.4 | 8.9 | 8,319 | 12.3 | 26.4 | 45.6 | 2.6 | ..... | 3.6 | 1.8 | 7.6 |
| Louisiana | 4,702 | 84.3 | 2.2 | 8.5 | 1.3 | ..... | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 5,083 | 71.2 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 2.6 | ..... | 2.9 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| Arkansas | 13,934 | 17.0 | 10.9 | 63.5 | 0.2 | ..... | 2.3 | 0.6 | 5.4 | 15,607 | 4.9 | 25.5 | 57.8 | 1.8 | ..... | 3.5 | 2.3 | 4.3 |
| Indian Territory | 2,605 | 13.0 | 10.4 | 62.1 | 0.3 | ..... | 9.6 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 4,146 | 3.3 | 25.8 | 49.6 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 9.7 | 4.1 | 1.9 |
| Oklahoma | 2,834 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 56.4 | 0.3 | ..... | 11.6 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 4,835 | 2.1 | 20.2 | 32.8 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 25.1 | 9.8 | 4.0 |
| Texas | 24,895 | 31.6 | 15.5 | 40.2 | 0.1 | ..... | 6.0 | 0.2 | 6.4 | 37,760 | 5.4 | 49.2 | 31.3 | 0.4 | ..... | 5.1 | 2.5 | 6.0 |
| Western division | 24,745 | 11.2 | 13.1 | 66.3 | 1.5 | (1) | 5.5 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 64,592 | 2.4 | 24.2 | 29.5 | 3.4 | 18.5 | 19.7 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| Montana | 1,688 | 15.2 | 5.6 | 70.1 | 1.7 | ..... | 6.3 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 4,766 | 2.9 | 22.7 | 31.6 | 2.4 | 12.2 | 25.5 | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| Idaho | 956 | 11.7 | 7.8 | 72.2 | 1.4 | ..... | 3.8 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 2,249 | 2.0 | 21.8 | 43.0 | 3.1 | 16.5 | 10.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 |
| Wyoming | 568 | 10.4 | 12.1 | 64.6 | 1.6 | ..... | 9.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1,204 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 27.5 | 2.7 | 18.6 | 30.5 | 2.0 | 0.7 |
| Colorado | 4,493 | 9.4 | 15.3 | 59.7 | 0.8 | ..... | 13.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 11,351 | 2.5 | 17.9 | 10.9 | 0.9 | 21.2 | 45.4 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| New Mexico | 798 | 17.7 | 2.8 | 71.2 | 1.3 | ..... | 6.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1,639 | 1.6 | 14.8 | 40.0 | 2.6 | 7.1 | 31.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Arizona | 795 | 18.0 | 5.9 | 71.8 | 1.8 | ..... | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1,585 | 3.2 | 20.6 | 39.5 | 4.5 | 24.0 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 0.9 |
| Utah | 1,050 | 9.0 | 10.3 | 67.5 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 3,620 | 1.3 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 2.3 | 26.6 | 44.0 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| Nevada | 274 | 11.7 | 13.9 | 66.1 | 3.3 | ..... | 3.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 771 | 2.7 | 26.7 | 22.8 | 2.6 | 23.7 | 18.8 | 2.2 | 0.4 |
| Washington | 4,571 | 9.6 | 16.8 | 61.0 | 1.6 | ..... | 3.3 | 6.1 | 1.5 | 11,644 | 1.7 | 26.2 | 28.2 | 4.9 | 25.6 | 9.0 | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Oregon | 3,143 | 7.9 | 19.2 | 68.2 | 0.7 | ..... | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 7,002 | 1.8 | 37.0 | 49.2 | 4.7 | ..... | 5.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| California | 6,409 | 13.0 | 11.5 | 70.4 | 2.2 | ..... | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 18,761 | 3.1 | 26.4 | 34.2 | 4.1 | 19.9 | 10.6 | 1.3 | 0.4 |

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TABLE 12.—*Divorces—Per cent granted to husband and to wife of the total number of divorces granted for each principal cause: 1887 to 1906.*

| State or Territory. | Per cent of the total number of divorces (1887 to 1906)— | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | For all causes. | | For adultery. | | For cruelty. | | For desertion. | | For drunkenness. | | For neglect to provide. | | For combinations of preceding causes, etc. | | For all other specified causes. | | For cause unknown. | |
| | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. |
| Continental United States | 33.4 | 66.6 | 59.1 | 40.9 | 16.1 | 83.9 | 42.5 | 57.5 | 9.4 | 90.6 | (1) | 100.0 | 16.1 | 83.9 | 25.8 | 74.2 | 41.1 | 58.9 |
| North Atlantic division | 31.2 | 68.8 | 45.4 | 54.6 | 9.6 | 90.4 | 36.1 | 63.9 | 13.7 | 86.3 | ..... | 100.0 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 22.6 | 77.4 | 33.7 | 66.3 |
| Maine | 26.8 | 73.2 | 59.8 | 40.2 | 18.5 | 81.5 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 6.7 | 93.3 | ..... | 100.0 | 6.2 | 93.8 | (2) | (2) | ..... | (2) |
| New Hampshire | 32.3 | 67.7 | 59.7 | 40.3 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 39.9 | 60.1 | 9.1 | 90.9 | ..... | ..... | 26.2 | 73.8 | (2) | (2) | ..... | ..... |
| Vermont | 28.2 | 71.8 | 58.2 | 41.8 | 8.9 | 91.1 | 45.5 | 54.5 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 100.0 | 7.2 | 92.8 | (2) | (2) | ..... | (2) |
| Massachusetts | 29.3 | 70.7 | 50.5 | 49.5 | 2.9 | 97.1 | 37.0 | 63.0 | 16.2 | 83.8 | ..... | 100.0 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 8.5 | 91.5 | (2) | ..... |
| Rhode Island | 21.8 | 78.2 | 63.7 | 36.3 | 9.9 | 90.1 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 42.2 | 57.8 | ..... | 100.0 | 6.6 | 93.4 | (2) | (2) | (2) | (2) |
| Connecticut | 29.6 | 70.4 | 51.9 | 48.1 | 5.1 | 94.9 | 37.0 | 63.0 | 13.1 | 86.9 | ..... | ..... | 5.9 | 94.1 | (2) | (2) | ..... | ..... |
| New York | 34.6 | 65.4 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 4.2 | 95.8 | 25.1 | 74.9 | (2) | (2) | ..... | (2) | 5.6 | 94.4 | ..... | ..... | (2) | (2) |
| New Jersey | 36.6 | 63.4 | 52.2 | 47.8 | (2) | (2) | 30.4 | 69.6 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | (2) | (2) | (2) | (2) | (2) | (2) |
| Pennsylvania | 32.6 | 67.4 | 64.5 | 35.5 | 8.2 | 91.8 | 34.6 | 65.4 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 32.1 | 67.9 | 25.5 | 74.5 | 34.4 | 65. |

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

[2] Per cent not shown where base is less than 100.

TABLE 12.—*Divorces—Per cent granted to husband and to wife of the total number of divorces granted for each principal cause: 1887 to 1906*—Continued.

| State or Territory. | Per cent of the total number of divorces (1887 to 1906)— | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | For all causes. | | For adultery. | | For cruelty. | | For desertion. | | For drunkenness. | | For neglect to provide. | | For combinations of preceding causes, etc. | | For all other specified causes. | | For cause unknown. | |
| | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. | Granted to husband. | Granted to wife. |
| South Atlantic division | 46.9 | 53.1 | 62.0 | 38.0 | 16.1 | 83.9 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 11.3 | 88.7 | ..... | (1) | 37.3 | 62.7 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| Delaware | 35.1 | 64.9 | 64.5 | 35.5 | (1) | (1) | 28.3 | 71.7 | (1) | (1) | ..... | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 38.2 | 61.8 |
| Maryland | 36.6 | 63.4 | 43.9 | 56.1 | 8.2 | 91.8 | 33.5 | 66.5 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 30.4 | 69.6 | (1) | (1) | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| District of Columbia | 27.2 | 72.8 | 43.0 | 57.0 | 5.2 | 94.8 | 28.0 | 72.0 | 13.2 | 86.8 | ..... | ..... | 14.9 | 85.1 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Virginia | 52.1 | 47.9 | 64.4 | 35.6 | 4.0 | 96.0 | 47.2 | 52.8 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 45.2 | 54.8 | 29.2 | 70.8 | 59.3 | 40.7 |
| West Virginia | 45.9 | 54.1 | 55.7 | 44.3 | 12.7 | 87.3 | 38.9 | 61.1 | (1) | (1) | ..... | ..... | 40.3 | 59.7 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 50.9 | 49.1 |
| North Carolina | 58.2 | 41.8 | 70.9 | 29.1 | 9.6 | 90.4 | 47.4 | 52.6 | (1) | (1) | ..... | (1) | 44.9 | 55.1 | (1) | (1) | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| South Carolina | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Georgia | 45.8 | 54.2 | 83.4 | 16.6 | 20.4 | 79.6 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 10.7 | 89.3 | ..... | ..... | 32.3 | 67.7 | 57.2 | 42.8 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
| Florida | 48.9 | 51.1 | 82.5 | 17.5 | 12.4 | 87.6 | 51.1 | 48.9 | 8.8 | 91.2 | ..... | ..... | 38.3 | 61.7 | 58.1 | 41.9 | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| North Central division | 28.3 | 71.7 | 58.1 | 41.9 | 17.5 | 82.5 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 7.0 | 93.0 | ..... | 100.0 | 12.2 | 87.8 | 23.4 | 76.6 | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| Ohio | 27.0 | 73.0 | 60.7 | 39.3 | 6.9 | 93.1 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 6.9 | 93.1 | ..... | ..... | 14.3 | 84.7 | 24.3 | 75.7 | 25.9 | 74.1 |
| Indiana | 26.9 | 73.1 | 63.4 | 36.6 | 22.1 | 77.9 | 40.1 | 59.9 | 5.6 | 94.4 | ..... | 100.0 | 11.7 | 88.3 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 29.5 | 70.5 |
| Illinois | 27.3 | 72.7 | 51.2 | 48.8 | 6.6 | 93.4 | 34.6 | 65.4 | 7.2 | 92.8 | ..... | (1) | 14.4 | 85.6 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 36.2 | 63.8 |
| Michigan | 27.3 | 72.7 | 74.5 | 25.5 | 33.7 | 66.3 | 54.2 | 45.8 | 15.2 | 84.8 | ..... | 100.0 | 7.0 | 93.0 | 8.0 | 92.0 | 42.2 | 57.8 |
| Wisconsin | 25.9 | 74.1 | 67.8 | 32.2 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 13.3 | 86.7 | ..... | 100.0 | 7.5 | 92.5 | 48.0 | 52.0 | 31.3 | 68.8 |
| Minnesota | 26.8 | 73.2 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 7.8 | 92.2 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 6.8 | 93.2 | ..... | (1) | 13.2 | 86.8 | 8.5 | 91.5 | 32.0 | 68.0 |
| Iowa | 24.3 | 75.7 | 53.0 | 47.0 | 10.2 | 89.8 | 33.4 | 66.6 | 4.0 | 96.0 | ..... | ..... | 14.0 | 86.0 | 15.0 | 85.0 | 24.9 | 75.1 |
| Missouri | 34.4 | 65.6 | 61.6 | 38.4 | 28.0 | 72.0 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 6.8 | 93.2 | ..... | 100.0 | 17.2 | 82.8 | 17.1 | 82.9 | 34.2 | 65.8 |
| North Dakota | 41.0 | 59.0 | 71.7 | 28.3 | 37.2 | 62.8 | 57.5 | 42.5 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | 15.8 | 84.2 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| South Dakota | 39.1 | 60.9 | 73.6 | 26.4 | 29.3 | 70.7 | 59.0 | 41.0 | 13.6 | 86.4 | ..... | 100.0 | 14.7 | 85.3 | ..... | (1) | 50.4 | 49.6 |
| Nebraska | 27.7 | 72.3 | 64.6 | 35.4 | 19.9 | 80.1 | 43.9 | 56.1 | 8.7 | 91.3 | ..... | 100.0 | 10.8 | 89.2 | (1) | (1) | 39.2 | 60.8 |
| Kansas | 29.6 | 70.4 | 62.3 | 37.7 | 13.1 | 86.9 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 4.7 | 95.3 | ..... | ..... | 19.4 | 80.6 | 25.5 | 74.5 | 29.5 | 70.5 |
| South Central division | 43.8 | 56.2 | 73.5 | 26.5 | 15.6 | 84.4 | 48.8 | 51.2 | 13.4 | 86.6 | ..... | 100.0 | 26.5 | 73.5 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 46.5 | 53.5 |
| Kentucky | 41.0 | 59.0 | 83.4 | 16.6 | 2.8 | 97.2 | 43.1 | 56.9 | 8.7 | 91.3 | ..... | 100.0 | 29.7 | 70.3 | 60.5 | 39.5 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Tennessee | 33.6 | 66.4 | 69.1 | 30.9 | 4.4 | 95.6 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 18.3 | 81.7 | ..... | 100.0 | 11.3 | 88.7 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 39.6 | 60.4 |
| Alabama | 57.4 | 42.6 | 82.1 | 17.9 | 2.3 | 97.7 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 11.0 | 89.0 | ..... | ..... | 37.7 | 62.3 | 75.7 | 24.3 | 56.5 | 43.5 |
| Mississippi | 58.4 | 41.6 | 81.2 | 18.8 | 16.8 | 83.2 | 58.2 | 41.8 | 21.9 | 78.1 | ..... | ..... | 46.1 | 53.9 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 62.0 | 38.0 |
| Louisiana | 48.1 | 51.9 | 52.3 | 47.7 | 17.0 | 83.0 | 43.0 | 57.0 | 32.3 | 67.7 | ..... | ..... | 40.9 | 59.1 | (1) | (1) | 47.1 | 52.9 |
| Arkansas | 47.2 | 52.8 | 75.6 | 24.4 | 27.7 | 72.3 | 49.5 | 50.5 | 9.2 | 90.8 | ..... | ..... | 37.7 | 62.3 | 18.3 | 81.7 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| Indian Territory | 38.6 | 61.4 | 71.5 | 28.5 | 20.2 | 79.8 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 4.9 | 95.1 | ..... | (1) | 38.4 | 61.6 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 53.8 | 46.2 |
| Oklahoma | 37.0 | 63.0 | 72.6 | 27.4 | 21.5 | 78.5 | 50.2 | 49.8 | 5.3 | 94.7 | ..... | 100.0 | 21.3 | 78.7 | 31.4 | 68.6 | 42.5 | 57.5 |
| Texas | 39.7 | 60.3 | 79.4 | 20.6 | 17.2 | 82.8 | 45.8 | 54.2 | 14.5 | 85.5 | ..... | ..... | 43.9 | 56.1 | 4.1 | 95.9 | 40.9 | 59.1 |
| Western division | 27.7 | 72.3 | 64.4 | 35.6 | 17.2 | 82.8 | 46.3 | 53.7 | 14.4 | 85.6 | 0.1 | 99.9 | 9.7 | 90.3 | 26.2 | 73.8 | 29.1 | 70.9 |
| Montana | 26.2 | 73.8 | 65.0 | 35.0 | 8.0 | 92.0 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 19.6 | 80.4 | ..... | 100.0 | 8.0 | 92.0 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Idaho | 29.8 | 70.2 | 70.9 | 29.1 | 13.3 | 86.7 | 41.6 | 58.4 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | 13.8 | 86.2 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Wyoming | 32.1 | 67.9 | (1) | (1) | 26.5 | 73.5 | 52.6 | 47.4 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | 12.2 | 87.8 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Colorado | 28.4 | 71.6 | 59.5 | 40.5 | 25.4 | 74.6 | 68.5 | 31.5 | 26.7 | 73.3 | ..... | 100.0 | 10.8 | 89.2 | 18.9 | 81.1 | (1) | (1) |
| New Mexico | 32.7 | 67.3 | 83.9 | 16.1 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 46.4 | 53.6 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | 8.8 | 91.2 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Arizona | 33.4 | 66.6 | 73.7 | 26.3 | 12.6 | 87.4 | 47.7 | 52.3 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Utah | 22.5 | 77.5 | 67.4 | 32.6 | 19.5 | 80.5 | 64.1 | 35.9 | (1) | (1) | 0.6 | 99.4 | 5.0 | 95.0 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Nevada | 26.2 | 73.8 | (1) | (1) | 15.6 | 84.4 | 50.7 | 49.3 | (1) | (1) | ..... | 100.0 | 5.8 | 94.2 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Washington | 28.2 | 71.8 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 20.1 | 79.9 | 45.9 | 54.1 | 11.6 | 88.4 | ..... | 100.0 | 12.6 | 87.4 | 45.1 | 54.9 | 28.9 | 71.1 |
| Oregon | 31.0 | 69.0 | 66.8 | 33.2 | 18.8 | 81.2 | 38.4 | 61.6 | 6.1 | 93.9 | ..... | ..... | 19.8 | 80.2 | 13.6 | 86.4 | (1) | (1) |
| California | 25.5 | 74.5 | 59.1 | 40.9 | 12.9 | 87.1 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 15.2 | 84.8 | ..... | 100.0 | 7.0 | 93.0 | 2.0 | 98.0 | 31.1 | 68.9 |

[1] Per cent not shown where base is less than 100.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not germane to this argument, but I know the Senator's speech will be read very widely, and there are some very instructive lessons to be drawn from the table to which I have referred, and that is the reason why I should like to have it inserted in his remarks.

Mr. BRYAN. There are, indeed, Mr. President; and I am very glad, indeed, to put the tables in the RECORD.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator give us the percentage in the suffrage States?

Mr. BRYAN. It is divided in the tables by the various grounds for divorce. For instance, take desertion; in Utah the percentage of divorces on the ground of desertion is only 11; and in none of the surrounding States, except Colorado, is the percentage below 27 on that particular ground.

Mr. THOMAS. Does that include Nevada?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the percentage there?

Mr. BRYAN. On the ground of desertion?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. In Nevada on the ground of desertion the percentage is 66.1; that is, the percentage of divorces granted to the husband on that account.

Mr. WARREN. We do not understand over here what the grounds of divorce are referred to.

Mr. BRYAN. Desertion.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, Mr. President, I infer, if the Senator will yield for a moment——

Mr. BRYAN. Just a moment. I gave to the Senator the percentage in Utah of divorces granted to the wife on the ground of desertion. Divorces granted to the husband for desertion in Utah were 67.5 per cent; in Colorado those granted to the husband for desertion were 59 per cent, and to the wife 10 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the figure for Nevada?

Mr. BRYAN. Of divorces granted to the husband in Nevada, 66 per cent were on the ground of desertion and 22 per cent of those granted to the wife were on the same ground.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know whether the Senator has studied the tables sufficiently to answer my question, but my understanding is that the lowest percentage of divorces granted for all causes in the United States is in my own State.

Mr. BRYAN. In the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. No; the average in the United States is 200 to 100,000 married population. In the Senator's State it is 274.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is for all causes?

Mr. BRYAN. In the States adjacent to the State of Utah the proportion of divorces to 100,000 married population is: For Montana, 497; Idaho, 347; Wyoming, 361; Colorado, 409; New Mexico, 193; Arizona, 344; Utah, 274; Nevada, 315; Washington, 513; Oregon, 368; and California, 297. I make no point about it, but the fact is that in all the equal-suffrage States the percentage is in excess of the average in the United States. That will appear from Table 7, which I ask to incorporate in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE 7.—*Divorce rates based on (1) married population, 1900 and 1890; (2) total population, 1900, 1890, 1880, and 1870.*

| State or Territory. | 1900 | | | | 1890 | | | | 1880 | | 1870 | | Divorces, annual average[1] per 100,000 population. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Population. | Married population. | Divorces, annual average.[1] | | Population.[2] | Married population.[2] | Divorces, annual average.[1] | | Population. | Divorces, annual average.[1] | Population. | Divorces, annual average.[1] | | | | |
| | | | Number. | Per 100,000 married population. | | | Number. | Per 100,000 married population. | | | | | 1900 | 1890 | 1880 | 1870 |
| Continental United States | 75,994,575 | 27,770,101 | 55,502 | 200 | 62,947,714 | 22,447,769 | 33,197 | 148 | 50,155,783 | 19,143 | 38,558,371 | 11,207 | 73 | [3]53 | 38 | 29 |
| North Atlantic division | 21,046,695 | 8,068,132 | 8,069 | 100 | 17,406,969 | 6,618,302 | 5,337 | 81 | 14,507,407 | 3,995 | 12,298,730 | 3,163 | 38 | 31 | 28 | 26 |
| Maine | 694,466 | 287,786 | 811 | 282 | 661,086 | 274,603 | 581 | 212 | 648,936 | 509 | 626,915 | 385 | 117 | 88 | 78 | 61 |
| New Hampshire | 411,588 | 169,565 | 461 | 272 | 376,530 | 157,184 | 377 | 240 | 346,991 | 295 | 318,300 | 199 | 112 | 100 | 85 | 53 |
| Vermont | 343,641 | 145,530 | 257 | 177 | 332,422 | 140,096 | 162 | 116 | 332,286 | 157 | 330,551 | 165 | 75 | 49 | 47 | 50 |
| Massachusetts | 2,805,346 | 1,053,937 | 1,307 | 124 | 2,238,947 | 843,208 | 718 | 85 | 1,783,085 | 527 | 1,457,351 | 360 | 47 | 32 | 30 | 25 |
| Rhode Island | 428,556 | 160,363 | 450 | 281 | 345,506 | 129,690 | 263 | 203 | 276,531 | 256 | 217,353 | 193 | 105 | 76 | 93 | 89 |
| Connecticut | 908,420 | 350,184 | 456 | 130 | 746,258 | 287,317 | 491 | 171 | 622,700 | 382 | 537,454 | 453 | 59 | 66 | 61 | 84 |
| New York | 7,268,894 | 2,804,152 | 1,670 | 60 | 6,003,174 | 2,307,592 | 1,047 | 45 | 5,082,871 | 806 | 4,382,759 | 715 | 23 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| New Jersey | 1,883,669 | 734,076 | 441 | 60 | 1,444,933 | 555,302 | 254 | 46 | 1,131,116 | 148 | 906,096 | 83 | 23 | 18 | 13 | 9 |
| Pennsylvania | 6,302,115 | 2,365,539 | 2,216 | 94 | 5,258,113 | 1,923,210 | 1,444 | 75 | 4,282,891 | 915 | 3,521,951 | 640 | 35 | 27 | 21 | 18 |
| South Atlantic division | 10,443,480 | 3,508,799 | 3,447 | 98 | 8,857,922 | 2,884,540 | 1,885 | 65 | 7,597,197 | 961 | 5,853,610 | 485 | 33 | 21 | 13 | 8 |
| Delaware | 184,735 | 70,263 | 30 | 43 | 168,493 | 62,351 | 31 | 50 | 146,608 | 15 | 125,015 | 9 | 16 | 18 | 10 | 7 |
| Maryland | 1,188,044 | 420,779 | 481 | 114 | 1,042,390 | 358,093 | 247 | 69 | 934,943 | 110 | 780,894 | 80 | 49 | 24 | 12 | 12 |
| District of Columbia | 278,718 | 100,327 | 163 | 162 | 230,392 | 79,314 | 78 | 98 | 177,624 | 55 | 131,700 | 40 | 58 | 34 | 31 | 30 |
| Virginia | 1,854,184 | 604,295 | 705 | 117 | 1,655,980 | 515,675 | 371 | 72 | 1,512,565 | 165 | 1,225,163 | 71 | 38 | 22 | 11 | 6 |
| West Virginia | 958,800 | 335,833 | 616 | 183 | 762,794 | 255,405 | 312 | 122 | 618,457 | 182 | 442,014 | 70 | 64 | 41 | 25 | 18 |
| North Carolina | 1,893,810 | 615,898 | 459 | 75 | 1,617,949 | 511,556 | 189 | 37 | 1,399,750 | 84 | 1,071,361 | 29 | 24 | 12 | 6 | 3 |
| South Carolina | 1,340,316 | 434,422 | ..... | ..... | 1,151,149 | 367,492 | ..... | ..... | 995,577 | 8 | 705,606 | 3 | ..... | ..... | 1 | (4) |
| Georgia | 2,216,331 | 742,821 | 576 | 78 | 1,837,353 | 609,891 | 433 | 72 | 1,542,180 | 220 | 1,184,109 | 121 | 26 | 24 | 14 | 10 |
| Florida | 528,542 | 184,248 | 417 | 226 | 391,422 | 133,979 | 224 | 167 | 269,491 | 142 | 187,748 | 43 | 79 | 57 | 53 | 23 |
| North Central division | 26,333,004 | 9,945,450 | 25,405 | 255 | 22,410,417 | 8,251,302 | 15,850 | 193 | 17,364,111 | 9,485 | 12,981,111 | 5,808 | 96 | 71 | 55 | 45 |
| Ohio | 4,157,545 | 1,633,276 | 3,765 | 231 | 3,672,329 | 1,380,550 | 2,355 | 171 | 3,198,062 | 1,537 | 2,665,260 | 979 | 91 | 64 | 48 | 37 |
| Indiana | 2,516,462 | 1,005,043 | 3,566 | 355 | 2,192,404 | 827,256 | 2,290 | 277 | 1,978,301 | 1,382 | 1,680,637 | 1,160 | 142 | 104 | 70 | 69 |
| Illinois | 4,821,550 | 1,808,263 | 4,837 | 267 | 3,826,352 | 1,391,660 | 2,875 | 207 | 3,077,871 | 2,086 | 2,539,891 | 1,295 | 100 | 75 | 68 | 51 |
| Michigan | 2,420,982 | 979,704 | 2,517 | 257 | 2,093,890 | 837,004 | 1,499 | 179 | 1,636,937 | 1,180 | 1,184,059 | 561 | 104 | 72 | 72 | 47 |
| Wisconsin | 2,069,042 | 745,586 | 1,345 | 180 | 1,693,330 | 609,506 | 866 | 142 | 1,315,497 | 545 | 1,054,670 | 403 | 65 | 51 | 41 | 38 |
| Minnesota | 1,751,394 | 598,692 | 960 | 161 | 1,310,283 | 453,282 | 537 | 119 | 780,773 | 211 | 439,706 | 92 | 55 | 41 | 27 | 21 |
| Iowa | 2,231,853 | 843,148 | 2,070 | 246 | 1,912,297 | 699,474 | 1,281 | 183 | 1,624,615 | 982 | 1,194,020 | 500 | 93 | 67 | 60 | 49 |
| Missouri | 3,106,665 | 1,139,106 | 3,205 | 281 | 2,679,185 | 985,492 | 1,993 | 202 | 2,168,380 | 875 | 1,721,295 | 501 | 103 | 71 | 40 | 29 |
| North Dakota | 319,146 | 104,573 | 281 | 268 | 190,983 | 66,096 | 89 | 135 | 36,909 | 17 | 2,405 | ..... | 88 | 47 | 46 | .... |
| South Dakota | 401,570 | 149,611 | 380 | 270 | 348,600 | 126,136 | 228 | 181 | 98,268 | 47 | 11,776 | 3 | 95 | 65 | 48 | 25 |
| Nebraska | 1,066,300 | 357,583 | 875 | 226 | 1,062,656 | 379,208 | 753 | 199 | 452,402 | 195 | 122,993 | 36 | 82 | 71 | 43 | 29 |
| Kansas | 1,470,495 | 560,363 | 1,604 | 286 | 1,428,108 | 526,900 | 1,193 | 226 | 996,096 | 438 | 364,399 | 186 | 109 | 84 | 44 | 51 |
| South Central division | 14,080,047 | 4,770,644 | 13,316 | 279 | 11,170,137 | 3,653,283 | 6,883 | 188 | 8,919,371 | 3,146 | 6,434,410 | 1,186 | 95 | 62 | 35 | 18 |
| Kentucky | 2,147,174 | 757,296 | 1,793 | 237 | 1,858,635 | 627,316 | 1,082 | 172 | 1,648,690 | 582 | 1,321,011 | 368 | 84 | 58 | 35 | 28 |
| Tennessee | 2,020,616 | 692,239 | 1,808 | 261 | 1,767,518 | 582,105 | 1,103 | 188 | 1,542,359 | 580 | 1,258,520 | 298 | 89 | 62 | 38 | 24 |
| Alabama | 1,828,697 | 667,942 | 1,264 | 208 | 1,513,401 | 490,864 | 818 | 167 | 1,262,505 | 341 | 996,992 | 104 | 69 | 54 | 27 | 10 |
| Mississippi | 1,551,270 | 536,468 | 1,145 | 225 | 1,289,600 | 406,992 | 614 | 151 | 1,131,597 | 345 | 827,922 | 99 | 74 | 48 | 30 | 12 |
| Louisiana | 1,381,625 | 450,244 | 571 | 127 | 1,118,588 | 357,678 | 326 | 91 | 939,946 | 94 | 726,915 | 34 | 41 | 29 | 10 | 5 |
| Arkansas | 1,311,564 | 447,951 | 1,786 | 399 | 1,128,211 | 375,606 | 1,012 | 269 | 802,525 | 423 | 484,471 | 114 | 136 | 90 | 53 | 24 |
| Indian Territory | 392,060 | 135,378 | 442 | 326 | 180,182 | 60,218 | 59 | 98 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 113 | 33 | ..... | ..... |
| Oklahoma | 398,331 | 148,915 | 515 | 346 | 78,475 | 29,422 | 36 | 122 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 129 | 46 | ..... | ..... |
| Texas | 3,048,710 | 1,022,179 | 3,992 | 391 | 2,235,527 | 723,080 | 1,833 | 253 | 1,591,749 | 781 | 818,579 | 169 | 131 | 82 | 49 | 21 |
| Western division | 4,091,349 | 1,477,106 | 5,265 | 356 | 3,102,269 | 1,060,146 | 3,293 | 308 | 1,767,097 | 1,566 | 990,510 | 567 | 129 | 104 | 89 | 57 |
| Montana | 243,329 | 81,935 | 407 | 497 | 142,924 | 46,022 | 198 | 430 | 39,159 | 49 | 20,595 | 15 | 167 | 139 | 125 | 73 |
| Idaho | 161,772 | 55,965 | 194 | 347 | 88,548 | 29,330 | 82 | 280 | 32,610 | 19 | 14,999 | 10 | 120 | 93 | 58 | 67 |
| Wyoming | 92,531 | 30,204 | 109 | 361 | 62,556 | 19,834 | 54 | 272 | 20,789 | 23 | 9,118 | 9 | 118 | 86 | 112 | 90 |
| Colorado | 539,700 | 206,314 | 852 | 409 | 413,249 | 145,063 | 814 | 561 | 194,327 | 209 | 39,864 | 24 | 158 | 197 | 138 | 60 |
| New Mexico | 195,310 | 73,651 | 142 | 193 | 160,282 | 60,693 | 73 | 120 | 119,565 | 14 | 91,874 | 1 | 73 | 46 | 12 | 1 |
| Arizona | 122,931 | 42,711 | 147 | 344 | 88,243 | 29,374 | 89 | 301 | 40,440 | 19 | 9,658 | 1 | 120 | 67 | 47 | 10 |
| Utah | 276,749 | 93,130 | 255 | 274 | 210,779 | 69,836 | 155 | 225 | 143,963 | 164 | 86,786 | 50 | 92 | 74 | 114 | 62 |
| Nevada | 42,335 | 14,936 | 47 | 315 | 47,355 | 15,014 | 46 | 307 | 62,266 | 66 | 42,491 | 42 | 111 | 97 | 106 | 99 |
| Washington | 518,103 | 186,453 | 951 | 513 | 357,232 | 123,280 | 390 | 316 | 75,116 | 58 | 23,955 | 21 | 184 | 109 | 75 | 88 |
| Oregon | 413,536 | 150,640 | 555 | 368 | 317,704 | 109,992 | 343 | 312 | 174,768 | 161 | 90,923 | 73 | 134 | 108 | 92 | 80 |
| California | 1,485,053 | 540,306 | 1,606 | 297 | 1,213,396 | 412,690 | 1,019 | 247 | 864,094 | 726 | 360,247 | 201 | 108 | 84 | 84 | 52 |

[1] For the five years of which the year stated is the median year.
[2] Includes population of Indian Territory and Indian reservations.
[3] Estimated for Indian Territory and Indian reservations.
[4] Less than 1 in 100,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume the Senator reads from the census of 1910. Is that correct?

Mr. BRYAN. I am reading the statistics for the years 1887 to 1906.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that up to that time, 1906, a number of the States, the divorce percentage of which he says was so high, were not equal-suffrage States at all. To make it plain——

Mr. BRYAN. Wait just a moment. Colorado was.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; Colorado was.

Mr. BRYAN. Idaho was; Washington was.

Mr. THOMAS. Wyoming was.

Mr. BRYAN. Utah was.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and I think those are all up to the compilation of the document from which the Senator has been reading.

Mr. BRYAN. That is correct.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, would the Senator object to my making a suggestion with regard to the matter?

Mr. BRYAN. Not at all. I would be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OWEN. I merely want to suggest that the fact that of the divorces granted to men in Nevada 66 per cent were on the ground of desertion and of the divorces granted to women 22 per cent were on the ground of desertion does not necessarily prove anything. It might only appear to follow from that that in the one case the men were so bad they could not be lived with and in the other case they ran away from their honorable wives.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. President, as to the grounds of divorce——

Mr. WARREN. Before the Senator leaves that matter I should like to ask him a question. He gives the statistics for Utah and then refers to the surrounding States. I notice he does not give Nevada and he does not give South Dakota. I should like to have the figures for those two States.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator gave the figures for Nevada.

Mr. WARREN. I did not hear the Senator give them.

Mr. BRYAN. The number of divorces per 100,000 of married people in Nevada was 315. South Dakota and North Dakota are given separately. The counties of the Territory of Dakota that fell into the present State of South Dakota are credited to that State, and likewise the counties that fell within the present State of North Dakota are credited to North Dakota. In North Dakota the number of divorces per 100,000 of married population was 268 and in South Dakota 270.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator that at the time the Territory of Dakota was divided into the States of North and South Dakota we had very liberal divorce laws, and a great many people came West for the purpose of getting divorces. I believe if the Senator had the statistics for the divorces granted since the Territory of Dakota was divided into North and South Dakota, or for the last 10 years, he would see that the percentage was much lower.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I think perhaps it is well, in that connection, to say that the same is true of quite a number of the States concerning which this comparison is sought to be made, and the figures therefore include divorces of people who have come there from the nonsuffrage States for the purpose of taking advantage of and securing the benefits of a more liberal divorce law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That proves the existence of very liberal divorce laws, does it not?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that proves the existence of a very loose state of public opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly it does; but it can not be attributed to a freedom of political voting which was instituted subsequently.

Mr. BRYAN. The granting of woman suffrage was not subsequent in all the cases.

Mr. THOMAS. No; but in most of them it was. In South Dakota it has not been granted at all as yet.

Mr. BRYAN. The average percentage of divorces granted in the United States for neglect to provide is 5.5. In many of the States that is not considered a ground for divorce. I can imagine no other ground, even including desertion, which can be taken advantage of so easily as that. Collusion is almost invited. Neglect to provide for a year gives a right to a divorce. No State can be very proud of its divorce laws; but, in my judgment, the States that have not that as a ground of divorce have better laws, in that respect at least, than the States that allow it as a ground.

In each of these suffrage States the percentage of divorces is higher than the average in the United States. I do not desire to attack the laws of any State; but when the argument is made here that by passing this resolution we shall do great things, not only in the way of furnishing a living for everybody, but in the protection of the home, I think it is only fair and just that the actual facts shall be placed before the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to correct two statements made by Senators from the West to the effect that the divorce laws are less liberal in those States than they were formerly. I think if those Senators will examine their own statutes they will find that they are just exactly the same in every one of those States, the only difference being with reference to the length of residence necessary to secure a divorce. The laws in my State have not been changed in any respect whatever as to the causes for divorce. I find that Colorado, I think, and practically all of the Western States, have essentially the same laws that we have relative to the causes of divorce.

The statistics given by the Senator are applicable as bearing upon the number of divorces in a particular State, but the question whether or not the laws are more liberal has nothing to do with the causes for divorce.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, as I say, no State can be very proud of its divorce laws; but would the passage of this resolution tend to decrease the granting of divorces? Many good women giving it their support undoubtedly believe it would. One of the leaders of this movement, who undertakes to speak for this association, said only a few days ago that pretty soon after woman suffrage came divorce would be as respectable as marriage.

Mr. President, as the number of voters increases, the responsibility of each voter diminishes. No body of persons ought to be admitted to vote unless they want to vote. It is a disputed question here as to whether or not women want to vote. Upon the one side, those advocating the passage of this resolution say that there are 8,000,000 of them; upon the other side, those who deny that the people of this country want this amendment adopted say that after all efforts had been made, those who were favorable to the proposition could get only 167,000 names on the petitions. I have seen it stated that in Massachusetts it was left to the women as to whether or not they wanted to vote, and not 4 per cent of them wanted to vote. That was some years ago. A year or two ago the legislature offered to pass a measure leaving it to the women of Massachusetts to say whether or not they wanted to vote; and the suffragettes withdrew the resolution upon the ground that people who had not studied the subject as they had would not be familiar with the reasons for suffrage.

Women opposing the forcing of suffrage by the United States upon them and upon the States say they have more political influence now, as the wives and the sisters and the mothers and the daughters of men, than they will have when they become politicians.

Mr. President, you can not point to every good law and say: "That law is good because women voted." In what community of this great country of ours is it not true that the best and the highest influence is always exerted by women? These people talk as if woman has no rights. They speak of her as a slave among humankind. They go around agitating and talking about the "enfranchisement of women" as if there were any slaves in the United States. Some of the leaders more frank than others concede that it is not the ballot that is desired, but it is the right to hold office, to be judges, to sit in the legislatures, to sit in Congress, and so forth.

Here is what one of them wrote to President Wilson at the time he was elected:

> Accept my congratulations. In making up your Cabinet please consider the women of the 10 suffrage States. As a member of your Cabinet a wise, scholarly woman would bring to your councils great assistance.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator right there whether he disputes the truth and correctness of that suggestion?

Mr. BRYAN. The women I know would not help the President of the United States by filling an office in the Cabinet half so well as they would serve this country in their homes. There may be some sufficiently acquainted with political matters——

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wanted to get the opinion of the Senator on that point.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the Senator believe that a woman ought to be a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. THOMAS. I should be very glad to see a woman in the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Mr. BRYAN. I should not.

Mr. THOMAS. And the time is coming, if the Senator lives the allotted period of life, when he will see it.

Mr. BRYAN. All right; possibly so.

Mr. President, that is what these agitators say about the condition of women in the United States. I read from the same volume what the great Frenchman, De Tocqueville, said when he was in this country:

> Thus the Americans do not think that man and woman have either the duty or the right to perform the same offices, but they show an equal regard for both their respective parts; and though their lot is different, they consider both of them as beings of equal value. They do not give to the courage of woman the same form or the same direction as to that of man, but they never doubt her courage; and if they hold that man and his partner ought not always to exercise their intellect and understanding in the same manner, they at least believe the understanding of the one to be as sound as that of the other and her intellect to be as clear. Thus, then, whilst they have allowed the social inferiority of woman to subsist, they have done all they could to raise her morally and intellectually to the level of man, and in this respect they appear to me to have excellently understood the true principle of democratic improvement.

Mr. CLAPP. I will ask the Senator from whom he is reading?

Mr. BRYAN. De Tocqueville on "Democracy in America."

Mr. CLAPP. And he pays American manhood the compliment of raising woman to the standard of manhood?

Mr. BRYAN. He pays woman a compliment right following that.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; he had better, I think.

Mr. BRYAN (reading):

As for myself, I do not hesitate to avow that, although the women of the United States are confined within the narrow circle of domestic life, and their situation is in some respects one of extreme dependence, I have nowhere seen woman occupying a loftier position; and if I were asked, now that I am drawing to the close of this work, in which I have spoken of so many important things done by the Americans, to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of that people ought mainly to be attributed I should reply—to the superiority of their women.

Mr. President, if the Senator thinks that article is intended to debase or can be construed as debasing woman, he has a right to put that construction upon it. The Senator ought to know that this book was written in the early part of the nineteenth century, and that woman has made much progress from that time to this, mostly due to increased educational facilities.

Mr. CLAPP. I was not criticizing the quotation as any reflection on women, except that it reflected upon the author's knowledge of American institutions when he said the men of America had raised the women to the standard of the men of this country.

Mr. BRYAN. We will see how the Senator from Minnesota likes this quotation from Mr. Bryce. I will read from Bryce's American Commonwealth.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. Bryce is not an authority for me on American institutions, any more than the other author is. I think the women of America have done more to raise the moral tone of this country than the men have.

Mr. BRYAN. They have not done it in politics. They have done it by attending to their own affairs.

Mr. CLAPP. If "their own affairs" are the raising of the moral standard of this country, leave them at the task and give them the additional equipment of the ballot to sustain their efforts.

Mr. BRYAN. They do not need it.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator says that. What do they say about it?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Minnesota says, "Can we not trust our own sisters and wives and mothers?" Let me ask him, Can not the mother trust the son? Can not the wife trust the husband?

Mr. CLAPP. I will answer that by asking, Can not the son trust the mother and the husband trust the wife? [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; but the Senator asks me a question without answering mine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment. Under a recent rule of the United States Senate, all applause is forbidden in the galleries; and it is the duty of the Chair to clear the galleries if it is repeated.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Bryce says:

Americans are fond of pointing, and can with perfect justice point, to the position their women hold as an evidence of the high level their civilization has reached. Certainly nothing in the country is more characteristic of the peculiar type their civilization has taken.

I ask permission to incorporate in my remarks without reading several extracts from Bryce's American Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

American women take less part in politics than their English sisters do, although more than the women of Germany, France, or Italy. That they talk less about politics may be partly ascribed to the fact that politics come less into ordinary conversation in America (except during a presidential election) than in England. But the practice of canvassing at elections, recently developed by English ladies with eminent success, seems unknown.

* * * * * * *

One hears of attempts made to establish political "salons" at Washington, but neither there nor elsewhere has the influence of social gatherings attained the importance it has often possessed in France, though occasionally the wife of a politician makes his fortune by her tact and skill in winning support for him among professional politicians or the members of a State legislature. There is, however, another and less suspicious sphere of political action into which women have found their way at the National Capital. The solicitation of members of a legislature with a view to the passing of bills, especially private bills, and to the obtaining of places has become a profession there, and the persuasive assiduity which had long been recognized by poets as characteristic of the female sex has made them widely employed and efficient in this work.

* * * * * * *

In no country are women, and especially young women, so much made of. The world is at their feet. Society seems organized for the purpose of providing enjoyment for them. Parents, uncles, aunts, elderly friends, even brothers, are ready to make their comfort and convenience bend to the girls' wishes. The wife has fewer opportunities for reigning over the world of amusements, because, except among the richest people, she has more to do in household management than in England, owing to the scarcity of servants; but she holds in her own house a more prominent, if not a more substantially powerful, position than in England or even in France. With the German hausfrau, who is too often content to be a mere housewife, there is of course no comparison. The best proof of the superior place American ladies occupy is to be found in the notions they profess to entertain of the relations of an English married pair. They talk of the English wife as little better than a slave, declaring that when they stay with English friends or receive an English couple in America they see the wife always deferring to the husband and the husband always assuming that his pleasure and convenience are to prevail.

The European wife, they admit, often gets her own way, but she gets it by tactful arts, by flattery or wheedling or playing on the man's weaknesses; whereas in America the husband's duty and desire is to gratify the wife and render to her those services which the English tyrant exacts from his consort. One may often hear an American matron commiserate a friend who has married in Europe, while the daughters declare in chorus that they will never follow the example. Laughable as all this may seem to English women, it is perfectly true that the theory as well as the practice of conjugal life is not the same in America as in England. There are overbearing husbands in America, but they are more condemned by the opinion of the neighborhood than in England. There are exacting wives in England, but their husbands are more pitied than would be the case in America. In neither country can one say that the principle of perfect equality reigns, for in America the balance inclines nearly, though not quite, as much in favor of the wife as it does in England in favor of the husband. No one man can have a sufficiently large acquaintance in both countries to entitle his individual opinion on the results to much weight. So far as I have been able to collect views from those observers who have lived in both countries, they are in favor of the American practice, perhaps because the theory it is based on departs less from pure equality than does that of England. These observers do not mean that the recognition of women as equals or superiors makes them any better or sweeter or wiser than English women, but rather that the principle of equality, by correcting the characteristic faults of men, and especially their selfishness and vanity, is more conducive to the concord and happiness of a home. They conceive that to make the wife feel her independence and responsibility more strongly than she does in Europe tends to brace and expand her character, while conjugal affection, usually stronger in her than in the husband, inasmuch as there are fewer competing interests, saves her from abusing the precedence yielded to her. This seems to be true, but I have heard others maintain that the American system, since it does not require the wife habitually to forego her own wishes, tends, if not to make her self-indulgent and capricious, yet slightly to impair the more delicate charms of character; as it is written, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

A European can not spend an evening in an American drawing-room without perceiving that the attitude of men to women is not that with which he is familiar at home. The average European man has usually a slight sense of condescension when he talks to a woman on serious subjects. Even if she is his superior in intellect, in character, in social rank, he thinks that as a man he is her superior, and consciously or unconsciously talks down to her. She is too much accustomed to this to resent it, unless it becomes tastelessly palpable. Such a notion does not cross an American's mind. He talks to a woman just as he would to a man, of course with more deference of manner, and with a proper regard to the topics likely to interest her, but giving her his intellectual best, addressing her as a person whose opinion is understood by both to be worth as much as his own. Similarly an American lady does not expect to have conversation made to her. It is just as much her duty or pleasure to lead it as the man's is, and more often than not she takes the burden from him, darting along with a gay vivacity which puts to shame his slower wits.

* * * * * * *

The better bred women do not presume on their sex; and the area of good breeding is always widening. It need hardly be said that the community at large gains by the softening and restraining influence which the reverence for womanhood diffuses. Nothing so quickly incenses the people as any insult offered to a woman. Wife beating, and indeed any kind of violence offered to women, is far less common among the rudest class than it is in England. Field work or work at the pit mouth of mines is seldom or never done by women in America; and the American traveler who in some parts of Europe finds women performing severe manual labor is revolted by the sight in a way which Europeans find surprising.

* * * * * * *

Three causes combine to create among American women an average of literary taste and influence higher than that of women in any European country. These are the educational facilities they enjoy, the recognition of the equality of the sexes in the whole social and intellectual sphere, and the leisure which they possess as compared with men. In a country where men are incessantly occupied at their business or profession, the function of keeping up the level of culture devolves upon women. It is safe in their hands. They are quick and keen witted, less fond of open-air life and physical exertion than English women are, and obliged by the climate to pass a greater part of their time under shelter from the cold of winter and the sun of summer. For music and for the pictorial arts they do not yet seem to have formed so strong a taste as for literature, partly, perhaps, owing to the fact that in America the opportunities of seeing and hearing masterpieces, except, indeed, operas, are rarer than in Europe. But they are eager and assiduous readers of all such books and periodicals as do not presuppose special knowledge in some branch of science or learning, while the number who have devoted themselves to some special study and attained proficiency in it is large.

* * * * * * *

Some one may ask how far the differences between the position of women in America and their position in Europe are due to democracy; or, if not to this, then to what other cause?

They are due to democratic feeling in so far as they spring from the notion that all men are free and equal, possessed of certain inalienable rights, and owing certain corresponding duties. This root idea of democracy can not stop at defining men as male human beings any more than it could ultimately stop at defining them as white human beings. For many years the Americans believed in equality with the pride of discoverers as well as with the fervor of apostles. Accustomed to apply it to all sorts and conditions of men, they were naturally the first to apply it to women also; not, indeed, as respects politics, but in all the social as well as legal relations of life. Democracy is in America more respectful to the individual, less disposed to infringe his freedom or subject him to any sort of legal or family control than it has shown itself in Continental Europe, and this regard for the individual enured to the benefit of women.

* * * * * * *

What have been the results on the character and usefulness of women themselves?

Favorable. They have opened to them a wider life and more variety of career. While the special graces of the feminine character do not appear to have suffered, there has been produced a sort of independence and a capacity for self-help which are increasingly valuable as the number of unmarried women increases. More resources are open to an American woman who has to lead a solitary life not merely in the way of employment, but for the occupation of her mind and tastes, than to an European spinster or widow, while her education has not rendered the American wife less competent for the discharge of household duties.

How has the Nation at large been affected by the development of this new type or womanhood, or rather, perhaps, of this variation on the English type?

If woman have on the whole gained, it is clear that the Nation gains through them. As mothers they mold the character of their children, while the function of forming the habits of society and determining its moral tone rests greatly in their hands. But there is reason to think that the influence of the American system tells directly for good upon men as well as upon the whole community. Men gain in being brought to treat women as equals rather than as graceful playthings or useful drudges. The respect for women which every American man either feels or is obliged by public sentiment to profess has a wholesome effect on his conduct and character and serves to check the cynicism which some other peculiarities of the country foster. The Nation as a whole owes to the active benevolence of its women and their zeal in promoting social reforms benefits which the customs of Continental Europe would scarcely have permitted women to confer. Europeans have of late years begun to render a well-deserved admiration to the brightness and vivacity of American ladies. Those who knew the work they have done and are doing in many a noble cause will admire still more their energy, their courage, their self-devotion. No country seems to owe more to its women than America does, nor to owe to them so much of what is best in social institutions and in the beliefs that govern conduct.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I have no idea that the rank and file of the women would be upon the side of the adoption of this amendment and approve the things that are being done and said by the leaders of the movement. The women of America, the women of the home, never originated this movement. Let us see, now, what the leaders say.

Of course, when women have equal rights with men they must assume some burdens. They want to go out and compete with men in every walk of life; and the first thing they propose is that the State shall care for the child. They advocate establishing by law some sort of an arrangement for the care of children smaller than a kindergarten will accept.

Let me read what is said by an Englishman by the name of W. L. George, who claims to be a leader in this movement. I have not seen any of the great leaders in this country repudiate what he has said any more than we saw the leaders repudiate the position of the militants of England. On the contrary, when Mrs. Pankhurst was here they crowded to the doors to get a chance to see her and to welcome her.

This gentleman says:

To put the matter less obscurely, the feminists base themselves on Weininger's theory, according to which the male principle may be found in woman and the female principle in man.

* * * * * * * *

The methods are to have revolutionary results, are destined to be revolutionary; as a convinced but cautious feminist, I do not think it honest or advisable to conceal this fact.

* * * * * * * *

As promoters of a sex war, they should not hesitate to declare it, and I have little sympathy with the pretenses of those who contend that one may alter everything while leaving everything unaltered.

* * * * * * * *

They have no use for knightliness and chivalry.

Therein lies the mental revolution—while the suffragists are content to attain immediate ends, the feminists are aiming at ultimate ends. They contend that it is unhealthy for the race that man should not recognize woman as his equal; that this makes him intolerant, brutal, selfish, and sentimentally insincere. They believe, likewise, that the race suffers because women do not look upon men as their peers.

* * * * * * * *

His [the feminist's] case against the treatment of women covers every form of human relations—the arts, the home, the trades, and marriage. In every one of these directions he proposes to make revolutionary changes.

* * * * * * * *

They complain, too, that the home demands of woman too great an expenditure of energy, too much time, too much labor; that the concentration of her mind upon the continual purchasing and cooking of food, on cleaning, on the care of the child, is unnecessarily developed; they doubt if the home can be maintained as it is if woman is to develop as a free personality.

With marriage, lastly, they are perhaps most concerned. Though they are not in the main prepared to advocate free union, they are emphatically arrayed against modern marriage, which they look upon as slave union.

He further says that—

The gaining of the vote is nothing but an affair of outposts; that the intention is that women shall vote as women and not as citizens; that they propose to sell the female vote en bloc to the party who bids highest for it in the economic field; that they will hold up trades and, when they are strong enough, hold up society itself. In the main they are opposed to indissoluble Christian marriage. That there should be established a state of society where man will not figure except as the father of her child.

So these are the ultimate aims of this propaganda. If the good judgment of the American people, men and women alike, will not furnish a ready answer to these morbid sentiments, it is useless for me to undertake to do so, and our case is hopeless.

Sir, these people seem to believe that their purpose in life is to hold political positions and places of honor, forgetting that the citizen best performs his duty to the Government and to his kind who busies himself with the daily duties about him.

I do not know any better sentiment with which to close my argument against this resolution than that of the immortal Lee:

There is a true glory and a true honor—the glory of duty done and the honor of the integrity of principle.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall not take more than 10 minutes in giving the reasons which shall govern my vote in this particular case. I shall not discuss the merits of equal suffrage. My reason for not discussing it here is that it has not the slightest bearing upon what my vote shall be upon this particular proposition before the Senate. The only subject I shall discuss is where the inherent right to fix suffrage should be located, whether in the State or in the Federal Government. I have strong convictions upon the subject of equal suffrage; but those convictions should always be subservient to the right of my own State, in acting in its sovereign capacity as a State, to fix the standard of suffrage. Therefore my vote will be based entirely upon that.

Yesterday I asked a question of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] which was a pertinent question, and one which was scarcely answered. I wanted to get his idea as to where this power should be justly located; so I asked him the question whether or not, if there were a proposition before the Senate to provide for male suffrage only in his State, he would contend that the Federal Government had a right to determine that question. He did not answer it, Mr. President; but to-day, in a colloquy, I noticed that he did answer it, stating that it would depend on just how he felt. If he was in favor of woman suffrage, he would be against such a proposition; if he was against it, he would vote the other way.

Mr. President, that is not meeting the question at all. The inherent right—not the mere legal power, but the inherent right—to fix the suffrage in any State either belongs in the Federal Government or it belongs in the State. There can not be two sovereignties. There can not be the equal jurisdiction of two sovereigns over the same territory. Either the Federal Government has the right to fix this matter in its entirety, or it has no right whatever to deal with it. Those who believe the Government should determine the right of suffrage naturally should vote in favor of the exercise of this right whether it was for or against equal suffrage, and those who believe the States have the exclusive right as an inherent right, not a mere legal power, should necessarily vote that the States should determine the question whether the State was for or against it.

Mr. President, in November next the qualified electors in my own State of North Dakota will vote on the question whether or not suffrage in that State shall be extended to the women of the State. If I remember correctly, the same question will be submitted, in some form, in one or more of the other States in the Union.

Have the people in my State the inherent right to determine that question for themselves, irrespective of the view of the majority of the States? If they have that inherent right, then the United States Government ought not to have the same right of sovereignty over the same question. There can not be two coequal sovereigns, as I have stated, over the same territory, and there can not be an inherent right upon the part of the Federal Government if there is an equal right upon the part of the States. One or the other must have the exclusive right, according to the conditions and the necessities of the case.

If the question is of such a nature that it should be controlled by the Federal Government and not by the State, then the State of North Dakota should not have the right to determine the qualifications of its citizens for suffrage. On the other hand, if the State has full right in the premises the Federal Government can not have or exercise the same right. If the Federal Government should have the right or authority to pass on this question of qualifications as to sex, then it must also have the same authority to pass on other qualifications, such as length of residence, citizenship, and like subjects.

Under our form of government, with its 48 sovereign republics, all these questions of age, length of residence, and sex, which qualify the individual as an elector, are, in my opinion, properly and inherently State questions and not Federal questions. If the Federal Government has the right to say that equal suffrage shall be extended whether a State favors it or not, then the Federal Government has the right to say that equal suffrage shall not be extended whether the State favors it or not; and I deny that proposition. If my State votes in favor of the extension of suffrage to the women of that State, it has the full power to do so, and the Federal Government has no inherent moral right to say that it shall not extend the suffrage to the women of that State.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been detained on official business during the afternoon and have been denied the privilege of listening to this interesting discussion, and very likely the question I am going to ask the Senator has been asked before. I will ask the Senator how he squares his contention with the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall touch upon that before I get through in my 10 minutes. I agreed not to take any longer time than that.

Let us suppose, Mr. President, that the majority of the people whom I represent say that the elective franchise shall not be extended. Would I have the right, as a representative of that State, to say that her will should be overruled? I do not care which way she votes, I will take exactly the same position. Or, placing the matter in another view, has the State of North Dakota the right, with her 700,000 people, to say to the State of New York, with her nearly 10,000,000 people, "We know better than you what suffrage is for the best interests of your State; we know better than you how long a residence one should have in your State before he is entitled to vote; we know better than you how long a person must remain a citizen of the United States before voting in your State?"

I insist, Mr. President, that New York has no right to speak for my State, and I have no right to speak for New York. If New York has not the right to speak for my State, then 20 States or 40 States have not the right to determine that question for my State. When I speak of a right I am speaking always of a moral right and not the legal power, because there is no question but that we can amend the Constitution so that three-fourths of the States shall govern all the States in relation to this question. The only proposition is whether it ought to do it, not whether it has the power to do it.

It seems to me that these questions answer the whole proposition. So, Mr. President, without prolonging the debate with the many more illustrations which could be given, I shall record my own conclusions in my vote on this amendment to the effect that every question concerning the qualifications of voters, the limitations and the extensions of the elective franchise, is a question that ought to be left to the State itself.

I now purpose to answer the proposition of the Senator from New Hampshire. I am aware, Mr. President, of the amendment to the Constitution which prohibits any State from depriving any citizen of the right of suffrage because of color or previous condition of servitude. This is not an analogous case in any respect. A great war between the States had been fought to its bitter end, a war that grew out of the question of human slavery. The race prejudice, supplemented by the bitterness of that war, was so great that to protect those whom the Nation had made citizens of the country in their citizenship rights the Federal Government under those conditions demanded the amendment. Without that amendment the emancipation of the colored man would have been a dead letter.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a moment. It was accepted as a condition of reinstating the old relation between the State and the Federal authority. But even with all that prejudice and all of the bitterness growing out of that conflict, it never occurred to the Congress of that day to infringe upon the right of the State to determine every question relative to the elective franchise with the exception of that one great question of the complete denial of the rights of citizenship on account of race or color or previous condition of servitude.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that in addition to what he says our experience in connection with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments has not been a very happy one, the fifteenth amendment being disregarded by a very great number of the States and the principal part of the fourteenth amendment being altogether disregarded by Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, no such question as this arises as the reason for that amendment in the consideration of this subject. There is no race hatred, there is no race prejudice within its possible scope. There is no bitterness of war that affects it. The manhood of the country has no prejudice against the womanhood of the country. The father or son has no prejudice against the wife, the mother, the daughter, or the sister.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just let me finish this statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. On the contrary, the manhood of the country has a reverence and respect more deeply rooted, stronger, and more effective than in any other country in the world.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I will, with the Senator's permission, put into the RECORD the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The Senator treats that as of little account because it was passed shortly after the Civil War. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] thinks it of little account because it has not been observed or enforced. I will ask the two Senators if they are ready to vote——

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall not allow the Senator to so state my position, that I treat this fifteenth amendment as of little account. On the contrary, I treat it as of great account. It was absolutely necessary for the protection of the citizenship rights of the colored people. The Senator has no warrant to assert that I treat that as of little account.

Mr. GALLINGER. I interpret the Senator's language in my own way. If I misinterpret it, of course I stand corrected. The Senator from Pennsylvania more particularly seemed to treat it lightly because it has not been observed or enforced, and I suppose the Senator from Pennsylvania is ready to vote to repeal it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I am not ready to vote to repeal it, but I am ready to vote for legislation that will enforce the amendment. My purpose in alluding to it was to call attention to the way in which these two amendments to our fundamental law have been treated, one by Congress in failing to enforce the decrees of the Constitution, and the other by a large number of States in failing to pay any attention to an important part of that fundamental law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course the Senator himself has a duty to perform in the matter. He is a Member of the legislative body, and it is competent for him, and perhaps it is his duty, to introduce a bill covering this point.

The point I wish to make, and the only point I intended to make, was that in view of the fact that the fifteenth amendment does prescribe that the States shall not by any means at their command prohibit a certain class of people from voting in a State, the Senator's argument that we have no right, as the National Government, to make an inhibition in regard to the right of women to vote, it seems to me, falls to the ground. I may be mistaken.

Mr. McCUMBER. It may seem to the Senator that it falls to the ground, but I can see a vast difference between determining that the citizenship of the country which we created after the war should be protected in the rights of citizenship and in a declaration that we shall go into every State and exercise a control over the elective franchise of the State and every matter that pertains to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in just a moment. One proposition was based upon a great necessity to protect the rights and liberty of a people just emancipated from slavery, and it was necessary. My claim is that this is not necessary to protect the citizenship or liberty of the people of any State. The people of the State of North Dakota can and will determine that question for themselves, and they will determine it by their vote next November. I have no doubt but that their vote will be an intelligent one, and whether it agrees with mine or does not agree with mine, it will be binding upon me as a citizen of that State, and it will be my duty to conform to it whichever way it is decided, and seek through the franchise adopted by the State to promote the progress and welfare of all its citizens.

Mr. GALLINGER. Nobody questions the right of the individual State to act in this matter. It never has been challenged. The Senator says that the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted to protect the rights of certain men who had been made citizens or who had been given the right of suffrage in consequence largely of the war. The proposition involved in this amendment is to protect the rights of citizens who have been citizens from the foundation of the Government, and I think it is quite as important that their rights, if they have rights, should be protected as that we should protect the rights of men who became citizens by the proclamation of emancipation.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not the slightest doubt in the world but that the people of the State of New Hampshire will be able to protect the citizens of the State of New Hampshire. I have not the slightest doubt in the world but that the citizens of the State of North Dakota will be able to protect the citizenship of that State. But, Mr. President, had I lived during the war period and understood the questions of that time I probably would have agreed with the men of that day that it would have been impossible to have secured the citizenship rights of

the colored people without the Government insisting upon that amendment.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator a question. If it be true that the State of New Hampshire can protect the citizenship of the women of the State, must we not then concede to the South the proposition which it makes, that they are quite as capable of taking care of the citizenship of the South, whether it be white or black? If we assert the one proposition, are we not compelled to concede the other?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have answered that question. I have said that due to a race prejudice, due to the bitterness of the war and a bitterness that still exists against the colored people of the South, I do not think that those States do protect them in their citizenship or that they are able to protect them in what I regard as their rights under the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Then we come to the other proposition that, although we passed a constitutional provision, the National Government does not protect them. We make a promise and we do not make that promise good.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator can get into no dispute with me upon that proposition. I am in favor of the National Government enforcing that provision to the limit and every law under the Constitution. I simply oppose the National Government reaching beyond and going into my State and determining what the elective franchise in my own State shall be, which I think in my State belongs to that State. The Senator and I do not disagree upon the duty of Congress to enforce the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. BORAH. I will say very frankly I am one of those who believe that it was a mistake to bestow upon the colored people at that particular time the right to vote. It would have been better for them had it come later and when they had had time to prepare for the responsibility.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, that may have been the case. I am inclined to think, however, that if it had not been granted then it never would have been granted, and we would have had in this day a large population that were not citizens of the country. If it had not been granted at that time it never would have been granted afterwards.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is now referring to the question of citizenship, I presume—to the fourteenth amendment. I do not take that view with reference to the fourteenth amendment, which bestowed citizenship upon people; but the fifteenth amendment was designed simply to protect them in their vote. I do not believe that it was wise to undertake to lift the race out of a thousand years of barbarism and 300 years of slavery into the duties and responsibilities of citizenship under a republic. Whatever may be our duty now, it having been granted, and after 50 years of experience it was a greater rôle than those people could carry at that time. No race in the history of the world could have been equal to the obligation which we placed upon the colored people. The question with me is whether or not we are here to-day contemplating the putting into the Constitution of another provision which, so far as that race is concerned, will be the same thing exactly. I am a firm believer in the proposition that whatever is in the Constitution should be obeyed and lived up to by us as a people. I hesitate to insert in it a provision which I know in advance will be ignored or defied. Especially do I hesitate when those States which want equal suffrage can secure it in their respective States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Neither the Senator nor myself can change what has been done. We have those amendments; they are part of the law of the land; and I do not believe in having a constitutional provision that is not enforced. I believe that greater evils will grow out of the nonenforcement of that amendment, even though it might have been a mistake, than would follow as the result of its enforcement. We ought either to enforce that law or we ought to wipe it out of the Constitution and the laws of the land. I can not agree that we should leave it in a position where we know that it is the Constitution and yet wink at its violation year in and year out. I think the intelligence of the South will always take care of the vote of the South, and I do not believe that the colored voters of the South would rule if everyone of them went to the polls. I still believe they would be ruled and governed by the white people of the South. I am quite strong in that conviction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the Senator how he can say that, in view of the historical fact that for 8 or 10 years after the war the negroes did rule us, under a saturnalia of crime and corruption unprecedented in the history of the world?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, because during a certain period people who had had no training whatever in self-government, people who had become intoxicated with the power that they thought belonged to them, used it as an intoxicated man will use his strength, is no reason why, after 50 years of education, education by the white man, that the same conditions would result. The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] just now said that in his own State the colored man does go to the polls; that there is nothing to prevent his going there and voting as he sees fit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; in the State of Florida there is a very substantial white majority.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, with the present increase—and I have made a computation of the number of white people in the States of the South—with a comparison of the increase in the negro population in the South, in 25 years there will not be a State in which the white population would not be greatly in excess of the colored population.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will pardon just one more remark, which has nothing to do with this debate, but somehow or other here, now and then, we get off on the question——

Mr. McCUMBER. I was drawn into it further than I intended to go.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There may be absolute negro rule in a State without a negro majority, provided there is a comparatively large negro vote. That grows out of the fact that the negro votes solidly. During the time immediately after the war he was not solid, by virtue of the intoxication of new freedom, at all; he was solid by virtue of his ignorance and an alien leadership and domination of white men who had gone down there for the purpose of utilizing his vote for their own pocketbook advantage.

Mr. McCUMBER. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With some of them it was with the idea that they could lift him up. So, whether there shall be a majority or not in every Southern State would not cut so much figure as the fact that the negro vote remains solid, as it always has done and always will where it is principally ignorant. Then there is a holding of the balance of power between two separated white factions which necessitates negro rule. But the point I rose to at first was just simply to correct what the Senator had said, that if every negro went to the polls in a Southern State he could not rule that State. If every negro went to the polls in the State of Mississippi to-morrow and if their votes were counted—and back in the time before we adopted the new constitution people resorted to absolutely revolutionary methods, either not counting their votes or intimidating them so as to keep them from the polls—if they went to-morrow they would rule Mississippi; and there is not an intelligent man in the State of Mississippi, there is not a man who has brains enough to shake in a mustard shell who would not, if he knew it was going to continue, sell everything he had and leave the State.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, Mr. President, I will answer both propositions of the Senator. The foreign importation of leadership has passed away.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it will come again.

Mr. McCUMBER. The carpetbagger is no longer in Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He would come again.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator said that all those elements which were responsible for the conditions which followed have gone, and I said, then, that I agreed with the Senator that they had got rid of those conditions. Now the Senator is assuming that if a colored man votes in Mississippi, every colored man will necessarily vote on the wrong side of every question. I can not believe that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am only assuming that he will vote solidly, that is all.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that he will vote en bloc, and that it will be a vote against the white man. I do not think that that is true in any sense. In most States of the Union this fact prevails, that after all it is the few that influence the many. Our campaigns are campaigns of education, and it is this education and this influence of the few upon the many that makes self-government really safe. What is true in other States in the Union is equally true, I believe, in the Southern States. I believe that with the white man's superior education and with his superior intelligence he will be able to always rule and have a white man's government; and that if there is now a close vote between the colored and the white, the increasing population of the white in excess of the colored will soon make the colored vote a negligible quantity in every State in the Union.

If it were a question strictly between black and white, even upon that your dark man would still vote into office the white man, but he might have a voice in saying which white man. Whatever weakness there may be in it—and I admit that there must necessarily be some weakness—nevertheless, greater injury in the end would befall a denial of the citizenship rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. President, in closing I will state that I have avoided the expression of my own views upon the merits of this subject,

because I have not had the opportunity for preparation which one should have to present the other features of the case. It is sufficient for this vote to say that I regard the right of the States to pass upon the question of the suffrage limitation as inherently superior to the right of the Federal Government to pass on it for them, and I shall not vote to give either the Federal Government or three-fourths of the States of the Union the right to overrule the judgment of the citizens of my State on a question that inherently and rightly belongs to the citizens of that State. They will vote, as I have stated, upon that question this fall. What we do here will not affect their rights in the slightest degree. Their votes will and should govern.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I intend to vote against this joint resolution proposing this constitutional amendment. It seems proper, therefore, that some explanations of my reasons for doing so should be given. In giving them I shall say nothing about the "superiority" of man to woman or the "superiority" of woman to man. Neither is superior to the other; they are simply different, that is all; and I do not want that difference obliterated. As to the difference between them, I thank God for its existence. Both sexes have their place in the economy of life; they both have their place in building upon the past a future brighter than anything we have ever seen. Nor do I believe that that difference, such as it is—man being superior to woman in some respects, and woman superior to man in some other respects, and each inferior to the other in certain respects—affects the ability or fitness of a woman to cast a ballot; I do not believe a word of that.

I do not know that I am opposed to woman suffrage at all, provided it is brought about in the manner in which I think it ought to be brought about, if at all, namely, by separate and voluntary State action. On the contrary, when the good ladies of my State who are in favor of woman suffrage have written to me upon the subject I have replied that I saw no inherent reason why a woman should not vote. I do not see any now; I never have seen any. I have never taken any stock in the idea that woman was incapacitated by her very nature to cast a ballot as intelligently as I or anybody else not individually her mental superior. But I have replied to them by saying that "the chief thing that I want to know is whether or not you—as a class, as a body—want to vote, because if you do not want to vote, you are not fit to vote; if you do not want to vote, then if the privilege be conferred on you you are not going to vote; and if you are going to have only a small part of the sex to vote, then you had better postpone the day of reckoning." I have replied "that is a question that I propose to leave to you as a body. Let the white women of the State of Mississippi petition the governor of the State to let them hold a white woman's primary in the State of Mississippi and let only the women go to the polls, and say in that primary whether or not they want to vote." That has been my uniform answer, and I have never yet received a rejoinder to the reply from one of those ladies.

An unwilling class of voters is a great misfortune to any country. To give a class of people the suffrage when only a small fraction of them will exercise it or really want it and have interest enough in it and knowledge enough about it to want it is a misfortune for the whole community, themselves included.

I lay down that proposition at the beginning. But although I am not in favor of woman suffrage, although I go further and say that I do not think that the results of woman suffrage will be of the importance that either side to the controversy attach to it, I still do not countenance this constitutional-amendment way of arriving at it; and even if I were ardently in favor of it, which I am not—I am indifferent to it—I would not countenance this way of reaching it. I am indifferent to it, because I think it is largely a tempest in a teapot, so far as the results to be expected are concerned. I do not arrive at that conclusion solely by a priori argument; I arrive at it also by a posteriori argument. I look out into the States that have had woman suffrage, and I look into the States with similar populations—not with dissimilar populations—which have not had it, and I do not find that woman suffrage has improved government particularly or hurt it materially. I take no stock in the phrases of those on the one side who say that woman suffrage would "break up the home," and that it would "degrade womanhood," and all that. Why, bless your heart, it would take more than a ballot box to degrade the sweet womanhood of the State of Mississippi, whatever might happen elsewhere. I do not think it a scarecrow; it does not frighten me; but, upon the other side, it is not a panacea, either. It is not going to bring about any great "moral uplift"; it is not going to bring about any millennium; it is not going to add very materially to the acceleration of the progress of the human race. Where it has already been tried it has not done it. There is as good government in States without it as in States with it.

The line of cleavage, moral and mental, in society is not a sex line at all. Keep that in your mind. When you get into a bad population the women are bad with the men—and a bad woman is worse than a bad man, just as a good woman is better than a good man—and when you get into a good population the women are good with the men. I have in mind now a State—I am not going to mention it, of course—where they had excellent government, and afterwards adopted woman suffrage, and still have excellent government. I have in mind another State where they had bad government, somewhat corrupt at all times. They established woman suffrage, and they still have exactly that sort of government. I dare say if you go into the population on the east side of New York you would not find political society elevated much by giving women suffrage any more than it has been elevated by giving it to the men. To take what many consider the other extreme, I fancy you would experience no greater change if women voted in the Back Bay section of Boston. It depends upon the family, the population, and not the sex. As the man is, so is the woman, and vice versa, when it comes to whole communities. So I do not go crazy about the question either way. I am perfectly willing to do whatever the good women of the State of Mississippi want me to do. I want them to tell me, only I want them to tell me in an unmistakable way.

The point of objection to this resolution with me is this: I do not want the balance of the Union to tell Mississippi what she shall do. I would be just as much opposed, if Mississippi wanted woman suffrage, to have the balance of this Union tell her that she should not have it as I would be, if she did not want it, to permit the balance of this Union to tell her that she must have it. It is her affair within her borders, and within her borders it is not your affair—you people from Wyoming, Colorado, and Oregon, and elsewhere, on the one side, or from New York, or Ohio, or Alabama, or elsewhere, on the other side.

Some Senator said—it was the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], I believe—that it will take three-fourths of the States to adopt this proposed amendment. I do not care whether it takes three-fourths or seven-eighths. If three-fourths of the States said to Mississippi, "You shall not have woman suffrage" when she wanted it, I would say she had a right to have it. If three-fourths of the States said to her, "You shall have it," when she did not want it, I would say that she had a right not to have it. I do not care if every State in the Union, except Mississippi, says either of the two things, my position would still be the same.

I tell you, you are too much losing sight of local self-government and its value and the right of communities to regulate themselves. You are undertaking too much every day to put the American people into a dull uniform caste. There are parts of this Union which differ from each other just as much in traditions, ideals, daily life, thought, sympathies, and sentiment as Alsace-Lorraine does from a county in Norway, and there is no more reason why they should be governed in the same manner, except in Federal affairs and international relations.

The framers of our Constitution were very wise when they did not delegate to the Federal Government and thereby left to the States the authority to determine who should be the electors in the States when they provided that those Federal officers elected in the States should be elected by those electors qualified by State law to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, reserving to the Federal Government certain powers in regard to the manner and time of elections, but leaving to the State to determine who should vote for the Federal officials, provided only that the State took the medicine that she gave the Federal Government, to wit, that the same people who voted for the Federal officials should be those who voted for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

We have had one mistake of that sort already—and I am not going to get off into an argument of the endless "nigger" question—but we have had one mistake too many already, to wit, the fifteenth amendment. It was not a crime; it was worse than a crime; it was a blunder. It ought to be repealed. Of course I am not moon struck and barking at the moon; I confess I do not now imagine that I can get it repealed; I am not saying that is a thing for your present consideration or my present hope in practical politics, but I say it would be infinitely better to-day if every State in this Union were left free to fix its own limitations of the suffrage in every respect without regard to sex, color, race, previous condition of servitude, or anything else. I tell you who imagine that you are the Federal Government that whenever you get to the point where you can not trust the States you can not trust yourself. When I get to the point

where I can not trust my heart or my legs or my arms or my eyes, which make me up, then I am arrived at the point where I can not trust myself, for they constitute me and must forever constitute me. I can not live outside of them any more than they can live outside of me.

I do not know why this question was brought in in this way anyhow. Woman suffrage in the several States has been traveling along nicely. Just in proportion as women take interest in it and want to vote, they will vote. I will make this assertion here, and I believe my colleague [Mr. VARDAMAN] and other Senators from the cotton States, will bear me out in the statement that women have more influence in regard to public measures in Mississippi and those States to-day than they have in any suffrage State in this Union. I do not care what the women put themselves behind in the State of Mississippi, that thing the men vote for, and the politician who dares oppose it gets defeated by the other men. Let it be prohibition; let it be anything else; if the women of Mississippi say to the men of Mississippi in sufficient tones, so that the men can understand them, "We want this thing," the men give it to them; and I have never yet seen a public man in Mississippi brave enough—if you call it courage; unchivalrous enough, I would rather call it, although in these modern days the word, like its counterpart, has grown into disrepute—to refuse them what they wanted. If they want the suffrage there now, they can have it; they can have a white women's primary to say whether or not they want it; and the minute they say so, in that way or clearly otherwise, there will not be 300 men in the State of Mississippi who would vote against it at the polls. But I do not want you to take Mississippi, pry her mouth open, and drench her with medicine of your own preparation. Even if it is good medicine, even if it is going to cure her—granting that she is sick—she has a right to take her own medicine, to send for her own doctor, and trust her doctors who are her chosen State representatives to prescribe for her.

Something was said to-day about "rights." Suffrage is not a right, and never was a right. It is a privilege granted to the individual by society in the interest of society. Therefore society does not admit idiots to exercise it, nor lunatics, nor paupers, nor men under 21, and in Mississippi those who are so ignorant that they can not read or write to exercise it, nor do we permit those who have so little civic righteousness as not to pay the State their taxes to exercise it. If they do not think enough of the State of Mississippi and of their own citizenship to pay what they owe to the State in taxes, then they can not vote. In the interest of society we say that if they have been convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude they shall not vote.

They have no right to vote. Mississippi has the right to determine whether they shall or shall not vote, and, in determining that matter, to consider Mississippi's interest, the interest of society, which far overbalances the interest of the individual who is seeking suffrage.

Coming back to the appeal that is made to the Senate to pass this resolution, and summing up all I have said in one sentence, my opposition to it is not because I am opposed to what is sought, but because I am opposed to the method pursued in seeking it, to the forum to which it is sought to send the question.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 4, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3, 1914.*

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

James E. McGovern to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Oliver C. Harper to be register of the land office at Independence, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel J. Teevan, Shelton.

IOWA.

Jacob H. Bahne, Sibley.
J. W. Cannon, Elma.
E. F. Douglass, Dysart.
William A. Keithley, Springville.
Charles E. Lynch, Waucoma.
John R. Mattes, Odebolt.
Arthur O. Reinhardt, Van Horn.
Henry S. Rosecrans, Oskaloosa.
P. H. W. Schippmann, Holstein.

LOUISIANA.

Ada A. Smart, Leesville.

MICHIGAN.

A. P. Benedict, Lawrence.
Ernest W. Brown, Farwell.
Fred Carroll, Manistique.
Sylvester Doremus, Lake City.
Thomas J. Dundon, Ishpeming.
Seymour C. Eslow, Homer.
Lloyd C. Feighner, Litchfield.
Robert D. Jenkinson, Vicksburg.
Edwin F. W. Neidhold, Wakefield.
Edward F. Riley, Mendon.
John P. Roberts, Sandusky.

MINNESOTA.

Gerrit F. Akin, Farmington.
George G. Allanson, Wheaton.
H. E. Kent, Sanborn.
P. H. Kifer, Barnesville.
E. C. Kiley, Grand Rapids.
J. W. New, Floodwood.
William L. Poseley, Renville.
O. W. Ramsdell, Akely.
John R. Serrin, Glenwood.
Joseph Wolf, Staples.

MONTANA.

J. E. Swindlehurst, Livingston.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *March 3, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Paul Robinson Hickok, pastor of Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, we acknowledge Thee to be Lord, sovereign over us and all our doings. We confess our weakness save as Thou dost make us strong, and our insufficiency save as Thou dost make us perfect and complete in Thee. In Thine infinite goodness, pardon Thou the iniquities we confess before Thee and take away all sin from our hearts.

Permit Thy gracious blessing to rest upon this Nation and all its people and upon their Representatives here assembled. Have in Thy loving care the President and all gathered with him in authority; the Speaker of the House and his associates. Direct and control our entire citizenship, holding in check all suspicion and bitterness and evil passions, and manifesting Thyself in all our relations with those within and without our borders.

And in all our serving and our labor may we glorify Thee by showing forth Thine enternal and ineffable glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—SARAH ANN HEPPS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. DYER to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of Sarah Ann Hepps, H. R. 4824, Sixty-second Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty Members present—not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 0, answered "present" 4, not voting 186, as follows:

YEAS—242.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Edwards | Kettner | Reed |
| Adair | Esch | Kindel | Reilly, Wis. |
| Ainey | Estopinal | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Rogers |
| Alexander | Faison | Kinkead, N. J. | Rothermel |
| Allen | Falconer | Kirkpatrick | Rouse |
| Anderson | Fergusson | Konop | Rubey |
| Ansberry | Ferris | La Follette | Rupley |
| Ashbrook | Fess | Langham | Russell |
| Aswell | Fields | Langley | Scott |
| Bailey | Fitzgerald | Lazaro | Shackleford |
| Baker | Fordney | Lee, Ga. | Sherley |
| Baltz | Fowler | Lee, Pa. | Sherwood |
| Barkley | Francis | Lever | Sims |
| Barnhart | French | Lewis, Md. | Sinnott |
| Bartlett | Gard | Lewis, Pa. | Sisson |
| Barton | Garner | Lieb | Slayden |
| Bathrick | Garrett, Tex. | Lindbergh | Slemp |
| Beakes | Gerry | Linthicum | Sloan |
| Bell, Cal. | Gillett | Lloyd | Smith, Idaho |
| Booher | Gilmore | Lonergan | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Borchers | Glass | McAndrews | Smith, Md. |
| Borland | Godwin, N. C. | McDermott | Smith, N. Y. |
| Bowdle | Good | McGuire, Okla. | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Britten | Goulden | McKellar | Smith, Tex. |
| Brockson | Graham, Ill. | McLaughlin | Sparkman |
| Brodbeck | Greene, Vt. | MacDonald | Stafford |
| Brown, N. Y. | Gregg | Madden | Stedman |
| Browne, Wis. | Hamilton, Mich. | Maguire, Nebr. | Steenerson |
| Bruckner | Hamlin | Mahan | Stephens, Cal. |
| Brumbaugh | Hardwick | Maher | Stephens, Miss. |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Hardy | Mann | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Buchanan, Tex. | Harrison | Mapes | Stephens, Tex. |
| Burke, Wis. | Hart | Mitchell | Stone |
| Butler | Haugen | Montague | Sumners |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Hay | Moon | Talbott, Md. |
| Callaway | Hayden | Moore | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Caraway | Hayes | Morgan, La. | Taylor, N. Y. |
| Carter | Heflin | Morgan, Okla. | Ten Eyck |
| Cary | Helm | Moss, Ind. | Thacher |
| Church | Helvering | Murray, Okla. | Thomas |
| Clark, Fla. | Hensley | Neeley, Kans. | Thompson, Okla. |
| Claypool | Hinds | Neely, W. Va. | Thomson, Ill. |
| Cline | Holland | Nolan, J. I. | Towner |
| Collier | Howard | Oglesby | Tribble |
| Connelly, Kans. | Hughes, Ga. | Oldfield | Underhill |
| Connolly, Iowa | Hull | Padgett | Underwood |
| Cox | Humphrey, Wash. | Page, N. C. | Vaughan |
| Cramton | Humphreys, Miss. | Paige, Mass. | Vollmer |
| Davenport | Igoe | Park | Walker |
| Davis | Jacoway | Parker | Walsh |
| Decker | Johnson, Ky. | Patten, N. Y. | Walters |
| Deitrick | Johnson, S. C. | Payne | Weaver |
| Dershem | Johnson, Utah | Peters, Mass. | White |
| Dickinson | Johnson, Wash. | Phelan | Williams |
| Dies | Kahn | Post | Willis |
| Dixon | Keister | Powers | Wilson, Fla. |
| Donohoe | Kelley, Mich. | Quin | Wingo |
| Donovan | Kennedy, Conn. | Ragsdale | Young, N. Dak. |
| Doolittle | Kennedy, Iowa | Rainey | Young, Tex. |
| Doremus | Kennedy, R. I. | Raker | |
| Eagle | Kent | Rayburn | |

NAYS—0.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adamson | Browning | Fairchild | Treadway |

NOT VOTING—186.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Dillon | Hinebaugh | O'Brien |
| Anthony | Dooling | Hobson | O'Hair |
| Austin | Doughton | Houston | O'Leary |
| Avis | Driscoll | Howell | O'Shaunessy |
| Barchfeld | Dunn | Hoxworth | Palmer |
| Bartholdt | Dupré | Hughes, W. Va. | Patton, Pa. |
| Beall, Tex. | Dyer | Hulings | Peters, Me. |
| Bell, Ga. | Eagan | Jones | Peterson |
| Blackmon | Edmonds | Keating | Platt |
| Broussard | Elder | Kelly, Pa. | Plumley |
| Brown, W. Va. | Evans | Key, Ohio | Porter |
| Bryan | Farr | Kiess, Pa. | Pou |
| Bulkley | Finley | Kitchin | Prouty |
| Burgess | Fitzhenry | Knowland, J. R. | Rauch |
| Burke, Pa. | Flood, Va. | Korbly | Reilly, Conn. |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Floyd, Ark. | Kreider | Richardson |
| Burnett | Foster | Lafferty | Riordan |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Frear | L'Engle | Roberts, Mass. |
| Calder | Gallagher | Lenroot | Roberts, Nev. |
| Campbell | Gardner | Lesher | Rucker |
| Candler, Miss. | Garrett, Tenn. | Levy | Sabath |
| Cantor | George | Lindquist | Saunders |
| Cantrill | Gittins | Lobeck | Scully |
| Carew | Goeke | Loft | Seldomridge |
| Carlin | Goldfogle | Logue | Sells |
| Carr | Goodwin, Ark. | McClellan | Sharp |
| Casey | Gordon | McCoy | Shreve |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Gorman | McGillicuddy | Small |
| Clancy | Graham, Pa. | McKenzie | Smith, Minn. |
| Clayton | Gray | Manahan | Stanley |
| Coady | Green, Iowa | Martin | Stevens, Minn. |
| Conry | Greene, Mass. | Merritt | Stevens, N. H. |
| Cooper | Griest | Metz | Stout |
| Copley | Griffin | Miller | Stringer |
| Covington | Gudger | Mondell | Sutherland |
| Crisp | Guernsey | Morin | Switzer |
| Crosser | Hamill | Morrison | Taggart |
| Cullop | Hamilton, N. Y. | Moss, W. Va. | Tavenner |
| Curry | Hammond | Mott | Taylor, Ala. |
| Dale | Hawley | Murdock | Taylor, Ark. |
| Danforth | Helgesen | Murray, Mass. | Taylor, Colo. |
| Dent | Henry | Nelson | Temple |
| Difenderfer | Hill | Norton | Townsend |
| Tuttle | Watkins | Whitacre | Woodruff |
| Vare | Watson | Wilson, N. Y. | Woods |
| Volstead | Webb | Winslow | |
| Wallin | Whaley | Witherspoon | |

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Until further notice:

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. AUSTIN (commencing February 6, until return from Colorado).

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. HOWELL (commencing February 6, until return from Michigan).

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. SUTHERLAND (until return from Colorado).

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. VARE.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. MCCLELLAN with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. POU with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. MURDOCK.

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. SHARP with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. PETERS of Maine.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. CROSSER with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. VOLSTEAD.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. BULKLEY with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. CANTOR with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COADY with Mr. BRYAN.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. DENT with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. DILLON.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. DYER.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas with Mr. FARR.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. HAWLEY.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HENRY with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. LAFFERTY.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill H. R. 13679, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, at breakfast this morning I happened to overhear a remark made by one of those two-by-four know-it-alls which set me thinking. It was this: "No class of people in this country except the farmer and the criminal can get any money from the Federal Government for any purpose." Continuing he said, "Do you know that there are appropriated $50,000,000 a year for the farmers of this country?" He had a good face, was well dressed, and seemed to be a man of intelligence, but his asinine display of ignorance, uttered with the arrogance of apparent information, made me propound to myself the query, "Is it possible that such gross ignorance is prevalent generally among the people with reference to what the Federal Government is doing for agriculture?" Mr. Chairman, instead of expending $50,000,000 a year for the agriculture of this Nation, the fact is that the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, which go in direct aid to the farmer, and to him alone, amount to only $9,690,000 annually.

The bill which we are about to consider appropriates in round numbers $25,000,000, including permanent annual appropriations. The annual appropriation carried in this bill is $18,947,232, an increase of $960,287 over the appropriation for the present fiscal year, an increase of about 5 per cent, which is less than the average annual increase for the past four years. Those who criticize the Committee on Agriculture for its so-called liberality in appropriating for the Department of Agriculture can not be familiar with the growing and accumulating lines of activity imposed upon the Department of Agriculture from year to year by mandates of Congress. The Department of Agriculture was created for the purpose of collecting and disseminating information on subjects relating to agriculture in the most comprehensive sense of that word, but the Congress from time to time has placed upon this department other burdens than those contemplated in the fundamental act. For example, we are spending something like $1,668,000 for the support of the Weather Bureau, which was created to aid commerce and navigation as well as agriculture. We are appropriating more than five and a half million dollars in this bill for the protection of our national forests, and surely this can not be charged against the expense account of agriculture. We are spending more than three million dollars a year for the meat inspection service to protect the people of the country from diseased meats. We are expending more than half a million dollars a year through the enforcement of the pure food and drugs act for the protection of the health of the people of the country.

The fact is that by congressional enactment the Department of Agriculture has been made to become the great police functionary of the Government, and the necessary increases in appropriations for this feature of its work must be the basis for the criticism of those who complain of the increasing appropriations for this department.

Without derogating from the importance of this line of work, it is only just to say that it has largely overshadowed in the minds of Members of the House, I fear, the fundamental constructive research, investigational, and demonstration work which formed the original concept of the department.

But Congress has placed upon this department these burdens, and they can not be effectively carried without sufficient appropriations. You can not enforce laws without means and money, and Members will be surprised to know how little is being appropriated in this bill for the promotion and encouragement of agriculture as such. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture has prepared for me a statement as to the amount of money being expended by the Government in direct aid of agriculture, and it shows this: Of the $25,461,000 of permanent and annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, only $9,690,000 is devoted to work in direct aid of the farmers. This, worked out in percentages, means that 62 per cent of the appropriation for the department is used in its regulatory, police, and quarantine work, while only 38 per cent is used in aid of the greatest occupation of the people of this country. [Applause.] In the face of such facts and with an understanding of what the research and demonstration work of this department means to the people of the country, is there one bold enough to repeat the charge that this committee has been unduly liberal in its attitude toward this work? For myself, I have no apologies to make; I am prepared to defend every item in this bill as a wise investment of public funds.

The appropriation provided in this bill is a mere bagatelle, inconsequential in comparison with our appropriations for other purposes. What are the facts? What will a comparison show? You will appropriate for the support of the Army this year in round numbers $94,000,000. This means that every time you appropriate $1 to aid in the development and encouragement of the greatest occupation and the oldest occupation of mankind you are appropriating $10 for the maintenance and support of the Army. You are spending more this year to maintain this little square of 10 miles in the District of Columbia than you are appropriating for the agriculture of the entire country. You are spending more for the maintenance of the wards of this Nation, the Indians, this year than you are appropriating in this bill for the encouragement of the agriculture of the country. You will appropriate very likely this year in round numbers $140,000,000 for the support of the Navy, and this means that every time $1 is expended to help the farmers of this country to keep their cornerib and smokehouses full and to feed the people of this Nation you are spending fifteen and a half dollars for your Navy. And I want to say in this connection, my friends, that the greatest security that this Nation can have against foreign invasion and foreign war does not lie in the strength of its Navy or Army but in the contentedness, prosperity, and happiness of its agricultural classes. [Applause.]

I should ten thousand times prefer to see the approach of a foreign fleet to our shores than to see the time when the American people are not self-sustaining in their meat and food supply. Give me a well-fed, well-clothed, prosperous people in city and on farm and I fear not the armies and navies of the world. [Applause.] What else, gentlemen? You will spend $180,000,000 for pensions this year. What does that mean? Every time you appropriate $1 for the promotion of this great American industry you appropriate $20 for pensions. I shall not continue the comparison, but ask to call your attention to the fact that the total appropriations for all purposes for the present fiscal year amount to $1,105,000,000, of which amount the paltry sum of only $9,690,000, or nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the total, goes to the development of the basic business of the country. Is the criticism of this committee, that it is overliberal to the Department of Agriculture and the farmers of this country, to be continued in the face of such facts? I should like to commend to such critics the fact that the total agricultural capitalization of this country is more than $42,000,000,000.

The farmers are producing annually more than $9,000,000,000 of products.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not ask that the appropriation recommended by the committee in this bill shall stand upon invidious comparisons. I am content to have each item rest solely upon its own merit and the character and importance of the work contemplated under it. Unless I am prepared to show that every dollar recommended for the work of the Department of Agriculture is an investment which will bring returns to the people in the way of improved and more profitable methods of agriculture, better living conditions, and a larger food and clothing supply, I am not justified in the recommendations contained in this bill. My study of the economic situation in this country and the unmistakable tendencies clearly apparent to students of these conditions furnishes the justification for this bill. I ask your indulgence while I call your attention to certain tendencies, certain danger signals which bid us "Stop, look, and listen."

In 1880 70.5 per cent of the population of the United States was classified as agricultural. In 1910 only 53.7 per cent of that population was so classified. And even these figures are misleading, for the fact is that only 28 per cent of our people actually live upon the farm. The drift of population from farm to city is unmistakable, and if the tendency continues unchecked, 50 years hence the number of people living on the farm will be negligible in comparison with the total population.

I venture into the field of prophecy to the extent of saying that 50 years hence less than 20 per cent of our people, unless present tendencies are arrested, will be called upon to feed and to clothe the remaining 80 per cent of the people. It is a stupendous task. Can they do it?

Mr. Chairman, statesmanship is not concerned alone with the present, but looks with equal care to the future, watches the birth and development of tendencies, and interprets their meaning and ultimate effect upon posterity, and I submit that the facts just presented are of such a character as to commend

themselves to the most earnest consideration of the wisest statesmanship of this generation.

But why this drift of population from farm to city? Why are our boys and girls leaving the farm, turning their backs upon the old homestead, with its tender memories and hallowed associations, to cast their lot among strangers in our great unsympathetic cities, where competition is keen and pressing and where they often hear "the cry of Hope in wild, merganser flight"? They are leaving because the opportunities for intellectual, social, and financial well-being furnished by the cities are better than can be had in the country, because the educational facilities of the city are better than those in the country, because communication in cities is easier, quicker, and better than it is in the country, because they believe that city life affords greater remuneration for labor, and because country life is thought to be monotonous, irksome, and ill rewarded.

Shall we exert ourselves to check this tendency or shall we stand by and permit it to go on until our cities have become crowded and our rural communities deserted? To me the deserted homestead presents the evidence of a tragedy, and is sufficient incentive to arouse my utmost enthusiasm and effort in behalf of the betterment of rural conditions. We can afford to neglect our towns and cities, we may dispense with the building of a battleship or the equipment of a regiment of soldiers, but we can not afford to neglect that class of our people whose brain and energy give us our food and clothing supply and whose patriotism is the Nation's greatest asset.

I would commend to you the beautiful lines of Goldsmith in The Deserted Village:

> Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay;
> Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade;
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made:
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroy'd can never be supplied.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture is the great constructive conservation department of the Government and deals in the most intimate and fundamental way with the most important and vital problems of the Nation. Its activities ramify in every direction. It touches almost every man in the country, and it touches him for the purpose of trying to help him. I do not propose to discuss the details of this bill, but I want to call the attention of the committee to certain other tendencies that have forced themselves upon my notice in the consideration of agricultural conditions. No problem can be so vital to a people as their meat and bread supply, and the people of this country, and you especially, gentlemen, need to awake to a realization of the true situation in this respect, that you may know to what end we shall be brought by a continuation of present conditions and methods.

What are the facts? In 1907—and these figures have been verified by the Bureau of Statistics—the number of beef cattle in the country amounted to 52,000,000, while in 1913, six years later, the number had decreased to 36,000,000, or a decline of nearly 30 per cent. Remember that these are beef cattle. In the fiscal year 1906 we exported 584,000 head of beef cattle and in 1912 we exported only 106,000 head, or a decline in our exportation in that time of 82 per cent. In the fiscal year 1906 we imported into the United States only 29,000 head of beef cattle, but in 1912 we imported 318,000 head, or an increase in our importation in six years of more than 1,000 per cent.

Do these figures mean anything? Do they bring a lesson or a thought to the people of the United States and to you, the custodians of their present and the guardians of their future here assembled?

In a bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture on the 7th of February this statement is made:

> With regard to meat animals, our estimates indicate an accumulated shortage since the census year of approximately 19.2 per cent, or 8,536,000 head, of cattle; 11.6 per cent, or 6,509,000 head, of sheep; and 5.2 per cent, or 3,214,000 head, of swine. The indicated total shortage of meat animals since the census of 1910 is therefore approximately 18,259,000 head, or nearly 9 beef cattle, 7 sheep, and over 3 hogs for each 100 of the total estimated population in January, 1914.

More than that, it will help to understand the import of these numbers if they are compared with the population for the years mentioned:

> The animals under consideration are cattle on farms other than milch cows. There was 0.49 of 1 animal per capita of the population in 1850 and 0.54 of 1 animal in 1860. This average was not surpassed until 1890, when the per capita ratio was 0.55 of 1 animal. The highest point reached, as far as is known, is 0.67 of 1 animal per capita of the population in 1900, from which time the ratio declined rapidly and strikingly to 0.45 of 1 animal per capita in 1910 and 0.36 of 1 animal in 1914, or but little more than half as much as the ratio or 1900. The figures may be found in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Number and per capita number of horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine on farms, according to the census June 1, 1840, to 1900, and April 15, 1910, and Department of Agriculture estimates, January 1, 1914.*

NUMBER OF ANIMALS.

| Year. | Horses. | Mules. | Cattle. | | | Sheep (not including spring lambs 1840 to 1890). | Swine. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total cattle. | Milch (dairy) cows. | Other cattle. | | |
| 1840 | [1]4,335,669 | [2] | 14,971,586 | [3] | [3] | 19,311,374 | 26,301,293 |
| 1850 | 4,336,719 | 559,331 | 17,778,907 | 6,385,094 | 11,393,813 | 21,723,220 | 30,354,213 |
| 1860 | 6,249,174 | 1,151,148 | 25,620,019 | 8,585,735 | 17,034,284 | 22,471,275 | 33,512,867 |
| 1870 | 7,145,370 | 1,125,415 | 23,820,608 | 8,935,332 | 14,885,276 | 28,477,951 | 25,134,569 |
| 1880 | 10,357,488 | 1,812,808 | 35,925,511 | 12,443,120 | 23,482,391 | 35,192,074 | 47,681,700 |
| 1890 | 14,969,467 | 2,295,532 | 51,363,572 | 16,511,950 | 34,851,622 | 35,935,364 | 57,409,583 |
| 0190 | 18,267,020 | 3,264,615 | 67,719,410 | 17,135,633 | 50,583,777 | 61,503,713 | 62,868,041 |
| 1910 | 19,333,113 | 4,209,769 | 61,803,866 | 20,625,432 | 41,178,434 | 52,447,861 | 58,185,676 |
| 1914 | 20,962,000 | 4,449,000 | 56,592,000 | 20,737,000 | 35,855,000 | 49,719,000 | 58,933,000 |

PER CAPITA NUMBER OF ANIMALS.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1840 | [1]0.25 | [2] | 0.88 | [3] | [3] | 1.13 | 1.54 |
| 1850 | .19 | 0.02 | .77 | 0.28 | 0.49 | .94 | 1.31 |
| 1860 | .20 | .04 | .81 | .27 | .54 | .71 | 1.07 |
| 1870 | .19 | .03 | .62 | .23 | .39 | .74 | .65 |
| 1880 | .21 | .04 | .72 | .25 | .47 | .70 | .95 |
| 1890 | .24 | .04 | .82 | .26 | .55 | .57 | .91 |
| 1900 | .24 | .04 | .80 | .23 | .57 | .81 | .83 |
| 1910 | .22 | .05 | .67 | .22 | .45 | .57 | .63 |
| 1914 | .21 | .05 | .57 | .21 | .36 | .50 | .60 |

[1] Including mules. [2] Included with "Horses." [3] Not given separately.

What do these figures mean, gentlemen? I want to call your attention to some more of them as to meat production and meat consumption in the United States, as follows:

AMOUNTS EXPRESSED IN DRESSED WEIGHT.

It has been estimated by this bureau that the production of meat in 1900 amounted to 16,052,000,000 pounds, as customarily expressed in dressed weight, but including lard. This does not include the extra edible parts, such as heart, liver, tongue, etc.

Of this production, 2,433,000,000 pounds were exported, so that the consumption amounted to 13,619,000,000 pounds, dressed weight. The consumption of beef in 1900 disposed of 5,853,000,000 pounds; of veal, 758,000,000 pounds; total beef and veal, 6,611,000,000 pounds; of mutton and lamb, 587,000,000 pounds; of pork, excluding lard, 5,405,000,000 pounds; of lard, 1,017,000,000 pounds; total pork, including lard, 6,422,000,000 pounds.

An estimate of the production of meat in 1909, partly resting on the method previously adopted by this bureau, but taking advantage of additional information provided by the census, was made by Mr. John Roberts, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and published in the annual report of that bureau for 1911. In this estimate the production of meat in 1909, on the basis of dressed weight, including lard, was 16,863,000,000 pounds, or 811,000,000 pounds more than in 1900.

The exports, however, declined to 1,263,000,000 pounds, or almost exactly one-half the exports of 1900, and the meat remaining for consumption, as expressed in dressed weight, was 15,600,000,000 pounds, or 1,981,000,000 pounds more than in 1900.

The consumption of beef increased during the nine years to 7,276,000,000 pounds, or 1,423,000,000 pounds more than in 1900, but the consumption of veal fell to 683,000,000 pounds, or 75,000,000 below the amount of 1900.

The mutton and lamb consumption in 1909 is estimated at 596,000,000 pounds, or an increase of 9,000,000 pounds above the consumption of 1900.

The pork and lard consumption for 1909 presents an increase of 612,000,000 pounds for 1909 as compared with 1900 and amounted to 7,034,000,000 pounds. An estimate of the consumption of goat meat in 1909 results in 11,773,000 pounds.

PER CAPITA RATIOS.

Still bearing in mind that the foregoing figures stand for dressed-meat weight and exclude the many extra edible parts that go into consumption, a comparison of 1909 with 1900 may be made with regard to per capita production and consumption of meat that is embraced in the description "dressed weight."

By a rough and very imperfect computation, the production and consumption of meat in 1914 are estimated, and these estimates in per capita form of expression are introduced for expanding the comparison.

The per capita production of dressed-weight meat declined from 211.2 pounds in 1900 to 186.2 pounds in 1909 and to 160.6 pounds for 1914, and the per capita exports of meat declined from 32 pounds in 1900 to 14 pounds in 1909 and to 8.7 pounds in the fiscal year 1913.

The consumption of meat, dressed weight, per capita, declined from 179.2 pounds in 1900 to 172.3 pounds in 1909, and then to 151.9 pounds for 1914.

Comparison of 1909 with 1900 with regard to different kinds of meat is not extended to 1914. For beef there was an increase of per capita consumption from 77 to 80.3 pounds, but the consumption of veal declined from 10 to 7.6 pounds, so that the per capita consumption of beef and veal increased almost 1 pound, or from 87 to 87.9 pounds.

The per capita consumption of mutton and lamb fell from 7.7 pounds to 6.6 pounds from 1900 to 1909, and the per capita consumption of pork, including lard, declined from 84.5 to 77.7 pounds. Goat meat was consumed to the extent of 0.13 of 1 pound per capita in 1909.

Mr. Chairman, if these figures mean anything at all they mean that we are face to face with one of two propositions: Either the American people must learn to eat less meat or produce more, or else they must depend upon foreign nations for

their future meat supply. Is it a pretty picture? Does it look good? Does it make you think? Where are we to get our beef cattle? From Australia? From Argentina?

Assuming that we can get sufficient meat from those countries to supply the demands of our people, who is going to pay for it? Where are we going to get the money with which to pay for it? The burden must fall upon the productive capacity of your farmers.

Your timber supply is going. It can hardly be replenished. Your coal supply is rapidly diminishing. It can not be replenished. All of the mineral resources of the country are going, and going rapidly, and when gone once they are gone forever. The only hope of the future of the country lies in the proper handling of its soil. It is the one great asset that we have which replenishes itself from year to year if properly treated, and we are brought to the conclusion inevitably that the prosperity, the happiness, and the security of this great Nation will rest in the future upon the shoulders of its farmers, who in the past have made it the great Nation it is to-day. [Applause.]

Let us take a look into the future 50 years hence, a short period in the life of a nation, less than the span of a human life, and see what is before us. And when we have done that and reached our conclusion, what shall be our provision for the children who are to come after us? The population of the United States during the last census period increased 21 per cent. If that increase continues—and there is no reason why it will not continue—the population of the United States in 1960 will be 238,000,000, an increase of 159 per cent.

Now let us see. In 1910, each man, woman, and child in this country had available 91 pounds of beef. If the ratio of decrease continues for 50 years as it has done during the past 10 years, then each man, woman, and child in the country will have available only 61 pounds of beef, or a decrease of 33 per cent. In 1910, the per capita supply of pork available was 89 pounds. If the decrease for the next 50 years in pork production continues as great as it has been during the last 10 years, the available per capita amount of pork at the end of 50 years will be 34 pounds, or a decrease of 61 per cent of available pork. We had available of mutton, in 1910, 7 pounds per capita, but, if the decrease continues, at the end of 50 years we shall have only 3 pounds of mutton per capita, or a decrease of 48 per cent.

In that connection, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to the fact that among the nations of the world the people of the United States rank second in the amount of meat consumed. We are essentially a meat-eating and white-bread-eating people. The only other nation in the world which consumes more meat per capita than we are the people of the Australian Commonwealth, with a total annual consumption of meat per capita of 262.8 pounds, as against 185.8 pounds for the people of the United States.

What shall we do? Shall we exert ourselves to stop this tendency of decreasing meat production, or shall we face the inevitable, which means that we must eat less meat, or shall we admit our dependence on foreign nations to furnish it to us? Yet gentlemen complain that we carry in this appropriation bill a few hundred thousand dollars to encourage the people of the country to eradicate disease from meat-producing animals and to encourage sections of this country which are not producing beef and pork and mutton to go into the production of those commodities. Is it a wise complaint? Is it a just criticism? Why, my friends, we appropriate something like $600,000—I am speaking from memory—for the eradication of diseases in animals. Listen! The loss from animal diseases in this country, as estimated by the Agricultural Department, annually amounts to $212,850,000, divided as follows:

*Loss from animal diseases.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Hog cholera | $75,000,000 |
| Texas fever and cattle ticks | 40,000,000 |
| Tuberculosis | 25,000,000 |
| Contagious abortion | 20,000,000 |
| Blackleg | 6,000,000 |
| Anthrax | 1,500,000 |
| Scabies of sheep and cattle | 4,000,000 |
| Glanders | 5,000,000 |
| Other diseases | 22,000,000 |
| Parasites | 5,000,000 |
| Poultry diseases | 8,750,000 |
| Total | 212,850,000 |

Two hundred and twelve million dollars a year lost from diseases in the meat-producing animals of this country, and yet gentlemen complain that the Committee on Agriculture is ramming its hands into the Treasury up to the elbow, drawing out money for the support of the Department of Agriculture. It makes me weary. [Applause.] You could afford, if you could save that $212,000,000 of annual loss, to spend your $35,000,000 a year building railroads in Alaska or your $140,000,000 a year for your big Navy or your $94,000,000 a year for your big Army. Again I say it makes me weary, because I necessarily feel that the critics of this bill either have never studied the facts or can not distinguish between an investment and an expenditure. [Applause.]

So much for the meat supply of this country. The facts with reference to the bread supply are equally positive and convincing. Meat and bread are the staffs of life, the two things that we must have above all other things. The food supply of a nation is the most vital factor of its existence and is a most important element in the social and moral well-being of its people. Our standard of living is high; it must be maintained, but we can not afford to sleep if it is to be so maintained.

I am going to take another peep and look into our cupboard 50 years hence. Remember, now, that during that period the population of the United States has increased from 91,000,000 to 238,000,000, an increase of 159 per cent. Let us see whether the acreage and production of corn, wheat, and potatoes upon which we depend for our bread-food supply will show an increase in proportion to the increased population.

From 1900 to 1910 there was an increase in acres in corn of 3.7 per cent only.

If that ratio of increase continues until 1960—and it is doubtful if it will do so—the increase in acreage at the end of that period will be only 20 per cent, as against an increase of 159 per cent in population; or, to put it in another way, in 1910 we had a per capita acreage of 1.7 acres of corn. If the disparity in the ratio of acreage to population is not checked, we shall have in 1960 only 0.49 of an acre per capita planted in corn, or a decrease of 54 per cent.

What about wheat? From 1900 to 1910 there was a decrease in acres planted in wheat of 15.8 per cent; so if that decrease continues in the same ratio, we shall have a decrease of acres planted in wheat in 1960 of 58 per cent. In 1910 we had 0.48 of an acre per capita planted in wheat. In 1960, if nothing intervenes in the meantime to change the tendency, we shall have only 0.08 of an acre planted in wheat, or a decrease of 84 per cent.

The only hopeful sign I see is in potatoes. There was an increase of 24.8 per cent planted in potatoes from 1900 to 1910, which would show, at that ratio, an increase in 1960 of 203 per cent in potatoes. But the per capita acreage of potatoes in 1910 was 0.04 and in 1960 it will be only 0.047, or an increase of only 18 per cent in the per capita acreage of potatoes, while the increase in population in the meantime will have been 159 per cent. The tendency is to increase the number of mouths to be fed and to decrease the food supply, meat and bread, with which to feed them. What is to be the result? We shall be forced, in respect to our bread supply, as with our meat supply, to produce more ourselves or to depend upon foreign nations to supply us. Oh, but you say acreage will increase. Where are you going to get your land? There is practically no more available public land to be had free, and this means that if we are to produce our own supply of bread and meat we must make the soil—our acreage—yield more.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LEVER. With pleasure; yes.

Mr. FOWLER. There are 75,000,000 acres of swamp land which have not been drained, in America, and more than 400,000,000 acres of unimproved farm land on the continent.

Mr. LEVER. That may be true; but where are your people to reclaim your land and to work it after you have reclaimed it? Do not forget that people are leaving the farm in order to escape its drudgery and hardships.

But, to continue. Let us see what the situation will be 50 years hence with respect to corn. I am taking these figures from the census.

In 1909 we produced 2,500,000,000 bushels of corn. We had 98,000,000 acres planted. In 1960, at the rate of increase the past 10 years have shown for corn, we would have only 118,000,000 acres. We should need, in 1960, 6,500,000,000 bushels of corn in order to maintain the present per capita supply for the Nation. Now, with 118,000,000 acres planted and a needed supply of 6,500,000,000 bushels, how much shall we have to produce per acre at that time to meet the need for corn? We shall have to produce 55 bushels to the acre. The average production per acre of corn in the United States for 1913 was 23.1 bushels. In other words, if we are to meet the necessities of the occasion in 1960, as far as corn is concerned, we shall have to more than double the production per acre of corn in this country. With these facts in mind, is this committee to be laughed at or its enthusiasm in the work of promoting and encouraging corn production through the boys' corn clubs and by the better methods of farming to be sneered at by the unthinking? We see a

problem which is worthy of the most earnest thought and consideration of this House.

What about potatoes? In 1960 we shall need 1,017,000,000 bushels of potatoes to keep up our present available per capita supply. The necessary per acre production, in order to produce that amount in 1960, will be 92 bushels. The production of potatoes per acre in 1913 was 90.4 bushels. I say again that the only bright spot in the future is in potatoes, and yet it is not very bright.

What about wheat? As I said a moment ago, our people are a white-bread-eating people. White bread measures somewhat the standard of civilization among a people. In 1909 we produced 683,000,000 bushels. In 1960, with the reduction in acreage, if the average of the last 10 years continues and even if the production per acre is increased to 35 bushels, the amount produced in Germany, where the production has reached the highest point in the world, we shall be producing only 630,000,000 bushels, or 53,000,000 bushels less than at present, to feed a population that will have increased from 91,000,000 to 238,000,000.

In order to maintain our present per capita supply of wheat we shall have to produce, in 1960, 1,796,000,000 bushels, and this means that unless acreage is very materially increased we shall have to produce 95 bushels per acre as against our production to-day of only 15.2 bushels per acre.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will my friend from South Carolina permit an interruption?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is oversensitive, perhaps, about the criticism he has referred to. I speak as a city member, but also as an agriculturist. I have heard nothing but the most favorable and complimentary comments upon the work of the Committee on Agriculture. I have heard it in the free lecture course of my city frequently alluded to as the great constructive department in the Government that was doing good for this country and was most essential to its future welfare. But I wanted to ask the gentleman if he does not think the bill recently passed by this House, which came from his committee, giving practical demonstrations in the various States throughout the country to the farmer, will not be productive of excellent results in the direction in which he is aiming now, namely, to increase the food and meat supply on the farms of this country to meet the increasing population?

Mr. LEVER. I think my friend is exactly right in his conclusions. That has been the purpose of the bill to which he refers, and it affords a reason for my activity and enthusiasm in its behalf, and, as for that matter, for my authorship of it.

But I want to go on. I will reduce this wheat problem to loaves of bread. That may bring home the proposition a little more strikingly than anything else.

The production of wheat in 1910 was sufficient to make about 39,000,000,000 loaves of bread, or 424 loaves per capita. At the same rate of yield per acre in 1960, and with 18,732,000 acres, the production would be sufficient for only about 17,500,000,000 loaves, or about 73 loaves per capita on the basis of 238,500,000 people.

In other words, gentlemen, if we do not check, through the Department of Agriculture and other agencies, notably the operation of the Lever extension bill, the tendency to which I have been calling attention, our people will be called upon to eat only 73 loaves of bread per annum per capita as against 424 loaves of bread they are now consuming, or they will eat one loaf of bread where they now eat six. Is this a pretty picture?

Mr. BOWDLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. BOWDLE. Does not the gentleman from South Carolina know that much of the evil of the modern situation grows out of the fact that so many people are leaving the country and rushing into the city to live?

Mr. LEVER. I made that statement at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. BOWDLE. Does the gentleman know of anything in the bill that will tend to correct that tendency?

Mr. LEVER. Every item of this bill has for its fundamental purpose the teaching of better methods of agriculture, which means in the end more profit to the farmer, better living, more conveniences at home, and more education for his children.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption right there?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think the good-roads bill which the House has passed recently and for which as a city Member I voted, with the telephones, daily mails, and other up-to-date improvements and comforts, will tend very much to make people in the country happier, more comfortable, social conditions better, and, in addition to that, will not the farms be made more profitable?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly that is true, and yet it is going to require all the thought, all the energy, all the work, and the most progressive leadership of this country to bring about such a result as suggested by the gentleman to stop the drift of population from the country to the town and to make rural life attractive.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I understand that there has been a considerable amount of importation of foodstuffs during the last few months into this country.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is true.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What, in the judgment of the gentleman, will be the effect of these increased importations on the production of our farmers?

Mr. LEVER. That would lead me into a discussion of the tariff somewhat. I will say that I do not think the time is ever coming when the farmers of this country are going to be forced to sell their products for much less, if any, than they are now receiving, for increasing consumption coupled with decreasing production will maintain a high standard of prices. In other words, I do not believe the importation of meat and other foodstuffs is going to affect materially the situation one way or the other. Now, can we check that tendency, can we raise more wheat, more corn, and more potatoes per acre?

Mr. BOWDLE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOWDLE. Does not the gentleman believe that in modern civilization we are working at cross purposes? For illustration, does not the gentleman know that in many large cities we have booster clubs, whose business it is to invite people to come from the country into the town, and then we have philosophers standing around inviting them to go from the town to the country.

Mr. LEVER. I think those people ought to be put into an insane asylum.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield again right there?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I never heard of a boosters' club in any city, except, perhaps, to boost the idle or employed population that we have in the city into the country, and make them earn their living on the farm, where they are needed.

Mr. BOWDLE. What is the gentleman's town? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOULDEN. It is a little town on the Hudson River called New York. Perhaps the gentleman from Cincinnati has heard of it.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman maintain in his argument and in his reply to the gentleman from Michigan that the rapidly increasing importation of foodstuffs from foreign countries will tend more and more to induce the population of this country to go upon the farms of the country?

Mr. LEVER. Let me call my friend's attention to the fact that values of meat, corn, wheat, oats, and potatoes have been steadily going up from year to year and, in my judgment, will continue to go up from year to year, because we are consuming now practically all we produce.

Mr. NORTON. I want to get the gentleman's argument and the direction of it.

Mr. LEVER. The argument is this: That unless we adopt better farm practices, and unless we force the soil to give up more than it is giving now, both of meat and of bread, in 1960 your children and my children will be up against a mighty hard proposition for food. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman appeared to argue that the importation of foodstuffs from abroad was tending to increase the price. I can not understand that kind of an argument.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is unfortunate in not following my line of thought.

Mr. NORTON. There are a great many farmers in this country that are likewise unfortunate.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWDLE] said that there were booster clubs in the cities that were advising men from the country to come into the city, while the philosophers in the city were advising men to go into the country.

The gentleman asked what about them, and the gentleman from South Carolina said they ought to be put into a lunatic asylum. I desire to ask which ones—the philosophers who

advise this surplus population to go from the city to the country, or the boosters' clubs in the cities that desire to get people from the country to the city?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the folks who are trying to get the people from the country to the city.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is what I thought the gentleman intended.

Mr. LEVER. Let me proceed. Can we increase the yield of wheat, potatoes, corn, and the like of that? I need only call attention of gentlemen to the fact that the committee had before it boys from all over the United States who were sent here by their States and communities as representing champion corn growers in their separate communities, and their yields of corn ran anywhere from 55 bushels an acre in the State of North Dakota to something like 235 bushels an acre in the State of Alabama. These boys in the North, East, South, and West have demonstrated to the satisfaction of every one, I think, that we can more than double the yield of corn per acre in the United States. I do not think there is any question about that.

What about wheat? The average yield of wheat in the United States per acre in 1913 was 14.3 bushels. In Germany, although they have been tilling their soil for more than a thousand years, and in its virginity it was no more fertile than our soil, they are producing 35.1 bushels per acre. In Austria they are producing 20 bushels per acre, and in Hungary proper 18.4, and in the United Kingdom 32.8 bushels per acre. With respect to potatoes, our average yield per acre in 1913 was 96 bushels. In Russia the average was 104 bushels per acre; in Germany, 196; in Austria, 142; in France, 129; and in the United Kingdom, 202½ bushels per acre.

Of course, gentlemen will understand that the system of agriculture in the countries to which I have referred is of the most extreme intensive character, and it can not be hoped that their method of intensive farming can be reached soon in this country, and yet it is a mark to which we should set our efforts. I know that the better practices of agriculture, the better preparation of seed beds, intelligent cultivation, and fertilization inaugurated in the South under the able leadership of the late Dr. Seaman A. Knapp is proving that the yields of staple products can be increased anywhere from 50 to 100 per cent.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those people who believe that the people of the United States, when they are face to face with the necessity, are just as capable of doing these things, or anything as far as that is concerned, as the people of any other country, and I believe that there is no reason why we should not double the productivity of our soil without causing our farmers to suffer by any depreciation in price on account of the enlarged supply. The heavy demand for farm products can be counted upon to continue for all time to come.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman rather think that in view of the fact that some of the questions asked seem to indicate a desire simply to increase the price of corn, wheat, meat, and other such things for the benefit of the farmer the gentleman is advocating a bad policy, because the price is likely to be affected by the quantity? If you can succeed in doubling the quantity raised, will you not also lower the price?

Mr. LEVER. I think not at all. I think the rapid increase in population in this country will take up at good prices everything that we are able to produce in the future, and more than we are able to produce, as I have been trying to show.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman has some other motive in view than simply raising the price higher and higher?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I am looking at this matter from the broad national standpoint.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Three years ago I retired, voluntarily, from this body and went abroad. I there witnessed the cultivation on the farms, especially the crops of corn, wheat, and potatoes, in the various countries, and I want to say that four words define the true situation—higher fertilization, better cultivation. Those four words cover the whole thing, so far as my observation went. That is what we need in this country to accomplish what the chairman is so ably advocating.

Mr. LEVER. My friend from New York is a pretty good farmer, even if he does farm in a skyscraper.

Mr. GOULDEN. Oh, I farm some other things nearer the ground than that, and not a hundred miles from this Capitol, where I was born.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask those who may complain about this bill and about what the Federal Government is doing for the farmer, if they have ever stopped to consider the other side of the question, namely, what the American farmer is doing for this Government? Has that proposition ever occurred to these gentlemen? I want to say that the perpetuation of representative government, the continuance of our present system, depends more upon the prosperity, happiness, wealth, education, conservatism, and the patriotism of the American farmer than upon any other factor. [Applause.] In the past he has been the Nation's greatest defense. In the future he must be the bulwark which is to protect it against the unrest and the anarchy of your great city centers. I stood in the gentleman's home city one morning, and looking across Madison Square I saw hundreds and hundreds of people who had spent the night in the open, some of them lying on the rustic benches, some underneath, with nothing but an evening newspaper for a pillow, and I said to myself that if the red flag of anarchy ever goes up in this country it will go up from the idle classes of our great cities; that if this Nation is to be preserved, if our flag is still to float in majesty, it will have to be preserved and kept floating by the boys and the girls and the men and women back down in the hills and in the valleys of South Carolina and on the farms throughout the length and breadth of this great land of ours. [Applause.]

With everything to face—climate, changing conditions of soil, insects, pests, the bulls and bears of the New York Cotton Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade—with no control over the price of what he produces, hauling his products into town and letting the other fellow set the price, this quiet American citizen, with no lobby in Washington to take care of his interests, with no skilled lawyers to plead his cause, continues heroically, patiently at the task of feeding and clothing the people of the world—a task which in the great plan of civilization has been mapped out for him. I ask again: What is the farmer doing for the Government? We are bound to consider his side of the question.

I shall insert in the RECORD at this point some figures showing, for instance, that the total losses through insects annually in the United States is conservatively estimated at $1,000,000,000, and that of this amount $795,000,000 is charged against loss to farm products through the work of insects.

This loss amounted to over 10 per cent of the total value of all crops raised in the United States; yet when we appropriate money in this bill to check the advance of the boll weevil, to take care of tobacco insects, to take care of the gypsy and brown-tail moth in the New England States, somebody complains that somebody is ramming his hand into the Federal Treasury. It is estimated that we are losing at least 10 per cent of the value of our crops on account of diseases of plants and forest trees. This makes up an annual loss, as estimated here, of $500,000,000.

LOSS FROM INSECTS.

The total money loss through insects annually in the United States is conservatively estimated at $1,000,000,000, and of this amount $795,000,000 is charged against loss to farm products through the work of insects. This loss amounts to something over 10 per cent of the total value of all crops raised in the United States.

THE ANNUAL LOSSES FROM TREE AND PLANT DISEASES.

On account of the wide variation in the prevalence of the destructiveness of plant diseases no exact determination of the annual loss is possible. Observation and experience indicate, however, that such losses may be conservatively estimated as amounting to at least 10 per cent of the value of the crops, taking the fluctuation one season with another. The value of the crops as reported by the census of 1910 is given at $5,500,000,000, indicating a monetary loss of approximately $500,000,000.

The most keenly felt losses are those in which an important crop is practically destroyed in a season or succession of seasons, as sometimes occurs, but the heaviest losses to the people at large result from the economic disturbance from the alternation of over large and insufficient production in the case of crops that are destructively attacked by diseases.

The development of methods of control of plant diseases steadily tends toward the steadying of production in that it enables the farmers to forecast much more intelligently than they could otherwise the area required to produce an amount which the market will take at a fair price. This reduces uncertainty and steadies the agricultural industry, making possible a more economical production. The effective control of plant diseases therefore removes one of the most important uncertainties and reduces speculative opportunity, thus steadying prices and making possible economic distribution which eventually results in benefit to the producer and consumer.

Estimates of the annual losses due to certain important crop diseases are appended.

The estimated annual losses to fruits from fungous and bacterial diseases is from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000. In addition to these heavy annual losses to the crop in certain districts and certain years, still heavier total losses, due to the destruction of orchards and vineyards occur from time to time, with the result that very large investments of capital are wiped out. Pear blight has practically wiped out pear culture in many communities, and peach yellows has temporarily eliminated the peach industry from some important districts. In cases where particular diseases are persistent the culture of certain fruits is practically suppressed in regions where trees and vines succeed. Thus one disease has nearly suppressed the cultivation of sweet cherries and the European plums in the eastern United States except in a few localities in the North or at considerable elevation above sea level, and the cultivation of the grape south of the Potomac River is very greatly restricted by the black-rot fungus.

The annual loss due to forest-tree diseases is not even approximately determinable. It may be noted that a single disease of forest trees—the bark disease of the chestnut tree—as thus far considered may be estimated with fair accuracy to be about $45,000,000.

Losses resulting through the ravages of diseases caused by parasitic organisms which prey upon the cereal crops may for convenience be classified as preventable and nonpreventable. Cereal diseases now known to be preventable were in some instances regarded as nonpreventable only a few years ago. Such a disease, for example, is the loose smut of wheat. Diseases of cereal crops now regarded as nonpreventable will probably in time yield to the efforts of the trained investigator in his endeavor to discover an effective fungicide or devise means of control at once practicable and effectual in the hands of the farmer.

The preventable diseases and estimated annual losses resulting from each are as follows:

| Name. | Bushels. | Dollars. |
|---|---|---|
| Bunt, or stinking smut of wheat | 16,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Loose smut of wheat | 4,500,000 | 3,500,000 |
| Smut of oats | 7,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Covered smut of barley | 3,300,000 | 1,900,000 |
| Naked smut of barley | 3,300,000 | 1,900,000 |
| Kernel smut of sorghum | | 100,000 |
| Total | 34,100,000 | 28,400,000 |

The nonpreventable diseases and estimated annual losses resulting from each are as follows:

| Name. | Bushels. | Dollars. |
|---|---|---|
| Wheat rust | 12,000,000 | 11,000,000 |
| Oat rust | 20,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Corn smut | | 60,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous: | | |
| Scab | | |
| Ergot | | |
| Barley stripe disease | | 15,000,000 |
| Blade blight of oats | | |
| Root parasites, etc | | |
| Total | 32,000,000 | 94,000,000 |

These estimates, based on crop statistics and on the observations of the members of the Office of Cereal Investigations, represent the average losses borne during the last 10 years by grain growers in the United States and are believed to be conservative.

The estimated losses from potato diseases are more definitely known than many others. The late blight is estimated to cost the country annually $36,000,000. The loss from this disease in the State of New York in 1904 was set at $10,000,000 after a careful computation. The total average loss from all potato diseases in the United States is set at $60,000,000 per annum, which is believed to be under rather than over the truth.

A number of cases in which the estimate is based on a fairly careful examination of the conditions are cited below:

Estimated annual loss from all sweet-potato diseases throughout the country, $8,000,000.

Bean pod-spot, or anthracnose, $2,000,000 annual loss in the State of Michigan alone. This disease not infrequently destroys 50 to 75 per cent of the crop of green beans in certain southern localities.

The late blight of celery, $50,000 in 1912, in the Kalamazoo area in Michigan.

The lettuce drop frequently destroys 10 to 15 per cent of the crop on infected fields in Florida.

The tomato-leaf blight cost Delaware $50,000 in 1913, and the loss in New Jersey was much greater.

The annual loss from cotton wilt and root knot is estimated at $10,000,000, and that from cotton anthracnose, rust, and other diseases at $20,000,000.

The loss from flax wilt was $3,000,000 in North Dakota in 1911 and $400,000 in Minnesota.

The loss from ginseng blight was $50,000 in Michigan in 1911.

The loss from sugar beet leaf spot in Colorado in 1910—when the disease was worse than usual—was $640,000.

Now, my friends, I have presented to you this problem from the Nation's viewpoint. I do not believe there is any more important problem to come before this Congress than that of the encouragement of the production of our meat and bread supply and the preservation of the same. But I do not want gentlemen to misunderstand me. It is not my thought, nor is it in my line of argument, that I expect the farmer of this country in his capacity as the furnisher of its food and clothing supply to do this from the standpoint of pure philanthropy. I believe that it would be criminal, absolutely so, for this Congress to give to the farmer the means and the encouragement for increased production unless at the same time we give him the means and the encouragement for a more economic distribution of his products; give him the means and the encouragement to produce and the knowledge to understand how to get the intrinsic value of what he produces. It is estimated that 57 per cent of all the farm products of this country is lost between the producer and the consumer. I noticed in a statement the other day in one of the Wisconsin papers that more than 57 per cent of the value of the cheese of that State was lost somewhere between the producer of that cheese and the man who ate it. The Committee on Agriculture has not been neglectful of this, the economic phase of agriculture. We are aware that the time has come when the subject of market economy should be approached as a great big economic proposition, and hence we have allowed an appropriation of $200,000 in order that the Department of Agriculture may make investigations and assemble and disseminate information on the business of farm marketing and distribution.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Just what does the gentleman mean by the statement that 57 per cent of the value of the farm product is lost between the producer and the consumer?

Mr. LEVER. I mean this: We will take a bushel of potatoes. If the consumer pays $1 for a bushel of potatoes, the farmer, the man who produces the potatoes, gets only 43 cents of that amount, the other 57 cents disappearing somehow between the producer and the consumer. This is a condition that must be corrected. It is one of the big problems before us.

Now, I have detained you too long. I want to close——

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very anxious to know, because I believe greatly in this Bureau of Markets that the committee has established; what is that division doing now, how far have they gone along in their work?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, I think, understands that the division has been at work only about five months, due to the fact that appropriations for that purpose did not become available until late last summer, and most of the work so far done has been in the way of organization for work in the future, but the plans they have in mind—the gentleman was before the committee at the time and heard the statement of Mr. Brand—impressed me as being in the right direction. I believe great good is to come from the work of that division, and I believe it ought to be very liberally supported, and I am proud to be the author of the language under which it is operating.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina how much is appropriated in this bill for soil surveys?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I had not intended to discuss the details of the bill, but the amount carried for that work is $359,235.

Mr. HAY. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman how many surveys can be made with that appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I do not recall, I am frank to say to the gentleman, but I will have that information when we take up the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HAY. I will say to the gentleman that it is impossible to get anything done at the Agricultural Department in the way of soil surveys in the counties in my district, although I have been trying to do it for a year or two.

Mr. LEVER. I know there is great pressure in the department for that work.

Mr. HAY. Not only do I not get anything done, but I do not even get an answer to my communications.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has the gentleman any definite information as to how much money is used in the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there is quite a large sum of money used for that purpose, namely, $2,245,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That includes everything?

Mr. LEVER. That includes everything, except the meat-inspection work, which is in a separate appropriation. Now, gentlemen, I shall close.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield? I have not read the bill, but I would like to know if it carries an appropriation to investigate the question of the marketing of farm products?

Mr. LEVER. It carries $200,000 for that purpose.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I will ask the gentleman if he has any statistics on the question of the difference between the price received for cotton by the farmer and the price paid by the spinner? My information is that the cotton crop for 1912 was sold by the farmer at an average of about 11 cents per pound, and that the cost to the spinners of the country was somewhere around 15 cents per pound. There is a difference of about $20 per bale, and I was wondering whether the gentleman had elucidated that subject.

Mr. LEVER. I do not have the figures here, but the statement was made before the Committee on Agriculture by Arthur R. Marsh, at one time president of the New York Cotton Exchange, and, in my judgment, the ablest defender it has, that the people of the State of Texas, on account of a lack of information as to the value of their low grades of cotton, had lost during the year 1913 more than $40,000,000.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And that is all the gentleman has on that particular subject?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; at this time.

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. KINDEL. I was going to ask you if, in your estimate as to cost, you have figured on transportation—freight, express, and parcel post?

Mr. LEVER. All of that; yes, sir.

Now, I have tried to point out what to my mind appear to be most dangerous tendencies of our time and to warn the Members of the House that we have reached a point where we must take some note of them. I want to quote from an address delivered by Mr. James J. Hill before the Farmers' National Congress at Madison, Wis., on September 24, 1908. He said:

> After all it is to the next generation mainly that we must look for the transformation of our greatest and most vital industry, though something may be done with this. In both fields, the man who assumes to be the farmer's friend or hold his interests dear will constitute himself a missionary of the new dispensation. It is an act of patriotic service to the country. It is a contribution to the welfare of all humanity, and will strengthen the pillars of a government that must otherwise waver in some popular upheaval when the land shall no longer sustain the multiplying children that its bosom bears. It is a high commission that is offered to you. By accepting it you will confer new dignity, worth, and satisfaction upon the calling in whose name you are gathered here, and help to garner health and comfort and happiness and an opportunity greater than our own for the coming millions, who are no strangers or invaders, but our own children's children, who will pass judgment upon us according to what we have made of the world in which their lot is to be cast.

I commend that thought and those sentiments to the members of this committee, and I thank you for your courtesy and patient attention. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural appropriation bill presented to the House reflects especial credit upon the chairman and subcommittee. The committee membership having labored in its preparation can view with general satisfaction nearly all of its terms and provisions as being calculated to encourage agricultural enterprise and activity and to furnish in some degree a palliation for the wrongs and injustice to which the food and clothing producers of this country have been subjected by adverse legislation not fairly forecasted to them, but inflicted with a remorseless disregard for the rights of the producer unparalleled in American legislation. [Applause.]

I agree with the distinguished chairman of this committee in doing all we can for agriculture, but the last means which I would expect to use to exalt agriculture and give the farmers of America a chance to advance would be to place the farmers of Nebraska and the farmers of the other States of the Union on a basis with the farmers of China, with the farmers of Argentina, and the posterity of the ticket-of-leave men of Australia. [Applause.] So that when the boys of the South, that are to raise 250 bushels of corn to the acre, are placed upon the basis of the boys of Argentina, whose lands are worth one-third of what they are in better agricultural sections, and the wages of their employees just one-half, and the transportation from Buenos Aires to New York only one-fourth of what the transportation of the Middle West is to New York, I think it is the one best means conceived by the men who perpetrated this adverse legislation not to bring men to the farms but to drive them into the cities to buy cheaper the product of the toilers of the farms. [Applause.]

The bill contains much to encourage food production for the Nation. It also contains much to furnish food for reflection to the producer. The Agricultural Committee, whose work should be essentially constructive, is obliged to perform the service of a legislative Red Cross corps to minister to the sick, heal the wounded, quarantine the diseased, and bury the dead, resulting from the onslaught of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the higher authority which seems to direct the course of each.

The bill provides $5,000 for importation of Corriedale sheep from New Zealand for breeding purposes. This is in the nature of first aid to injured woolgrowers. Forty thousand dollars is provided for study of corn improvement and production, besides being a salve for the suffering corn growers. It is expected by those who do not know to aid our producers in meeting in competition the enormous imports from Argentina. For additional meat and live-stock inspection at our ports, arising out of the relinquishment of our duties, about $50,000 is appropriated. This amounts to a quarantine against the spread of disease. Forty-one thousand four hundred and ninety-five dollars is set aside for sugar-beet investigation and promotion. This is an application of a pulmotor in an attempt to revive a sore-stricken industry, and the beet grower is to be thereby armed with a feather to battle against the sword of the Refiners' Trust, which trust is the only industry which the papers have recently announced as starting up on full time and with full complement of employees. [Laughter.] Fifty thousand dollars is appropriated for live-stock demonstrations in the congressionally devastated Louisiana cane fields. This is the Red Cross' sad duty—to bury the dead. [Laughter.] The Ways and Means Committee, like a destroying army, tries now to palliate its cruelties by showing that it is followed by an efficient hospital corps—the Agricultural Committee.

During the history of the world and throughout the civilized nations generally, agriculture has been deemed an honorable profession and its votaries accorded special consideration. Under early Roman law and practice mechanic arts was largely confined to the unfavored and servile class. Work on the farm was considered the only kind of manual labor worthy of Roman citizenship.

It was said of Horace "when cloyed with pleasures in the imperial state—to journey to his farm, well fitted for its tenants' habitation, with food for all, and containing secluded spots for the poet's dreams." It is related that visitors to the Old World "still journey with increasing interest to the Horace farm."

Gibbon quotes Artaxerxes as follows:

> The authority of the prince must be defended by military force. That force can only be maintained by taxes. All taxes must at last fall upon agriculture and agriculture can never flourish except under the protection of "justice and moderation."

Bancroft, speaking of France, said:

> The great employment of France was tillage of the soil, than which no method of gain is more grateful in itself or more worthy of preferment or more happy in rendering service to the whole human race. "No occupation is nearer heaven."

The farmers of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Scandinavian countries all receive first consideration at the hands of their respective Governments when levying duties to be collected at their ports, the levying of which will give the producers first and favored opportunity to resort to and control the home market.

More people in the United States are engaged in agriculture than in any other occupation. The following gives estimated numbers engaged in the several leading lines of activity:

| | |
|---|---|
| Agriculture and animal husbandry | 12,500,000 |
| Manufacturing and mechanical industry | 10,500,000 |
| Domestic and personal service | 3,800,000 |
| Trade | 3,500,000 |
| Transportation | 2,700,000 |
| Clerical service | 1,700,000 |
| Professions | 1,600,000 |
| Minerals | 900,000 |

The character and ability of its members are the highest, whether measured by a low rate of illiteracy, the source of the

Nation's students, few infractions of the penal code, or the moral tone pervading their home life and business practices. This industry ministers to the first great wants of American citizens—food and clothing. Moreover, it is the one great industry whose members are by the nature of their isolation and limited individual participation in business affairs unable to combine and become factors of oppressive organizations against which politicians inveigh, political parties denounce, legislatures resolute, and executives back and fill.

While agricultural pursuits in America have not been exalted in dignity above other lines of activity because of our general recognition of equality, yet for more than a quarter of a century, with but a brief interregnum—between 1894 and 1897—the direct and indirect products of the soil have been protected in the laying of national revenues. This has been for two reasons: First, they are entitled to it as a matter of right, which all civilized nations recognize, save the United Kingdom alone; second, the self-interest of our great people to encourage soil culture, conservation, and improvement, which never can or will be done if farmers are treated as mere peasants and discriminated against by our own people in favor of foreign farmers.

The present Congress, advised and directed by our Executive, under the whip and spur of caucus lash enacted a tariff law which had for its basic purpose the cheapening of American farm products to the enormous loss of our farmers and the sacrifice of millions to our National Treasury, and with the deliberate admonition by the Ways and Means Committee to our producers that to thrive they must go beyond our national borders. This was perpetrated on the agricultural people of the country without notice and without authority.

Upon this question the American people had largely and fairly expressed themselves. The Republican platform adopted at Chicago in 1912 said:

> The products of the farm and of the mine should receive the same measure of protection as other products of American labor.

The Progressive national platform adopted at Chicago in 1912 said:

> We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

There were cast in support of these platforms for unsuccessful presidential candidates 7,604,518 votes. There were cast for the successful minority candidate for President only 6,293,454 votes. There were lacking 1,311,064 votes of a majority. And, moreover, of all candidates for the present House of Representatives the expression of the voters on this great subject of legislation if carried into effect would have elected 211 Democrats and 224 Members favoring reasonable protection to the products of farm, factory, and mine. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Further, the two great agricultural organizations of this country have not been silent on this subject. The National Grange, speaking upon this subject, said:

> We confirm the position of the Grange upon the tariff question as passed by the forty-second session of the National Grange, namely, "That whatever the policy of the Government may be, the farmers of the United States demand that, as far as possible, such measures of direct benefit therefrom as is given to manufacturers or any other industries of the country shall also be accorded to agriculture."

The Farmers' National Congress, in its last formal deliverance on this subject, said:

> A fair and equal measure accorded to all industries of the country needing protection. Any legislative discrimination will be opposed by our influence and resented by our votes. We will never submit to selling in a free-trade market and buying in a protected market.

Upon the other hand, no farmers' organization has demanded free or substantially free trade in farm products.

Neither does the Democratic national platform convey any warrant by its terms for free trade in American farm products. The utmost which could be fairly construed from that platform in this particular was that there should be a reduction of duties. The plank of the platform relating to this is as follows:

> We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high and in many cases prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life.

Speedy reductions of duties can not be tortured by any honest interpretation into meaning a removal of duties. The idea involved in the word "reduction" indicates a lessening, but a continuance in form and substance of the original factor. So farmers may have been warned that duties on farm products would be reduced in case of Democratic success, but no one was given to understand, or had a right to understand, that the duties would be removed and farm products placed on the free list.

However, further on the platform states:

> Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

The products of the American farm do not enter into competition with trust-controlled products and have not been sold abroad more cheaply than at home. The wheat, corn, rye, cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry, eggs, potatoes, and other products of the farm are neither sold cheaper abroad than at home, nor are they sold by our farmers in competition with any trust.

The only other provision of the Baltimore platform which related to duties on farm products is where it says:

> We denounce the action of President Taft in vetoing the bills to reduce the tariff in the cotton, woolen, metal, and chemical schedules and the farmers' free list bill.

It will be recalled that the farmers' free list bill as it passed Congress and was presented to President Taft did not contain a single article produced upon the farm. The articles, including meats and cereals, which had been in the free list bill when originally introduced, had been by the deliberate action of a Democratic House and a Republican Senate cut out of that bill. So that all any farmer had reason to fear if fairly dealt with by the successful party was a reduction of the rate of duties upon his products, and he was in nowise warned that any of them would be placed upon the free list. In fact, the Democratic platform, fairly construed, assures him of that degree of protection.

The American farmer represents somewhat varied sentiment as to the degree of protection demanded for farm products, but few of them are willing that the product of any foreign field or pasture shall enter our ports without bowing to the American flag and paying tribute to our Treasury. They all agree there should not be protection for the manufacturers, who work and produce under a roof which shields them from summer sun, winter cold, and stress of storm; while the farmer, to be successful, must toil under burning sun, through winter frosts, through long daily hours. He must combine the training of an engineer to manipulate his now complex machinery with the study of the scientist to understand preparing the soil, seeding, harvesting, and garnering.

Moreover, he must be a financier to know when, how, and under what circumstances to market his product that best results may follow. They might regard an ultra high protection upon their products as not wise; they might consider a low tariff as not unwise; but a tariff that protected those with whom they deal and which does not protect them in a reasonable advantage for the home markets they regard as unjust and infamous. Further, the producers of the grains and the food animals of the North and West did not agree nor will they long tamely submit to a revenue measure which protects the agricultural products of the South and discriminates against similar or related products of the North.

A division in the ranks of the friends of agriculture in 1912 allowed a House, Senate, and Executive unfavorable to the interests of the farmer and prejudiced in favor of the large cities of the East and the interests of the South to come into power. They saw their duty to deal fairly with the agricultural classes in their proposed important tariff legislation, and knew that neither by the authority of the people nor as a matter of justice should the producers of this country be discriminated against. But while seeing their duty they also recognized the opportunity clamored for by the great cities of the East and the interests of the South to retain substantial protective duties upon articles in those sections and place upon the free list or at ridiculously low rates of duty northern farm products. Further, where duties were to be laid on agricultural products and a possible discrimination could be effected between the North and the South the South should be favored.

Following these considerations and with these purposes in view, the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill became a law.

Of the great agricultural products of the North and West bearing a reasonable duty under the old law, the following were placed upon the free list: Corn, wheat, rye, cattle, hogs, sheep, meats, flour, eggs, poultry, potatoes, and wool. Agricultural products, including raw wool, constituted 80 per cent of the value of all the articles free listed under the Underwood-Simmons law. There was retained upon the dutiable list, however, the southern products—rice, peanuts, tobacco, mica, and the hair of the Angora goat, whose champion has just left the Hall.

Moreover, 80 per cent of the products of the State of New Jersey was retained on the dutiable list, while only 35 per cent of Nebraska's was so retained. The average per cent of dutiable articles retained in the States west of the Mississippi River is 36. The average per cent of the following States, New Jersey,

New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida, is 56. Add to this the rates upon the articles left in the dutiable list in the States west of the Mississippi are, on an average, less than half those retained in the eastern and southern group, giving tariff advantage to East and South fully 5 to 1 as against the North and West.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will yield briefly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was going to ask whether, in considering that, you took into your calculations the extreme Northwest—the Northwest Pacific States?

Mr. SLOAN. I included those; I included them all. I would not forget the gentleman's State.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think you will find it even less in that State than you gave it.

Mr. SLOAN. As they got away from the home territory of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee the harder they hit the producing classes of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In the far Northwest they did not leave us anything.

Mr. SLOAN. They did not seem to know there was a Northwest.

For this unjust discrimination a cause is naturally demanded by the inquiring mind. Especially so by those among the injured. If a line were drawn from Canada to the Rio Grande River, leaving three-fifths of the area of the United States to the West and two-fifths to the East, there would be found residing within two-fifths area every Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee credited with drafting the tariff bill. Moreover, 9 of these 14 were residents of the South or of some large eastern city. When we consider that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee appoints all the majority membership of all other standing committees and thus controls the legislation of the House, its ability to reach unjust ends will be readily recognized.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I was wondering if the gentleman forgot rice.

Mr. SLOAN. I have rice in there. I remember eggs and rice. They are both favored by the Chinese, and I will discuss them later.

It has been pertinently inquired, however, why the other branch of this Congress, which has not yet ceased to be a deliberative body, should have sanctioned this outrage by the House. It is properly suggested that that body has not a large Democratic majority and that there are a number of Democratic Members from the Northwest. These considerations appealed strongly to me. I could not understand why Members of that body representing the great northwestern producing States should allow their party colleagues to trample upon the rights and interests of the States and peoples whom they were in duty bound to defend. A careful reading of the Congressional Directory, however, reveals the fact that some half-score Members of that body from the Northwest found their nativity in the South in States where at the time they left were devoted to the ultra doctrines and theories of John C. Calhoun. Migrating into the Northwest they carried with them their prejudices and held the same apparently superior to the interests of the States whose legislatures had granted them commissions. They were confronted with the question in their party caucus whether they would defend the interests of their States or blindly follow the prejudices they had carried into those States. They were further asked to support legislation which Members of that body from the South would not now support when applied to the products of their own States; so that we have southern Members of that body standing against free peanuts, free mica, free sugar, free tobacco, free rice, and free angora goat hair. The wonder is that this half-score men did not boldly face their pressing colleagues and say: "True we came from your section. We love it and all its traditions and history. We carried to our new homes and our new people the economic and political beliefs which we absorbed in our childhood and youth, but we will not now be party to the perpetration of a sectional wrong, especially if that wrong is to be inflicted upon the people whose commissions we hold. When we left your section of the country these new people became our people, and their interests our interests."

Parliamentary rules forbid more definite statement as to name and act, but upon suitable occasion I shall publicly state specifically to whom I have referred and make other pertinent comments thereon.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there was one Senator who did not belong to the Democratic Party, but it suits his description, who voted for the bill.

Mr. SLOAN. If my blanket is larger than I figured, let it cover that with which it comes in contact.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman say what party the Senator belonged to?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not the floor.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to proceed. The gentleman from Washington has already pretty well set forth as to whom the description applies.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think it will be very hard to identify him. There are but three parties in the Senate, and only one man belongs to one of those parties.

Mr. SLOAN. Let no man complain of sectionalism in this speech. That it is charged is true. But the issue was not made on this side of the Chamber; it was made by the authors and supporters of the Underwood bill in this House, the Senate, and the White House. Let him who would remove sectionalism rise in the place of power and cause to be repealed that part of the law affecting farm products and substitute a fair schedule in harmony with the favored schedules of the new law. Until you do so do not complain of sectionalism. You made it. Until you remove it you must answer for it. [Applause.]

If this injustice could have been excused by pressing revenue necessities, it might be tolerated, but the revenue effect of the Underwood-Simmons law amounted to a willful and deliberate diversion of revenues from the United States Treasury.

I submit the following tables, showing the dutiable goods entered at our ports for the period for the fiscal years beginning with 1897 and closing 1912; also separate table for 1913, which, by reason of the foreshadowed tariff action, is given a place by itself.

*Imported dutiable merchandise entered for consumption: Values, duties collected, and ad valorem rates, 1897 to 1912, by schedules of the respective tariffs in force in the years named.*

| Year ended June 30— | Schedule A.—Chemicals, oils, and paints. | | | Schedule B.—Earths, earthenware, and glassware. | | | Schedule C.—Metals, and manufactures of. | | | Schedule D.—Wood, and manufactures of. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
| | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* |
| 1897 | $19,003,638 | $5,440,024 | 28.63 | $21,166,515 | $7,605,169 | 35.93 | $23,603,665 | $8,955,132 | 37.94 | $1,485,479 | $339,974 | 22.83 |
| 1898 | 19,513,037 | 6,146,884 | 31.50 | 15,192,178 | 7,387,433 | 48.63 | 18,847,123 | 8,454,289 | 44.86 | 5,241,083 | 1,205,278 | 22.57 |
| 1899 | 21,570,616 | 7,009,695 | 32.50 | 17,244,220 | 8,863,349 | 51.40 | 18,152,727 | 7,809,281 | 43.02 | 7,568,420 | 1,671,048 | 22.08 |
| 1900 | 26,955,991 | 8,184,044 | 30.36 | 20,090,172 | 10,106,541 | 50.31 | 29,089,333 | 11,280,853 | 38.78 | 11,711,446 | 2,351,940 | 20.08 |
| 1901 | 26,414,360 | 7,415,496 | 28.07 | 20,166,399 | 10,301,486 | 51.08 | 28,631,743 | 10,922,077 | 38.15 | 10,635,183 | 2,049,457 | 19.27 |
| 1902 | 29,991,974 | 8,499,709 | 28.34 | 21,424,011 | 11,365,381 | 53.05 | 38,870,207 | 14,973,244 | 38.52 | 14,556,267 | 2,572,527 | 17.67 |
| 1903 | 31,249,644 | 8,980,673 | 28.74 | 25,735,463 | 13,320,181 | 51.76 | 65,164,750 | 22,368,210 | 34.33 | 16,650,206 | 2,814,734 | 16.90 |
| 1904 | 30,808,543 | 8,813,962 | 28.61 | 24,704,368 | 13,163,258 | 53.28 | 40,011,304 | 15,682,494 | 39.20 | 14,449,585 | 2,463,948 | 17.05 |
| 1905 | 31,010,996 | 8,845,176 | 28.52 | 23,126,296 | 12,193,546 | 52.73 | 36,327,218 | 14,448,673 | 39.77 | 16,707,735 | 2,750,017 | 16.46 |
| 1906 | 33,481,921 | 9,664,910 | 28.87 | 26,589,979 | 13,749,020 | 51.71 | 50,917,147 | 18,769,616 | 36.86 | 22,760,988 | 3,650,271 | 16.04 |
| 1907 | 40,246,137 | 11,124,088 | 27.64 | 31,306,009 | 15,350,019 | 49.03 | 67,148,963 | 21,882,145 | 32.59 | 24,472,483 | 3,701,201 | 15.12 |
| 1908 | 39,127,306 | 10,530,174 | 26.91 | 26,224,241 | 13,250,558 | 50.53 | 45,279,789 | 16,003,780 | 35.34 | 23,349,686 | 3,301,256 | 14.14 |
| 1909 | 42,936,600 | 11,217,784 | 26.13 | 21,148,142 | 10,641,572 | 50.32 | 41,103,417 | 15,656,102 | 38.09 | 23,285,386 | 3,140,844 | 13.49 |
| 1910 | 42,021,558 | 11,072,239 | 26.41 | 24,774,251 | 12,467,509 | 50.33 | 66,960,781 | 22,333,344 | 33.35 | 27,489,155 | 3,184,697 | 11.59 |
| 1911 | 48,869,382 | 12,563,788 | 25.71 | 24,495,258 | 12,669,182 | 51.72 | 58,757,341 | 18,869,321 | 32.11 | 24,709,532 | 2,959,669 | 11.93 |
| 1912 | 47,235,641 | 12,239,742 | 25.91 | 21,994,265 | 11,156,221 | 50.72 | 50,491,870 | 17,346,221 | 34.35 | 24,414,943 | 3,042,834 | 12.45 |

*Imported dutiable merchandise entered for consumption: Values, duties collected, and ad valorem rates, 1897 to 1912, by schedules of the respective tariffs in force in the years named*—Continued.

| Year ended June 30— | Schedule E.—Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of. | | | Schedule F.—Tobacco, and manufactures of. | | | Schedule G.—Agricultural products and provisions. | | | Schedule H.—Spirits, wines, and other beverages. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
| | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* |
| 1897 | $98,283,469 | $41,346,400 | 42.07 | $18,782,789 | $20,971,682 | 111.66 | $33,716,958 | $8,613,987 | 25.55 | $11,880,430 | $8,136,014 | 68.48 |
| 1898 | 38,300,580 | 29,695,301 | 77.47 | 8,225,482 | 9,916,183 | 120.55 | 29,853,286 | 11,608,121 | 38.88 | 9,319,646 | 6,026,607 | 64.66 |
| 1899 | 81,227,498 | 61,660,942 | 75.91 | 9,371,597 | 10,627,399 | 113.40 | 32,505,236 | 12,743,785 | 39.21 | 11,072,774 | 7,490,074 | 67.64 |
| 1900 | 80,890,937 | 57,823,285 | 71.48 | 13,597,162 | 14,382,305 | 105.77 | 35,762,588 | 13,183,635 | 36.86 | 12,807,506 | 8,828,660 | 68.45 |
| 1901 | 87,079,079 | 63,089,412 | 72.45 | 15,055,501 | 16,655,744 | 110.63 | 38,566,704 | 13,043,820 | 33.82 | 14,099,924 | 9,533,524 | 67.61 |
| 1902 | 61,116,367 | 53,040,877 | 86.79 | 16,331,536 | 18,756,035 | 114.85 | 43,682,461 | 16,012,639 | 36.66 | 15,367,757 | 10,502,022 | 68.73 |
| 1903 | 65,959,060 | 63,625,731 | 96.46 | 18,298,780 | 21,891,687 | 119.63 | 46,221,428 | 16,282,144 | 35.23 | 16,784,608 | 11,646,532 | 69.39 |
| 1904 | 77,898,029 | 58,152,347 | 74.65 | 17,875,683 | 21,176,293 | 118.46 | 49,013,792 | 16,896,988 | 34.46 | 17,120,014 | 12,105,786 | 70.71 |
| 1905 | 91,577,274 | 51,442,112 | 56.17 | 20,725,297 | 22,689,611 | 109.48 | 47,570,416 | 15,418,334 | 32.41 | 17,012,332 | 12,547,900 | 70.05 |
| 1906 | 86,133,491 | 52,648,866 | 61.12 | 22,917,352 | 23,927,700 | 104.41 | 53,868,946 | 18,126,575 | 33.65 | 19,609,398 | 14,009,516 | 71.22 |
| 1907 | 92,784,081 | 60,338,523 | 65.03 | 29,959,081 | 26,125,037 | 87.20 | 63,720,855 | 19,203,886 | 30.14 | 23,083,420 | 16,318,120 | 70.69 |
| 1908 | 83,626,684 | 50,168,155 | 59.99 | 26,495,243 | 22,160,089 | 83.64 | 69,609,535 | 21,618,559 | 31.06 | 21,419,770 | 15,213,085 | 71.02 |
| 1909 | 93,478,607 | 56,414,434 | 60.35 | 27,332,038 | 23,269,458 | 85.14 | 71,719,009 | 23,633,333 | 32.95 | 23,381,943 | 16,144,031 | 69.05 |
| 1910 | 101,586,708 | 53,105,357 | 52.28 | 29,581,469 | 24,124,239 | 81.55 | 84,872,747 | 25,160,516 | 29.64 | 25,315,878 | 18,113,512 | 71.55 |
| 1911 | 97,877,463 | 52,809,371 | 53.95 | 29,788,180 | 26,159,615 | 87.82 | 105,974,044 | 28,744,295 | 27.12 | 20,354,501 | 17,208,858 | 84.99 |
| 1912 | 105,744,519 | 50,951,199 | 48.18 | 31,116,052 | 25,571,508 | 82.18 | 117,711,156 | 34,146,071 | 29.01 | 20,731,233 | 17,409,815 | 83.98 |

| Year ended June 30— | Schedule I.—Cotton manufactures. | | | Schedule J.—Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of. | | | Schedule K.—Wool, and manufactures of. | | | Schedule L.—Silks and silk goods. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
| | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* |
| 1897 | $22,650,234 | $9,903,895 | 43.73 | $34,852,448 | $14,110,685 | 40.49 | $48,902,866 | $22,702,726 | 46.42 | $26,517,092 | $12,421,970 | 46.85 |
| 1898 | 14,663,418 | 7,500,252 | 51.15 | 33,704,889 | 15,712,121 | 46.62 | 18,300,031 | 13,057,164 | 71.12 | 22,639,597 | 12,231,681 | 54.03 |
| 1899 | 17,002,769 | 8,934,913 | 52.55 | 44,412,454 | 20,892,285 | 47.04 | 22,342,090 | 17,230,152 | 77.12 | 25,026,504 | 13,506,312 | 53.97 |
| 1900 | 20,684,578 | 10,565,562 | 51.08 | 54,732,531 | 25,701,451 | 46.96 | 30,656,717 | 21,637,428 | 70.58 | 30,358,771 | 15,771,795 | 51.95 |
| 1901 | 19,568,242 | 9,715,747 | 49.65 | 57,669,270 | 26,218,962 | 45.46 | 30,727,663 | 21,575,104 | 70.21 | 26,836,267 | 14,245,693 | 53.12 |
| 1902 | 21,129,139 | 10,422,930 | 49.33 | 68,133,003 | 30,694,804 | 45.05 | 35,363,788 | 26,396,923 | 74.64 | 32,242,228 | 17,293,290 | 53.64 |
| 1903 | 25,332,216 | 11,944,300 | 47.15 | 71,207,682 | 33,190,646 | 46.55 | 40,560,037 | 29,195,736 | 71.98 | 36,047,873 | 19,276,546 | 53.47 |
| 1904 | 23,442,254 | 11,035,018 | 47.07 | 71,460,146 | 32,898,495 | 46.04 | 39,962,848 | 27,252,492 | 68.19 | 31,483,007 | 16,610,210 | 52.76 |
| 1905 | 22,027,367 | 10,409,188 | 47.26 | 73,284,154 | 33,768,719 | 46.08 | 53,465,490 | 33,077,578 | 61.87 | 31,822,655 | 17,010,130 | 53.45 |
| 1906 | 26,656,366 | 12,292,896 | 46.12 | 92,055,209 | 41,777,068 | 45.38 | 63,265,115 | 37,968,695 | 60.02 | 32,591,910 | 17,351,095 | 53.24 |
| 1907 | 31,857,017 | 14,284,628 | 44.84 | 114,124,372 | 49,890,953 | 43.72 | 62,831,601 | 36,561,217 | 58.19 | 38,816,839 | 20,313,706 | 52.33 |
| 1908 | 31,577,132 | 13,878,022 | 43.95 | 96,177,445 | 41,921,732 | 43.59 | 45,822,496 | 28,845,245 | 62.95 | 31,755,212 | 16,493,078 | 51.94 |
| 1909 | 26,228,434 | 11,666,308 | 44.48 | 91,209,596 | 42,144,980 | 46.21 | 52,814,238 | 33,365,316 | 63.17 | 31,001,207 | 16,284,117 | 52.53 |
| 1910 | 28,310,523 | 13,619,191 | 48.11 | 106,374,854 | 49,735,027 | 46.75 | 70,745,252 | 41,904,850 | 59.23 | 32,295,926 | 17,023,622 | 52.71 |
| 1911 | 26,204,150 | 12,325,584 | 47.04 | 99,401,935 | 47,053,000 | 47.34 | 48,395,406 | 28,982,553 | 59.89 | 30,993,562 | 16,053,261 | 51.80 |
| 1912 | 24,358,360 | 11,065,150 | 45.51 | 108,698,102 | 49,002,348 | 45.14 | 48,301,374 | 27,072,116 | 55.98 | 26,571,519 | 13,695,239 | 51.54 |

| Year ended June 30— | Schedule M.—Pulp, papers, and books. | | | Schedule N.—Sundries. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
| | | | *Per cent.* | | | *Per cent.* |
| 1897 | $5,319,055 | $1,200,043 | 22.56 | $41,184,008 | $10,011,200 | 25.04 |
| 1898 | 4,684,291 | 1,202,328 | 25.67 | 56,868,214 | 14,073,599 | 24.75 |
| 1899 | 5,223,698 | 1,349,575 | 25.84 | 66,420,234 | 16,272,012 | 24.50 |
| 1900 | 7 695,417 | 1,764,834 | 22.93 | 77,801,134 | 18 706 305 | 23.91 |
| 1901 | 7,021,206 | 1,702,776 | 24.25 | 76,103,674 | 17,912,848 | 23.51 |
| 1902 | 8,047,824 | 1,896,456 | 23.56 | 86,667,841 | 20,180,984 | 23.29 |
| 1903 | 9,907,819 | 2,220,736 | 22.28 | 96,422,645 | 20,843,433 | 21.18 |
| 1904 | 10,771,269 | 2,379,354 | 22.09 | 78,680,617 | 18,767,420 | 23.85 |
| 1905 | 11,974,859 | 2,525,895 | 21.09 | 92,512,767 | 20,771,250 | 22.45 |
| 1906 | 14,173,917 | 3,020 980 | 21.31 | 119,640,143 | 26,600,776 | 22.23 |
| 1907 | 20,005,025 | 4,136,029 | 20.67 | 133,092,951 | 29,892,107 | 22.45 |
| 1908 | 22,335,007 | 4,414,633 | 19.75 | 94,616,374 | 24,475,096 | 25.87 |
| 1909 | 22,764,740 | 4,412,020 | 19.39 | 113,862,410 | 26,387,061 | 23.17 |
| 1910 | 24,832,627 | 5,285,103 | 21.28 | 120,594,291 | 29,133,889 | 24.16 |
| 1911 | 26,110,975 | 5,645,302 | 21.62 | 109,049,908 | 27,448,145 | 25.17 |
| 1912 | 22,828,121 | 4,886,671 | 21.41 | 108,952,769 | 26,931,900 | 24.72 |

***Imported dutiable merchandise entered for consumption, values, duties collected, and ad valorem rates, by schedules, of the existing tariff, during the fiscal year 1913.***

| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Schedule A: Chemicals, oils, and paints | $49,386,692 | $13,017,094 | 26.36 |
| Schedule B: Earths, earthenware, and glassware | 24,862,282 | 12,340,456 | 49.64 |
| Schedule C: Metals, and manufactures of | 64,299,772 | 20,513,674 | 31.90 |
| Schedule D: Wood, and manufactures of | 27,851,295 | 3,408,228 | 12.24 |
| Schedule E: Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of | 91,447,552 | 53,481,801 | 58.48 |
| Schedule F: Tobacco, and manufactures of | 32,437,743 | 26,748,125 | 82.46 |
| Schedule G: Agricultural products and provisions | 99,798,484 | 27,754,576 | 27.71 |
| Schedule H: Spirits, wines, and other beverages | 22,372,476 | 19,475,562 | 87.05 |

***Imported dutiable merchandise entered for consumption, values, duties, collected, and ad valorem rates, by schedules, of the existing tariff, during the fiscal year 1913*—Continued.**

| | Values. | Duties collected. | Average ad valorem rates. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Schedule I: Cotton manufactures | $25,036,975 | $11,061,373 | 44.14 |
| Schedule J: Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of | 116,587,611 | 48,911,883 | 41.95 |
| Schedule K: Wool, and manufactures of | 45,335,616 | 25,833,028 | 56.98 |
| Schedule L: Silks and silk goods | 29,224,018 | 14,811,561 | 50.68 |
| Schedule M: Pulp, papers, and books | 24,899,335 | 5,091,232 | 20.45 |
| Schedule N: Sundries | 126,157,230 | 29,803,424 | 23.62 |
| Total dutiable | 779,717,079 | 312,262,215 | 40.05 |

An examination of the foregoing statistics will show the following facts:

First. That Schedule G, in 1897, in point of view of dutiable imports, ranked No. 5, while in 1912 it was first.

Second. That Schedule G as a revenue producer among the schedules in 1897 ranked ninth, while in 1912 it had risen to third.

Third. That Schedule G in 1897 showed dutiable importations of only $33,716,958, in 1912 it had risen to $117,711,156; and Schedule G in 1897 produced only $8,613,987 revenue, increased in 1912 to $34,146,071.

Fourth. That while Schedule G in 1897 had but 8 per cent of all the dutiable importations, in 1912 it had risen to 14 per cent.

Fifth. That while Schedule G in 1897 produced only 5 per cent of the import revenues, in 1912 it produced 11 per cent.

Sixth. It will be noted that while the revenues of Schedule G in 1897 were less than those of Schedule C (metals), in 1912 they were twice as great. While the revenues from Schedule G in 1897 were less than one-half those of Schedule F (tobacco), it now exceeds Schedule F by nearly $9,000,000. While approximately equal to Schedule H (spirits) in 1897, Schedule G now doubles it in the revenue production. While Schedule G was less than Schedule I (cotton), it now produces three times Schedule I's revenue. That Schedule G in 1912 produced more revenue than Schedule I (cotton manufactures), Schedule K (wool—raw wool amounting to $14,000,000 eliminated), and Schedule D (lumber) combined.

Seventh. The dutiable importations of Schedule G have increased more between 1897 and 1912 than any other schedule, and Schedule G has increased as a revenue producer more rapidly than any of the other grade schedules, its percentage of increase in that period being 296 per cent.

As a schedule for "tariff for revenue only," viewed under the 1909 law, it is certainly ideal. From a competitive tariff standpoint it is the most nearly perfect schedule of the list, and from a protective basis it has been satisfactory. Yet this is the schedule from which the free list received its most numerous recruits, and the reductions on its remaining articles have been the most drastic of all the schedules.

Now let us see. The general fund of our Treasury on February 28, 1913, had a balance of $147,036,682.68 and on October 4, 1913, the day before the tariff bill went into effect, a balance of $123,694,624.96. Since then it has been falling with increasing speed until now the balance is only $92,866,547.85, and for the last month it has been going down at the rate of $68,000 for every hour the Treasury is kept open.

Objections to these discriminations and injustices, and the sacrifice of the Treasury's rights, made on the floor of the House and Senate fell upon dull and scornful ears. The substantial answer given was: "The caucus had decreed that the deed be executed. The majority of the House was simply executing caucus decrees. Let the Northwest tell its troubles to the police."

The tariff bill has been in effect for nearly all of October and the full calendar months of November, December, January, and February, and this period is pertinent for consideration. I submit the following table showing farm-product importations for those months, together with importations for corresponding months of the preceding fiscal year:

*Imports into United States of certain farm products, for October, November, December, 1912, and January, 1913, under 1909 tariff act, together with those for October, November, December, 1913, and January, 1914, under 1913 tariff act.*

| | October, 1913. | | October, 1912. | | November, 1913. | | November, 1912. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. |
| Cattle [1] ..... number.. | 130,639 | $3,389,667 | 27,696 | $578,843 | 123,118 | $3,306,723 | 43,758 | $820,358 |
| Horses ..... do.... | 2,154 | 227,150 | 1,704 | 398,102 | 4,705 | 295,262 | 1,474 | 164,217 |
| Sheep [1] ..... do.... | 26,035 | 57,859 | 2,406 | 15,562 | 46,995 | 99,187 | 5,077 | 24,731 |
| Bread and biscuits [1] ..... | ..... | 33,855 | ..... | 32,899 | ..... | 46,412 | ..... | 30,457 |
| Corn [1] ..... bushels.. | 473,259 | 378,011 | 226,471 | 114,796 | 1,632,643 | 1,182,672 | 25,819 | 21,567 |
| Oats [2] ..... do.... | 2,524,793 | 886,994 | 379 | 186 | 5,132,308 | 1,821,789 | 4,266 | 2,052 |
| Rice ..... (total).. pounds.. | 13,047,165 | 316,265 | 15,274,409 | 385,916 | 21,699,389 | 647,569 | 11,322,287 | 331,166 |
| Wheat [3] ..... bushels.. | 233,217 | 213,483 | 52,213 | 29,510 | 127,039 | 107,011 | 2,187 | 2,152 |
| Wheat flour [3] ..... barrels.. | 8,444 | 35,065 | 12,981 | 58,525 | 10,824 | 47,718 | 6,190 | 25,538 |
| Beef and veal [1 4] ..... pounds.. | 5,677,461 | 466,987 | | | 10,856,516 | 900,296 | | |
| Mutton and lamb [1 4] ..... do.... | 60,047 | 5,452 | | | 32,385 | 3,445 | | |
| Pork [1 4] ..... do.... | 14,699 | 2,218 | | 121,583 | 109,832 | 17,333 | | 128,818 |
| Prepared and preserved meats [1 4] ..... do.... | ..... | 41,301 | ..... | | ..... | 136,105 | ..... | |
| Bacon and hams [1 4] ..... do.... | 46,013 | 11,051 | | | 70,117 | 15,759 | | |
| All other meats ..... | ..... | 47,381 | | | ..... | 98,582 | | |
| Sausages, bologna [5] ..... pounds.. | 31,073 | 8,171 | 32,881 | 8,625 | 70,489 | 18,417 | 71,288 | 18,436 |
| Sausage casings [5] ..... do.... | 470,481 | 213,566 | 357,189 | 203,024 | 412,334 | 174,506 | 317,214 | 152,334 |
| Milk and cream, fresh and condensed [1] ..... | ..... | 134,352 | ..... | 78,962 | ..... | 181,656 | ..... | 68,631 |
| Butter and substitutes [6] ..... pounds.. | 463,399 | 105,975 | 107,046 | 27,088 | 1,069,617 | 234,197 | 169,233 | 42,458 |
| Cheese and substitutes [7] ..... do.... | 5,424,600 | 1,005,884 | 4,950,658 | 949,359 | 6,722,892 | 1,197,566 | 5,492,871 | 1,042,711 |
| Eggs [1 8] ..... dozen.. | 21,594 | 5,322 | ..... | ..... | 165,263 | 36,500 | ..... | ..... |

| | December, 1913. | | December, 1912. | | January, 1914. | | January, 1913. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. | Quantities. | Value. |
| Cattle [1] ..... number.. | 87,470 | $1,911,882 | 40,522 | $610,569 | 90,694 | $1,503,276 | 24,111 | $340,841 |
| Horses ..... do.... | 4,544 | 215,577 | 568 | 103,114 | 7,239 | 255,635 | 255 | 66,048 |
| Sheep [1] ..... do.... | 36,073 | 90,019 | 792 | 9,387 | 15,485 | 29,169 | 95 | 1,141 |
| Bread and biscuits [1] ..... | ..... | 62,619 | ..... | 29,235 | ..... | 17,454 | ..... | 25,454 |
| Corn [1] ..... bushels.. | 2,343,444 | 1,485,397 | 637 | 415 | 2,554,813 | 1,610,136 | 5,757 | 2,988 |
| Oats [2] ..... do.... | 5,577,656 | 1,918,985 | 8,984 | 3,069 | 2,959,388 | 1,000,637 | 9,951 | 6,372 |
| Rice ..... (total).. pounds.. | 29,889,890 | 864,672 | 12,252,096 | 374,629 | 25,262,075 | 701,853 | 17,399,296 | 558,186 |
| Wheat [3] ..... bushels.. | 149,304 | 124,782 | 151,616 | 117,579 | 901,130 | 793,024 | 109,437 | 85,739 |
| Wheat flour [3] ..... barrels.. | 6,883 | 26,720 | 16,441 | 65,539 | 8,696 | 35,011 | 8,340 | 32,594 |
| Beef and veal [1 4] ..... pounds.. | 15,483,670 | 1,227,037 | | | 12,746,749 | 1,029,137 | | |
| Mutton and lamb [1 4] ..... do.... | 441,308 | 34,598 | | | 521,730 | 41,464 | | |
| Pork [1 4] ..... do.... | 104,211 | 14,321 | | 163,871 | 172,272 | 20,736 | | 122,532 |
| Prepared preserved meats [1 4] ..... do.... | ..... | 169,999 | ..... | | ..... | 273,817 | ..... | |
| Bacon and hams [4] ..... do.... | 139,242 | 31,170 | | | 195,589 | 39,553 | | |
| All other meats ..... | ..... | 137,074 | | | ..... | 10,555 | | |
| Sausage and bologna [5] ..... pounds.. | 118,451 | 28,064 | 120,694 | 26,248 | 56,680 | 14,067 | 81,650 | 16,791 |
| Sausage casings [5] ..... do.... | ..... | 211,821 | ..... | 192,558 | ..... | 152,997 | 329,515 | 198,484 |
| Milk and cream, fresh and condensed [1] ..... | ..... | 112,277 | ..... | 121,857 | ..... | 129,537 | ..... | 47,932 |
| Butter and substitutes [6] ..... pounds.. | 1,183,152 | 244,321 | 145,949 | 37,655 | 1,858,911 | 447,266 | 47,947 | 15,112 |
| Cheese and substitutes [7] ..... do.... | 6,979,241 | 1,233,453 | 4,571,922 | 852,577 | 3,530,972 | 1,039,956 | 3,688,186 | 703,701 |
| Eggs [1 8] ..... dozen.. | 1,514,296 | 334,316 | ..... | ..... | 1,184,408 | 236,622 | ..... | ..... |

[1] Free on and after Oct. 4, 1913.
[2] Duty decreased from 15 cents per bushel to 6 cents per bushel.
[3] Free if imported from countries which impose no duties on like imports from United States. Wheat reduced from 25 cents to 10 cents. Flour, 25 per cent to 45 cents per barrel.
[4] Included in all other meat products prior to July 1, 1913.
[5] Free under both laws.
[6] Duty decreased from 6 cents to 2½ cents per pound.
[7] Duty decreased from 6 cents per pound to 20 per cent.
[8] Included in all other articles prior to Oct. 4, 1913; free after Oct. 4, 1913.

*Imports into United States of certain farm products, for October, November, December, 1912, and January 1913, etc.*—Continued.

| | Total for four months under tariff act of 1913. | | Total for four months under tariff act of 1909. | | Per cent of increase or decrease, four months under 1913 law, compared with four months under 1909 law. | Total imports, year ending June 30, 1913, under law of 1909. | | Amount of increase in value of four months under new law over full year under old law. | Per cent of increase, four months over full year. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Values. | Quantities. | Values. | | Quantities. | Values. | | |
| Cattle[1]....number.. | 431,921 | $10,110,948 | 136,087 | $2,359,611 | + 324 | 421,649 | $6,640,668 | $3,450,280 | 52 |
| Horses....do.... | 18,642 | 993,624 | 4,001 | 731,481 | + 35 | 10,008 | 2,125,875 | ..... | ..... |
| Sheep[1]....do.... | 124,588 | 276,231 | 9,430 | 50,821 | + 443 | 15,428 | 90,021 | 186,210 | 206 |
| Bread and biscuits[1]..... | ..... | 160,340 | ..... | 118,045 | + 36 | ..... | 255,336 | ..... | ..... |
| Corn[1]....bushels.. | 7,004,159 | 4,656,216 | 248,684 | 139,766 | + 3,224 | 903,062 | 491,079 | 4,165,137 | 848 |
| Oats[2]....do.... | 16,194,145 | 5,628,405 | 23,580 | 11,679 | +46,380 | 723,899 | 289,364 | 5,339,041 | 1,838 |
| Rice....(total)..pounds.. | 89,998,519 | 2,530,350 | 56,248,098 | 1,649,897 | + 54 | 222,103,547 | 5,916,864 | ..... | ..... |
| Wheat....bushels.. | 1,410,690 | 1,238,300 | 315,453 | 234,970 | + 423 | 797,528 | 559,559 | 678,741 | 121 |
| Wheat flour[3]....barrels.. | 34,847 | 144,514 | 43,952 | 182,192 | − 20 | 107,558 | 453,681 | ..... | ..... |
| Beef and veal[1 4]....pounds.. | 44,764,396 | [3,614,457 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 4,228,764 | 322,567 | 3,291,890 | 1,020 |
| Mutton and lamb[1 4]....do.... | 1,055,474 | 84,959 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 212,843 | 16,406 | 68,553 | 411 |
| Pork[1 4]....do.... | 400,914 | 54,607 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 261,247 | 38,682 | 15,925 | 41 |
| Prepared and preserved meats[1 4]....do.... | ..... | 621,222 | ..... | 536,804 | + 787 | ..... | 426,788 | ..... | ..... |
| Bacon and ham[1 4]....do.... | 450,961 | 97,533 | ..... | ..... | ..... | 628,367 | 156,933 | ..... | ..... |
| All other meats..... | ..... | 293,592] | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | 297,581 | ..... | ..... |
| Sausage and bologna[5]....pounds.. | 276,693 | 68,719 | 306,513 | 70,100 | − 3 | 728,469 | 157,871 | ..... | ..... |
| Sausage casing[5]....do.... | ..... | 752,890 | ..... | 746,397 | + 1 | ..... | 2,476,082 | ..... | ..... |
| Milk and cream, fresh and condensed[1]..... | ..... | 557,822 | ..... | 317,382 | + 75 | ..... | 1,203,833 | ..... | ..... |
| Butter and substitutes[6]....pounds.. | 4,575,079 | 1,031,759 | 470,175 | 122,313 | + 744 | 1,162,253 | 304,090 | 727,669 | 240 |
| Cheese and substitutes[7]....do.... | 22,657,705 | 4,476,859 | 18,703,637 | 3,548,348 | + 20 | 49,387,944 | 9,185,184 | ..... | ..... |
| Eggs[1 8]....dozen.. | 2,885,561 | 612,760 | (9) | 63,904 | + 858 | 1,271,765 | 191,714 | 421,046 | 219 |
| Total..... | ..... | 38,006,107 | ..... | 10,893,810 | + 248 | ..... | 31,598,265 | 6,407,902 | 20 |

[1] Free on and after Oct. 4, 1913.
[2] Duty decreased from 15 cents per bushel to 6 cents per bushel.
[3] Free if imported from countries which impose no duties on like imports from United States. Wheat reduced from 25 cents to 10 cents. Flour, 25 per cent to 45 cents per barrel.
[4] Included in all other meat products prior to July 1, 1913.
[5] Free under both laws.
[6] Duty decreased from 6 cents to 2½ cents per pound.
[7] Duty decreased from 6 cents per pound to 20 per cent.
[8] Included in all other articles prior to Oct. 4, 1913; free after Oct. 4, 1913.
[9] No figures for months. Value one-third of value for year.
[a] Total for four months, $4,766,370.

The facts of this table may be comforting to the farmers. That is comforting to the people who want to be spurred to competition by the chairman of our committee.

I remember how that side laughed when I insisted that we were entitled to keep at least a part of the duty on corn. The increase in corn importation was 3.224 per cent for the four months under the new law over the full year under the old law.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What effect did that have on the price of corn?

Mr. SLOAN. Corn has gone down, according to the estimate of men who are competent to judge, from 10 to 15 cents a bushel.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the average corn crop this year up to the standard of other years?

Mr. SLOAN. It is not up to the standard, and notwithstanding our reduced amount of production, the price went down, when the Argentine cargoes came in sight, from 10 to 15 cents a bushel.

Now, in oats the increased importation was 46,000 per cent.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. How much reduced in price is the manufactured article made out of corn to the consumer by the cheapening of the product to the farmer?

Mr. SLOAN. Well, it would take a market microscope and the imagination of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to discover it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WINGO and Mr. MOORE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. If the prices of corn, potatoes, and so forth, have gone down on the farm, and we still pay the same for them in the cities, will the gentleman explain who gets the benefit of this reduction in price?

Mr. SLOAN. The importers get the benefit. The men who financed the Democratic campaign in 1912 obtain the advantage.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thought I heard the gentleman state that the price of corn and potatoes had gone down?

Mr. SLOAN. I spoke of corn.

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to say, so far as the East is concerned, that that is not correct. I sold a thousand bushels of corn and quite a quantity of potatoes in the last few weeks at exactly the same price that I received last year for them.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman's comparison is imprope.. If he has noticed the imports coming from Argentina, he will have noticed that the price fell 10 or 15 cents a bushel in January and February. The gentleman should not compare the price with what it was last year because that would not be fair either to himself or to myself. I deal and have dealt in corn myself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If the price of corn and wheat and oats and potatoes goes down, what will happen in the fall?

Mr. SLOAN. The Democrats will also. Then there will be justice in the land. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WINGO. A moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] asked the gentleman if the price of corn products—that is, the articles that the consumer gets, manufactured out of corn—had gone down, and the gentleman from Nebraska said it had not. Will the gentleman tell us what particular corn product he had in mind?

Mr. SLOAN. I had occasion to look all over that, and the gentleman knows how varied they are, and the price lists are available to him. I went into the matter before I made that statement, because I was satisfied that the inquiring mind of the gentleman from Arkansas or of somebody else would raise the question.

Mr. MOORE. With reference to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], does not the gentleman from Nebraska think that inasmuch as the colonel's corn is produced near to a city market and he knows what the city market is, he would ask the market price when he takes it there?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; but I do not want to step on the gentleman's corn. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman is in error, as he usually is when he speaks of such things.

Mr. SLOAN. Of these cattle 271,387 came from Mexico. That immediately after our duty was removed the enterprising statesman-soldiers of that country levied an export duty on these cattle running from $2 to $10 per head. It may be a matter of comfort to the farmers of this country to know that while cattle are shipped into the United States to compete with the products of their fields and pastures, there has been paid export duty of at least $542,774, which, instead of going into the Treasury of the United States, has gone to swell the war chests of the bloody Huerta or fill the girdle of the villainous Villa. Thus is pillage, brigandage, and war continued south of

the Rio Grande while on the north "watchful waiting" goes somnolently on. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that because of our present tariff policy we are furnishing the funds with which to carry on the slaughter in Mexico?

Mr. SLOAN. I am not a master of English, but I thought I was able to say that, and I think I did. If I did not make it plain, I do it now. The present tariff policy is furnishing them funds, because it gave them an opportunity to put on an export duty on cattle the minute we took off the import duty, and William Benton knew it, and because Benton would not pay it he lost his life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit figures to show the enormous increase of the importations into this country from Argentina. Argentina is our great competitor, actual and potential. The table shows importations from Argentina of 4,102,598 bushels of corn during three months, which had the effect of reducing the price of corn to our farmers. The corn crop of Argentina just ripening is about 900,000,000 bushels as against 500,000,000 one year ago. There will be for export at least 500,000,000 bushels as against 90,000,000 bushels a year ago. Last year Argentina shipped to the United Kingdom 13,464,204 bushels; the United States to United Kingdom 7,834,599 bushels, and Argentina will this year wrest the United Kingdom markets from the American corn producers, as it has in the last few years taken the United Kingdom beef markets from the Americans, as the following table will demonstrate. United States export of corn for 1912 was 41,000,000; for 1913, 46,000,000.

*Exports of corn from United States and Argentina to the United Kingdom for certain years.*

| | United States. | Argentina. |
|---|---|---|
| | *Bushels.* | *Bushels.* |
| 1910 | 10,667,812 | 5,485,194 |
| 1912 | 7,834,599 | 13,464,204 |
| 1913 | 14,106,720 | [1] 27,384,857 |

[1] Trade figures.

*Exports of beef from United States and Argentina to the United Kingdom for certain years.*

| | United States. | Argentina. |
|---|---|---|
| | *Hundredweight.* | *Hundredweight.* |
| 1901 | 3,180,291 | 771,929 |
| 1902 | 2,290,465 | 923,748 |
| 1903 | 2,693,920 | 1,152,211 |
| 1904 | 2,395,836 | 1,675,271 |
| 1905 | 2,282,206 | 2,580,152 |
| 1906 | 2,426,344 | 2,795,913 |
| 1907 | 2,417,604 | 2,756,965 |
| 1908 | 1,432,142 | 3,706,245 |
| 1909 | 856,805 | 4,336,079 |
| 1910 | 477,147 | 5,041,158 |
| 1911 | 174,350 | 6,176,503 |
| 1912 | 6,111 | 6,813,578 |

Corn is shipped from Argentina to our coast cities at about 3 cents per bushel. To ship corn from the Missouri River to the Atlantic seaboard the producer must pay an average of 12 cents per bushel. When we consider that the Argentina laborers get less than one-half what our farm hands receive, and that their lands sell for less than one-half what our lands sell for, we can readily see what disadvantage the western farmer will have in competing with the Argentine producer for the Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans markets. It is probably owing to this fact that this Government is so interested in Argentina, and the fact that Argentina is taking our markets from us, that Democratic leaders are now engaged in the delightful task of raising Argentina from a ministerial rank to an ambassadorial rank.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Does not the gentleman think it is a good thing for the United States to import foodstuffs?

Mr. SLOAN. No; I do not think it is a good thing for the United States to import foodstuffs, because I believe that you who live here and pay the taxes should be allowed to build up your soil and produce your meat and flour and everything of that kind, so that you will have a staple product upon which the country may rely in time of war as well as peace. I am not in favor of permitting the producers of Argentina, Canada, and Australia to fix the New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore price of our meats and cereals.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Let me ask the gentleman another question, and then I shall be through. Does not the gentleman think it a good thing for the United States that Argentina has so much corn and cattle to sell us, in order that Argentina may buy our manufactured products, which statistics show are increasing to a great extent?

Mr. SLOAN. I understand that is the policy of the party that is very much enamored of what Argentina is doing——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Just wait a moment. It is probably owing to this fact that this Government is so interested in Argentina, and the fact that Argentina is taking our markets from us, that Democratic leaders are now engaged in the delightful task of raising Argentina from a ministerial to an ambassadorial rank. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since Argentina has been selling more largely to us, instead of our going down there and capturing her markets, the figures are the other way. We are selling less abroad and buying more abroad.

Mr. SLOAN. That is the way it goes, of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] evidently has not examined the figures.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the statement of the gentleman from Colorado were true—and it appears not to be—does not the gentleman from Nebraska think it would be simply trading the farmer for the benefit of the manufacturer?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; that is what they have been doing all along. I suppose it will comfort the gentleman from Colorado and his constituents to know this fact: That the corn shipped from Argentina to New York is shipped in bottoms, costing 3 cents a bushel. His corn, shipped from Omaha to New York and other Atlantic ports in competition with Argentina corn, would have to pay 12 cents a bushel for transportation.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt the gentleman again, but does not the gentleman know that the reason for the importation from Argentina of farm products in such large quantity is largely the failure of the corn crop in certain sections of the Middle West?

Mr. SLOAN. I know nothing of the kind. I know it is simply because we removed last summer the 15 cents per bushel duty which the old law placed upon corn. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman from Colorado had taken the right position, and if that were true that they are shipping here because of the failure of crops in this country, what becomes of the argument on that side of the House that we ought to buy at all times in foreign markets?

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, they have not any argument on the other side except the law of force and caucus decree. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I do.

Mr. WINGO. I only want some information, and do not ask this question in the spirit of controversy. I understood the gentleman a moment ago to say that the rate from Argentina was 3 cents a bushel and the rate from Colorado to New York was 12 cents.

Mr. SLOAN. From Omaha to New York it is 12 cents.

Mr. WINGO. The old tariff rate under the Payne-Aldrich bill was 15 cents, was it not?

Mr. SLOAN. It was 15 cents.

There has been shipped in beef from Argentina into the United States ports from October 3 to January 1, 6,606,886 pounds. This is placing the American pastures in competition with those of Argentina and American unshipped corn in competition with the Argentina unshipped corn.

It has been recently boasted by Josephus C. Daniels, Secretary of our Navy, that he had purchased a large cargo of Argentine beef to feed our Navy rather than pay the American price. He paid 11.9 cents a pound—the American bid was 12½ cents. He saves a little more than half a cent on the pound for the Treasury. If the enterprising Argentinians who had been shipping to us considerable under the old law had brought into America the same meat under the former tariff law they would have paid 1½ cents a pound into the United States Treasury. Our genial Secretary of the Navy has to his mind saved one-half

cent to our Treasury where the Ways and Means Committee on the same pound of beef lost to the Treasury 1½ cents, a net loss to the United States Government and its now rapidly depleting Treasury of nearly a cent a pound. It reminds me of the North Carolinian farmer in the ante bellum days, whose servant was asked if his master was a good farmer. He said, "Of co'se he is. In the fall he sells the corn what the cattle needs and makes money once, and in the spring he sells the hides of cattle what died for the want of corn and makes money twice." [Laughter on the Republican side.] Then one might wonder how much additional patriotism, bravery, and fighting qualities would be instilled into our jolly sailor boys by having the Secretary of the Navy announce to them that he was feeding them upon Argentine beef instead of that America produced.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know whether the standard of beef raised in the Argentine Republic is as high as the standard of the beef raised in the United States, and whether or not it brings a less price in the European markets than American beef?

Mr. SLOAN. I have made a careful study of that subject, and what the gentleman indicates by his question is absolutely true. Argentine beef does bring a less price in European markets than American beef. If cheapness is all that our naval officers have in mind, the fine glorious silken national emblem, with all the colors of the rainbow within its folds, might be displaced and a cheaper flag bought from some country with a surplus. [Applause.]

Wheat is on the free list, except where the exporting country charges a duty, yet Argentina, our great competitor, actual and potential, has recently so adjusted her tariffs that wheat and its products can all enter our ports free. Every morning paper brings an account of heavy shipments of butter from Belgium, Canada, Argentina, and elsewhere. The farmers of the Northwest, who during recent years have invested freely in dairy cattle, in response to American demand for butter, now find the cow values reduced. Every farmer and housewife in the Northwest who have been finding the means to meet their grocery and clothing bills from butter or butter-fat sales have now the opportunity to see the concrete realization of the free-trade predictions with which the country has been recently regaled.

In Nebraska our egg products have for the last several years exceeded the vaunted gold output of Alaska. One of the principal sources of the farmers' wealth, especially those of small holdings, has been the poultry yard. This source of northwestern prosperity did not escape the vigilant eye of an adverse administration. The impatience of the party in power and its supporters to wreck the poultry and egg industry was shown in a movement during the month of December here at the National Capital, aided and abetted by the wives of those in high places, in a well-organized egg boycott, where cheaper eggs were demanded or the market be closed. While this was going on great ships laden with eggs purchased at from 7 to 10 cents a dozen in China were speeding their way to American ports. In every great market of the United States these cargoes have for several weeks past been discharged, and the price of eggs has been going down like the general fund of the National Treasury. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to inquire of the gentleman if the hens in China work at the same rate of wages as the men in China?

Mr. SLOAN. Relatively the same, I think. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

A tariff argument is being presented to the poultry people of the United States which if not gratifying is undoubtedly convincing. When the administration supporters, under a boycott and an adverse tariff law, join hands across the great seas with the Chinese against the interests of American producers, then will egg prices go down; but I do not think Democratic tariff doctrine will go down much longer with the poultry people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; if the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Has the gentleman taken into consideration that the wages paid for farm labor in those foreign countries are not more than one-fourth what the farmers in the United States pay for their farm help?

Mr. SLOAN. I made that statement, but I did not make it quite so strong. I said one-half as much. I have made a careful study of that matter, especially in the Argentine.

Mr. Chairman, the boycott is an un-American system of attaining an economic end. The producers of this country view it with abhorrence. But if the boycott is to be used or countenanced by those in authority, might it not be well to consider what would be the effect if the American producers should resent this unjust and unwarranted discrimination against themselves by producing for a season only that which they required for their own necessities and left the consuming public, which to some extent seems behind this legislation, to depend upon the prices the foreign importers would see fit to fix upon their supplies?

Nearly every foreign freighter coming to our shores tells the story of increased importation of products to compete with the northwestern farmer. The depression in foreign countries is being relieved; but in being relieved it is communicated to this country. One of the strongest evidences of this is the idle freight cars. The surplus freight cars on December 1, 1912, were 26,135, while on the same date in 1913 they were 67,466. On February 1, 1913, they were 62,045; February 1, 1914, they were 211,960.

A large portion of this idleness is attributed to the fact that during the first nine months of 1913 the freight cars toiled their way from the country districts to the great cities bearing farm products to our ports for consumption. Now the great ocean freighters coming from all quarters of the globe, each carrying many trainloads of products, are delivered in the great cities and dispense with the use of the freight cars.

The additional imports of live stock and food products carried to our shores in foreign vessels since the enactment of the Underwood law over that of the corresponding period of one year ago, reduced to carload loads, would have set in operation 50,000 cars. It would have given employment to many thousand railroad men, freight handlers, and others. There would be many less idle cars, many less idle men; much more paid to the railroads, much less to the foreign shipowners; more wages to American laborers, much less to the foreign producers, dock men, and shipping interests.

Never, perhaps, was the simple tariff doctrine of Abraham Lincoln more clearly indorsed than in the commercial movement of the present time—that if we bought from the foreigners we would have the goods and the foreigners would carry away the money, but if we buy from our own people we retain the goods and keep the money. The currents of the Atlantic are taking on a decidedly tawny hue. Large gold shipments are leaving our ports for the foreign shores. On the 12th of February, Lincoln's birthday, an admiring supporter of our honored President, rhapsodizing his chief, compared him to the great Lincoln. Our President has manly qualities and distinguished ability.

The student may find points in common as well as of difference between him and the martyred President. But in seeking similarities I have heard none of them start out with the tariff. They were alike in this, both were elected by a minority of the American people. Lincoln was personally in favor of freeing the slaves, but only a minority of the American people so voted. However, a majority did vote to support the Union. Lincoln saw his opportunity and also his duty. He made his first consideration the support of the Union, and never pressed his special personal object until it was used as an incident to support the main proposition which was close to the hearts of the American people. President Wilson, confronted by an adverse majority vote and supported by only a minority in favor of sectional free trade, saw his opportunity and used it rather than following the line of duty as pointed out by a majority of the American voters. Lincoln, as a blow in behalf of the Union, liberated from involuntary servitude more than a million able-bodied men. They called the act the Emancipation Proclamation. President Wilson liberated more than a million able-bodied men from voluntary well-paid service. And they called the act the "New Freedom." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

At Chicago, recently, Secretary Daniels called attention to President Wilson's following statement made some months ago in that city:

> I am trustee for the prosperity of the United States in council.

I think a great deal of our President and am very patient in matters which challenge criticism. But permit me to say there are many million of farmers watching their falling prices, as well as one and one-half million laborers with a great deal of leisure on their hands who are examining their trustee's accounts, inspecting the form of his bond, and ascertaining the responsibility of the sureties. [Applause.]

In my opening remarks I criticized the lack of frankness of the Democratic platform in its assurance to the farmers of the country. I can not charge lack of frankness to the authors and supporters of our new tariff law. With a frankness almost brutal there is indicated on page 3 of the report filed by the Ways and Means Committee in support of the Underwood bill the following statement, the remedy for which is the principal object of the Underwood bill.

TABLE 1.—*Relative wholesale prices and per cent of increase over 1897.*

| Commodity. | Price, 1897. | Price, 1900. | Increase over 1897. | Price, 1910. | Increase over 1897 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farm products | 85.2 | 109.5 | 28.5 | 164.6 | 93.2 |
| Food | 87.7 | 104.2 | 18.8 | 128.7 | 46.7 |
| Clothing | 91.1 | 106.8 | 17.2 | 123.7 | 35.8 |
| Metals and implements | 86.6 | 120.5 | 39.1 | 128.5 | 48.2 |
| Drugs and chemicals | 94.4 | 115.7 | 22.5 | 117.0 | 23.9 |
| House furnishing goods | 89.8 | 106.1 | 18.1 | 111.6 | 24.2 |
| Miscellaneous | 92.1 | 109.8 | 19.2 | 133.1 | 44.5 |
| All commodities | 89.7 | 110.5 | 23.1 | 131.6 | 46.7 |

At the head of the list and charged as principal offender is the high price of farm products, which demands a lowering remedy. This is made despite the fact that farm products in 1897 were relatively much lower than were the other classes of articles at that time, and the tariff bill delivered its most deadly blow against farm-product prices. The committee, on page 38 of its report, concentrated the meaning of its whole measure within the limits of a single sentence which expresses now its obvious effect. This is the committee's deliverance:

In our judgment the future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas.

Of all our industries, agriculture is and has been the greatest. It has been the belief of most Americans that the growth of our industries should be within our own national borders and not "beyond the seas." Yet this measure, by its terms calculated and by the quoted statement, professes the purpose to locate the growth of our greatest industries beyond our national borders. Most of us would rather see prosperous wheat fields this side of the Canadian line than beyond it. Somehow or other, I have not been especially interested in the special prosperity of our wheat, oats, and barley in Canada, beyond the "unsalted seas."

A fierce attack was recently made in the Senate of the United States upon a publisher of my State for advertising the advantages, prospects, and the benefits of Canadian lands. His means of inducing the migration from the United States to Canada was severely censured. How slight his offense was compared with the deliberate statement of the great Ways and Means Committee, which, over the signatures of 14 members out of 21, tells every American citizen interested in the production of meats and cereals that growth in that industry does not lie within the American borders, but does lie "beyond the seas." I think that a vast majority of the American people would rather see rich waving fields of corn all the way from the Lakes to the Gulf and from ocean to ocean than its large source of production "beyond the seas" upon the slopes of Argentina. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Ways and Means Committee directs the attention of the young farmer to the grassy plains of Australia, Argentina, and Canada for the production of cattle and sheep, and bids the enterprising citizen go hence to mingle and participate. I would rather keep this class of citizens at home and build up our flocks and herds here, so that the American people in time of war as well as peace can depend on American sources for American meat and American clothing.

The people of the Northwest are now observing the workings of the new tariff. Beautiful theories of prospect have given way to the grinding, crushing realities of fact. They have seen increasing competitions, decreasing prices.

These facts are not only admitted, but gloated over by Hon. W. C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce, in a recent speech at Wheeling, W. Va., following which he says that the Government intends to help and not hinder legitimate business. Thus the farming industry receives from the head of the Department of Commerce its first official brand of illegitimacy.

The Secretary contends "climatic conditions, not business depression, is responsible for the number of unemployed in New York and other industrial centers." A great defense. Almost ingenious, nearly desperate. I would suggest that the next tariff bill be referred to the Weather Bureau instead of the Ways and Means Committee. I suppose the 211,960 idle freight cars on the 1st day of February, 1914, would be accounted for by the precession of the equinoxes, and the one and a half million idle men due to the precise position of the southern cross upon the date of the summer solstice. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

When the tariff bill was under way the Ways and Means Committee, to silence the protest of the farmers and northwestern Congressmen, set forth in its report a statement claimed to be based on legitimate Treasury information showing probable importations during the first year's operation under the proposed law. The following shows forecast for a full year and the actual imports for the first four months under the new law:

| | Forecast for year. | Imports for 4 months. |
|---|---|---|
| Cattle | $5,570,000 | $10,110,948 |
| Horses | 612,500 | 993,624 |
| Eggs | 210,000 | 612,760 |
| Butter | 325,000 | 1,031,759 |
| Oats | 945,000 | 5,628,405 |

Those proposed for the free list had no accompanying prophecy. Some of the above articles were on the dutiable list when the bill passed the House, but were free listed in the Senate.

These estimates are in keeping with the general lack of accuracy of Democratic forecasts. On cattle I figure it they came within 300 degrees of hitting the mark. That kind of aim directed at the Gatun Dam in the Panama Canal would have hit the round house on the new Alaska Railroad. [Laughter.] The guess on the importation of oats shows more imported in the month of January than forecasted for a full year under the bill. The aim and hit recalls the juvenile couplet, "Alexander, great commander, shot a goose and killed a gander." Compared with many of these forecasts the lurid and discredited free-silver predictions of 1896, at which the world has been laughing for 18 years, would appear as unerring certainties. I commend to the Republicans and Progressives of this country the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House on the Underwood bill as an effective campaign document.

This illustrates the unreliability of the now dominant party to grasp the large economic facts of our national revenue, industries, and commerce, and to frame legislation in accordance therewith. It is also an illustration of government by imagination that Democratic function which, unlimited by latitude, longitude, altitude, or depth, divorced from reason, unhampered by rule, untrammeled by law, unencumbered by logic, uncontrolled by history, regardless of equity, in violation of right, expecting to miss, but hoping to hit, disregarding consequences, says, "We are in now for once; it can not be for long; we will do our worst." Following this rule, they drafted and passed Schedule G of the Underwood bill.

It is related of a western Member of this House who voted for the Underwood tariff bill that when confronted by an incensed farmer constituent who saw his sale prices on the toboggan and his buying prices remaining on the old level, and a reason demanded for it, the Member said, "We concluded in the caucus that that bill was all right, but we are like the Arkansas vigilantes who had lynched a man charged with horse stealing, and no sooner was the man dead than proof of his innocence was presented. They carried the body to the cabin of the disconsolate widow; the leader pushed it through the door saying, 'Here's your husband, marm, we thought he stole a horse and we hung him. It's our mistake, and the laugh is on us.'" The producers of this country, like the widow, must at present accept this flippant excuse. Wait, however, until her separated brothers and faithful father get together to avenge the wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.]

What could you expect of a legislative body which takes deliberation away from the floor of the House and transfers it to an unconstitutional body called a caucus? Further, what can you expect of a system which takes legislation to the Executive for his approval before its passage instead of carrying it to him after passage, as the Constitution prescribes? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The producers of this country are Constitution upholders, law abiders, and believe in compliance with the expressed will of the people. Not only do they believe in it, but they insist upon it. They are willing to bear burdens if they have corresponding benefits. But they refuse to be made burden bearers for burden beneficiaries. They have intelligence to see injustice; they have the courage to resent it; and that resentment will be effective. The perpetrators of the injustice to them in the Underwood bill will ere long feel the weight of their hands. Because a burden, if fraught with equity, is light, indeed; discipline tempered with justice is readily tolerated; but injustice, though feather-weighted, bears down like a plummet of lead, and unwarranted discrimination will meet with emphatic rebuke. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] asked the question

a while ago if it was not a good policy for us to buy from Argentina so that Argentina would buy from us. That has always been a favorite Democratic theory. The facts, however, do not fit it. Our Democratic friends should look at the figures of the imports and exports for the last few months—since they have enacted their theory into law. I hold in my hand the statistics for the months of December, 1912 and 1913, and I find that under the present Democratic tariff law we bought in December, 1913, $2,034,581 more from Argentina than we did in December, 1912. I find also that instead of Argentina buying more from us under this free-trade law she bought $145,131 less in December, 1913, than she did in December, 1912. These statistics show that every country of North America, South America, and Europe under the new tariff law have sold us more and we have sold them less than we did under the Payne law. This is the way we are now capturing the markets of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the problem of the high cost of living continues to agitate the public mind. It is a live issue in the large cities, where, despite the revision of the tariff downward, the price of food supplies continues to increase. Instead of the "high" it has become the "higher" cost of living.

The lowering of the tariff has not afforded the relief expected by the people. The distance from the farm in Iowa to the consumer in Philadelphia is just as great to-day as it ever was, and the hens, in proportion to their number, do not favor us with any more fresh eggs in January than they did 100 years ago.

We do not get our clothes any cheaper because the duty has been taken off wool, nor are we paying any less at retail for underwear or hosiery made of cotton. We are still paying freight to the transportation companies, and the department stores are still performing the benevolent function of introducing the producer to the consumer, at a reasonable commission.

It is not to be expected that any of these middle-of-the-road agencies between the farmer and the ultimate consumer are to go unpaid for the service they perform. The only question is, Are they being paid unduly high for the service rendered?

Agitators who do not lay the blame to the tariff have been in the habit of charging it up to cold storage, transportation, advertising, middlemen, and the like. They usually omit the labor charges along the line that are indispensable to distribution, but they never overlook the railroads. Railroads are held to a strict accounting and are easily assailed. Even those who advocate the improvement of waterways to afford competition for commerce sometimes fall into the mood of criticizing the railroads with exceptional severity.

THE RAILROAD VIEWPOINT.

It is therefore refreshing to have the railroad viewpoint frankly stated. Those who have given close attention to the question of distribution as it bears upon the cost of food supplies are fully aware that the railroad is not "the only culprit" in advancing the price to the ultimate consumer. Many of them believe the freight rates upon coal or farm products might be brought down if water routes were generally available to the people and rail and water lines were coordinated, but even those who so believe are not unmindful of the many subsidiary agencies that add their mite and portion to the breakfast-table cost.

They know that distribution is an umpire in the game between the producer and the consumer, and that according as it operates the food-supply costs advance or decrease.

I am thus taking the time of the House to introduce into the RECORD an unusual statement relating to distribution costs. It indicates that the railroads get only 5 cents out of 20 cents' worth of transportation for food supplies for which the consumer pays $1, and is best explained by the following letter from the president of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.:

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD CO.,
*143 Liberty Street, New York, February 27, 1914.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Some time ago the Lehigh Valley Railroad began an investigation for the purpose of tracing the cost of farm products of various kinds from their source to the ultimate consumer. In other words, we looked for every element and agency which enters into the cost of food from the farmer to the kitchen.

Our statistical experts followed the commodities from their actual sources to their final destination in the consumers' hands, securing accurate selling prices in every instance.

Because of your investigations into the so-called high cost of living and because the Lehigh Valley Railroad, like yourself, serves the people of Pennsylvania, we believe the result of our investigations will be of interest to you and we are sending herewith a summary of our statistical sheets.

Very truly, yours,

E. B. THOMAS, *President.*

The cost analysis to which Mr. Thomas refers is a valuable contribution to one of the great economic questions of the day, and I shall present it in full. It is especially interesting at this time in view of the many legislative restrictions confronting the railroads and because of the railroad contention that progress and improved industrial conditions depend largely upon an increase of rates. The statement will also have its interest for the farmer and the distributor, as well as the consumer, since analyzed it shows that of the consumer's dollar invested in food supplies hauled 1,500 miles—

| | |
|---|---|
| The farmer gets | $0.50½ |
| The middleman, including the packer, the local shipper, the distributor, the retailer, etc., get | .44½ |
| And the railroads, for transportation, get | .05 |
| Total | 1.00 |

I submit the statement, as follows:

A RAILROAD ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION COST OF FOOD SUPPLIES FROM THE FARM TO THE BREAKFAST TABLE.

The Lehigh Valley Railroad has made a compilation of the most commonly used farm products showing how much the farmer, the middleman, the railroads, and the retailers receive for their services.

Using the consumer's dollar as a basis, the figures obtained indicate that the farmer gets an average of 50½ cents, packers, local shippers, distributors, and retailers combined get 44½ cents, and the railroads get 5 cents. For an average haul of 1,500 miles the railroads get only one-twentieth of the retail price.

These figures are based on the varieties of food that go to make up about nine-tenths of every family's grocery bill. Meat is not included on account of the difficulty in arriving at a fair figure. But on such commodities as butter, eggs, milk, rice, potatoes, onions, sugar, tea, and the many kinds of canned, dried, and prepared fruits and vegetables it is entirely feasible to arrive at comparatively accurate figures. Any variation in the selection of the list will, of course, make some difference in the relative position of the producers and distributors, but the railroads' share remains the same. That can be figured to a certainty. For a 1,500-mile haul the railroads get only 5 cents.

Confining the inquiry to the haul over the Lehigh Valley Railroad itself, products from the large farming districts in western New York are brought to New York City, an average of nearly 400 miles, for a trifle over 2½ cents out of the consumer's dollar. While this is considerably less than the average haul, it shows that the butter, eggs, apples, poultry, and vegetables produced in all that rich and productive section are taken to their best market—New York City—for one-fortieth of what the city family pays for them.

The accuracy with which these figures have been obtained can be shown by comparing them with the figures of the Department of Agriculture. For instance, the Lehigh Valley gets half a cent out of a dollar's worth of western New York eggs sold in New York City, the farmer getting 50 cents and the 49½ cents being divided among shippers, producers, and retailers. The Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for 1910, which takes up the question of freight rates, gives the average freight rate on a dollar's worth of eggs as six-tenths of 1 cent, a trifle more than the Lehigh Valley charges.

The Department of Agriculture says "when the farmer receives 50 per cent of the consumer's price the freight charge on butter is about one-half of 1 per cent of the consumer's price." The railroad's figures show the railroad also gets only half a cent out of each consumer's dollar, even when the farmer gets as high as 65 cents.

On butter, eggs, and sugar, however, the railroads receive the least share of the consumer's dollar. On commodities which are worth less in comparison to bulk the freight charge is naturally higher. On canned peas it is 3 cents; canned tomatoes, 4 cents; potatoes, 5 cents; and on such vegetables as turnips and cabbages, 6 cents. But canned salmon is brought all the way from the Pacific coast to New York—3,000 miles—for 7 cents out of the dollar for which it is sold. The highest rate the railroads get on a food product is 11½ cents of the consumer's dollar for bringing oranges in refrigerator cars, which are iced five times, from California to New York. All of which would tend to show that the railroads are being paid very little for the service they perform and are not in any way responsible for the high cost of living.

Their charge is so low, in fact, that if the railroads are granted the 5 per cent increase in freight rates for which they have petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission it will only make a difference of 20 cents to each household a year. This does not refer to food alone, but to every article of food, clothing, furniture, or fuel that enters the house during the year. At the outside the additional cost for food to each household, based on an increased freight rate, will be 15 cents a year. A much more important item to the cost of living is the cost of city traffic.

It costs three times as much to haul farm produce from the water front of New York City to the stores where it is sold as it costs to haul it three or four hundred miles over the railroads that bring it to the city. Out of every dollar the consumer pays for fruits and vegetables the railroads get an average of only 5 cents, while the actual cost of cartage within the city is 15 cents. This means that the railroads get only 1 cent for carrying a dollar's worth of produce 100 miles, while the retailers and distributors charge 3 cents for hauling a dollar's worth of produce 1 mile.

These figures on street traffic have been secured by the Lehigh Valley Railroad, which has been conducting an investigation into the cost of living with the purpose of showing that the railroads receive a very small return for the important service they perform. The figures are based on the cost of bringing farm products from the rich districts about Geneva, N. Y., to New York City, a distance of 344 miles. On potatoes, onions, carrots, cabbages, apples—in fact, all manner of farm produce—the railroad charges less than 5 cents for hauling a dollar's worth the 344 miles to Jersey City and for transferring the car to a float and delivering it in New York or Brooklyn. But as soon as that dollar's worth of produce leaves the wharf the cartage charges begin to climb.

The distributors take for themselves out of that dollar's worth of produce 15 cents, 5 cents of which is charged against cartage. The retailer gets 30 cents out of the dollar, and 10 of this must also be charged against cartage.

Out of every dollar, then, which the city man pays for farm produce 20 cents is chargeable against transportation; but the railroads, which

do the most important piece of transportation, get only one-fourth, and the distributors for their comparatively trifling service get three-fourths.

An investigation of a similar character conducted by Bailey B. Burritt, director of department of social welfare of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, shows that the cost of distributing farm produce in New York as figured by him varies from the Lehigh Valley Railroad's figures by only seven-tenths of 1 per cent.

STORM EFFECTS ON FOOD SUPPLIES.

Mr. Chairman, the great storm which has swept the Atlantic coast during the last two days adds a new interest to this railroad analysis of the factors entering into the higher cost of living. It is reported that the holding up of certain trains carrying milk and other provisions threatened a temporary food famine in the city of New York. This may or may not be true, but if a storm of such severity should continue for a week or a month, or if the railroads were held up that length of time for other cause, it is evident that much distress would fall upon nearly 5,000,000 people in that great city. Apparently their dependence for food supplies is not so much upon the steamships which bring foreign provender into the port of New York as it is upon the railroads that bring the supplies in from the farms and storehouses of the United States. Such supplies as have come in from abroad because of the removal of the tariff, like eggs from China, potatoes from Europe, and beef from the Argentine, have neither met the demand for food nor reduced the cost to the consumer.

IMPORTS NOT LESSENING COSTS.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. These importations that the gentleman speaks of were in negligible quantities, not sufficient to permit of a statement by percentage of the total amount required by the population in New York State.

Mr. MOORE. They have not been of sufficient quantity apparently to reduce the retail price to the consumer, because the consumer in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston is paying as much, if not more, for foodstuffs to-day as he did before the tariff bill was passed.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Certainly.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. There were 14,000,000 bushels of potatoes imported; does the gentleman call that a negligible quantity?

Mr. MOORE. That would not be, but the imports may be negligible in the sense that the gentleman from New York puts it. They would not be negligible to the American farmer who has potatoes to sell, but no matter what the volume of imports, they have not been effective in reducing the price the consumer pays for potatoes. The people of New York City are paying just as much for their food supplies to-day or more than they did before these importations came in. What the gentleman from Nebraska said in answer to the gentleman from New York a little while ago is the truth—the importer is the chief beneficiary of whatever difference there is in the cost by reason of the lowering of the tariff. Neither the producer nor the consumer gets the benefit of it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is not the farmer getting just the same price as he always got?

Mr. MOORE. The testimony of those who speak for the farmer is that they are not. In the grain case spoken of a little while ago by the gentleman from New York it is probable that he was shrewd enough to get the price at Baltimore, near to his farm. There are plenty of farmers next door to the big cities who do not sell at the Nebraska price. They sell at the price the city people are paying. If there are any fresh eggs being laid in the vicinity of Washington just now, the farmer who sells them will not let them go for the Nebraska price in April. He wants the Washington price to-day.

EFFECT OF ARGENTINE CORN IMPORTS.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. For a question. My time is short.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is it not true that the price of grain went down 12 cents a bushel on the arrival of corn in New York from Argentina?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Washington I would say that it may be true that the arrival of grain from Argentina caused the American farmer's price to fall. I find nothing for congratulation in that incident, nor have I seen any evidence that the American consumer benefited by it. Just as it is in the matter of factory labor, the new tariff seems to have operated more in the interest of the foreign countries than it has in favor of our own. We are sending our gold to Argentina for cattle and corn when we might be sending it to the farmers of the United States. Meanwhile, the consumer is paying the same old prices for his food supplies, despite the fact that he has less business and less money to go upon. We are a mighty generous and self-sacrificing people under the free-trade habit.

PLIGHT OF THE NEW YORKERS WITHOUT STORAGE.

But to return to the plight of the New Yorkers. Mr. Chairman, it requires a vast quantity of foodstuffs to meet the needs of 5,000,000 human beings who are not themselves the producers of food supplies. In New York, as in other large cities, the people are housed up in long rows of brick and mortar, with only an open space here and there sufficient to raise a few flowers. Without communication with the farming sections of the country their position would be serious, even more so than that of the farmer who desires to sell his product to so profitable a market; the farmer would at least provide for himself. Therefore if a two days' storm is sufficient to give concern to the inhabitants of a great city, it follows that ample provision must be made for entire winters in the cities when the farms are not productive.

Anyone who has examined the subject of production and distribution knows that such provision has been made; that it had to be made long ago to meet the requirements of the ever-increasing urban population. Had it not been made on a large scale to care for just such a situation as is presented by the storm of the last two days, dire consequences would long since have overtaken many communities. There may be temporary embarrassment with regard to milk or similar daily needs, but the country's supplies have been stored up for just such an emergency. The economic conditions have demanded it, and each year the stores have been laid by against the day of need, to be drawn upon by large communities, just as the original farmer, who had no market in the wintertime, would draw for his own use upon his corn bin or the reserve stock of potatoes in the cellar, or the ham or shoulder in the smokehouse.

The problem of the larger supply than the individual farmer's stock would afford has been met by the warehouse and the cold-storage establishment. They draw upon the farm in times of plenty and store away for the consuming public in times of need. A process of such importance to producer and consumer may properly be subjected to legal regulation, but it is certainly not without its compensations, and these should always be considered.

PENDING BILLS AND NEED OF CAUTION.

There are now before Congress a number of bills the purpose of which is to regulate this system of storing and preserving food supplies. We are told they are not to be pressed for action by Congress until the administration has disposed of other measures which it deems of more importance. Whether these bills are pressed at this session or not, they should be carefully scrutinized and ample opportunity should be given for hearing those who are interested in the questions involved.

If it is true, as pointed out by the Lehigh Valley Railroad experts, that the producer gets only about 50 per cent of the consumer's paying price, and the railroads get only 5 per cent for transportation from the producer to the consumer, it is fair to assume that the remaining 45 per cent is earning its way in cold storage or in distribution or labor cost, in one form or another, somewhere along the line. There may be inequalities which should be adjusted, and regulation may be necessary to prevent corners in the market or other unscrupulous dealing, but any sumptuary legislation with regard to prices or distribution within the United States may be found to fall more heavily upon the producer and the consumer than upon the manipulator, who is presumed to operate between the two. If there is any crookedness in transportation, in storage, or in distribution, we should reach out for the crook and punish him; but the chief difficulty now, as it has been since the era of investigation first overwhelmed us a few years ago, is to find the crook. In the quest for this disturbing element much legislation has been passed, with no very great number of malefactors being exposed and brought to earth. Incidentally business has suffered, as it is still suffering, so that whatever legislation is still to come should be so framed as to do the least injury to the legitimate and long-suffering carriers, distributors, and business men, upon whom, after all, the producers and consumers, in large measure, depend for the market and the commodities they enjoy.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the consideration of this splendid bill brought out by the committee. As an old member of the Patrons of Husbandry, taking

an active interest in the organization, I desire to express my gratitude, and that of the organization, to the committee, and especially to the chairman, for the splendid work they have accomplished. The country is proud of you.

Mr. Chairman, with many others in this House, I was deeply interested this morning in the splendid address of the able chairman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The Committee on Agriculture and its chairman are to be complimented and the country, too, upon the satisfactory measure now under consideration.

As an old member of that magnificent organization, the Patrons of Husbandry—Grangers—I desire to extend their congratulations and mine upon the work being done by Congress for the farmers of this country.

You may rest assured that your efforts are highly appreciated and will not be forgotten by the men and women on the farms—the bone and sinew of the Republic—who are keenly alive to the needs of the consumers of the Nation.

The farmer of to-day, with daily mail service, telephone, good schools, commodious churches, free circulating libraries, and with better social relations, is more contented, happier, and more prosperous than ever before.

These advantages, largely due to the Congress, and encouraged by the Agriculture Committee, are being more appreciated from year to year by the good, patriotic people on our farms.

It is also having the effect of keeping the young men and women, the sons and daughters of the farmers, at home and opening their eyes to the advantages and benefits of country life over that of the city. They are learning slowly, but surely, of the differences, and in 75 per cent of the cases of the young man or woman who emigrated from the country to the city only a bare living is made. I could enumerate scores of cases of this character that have fallen under my personal observation.

The one out of four from the farm who succeed in the city is somewhat like the man on Wall Street who makes a lucky strike. The world hears of it, while the large class of suckers—lambs—who lose their all, no one either hears or sympathizes with them. I have a case to the point: A young man with a nice little family came here eight years ago and has enjoyed a decent income of more than $1,200 yearly. Now he voluntarily is returning to a farm which he left in 1906 with less money than he had then. I have congratulated him upon his wise decision. He is not alone, as I personally know a score or more of farmer boys now in the cities who are anxious to follow the example of the young man mentioned, and are only waiting an opportunity to do so.

As one approaching the allotted sphere of man and who has had ample opportunities to try out both the country and the city life, with a fair modicum of success, I feel deeply that the Nation needs more farmers, and that, taken all in all, the chances of acquiring a competency in old age and of enjoying a life of greater comfort, better living, and contentment are in favor of those on the farm. The producing element, especially those on the farm, where the necessaries of life are obtained, must be increased.

The soil must be improved and better cultivated, so that the fruit of the soil may be doubled. In an examination of agriculture abroad, in 1911, I found that this condition universally prevailed, and that the crops—wheat, corn, rye, oats, potatoes, and so forth—were double that of our own country per acre.

I stated this morning in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], that four words explained this matter, "higher fertilization, better cultivation."

In Carroll County, Md., less than 70 miles distant, in the district of Mr. TALBOTT, of that State, the county grange have tried to stimulate the growing of an increased yield of corn, with partially satisfactory results. The sons of farmers, by faithfully following the four words, "higher fertilization, better cultivation," added from 40 to 60 per cent increase over the crop of their fathers, with a net gain in profit of from $4 to $8 per acre. Last year two boys of a tenant of mine in the county named raised on the average ground of the farm 115 and 135 bushels, in the ears, of excellent corn, while the father averaged less than 100.

These and girls' canning clubs should be encouraged by all those who love their country.

If the committee and the Congress can bring these things about—and I admit that the present bill and others recently passed tend in that direction—great good will be accomplished.

The farmer is a responsive, an appreciative being, fully realizing the importance of his place in the life and prosperity of the Nation, and I am confident that he will measure up to the demand.

Carry the good news to him through the newspapers, which create public sentiment, through the splendid bulletins issued by the Agricultural Department, by the well-conducted farmers' colleges, institutes, associations, and clubs, of the demands made on the people living on the farm by the Nation.

Let the committee continue its excellent work, confident that the members are meeting the almost unanimous approval of the American people and doing a splendid patriotic duty. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is no pursuit more important to the people of this country than that of agriculture. There is no industry or a pursuit in life that is not dependent upon agriculture.

We must first till the ground, plant, and harvest the wheat, before we can manufacture the flour, cereals, and bake the bread. The ground must be tilled, the cotton planted and harvested before the cotton goods can be manufactured, placed upon the market, and sold. The calf and the pig must be raised by the farmer and fattened by the products of the farm before it can be slaughtered and sent to market to be consumed for food. Agriculture is the foundation of our wealth and prosperity.

The tillers of the soil have always been the backbone and sinew of our country. This is necessarily so, as the farmer lives upon the best that the land can produce, pure, wholesome foods, and his business requires him to be out in the open, where he breathes into his lungs the fresh, pure air that keeps not only his body but his mind in a healthy and active condition.

When this country was first settled by the white man he found the soil in a virgin condition, filled with soluble plant foods, containing quantities of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, lime, and sulphur. These chemicals are absorbed by the plant and taken from the soil in the process of growing, and in return, by a process of evolution, plants when consumed by the human being or beast reimpart these chemical properties to the consumer.

Recently it has been discovered that no plant can thrive above earth unless smaller plants, known as bacteria, are growing in the earth. In other words, a lower order of life is produced, which yields up its life to a higher order in the shape of farm crops, which in turn yield up their life that man and animals may exist, thus rounding up a marvelous cycle, the connecting links of which we are just beginning to study and in a small way comprehend.

The thought has often occurred to many as to why the son and daughter of the original settler of the fertile valleys of Virginia and the plains of Massachusetts should have risked their lives and fortunes in pushing westward into a wild, somewhat desolate country, inhabited by savages and wild beasts, and suffer all the hardships that such an adventure imposes. The farmer has ever sought the virgin soil. He pushed westward from Virginia and Massachusetts into the Middle West, thence westward to the Pacific. Lately he migrated into Canada, always seeking the virgin soil, taking from it these necessary chemical properties that he found in it, but seldom restoring them. We have now reached that period in farming where we can not migrate any longer and find the virgin soil. We must replenish that which we have.

It is only within the past few years that we have been giving any thought whatever to the manufacture and use of fertilizers and commercial plant foods. We are just beginning to appreciate that we must furnish the plant with the nourishment that it is to take from the soil, and that these plant foods must be in a soluble condition, as the plant is germinated and full grown within a period of about 60 days. Many of our farmers understand very little about the use of commercial plant foods.

Part of the money to be appropriated by this bill is to be used by the Agricultural Department for the purpose of experimenting in and obtaining more knowledge of commercial plant foods, and at the same time disseminating this knowledge among the American farmers.

The average yield of wheat per acre in the United States for the year 1913 was 14.3 bushels; in Germany where they have been tilling the land for thousands of years, and where the land is no more fertile than that in the United States, for the year 1913 they produced 35.1 bushels per acre; in the United Kingdom during the same year they raised 32.8 bushels to the acre. In the United States during the year 1913 our average yield of potatoes to the acre was 96 bushels, whereas in Russia during the same period of time the average yield was 104 bushels to the acre; in Austria, 142; France, 129; Germany, 196; and in the United Kingdom, 202½ bushels per acre. The question is naturally asked, Why can not we produce as much per acre in this country as they do in the foreign countries? We can. If the ordinary American farmer only knew how. He has been living

upon the virginity of the soil for so many years that he is just beginning to realize that the soil is no longer virgin; conditions have changed. They have changed overnight, as it were. If the Department of Agriculture did no more than to instruct the farmer to increase the yield per acre, it would do a great deal toward reducing the high cost of living. It takes no more labor to produce 202 bushels of potatoes to the acre in the United Kingdom than it does to raise 96 bushels to the acre in this country.

We can increase the yield of wheat, potatoes, corn, and smaller articles to the acre if we would but try. The department has caused a number of boy and girl corn clubs to be formed in different sections of the country, and not long ago boys and girls in the North, South, East, and West assembled here at Washington and appeared before your committee. One boy in Alabama increased the yield of corn to the acre so that he was able to grow 235 bushels, and a boy from New Hampshire succeeded in raising 50 bushels to the acre, which is a considerable increase when it is considered that the ordinary farmer in that State seldom raises more than 30 bushels to the acre. It is results of this character that not only aid the producer but materially assist the consumer.

The successful business man of to-day bases his success upon the fact that he takes care of the little things. He succeeded in his large commercial undertakings, whether it be that of a department store or operation of a railroad or other lines of commercial adventure, because he sought out and stopped waste wherever possible, not only waste of product but waste of time and labor of his employees. For example, a large department store in the city of New York discovered that they were losing thousands of yards of materials in one department. They employed detectives to watch the employees, but they could not find a clew. The owner of the establishment then employed an efficiency engineer, who discovered that the loss was due entirely to the fact that the tacks upon the counter used in measuring the goods were more than 3 feet apart and that the clerks were careless in the method employed in measuring the goods. By readjusting these tacks and instructing the clerks in the art of measuring the goods the owners of the department store stopped the leak and saved thousands of dollars a year.

In order to reduce the high cost of living it is necessary for the farmer to seek out and stop every item of waste, whether that waste be due to the misapplication of his own energies, his failure to properly cultivate and prune the trees in his orchard, or the improper preparation and fertilization of the land. In these stirring times, when application and energy count for everything, the farmer as well as the business man must make every effort count.

Statistics show, and it is conservatively estimated, that the loss to the farmer, to say nothing about the unnecessary wastes, exceed $1,000,000,000 a year. Of this amount $795,000,000 is estimated to be the loss sustained in farm products because of the havoc and destruction worked by insects. Of this sum about $25,000,000 is lost in fruits from fungous and bacterial diseases, and $28,400,000 in wheat, oats, barley, and sorghums through preventable diseases, usually created by parasitic organisms, and the loss sustained in reference to the last named from nonpreventable diseases is estimated annually at $94,000,000. These enormous losses are not all that the farmer sustains. There is a further loss from diseases of animals which amounts to $212,850,000.

In order that this country should regain its previous prestige as an agricultural Nation and the high cost of living should be reduced, these losses must be overcome and conquered, for they are not only sustained by the producer, but in greater proportion by the consumer. Some one must stand these losses, and it is usually the man who needs the article who must pay an additional price to make up these losses.

In this bill the Department of Agriculture is asking appropriations to continue the Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Entomology, Bureau of Plant Industry, and Bureau of Chemistry. Each of these bureaus have trained men and women, some of whom are examining into the life and characteristics of the insects that destroy plant life and fruits, as well as the causes and reasons for the fungous growths that are so injurious to our fruit trees. These bureaus are also attempting to find a cure or means of destroying these pests, and particularly those, such as the tick and other germs and diseases, that are destroying our meat-producing animals. By means of a system of quarantine and the application of dips, eradication of the cattle tick, which has been so destructive to beef cattle, is almost accomplished.

It is as much to the interest of the constituency that I represent in this body for the Government to meet and destroy the cotton-boll weevil and prevent its ravages as it is to the cotton planter of the South. The destruction caused by this insect produces a loss, a portion which every man, woman, and child in the United States must bear. For this, if for no other reason, I believe that the Agricultural Department is the most important branch of our Government, as its work benefits all.

If the ravages caused by hog cholera are continued, pork, one of the most important of our cheaper food products, will become a luxury.

During the past 15 years agriculture in the East has been on the decline. This situation was brought about by the fact that the large western plains were opened up to civilization and, being easier cultivated on a large scale than the small eastern farms, they could raise wheat, corn, beef, and such products and ship them into the East cheaper than they could possibly be raised there. Our population has been increasing so fast during the past 10 years, and our industrial centers have become so crowded, and the demand for agricultural products so great, that agriculture in the East is becoming profitable. There is no reason in the world why we should be required to import corn and beef from Argentina and potatoes from Europe. We can grow them as cheap, if not cheaper, in this country if we would only set our minds upon it and face the economic problems that confront us and work them out. If our population continues to grow in the next 25 years as it has grown during the past 25 years, unless we do something to stimulate agriculture we will cease to be a self-supporting Nation and be required to depend upon other sections of the world for our foodstuffs.

In 1910 the per capita supply of pork available was 89 pounds. If the decrease for the next 50 years in pork production continues as it has during the past 10 years, the available per capita amount of pork at the end of 50 years will be 34 pounds, or a decrease of 61 per cent of available pork. In 1909 we produced 683,000,000 bushels of wheat. If the reduction in average of wheat continues during the next 50 years upon the same average as the past 10 years, and even though the amount of wheat grown upon every acre is increased to 35 bushels, we shall then have only 630,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 53,000,000 less than we have at the present time, to feed what will at that time no doubt be a population of 238,000,000 people. At the present time we have about 425 loaves of bread for each individual in the United States. If the average decrease in wheat production continues, at the end of 50 years we will have less than 73 loaves per capita. These are facts, and when once brought to our attention they become startling, and the sooner we realize the conditions as they exist, the quicker we will produce a remedy and prepare not only for the future but take care of the present.

It is estimated that the waste in the poultry trade is about $100,000,000 a year; in the cotton trade, $150,000,000 annually, to say nothing about the loss suffered by the cotton raiser because of his failure to understand and know the value of his cotton crop. This waste in the State of Texas alone during the year 1913 was estimated to be over $40,000,000. These items of waste are not to be confused with the losses above mentioned. They are additional, separate, and distinct; and, again, they must be borne in the greater proportion by the consumer. The Department of Agriculture, through one of its bureaus, is attempting to save the waste in the poultry trade by instructing the poultry raiser how to kill and ship his product to market and candle and store his eggs so that they remain in a fresh condition until they reach the market.

Twenty-five years ago our shoes, for example, were manufactured upon the farms. The farmer not only tilled the soil, but made shoes. To-day the men and women working in the shoe factory produce only shoes and live within close proximity to the factory. In this way our great industrial centers have become thickly populated. In fact, they have grown beyond our belief, and we are just beginning to realize that it is not only necessary to produce in an agricultural way provisions to feed the people in our manufacturing cities, but to so prepare our foodstuffs that they can be transported to factory and thickly populated districts in an eatable condition. The terminal markets are suggested by many as a solution of this problem. Some of the funds appropriated in this bill are to be used for the purpose of investigating the question of terminal markets and to what extent they should be adopted.

Our consuming population has become so great that it behooves us in the hour of plenty to prepare for the time of need.

During the hearings before the Agricultural Committee I suggested that something should be done to stop the willful waste and destruction of fish destroyed for the purpose of keeping up the price. Since making that statement I have given the matter attention. The wholesale fish dealer lays the blame upon the retailer, who in turn lays it upon the wholesaler. Testimony was taken the other day before one of our com-

mittees to the effect that large quantities of wholesome fish were ground up and sold for fertilizer. It is neither the wholesaler nor the retailer who causes the trouble. It is the neglect and oversight of our people. Let us assume that on a certain day the fishermen make a large catch of bluefish—which is customary, as these fish run in schools—and bring them into the market. The wholesaler will naturally buy what he believes his trade will take. If he bought more, the effect would be to flood the market, and not only force down the price of bluefish at that time but keep it down. As a result, the fish that the wholesaler will not buy are destroyed—either thrown overboard or sold for fertilizer. This condition of affairs could be easily remedied by providing storage warehouses where this surplus of fish could be stored and placed upon the market gradually. This would be to the interest of not only the wholesaler but of the people.

In order to bring about this condition of affairs it is necessary that the people should be accustomed to the more liberal use of fish. In this way the wholesaler would have a market for all the fish caught and would sell in such large quantities that he could well afford to sell at cheaper prices.

The Department of Agriculture intends to spend money appropriated under it for the purpose of investigating these conditions and instructing both the seller and consumer of fish.

The department is investigating and experimenting with the most up-to-date methods of cold-storage transportation. They have pointed out to the railroad companies and those who construct refrigerator cars certain defects which they have willingly remedied. A cold-storage warehouse, as our population grows, has become more of a necessity daily, and the use of these warehouses should be stimulated and their abuses prevented.

There is legislation pending, introduced after investigations made by this department, that will go a great ways toward remedying the evils that have been brought about by the improper use of cold-storage plants, such as buying up of the apple crop, storing the fruit in cold-storage plants and keeping it there until by reason of a scarcity on the market the price is advanced.

Potatoes to-day are selling in my district for about $4 a barrel, which were purchased by speculators and cold-storage men from the farmers for less than $1.50 per barrel, placed in warehouses, and kept there for the purpose of cornering the market and forcing up the price.

Statistics show that the farmer receives 40 cents out of every dollar spent by the consumer for farm products. The question is, What becomes of the balance? And it is this question that this department proposes to solve by investigations.

One fact disclosed by the last Federal census is that in 10 years our population has increased over 15,000,000, while our farming population has decreased from 70.5 per cent in 1880 to 53.7 per cent in 1910. These figures are misleading, as only 28 per cent of our people live upon the farms. The drift of population is from the farm to the village and city. While our population has increased during the past 10 years, our meat-producing animals have actually decreased over 20,000,000 during the same period of time, so that to-day we are importing where six years ago we were exporting meat and its products. Our export of meats in the past six years have fallen off 97 per cent and our dairy products over 75 per cent. With these facts before us, there is no wonder that the people voted for a reduction of the tariff. Still many do not appreciate reduction of the tariff is only one move in the direction toward reducing the high cost of living.

The Department of Agriculture, by means of experiments, has been able to obtain a wonderful store of knowledge which it is just getting in condition to be disseminated about the country. These facts present serious problems, the solution of which must be made by the Government through this department. These are economic problems in which every man and woman in this country—it makes no difference what be his or her position or stage in life—are interested. For this reason I am heartily in favor of the appropriations contained in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time did I consume in my opening remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and twenty-three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I gladly supported the Alaskan railway bill. That bill passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and also passed the House by a big majority, or by a vote of 231 to 87. The vote will be taken on the conference report of the two Houses within a day or two, and the bill will be promptly signed by the President and become a law.

Mr. Chairman, by passing this legislation we are carrying out another platform pledge of the Democratic Party. The Baltimore platform says:

Immediate action should be taken by Congress to make available the vast and valuable coal deposits of Alaska under conditions that will be a perfect guaranty against their falling into the hands of monopolizing corporations, associations, or interests.

There is no way to make the vast and valuable resources of Alaska available to the people except by providing transportation facilities by which these resources may be gotten to the markets. There are two ways to get transportation facilities for Alaska—first, the United States Government must provide proper transportation facilities and let the people share in the profits of the sale of the Alaskan products when transported to the markets and sold or, second, permit such interests as the Guggenheims and the Morgans and other special interests to build railroads in Alaska and ultimately gobble up the vast resources of that great Territory.

Our Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, true to the interests of all the people, have in enacting this legislation declared in favor of the people as against the special interests.

President Wilson in his address to the Congress on the 2d day of December last strongly urged this legislation in the following language:

A duty faces us with regard to Alaska which seems to me very pressing and very imperative; perhaps I should say a double duty, for it concerns both the political and the material development of the Territory. The people of Alaska should be given the full Territorial form of government, and Alaska, as a storehouse, should be unlocked. One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should itself build and administer and the ports and terminals it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

But the construction of railways is only the first step; is only thrusting in the key to the storehouse and throwing back the lock and opening the door. How the tempting resources of the country are to be exploited is another matter to which I shall take the liberty of from time to time calling your attention, for it is a policy which must be worked out by well-considered stages, not upon theory, but upon lines of practical expediency. It is part of our general problem of conservation. We have a freer hand in working out the problem in Alaska than in the States of the Union; and yet the principle and object are the same wherever we touch it. We must use the resources of the country, not lock them up. There need be no conflict or jealousy as between State and Federal authorities, for there can be no essential difference of purpose between them.

The resources in question must be used, but not destroyed or wasted; used, but not monopolized upon any narrow idea of individual rights as against the abiding interests of communities. That a policy can be worked out by conference and concession which will release these resources and yet not jeopard or dissipate them, I for one have no doubt; and it can be done on lines of regulation which need be no less acceptable to the people and governments of the States concerned than to the people and Government of the Nation at large, whose heritage these resources are. We must bend our counsels to this end. A common purpose ought to make agreement easy.

Mr. Chairman, on this, as on all other public questions, the President is on the side of the people and on the side of progress. He is against the exploiter and monopolist. With my voice and my vote I shall support the President and his policy. I shall oppose those who would exploit Alaska and her splendid resources. Secretary Lane, of the Interior Department, under whose jurisdiction and control are all the public lands of the United States, including Alaska, and who has given this great question deep and thorough study, has indorsed and urged the speedy enactment of this legislation, as will be seen by a perusal of the following letter, written to Senator KEY PITTMAN, chairman of the Committee on Territories in the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, May 15, 1913.*

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
*Chairman Committee on Territories, United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: My opinion is requested as to Senate bills 48 and 133. These measures, in a word, provide for the construction by the National Government of a railway system in the Territory of Alaska.

I favor the adoption of this policy. I believe it to be that under which Alaska will develop most safely and most speedily and under which the resources of that Territory will most certainly become available to the whole people.

There is but one way to make any country a real part of the world—by the construction of railroads into it. This has been the heart of England's policy in Africa, of Russia's policy in western Asia, and is the prompting hope of the new movement in China. Whoever owns the railways of a country determines very largely the future of that country, the character of its population, the kind of industries they will engage in, and ultimately the nature of the civilization they will enjoy. The policy of governmental ownership of railroads in Alaska seems to me to be the one that will most certainly make for her lasting welfare

To many of our people Alaska is little more than a land of natural wonders, here and there dotted with mining camps and fishing villages. If Alaska is to be nothing more, it is almost a matter of indifference as to who builds her railroads. I have talked with many who know that country well, and I am convinced that we should think of Alaska as a land not only of mines and fisheries, but of towns, farms, mills, and factories, supporting millions of people of the hardiest and most wholesome of the race. If this conception of a possible Alaska is a true one, our legislation should be such as to most surely bring about this pos-

sibility, and it seems to me there is less of hazard as to Alaska's future if the Government of the United States owns the railroads which will make its fertile interior valleys accessible from the coast and bring its coal, iron, copper, and other mineral resources within the reach of the world.

This is a new policy for the United States. Very true. This is a new part of the United States. And policies properly change with new conditions. The one determining question in all matters of government should be: What is the wise thing to do? The ancient method of opening a country was to build wagon roads. The modern method is to build railroads. To build these railroads ourselves and control them may be an experiment, but such a plan does not suggest scandals more shameful, or political conditions more unhealthy, than many we have known in new portions of our country under private ownership. And in the end, we will be free to establish and maintain our own chosen relationship between Alaska and the rest of the United States unhampered by threats of confiscation or the restraining hand of any merely selfish influences. We can only secure the highest and fullest use of Alaska by making her railways wholly subordinate to her industrial and social life and needs—true public utilities.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Secretary Lane, like the President, stands for the development of Alaska, stands for the construction of this railway by the Government, stands for the protection of Alaska's great riches against the graft of monopolizing special interests. I shall uphold the hands of Secretary Lane in this contest between equal rights and equal opportunities on one side and special privilege and favoritism on the other.

Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State, and all the other members of the President's Cabinet have strongly supported this bill. I know not how it may be with others, but as for me I am perfectly content to find myself in such company, and I prefer such companionship to that of the minions of monopoly and the despoilers of a Nation's heritage. This is an administration measure, another one of the great pieces of constructive legislation since we came into control of the Government a year ago.

In area Alaska is a great Territory, one-fifth the size of the United States or about ten or twelve times as large as the great State of Arkansas, and this vast Territory belongs to the United States. We bought this Territory from Russia in 1867 and paid therefor $7,200,000; and products consisting of gold, silver, copper, tin, coal, and so forth, to the value of $500,000,000 have been taken out of Alaska since that time.

The experts tell us that Alaska has more coal than Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio; more copper than Michigan and Arizona; more gold than California and Colorado; more tin than Wales; and more fish than all other American waters combined; and this great storehouse of these products belongs to the people of the United States; and when the President builds these railroads as this bill provides, and these products are mined and marketed either by the Government direct or on some leasing plan, it will many times over pay for these railroads and also put millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this legislation shows the difference in the public thought and public sentiment of to-day and that of a little more than a generation ago. Then the Government gave millions of acres of the public domain to the railroad builders—about 150,000,000 acres in all—to get them to build the railroads of our country. And the railroads to-day have this vast area of the people's lands and also the railroads. But conditions have changed. We will not give the resources of Alaska to special interests, as we did when the railroads of this country were built.

Then a spirit of reaction and special privilege controlled the situation; to-day a spirit of progress controls. I am unable to discriminate between the spirit that would oppose this Alaskan railway bill and the spirit—I might say the great transcontinental railway interests—that opposed the construction of the Panama Canal. Where is the man that would vote to-day to turn over that great international highway to a private corporation, to a private monopoly, for the gratification of private greed?

The Alaskan railway and the Panama Canal will forever stand out as two magnificent monuments to the spirit of modern progress and the spirit of modern improvement. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago my colleague from Missouri, Judge SHACKLEFORD, arose to a question of personal privilege in reference to a certain editorial published in the Philadelphia Ledger condemning the Shackleford road bill as an example of a legislative pork barrel. In the course of his speech my colleague not only repelled the statements of the particular editorial, but charged, in some detail, that there was a malevolent organization or syndicate of organizations opposing his bill which had some evil influence, by intimidation or otherwise, over certain portions of the press and Members of Congress, or were seeking to establish such an influence. He made specific charges of the collection of money by various organizations in pursuance of this purpose. Immediately upon the close of his speech I prepared and introduced a resolution providing for a committee of Congress to investigate these charges. The resolution was prepared upon my recollection of the speech as I heard it delivered, but since I have seen it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that some of the more positive statements have been omitted. I can not find the word "lobby" anywhere in the printed speech, and there are a great many other portions of the speech as made on the floor of the House which I do not find in the RECORD. Some of the most offensive matter has been omitted. Doubtless this is to my colleague's credit, and I sincerely trust that both his natural life and his political life will be long enough for him to regret sincerely the entire speech.

The Shackleford road bill was a great disappointment to thousands of friends of good roads throughout the country. No wonder my colleague is stung by the criticism it has received. But I doubt the wisdom or propriety of his attempt to divert public attention from the merits or demerits of his measure by an attack upon the character of private citizens. So far as the citizens of my own district are concerned, I do not intend that it shall be done without a protest from me. These gentlemen have no voice on this floor to reply to such charges and are taken at an unfair disadvantage. The most offensive portions of the speech still remaining in the printed version are as follows:

Mr. Speaker, look at these editorials. Here is one headed "Another pork barrel." Here is another, which says: "It is distinctly a bad bill, the effect of which would be first to plunge the good-road movement head over heels into Federal pork barrel." Here is another: "Think what an entering wedge and scandal that 'pork-barrel' road bill would be." Here is another: "Judge Lowe is warning all supporters of the good-road movement throughout the length of the proposed old-trails route to help defeat the pork barrel." Here is another, from Kansas City, headed: "J. G. Paxton opposes the national-road pork barrel." Here is another: "That, at least, would stimulate State and local road building and would not be a distribution of pork." The distinctive feature of all of these editorials is the words "pork barrel."

If one comes across a quadruped and wants to know to what particular species it belongs, there are certain distinctive features which will point him to a correct solution. If a naturalist should go afield and discover a little animal under a hedge and he looked at it and was in doubt what it was, he would approach it closely. He would notice that it had a nose; so has a horse. He would discover that it had two eyes; so has a cow. He would discover that it had a tail; so has a dog. He would discover that it had teeth; so has a wolf. Approaching nearer still, he would suddenly discover the air filled with a fog which would penetrate his eyes, his mouth, his nose, his ears. From the distinctive odor of that fog he would instinctively discover the particular family to which the animal belonged.

When the big industries desired to erect a tariff board they organized headquarters in Washington, and until yet the stench of Mulhall rises up to high heaven; but the money expended by Mulhall and his coadjutors is as dimes to dollars as compared with the money that is being put into this propaganda now for peacock lanes that extend from New York to San Francisco.

Now, let us get down to him—this old trails man. What does he do? When he needs money to carry on his editorial canning factory he takes a United States map and a piece of red chalk and marks an old-trails highway across some State and then goes to the people in the towns along that line and collects dues.

The newspapers out in my country, like the Congressmen, are not rich. They have nothing to sell but their space. [Laughter.] If this old-trails hero is asking all of these newspapers to put up free hundreds of square feet of space in order to push his propaganda, then all I have got to say for him is that he is a little stingy in his disposition. He has got the money. Why does he not pay these people for the space he uses, if he does not?

The evil of a pork barrel is that it is cleverly designed to aid in the reelection of the sitting Member by the expenditure of public money. The money is distributed in such a way as to produce the largest political effect. It has not even the merit of being a party measure. It helps the sitting Member who had a chance to vote for it as against his opponent at the primaries who did not have a chance. The highest duty the press of America can perform is to turn the light of pitiless publicity upon the expenditures of public money. The humblest citizen in the land has a right to criticize public men and measures in his own way, with full responsibility for what he says under the laws relating to libel. If a corrupt lobby exists, both this House and the courts are clothed with ample power to punish it.

As near as I can understand the matter, my colleague has taken great offense at what he calls "peacock boulevards." If we disregard the epithet and get down to what he really means, the logic of his position is that he is assailing any form of improved highways which lead from city to city or town to town, or which cross an entire State or run into two or more States. It so happens that the present strength and success of the good-roads movement is very largely due to business men all over the country who are advocating just exactly this type of road. These men by the expenditure of a great deal of time, energy, and their own means have held road meetings in different parts of the country and in different portions of the various States, and from this has grown the present strength of the good-roads movement. Very few of these men have anything to

gain personally in the matter. For instance, the National Old Trails Road Association, which he denounces and which he compares to the odoriferous quadruped, has the following list of officers:

Judge J. M. Lowe, president, Kansas City, Mo.; Harvey M. Shields, general vice president, Dawson, N. Mex.; Walter Williams, advisory vice president, Columbia, Mo.; E. S. Ralph, treasurer, Springfield, Ohio; Frank A. Davis, secretary, Herington, Kans.; E. J. McGrew, chairman finance committee, Lexington, Mo.; J. A. Hudson, chairman executive committee, Columbia, Mo.

In our own State of Missouri is a similar organization, known as the Missouri Old Trails Road Association, with the following officers:

Walter Williams, president, Columbia, Mo.; E. N. Hopkins, vice president, Lexington, Mo.; Howard Ellis, secretary, New Florence, Mo.; Charles A. Sombart, treasurer, Booneville, Mo.

In addition to these there are in the State of Missouri the following local associations of the same class:

Short Line Routes Association. M. H. Hall, president, Tarkio, Mo.; F. S. Travels, secretary, Tarkio, Mo.

St. Joseph-Des Moines Interstate Trail Association: W. A. Hopkins, president, Lamoni, Iowa; Daniel Anderson, secretary, Lamoni, Iowa.

Cannon Ball Trail Association: James R. Bowsher, president, Leon, Iowa; Charles D. Davis, secretary, Princeton, Mo.

Sedalia-Springfield Highway Association: W. S. Jackson, president, Warsaw, Mo.; M. V. Carroll, secretary, Sedalia, Mo.

Capital Route State Highway Association: J. H. Bothwell, president, Sedalia, Mo.; M. V. Carroll, secretary, Sedalia, Mo.

North Missouri Cross State Highway Association: George Robertson, president, Mexico, Mo.; John F. Morton, secretary, Richmond, Mo.

Capital Trails Association: John W. Bingham, president, Milan, Mo.; A. B. Pratt, secretary, Unionville, Mo.

Western Missouri Good Roads Association: Bud M. Robinson, president, Joplin, Mo.; J. B. Grigg, secretary, Joplin, Mo.

Every State in the Union shows from three to a dozen of these associations designed to encourage the building of improved highways leading either across the State or across two or more States. Most of the members of these associations are business men of the highest type and the most unselfish patriotism. It may be possible that they are mistaken in their views, but it is not possible that they belong to the tribe of quadrupeds indicated by my colleague, or that they are engaged in any corrupt attempts to influence the press or Congress.

There is scarcely a paper that you can pick up that has not a statement of an effort along that line. Here is one that I picked up which shows a highway of that class extending from Canada to the Mexican line. A meeting was held at Excelsior Springs and presided over by Judge Low. Mr. Buffam, the State highway commissioner, was present, as was also Col. E. M. Harber, Trenton, Mo., supposed to be the selection of President Wilson for collector of internal revenue.

I find that Mr. Caminetti, the Commissioner of Immigration, has advocated a road of this kind along the Mexican border and the Rio Grande River, evidently a peacock boulevard. There are good-roads associations in every State in the Union, from three to a dozen. In addition to that there are a number of national associations. The South Appalachian Good Roads Association, the Southern National Association, the Capital National Association, the Quebec to Miami Association, and the Intermountain Good Roads Association. Every State has its own local association of the same class.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Briefly.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Does the gentleman mean to imply that the criticism of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] went to these associations or to their methods of propaganda? Did he mean to criticize all the road associations?

Mr. BORLAND. I understood from the speech that he was criticizing the character of the roads and the methods of the associations. The particular hit of the speech was calling them peacock boulevards, which referred to all improved roads that went farther than the nearest railway station.

Evidently from the hostility shown by my colleague to this class of roads he has made it impractical in this bill for the Government to aid in their construction. Of course, if it is wrong for the Government to aid in their construction it is equally wrong for the State and certainly wrong for the counties.

I have been an earnest advocate of having as good roads in every locality as possible; good dirt roads from the farm to the nearest main road; good main roads to the nearest town, so the farmer can haul any day in the year and can haul bigger loads without overtaxing his team; good through highways to competitive railroads or into the cities. Every class of roads should be improved by the aid of the Federal Government and the States. In this way the taxation of the cities help all the country roads, whether dirt roads or surfaced, and the good roads thus built for the farmers helps the wage earner in the cities by making cheaper and more abundant supplies. But I am opposed to wasting road money on politics, and I am opposed to making campaign matter by denouncing men who are working for any class of good roads. The farmer can not lose if good roads of any class are built, but he can lose if, under the name of good roads, money is spent only in politics. However, I do not intend at this time to reargue a question upon which I have already expressed myself in full in the debates. It seems to me unexplainable that the only Member of Congress, so far as I know, who belongs to any of these "peacock boulevard" associations is my colleague, the chairman of the Roads Committee. He is a member of the only highway association from ocean to ocean supported by automobile manufacturers, the one which runs through Chicago, Omaha, and Denver.

I know of no distinction between this association to which my colleague belongs and the National Old Trails Road Association, except that the old trails route is through Missouri, while the other route is through other States, and the National Old Trails Road Association has not the official backing of the automobile manufacturers, while the association to which my colleague belongs has. If my colleague really believes that these people belong to the class of quadrupeds to which he has referred, I am surprised to find him in their company, unless he is there purely as a naturalist. The truth is that large numbers of people, some of whom have a selfish and business interest, and many of whom have only a patriotic interest, have worked up in this country a splendid movement in behalf of good roads. When a movement approaches success it is hardly possible to prevent ambitious politicians from jumping astride of it and riding it to victory or death, as the case may be; but why the people who furnish the steed must also be kicked in the face is more than I can understand.

Many friends of good roads who have studied the bill of my colleague are strongly opposed to it on the ground that it is not an aid but rather a detriment to the cause of good roads, and that it will tend more to the building of political fences than to the building of roads. They have the right to so express themselves, whether their judgment is sound or unsound. This opinion of the bill is growing as the public becomes more familiar with its terms. I am surprised that my colleague should find it necessary in supporting this measure to make attacks upon the character and motives of the people who oppose it. The keynote may be found in his own speech—

Of course we all know the efficacy of an ad hominem attack—an attack not on a measure, but on the character and motives of the man who advocates it.

I am at a loss to know the occasion for his recent speech unless it be to support a measure in which the public is fast losing confidence. If he really believed that a dangerous and corrupt lobby was at work, in Washington or elsewhere, a very proper course open to him would have been to ask for an investigation of the lobby. I am surprised that he did not take this course. I doubt the propriety or the necessity of assailing on the floor of the House the character and motives of private citizens who are utterly unable to defend themselves. As my personal acquaintance with the matter is confined to the three gentlemen who reside in my district, I can speak only for them.

Judge J. M. Lowe, president of the National Old Trails Road Association, is a true and tried Democrat who has been prominent in affairs in Missouri for many years. He was prosecuting attorney of Clinton County during his young manhood, and more recently he was election commissioner of Kansas City by appointment of Gov. Folk. I am astonished to think that my colleague has intimated that Judge Lowe is engaged in buying or attempting to buy either newspapers or Congressmen, or, in fact, that there are in Missouri either newspapers or Congressmen for sale, but it is hard for me to read any other meaning into his language when he says:

The newspapers in my country, like the Congressmen, are not rich. They have nothing to sell but their space. [Laughter.] If this old trails hero is asking all these newspapers to put up free hundreds of square feet of space in order to push his propaganda, then all I have got to say for him is that he is a little stingy in his disposition. He has got the money. Why does he not pay these people for the space he uses if he does not?

I am utterly unable to explain that language upon any hypothesis consonant with the innocence of Judge Lowe or the newspapers. It appears to me as direct a charge in parliamentary language of corrupt influence as I can imagine. The fact is that Judge Lowe is a man of very modest means but large public spirit. He has given freely of his time and work and I have no doubt also of his means in devotion to what he believes to be a patriotic duty. His letter referred to by my colleague shows that he is asking friends to assist him in this work and entirely negatives the idea that any pay is offered or expected.

Judge J. G. Paxton is another distinguished Missouri Democrat of tried ability and spotless character. He is a man of strong views and personal force and expresses himself on public

matters with great independence and frankness. He has frequently disagreed with me upon public matters in the frankest manner, and I have the utmost confidence in his intellectual honesty. I know of no connection whatever that he has with the road movement except as any other public spirited citizen who has aided in forming public opinion.

Mr. H. D. Train is a prominent and successful business man who was at one time active in Republican politics. He was at one time president of the Automobile Club of Kansas City. This fact has not discredited him in the eyes of his business associates nor cast any suspicion upon his integrity. I know personally that he has not a dollar to gain by any form of road improvement, and I am confident that he would not engage in any corrupt practices. and yet my colleague says of him:

Wherever Mr. Train and others like him can do anything to put some of those Members out of commission it will be done. They have not many votes in my district, and I do not know to what method they would resort to defeat me at the coming election, as he says they are determined to do, except by putting their hands down into their treasury and fill the papers of my district and my State with canned editorials against me.

Again, it is difficult to reconcile this language with any hypothesis of the innocence of Mr. Train or the newspapers of Missouri.

The Public Printer tells me that 36,000 copies of this "polecat" speech have been ordered printed by my colleague, to be circulated under the Government frank. And this in the face of the fact that a demand for an investigation is now pending to determine the truth of the charges.

Of course, the circulation of these 36,000 copies will prove conclusively that the Shackleford bill is a good bill and in the interest of the farmers; that the opponents to it are divided into zoological groups of polecats, peacocks, and suckers; that the peacocks are not only found associating with such strange friends but have taught the polecat and suckers to "strut" like themselves; that the press of Missouri is poor and has nothing to sell but its space, and that good-roads associations should be put out of business. Well, after all, the 36,000 copies tell the tale without any words of mine. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. BORLAND, has just finished a somewhat caustic arraignment of me for some things I said in a speech delivered in this House a few days ago. He belabors me because in that speech I charged that some of the big road associations and special interests have been and are lobbying in favor of ocean-to-ocean highways and against a general system of good roads connecting the farms with the nearest towns and railway stations. I did make such a charge, and I again repeat it.

The International Dictionary gives the following as the meaning of the word "lobbying":

To endeavor to secure the passage of a bill in a legislative body by influencing, as an outsider, the votes of members. To solicit the votes or attempt to influence the official action of a member of the legislative body in the lobby or elsewhere.

My friend Mr. BORLAND has added to my speech a word which I did not utter—the word "corrupt." I simply charged that a powerful lobby was being maintained here and elsewhere throughout the country against our road bill and in favor of some fancy boulevards connecting up the oceans, to be used primarily by automobile tourists. I did not say that it was done corruptly; but I did say, and I do say now, that it is a most thoroughly organized lobby and is supplied with adequate funds with which to carry out its work.

In my speech the other day, of which my friend Mr. BORLAND complains, I read an account of a meeting of the American Automobile Association, at which it adopted a resolution to establish headquarters at Washington for the purpose, as explained in the resolution—

To keep in close touch with Congress in order to wield a greater amount of influence.

Mr. Robert Hooper, who was president of the American Automobile Association at that meeting, in his address used the following language:

I have no hesitancy in saying that inside of two years we will have committed the Federal Government to a system of national roads that will connect all parts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, what does he mean when he says "we will have committed the Federal Government"? There is no other way to do that except by influencing Members of Congress.

Let me read further from Mr. Hooper's address:

The report which you will receive from the committee in regard to establishing additional headquarters at Washington has had my very careful consideration, and I can not but feel that it would be better for us to consider such a movement favorably. Inasmuch as our work is entirely national in scope, not only in regard to good roads but also as to touring and legislation, I feel that the closer we can keep in touch with Congress the greater amount of influence we can wield.

Following out that suggestion they did come here and established expensive headquarters, which are open yet. What for? Mr. Hooper, in his address, gave the answer:

The closer we can keep in touch with Congress the greater amount of influence we can wield.

That is what they said when they opened up here and that is what they have been trying to accomplish since they came here. I do not believe that they have attempted anything here by bribery. Be it said to the credit of our country that nothing could be done here by that method; hence it is not attempted. But there are other ways by which they hope to keep in touch with Congress.

This gentleman, Mr. Hooper, was not only president of the American Automobile Association, but also of the Pennsylvania Motor Federation. A big road fight was pulled off in Pennsylvania during the last two years. The automobile crowd in that State undertook to concentrate all road funds in the construction of some expensive cross-country automobile roads. To carry out this they also attempted to put over a $50,000,000 bond issue. The Grangers of that State opposed it. They favored a general system of roads extending out among the farms. The opposing forces developed a very hard fight on this question. Let us see what part Mr. Hooper and his Motor Federation took in this contest. I will read from one of his letters on the subject:

[Pennsylvania Motor Federation, affiliated with the American Automobile Association.]

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
JUNIPER AND CHERRY STREETS,
*Philadelphia, Pa., March 11, 1911.*

Mr. L. W. PAGE, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PAGE: Generally speaking, however, as president of the Pennsylvania Motor Federation, I would request that before you make any assertion in Harrisburg you consult with me. The facts as given to you in regard to the present highway bill in Pennsylvania are a little inaccurate, and I also would state to you in confidence that the highway bill now before the Legislature of Pennsylvania was drawn up completely in my office and that the Pennsylvania Motor Federation have the entire matter well looked after.

The American Automobile Association or any other outside organization have not been asked to help out in any way, as we know exactly what is required better than any outside organization could know and we do not want any help.

When I have the pleasure of seeing you personally I will explain to you in confidence the situation as it exists in this State, which position may be different from that occupied by similar organizations in other States; but here we have such a compact and thoroughly organized body and we are working so closely to the administration that we are pretty ably backed, and the chances are so strongly in favor of the bill being passed that there is very little doubt about it.

I would also state to you that the "$50,000,000 bond issue" bill was also drawn up by us.

We have had several outside organizations ask us whether we needed any help, but we thanked them very kindly and asked particularly that they let it alone.

With very best regards, and hoping to have the pleasure of seeing you again, I remain

Yours, very truly,

ROBERT P. HOOPER, *President.*

From reading that letter it would appear that they not only keep in close touch with Congress, but with State legislatures as well. According to that letter they write the bills and then get busy to put them across.

Let me read another letter from Mr. Hooper to show how they do their work:

[Pennsylvania Motor Federation, affiliated with the American Automobile Association.]

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
JUNIPER AND CHERRY STREETS,
*Philadelphia, Pa., November 1, 1913.*

Mr. LOGAN WALLER PAGE,
*Director United States Office Public Roads, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PAGE: We are very much interested over the result of our election on Tuesday, as it will decide whether the $50,000,000 loan bill will be passed by the people. The motor federation has spent a very large sum of money trying to overcome the opposition of the Pennsylvania State Grange, but I do not feel very optimistic as to the passage of the bill.

Yours, very truly,

ROBERT P. HOOPER, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, in the face of those letters and in the face of the fact that the American Automobile Association has established headquarters at Washington to keep in close touch with Congress, who will say that there is no lobby being maintained on the road question?

Let me read the last sentence of Mr. Hooper's letter again. Here it is:

The Motor Federation has spent a very large sum of money trying to overcome the opposition of the Pennsylvania State Grange.

Now, I ask my friend, Mr. BORLAND, if that does not have every earmark of a lobby, of an active lobby, of a well-financed lobby, a lobby led by talented men?

It is the opposition of that lobby which our road bill has met before the country. It was the opposition of that lobby which

our bill met here. It is the opposition of that lobby which our bill will meet in the Senate.

In my speech of a few days ago about which my friend, Mr. BORLAND, complains, I read a letter from one of his constituents, Mr. Harry D. Train. He was vice president of the American Automobile Association and the member of its executive committee. In that letter Mr. Train uses these words:

> We consider this bill the biggest joke ever introduced into Congress. The American Automobile Association beat this bill once in the Senate after it had passed the House.

If that statement be true, then Mr. BORLAND's resolution to investigate should have been introduced in the Senate, not here. That letter does not claim that this lobby was able to keep in close enough touch with the House to defeat the legislation against which it was operated, but does boast that it was able to do it elsewhere.

My friend Mr. BORLAND comes to the rescue of Mr. Paxon, whose name I called in my speech a few days ago. I know Mr. Paxon. He is a gentleman of the highest character, incapable of any dishonorable act. Should dishonor be laid at his door, I would be as ready as Mr. BORLAND to defend him. The fact is, however, that I said nothing against Mr. Paxon. It looks as though Mr. BORLAND were lugging his name in to lend strength to himself. The only foundation for it all is that I read a number of editorials to show they all of them carried the words "pork barrel." One of them carried an article headed "Mr. Paxon opposes the pork barrel." I read this and made no further reference to him.

The third and last of his constituents whom Mr. BORLAND has felt constrained to defend against my alleged attack was Judge J. M. Lowe, of Kansas City. Now, what about him? He is a man, so far as I know, of unsullied reputation. He possesses great enthusiasm and firmness of purpose. He is obsessed with the idea of having the Federal Government build some peacock lanes to connect up the antipodal oceans. He has devoted himself to chasing this jack-o'-lantern. In his dreams he sees the old Cumberland Road, the old national trails, as they were in the days of long ago. In his waking hours he yearns for a restoration of these old ways of travel over which our forefathers drove their ox teams. He thinks that if these conditions were restored the crack of the ox driver's whip would drown the sounds of the clanging bell and the screeching whistle of the speeding locomotive. To bring all of this about he has been through the years conducting one of the most persistent lobbies that has ever existed in connection with legislation here. Just now he is procuring editorials to be inserted in every newspaper whose columns he can enter. For what purpose let him answer. Here is what he says in his letter to the editors:

> It is needless to add that we beg of you your best efforts, for it will be read in the Senate, together with the name of your paper and your own name and politics.

All of this, of course, has for its object the influencing of the votes of Members of Congress.

To get out all of this stuff to the newspapers takes money. To get it back takes money. To get it to Washington to be read on the floor of the Senate takes money. To travel about year in and year out to work up sentiment along the old trails takes money. He gets the money and spends it. What for? To influence Congress to kill a road bill which would extend a system of good roads among the farmers and to secure legislation for a construction of the old trails of which he is so much enamored. He is president of the Old Trails Association. He directs its movements. This association collects and spends every year large sums of money. Not a dollar of it has ever gone to build a rod of road.

Now, let me say again that I do not charge that Judge Lowe has been guilty of corrupt lobbying. I do charge, however, that he is expending large sums of money trying to influence legislation on the road subject.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask you if Judge Lowe has not denied to you that he is behind my bill?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have a letter from him in which he makes that explicit statement, but he is advocating the construction of the Old Trails Road, and that road is embraced in the bill which my friend Mr. BORLAND introduced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must finish. No lobby in recent years has spent more money in trying to move Congress and the country into the support of a measure than has been put into this fight for peacock lanes and against roads connecting the farms with the towns and railway stations. If a road congress or road convention is held anywhere, this lobby is there to fashion the resolutions and see that they are widely published. Is a State legislature in session, this lobby is there to keep in touch and mold its measures. Is a road magazine published, this lobby is on hand to get behind it and subsidize it. And when the road question gets to Washington this lobby is here, with its headquarters open under the management of talented men to keep in close touch with Congress to wield its influence.

Mr. Chairman, they want ocean-to-ocean highways for automobile tourists at public expense, and they are not willing that a dollar shall be spent upon any system of roads leading from the farms to the markets. The tourist has his lobby here. Who is here to lobby for the farmer and the consumer of farm products? Nobody. They elected us to guard their interest, and we will be unfaithful to our trust if we fail to do it.

My colleague [Mr. BORLAND] has entered the lists against me and my road bill so often that it may lead some to infer that there is personal antagonism between us. Such an inference would be unwarranted. I am happy in the belief that he is my personal friend. I know I am his. I cherish for him a high personal esteem, and regard him as a gentleman of high character and conspicuous ability. We simply differ about the road bill, and each of us is waging the best fight he can. Indeed, I have had a conversation with him to-day, and was both surprised and gratified to find that, in fact, we are not so far apart as at first appeared. I gathered from my conversation with him that he, too, is in favor of a system of community roads connecting the farms with the towns and market places; that his opposition to my bill is more upon administrative features than upon the real principle involved in it. I have no doubt that ultimately he and I will be found supporting the same measure.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAUGEN] yield some of his time?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the pending bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture on the 20th of February last. The time which has elapsed since its introduction has been too brief to permit one not a member of the committee to gather the information and make the analysis which he would like to make on this occasion. I hope, however, to present some figures which will be of value to the Members of the House and to the country.

One of the most reprehensible and, at the same time, most inexcusable practices which is indulged in in the House is that of reporting bills without giving the membership of the House any adequate idea of the reasons which influenced the committee in its conclusions.

The report which accompanies this bill, however, is one of the most comprehensive which has ever accompanied a bill of this character. I congratulate the chairman of the committee upon the care with which he has prepared it; and yet the report conveys no idea of the character of the work or the scope of usefulness of the Department of Agriculture, and especially it gives no answer whatever to the important query whether the department is efficiently organized and administered, whether we are getting our money's worth from the activities of the department in results. These questions are in no sense political or partisan in character. But it is natural that the party in control of the Government and responsible for administration as well as legislation should point out the things in the bill which are commendable and emphasize the achievements of the administration. On the other hand, it is the duty of the minority to criticize, to point out defects, to emphasize failures and extravagances, and to protest against discriminations.

It is my purpose to point out some particulars in which I think the department is inefficient and the results which it produces insufficient in comparison with the amount expended. I intend to show that the bill and some of the expenditures contemplated under it are either discriminatory or ineffectual. It has been necessary, in order to bring these discriminations out clearly and to emphasize the deficiencies and inefficiencies of administration, to make certain comparisons of expenditures in different sections of the country and for different purposes. In making these comparisons I disclaim any motive of partisanship or any feeling or purpose of sectionalism. I do not even claim that my deductions from these comparisons are necessarily conclusive. The comparisons speak for themselves. I assert that they show an apparent discrimination, which ought to be made the subject of careful investigation and consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and the heads of the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

There are 11 items in this bill, carrying aggregate appropriations of $1,119,200, which apply exclusively and peculiarly to the South. They are:

*Items in H. R. 13679 (the Agricultural appropriation bill) which are peculiar to the South and the amount appropriated therefor.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Page 11, line 20, "for all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks," etc | $400,000 |
| Page 17, line 1, "for the control of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants" | 46,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Page 17, line 8, "for acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions and for the improvement of cotton by cultural methods, breeding, and selection" | $38,000 |
| Page 17, line 18, "for investigating the ginning, handling, grading, baling, and wrapping of cotton and the establishment and demonstration of standards for the different grades thereof" (This is $50,000 above the estimate.) | 80,580 |
| Page 18, line 23, "for the investigation and improvement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production and handling" | 25,000 |
| Page 19, line 9, "for investigations in connection with the production of table sirup, including the breeding, culture, and diseases of cane and the methods of manufacture, standardization, and marketing of sirup and the utilization of cane by-products" | 10,000 |
| Page 19, line 23, "for farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil" | 378,240 |
| Page 19, line 5, "for the breeding and physiological study of alkali-resistant and drought-resistant crops" (Egyptian cotton) | 22,280 |
| Page 48, line 3, "for investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane," etc | 49,000 |
| Page 48, line 12, "for investigations of insects affecting tropical and subtropical fruits," etc | 20,100 |
| Page 67, line 5, "for experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane and cotton districts of the United States" | 50,000 |
| Total | 1,119,200 |

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEAVER). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman know that only two of the items to which he has called attention are new and that all the other items to which he has called attention have been carried in this bill for 10 years?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I am not particularly concerned with that; but I will say to the gentleman that after he and his brethren on that side, with all the native eloquence and wealth of diction which they possess, have for 18 years tiraded against the party to which I belong, I do not think it befits them very well now to appropriate the cloak which they say the Republican Party has been wearing for 18 years.

One of these items is of such unusual character as to merit special mention. This is the item for experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane and cotton districts of the United States. No explanation of this item accompanied it in the Book of Estimates, but the hearings illuminate its general purpose. Dr. Galloway, in his testimony before the committee, says:

> Recognizing the fact that there will be economic changes so far as the production of sugar is concerned, we feel that the Government owes it to the people to do something constructive for them either in redirecting their work in sugar production or else in directing their work so that they take up other kinds of agriculture * * *. Certain projects have been planned, and we have included an item of $50,000 for taking up work in south Louisiana and south Texas, where the sugar cane is now growing.

Reduced to plain English, this statement means that having destroyed the sugar-cane industry in Louisiana by tariff legislation, the administration now proposes that the Government shall assist these people who have been injured by directing their activities to stock raising and other lines. It would be cruel to deny this constructive relief to the cane growers whose business has been destroyed by tariff legislation, but it seems fair to inquire why similar constructive efforts are not suggested to compensate for injury to the farmers of the North by tariff legislation and in the interests of the thousands of unemployed in the country. Observe that of the total $1,119,200 for projects in the South $591,240 is available in whole or in part for investigations and demonstration work in connection with the growing of cotton; $80,580 is available for investigating the ginning, handling, grading, baling, and wrapping of cotton, the establishment and demonstration of standards for the different grades thereof, and so forth. Compare this item with the $76,320 which is provided for the investigation of the handling, grading, and transportation of grain and the fixing of definite grades thereof. Remember that in 1909 the acreage in cotton was 32,043,838 and in cereals 191,395,963; that the value of the cotton crop in that year, including cotton seed, was $824,696,287, while the value of the cereal crops was $2,665,539,714. Bear in mind that the appropriation for cotton grading, and so forth, is $50,000 more than the department asked; that standard grades have already been established under previous authorizations on cotton and that of cereals standard grades have been established only upon corn and you will have some idea of the inequality of these provisions.

There are in the bill two items which are peculiarly comparable both in amount and in the character of the work covered, and which are fairly illustrative of the sectional character of the appropriations of this bill and their application. These are the items for farm-management work in the North and cooperative demonstration work in the South. The bill making an appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, carried an appropriation for farm-management work of $375,000 and an equal amount for cooperative demonstration work. Of the $375,000 allotted for farm-management work $240,000 was spent in actual field studies and demonstration according to the summary of projects submitted by the Bureau of Animal Industry. Actually, however, but $157,231 was spent in the field. The remainder of the $240,000 was disposed of as follows: For payment of district leaders' salaries and the general work, $39,165; for investigational work in some 13 Southern States, $33,285; and approximately $10,000 for miscellaneous supplies. Not only has the appropriation for farm-management work in the North not been spent in the field, but $33,000 of the appropriation was diverted to investigational work in Southern States already receiving more than their share of the funds available for cooperative work.

Of the $375,000 appropriated for farm-demonstration work in the South, $322,000 was actually used in the field and $53,000 in administration. It is the theory of these items that both of these funds shall be spent in cooperation with the States, the States contributing to the cooperative work an amount equivalent to that expended by the Government in the field or as much more as it desires. I wish now to make a comparison of the respective amounts contributed by the States as against each of these funds.

As I have stated, of the farm-management item $157,231 was expended in the field. This amount was distributed among 26 Western and Northern States, the average amount received by each State being $6,047. Of the cooperative demonstration work item $327,801 was allotted to 9 Southern States, an average of $36,422 to each State. The 26 Northern States received $157,321 and contributed $478,471 to the cooperative farm-management work, while the 9 Southern States, receiving $327,801, contributed $250,906. Minnesota received $6,963 and contributed $62,500. Alabama received $40,000 and contributed $33,818. North Dakota received $5,413 and contributed $60,830. Mississippi received $40,000 and contributed $18,091. Indiana received $5,682 and contributed $65,150. Louisiana received $33,741 and contributed $14,539. Besides the $327,801 received by the 9 Southern States referred to, these States and 6 other Southern States received an additional $250,000 for cooperative demonstration work from the general educational board, making a total of $577,801 received by 15 Southern States as against $157,321 received by 26 Northern States.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will be fair enough to state, of course, that it was not until this House became Democratic—and this is the first time I ever used that word in connection with this bill—that the Northern States received any money for farmers' cooperative work at all, and the gentlemen who were here at that time will back up that statement as true.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is due that I should state here that the expenditure of the money heretofore appropriated has been left to the discretion of the Department of Agriculture, and the committee has had confidence in that great department that it would apply the money where it would bring the greatest results.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] says that only since the House became Democratic has an appropriation been made for farm-demonstration work in the North. I think he is in error in that. The year before the House became Democratic the appropriation for farm-demonstration work used in the North, as I remember, or available for use in the North, was $144,000. The amount was increased during the first Democratic House to $300,000. Last year it was $375,000.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that the gentleman may be correct in his recollection, but the gentleman will admit, of course, that the large increases for that work have come in the last two or three years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Oh, the increases have come on my motion in this House, and over the opposition, at least, of the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who was not a member of the party to which I belong.

Mr. ANDERSON. From the summary of projects which appears in the appendix of the hearings before the committee, I have prepared another comparative table. It shows the amount expended by the Department of Agriculture in cooperative work of one kind and another in 10 Southern States and the amounts contributed by each of said States to the same work, and also in comparison therewith the amounts contributed by the different bureaus of this department to cooperative work in 10 of the great agricultural States of the North and the amounts contributed by each of these States to this cooperative work. Without going into the details of the table at this point, I may say that the department expended in the 10 Southern States referred to $748,561; or an average of $74,856, while in the 10 Northern States the department expended $432,302, or an average of $43,230. The table further shows that the amounts expended by the department in the Southern States mentioned was offset by contributions from said States, amounting to $851,840, an average of $85,184, while the 10 Northern States contributed $834,780, an average of $83,478. Averages are rather unsatisfactory, and sometimes lead to erroneous conclusions. I wish therefore to be more specific. The table shows that the department expended in Alabama $90,421, while Alabama contributed $89,789. The department expended in Minnesota $47,534, while the institutions of Minnesota contributed $179,213. In Louisiana the department expended $56,757 and the State $36,174. In Wisconsin the department contributed $22,640 and the State $41,516. In Arkansas the department expended $74,049 and the State $61,192, while in Kansas the department expended $28,777 and the State $56,850. In Texas the department contributed $125,699 and the State $105,551, while in New York the department contributed $32,073 and the State $93,699. Is it possible that the agriculture of these Southern States is of as much greater importance than the agriculture of the Northern States as these comparisons indicate? The evidence certainly does not so indicate. The total value of crops in the Southern States mentioned, in 1909, was $1,454,695, while the value of all crops in the Northern States included in the table was $2,958,553,064. The value of live stock and live-stock products in the Northern States referred to was double the value of live stock and live-stock products in the Southern States included in the table.

I come now to the consideration of another phase of the matter. The last appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture carried a total appropriation amounting to $17,896,945, exclusive of unexpended balance, amounting to about $8,000,000. I have been unable to get some of the figures which I wished to submit in connection with this phase of the discussion, but as near as I can determine from the statement submitted in the Book of Estimates and in the hearings, of this sum $2,375,317 has been expended or allotted to be expended in the field. This sum is 13 per cent of the total appropriation. It covers everything expended in the various cooperative projects of the department, including eradication of cattle ticks and sheep and cattle scab, soil surveys, improvement of post roads, farmers' cooperative demonstration work, farm management, field studies and demonstrations, and some 20 or more other projects. It seems strange that only 13 per cent of the appropriations for a great department of the Government, presumably dedicated to advancing the interests of the farmer, should find its way into the field where the farmer actually is. It seems strange that slightly over $2,300,000 should represent the results in the field of the expenditure of more than $17,000,000.

The fact of the matter is that the department has become a great investigational and regulatory machine. It has ceased to be engaged principally in the effort to advance constructive agriculture by increasing production or by the introduction of better methods by actual demonstrations in the field. It is natural, perhaps, that demonstration work should give way to the greater pressure of regulatory services and the more pleasant tasks of investigational work, but it is none the less unfortunate for the farmers. The department's activities which have actually reached the farmer in the field at all seem to fairly lead to the conclusion that we are bunkoing the farmer by calling this institution a Department of Agriculture at all. Most of its activity seems to be taken up in the regulatory and scientific work, which touches the farmer only in a very remote and impersonal way.

I find a very interesting and significant corroboration of the conclusions I have just stated in the last report of the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

> The present appropriations for work of a regulatory nature or only indirectly affecting agriculture constitute about three-fifths of the total funds of the department, or approximately $15,000,000, leaving two-fifths, or $9,000,000, available for scientific research, experiments, and demonstration work directly affecting the farmer. While it would be difficult to segregate the funds which are used for purely demonstration work, because of its close relation in many instances to investigational work, it is safe to say that more than $1,000,000 is devoted to such work.

It seems that I have been too generous in my estimates of the amounts spent by the department for demonstration work in the field. The annual amount expended in increasing production would scarcely buy one round of ammunition for a single battleship, while the total amount expended by the Department of Agriculture, outside of its regulatory services, is about one-half the cost of a battleship.

We have recently passed the Army bill, carrying appropriations of some $90,000,000. We are soon to pass the naval appropriation bill, carrying appropriations of $140,000,000. Beside these amounts for military expenditures the $18,000,000—and more especially the two or three million dollars actually spent in increasing production by demonstration work in this country—seems ridiculous. It is the boast of the department that it "has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before." This boast does not appear to be justified by results.

I have compiled a table showing the average production per acre in the United States, Germany, and Austria for the following periods: 1890–1899, 1900–1909, and 1908–1912. The table shows that the average production of wheat per acre during these periods in the United States was 13.2, 14.1, and 14.1 bushels per acre; in Germany, 24.5, 28.9, and 30.1; in Austria, 16.2, 18, and 19.8. The average yield of oats for the same periods was as follows: United States, 26.1, 29.3, and 29.6 bushels per acre; Germany, 40, 50.7, and 51.9; Austria, 25.3, 29.8, and 31.1. The average yield of barley per acre for the same periods was as follows: United States, 23.4, 25.5, and 25.3; Germany, 29.4, 35.3, and 36.3; Austria, 21.1, 26.3, and 26. The average yield of rye per acre for the same periods was as follows: United States, 13.9, 15.7, and 15.8; Germany, 20.9, 25.6, and 27; Austria, 16.1, 19, and 20.6.

The average yield of potatoes per acre for the following periods, 1900–1909 and 1902–1911, was as follows: United States, 91.4 and 94.2; Germany, 200 and 194.4; Austria, 151.1 and 152.7.

I do not complain because the per-acre production in this country of the cereal crops is not as great as it is in some of the foreign countries; this is probably not to be expected. But it does seem to me that the fact that the per-acre production of the cereals in this country has increased only a very small extent in the last two decades, and that the proportional increase is by no means as great in this country as it is in some foreign countries, should be a matter of serious consideration and concern to the department, the committee, the Congress, and the country. It is a direct result of what seems to me a false policy. That policy is one of spending millions of dollars in getting information and a few thousands in making it available and of use to the persons for whose benefit it is gathered. The situation is no reflection upon the farmer. He is doing the best he can with the help he is getting.

Again, I find some confirmation of my views on this subject in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

> What about the efficiency of the work on the land now under cultivation? What part of it may be said to be reasonably efficiently cultivated? What part of it is satisfactorily cultivated and is yielding reasonably full returns? The opportunity for guessing in this field is unlimited, but according to the best guesses I can secure it appears that less than 40 per cent of the land is reasonably well cultivated and less than 12 per cent is yielding fairly full returns or returns considerably above the average.

And again:

> Increased tenancy, absentee ownership, soils still depleted and exploited, inadequate business methods, the relative failure to induce the great majority of farmers to apply existing agricultural knowledge, and the suggestions of dependence on foreign nations for food supplies warn us of our shortcomings and incite us to additional effort to increase production.

Here is the nub of the situation. The Secretary says:

> The relative failure to induce the great majority of farmers to apply existing agricultural knowledge warns us of our shortcomings—

And so forth.

The plain, unvarnished truth is that the department is working 40 years ahead of the farmer. This is a direct result of the disproportionate relation between the amount spent for investigational work and that devoted to practical demonstration and education. I do not know that too much money is spent upon investigation. I do know that much of the results of these investigations are useless now, from the standpoint of the practical farmer, and will be for many years to come. There is too much rehashing of work already done and duplication of investigational work carried on by the States. I am satisfied that too little money is being spent on disseminating the information that is valuable among the farmers in a practical way. The Secretary says:

> We have unmistakably reached the period where we must think and plan.

In my opinion, we reached that period long ago. We have now reached the period when we must "do." We have reached

the point where we must make the knowledge gathered by the department effective in a direct and personal way.

The committee has increased the appropriation for the office of markets from $50,000 to $200,000. I congratulate them upon having done so; but I should do so with more confidence and less mental reservation if I felt certain that practical and speedy results were likely to follow from the uses to which the department proposes to put the funds. I have reference again to the report of the Secretary. Relative to the proposed activities of the office of markets, he says:

The department has arranged its marketing investigations under five important subdivisions:

First. Marketing surveys, methods, and costs, including especially available market supplies in given production areas, demand at consuming centers, cold and other storages, marketing systems and prices, and costs of wholesale and retail distribution of farm products.

Second. Transportation and storage problems, having in mind the elimination of waste and the study of problems connected with surplus market supplies; terminal and transfer facilities, including freight congestion, car supply, deterioration in transit, extension of the practice of precooling of perishable products, and other special services.

Third. City marketing and distribution investigations, involving a study of the uses and limitations of farmers', municipal, wholesale, and retail market houses; systems of city distribution; the promotion of direct dealing between producers and consumers by parcel post, express, and freight.

Fourth. Study and promulgation of market grades and standards. A consideration of sizes and suitability of packages and containers, methods of preparation of perishable products, and the ultimate establishment, so far as practicable, of official market grades and standards for farm products.

Finally, cooperative production and marketing investigations.

In the first place, the investigations pertaining to most of the subjects mentioned in the first four subdivisions can be better and more profitably undertaken by other departments of the Government. In fact, the investigations along several of the lines proposed are already underway in other departments. In the second place, the $200,000 provided would not be a drop in the bucket toward even beginning investigations of the scope proposed. In the third place, the information proposed can not be obtained in less than five or six years with an adequate appropriation, and the beginning even could not be made toward getting it with the appropriation provided. In the fourth place, the investigations proposed are so far ahead of the present ability of the people to perform that it will be at least 10 or 15 years before it can be practically applied. If the appropriation provided is to be spread out over the various fields of investigation proposed in these four subdivisions I am fearful the results will be very much like the Irishman's dinner, "So fine you can't see them." I suspect that much of the activity of the department is dissipated in much the same way. It seems to me that better results will be obtained if the activity of the office of markets is practically confined to one or two projects which give hope of comparatively immediate and practical returns.

The fifth subdivision, "Cooperative production and marketing investigations," seems to offer results. I trust it is not too much to hope, however, that the activities of the office of markets, in aid of cooperative production and marketing, may be constructive in character as well as investigational. If the office of markets can work out and establish in some suitable section or sections of the United States a plan of cooperative production, but more especially in some farming community, a system of cooperative or community marketing, and make a practical demonstration of the economies that can be effected, it will have done much to solve the problem of the high cost of living and will have performed a service of greater value than a million dollars' worth of investigation. The example of such a system in actual operation—the proof of the pudding, as it were—would speedily result in the adoption of similar systems. The tendency toward cooperation in agriculture is irresistible. It only requires a successful demonstration of its possibilities in production and marketing to promote its universal adoption. There are peculiar conditions in agricultural lines which lend themselves to cooperative effort.

The farmer has been an intense individualist. In a sense he is king of his domain. He is naturally rather suspicious of the Greeks bearing gifts; but he is fast coming to recognize the value of cooperation with those in his own line of business. It needs, as I have said, but the practical demonstration of the possibilities of cooperative production and marketing to bring about its universal adoption. The adoption of cooperative methods does not mean, as many seem to think, the elimination or even injury to the country merchant. It means simply that the farmer intends to avail himself of the advantages which the labor unions have secured for themselves by organizing for the purpose of collective bargaining.

The Secretary proposes and the committee provides for the presentation by the department of a plan of reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. A great many of us have felt for a long time—certainly I have felt ever since the beginning of my brief membership in the House—that there was something the matter with the Department of Agriculture; but, like a great many others, I have not been able to diagnose the difficulty. It is encouraging to note that the department also recognizes that something is wrong and is disposed to try to remedy it. I am not so sure that the method of reorganization proposed by the department is the best method that can be devised. It seems to me, as I have intimated, that the real difficulty so far has been our failure to provide a sufficient appropriation for demonstration and the disproportionate amounts allowed for investigation or regulatory work in comparison to the amounts allowed for demonstration work. I hope that the reorganization of the department will be directed rather to making the information already gathered of value to the farmer than to additional investigational projects. I hope that it will be of such a character and will so closely touch the farmer that in the end he will be able to say, with the spirit of Joaquin Miller:

And I have said, and I say it ever
As the years go by and the world goes over,
'Twere better to be content and clever
In the tending of cattle and tossing of clover,
In the grazing of cattle and the growing of grain,
Than a strong man striving for fame and gain.

[Applause.]

The tables referred to in the text follow:

*Amounts expended by Bureau of Plant Industry and State and county institutions in cooperative farm management and demonstration work.*

FOR COOPERATIVE FARM MANAGEMENT WORK IN THE NORTH.

| States. | By Bureau of Plant Industry. | By State and county institutions. |
|---|---|---|
| Vermont | $6,001 | $8,700 |
| Connecticut | 1,500 | 1,600 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1,800 |
| Massachusetts | 2,681 | 7,580 |
| New York | 17,727 | 39,100 |
| New Jersey | 2,100 | 3,700 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,752 | 13,200 |
| Ohio | 4,683 | 17,880 |
| Indiana | 5,682 | 65,150 |
| Illinois | 10,500 | 20,300 |
| Michigan | 16,204 | 27,700 |
| Wisconsin | 5,801 | 10,333 |
| Iowa | 10,152 | 19,300 |
| Missouri | 10,035 | 21,125 |
| Minnesota | 6,963 | 62,500 |
| North Dakota | 5,413 | 60,830 |
| South Dakota | 2,654 | 15,400 |
| Nebraska | 7,125 | 7,000 |
| Kansas | 4,860 | 14,320 |
| California | 1,501 | 5,500 |
| Colorado | 6,100 | 7,445 |
| Wyoming | 5,402 | 7,530 |
| Utah | 4,921 | 9,705 |
| Idaho | 1,802 | 8,950 |
| Washington | 1,445 | 14,445 |
| Oregon | 4,291 | 7,200 |
| Total | 157,231 | 478,471 |
| Average | 6,047 | 18,403 |

FOR COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION WORK IN THE SOUTH.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Texas | $65,000 | $72,583 |
| Oklahoma | 36,000 | 20,283 |
| Louisiana | 33,741 | 14,330 |
| Arkansas | 34,000 | 43,344 |
| Tennessee | 28,227 | 7,670 |
| Mississippi | 40,000 | 18,091 |
| Alabama | 40,000 | 33,818 |
| Florida | 21,000 | 9,740 |
| Georgia | 29,834 | 30,824 |
| Total | 327,801 | 250,904 |
| Average | 36,422 | 27,878 |

*Comparative table showing relative amounts contributed by the Department of Agriculture and State and county institutions in Northern and Southern States.*

SOUTHERN STATES.

| States. | By Department of Agriculture. | By State and county institutions. |
|---|---|---|
| Texas | $125,699 | $105,551 |
| Louisiana | 56,757 | 36,174 |
| Arkansas | 74,649 | 61,192 |
| Tennessee | 76,202 | 85,790 |
| Mississippi | 158,428 | 281,757 |
| Alabama | 80,421 | 89,789 |
| Florida | 33,665 | 20,925 |
| Georgia | 70,785 | 71,325 |
| South Carolina | 30,200 | 45,148 |
| North Carolina | 31,755 | 71,493 |
| Total | 748,561 | 851,849 |
| Average | 74,853 | 85,184 |

*Comparative table showing relative amounts contributed by the Department of Agriculture and State and county institutions, etc.*—Continued.

NORTHERN STATES.

| States. | By Department of Agriculture. | By State and county institutions. |
|---|---|---|
| Indiana | $12,487 | $61,300 |
| Iowa | 28,694 | 32,972 |
| Minnesota | 47,534 | 179,213 |
| Nebraska | 45,739 | 35,750 |
| New York | 32,073 | 93,699 |
| North Dakota | 51,546 | 31,940 |
| Ohio | 131,957 | 263,840 |
| Pennsylvania | 29,945 | 37,700 |
| Wisconsin | 22,640 | 41,516 |
| Kansas | 29,777 | 56,850 |
| Total | 432,392 | 834,780 |
| Average | 43,239 | 83,478 |

*Comparative table showing total value of all crops in Northern and Southern States.*

NORTHERN STATES.

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | $204,209,812 |
| Iowa | 314,666,298 |
| Minnesota | 193,451,474 |
| Nebraska | 196,125,632 |
| New York | 209,168,236 |
| North Dakota | 180,635,520 |
| Ohio | 230,337,981 |
| Pennsylvania | 166,739,898 |
| Wisconsin | 148,359,216 |
| Kansas | 214,859,597 |
| Total | 2,058,553,664 |

SOUTHERN STATES.

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | $289,133,466 |
| Louisiana | 77,336,143 |
| Arkansas | 119,419,025 |
| Tennessee | 120,706,211 |
| Mississippi | 147,315,621 |
| Alabama | 144,287,347 |
| Florida | 36,141,895 |
| Georgia | 226,595,436 |
| South Carolina | 141,983,354 |
| North Carolina | 142,890,192 |
| Total | 1,454,808,695 |

*Average yield of products in countries named (bushels per acre), 1890–1912.*

WHEAT.

| Year. | United States. | Germany. | Austria. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1890–1899 | 13.2 | 24.5 | 16.2 |
| 1900–1909 | 14.1 | 28.9 | 18.0 |
| 1903–1912 | 14.1 | 30.1 | 19.8 |

OATS.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1890–1899 | 26.1 | 40.0 | 25.3 |
| 1900–1909 | 29.3 | 50.7 | 29.8 |
| 1903–1912 | 29.6 | 51.9 | 21.1 |

BARLEY.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1890–1899 | 23.4 | 29.4 | 21.1 |
| 1900–1909 | 25.5 | 35.3 | 20.3 |
| 1903–1912 | 25.3 | 36.3 | 26.0 |

RYE.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1890–1899 | 13.9 | 20.9 | 16.1 |
| 1900–1909 | 15.7 | 25.6 | 19.0 |
| 1903–1912 | 15.8 | 27.0 | 20.6 |

POTATOES.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1890–1899 | 91.4 | 200.0 | 151.1 |
| 1903–1911 | 94.2 | 194.4 | 152.7 |

[By unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, and Mr. WEAVER obtained leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the committee to pass for a moment from the consideration of the peaceful ennobling and helpful pursuit of agriculture to a very brief consideration of some facts of current history. My excuse for it is that I think it is always important, when history is in the making, to have the facts fairly presented, stated, and understood.

Day before yesterday the Washington Post, published in this city, a paper of wide circulation, very ably edited, contained an editorial under the caption "Mexico in the Campaign."

That editorial, ably written, as Post editorials uniformly are, contains in addition to a number of suggestions, two definite statements of alleged fact relative to the Mexican situation. That editorial is as follows:

MEXICO IN THE CAMPAIGN.

The Mexican question is rapidly taking on a political aspect, notwithstanding the general indisposition in and out of Congress to infuse a partisan spirit into international complications likely to take a turn that would necessitate a call for men of all parties to stand together.

Congress affords the most conspicuous outcropping of this tendency to give our dealings with Mexico a political twist, and if anyone would realize how far the change of sentiment has progressed he has only to compare the temper of Congress to-day with what it was at the time the wisdom of the "watchful waiting" policy was impressed upon it by the President in person.

Analysis of the causes for the altered feeling, except along the line that human nature is what it is, would not be profitable. That a change of heart is under way is a matter of vital concern as regards the future rather than the past. The movement is yet to reach its full proportions and a definite plan of action. The responsible authorities are sharply assailed, but when it comes to recommending a new plan of restoration of peace and quiet in Mexico on a plane short of invasion and bloodshed nothing sound and practicable results.

Possibly the administration leadership, seeing that adverse opinion is geting out of hand, would prefer that it take a political direction for the moment, sooner than have it exert a disturbing effect on diplomacy as now brought to bear on the vexatious problem. Why not as well keep hands off and let the third party, which is badly off for an issue it may call its own, get all the campaign thunder possible out of the Mexican affair, while the Republicans keep pounding away on the tariff, themselves silenced as to the Mexican policy by the vital fact of that party having inaugurated the policy, and Mr. Taft's hearty indorsement only a day of two ago of the Wilson administration's past and present course.

As to evidences of insurgency in the Democratic ranks, does the possible defection of the Mexican program present any obstacles to the exercise of party discipline such as composed the differences which arose over the tariff and the currency?

All this, to be sure, is contingent on the success of the guiding hands in maintaining the present status of affairs in face of not improbable fresh complications in the interim, foreign or domestic.

There are two distinct statements of alleged fact in this editorial—one that members of the Republican Party are silenced as to the Mexican policy of this administration because the late Republican administration inaugurated that policy, and, second, that President Taft a few days ago gave hearty indorsement to the policy of the Wilson administration, past and present.

The writer of this editorial unfortunately fell into a very grievous error in both of those statements. It is not a fact that the last Republican administration, which went out of office March 4, one year ago, inaugurated the present Mexican policy, if indeed the attitude of the present administration toward Mexico and its people can, out of courtesy, be referred to as a policy. The fact is that Victoriano Huerta became provisional President of Mexico on the 18th day of February, just two weeks prior to the close of the last Republican administration; that the very lamentable and unfortunate assassination of ex-President Madero, of Mexico, occurred only 11 days prior to the close of the Republican administration, scarcely time in which to obtain from the City of Mexico accurate and circumstantial information as to the actual occurrences or the facts and conditions surrounding the establishment of the Huerta government. As a matter of fact, the Taft administration had not sufficient time to formulate a permanent policy touching the changed conditions in Mexico. So far as its failure to recognize the government of Huerta was concerned, it was based, first, on the fact that up to the close of the administration, or to within a few days of the close of the administration, we were not fully and accurately informed as to the actual occurrences, if, in fact, we have been at any time. Further, it was natural and proper that the Taft administration should for a time withhold its recognition of a government established through arbitrary methods, though with a claim to constitutionality, and particularly in view of the dreadful crime that stained the first days of the administration of President Huerta. Further, President Taft, out of consideration for the incoming administration and in order that it might not be embarrassed by any action he should take, deemed it proper that he should leave the settlement of the question of recognition or nonrecognition of the new Government to the new administration, a view and action which reflected great credit upon President Taft.

The present policy, if you may call it a policy, of the administration relative to Mexico was not, therefore, one which is inherited from the administration of President Taft. As a matter of fact, the policy of "watchful waiting" which the present administration claimed to follow for a time gradually merged into an attitude of open hostility toward the Federal Government in Mexico and became one of indirect intervention when President Wilson himself declared that Huerta should and must be eliminated from the situation in Mexico, whatever the people of a large part of Mexico might think of it, and later gave aid and comfort to the revolutionists by removing the embargo on the importation of arms.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MANN. Under this administration Americans in Mexico have been robbed, raped, murdered, and driven out of the country, without any apparent definite policy being taken by our Government; but now that one Englishman has been killed, does not the gentleman think we will have to do business down there and have a policy? You may kill many Americans, but can you kill an Englishman without trouble?

Mr. MONDELL. The death of one Englishman seems to have stirred up the administration more than all the outrages committed against Americans for months. The fact that at last an Englishman has suffered at the hands of these outlaws seems to have aroused the administration tremendously.

The unfortunate and humiliating feature of the present situation is that the very men we have been giving aid and comfort, by furnishing them with arms, by insisting on the fall of the Federal Government, are at this very moment refusing to deal with our Secretary of State and impudently repudiating and flaunting our authority, our power, and our jurisdiction.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not that fact show that neither side of that crowd down there is worthy of the blood of the young men of this country to be spilled in war?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman's thought is that we ought not actively to intervene I certainly agree with him. I think that is one thing above all others that we should avoid. Now, coming to the second proposition contained in the editorial to which I have referred, to wit, that President Taft, as they state, gave his hearty indorsement to the policy of the Wilson administration, past and present. I heard what President Taft said before the National Geographic Society, and it is as follows.

COST OF INTERVENTION.

He said:

Those of us who have had experience in the tranquilizing of a tropical country, with a people not very different from the Mexicans, who take naturally to guerrilla warfare, and who would rather fight than work—that is, would rather fight and run than work—know the difficulties that an army would have to meet to accomplish the only purpose that we would have in going in, to wit, the bringing about of law and order. It would involve the garrisoning with a sufficient force of every town.

It would involve the organization of columns to chase the guerrillas into their mountain fastnesses and across trackless desert plains and the subjugation of 15,000,000 of people. I don't know when we would get through; I don't know how many lives it would involve; I don't know how much it would cost; but I do know it would be a drag upon us, and then when we had gotten the thing done the future would still be doubtful and still be a charge and a burden upon our Government and upon our Treasury. I do not speak thus positively without some knowledge of the subject. No effort ought to be omitted to prevent a catastrophe like this.

Thus it will be seen that he did not directly or indirectly indorse the acts of the Wilson administration, but did say that intervention would be most unfortunate and costly in lives and money and that no effort ought to be omitted to prevent such a catastrophe. In all that I agree with him, and I am sure that a great majority of the American people do.

I do not wish to be understood as differing with the view of the President relative to intervention. Rather I indorse his views that active intervention should be avoided. The criticism I make is that the present policy or the present attitude of the administration toward the situation in Mexico is one that must inevitably lead to intervention. There can be no other outcome. If the only Government in Mexico which maintains order falls, we must intervene to preserve order and prevent further desolation and devastation or be held responsible for all that may occur. Therefore I have felt it my duty, as having some small responsibility as a Member of this legislative body, to voice my protest, not against the President's desire to avoid a conflict, but against those acts and omissions in our dealings with Mexico and its people which, it seems to me, are hurrying us forward toward the unfortunate condition of armed intervention.

Republicans are free to express their views in regard to these matters unembarrassed by any act of our former administration, not with the thought of making trouble, certainly not with the thought of bringing on war, but in the hope that a policy that leads or tends toward armed intervention shall be so modified that we may maintain our prestige in Mexico and aid in the early establishment of a permanent government there without resort to arms. Certainly our indirect alliance with the forces operating in northern Mexico and the often-reiterated declaration of our President—taking no account of the attitude of the Mexican people—that the Huerta government must fall, must inevitably lead to further complications and, I fear, to armed intervention. I hope there will be such a change of policy that such a calamity may be avoided. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used two hours and eight minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS] 20 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, this is constructive legislation and is in the interest of the whole people, because the whole people are dependent upon the products of the farm for food and clothing. I count it a pleasure and a privilege to speak and vote in support of this measure.

This bill carries $18,947,232 for agricultural work. It is nearly a million dollars more than was carried in the last Agricultural bill. It will enable the Agricultural Department, with its corps of efficient and well-trained scientists, to do more and better work than ever before in the development of the agricultural industry in the United States.

The Department of Agriculture is the farmers' department. It is doing a great work. It ramifies into every direction and comes into the most intimate contact with all the people of the country. The department is organized into 15 main groups, as follows: Office of the Secretary, Weather Bureau, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Plant Industry, Forest Service, Bureau of Chemistry, Bureau of Soils, Bureau of Entomology, Bureau of Biological Survey, Division of Accounts and Disbursements, Division of Publications, Bureau of Statistics, Library, Office of Experiment Stations, and Office of Public Roads.

It can not be truthfully said that this Congress has been "stingy" or "narrow" in dealing with matters of interest to the American farmers. On the other hand, this Congress has been very liberal in this regard. It might not be out of place for me to refer to a few things we have done for the people on the farms. There is the bill passed by the House which provides $25,000,000 for the building and maintenance of "community" or "wagon" roads. This will be a great help to the American farmers and will make farm life more attractive. It will effect a saving to the producers that will make farming not only more attractive, but more profitable. If farming is profitable, it will be attractive. It is to this end that the Agricultural Department is striving, and it is to help the farmers put their occupation upon a paying basis that we have been legislating.

We have passed the cooperative agricultural extension bill, known as the "Smith-Lever bill," which provides for field demonstrations, publications, and other effective means that will bring to the attention of the farmer, his wife and children, such demonstrated truths and practices of successful agriculture which, if lived up to, make farming desirable and profitable as an occupation. It is a link that will connect the source of information with those who are seeking and are in need of it in agricultural matters, and is another mighty agency to our system of agricultural teaching. It carries to the farm and gives a personal and ocular demonstration to the farmer the most modern methods and practices of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, the Department of Agriculture, and the best farmers, and proves their value under the immediate environment of the farm itself, thus demonstrating the means by which the organized agricultural institutions of the country may be made to serve all the people, rather than a privileged few.

Cooperative relations were perfected in Georgia, beginning December 1, 1912, so that since that date the "farmers' cooperative demonstration work" is carried on jointly by the College of Agriculture of the State of Georgia and the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture. Splendid work is being done in that State under the direction of Prof. J. Phil Campbell, State agent; Prof. J. Walter Hendricks, district agent; Prof. R. J. H. De Loach, connected with the State Agricultural College; and other able and trained gentlemen who are engaged in this work. We now have demonstration work in half of the counties in Georgia. About 50 of these counties are cooperating in paying expenses of an agent. The county usually pays $50 to $75 per month, and the department an equal amount. Last year the agents conducted 18,000 acres in corn demonstration, with an average yield of 36.3 bushels per acre; 15,000 acres in cotton demonstration, with an average yield of 1,303 pounds of seed cotton per acre; 5,000 acres in oat demonstration produced an average of 43 bushels per acre; 10,000 corn club boys averaged 52 bushels of corn per acre, at a cost of 46 cents per bushel. More than 100 corn club boys produced from 100 to 185 bushels of corn per acre, at a cost of less than 30 cents per bushel. In addition to this work, the agents organized the pig clubs with the boys, and the canning and poultry clubs with the girls. They promote the live-stock industry and were instrumental in having shipped into the State several hundred Percheron horses, beef cattle, and pure-

bred hogs. A great deal of work is done in encouraging farmers to use better machinery, more horsepower, build better pastures, fencing, stumping, and draining of lands. Five hundred and thirty-five hog pastures were built in Georgia under the plan of the Federal Department of Agriculture, and a large number of silos and dipping vats were constructed as the result of the demonstration work.

This work will revolutionize farming not only in Georgia but throughout the country. It will put the industry on its feet and give to it that dignity and standing to which it is entitled.

This cooperative and demonstration plan means a new and bright era for the farmers and is a wise piece of constructive legislation, which every American farmer, large or small, should appreciate. It will give scientific aid and modern methods to the farmer, and that is what he needs. It will show him how to increase his yield, how to build up his soil, how to decrease the cost of production, how to increase farm profits, and how to shorten his hours of labor by an increase of brain power. It means that the farm demonstrator will create interest in farming among the young people. He will show them the splendid opportunities and the large and sure reward scientific farming opens to them; that it is a big business, an interesting business, a dignified business, and, when coupled with brains, industry, and patience, the best and safest business in the world. The farm demonstrator or "county agent" that we have provided for will literally connect the farm with the source of scientific knowledge. He will aid in building up a community spirit, will aid in cooperative movements and educational and social development, out of which will grow a higher and better type of citizen—the world's most valuable and necessary man—the scientific, efficient, and prosperous farmer.

The Smith-Lever bill will in time double the efficiency of the average American farmer. It is the opinion of nearly every authority, at home and abroad, that this "show-me" plan is the only one that will effectively reach the great toiling masses that most need help.

The rural credits system will be another great blessing to the American farmer. It is now being considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which will soon report a bill to the House for its consideration and passage. This will enable the farmer to finance his operations at the smallest rate of interest and with more ready money than ever before in the history of the country. This help is not coming any too soon, because the farmers are needing relief. In the district I represent there are about 1,000 mortgaged farms, upon which high rates of interest are being paid. What is true of the district I represent is true of many other agricultural districts of the United States. What those people, groaning under mortgage liens and high tax rates, want is a way to raise the mortgages, stop the interest, and regain the right and title to their homes and farms. What the farmers want is a way to keep out of debt. They are being told and shown that if modern and improved ideas and machinery are adopted and used, and if antiquated and unprofitable ways are discarded, their crops and profits are more certain, and that in this way they can get out of debt and lay aside something as a surplus, as banks and other business concerns are doing, through business methods.

The trouble with some farmers is they will not take advantage of the aid that is offered them, and then they "cuss" the Government, their Representatives, and Senators for never doing anything for them. The world, for all time, will have its "doubting Thomases," who will not join a new or progressive movement. This movement on the part of Congress and the department is to show by actual results what improved methods, if put into practice, will do.

There are elements that tend to discourage. Now and then you will find a "patriot," who has a long record of offices held by him, but who has never done or tried to do anything for the farmer, who is willing and anxious to "go to the front" for the "dear p-e-e-p-u-l," providing he is given an office through which to "save the country." It does not occur to him until he is thoroughly in the "swim" of his own "enthusiasm" that the farmers will say to him: "Bud, don't tell us what you are going to do, but tell us why you didn't do or try to do something for the farmers when you had a chance." If a man does not accomplish all he undertakes, the people at least like to see him "try." A moment of "effort" is worth a century of "inactivity." But to have something to "harp on" these "campaign-year friends of the farmer," who are willing to sacrifice much to get in office, feeling that it is no less than the people owe them, indulge in making light of the farmers' needs and what Congress and the department are doing and trying to do for the farmers, instead of planting themselves upon issues of public concern. Such a fellow loses sight of what the people have done for him and what he has not done for the people, and reserves the "fee-simple right" to be the "only friend to the f-a-r-m-e-r." A few will join with him in his "criticisms" of what the "free-pass friend of the farmers" is pleased to term "book farming." And of course this "biennial friend of the farmer" takes a "shot" at "free seed," which he has never seen fit to condemn before, and the "congressional frank," which never alarmed him when, no doubt, he was in position to have corrected these "great evils," and under which is sent out seed, documents, bulletins, books, scientific publications, and other agricultural literature. He does not stop to think that these things are sent to the people in many cases at their own request and that the literature and books are sent for the benefit of the man who toils and who not only needs but appreciates the useful things he gets from the department to help him in his work. The purpose of the "free-pass friend of the farmer" is not so much to discredit the work of the Agricultural Department as it is to discredit and ridicule the Representative who is at the post of duty in Washington, trying with all the earnestness of his soul to accomplish something for the people and district he represents.

You really never hear of these "spasmodic friends of the farmer" except in campaign years. They raise the cry of "country against the city," and "try" to "out-country" the man who put "try" in "country." In off years these "holier-than-thous" are talking about what "strength" there is in "union," and how "a house divided against itself can not stand," and how the people "should stand together and pull together," in order that development and progress may result. But the "tune" is changed when election year rolls around. As a general thing he believes that experience better equips one to render more efficient and effective service until election year rolls around; then his mind is changed; he does not believe in "free seed" or "long tenure" in office, except, of course, for some of his own folks or himself. It is all right if he or some of his own folks hold office for a lifetime. He just does not believe in long tenure in office for the fellow who is in. Such a fellow "bobs up" every two years and gives the people the same old "wail" about "free seed" and "worthless bills," and yet never designates a bill by name as being worthless. They say you are "doing nothing" if you do not introduce bills and make speeches, and they criticize and say you are "doing too much" if you introduce bills and make speeches, yet they never tell how a bill can be passed unless it is introduced and goes through the regular channels. The "free pass friend of the farmer" and a few "professional knockers" call attention to the minor things, like "free seed," with the hope that the people will lose sight of the larger and more important things that their Representatives and Senators have done and are trying to do for the farmers. No one is fooled or "gulled" with such "demagoguery," for the farmers, blessed with a good rural free delivery mail service, which we have given them, are taking and reading the daily and other papers and magazines. The fellow who thinks the farmer is not keeping up with the times is badly mistaken.

The farmer who is honest with himself about it knows that what the American farmer needs is something that will give him greater profits and more spare money, and that improved methods is the remedy, regardless of what the "sneering campaign friend of the farmer" may say to the contrary about "book-farming" and "free seed." I have never sent out a package of seed to anyone about which I had any regret, except where, by an oversight, a package was sent to some fellow who was too lazy to plant them. It is to the "street-corner drones" and the "ring politicians" a mortal offense and a personal insult to receive "free seed," because the planting of them suggests work to the "drone" and the receipt of them suggests to the "free-pass ringster" the idea that the people's Representative is not forgetting the folks on the farm. He then gets busy and rides around on his "free pass" denouncing a Congressman who would dare remember the folks at home by writing to them or by sending them seed and agricultural literature under the "congressional frank."

The "old idea" that a farmer does not need an education, and that it is of no use to educate a boy if he is going to be a farmer, is a great mistake. The people know this fact and are seeking to educate their boys and girls so that they will be better fitted for the responsible duties of life.

All are agreed that good and helpful books, bulletins, and other literature on agricultural topics, if read, understood, and applied, help to educate the people as to what is best for their farms. No man can read good literature on any subject without being benefited and enlightened. All agree upon this except the "campaign-year friend of the f-a-r-m-e-r" and the "professional knocker," who never see any good in anything except as it is promulgated by himself or some of his crowd. Everybody knows that the farmer, like the doctor and the lawyer, ought to be

well fitted and prepared for the avocation he is to follow, as it equips him for a fuller understanding of his important work and makes of him a more progressive and useful citizen.

The Agricultural Department was created and is kept up for the purpose of making investigations as to the best seed, methods, and ways, and for the purpose of giving the farmers of the country the benefit of these investigations, which I think the people, as a general rule, are glad to receive. The literature, like the seed, is generally sent out by mail.

It is an easy matter to "criticize" and "find fault." It is an easy matter to "obstruct" and "tear down," but it is a hard matter to "build up" and "construct." The country needs and the people want "construction" and not "destruction" in legislation pertaining to our great agricultural industry.

At the rate our country is growing our population will be 200,000,000 in 50 years. A serious question arises as to how that population will be clothed and fed. Such legislation as we are enacting looks to the development of our country and to the solving of that very question. We now consume 91 per cent of our wheat and 98 per cent of our corn. We exported 525,000 head of cattle in 1906, as against only 105,000 in 1912, which shows a decline of 75 per cent in six years. We imported 16,000 head of cattle in 1906, as against 318,000 in 1912, or an increase of 2,000 per cent in six years. In 1907 our beef cattle numbered 51,566,000 and in 1913, 36,030,000, a decrease of 30 per cent in six years. No wonder beef is scarce. No wonder living expenses are a problem. There is something wrong, and the people are concerned about it. They want that wrong righted. The man in the city is as deeply concerned as the man on the farm. There is an earnest desire of all the people to get to the root of the trouble and to correct the evil. Farming has not proven as profitable or as desirable as it should have been, with the result that great numbers of our boys and girls leave the farm every year and go into the towns and cities.

"Man for man the American farmer produces twice as much as the farmer of Europe, but he requires four or five times the area on which to do it." In Europe farming is more hand and less machine work than with us. There the whole family is in the field for long hours of labor. This means a peasant farmer. This we do not want. Our need is the best farm methods that can be carried on by machinery, cultivating smaller areas in a better manner. It is better to raise 80 bushels on 30 acres than 30 bushels on 80 acres. Too often the mistake is made of trying to cover too much ground. This legislation provides for a trained farm demonstrator or "county agent," to carry to the farmer in the field the best-known methods and show him how to apply them. It means greater productions at less cost and with less labor. That is the work that the department is trying to do. It is a noble work and it is an important work, upon the success of which much depends.

With national aid for roads, the "Smith-Lever bill," the "rural-credits bill," Rural Free Delivery Service, parcel post, and other beneficial legislation which Congress has given the farmers, with what is being done for them daily through the Agricultural Department, ought to bring "renewed hopes" to the breasts of all those who have been tempted to turn from the farm.

In extending these various benefits and advantages to the farmers we are but doing a simple justice to the sinew and backbone of our great citizenship. In helping the farmers we are helping the whole country, for every class is dependent upon the farmer. Our country is great only as her people are prosperous, patriotic, contented, and happy. We can do nothing that will make for the future welfare of our country more than to aid in this work, which means the establishing of farms and homes. The strength of this Republic must rest upon its noble womanhood, its strong manhood, and its Christian homes. In making appropriations to improve agricultural conditions we are "casting bread upon the waters," that will return not only to feed the people of this country, but will mean a tremendous increase in our annual farm productions, and will add to the country's wealth, prosperity, happiness, and greatness. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER].

[Mr. COLLIER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the basis of all wealth and the prosperity of a country. It has been aptly said that public prosperity is like a tree—agriculture is its roots, industry and commerce its branches and leaves. If the root suffers, the leaves fall and the branches decay and the tree dies.

This fact being well established in the minds of the Members of this body, it is not necessary for me to urge that this most important branch of our Government should receive substantial consideration.

I speak on this subject with experience rather than with theoretical knowledge as a guide, for the major part of my life has been spent not in experimental farming, nor in farming by proxy, but doing the work incident to this industry; not for pleasure and experience, but to make legitimate profit and earn my daily bread. As I looked about me and saw men that scorned to do manual labor waxing rich on the profits of my labor, while I, by being frugal, could hardly make advance for that proverbial rainy day, I knew that the time would come in the history of this Nation when the great food producers would demand and receive the consideration due them; and, mark me, that time is approaching with a velocity and volume of a western cyclone.

The farmers of this country—and when I say farmers I say it advisedly; I do not mean the city farmer, the farmer by proxy, or the man with thousands of acres that is so far away from the business that he only advises with his overseers, but I do mean the farmer who goes squarely into the work himself. This man has been covered for many years past with leeches, who at the end of each season extract the bright red, rich blood, leaving only an impoverished body to recuperate during another season to again be subjected to the same process.

These leeches are first the gamblers, who, lolling in their rich and luxurious offices and places of business, play with the prices of the foodstuff the farmer produces and by one turn of the wheel deprives him of the legitimate profit that he has wrung from the earth during a season of hard work.

The second is the interest shark, the shylock who takes his last pound of flesh. We pay much attention to the loan shark who infests our cities and places his dollars at an exorbitant rate for interest. He is damned by the public and the press. He is the man who loans to the salaried employees the money with which he may keep pace in society's fierce gait, or who, perchance, wants a little money to make the lights shine brighter on Broadway, but little, if any, attention has been given the man who, with calloused hands, stooped shoulders, and sunburned face, is paying interest on his farm mortgage. The man whose daily prayer is that he may pay the mortgage and own his home; the man who is the very foundation of our Government.

We should adopt a law at this session of Congress giving the farmer a rural credit bill that means something, and this rural credit bill should in no sense of the word be a banker's bill. The Government gets only 2 per cent for its money when placed in banks, and we know that the soil of this country is just as good security as any asset on earth. If the farmer could get his farm loan at 3 per cent, covering an extended period of time, we would encourage farmers and men who are not farmers to go on the farm with the incentive that they may own it and become permanent producers.

We should forbid by law gambling in foodstuffs, just the same as we have forbidden other species of gambling in the localities from which we come, and by performing this meritorious legislation we would not only better the moral tone of our entire country, but take this old man of the sea off the backs of our producers. [Applause.]

Many other suggestions of importance could be urged, but these subjects mentioned are of prime importance and should receive immediate action. It would be quite interesting to take the price of the different productions of the farm, such as butter, eggs, poultry, hogs, beef, corn, wheat, fruits, and so forth, at the home of the farmer and trace the 50 to 60 per cent increase that is placed on these products when they reach the tables of the ultimate consumer. We should know where these profits go, and I am glad that this bill carries an appropriation permitting the market division under the Department of Agriculture to make this very valuable research.

Neither do I agree with my Democratic brethren, who have taken the tariff off practically everything that the farmer of the North and West raises, that we need to import our foodstuffs from foreign countries. Secretary of Commerce Redfield, in a recent speech at Hamilton, Ohio, treating the new tariff law, said:

A comparison of the last three months of 1912 with the last three months of 1913 shows that our imports increased during the year as follows:

Cattle, 112,000 head in 1912 to 341,000 head in 1913.
Corn, 253,000 bushels in 1912 to 4,450,000 bushels in 1913.
Fresh meat, 865,000 pounds in 1912 to 35,500,000 pounds in 1913.
Potatoes, 41,000 bushels in 1912 to 2,880,000 bushels in 1913.

This, in my judgment, shows what we may expect in the next few years in the way of importations of foodstuffs. My theory of government is entirely at variance to this condition, for, as I have said before, I believe that this broad, fertile country of ours can not only furnish all the foodstuff necessary for the consumption of this Nation, but that we can add a material export.

The agricultural problem is, in my judgment, one of the biggest questions before this body for solution. It is quite common from the press and platform to cry, "Back to the farm!" but making the statement does not put people on the farm. They must have some incentive, and the incentive in all business is the opportunity not only to make a comfortable living, but to be able to lay aside enough of the world's goods to care for one when they reach the age of nonactivity.

Dr. Cyril G. Hopkins, a member of the international commission who study the chemical methods of soil analysis, said in his speech before the Railway Development Co., at Baltimore, Md., that during the last 30 years of the old century, from 1870 to 1900, the population of this country increased by 98 per cent, from 38,600,000 to 76,100,000; but the area of farm land increased by 105 per cent, from 408,000,000 to 839,000,000 acres. Under these conditions there was no difficulty in producing sufficient food for our increasing population. Even during the last 10 years of this 30-year period, from 1890 to 1900, the population increased by only 21 per cent, while the area of farm land increased by 34 per cent. But almost coincident with the end of the century we came practically to the end of our free lands suitable to agriculture, and during the first decade of the present century, 1900 to 1910, the population continued to increase by 21 per cent; but the increase in farm land for the same period was less than 5 per cent, and President Taft, in his address before the National Conservation Congress in 1911, reported that the total possible future increase in farm land in this country was only 9 per cent, and even this addition required large expenditures for irrigation or drainage.

During the last decade the cattle in the United States decreased 6,000,000; swine, 5,000,000; sheep, 9,000,000. There was a positive decrease in food-producing animals during that 10-year period. It may be asked, If there has been practically no increase in food grains and an actual decrease in food-producing animals, then how have we fed the increase of 16,000,000 new people that came to our shores? By decreasing our exportations of foodstuff. This answer is simple, correct, and well authenticated. By comparison of the five-year average 1898 to 1902 with another five-year average of 1908 to 1912, we find that our average annual exportation decreased during the decade from 215,000,000 to 103,000,000 bushels of wheat and from 162,000,000 to only 48,000,000 bushels of corn. That in food animals and their products our exportations decreased from 416,000,000 to 190,000,000 head of cattle, from 635,000,000 to 357,000,000 pounds of beef, and 1,535,000,000 to 900,000,000 pounds of pork. Thus we saved for domestic use 112,000,000 bushels of wheat and more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of meat, and we thus provided per capita for the 16,000,000 new people 7 bushels of wheat and 64 pounds of meat, while the average per capita consumption for Americans has been reckoned at 6½ bushels of wheat and 162 pounds of meat.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says he is a practical farmer or has been one. Will he give his idea of what caused the enormous decrease in our productions of live stock? What is his personal view of that? What caused it?

Mr. BARTON. In the exports?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; in the actual production of live stock in this country. You gave some figures there showing an enormous decrease.

Mr. BARTON. I think it has been caused by making farm land out of our ranches.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is your answer?

Mr. BARTON. Yes, sir. Then, I think that the high price of land makes it unprofitable to raise cattle on the land that once had no other value, and the ravages of hog cholera, which depleted our herds 2,245,000 head last year.

The problem before us is not so much how to get more land, but how to make the land we have now in cultivation more productive.

In a report of Vice Consul De Witt C. Poole, Berlin, Germany, he makes the statement showing the increase in the yield per acre of rye, wheat, summer barley, potatoes, and oats, making a comparison covering a four-year period from 1883 to 1887 and from 1908 to 1912. During this latter period the German Government were interesting themselves in the study and culture of soils furnishing the food that makes it most productive. The yield per acre according to this statement was:

| Crops. | Average annual yield. | | Per acre yield. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1883–1887 | 1908–1912 | 1883–1887 | 1908–1912 |
| | *Tons.* | *Tons.* | *Bushels.* | *Bushels.* |
| Rye | 5,867,800 | 11,012,171 | 15.93 | 28.36 |
| Wheat | 2,585,200 | 3,962,390 | 19.93 | 30.79 |
| Summer barley | 2,232,800 | 3,220,066 | 23.80 | 37.27 |
| Potatoes | 25,459,200 | 44,220,213 | 130.00 | 198.43 |
| Oats | 4,291,000 | 8,189,082 | 31.50 | 52.90 |

We should conserve our fertilizers of all kinds. We are exporting to Europe more than a million tons of limestone a year of the highest grade. For the paltry sum of $5,000,000 we ship abroad every year twice as much as is required for the production of the entire wheat crop of the United States, an amount which, if applied to our own land, would be worth to us and our children not $5,000,000 but $1,000,000,000 for foodstuffs—so says Dr. Hopkins. We should, in taking an invoice of our worn-out lands, think of this most valuable resource and build up our soil as they do in Europe to make it productive, to the end that we can produce the foodstuffs for this Nation.

I insert here a statement of the appropriations made by Congress since 1881 and 1882:

| | |
|---|---|
| Agriculture | $162,803,495.65 |
| Army | 1,726,861,907.26 |
| District of Columbia | 227,160,819.00 |
| Fortifications | 145,333,746.72 |
| Navy | 1,841,984,460.55 |
| Military Academy | 25,816,818.41 |
| Pensions | 4,184,301,783.52 |
| Rivers and harbors | 596,962,790.01 |
| Total of all appropriations made by Congress during this period | 20,479,013,289.16 |

An examination of this statement will show how little assistance the business of agriculture has received from our legislators. Ten times as much for the Army. Ten times as much for the Navy. We have donated more to the District of Columbia than to this great industry.

Again there are a great many things included in this Agricultural bill that do not go direct to the farms in the interest of the farmer. For instance, the appropriation for the Weather Bureau, the inspection of meats, the Forestry Division, and many other like items.

The farmers are not asking for charity. They are only asking the same consideration for their business others receive. They are asking for laws that prohibit interests from wronging them. They are not asking for garden seeds, and would much rather this same money be expended in seeds or stock that would raise the different standards in their section of the country.

All the farmer asks is justice at the hands of this Government, and let me tell you he is a sleeping giant that does not fully recognize his strength, but continued persecution from all points of the compass will awaken him and when once awakened he is bright, intelligent, and capable, and will demand laws that give to him his rightful heritage.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, of all the appropriations that have been before this House this is the first one that my heart has really been in, with the exception of that good bill of old man SHACKLEFORD, which gives the farmers a road in this country over which to haul their produce to market. [Applause.] We come along with the small amount here—I think $22,000,000—and that sounds like a big sum of money, but when you think about this $94,241,000 that the Military Committee brought up, and I had the honor to be on that committee and wanted it to be $30,000,000; when we think of a great sum of $140,000,000 that is brought out for the battleships and the Navy and $200,000,000 for pensions, I think this is a very insignificant sum that we are giving to the backbone of this country—the old farmer—the man that puts us all here and pays us our salaries for staying here. But I am happy to say in this Congress more has been done for the farmer than in any other Congress since I can remember. According to my recollection, the farmers of this country never had any progressive legislation in their favor. But this Congress has come to the front and is enacting legislation that is going to make it worth while for the man on the farm. And when I say "the farmer" I do not mean the man who sits out in the summer time in the shade in a rocking chair reading the history of Greece or Rome. I mean the man that is out behind "Old Bet" saying "gee" and "haw," the man that pulls fodder, the man that takes his cradle and cuts oats, the man that goes out and husks his corn and throws it into a wagon. That is what a

farmer has to do in my country, and he is the man that this Congress is endeavoring to help.

My distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] just made an able speech about the interlocking directorates. We all know that is one of the worst evils this country has. I think that to such an extent that I even voted for the Murdock amendment on the floor of this House. [Applause.] That is how much I think about that proposition. But we have here before us a committee that has brought out what I believe is the most vital part of this whole bill. It has put in $200,000 for the purpose of creating a bureau of markets. The farmer of this country is cheated out of his produce. Do you know that the man that produces vegetables does not get in reality 20 per cent of their value? That is the naked truth. I speak from actual experience. I represent a district in southern Mississippi that produces vegetables to a great extent, and they are shipped all over the United States. The Crystal Springs tomato produced in my district, is quoted in the market as the choicest and highest-priced tomato. We find that the man producing those vegetables can hardly live because of the fact that the transportation and the commission charges are so much that by the time he gets his returns he has hardly enough to pay for his fertilizer, to say nothing about allowing him a reasonable amount for his labor. We must have the bureau of markets enlarged. I introduced a bill in this Congress and went before this distinguished Committee on Agriculture, and I am happy to say that a part of that bill comes out with this bill, but not to the extent that it must come in order that the producers of the farm products will receive the value of their labor.

In my district, not more than two weeks ago, a man shipped to the city of Chicago $36 worth of vegetables. That is what it brought in Chicago. It was worth about $96. He received $36 for it, and the commission merchant's charges and the freight charges amounted to all of it except $1.06.

Mr. OGLESBY. I would like to say to the gentleman, right along that line, that a case came within my experience last summer where a young man from Georgia shipped 1,000 watermelons to New York City. The market there was quoted at $385 a car, and he got back $11.14.

Mr. QUIN. That is a part of the scheme. One reason for it is, gentlemen, that you have so many rascally commission merchants. They send out flaring literature to the farmers of this country saying chickens are so much to-day, eggs are so much, watermelons, beans, cabbage, tomatoes are so much; and when the man gets his stuff to the market they send back the excuse that the market is glutted and that the stuff came in a rotten condition, all of which is a lie. They are skinning the farmer out of his work. Do you think for one minute that the farmers of this Republic are getting value received for their toil? These commission men in the cities have no restraints around them, and when the farmer's produce is handled by them they can handle it to suit themselves and make any returns they please.

I guess there are a great many honest men in that business, but it seems to me that many rascals ply the vocation of "produce commission men." A great many of them are meretricious thieves and robbers, unblushingly stealing from the vegetable farmer the honest value of the produce consigned to him. I maintain it is the duty of this Government to protect the farmers from such outrageous thievery.

If we hammer on it long enough, the farmer will come into his rights. I am going to stand up for him on the floor of this House and everywhere else. [Applause.]

This appropriation for the bureau of extension of markets, as provided for in this bill, whereby the farmers of this country can be protected, will be the best money that this Congress could ever appropriate. If my bureau of market bill is fully enacted into law, it will redound to the benefit of those men who are the wealth producers of this Nation, the men who work in the sun and in the rain, who work by day and night. It is the legislation that will give them the real value of their toil.

Mr. Yoakum said that out of the $13,000,000,000 of farm products produced in this country, $6,000,000 is consumed in transportation charges. Now, when you take in connection with that the amount that the commission merchant gets out of it, what is it that the man who cultivates the soil and produces the crops and ships those products to market gets? He and his family get the privilege of working like thunder by day and by night, and then if he has enough to get a new dress for his wife on Christmas he is lucky indeed. [Applause.]

I believe that Congress can remedy that situation, and I believe this part of the bill which gives the bureau of extension of markets $200,000 will begin to remedy the trouble. And it would be the proper thing for the Government to have in that bureau inspectors to see that the market stuff as it is brought in by the farmer is in good condition, and that it is shipped properly, and inspectors at the other end to see that these commission merchants can not rob the farmer after he has produced his stuff. [Applause.]

The Government can do that and still not be guilty of paternalism. And I want to say that if there is any man in the United States whom the Government ought to be a papa to it ought to be the farmer. [Laughter and applause.] But it seems he is the last man who is looked out for.

This committee has brought a bill in here that is intended to help the farmer. This Congress is carrying on a program that will help him. I believe it will. The farmers of this country are waking up. They know who their friends are, and they are going to keep their friends in Congress, too. [Applause.] I can tell you from my experience with farmers of my district that they know as much about what is going on in this Congress as the lawyer or the doctor knows.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. QUIN. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that the farmers of his district have any idea of the attendance here this afternoon?

Mr. QUIN. Yes. They know there are a lot of men always lagging behind on their business. [Laughter.] They know that; but they know also that the men who are standing up for them on the day this bill comes up for passage are here. They realize that. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. QUIN. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. DIES. Does not my friend from Mississippi think there will be more here when they get ready to vote for the battleships that are paid for by the farmers?

Mr. QUIN. Yes. The gentleman will remember last year that I sat on the floor of this House, on about the 24th day of February, and you could not get standing room around here. Every man was here in his place, and almost everybody was hollering for big battleships. If you want to start a big standing army in this country and put floating palaces on the high seas for a few men with great big fine suits to march around in, you can get the crowd in here always, because the farmer is paying the bills. [Laughter and applause.]

But I want to say to my friend from Texas that the farmers of the country are going to see what is being done with their money. We are putting the saddle on the rich men. Before we put on the income-tax law the people had always been ridden. The battleship men, the special-privilege crowd, and the big standing-army men had been riding the farmer with whip and spur. The farmer bucked, but he could not throw his oppressor. The saddle was pinching him, but the farmer could do nothing but sweat and holler. Now we are putting the bits in the mouths of the plutocrats. We are putting the saddle on them. They are going to buck and snort and stand up on their hind legs; but, thank the Lord, a Daniel has come to judgment. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When they see the extravagance of Congress they will say that a sufficient amount of money is not raised, and then we will increase the income tax. Then we will put an inheritance tax on them. That is the way to get an economical administration in this country.

The rich men control the magazines and the big newspapers. They are the men who never care anything about the expense—graft and extravagance—of government except to whoop up the boys and ride the old farmers. But let me tell you, when the magazines and newspapers carry the news to the rich men in the United States they will be the first men who will holler against a big standing Army, extravagance and waste of public funds. They have never felt the oppressive weight of taxes, because the real taxpayer is the farmer and the laboring man—the toiling masses in this country.

Let us ride with the spurs on the back of Plutocracy. They will be the first men, then, to cry out against these big battleships. They will be the first men to holler against the pensioning of all these 400,000 employees of this Government, too. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to his colleague?

Mr. QUIN. I do.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that those people who pay the least to the Government and get the most from it are the first ones to demand Government protection when they get into trouble? They are not willing to pay the expenses of the Government, but they are always willing to receive the benefits.

Mr. QUIN. Yes; that is their program. They are brought up in that way. The first thing they say when you suggest, "Let us do something for the farmer," is, "That is paternalism"; and yet they are always standing around and wanting the Government to guard them personally. If you take these battleships and soldiers and guard these men, the trust magnates of this country will say you are guarding the interests of the country. The plutocracy ever since the founding of this Government has thought that the Government was organized for its special benefit.

I am constrained to say most of the legislation has been in the interest of the plutocratic class. What does special privilege care about extravagance in government? The invisible government has always pandered to extravagance, because the special interests received what they desired from the hands of the Government, and the people, in the last analysis, paid it all.

Why, out in Colorado right now they have an army of soldiers around a mine oppressing a lot of poor laboring men. They have the same thing up in Michigan. Your committees are investigating that subject, which became a stench in the nostrils of honest people. Those are the men who always holler to us: "We want the Government, with all of its soldiers and all of its battleships, to come and help us." Big business sends out a Macedonian cry, and always gets soldiers at the expense of the people; but whenever you say, "Let us do a little something for the farmers, the wealth producers of this country, the men who are the real soldiers in the actual battle of life, the men who maintain and support the government," these plutocrats say, "Oh, no; this is a waste of money." I want to say that the farmers of the United States are the men who now need the help of this Government. They never ask for special favors. The only thing they want you to do is to keep the other fellows from running their hands down into their pockets and taking the benefit of their toil. That is all they ask for. All they ask for is honest and just laws. If the farmers of the United States can get this bureau of markets properly created, they will then receive the value of their labors.

I want to refer to another thing that, in my judgment, is doing much to keep the farmer out of his own. That is these gambling exchanges in the large cities. In the city of New Orleans there is a cotton exchange. In New York City there is what they call the board of trade. Gentlemen, those are nothing but gambling hells. Instead of following the law of supply and demand, a lot of trained and expert financiers, men who do not toil, neither do they spin, but who are smart and understand the game, are continually manipulating prices. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. I should like to have a little more time.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is making such a splendid speech that I yield to him five minutes more. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. I will tell you. I live in McComb City, a town of about 8,000 people. I started to speculate once, and I had a good friend who told me what a great fortune we could make in the cotton business. I went into partnership with him and put in $200 in his name. The market went up. That was in 1900, a long time ago. The market went up day by day, and I was watching the figures. It went up, and my friend said, "Let us put in some more." I put in more, until I had $500 invested. Do you know, on the 10th day of December of that year the Government sent out a report, and these speculators took advantage of that report and ran the market down from 10 to 7.88 cents a pound and pretended that it was on the Government crop reports? That was my first and my last gambling. The amount that I lost was small, only $500, but it was a large amount for me then and would be a terribly big amount for me now. [Laughter.] And all the men who go into stock speculating or anything of that kind, if they are on the outside of the ring, will go busted. That one thing has busted more honest, upright merchants in the State of Mississippi than the boll weevil and all other pests combined. [Applause.] This Congress ought to make a law to put the farm products and stock gamblers out of business. Then the people of this country who produce the wealth could depend on the law of supply and demand to get the just and real value of their farm products.

The people of America are not asleep. They know that this is true. You can not pick up a newspaper that will not talk about it. Every farmer in the United States knows it is true. A few men who have been riding in the automobile of special privilege will stand up and talk about cotton gambling and farm-produce gambling and the stock exchange as a good thing, and they even find some big city preachers who will talk that way. You know when Christ went into the temple and saw the money changers there engaged in their nefarious operations, he kicked them out bodily, overturned their tables, and ran the money changers out of the temple. I am in favor of the American Congress, the representatives of the people, enacting statutes which will kick the money changers out of the temple and run speculators out of the stock, cotton, and grain exchanges of this country, and let the law of supply and demand produce natural prices under real, economic, just administration of the affairs of this country. Then the farmer can stand up and say, "Lord, I am proud that I live and am able to work." Now they are working for some one else. The people of this country support a great horde of parasites who do not know what it is to do an honest day's work. The people who speculate do not produce any wealth. The man who produces the wealth is always the one who derives the smallest amount of benefit from his labor.

The man who does the real toil of this land is the man that receives the smallest benefit of the law; the man who is the real wage earner of the United States can never expect to be anything but a poor man, and the one-horse farmer of this country can never expect to be anything but poor, unless my bill becomes a law. If he works from daylight to dark, and in the moonlight at night for good measure, and saves everything he makes, he is going to die a poor man, because of the fact that 50 per cent of all he makes is all he can ever get out of it. The transportation companies and the commission merchants and the people who handle his products take the balance, and it resolves itself into such analysis that Mr. Farmer is going to be kept with just enough to start another crop, and most of the time that on credit.

You know what the retailer has to pay for farm produce. Understand me, he is robbed, too. We pay in Washington City 46 cents a dozen for eggs to-day. I do not know what you pay for cabbage. I have a small family and do not eat much, but we pay enormous prices for hen fruit, vegetables, and all farm produce. The farmer is not getting the benefit of it, but somebody is getting too much. The poor retail grocer does not get it. He walks around a part of the time wearing patches on his breeches. [Laughter.] You have the man that produces and the man that retails it with patches on their breeches, while the railroad companies, with enormous bulks of inflated and watered stock, make a good profit on their water as well as on their real stock, and the commission merchant or broker, who works not with his hands but who is an artist at figuring returns of sales, rides in a fine automobile and wears a silk hat and diamonds. [Laughter and applause.]

I will append as a part of my remarks the following bill:

A bill (H. R. 9121) to establish a bureau of markets in the Department of Agriculture.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter there shall be in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the market bureau. The chief of said bureau shall receive a salary of $5,000 a year and the assistant to the chief shall receive a salary of $3,000 a year, both of whom shall be selected and appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The chief of the bureau of markets shall name all special agents, clerks, and other employees that may be necessary to fulfill the duties of such bureau in or out of the District of Columbia, and they shall receive the same compensation as other United States Government clerks doing similar work.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the chief of the bureau of markets to make thorough investigations as to the system of marketing all farm products, especially vegetables, fruits, hogs, poultry, and all diversified products of the farm, cooperative and otherwise, in practice in various sections of the United States and foreign countries. The information and data thus collected shall be distributed to farmers, farmers' unions, farmers' organizations, and societies of consumers throughout the various agricultural sections of the United States, and made available for the use of any individuals or organization, either by the circulation of printed bulletins, letters, circulars, telegrams, or by information given personally by special agents or employees of said bureau. It shall also be the duty of the chief of the bureau of markets to make investigations of the demand for farm products in various trade centers and the current movement of such normal demand and the price thereof, with the view of furnishing information as to the best available markets, which information shall be distributed as above set forth.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the chief of the bureau of markets created under this act, from time to time, and at appropriate intervals, to gather accurate information from the various production areas of the United States upon and relative to the amount of productions of the various fruit and vegetable crops thereof, including the acreage planted therein, and of the various kinds, classes, and varieties thereof, respectively, and the probable dates upon which such crops will become ready for market, and to distribute such information through reports to interested persons, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the bureau of markets to aid in every practicable way the sellers and buyers of such crops and farm products as are mentioned in this act while the same are subjects of interstate commerce, to the end that such buyer shall receive the full amount, quality, and quantity of such crop or commodity shipped, and the seller shall receive the full amount or price, less expense, for which such crops or commodities are bought; and that to this end such bureau

and the agents thereof shall have a right, and it is hereby made their duty, to inspect the quality and quantity of such crops or commodities that leave the hands of the shippers thereof and the quality and quantity of such crops or commodities that come into the hands of the buyers thereof, as well as to ascertain by inspection of the records hereinafter provided for, or by deposition or otherwise, the prices paid for such crops or commodities by the buyers thereof, and to report such information to persons directly interested therein; and further to prosecute persons guilty under this act of infringements hereof.

SEC. 5. That it shall hereafter be the duty of every agency, person, or corporation instrumental in selling, handling for sale, or arranging the sale of any such crops or commodities the subject of interstate commerce on behalf of the shipper, whether before or upon delivery to the first purchaser thereof, in each case of such nature to make a true and correct record in writing, dated and signed by the person entering such record, showing the quantity of such crop or commodity received by such agency, person, or corporation, the date and the time of day at which it was so received, the name of the shipper from whom it was received, the quality and condition of such crop or commodity when so received and when sold, the name and address of the first bona fide buyer thereof, the price paid by such buyer to such agency, person, or corporation to such shipper, and the date of such remittance, the original of which record shall be prepared immediately upon the transaction of the facts and matters therein recorded, and shall be thereafter forthwith transmitted by mail, duly addressed to such shipper, and a duplicate of which record shall be correctly entered by such agency, person, or corporation in a well-bound book or books to be kept for such purpose in the office of such agency, person, or corporation, subject to the inspection of the shipper and the bureau of markets.

SEC. 6. That any person or persons, corporation, or other agency, as well as any agent or employee thereof, who shall omit to send the original record, or to keep the duplicate thereof, or to allow inspection of such duplicate, as above provided, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000 and imprisonment of not less than 12 months or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 7. That any farmer, farmers' union, organization, buying or selling agency that desires telegraphic or telephone information from the bureau of markets shall deposit the actual cost of transmitting such telegraphic or telephonic information with the chief of the bureau of markets.

SEC. 8. That the sum of $—— shall be appropriated out of the funds of the United States Government, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide suitable offices in which said bureau of markets can conduct the business thereof and the chief of the bureau of markets shall make an annual report to Congress, giving in detail the workings, affairs, operations, and expenditures of such bureau.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE].

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an editorial in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the editorial about?

Mr. ROUSE. It is on the Mexican situation, from the Kentucky Post.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent in part one of the great agricultural States of this Union, having a territory from north to south of something over 800 miles, and from east to west of like dimension; a territory so large that if Texas were turned on its north boundary line as an axis the southern extremity of that State would fall across the Great Lakes. It is a State, I may say, wholly agricultural, for our manufacturing interests are quite limited. We have a diversified soil, producing almost every crop known to the civilized world, and, of course, I am intensely interested in any legislation that looks to the advancement and betterment of the great State from which I come.

Our chief product is cotton. We have in the past grown as high as 4,500,000 bales annually. One of the chief matters of interest to our State is the cattle industry, and if I shall direct my remarks to any one item more specifically than to another, it is at this time to the matter of the meat supply of this country.

Mr. Chairman, if we should look to the figures as they are handed to us by the experts of our Government, we find in this question of meat supply one of the great questions that not only confronts us for the future, but it confronts us at this very moment. Our population is growing very rapidly. Probably now the population of the United States will amount to between ninety-six and ninety-eight millions of people. Our foreign immigration runs the population up one million and a half annually. These people that come to us from other shores must to fed, our own people must be fed, and this is essentially a meat-eating people.

The cattle interest has been on the decline. The swine interest has been on the decline, and the sheep interest has been on the decline. In other words, we are not raising meat-producing animals as rapidly as our population is increasing. The rule is that while the population increases, the meat supply declines. What is the cause of it? There are many existing causes. Take the great State of Texas that formerly was chiefly a cattle-producing State. Even within my memory, and I am not an old man, the agricultural section of Texas was in the eastern part of the State, the timber section. The great prairie belt began in the county in which I reside, only about 125 miles from the eastern border of the State, and from that section to the west was an unfenced territory, largely privately owned, and what was not privately owned was State land. The grass that grew was free to the people, and the cattle interest predominated. Great herds of cattle grew from year to year that helped to supply the markets of the world. With free grass, mild winters, it was a great producing section for cattle. That condition has changed within my recollection. My home county that was formerly a cattle county, every foot of it to-day is under fence, and practically every foot of it to-day is bearing agricultural crops, and the cattle interest has been driven from it.

Land is worth from $25 to $200 an acre, and it has been found that it is not a good business proposition to any longer have it in grass to raise cattle, and they have turned it into cotton fields. What is true of that county is true of the great body of Texas, and hence Texas has ceased to produce great herds of cattle that formerly came from that section, and the farming interests have taken it up. That is true also in many of the Western States where they had their great herds. The small and the large farmer have now gone in there with the plow and have displaced the cattle industry, and they are now growing crops of wheat and corn.

This is one of the causes of the shortage of cattle. Mr. Chairman, in this bill there is one item that is inserted of $400,000, for eradication of the southern cattle tick, in which I am extremely interested; and, as I say, any appropriation made that will advance the farming interests of the country should be made, in my judgment, unstintingly by this Congress, because we depend for our food supply upon the farmers of the country. In the Southern States we have our problem in the way of stock raising, as people in other sections of the country have their problems. In the Western States and in the Central States, the great hog-producing States of the country, the hog cholera is a serious problem, and we have grappled with it and have appropriated $500,000 for stamping it out. In the Southern States we are grappling with the proposition of the infestation of what is known as the cattle tick. This Government, through its experts, has found a remedy which when applied, as it is being applied, will help to destroy and drive from us this infestation; but as the cattle interest now is it is a matter of education, something which must be carried to the farmer, and the separate States of the Union have not been able to cope with it as they should, although most of them have made appropriations looking to the extermination of the cattle tick.

As I say, great herds of cattle have been displaced, and now, in a large measure, the cattle supply comes not from the great ranches but from the individual farms, where each farmer has from 1 to 20 cows, and the infestation of the cattle tick is a serious item with him. But we are answered on the floor of the House, as in former Congresses we were answered, that the Government, having discovered the remedy it ought not go any further in appropriations to help carry this knowledge to the individual farmer, but that it should step back and leave it to the States to cope with. Under certain conditions this principle might be wise, but in the cattle-growing sections of the country it will not avail anything. The dipping vat, with a certain mixture, has been discovered, and the herd is driven through it, and in that way the tick is destroyed. The large ranchmen of the country have provided their individual dipping vats at a cost of from $500 to $800, but how about the farmer on the 160 acres of land who has but a few head of cattle—5, 10, 20, or 30, as the case may be? He is not able financially to have his individual dipping vat. In fact, many of them have not yet this knowledge brought to their doors, and in order to reach the individual farmer who is a small cattle grower, it is absolutely important that this work be kept up; and why is it a national question? Because the Nation, first, needs the products of the farm, and, second, the Nation has seen fit by its laws to draw a dead line about the States that have this infestation and say to the cattle grower, you can not ship from the infested district to the markets of other States. That quarantine line is a dead line to our people; and since the Government exercises this power of prohibiting our cattle from entering the commerce of the world, then can the Government say, or can any man on the floor of this House say, that it is not a national problem to help further free ourselves of the infestation of this cattle tick?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. Is it not a fact that the dead line to which the gentleman refers is costing from $4 to $6 a head on every head of cattle that is shipped above it?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That is true.

Mr. LEVER. That was the testimony before the committee?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I feel deeply interested in this particular branch of agricultural legislation, because at this very session of Congress there was an effort made to prohibit cattle from the Southern States being shipped across the quarantine line for immediate slaughter. Under the act of 1884 it was provided that, although we were an infested district, as all of the Southern States were, yet we could ship our cattle to the foreign markets—that is, the markets of other States—provided that they were shipped for the purpose of immediate slaughter.

There was an effort at this session of Congress to have inserted in this bill a provision repealing that act in so far as it permitted the Southern States to exercise the privilege of shipping their cattle for immediate slaughter. I want to show, Mr. Chairman, that had this matter been consummated as it was attempted in the beginning it would have absolutely destroyed the cattle interests of Texas and every other Southern State. In Texas we have one great market for our cattle, and that is the Fort Worth market. In that market we have the same great packers that operate throughout the United States and foreign countries. It does seem to a man who is not on the inside working of these great meat-packing interests that the Texas cattle dealer ought, at least, to get as much in the market of Fort Worth for his cattle plus the freight that is necessary to bring it from Texas to St. Louis as he could get in St. Louis. That is not true; but the cattlemen of Texas, with their choice cattle, all ship to St. Louis and Kansas City, and hence all that choice foodstuff goes from the Fort Worth market because they will not bring the price in Fort Worth markets, although the same packing houses operate in Fort Worth, Tex., as at St. Louis and Kansas City.

Now, had this attempted effort been carried out to prohibit the people from shipping from Texas cattle across this quarantine line for immediate slaughter, what would have been the result on the cattle industry of Texas? It would be holding these people to one market, and that market is at Fort Worth. That means that we would have been at the mercy of the people who own these packing plants in Fort Worth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I would like to have about five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I want to produce some figures on the proposition. The census of 1910 showed, and these are important figures, that in Texas during that year we had 7,133,400 head of cattle. Not one hoof of this great amount of cattle could have ever gotten out of the State of Texas into the market except through the Fort Worth market. In Oklahoma, below the quarantine line, they had 2,026,540 head of cattle; in Alabama they had 1,007,125 head of cattle; in Arkansas, all below the quarantine line, they had 1,091,733 head of cattle; in Louisiana they had 862,695 head of cattle; and in Mississippi they had 1,084,788 head of cattle. Mr. Chairman, had that effort succeeded these cattle would have depreciated in value not less than from $5 to $10 per head the very moment that they got the act of 1884 repealed.

Mr. DIES. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DIES. If that provision had been made, not only would the cattle in the States mentioned by my colleague have depreciated in value but the meat supply for the balance of the Nation would have appreciated in value very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Surely. It put us at the mercy of these great packers, who have already grown too abundantly rich off the cattle growers of this country.

Mr. KETTNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will.

Mr. KETTNER. Is it not a fact that cattle are shipped from Mexico into certain parts of Texas?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. It is.

Mr. KETTNER. Is it not a fact also that the reason for this opposition coming up was because those cattle were shipped from Mexico into Texas and it was the only State in the Union that under the law was permitted to have cattle shipped from Mexico?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman means the effort to repeal this law?

Mr. KETTNER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I think not, sir. If they had singled out simply the State of Texas, they would have written into the law that it should apply to Texas alone and not to these other Southern States below the line.

Mr. KETTNER. The reason I make the statement is, I live 17 miles from the line of Mexico, where they have thousands of head of cattle that we can not make use of, because under the law we can not send them across the line into the city of San Diego.

Under the law as it stands now the cattle have to be dipped and then held 60 days. The cattle can be fat and in good shape, but in order to bring them up and dip them you would have to feed them two months in some other section, take them perhaps 200 miles and feed them, before you could bring them into southern California.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman is correct about that. As to the proposition of dipping a steer, you might as well knock him in the head for the time being as far as the owner of the fat steer is concerned. I am interested in this item in this bill not only because of the cattle industry of my State, but because of the effect it has on the general meat supply over the whole country. When you put it so that the cattle grower can not get a profit out of the cattle he raises we are going to stop growing the cattle, and we will be in a worse fix than ever as to the meat supply. I am glad to know that the Secretary of Agriculture withdrew his recommendation for the repeal of the act of 1884, and I am indeed glad that personally I was in a position on the Committee on Agriculture to forestall this effort to repeal said act by making a point of order against it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have some interesting data here, prepared by Judge Sam H. Cowan, the representative of the cattlemen of the United States, relative to the eradication of the cattle tick, two or three pages of it, and I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD so as to insert this data.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including the data referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I append as a part of my remarks the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 5, 1914.*

To the Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER,
*Chairman of Committee on Agriculture,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: As the representative of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas and of the American National Live Stock Association, and by direction of those associations, I hereby submit to your committee the protest of those organizations, who represent the cattle raisers not only south of the quarantine line but those engaged in the business of feeding, raising, buying, and selling cattle to points north of the quarantine line, against the proposal which we understand has been made by the Agricultural Department to repeal the act of 1884, which act established the Bureau of Animal Industry, and which act provided (act of May 29, 1884, ch. 60, sec. 6, 23 Stat. L., p. 32) that:

"Railroads and other carriers are prohibited from transporting between States live stock affected with a contagious, infectious, or communicable disease, and all persons are prohibited from delivering animals so infected for transportation or to drive the same, etc., with the following proviso:

"'*Provided*, That the so-called splenetic or Texas fever shall not be considered a contagious, infectious, or communicable disease within the meaning of sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of this act as to cattle being transported by rail to market for slaughter when the same are unloaded in order to be fed and watered in lots on the way thereto.'"

As will be observed, the law excepts Texas or splenetic fever from the regulations governing infectious or contagious diseases among cattle. For 30 years or thereabouts cattle have been shipped from south of the quarantine line to points north for immediate slaughter under regulations of the Bureau of Animal Industry, which regulations require that cars containing such cattle be tagged "southern cattle," and they are unloaded into separate pens, commonly known as quarantine pens, en route, where that is necessary, and at the markets throughout the United States, and no outbreaks of Texas fever have resulted in many years.

Occasionally, in case of the wreck of a train and the escape of cattle therefrom, the near-by native cattle have contracted the Texas fever; but these happenings have been so infrequent as not to merit attention.

The Texas fever is communicated only by means of the cattle tick; that is, not by means of a tick or ticks leaving one animal and going to another, but only by the process of the grown, matured ticks dropping off of the southern cattle, where the female tick has matured its eggs (about 2,000), each very much smaller than a mustard seed, and then hatching out in the sand or soil and crawling on the blades of grass, where cattle passing knocked them off, and thereupon the ticks crawl up the legs of the cattle and attach themselves in the inside of the thighs or along the belly, or around the udder, in case of cows, and after attaching themselves to the thinner skin set up a circulation with the animal, and if the animal is susceptible to the disease a sufficient number of ticks will communicate the Texas fever to cattle north of the line which are not immune from the disease. Once an animal has had the Texas fever (and that applies to all animals south of the line) he is as immune from it as a person who has had the smallpox is immune from a subsequent attack. This explanation is necessary in order to show that the southern cattle are not themselves diseased, but they may carry the means of disseminating the disease, just like horses may do.

The transportation for immediate slaughter under the regulations of the Department of Agriculture—that is, the Bureau of Animal Industry—have been perfectly successful, and no complaint is made by anybody, so far as we know, that any danger of disseminating Texas fever arises from the shipments for immediate slaughter.

The very large proportion of cattle shipped from the great breeding grounds of Texas and Oklahoma, saying nothing of the other States,

which furnishes the beef in all the markets of the United States, comes from south of the quarantine line, and has been for 30 years successfully shipped under the provisions of the act of 1884 and the regulations provided for unloading en route.

It caused astonishment to the cattle raisers and shippers and those who buy these cattle at the markets to find that a recommendation had been made to repeal this law. No opportunity had been offered or has been offered to stock raisers or to those who purchase these cattle for slaughter to be heard on the subject. I am safe in saying that all of them universally protest against the proposed repeal of the act of 1884.

As I understand it, the repeal of that act carries with it the proposal that all beef cattle—that is, cattle shipped for immediate slaughter from all territory south of the quarantine line (not merely in Texas and Oklahoma, but from Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida)—could not be moved for interstate slaughter or otherwise unless they should first be dipped in some dip prepared or patented by somebody and recommended by the Bureau of Animal Industry. I assert it as a fact that stockmen can not afford to stand the loss incident to dipping cattle and then ship them to market.

They would therefore be compelled, for business reasons, to ship them only to a slaughtering establishment within the State of origin, trusting to it that the State authorities would not make a ruling which would prohibit such shipments for slaughter within the State.

No one contends that the health of the animal would be benefited by dipping just for shipping for slaughter. No one contends that the meat and meat-food products from the southern cattle would be improved by the dipping process. The only contention which we have heard is that if all southern cattle were required to be dipped before going to an interstate market for sale that the opportunity of those who desire to purchase cattle on such markets for feeders might be beneficial to those who want feeders. This overlooks the fact that a man engaged in the business of producing cattle ought to have the right to choose whether he desires to dip them or not with the view of selling to feeders if the price offered by slaughterers is not satisfactory.

Take the State of Texas as the most prominent example with its 14,500 miles of railroad, we find that about 12,000 miles of the railroads in Texas are situated below the quarantine line. We may fairly figure that there is a station on the average of every 8 miles. We may fairly assume that there are stock pens and shipping facilities where cattle are loaded constantly at two-thirds of these stations. It is impossible for the Government or the State to provide dipping facilities at these stations. So, therefore, a shipper of a carload of cattle (and it may be well said that there are thousands of people who don't ship more than one or two carloads in a year) could not dip them if they desired to do so without driving a long distance to some place where there might be dipping facilities.

The Government now provides supervision for dipping and so does the State of Texas for stock cattle going to northern pastures, but the facilities for dipping are not sufficient to provide them everywhere, and hence they are located in just a few places where the stockmen have sufficient interest in the matter to build the vats and provide the dipping. I am told it costs about $800 to build a proper vat for dipping and preparing facilities therefor. The dip is prepared, heated, and put in the vat, and the cattle are driven through it and made to swim and are immersed in the dip solution, and then walk out on a platform to dry off and drain the dip, so that it runs back into the vat.

From this it will readily occur to any man of ordinary sense that when you have prepared dip enough for a carload of cattle you have sufficient for 20 carloads or more. The process, therefore, of dipping 1 or 2 carloads of cattle would be enormously expensive and practically impossible. The estimate of the minimum expense judged by practical stock raisers is from $4 to $10 per head.

Whatever may be said of the propriety and benefit of dipping, it is a fact shown by actual experience that there is a large death loss resultant. For example, I know of one man who buys fine bulls on the Fort Worth market and carries those bulls north of the quarantine line to his pastures, who always contracts with the seller of the bulls, which are purchased south of the line, guaranteeing them for a period of time, and he tells me that in every case where he has bought bulls which, in order to get to his ranch, have to be dipped, there has been a considerable percentage of death loss attributable only to the effects of dipping.

Nevertheless the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas has used and is using every effort to eradicate the ticks and has been the foremost leaders in the enactment of the law by the Legislature of Texas to that end, and in securing the largest appropriations which can be obtained from the legislature for that purpose. But to prohibit the movement for immediate slaughter without dipping would be the most serious detriment to the cattle business in Texas, Oklahoma, and all points south of the line, and I could not use language which would magnify sufficiently the importance of this statement.

I submit herewith a resolution passed by the American National Live Stock Association at its recent convention in Denver, where there were representatives of the most prominent stock growers and the officers of the State live stock associations from practically every State west of the Mississippi River who represented and spoke for the industry in those States, and they unanimously adopted this resolution without a single dissenting vote after mature consideration by the executive committee of American National Live Stock Association, composed of the most representative stockmen from the entire western stock-raising country.

Resolution adopted at the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the American National Live Stock Association at Denver, January 22, 1914, protesting against proposed repeal of quarantine law of 1884.

Whereas in a bulletin issued by the Agricultural Department of the Government, entitled "Weekly news letter to crop correspondents," of date January 14, 1914, it is stated:

"CONGRESS ASKED TO PROHIBIT MOVEMENT OF TICKY CATTLE BEYOND THE QUARANTINED AREA.

"The Secretary of Agriculture has recommended that Congress repeal the provision in the law of 1884 establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry which permits the shipment of cattle from the Texas fever region by rail to market for slaughter. This law was passed before the nature of the infection and its transmission by ticks were understood. The effect of the change would be to place Texas fever on the same basis as other communicable diseases and to prohibit the interstate movement of tick-infested cattle. Since the eradication of the ticks has been shown to be entirely practicable there is no longer any good reason for allowing the shipment of ticky cattle outside of the quarantined area, especially since this is now attended with danger of reinfecting some of the territory that has been freed of ticks.

"The Secretary's recommendation to Congress was unanimously indorsed by the Southern Cattlemen's Association at its recent convention in Memphis, and also received the approval of the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association at its recent Chicago meeting.

"Under the proposed change in the law cattle could be shipped interstate from the quarantined area only after they had been dipped or otherwise freed of ticks, but when so shipped they would be free from quarantine restrictions on account of Texas fever, and would not have to be sold for immediate slaughter.

"It is believed that this change would be of great advantage in promoting the eradication of the ticks in the South and also in protecting the territory already freed"; and

"Whereas by the act of 1884, which established the Bureau of Animal Industry and quarantine lines dividing the tick-infested area from the area not so infested, it was provided that cattle may be moved from the tick-infested area for immediate slaughter in interstate shipments, and that has been practiced now for 30 years with entire satisfaction to the Bureau of Animal Industry, and, under the various regulations which have been provided to prevent the spread of any infection from such shipments, quarantine pens have been established throughout the United States, in order that persons producing beef cattle or other cattle designed for slaughter may ship the same to any market which they may wish to patronize, and there have been no bad results and no outbreaks of Texas fever resulted from these shipments; millions of cattle have been shipped from year to year to the northern markets from Texas, with not even a suggestion opposing it from the Department of Agriculture, and with no protest from the States through which they moved, and thus the markets of the country have been open to the enormous production of cattle from the tick-infested area, to furnish a supply of beef to the entire trade of the country; and in the various reports of the Bureau of Animal Industry it has been shown, by experiment of the most detailed and painstaking sort, that the meat and meat products from such animals are as wholesome and healthful for consumption as any other beef and meat food products, which fact up to this time has never been questioned and can not now be questioned; and

"Whereas if this law is repealed and the Department of Agriculture shall require that cattle shipped to market be dipped, in order to free them from ticks, before they can be sent to market beyond the State in which they are produced, a loss of from $4 to $10 per head will result from such dipping, as well as a shrinkage in the weight of such cattle and a deterioration in the quality of the meat itself, with no benefit to anyone as a producer or consumer; and

"Whereas the expense incident to carrying out any such plan would prohibit the shipment to interstate markets, and thus force the shippers of cattle from the tick-infested area to the markets within the State in which such cattle are produced, thereby congesting such markets and giving a monopoly to slaughterers within such State, depriving the producers of the competition of the various markets which they have enjoyed for 30 years; and

"Whereas the Government and no State has provided or can provide the facilities for dipping at the thousands of railway stations at which cattle are shipped in one, two, or three carload lots, often gathered up in small bunches; and

"Whereas when such cattle are shipped to a market within a given State by a shipper who does not have the opportunity to dip such cattle under the regulations of the department, the producer who sells them must sell them either to the slaughterer or to some person who has provided means for dipping the cattle, and thus give to such persons a monopoly in the purchase of such cattle before they can enter interstate commerce, or force the sale of all cattle produced within a given State in the tick-infested area to such slaughtering establishments as may happen to exist within such State; and

"Whereas this would prevent the small stock raisers, who produce a large proportion of the cattle in the tick-infested area, from having a competitive market, thus discriminating against them, practically to the destruction of their business; and

"Whereas the proposition is revolutionary and has never been submitted to the representatives of the large producing live-stock districts south of the quarantine line, and its indorsement, as recited in the bulletin from which the quotation in this resolution is taken, by the so-called Southern Cattlemen's Association is not the indorsement of the producers in Texas and other States west of the Mississippi River, nor was the subject matter which is recited to have been approved by the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association ever made public, or the opportunity for an expression on the subject afforded either to the producers from south of the quarantine line or to the sellers, dealers, slaughterers, and others at the markets patronized by the producers from south of the quarantine line: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association, at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., January 20–22, 1914,* That, in behalf of all live-stock raisers, slaughterers, and others interested, we protest against the repeal of the law of 1884, permitting the shipment of cattle from the tick-infested area to market for immediate slaughter; and in doing so we assert that it is equivalent to a prohibition to ship to interstate markets and destructive of the interests of the live-stock producers in that territory; and we urge upon the Members of Congress to afford an opportunity for those engaged in the business to have fair consideration of the proposed repeal of this law, in order that a business which has been safe, sound, and satisfactory may continue, and that the people engaged in that business shall not be injured by an act of Congress."

The importance of this matter can not be better stated than to show you by the statistics from the Census Bureau, kindly prepared for me, for the purpose of presenting to your committee the number of cattle south of the line, according to the cattle census of 1910, there were:

| | |
|---|---|
| IN TEXAS. | |
| Cattle in quarantined counties | 5,624,466 |
| Cattle released in counties formerly quarantined | 397,080 |
| Cattle in counties not quarantined | 1,101,254 |
| Total cattle in State | 7,133,400 |
| IN OKLAHOMA. | |
| Cattle in quarantined counties | 1,049,590 |
| Cattle released in counties formerly quarantined | 531,602 |
| Cattle in counties not quarantined | 445,508 |
| Total cattle in State | 2,026,540 |
| IN ALABAMA. | |
| Total cattle in State, all in quarantined counties | 1,007,725 |
| IN ARKANSAS. | |
| Cattle released in counties formerly quarantined | 231,797 |
| Cattle in quarantined counties | 859,906 |
| Total cattle in State | 1,091,703 |

| | |
|---|---|
| IN LOUISIANA. | |
| Total cattle in State, all quarantined | 862,695 |
| IN MISSISSIPPI. | |
| Cattle in quarantined counties | 881,227 |
| Cattle released in counties formerly quarantined | 203,561 |
| Total cattle in State | 1,084,788 |

I have not the precise and accurate figures of the total number of cattle marketed during the year 1913 from points south of the line which have been shipped under the regulations of the department made in accordance with the act of 1884; but I will vouch for it that from States west of the Mississippi River and from stations south of the quarantine line there was sent for immediate slaughter to the various markets not less than 2,500,000 head of cattle.

I made the assertion, which I think I can prove by men who have had experience in dipping cattle, that the loss which would occur in the shrinkage and in the expense of dipping, had these cattle been required to be dipped, would amount to $25,000,000, and would benefit nobody one cent. This is because we know that the southern cattle are just as healthful for food before they are dipped as they are afterwards.

The proposition to repeal this law is a grave mistake. It has not received the consideration which such an important matter should receive, and until Congress can give it proper consideration I denominate it an outrage on the public to enact such a law without the most careful deliberation.

It may be that persons who feed cattle desire to have the most extensive opportunity to purchase them for that purpose, but the man who owns them and ships them to market ought to have the right to choose whether he wishes to dip them with a view to selling them for feeders or whether he wants to ship them for immediate slaughter, dismissing the opportunity or chance to sell them for feeders.

The tables incorporated above will show the total number of cattle south of the quarantine line in the States named in the table, from which I have asserted there are marketed in a year at least 2,500,000 head.

They also show in the case of Texas and Oklahoma the number which are north of the line. I should state what will be borne out by Texas Congressmen who represent that part of the country north of the line, that young steers and a great many heifers under the commercial term "spaed" are sold together to northwestern pastures and very few are marketed directly as fat cattle from that part of Texas. Of the nine hundred and odd thousand head of cattle marketed at Fort Worth, or which went from the Fort Worth stockyard last year, only about 50,000 head were natives which came from north of the line. Oklahoma City, Wichita, and other places keep their buyers on the Fort Worth market to purchase cattle for their slaughtering houses for shipment for immediate slaughter. These cattle come from south of the quarantine line, which is the great source of supply.

We appeal to your committee on the merits of this case not to repeal the act of 1884. It could do nobody any good and would do everybody north and south of the line and the public infinite harm.

Very respectfully, yours,

S. H. COWAN.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how much of the last five minutes did the gentleman consume?

The CHAIRMAN. He consumed all of it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, agriculture from the first dawn of our civilization has been man's chief industry, and in my childhood fancy, in reading of the vast multitudes of the workingmen of ancient times and the armies of the Philistines, Pharaoh and his hosts, and even of the Cæsars, Hannibal, and the great chieftain, Napoleon, I have wondered how their support was provided.

To-day we are confronted with the great problem concerning the support of our own population. To-day we are not lacking in inventive genius, and we have the most advanced machinery of any nation on the globe, still the question of how to increase the production of the farm and make farming more profitable and more attractive is our most vital national question.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration and purport of the pending bill I am in most hearty accord. It purports to appropriate for the benefit of agriculture $18,947,000 out of the Treasury of the United States; and I here insert the table taken from the report of the Committee on Agriculture, showing the various expenditures, the amount allotted to each department, and what the money is to be used for.

*Appropriations, 1915 United States Department of Agriculture.*
(Reported by House committee.)

| Bureau or office: | |
|---|---|
| Office of the Secretary | $320,830 |
| Weather Bureau | 1,668,270 |
| Bureau of Animal Industry | 2,245,026 |
| Bureau of Plant Industry | 3,053,975 |
| Forest Service | 5,543,256 |
| Bureau of Chemistry | 1,076,481 |
| Bureau of Soils | 359,235 |
| Bureau of Entomology | 792,560 |
| Bureau of Biological Survey | 220,090 |
| Division of Accounts and Disbursements | 61,320 |
| Division of Publications | 189,240 |
| Bureau of Agricultural Forecasts | 274,180 |
| Library | 45,360 |
| Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture | 106,000 |
| Rent in the District of Columbia | 108,329 |
| Office of Experiment Stations | 1,601,020 |
| Office of Public Roads | 353,060 |
| Total Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work | 18,327,232 |
| Miscellaneous appropriations: | |
| Enforcement of insecticide act | $95,000 |
| Fighting forest fires in emergency | 100,000 |
| Enforcement of plant quarantine act | 50,000 |
| Office of Markets | 200,000 |
| Demonstrations on reclamation projects | 25,000 |
| Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams | 100,000 |
| Live-stock production in cane-sugar and cotton districts | 50,000 |
| Grand total, Department of Agriculture | 18,947,232 |

While this seems like a large sum in comparison with other appropriations made for the general welfare, it is rather insignificant, and the more so when the overhead charges for carrying out the provisions of this bill are eliminated. As stated by the chairman, it would leave approximately but $9,000,000 to be used for the direct purpose of agriculture, much of which will be consumed in places and localities and for purposes rather local, but none the less a benefit to all the people.

The rivers and harbors bill carried appropriations of $262,000,000 in the last six years; there was appropriated for the Army and Navy this year the sum of $149,000,000; highways this year have received an appropriation of $25,000,000; and $35,000,000 have been appropriated for the construction of an Alaskan railway. The expenses of the Panama Canal are consuming millions.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

In the short time allotted to me I am convinced that agriculture or farming has not kept pace with other industries, and although it furnishes more employment to a greater number of people, and more people are engaged in farming than in any other occupation, it furnishes less emolument and less money for the work done than any other trade.

OUR INDUSTRIES.

The three leading enterprises which form the basis of our prosperity are agriculture, commerce, and manufacture. The total wealth of the Nation, we are told, is $130,000,000,000, of which $40,000,000,000 is represented by agriculture, $18,428,000,000 are invested in manufacture, and $15,895,000,000 are invested in railroads.

EMPLOYMENT.

There are engaged in agriculture 35,000,000 people, less than 8,000,000 in manufacturing, and 1,665,000 employed by the railroads.

The value of the products of the farm is estimated at $9,000,000,000, and manufactured products at $20,672,000.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

The total foreign trade of Argentina in 1909, with a population of 6,800,000 people, was $675,000,000. This is more than the foreign trade of China, with a population of 450,000,000, or Japan, with a population of 50,000,000 of people, and out of this great foreign trade of Argentina only $56,000,000 was with the United States.

BRAZIL.

Brazil furnishes a good illustration of free commerce. In 1909 the United States purchased coffee and other products of Brazil amounting to $108,000,000 and sold to Brazil less than $21,000,000.

CUBA.

The foreign trade in Cuba in 1909 amounted to $204,000,000, but the trade with the United States amounted to only $30,000,000.

CHILE.

The total foreign trade or commerce of Chile in 1909 was $204,000,000, and only $30,000,000 with the United States.

SCIENCE OF FARMING.

That farming is a complete science is shown by some of the topics covered by this bill, viz:

Investigation and control of plant diseases.
Physiology of crop plants.
Soil bacteriology and plant nutrition.
Acclimatization and adaption of crops.
Technological and fiber-plant investigation.
Handling and standardizing cotton.
Handling and transportation of grain.
Testing commercial seed.
Investigation and improvement of cereals.
Study and improvement of corn.
Sugar-beet investigation.
To investigate and encourage farm management, farm practice, and demonstration work.
Corn production on dry land.
Improvement of fruit growing and handling and shipping.
Producing and shipping and garden truck.
Entomology and insect life.
Chemistry.

Types, composition, and chemical properties of soil.
Biological surveys.

All of which subjects are treated scientifically and are of the utmost importance to agriculture and farming. By the investigation of these subjects we are told when to plow, how to plant, how to cultivate, and how to harvest. By the science of chemistry we are told of the properties of the various plants and products and by the analysis we are told how oats require 500 pounds of water per pound of dry matter, clover about the same, and corn nearly 300 pounds of water to each pound of corn; and, although the net average of the farmers of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, four of our best farming States, was less than 3½ per cent on their investment, we are told that he is getting rich by metes and bounds, and that he is a most valuable citizen; that he should rise early in the morning; he is also told when to retire at night, "that all he has to do when spring comes is to fight the weeds of all kinds and classes, named and unnamed, whether they are annual, biennial, or triennial; his corn field may be clean one day and full of weeds the next; he is to fight rusts, smut, and bugs, hoppers, weevils, ticks, and vermin," and cholera, which infests his herd of hogs, coming in for its share, with an appropriation of $500,000. Of course, it is not yet known where cholera comes from or exactly what causes it, and to discover and eradicate this fatal malady is laudable.

SCIENCE.

One horde saps the juice and bud suckers follow in the trail of the lively English sparrow until he must not only be the harvester but a born prophet. The cutworm, squirrel, gopher, red ant, and animal parasite is his constant companion, and when the storm lays low the golden corn which measures his toil and has ripened in the torrid sunshine he must have the patience of Job, tell his city cousins that he will do better next time, and go on raising his products for the next falling market.

If he organizes to follow the pattern set by other great industries he is threatened with injunction laws, and the plaint is made that the Sherman anti-trust law should reach out and extend its benign protection to the cooperating organizations of the farmer; for him has the old New England day of Thanksgiving been preserved, and this of all days is the one he is supposed to celebrate.

BUT THE FARMER SHOULD NOT BE DISCOURAGED.

The farmer should not be discouraged because recently we have opened the doors of our American market and admitted free of duty the agricultural products of the world. Recognizing that this done him a great injustice; the implements he purchases and did purchase made in his own market by American labor are furnished to him duty free, and the duties on his commodities have been reduced all along the line.

He even buys his sugar now tariff ridden. This has destroyed one of his most profitable products—the sugar beet and the cane; but will it not please the ultimate consumer to buy his sugar at the same old price, manufactured by the National and Federal Sugar Trust, now running at full blast night and day, after a shutdown of many months waiting for the tariff law on sugar to take effect? The ultimate consumer has our most earnest consideration. He rides the highways in his automobile, while the farmer is picking off potato bugs, spraying his orchard, or cultivating his crops, so that the consumer can get his produce cheaper. The consumer who cuts his coupons wants his breadstuffs, his clothing, and his fuel cheap, and of the great wealth piled up by farming we have yet to learn that among the list of millionaires and multimillionaires of our country they acquired their wealth by following the plow.

Can anyone produce a list of farmers whose yearly income compares with the income of these citizens:

| | |
|---|---|
| John D. Rockefeller | $100,000,000 |
| Andrew Carnegie | 15,000,000 |
| William Rockefeller | 13,000,000 |
| George F. Baker | 5,000,000 |
| William A. Clark | 4,000,000 |
| J. P. Morgan estate | 7,500,000 |
| Mrs. E. H. Harriman | 3,400,000 |
| Mrs. Russell Sage | 3,200,000 |
| W. K. Vanderbilt | 2,500,000 |
| Vincent Astor | 3,700,000 |
| Jay Gould estate | 3,700,000 |
| Mrs. Hetty Green | 3,000,000 |
| W. H. Moore | 2,500,000 |
| Arthur C. James | 2,500,000 |
| Robert Goelet estate | 3,000,000 |
| Thomas F. Ryan | 2,500,000 |

To him who thinks that farming is a snap I recommend a trial; he may make some discoveries of value to him. Of course following a furrow in loose dirt all day may make him foot weary; it is quite different from walking on the pavements. He may run into a little sour, cold clay which sticks to his feet and resists all known methods of cultivation in wet weather. If he works like a galley slave, he may keep his head above water. He will get to the field before 9 o'clock in the morning; he will do his work standing, and have no use for Turkish baths to open the pores of his body. After his day's work in the field there will be plenty to do before retiring.

HOG CHOLERA.

As a benefit to the farmer, there has been appropriated $500,000 to aid him in eradicating hog cholera from his droves of swine, a most worthy and laudable appropriation.

We see by the above appropriation hundreds of thousands of dollars are appropriated for farm extension work and farm demonstration work, for all of which the farmer takes off his hat to this body.

The field of credit to the manufacturer has been extended to the banks under the new regional reserve association where he can have discounted his trade bills for carrying on his manufacturing industry. This meets with the approval of the country and there is no one who does not want to see manufacturing prosper.

FARMERS WANT ONLY EQUAL SHOW.

Is the farmer getting a fair show by the legislation and laws that are being enacted? To me there are some inconsistencies which ought to be apparent to any fair-minded man. I for one do not think it is just to the American farmer to permit the farm productions of the world to be admitted into our country and into his market free of duty when that country from which they are shipped charges the farmer a duty for his products when he exports them into it. This was the great injustice and inequality in the Canadian reciprocity act. To me it appears like an injustice; it is not Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, Lincolnian, nor American. We are an independent Nation of people. Our market consumes 95 per cent of our home products, and is admitted to be the best market in the world; and why the bars should be laid down to the foreign produce of the world and various duties reaching as high as 100 per cent retained on the manufactured products is another discrimination.

I am glad that Canada knocked out the reciprocity treaty, and I am opposed to allowing other countries favors not given to our own people. A very good illustration of this kind of legislation was shown recently in the House when it voted for another Canadian reciprocity treaty, which permitted Canadians to fish in Sturgeon Bay with a fine-tooth comb while we were to fish with the meshes of a wire fence in our waters.

It seems to me that we should do more legislation for our own country and not so much for other countries. There was not a foreign country on earth but what rejoiced at the passage of the Underwood free-trade bill. Why was this? There has been no answer made satisfactory to me, except that it gave other countries our markets for farm products free. It is stated that citrous fruits are shipped from Europe and sold in New York market for less than the freight from California to New York and that it has demoralized and worked injury to the fruit growers of the West.

INCONSISTENCIES.

We pass laws excluding the Chinese and the Japanese, but we admit their farm products free into our markets. This was the crying need of better immigration laws, and against which principle the recent bill was passed. Of course, one might say that they are not injured by farm products coming from China or Japan; and while no country on earth has better artisans of the soil or can apply intelligent industry superior to the American farmer, I wish to include in my remarks a sample of the Chinese importation taken from the Grand Rapids Herald of February 21, 1914.

EGGS IMPORTED FROM CHINA ARE SOLD IN ST. LOUIS.

ST. LOUIS, *February 23.*

Thirty-six thousand eggs arrived in St. Louis from China to-day. They were received by a local commission dealer, who said he could sell the eggs to retailers at 20 cents a dozen and still make a profit. Eggs for the last week have been quoted here around 26 cents.

From the Washington Times of February 26, 1914, the following statement:

TO INVESTIGATE EDIBILITY OF CHINESE EGGS 50 YEARS OLD.

PHILADELPHIA, *February 26.*

Eggs which are possibly half a century old will be the subject of a special investigation here to-day by Pure Food Commissioner Faust and other Government experts. Since the tariff was removed, in October, tremendous shipments, totaling 300,000 pounds, have been received from the Far East, particularly China and Korea, where they are known to preserve eggs for as long as fourscore years. Large consignments have been shipped west also.

I have heard of embalmed meat, but this is my first introduction to mummified eggs.

Now, I am opposed to the importation of these "mummified" eggs, and I am in favor of keeping them within that Chinese wall.

The good housewife of the American farmer who gets the only money she sees from the butter and eggs will not be especially pleased at the depletion of her market.

I now wish to introduce as a part of my remarks something about the American potato, and as I am an Irishman I may be a little partial to the American potato.

Taken from a farm journal:

VALUE OF POTATO CROP.

The potato crop of the United States in 1913 had a farm value of $228,000,000, according to statistics made public early this week by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. With the exception of 1911, this was larger than for any earlier year. The statistics show, that the largest importation of potatoes in any single year occurred in the fiscal year 1912, when the total quantity imported was 13,750,000 bushels.

Prior to the passage of the free-trade Underwood bill the duty on potatoes was 25 cents per bushel, and the above potatoes paid a duty of $3,430,000.

The importation of potatoes may not injure the American farmer. It is a great crop in Michigan, New York, Maine, and Wisconsin, and in November, 1913, more than 750,000 bushels were imported into the United States.

Corn is the greatest American farm product. Last year we raised 2,500,000,000 bushels in the United States. There is now at this time being unloaded in American ports 10,000,000 bushels of corn from the Argentine Republic. It is admitted that this will at least steady the American market. I believe it will depress the farmers' market for his corn and will reduce the market price of his cereals. Anyway, I do not see how the American farmer is to compete with the farmers of the world in his own market and expect to pay his farm help American wages.

I believe, further, that the time will come when this will be a social question, and under free trade the people will see that the condition of the American farmer and the American laboring man must be drawn to a closer level with the laboring man and farmer of other countries if we are to compete with them in the market.

Some say that they pay as much now for their meat, their corn, potatoes, apples, butter, and eggs as they did before the tariff was removed; but let me say that if the removal of the tariff does not cheapen the price of farm products and bring down the cost of living, then it is a failure.

The price of farm products can not be affected immediately; but sooner or later, as sure as the bill remains in existence, it will have its effect ultimately to reduce the price paid to the farmer.

The high cost of living was the slogan of a great party during the last election. It brought into existence the free-trade Underwood tariff bill. I only ask whether any consumer gets his bread for less, his potatoes for less, his groceries for less, or his clothing for less than he paid before the act was passed? It is plain he does not. Although, if foreign importations continue and we procure our meat supply and food supply from foreign countries, we are certainly brought into absolute competition with them, and the price to the American farmer for his products must go down.

The working of the tariff may be noticed by the American farmer when he takes his wool to market next spring, and sells it for 12 to 15 cents a pound, instead of 18 to 25 cents, as formerly.

The transportation on corn from Argentine Republic to New York is 3 or 4 cents, while the railway freight from Iowa to New York is about 10 or 12 cents per bushel; so that the farmer is not only at a disadvantage in the cost of his production, but he pays more than twice as much for his transportation to the New York market than the Argentinian. Argentina exported last year 200,000,000 bushels of corn. There was raised in the United States last year 2,447,000,000 bushels, nearly all of which was sold and consumed in the American market. The total importation from Argentina of corn during the months of November, December, and January just past was approximately 12,000,000 bushels at the different Atlantic and Gulf coast ports for distribution throughout the eastern market, and if it was not for the importation of Argentina's corn the visible amount of corn in this country would be that much less. The Argentinian harvests his corn from May until July in a mild climate, without chances of frosts or wet weather, and can raise it at an expense much cheaper than the American farmer.

WAGES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

I notice from Wallace's Farmer of February 27 and from an article on farming in the Far East that there was exported from the Philippines agricultural products to the amount of $140,000,000 in the year 1913. In Japan there are millions of acres of rice land. The exports from Japan was much of this product. The American rice farmer has a protection of 1 cent a pound on his rice, while the American farmers' wheat is free from every country admitting our cereals free, and keeping a duty on rice while having free trade for wheat is discrimination.

INCONSISTENCIES.

It can not be very consoling to California to exclude the Chinese and Japanese and let in the products of their labor duty free.

WAGES AND POPULATION.

If free trade is good for the farmer, why not extend it to other industries? Why would it not be good for them? The avowed purpose of the Underwood free-trade bill is to cheapen products and reduce the high cost of living. If free trade will not reduce the article, then it is a failure. The very purpose of free trade is to reduce the price of the article. It will not only reduce the price of the product, but destroy the home market.

Can anyone tell how an article can be manufactured in a foreign country and shipped into the United States and furnish a day's labor to any laboring man here? And what is true of manufactured articles applies to farm products. If the farm products were raised in foreign countries and sold in our home markets, the farmer loses just that much and the country loses the money paid out.

My friends, the American farmer is a superior artisan, the best workman in the world; but look what he must compete against—half-fed, half-starved, half-housed, half-clothed laborers of Japan, China, southern Italy, and many other foreign countries, where workmen receive from 17 cents to $4 a week, while the farm hands of America are well paid and well fed. I, for one, am opposed to reducing our American farmers and farm help to foreign conditions. In Japan the population is dense. In some places 2,000 to the square mile, and some fields have been cultivated for centuries by keeping up the soil.

In passing the free-trade bill we were told that prices were soaring mountain high, that people were all flocking to the cities, and that the American farmers could not produce enough to feed the people. Well, I fail to see that foreign farm productions sold upon our home market will better the farmers' condition or give them better prices. Foreign farm products on our home markets will not tend to send the town people back to the farm.

In the passage of the Underwood tariff bill we have been most kind to foreign countries. Prior to the passage of this bill the country was most prosperous; immediately thereafter the depression set in. Then we were told that the tariff needed a better banking system to help it out. We were also told on the floor of the House that as soon as the banking and currency bill was passed on that very day a flood of prosperity would sweep over the land. What has followed? Thousands of idle workmen are found in each of our great cities, and millions of our people are without employment in the country. Farming is without monopoly or trusts. If the tariff is based on healthy competition, we certainly have healthy competition in farming; every farmer in the land is a competitor with every other farmer and did not need the "injustice" of free trade to improve his condition.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill because it contributes to the welfare of agriculture, but I am much opposed to the American farmer being placed on equality with the farmers of foreign countries where farm products are raised by pauper labor and the condition of the workingman is abject poverty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING THURSDAY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow—Wednesday—it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Thursday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 4, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Mich., with a view to determining whether additional works are necessary or desirable to maintain the channel of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 808); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending that the following provision in the Army appropriation act, approved March 31, 1911, be repealed: "The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to release to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a strip of land not exceeding 23 feet in width on the north line of the Fort Marion Reservation for the purpose of restoring the street formerly known as Clinch Street, extending from San Marco Avenue on the western boundary of said reservation to the Matanzas River" (H. Doc. No. 809); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13496) granting a pension to Charles J. Rosenecker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13790) granting a pension to Peter Reno; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13970) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. York; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13748) granting a pension to Warren E. Beam; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10343) granting a pension to Louis Hoffman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 14154) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers and reserving the public lands for that purpose; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14155) to amend an act of Congress approved March 28, 1900 (Stat. L., p. 52), entitled "An act granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing an experiment station of the Kansas State Agricultural College, and a western branch of the State Normal School thereon, and for a public park"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 14156) to provide for voluntary admissions to the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 14157) to require all cotton exchanges in the United States doing an interstate or foreign business or both to keep a record of all sales made, and to require the buyer of cotton on such exchange to specify the grade he is to receive, and the seller of cotton on such exchange to deliver the grades so specified by the buyer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14158) to appoint a committee to inquire into the advisability of changing the date of the inauguration of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14159) granting an increase of pension to James K. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14160) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Logsdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 14161) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Oliverson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 14162) for the relief of Samuel H. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14163) granting a pension to Lydia B. Lanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 14164) for the relief of James T. Barker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 14165) granting an increase of pension to James T. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14166) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14167) for the relief of Emily J. Byrd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14168) granting an increase of pension to George O. Steadman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 14169) granting a pension to Carrie E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 14170) for the relief of certain officers of the Confederate States Army in the War between the States; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14171) granting an increase of pension to D. J. Doughty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14172) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14173) for the relief of William J. Rosselot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14174) granting a pension to Johanna Niehaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14175) granting an increase of pension to John R. Vickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14176) granting an increase of pension to Willis G. Craddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14177) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stasel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 14178) for the relief of Horatio N. Thomson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14179) granting a pension to Edgar A. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14180) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Shirey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 14181) granting a pension to Jennie Adel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 14182) for the relief of Flora E. Campbell Sudduth, administratrix of the estate of Walter L. Campbell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 14183) granting a pension to Frank E. Saxon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 14184) for the relief of Hamilton Perryman and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 14185) granting an increase of pension to George Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 14186) granting a pension to Hattie Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14187) granting a pension to Lucy B. Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 14188) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Pace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of S. M. Huddleson, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the Johnson-Prouty amendment to the George taxation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens and organizations, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of William Graham and 234 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against charging concerns for use of private switch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the George F. Ottoe Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, regarding proposed change pertaining to articles sold at a uniform price; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Resolution and petitions signed by J. V. Shiffer, president, and other members of the German-American Alliance; also by other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 14099) for the relief of Eliza M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Memorial of the Altoona (Pa.) Ministerial Association, protesting against the clause in House bill 12928 relative to compensatory time clause applicable to post-office clerks, carriers, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of sundry citizens of the nineteenth ward of Pittsburgh, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Stock Exchange, against Senate bill 3895, relative to the use of mails in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of the San Francisco Labor Council, approving action of the Government in bringing about the dissolution of the Central Pacific and Southern Pacific Railroad Cos.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, favoring the rural farm credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of Fred S. Swanson and others, of South Dakota, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Watertown, S. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Port Washington, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of various banks, bankers, and trust companies of Vicksburg, Miss., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Francis B. White and others of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Hause A. King, T. F. Whitfield, Thomas McCormick, Adolph Roth, Henry Rissler, Edwin Kroening, Julius Breslauer, John O. Erickson, Harry Breslauer, Max Breslauer, H. W. Schnetzky, H. C. Eisendrath, all citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50 or any other prohibition measures which interfere with the rights of American citizens and a usurpation by the Federal Government of a domestic question belonging to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: Petition of various bankers of Iowa, favoring amendment of income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX: Petition of Ned Krew, of Dubois County, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Marcus D. Russell Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, favoring Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dade County, Mo., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Danbury, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Automatic Machine Co., favoring passage of House bill 16457, against steam trawlers; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the George Washington Branch of American Continental League, of Danbury, protesting against the "One hundred years' peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Petition of Lodge No. 245, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Las Vegas, N. Mex., relative to longevity and overtime pay for organized labor on the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Major How Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, of Haverhill, Mass., against any changes in the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of the Lima Local Union of Bartenders' Association, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOOD: Petitions of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Protest of William Thynne and other residents of the first congressional district of Vermont, against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, proposing a nation-wide prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States or any similar prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Memorial of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to cotton exchanges being placed under the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, protesting against passage of House bill 12928, relative to removing of assistant postmasters from civil-service protection; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the New York State Drainage Association, favoring passage of House bill 8189, relative to flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Steel Rail Co., of New York City, favoring bureau for bill drafting, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Abraham Philips, of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York City, protesting against increase of postage on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Volunteer Retired List Association of Kansas, favoring passage of Senate bill 200, relative to pay for retired volunteer officers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: Petitions of sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of Kentucky, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Battle Ground, Wash., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of various bankers of California, favoring amendment of income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 183, providing for investigation of conditions of trade in China; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., against the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various voters of Jefferson County, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing Government ownership of telephones and telegraph; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring first Monday in October as Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, against requiring assistant postmasters to pass civil-service examination; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of sundry citizens of Hannibal, Mo., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of sundry citizens of Deitz County, Mich., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of sundry citizens of College View, Nebr., protesting against the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petitions of various banks, bankers, and trust companies of the State of New York, favoring change in income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Covington, Jeffersontown, Louisville, and Henderson, all in the State of Kentucky, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Petitions of E. Westfall and other citizens of Carlisle, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the supervisory employees of the Williamsport (Pa.) post office, protesting against the passage of House bill 12928, relative to annulling of the civil-service status of assistant postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of San Antonio, Tex., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Protests of various voters of the second congressional district of Maryland, against House joint resolution 108 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of F. M. Penney, of Utica, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of Camp No. 78, United Spanish War Veterans, of Athens, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for widows' and orphans' pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the People's Banking Co., of McComb, Ohio, in favor of amendment of the income-tax law so as to provide for a method of "information at the source"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of the fourth congressional district of New York, favoring passage of House bill 12740, the machinists' wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the General Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 21, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of House bill 7374, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the State of New York Conservation Commission, relative to increase in appropriation for State of New York for control of forest fires, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of sundry citizens of Gaylord and Waters, Mich., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various bankers of Michigan, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

### WEDNESDAY, *March 4, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art so closely associated with us and hast called us into such intimate relation to Thyself as that Thou art willing to make our will Thy will and our heart Thy heart. Our life may be lived in God. All our activities may be God-centered. In Thy possession of us we find our largest liberty and out of it come our highest hopes and aspirations. As our interests are in Thy hands, Thou dost guide our steps. This day we pray that Thou wilt look upon us in Thy fatherly tenderness and keep us from harm. Help us to perform the duties of the day with an eye single to Thy glory. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

#### EDIE HOOK LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, WASH.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3454) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property, which were, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "and demise"; on page 1, line 5, to strike out "of" where it first occurs; on page 2, line 23, after "times," to insert "and that the said city of Port Angeles shall not sublet any portion of the said property without first having obtained the consent of the Secretary of Commerce and his approval of all the terms and conditions in any such subleases"; and on page 3, line 18, after "Commerce," to insert "In addition to the aforesaid consideration, the said city of Port Angeles shall pay to the Government of the United States such annual rental for the aforesaid property as may be decided upon by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided*, That there shall be a stipulation in the said lease that at the end of every 10 years during the existence thereof the Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revaluation of the leased premises to be made, and that the said Secretary shall thereupon be authorized to determine and fix the annual rental of the premises for the ensuing period of 10 years in accordance with such revaluation."

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### WATER SUPPLY OF BAKER, OREG.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3206) for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon, which were, on page 1, line 12, to strike out "reservoir," and on page 1, line 13, after "the," to insert "rights hereby granted to said city shall cease and the unrestricted."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the amendments of the House of Representatives be concurred in by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF CONVICTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting in further response to a resolution of November 10, 1913, additional data in regard to the employment of convicts in foreign countries, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of Lafayette Branch, American Continental League, of Jersey City, N. J.; of Lincoln Branch, American Continental League, of Providence, R. I.; and of Local Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of that part of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the pay of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Second Presbyterian Church of Columbus, Ohio; of sundry citizens of Reno, Pa.; and of General Canby Post, No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, Brazil, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of De Witt County, Tex.; of the Merchants & Mechanics Bank of San Antonio, Tex.; and of Local Union No. 547, Bartenders' League, of Dallas, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants & Mechanics Bank of San Antonio, Tex., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the income-tax law to provide for a method of information at the source, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBINSON presented the petition of Herb Lewis, editor of the Gravette News Herald, of Arkansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a resolution adopted at the Lutheran Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Synod, indorsing the so-called Burnett immigration bill. I ask that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LUTHERAN MINNESOTA CONFERENCE
OF THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD.
*Cannon Falls, Minn., February 25, 1914.*

Senator A. J. GRONNA,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The Lutheran Minnesota Conference, representing about 100,000 individuals throughout the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakotas, in session assembled February 17–23 in the city of Minneapolis, Minn., passed the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Lutheran Minnesota Conference most heartily indorses the Burnett immigration bill, H. R. 6060, and does

hereby express its wish that it may become a law: And be it furthermore

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota, North and South Dakotas, and that we earnestly request that they do all in their power to the end that this bill may become a law."

Respectfully submitted.

P. A. MATTSON, *President.*
J. P. A. IDSTROM, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of sundry citizens of Courtenay, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of W. W. Perkins Woman's Relief Corps, No. 18, Department of Connecticut, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, of New London, Conn., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of the pending resolution to submit to the States a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the adoption of the pending resolution to submit to the States a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of General Henry M. Duffield Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of survivors of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Port Huron, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Hudson, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vienna, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of Local Union No. 31, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Franklin, N. H., and the memorial of W. E. Wiggin, of Lancaster, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the New Hampshire Peace Society, praying for the establishment of international arbitration, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of the Marshall County Sunday School Association, of Indiana, and a petition of sundry citizens of Jay County, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Davenport, Burlington, Clinton, and Lyons; of Local Union No. 223, Culinary Alliance, of Des Moines; of Local Union No. 518, Bartenders' League, of Fort Dodge; of Local Union No. 150, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Sioux City; of Local Union No. 252, International Association of Machinists, of Cedar Rapids; of Local Union No. 460, Cooks and Waiters, of Waterloo; of Local Union No. 357, Bartenders' League, of Sioux City, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Valera Irwin, of Clarinda, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of Level Green Council, No. 75, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Kenvy, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to nurses who served in the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the Bavarian Benevolent Association, of Covington; of the St. John's Benevolent Society, of Covington; and of sundry citizens of Paducah, all in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the circulation through the mails of the publication known as "The Menace," which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 626, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Wilmington, Del., and a memorial of Local Lodge No. 184, International Association of Machinists, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 588, United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, Steam Fitters' Helpers, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3590) to make the appointment of pay clerks in the United States Navy permanent and to create the grade of chief pay clerk, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 314) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4553) to authorize the appointment of an ambassador to Argentina, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 313) thereon.

## MUSKINGUM RIVER BRIDGES, OHIO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 11331) to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 310) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## PAYMENT UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 312) thereon. As there is a very large demand for copies of the bill and there will also be a large demand for copies of the report I ask unanimous consent that 7,500 extra copies may be printed in document form for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. SMOOT. Of the bill and report?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Of the bill and report, to be printed as one document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). There being no objection, that order will be made. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4682) making additional appropriation for the purchase of a site for a post-office building in the city of Rockingham, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 4683) granting an increase of pension to Mary Reidi (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4684) granting a pension to Georgeanna Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4685) granting a pension to James L. Dawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 4686) for the relief of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4687) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Apperson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 4688) granting an increase of pension to Harrison W. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

COL. GEORGE WASHINGTON GOETHALS.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a joint resolution. I ask that it may be read and then I will move its reference.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) extending the thanks of Congress to Col. George Washington Goethals, United States Army, and authorizing the President of the United States to appoint him a major general in the Army, and for other purposes, was read the first time, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, presented to Col. George Washington Goethals, United States Army, in recognition of his great services as chief engineer and administrator in building the Panama Canal.

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Col. George Washington Goethals a major general in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the number of major generals authorized by law is hereby increased by one for the purposes of this act.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the joint resolution may be read the second time, by unanimous consent, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The joint resolution was read the second time by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which were ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer a resolution which I ask may be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I observe that the chairman of the committee is not in his seat. Therefore I ask that the resolution may lie over until to-morrow under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the resolution will lie over until to-morrow and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 285), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is hereby authorized to employ temporarily a clerk at a salary of $120 per month.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have a copy of the first annual report of the Chief of the Children's Bureau, made to the Secretary of Labor, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913. I ask that the report may be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to its publication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire now to proceed with the argument I was making upon Senate bill 120,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that the bill be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not get very far in my argument upon the grain question yesterday. About all I accomplished was locating the opposition, and really I had not much difficulty in doing that, because I have for a long time felt the power and influence of the great grain exchanges, which are not only powerful in fixing the sentiment in their own sections, but which sentiment necessarily reaches into the Senate. I criticize no one whatever, because one naturally absorbs the influence of his surroundings. I expected to find opposition from those Senators who live in the shadow, or, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] probably would express it, in the effulgence of the glory of the stock exchanges.

I wish now to go on with some of the fundamental principles and then get directly to the testimony. I will boil down what I have to say upon the general proposition.

Since the year 1900 the price of land throughout the Northwest has increased 100 per cent, and if we take the wage price of farm labor for the year 1912 as a basis, farm labor has advanced in value more than 100 per cent. All live stock necessary for the operation of a farm has also increased about 100 per cent during that period. If one were, therefore, to buy a farm and the stock necessary to operate it, it would require an investment of capital nearly double that required in 1900. Interest on the capital invested in land and stock and the cost of labor annually expended constitute three great elements of expense in operating a farm. And with these three factors doubled in the last dozen years, the question of making ends meet, of making enough out of a farm to meet its running expenses and in addition thereto the necessary living for the owner and his family becomes a most serious one, and compels that owner to investigate with profound interest the problem of so marketing his grain as to secure the greatest possible price for it. Under our present system of doing business throughout the country and the world he recognizes if not the necessity at least the firmly rooted practice of a large army of middlemen, who must be supported out of profits which attach to the products after they leave the farmer's hands and before they reach the hands of the consumer. If he scans the situation on its surface appearance, he can not fail to note that these profits have not only been sufficient to support in lavish plenty this great army of middlemen, but has also made more multimillionaires than have been made in any other single line of business. He knows that more than a legitimate profit has been made by the many middlemen engaged in placing his products in the hands of the consumer. He knows also that the value of his products at the point of production is fixed by the demand and consequent value at the point of consumption; that it is the consumptive demand that makes his value; and that, therefore, any excessive profits in the handling of those products must come out of his pockets.

If he proceeds further and delves beneath the surface he will find that while the average buyer and seller conduct their business upon a reasonable margin on each grade bought and sold, another very large class so manipulate the grades, so mix inferior grades, so take advantage of a lack of uniformity in grades, that in addition to the reasonable profit charged for handling each grade they also make from one to two grades on each bushel bought, which gives them an enormous profit, and which enormous profit must necessarily be to the disadvantage of either the producer or the consumer, or both.

Desiring to be fair, the farmer is asking, not that a reasonable profit shall not inure to the middleman who handles his grain, but that the enormous profit above the legitimate be eliminated, to the end that he may receive the full value of his profit and no more, and that the consumer shall be required to pay only the value of his product with just charges for handling.

His investigation will show him that the illegitimate profits are made possible because of inaccurate and irregular inspection and lack of uniformity of inspection. In this bill he therefore is seeking to eliminate the source of all injustices inflicted upon both himself and the consumer.

The evolution in the handling and marketing of the farmer's grain, from the simple barter of a few bushels to the complex system of the present time, when the product is sold by millions of bushels, necessitates laws to guide commercial intercourse in that grain. In the primitive days, when the producer and the miller met face to face and agreed upon a purchase price, there was left no room for complaint or distrust. The

value of the article always depended upon the necessity of the purchaser or the seller. The law of supply and demand worked out approximate justice. There were no combinations to make or break markets, no vast field for the spirit of speculation, no complex conditions in which the expert manipulator alone could operate. But just to the extent that we have advanced from the simple plan into the realm of complexity we have opened up avenues for wrongs and injustices, and in the proportion that the few bushels handled in a single transaction under the old system bears to the millions handled under the present system have those wrongs and injustices increased.

There have been three great steps marking advanced methods in the handling and disposition of grain, which became necessary as the volume of business increased. In the earlier days there were no grades. The miller examined the grain in the farmer's sacks and the two agreed upon the price. The evil of that system was that there was no fixed value of the entire crop of the country. Grain of a certain grade sold at markets within a few miles of each other varied greatly in value.

This was followed as business increased by making contracts upon samples. But here again the sample was ordinarily so small that it was not a fair test of the bulk, and the value again depended upon the demand in a particular small locality.

The next step was a certificate as to the just quality or condition of a particular quantity of grain, signed by the party offering the same for sale. But here again two dealers in practically the same kind of grain might differ materially in their views as to the character and quality of the grain. This was so unsatisfactory that as the volume of the business increased the matter was taken up by trade organizations, and the certificates were issued by officers selected by these bodies. And under this system was born the method of dividing the grain into grades, and this system, though modified and expanded, and in many instances, under the control and direction of bodies authorized by the law of the State in which any great terminal might be situated, is the method adopted to-day in the handling of grain.

Great abuses have been in existence under this system for many years. As early as 1885 the State of Minnesota adopted a plan of having inspection and grading of grain made by State officials appointed by the governor. The evils of this system are somewhat numerous. The grading in all of these centers is controlled by rules either directly promulgated or indirectly established by the interests that deal in the grain—the buying and selling interests. The producer has no voice whatever in the determination of the method by which his product is to be marketed, nor the system of inspection and grading. No two terminals in the country have the same system of grading like grain. The grading is often inaccurate, is very uncertain, and sometimes fraudulently made for the purpose of meeting exigencies in the grain trade. While the producer has a right to appear in case his product is not graded in accordance with what he believes to be correct, the appeal is taken to one who is a part of the same system which made the initial inspection and grading. The fact that many more bushels of the higher grade of grain are sold out of every terminal than are accredited into it shows the injustice of the present system and how it works against the producer. It is a well-known fact among all dealers and producers that in a season of short crop the inspection and grading are liberal; we get good grades—that is what that means—when we have short crops; while in a season of bounteous crops the inspection is generally very rigid; in other words, during those seasons we do not get honest grades, for grain of exactly the same character graded in a year of short crop will grade much higher than the same kind of grain in a year of plenty.

The most prolific source of injustice, both to the producer and ultimate consumer, is that of mixing grains at the terminals. A few bushels of No. 1 northern will be mixed with many bushels of Nos. 2 and 3 and the whole sold as No. 1, thus perpetrating fraud upon both the producer and the consumer.

Ever since the grading system was adopted there has been strenuous complaint over the whole country and a plea made for Federal inspection.

Mr. President, this is not new at all. Away back in 1892, the first Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary Rusk, in his report transmitted November 15, of that year, said:

> Another matter which is the subject of legislation now pending is that of a national standard of grain. There is evidence in the correspondence of this department of a steadily growing feeling in favor of the establishment of such a national standard, which will relieve the grower from the annoyance inseparable from the existence of several standards, varying in the different grain markets of the country. Unquestionably some system of national inspection and grading under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture should be established in the interest of the grain growers, and would be without doubt in a very short time accepted and recognized in all the great market centers of the United States.

Mr. President, that utterance of Jerry Rusk, made as Secretary of Agriculture in 1892, is just as vital, and, indeed, more vital, to-day than it was when he uttered the sentiment. In support of Federal inspection he calls attention to the Federal inspection of meats, as follows:

> As a result of the meat inspection already executed under the direction of this department, we have raised the standard of taste in this matter among consumers themselves; witness the increased price willingly paid not only in our own markets but abroad for meat bearing our certificate of inspection. The second object to be thus accomplished is that which has been already, in a very satisfactory degree, attained, but which must be sedulously maintained—the reputation of our meat products abroad.

What applies to our meat production abroad, as I will show you in this argument, applies with equal force to our grain production. The same year—in 1892—bills were introduced by Senator Sherman and Senator Paddock for Federal classification and grading of grain. Senator Sherman's bill passed the Senate on April 28, 1892, but was lost in the House.

I want to say right here, Mr. President, that Senator Sherman's bill was practically the same bill that we now have under consideration.

In the Fifty-third Congress Senator Casey, of North Dakota, introduced a similar bill for Federal inspection of grain. In the Fifty-seventh Congress, in 1902, I also introduced a bill, practically the same as the one now before the Senate, and I have kept the matter before the Senate since that date.

Mr. President, let us first understand the methods of disposing of wheat and other cereal products. Let us remember that the real market—the market that fixes their value—is not at the local elevator where they are sold, but at the great terminals, such as Minneapolis, Duluth, Chicago, Buffalo, St. Louis, Kansas City, and so forth. Many of our farmers ship direct in carload lots to these terminals. The majority sell to the local elevators. These elevators, for the most part, are what are called line elevators. Hundreds of elevators along the lines of railway throughout the agricultural States are owned and operated by the men who are engaged on a large scale in buying and selling at the great central markets, where they have great elevator capacity for storing and handling.

The country elevator is in charge of an agent. Each morning this agent receives a wire from headquarters informing him what price he shall pay during the day, and often instructing him as to the method of grading, whether he shall be strict or liberal, dependent upon the conditions of the terminal market. This agent is under contract, with security, which holds him responsible in case the quantity in bushels or the grades which he allows to the farmer shall not hold out when the grain is regraded and weighed at the terminals. You can see, Mr. President, that this of itself forces the buyer to resolve every question of doubt against the producer for his self-protection. I have been informed—but this is not verified information—that in some instances the local buyer is given a part interest in the amount of overweight at the cleaning-up periods of the elevators, which of itself would induce him to make it as large as possible. If this is done, I imagine it is the exception and not the rule; and if done, it but accentuates the inclination to be extra careful not to overweigh or overgrade a load of grain.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. REED. I am interested in the statement the Senator has just made. Has the Senator any information of a character that he would regard as sufficiently authentic so that Congress could act upon it?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will not give the name, but I have the statement of a wheat buyer at one of the local elevators, who told me that that was the contract under which he worked. He told this, of course, after he had gone out of the buying business. I would not care to bring his name into the Senate upon that question. As I have stated, this is an unverified statement; that is, it is merely the statement of one man. I have also stated that, if it is true, it is the exception and not the rule.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator, then, whether this informant of his referred to an elevator that was covered by State grain inspection, or was it simply a private elevator?

Mr. McCUMBER. It was an elevator run by one of the great elevator companies, who have what we call "line elevators" scattered throughout the country, and the only inspector and grader is the wheat buyer himself.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; then it would not apply to those cases where there is State grain inspection.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; it would apply just the same. For instance, the case that I mentioned was in my own State, where there is no State inspection, because all of our wheat that is

shipped out is sold in another State, and our inspection, of course, would not amount to anything.

Mr. REED. This particular instance would not apply, then, in any State where there was State inspection?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; it would in the division of the overweight; and the overweight is what I suppose the Senator refers to.

Mr. REED. I do not want to continue to interrupt the Senator, but the Senator mentioned one instance where he had information——

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. REED. And that, it appeared, was with reference to an elevator in his own State, where they do not have State grain inspection.

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. REED. So that that one instance which has come to the Senator's information is with reference to what we would call a noninspected elevator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; but that could happen at the line elevators in States having State inspection, except probably at the terminals.

Mr. REED. It could happen; but the Senator has no information that it has happened?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have no information of that in other States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, that is a question I desired to ask, whether the Senator from North Dakota knows of any case, or has reason to believe any case exists, where an inspector appointed by the State has profited by his grading and weighing of the grain?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will show the Senator that the man who employs the inspector has profited by the inspection and the weighing of grain and the difference in the inspection. This little item is infinitesimal in its injustice in comparison with those that I will disclose further on in the discussion of this case; but I hope to get through with these general propositions first, and then I will get down to the evidence.

The buyer has not only the fear of loss but the hope of reward to intensify his endeavor to be generous to his employer. The agent in the buying season, as rapidly as he is able to secure cars, ships from the local elevator to the terminal house. Before a car can be unloaded it must be inspected, either by a commission provided by the law of the State or by agents of a board of trade or chamber of commerce, and the grade of each carload, together with an estimated dockage for dirt, and so forth, certified. If unloaded into the purchaser's elevator, it is, of course, ordinarily mixed with other grain of like grade. It is then measured, cleaned, different grades mixed and regraded and certified, and those certificates are used to fill the orders for vast quantities bought and sold on the floor of the exchange and used for speculative purposes, either in making or breaking a corner.

Where the grain is shipped directly by the farmer or independent elevator company each car is inspected and graded in the same manner and sold by commission men upon the certificate of the inspector.

And in some of our exchanges, as I think in Minneapolis, they also, in addition, have samples from each car, so that the buyer may be able to see the grain as well as the certificate of inspection. It will therefore be seen that the value of every carload of grain sold from the farm is wholly dependent upon the certificate which is attached to it at the terminal. The owner is therefore entitled to just such grade as his grain will warrant, no more and no less. It follows, then, that one who weighs the grain, who determines the grade that properly belongs to it and the amount that ought to be docked for foul seed and dirt, ought not to be either one whose profit is greater to the extent that he undergrades or overdocks, or his agent. It ought to be made by an agency not under the control or domination of either buyer or purchaser.

In every little town, in every little village, there are scales where the farmer may have his load of hay weighed. The weigher's certificate is always accepted both by the owner and the purchaser, because the weigher himself has not the slightest interest in the article. Now, if that hay were weighed by the purchaser in some place where the owner could not see it weighed, there would be every inducement on the part of the purchaser to favor himself, and even if extremely honest the seller would not be without some justifiable suspicion. If that system should be applied not only to the weighing, but in addition, the purchaser decides that much of the load of timothy hay which the farmer brings to town is broom grass of inferior quality, the farmer would have greater reason for suspicion. He is not there to say that the purchaser's grade is not true; there is no forum in which he can be heard. It must be remembered that the producer of grain may live 500 or 1,000 miles from where that grain is inspected and graded. It ought, therefore, to be graded by those in whom he has entire confidence, both as to ability and integrity.

Let us consider the defects of the present system.

As I stated, if I should raise on a farm in western Minnesota or North Dakota three carloads of grain of exactly the same character in respect to color, weight, grade, and cleanliness, and should ship those three carloads, say, to Minneapolis, I might possibly receive the same grade for each of these three cars, or if I should send them all to Chicago I might possibly receive the same grade; there is no assurance that I would, but I might; and the dockage might be the same, but the chances are that they would not grade the same. If I were to send one carload of grain to Minneapolis, another carload of the same grain to Superior, and another to Chicago, it would be certain that no two of them would receive the same grade. It would be impossible to give the same grade to each, because the standard in each instance would be different. The Minnesota standard would require, if the grain were, say, No. 1 northern spring wheat, that it should be sound, well cleaned, must contain a larger proportion of the hard varieties, and must weigh not less than 57 pounds to the measured bushel. The Chicago standard might require a greater amount of a hard variety of wheat and a less weight. The Superior grade for No. 1 northern might differ in both respects from the grade of either of the other two centers. As the price of each carload would be wholly dependent upon its grade and the certificate under which it was sold, the probabilities would be that there would be a different value received for each carload, irrespective of the influence of freight.

The evils of the lack of uniformity can be best expressed by me by reading a portion of a resolution adopted at Salina, Kans., January 15, 1907, by the independent grain dealers. I especially wish to call the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] to this statement, because it is so clear and so lucid and places the matter before the Senate in such a way that even one not thoroughly acquainted with the handling of grain can understand it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before the Senator reads the resolution, I should like to ask him a question. The Senator mentioned the fact that in the hypothetical case of shipping three cars of the same quality of grain to three different markets, three different grades would be given to the product. I am not so familiar with that as I am with some other systems of grading. I wish to ask the Senator whether there is a uniform price throughout the shipping territory in the West according to the grade?

Mr. McCUMBER. Always.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. All right. Now, wherever there is a difference made by an exchange as to the quality constituting a certain grade, if it is higher than it is elsewhere, then the farmer loses?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And if it is lower than elsewhere he may gain as compared with where it is higher?

Mr. McCUMBER. As between one State and the other, to these points; yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wanted to get that clear.

Mr. McCUMBER. You will see the opportunity for manipulation through those grades, and the losses of which the farmer in the end must always pay. I will reach that further along in the argument.

I now call attention to this resolution, which says:

> Too much can not be said and done in favor of a national inspection law. We have no uniform inspection of grain and cotton, the principal farm products, which are so largely dealt in and which are of such great importance to both the producer and consumer. A shipper of grain can not send a car of wheat from one point to another with any degree of security at the present time, take all the precaution he may. A shipper at some point in Kansas may have a car of grain inspected by the Missouri State grain-inspection department as No. 3; the same car of grain may be forwarded to Illinois, and there inspected as No. 4; and from Illinois it may be sent to New Orleans, and there inspected as "no grade"; discounted from place to place anywhere from 1 to 15 cents per bushel, until it falls into the hands of the trust exporter, when it is again inspected as No. 2 and sold for No. 2 at No. 2 price, the difference falling into the hands of the trust instead of the farmer and producer.

It is but fair to say that this evil has been sought to be remedied by the National Association of Grain Dealers. The attempt failed only because of the suspicion and selfishness of

the several terminals, each fearing that the other might obtain an advantage. I believe a system was adopted for a short period of time; but as soon as an advantage would accrue to one terminal by abandoning the agreement for uniformity, self-interest rather than agreement governed at such terminal. There is no reason in the world why the same character of grain, raised in the same locality, should not be graded the same, whether sold in Chicago, Duluth, or Buffalo. A Federal law could reach the case and prevent the injustices that are being perpetrated under the present system, due to the lack of uniformity in grade.

Mr. President, possibly the greatest injury that has resulted to our general grain trade has been the effect of these fraudulent grades on our export business. It has been so grave that a congress of wheat buyers in all Europe was held in Berlin some few years ago, in which they passed resolutions against the purchasing of American wheat wherever they could avoid it because of the fact that they could not depend upon our certificates. They knew that grain from Chicago was graded under a certain system. They bought their grain under that system, but when it reached Liverpool or Hamburg or other places across the ocean it would be entirely a different kind of grain than that evidenced by the certificate. The condition became so bad that the great grain exchanges of Liverpool, Hamburg, Berlin, and other places appealed to the President of the United States to see if something could not be done in this country whereby our customers across the ocean could put some reliance on the grades of grain they were receiving. This was because, under our system of sales, the party purchasing had no remedy; the purchaser must buy according to the certificate; he must rely upon that certificate, and anything that was certified out as No. 2, although it might be rejected and bin burnt, he was compelled to take as No. 2.

There is a great deal on that point in the testimony. I purpose now to go over a portion of the testimony relative to the different exchanges. I shall take up that of Chicago first, because that was discussed yesterday. I will quote only marked portions.

I will first take the testimony of Mr. Greeley, who is at present in the city and probably could be found, as I understand he has been subpœnaed to give testimony on the House side upon a bill that is pending there now to investigate the methods of carrying on business at these exchanges.

Mr. Greeley was a member of the Chicago exchange and a purchaser of grain there. I want to quote something he says about the business in Chicago. He is speaking now as the representative of a farmers' cooperative company, I think, in the State of Iowa. He says:

> The men whom I represent are stockholders in the farmers' cooperative elevators. Whenever there is any question which seriously affects large bodies of men, numbering in the thousands, it is generally the case that some relation exists between the State and the individual, or the individual and the State, by which either the individual usurps the right of the State or the State fails to perform a certain function for the individual. Wherever the State refuses to perform a certain function for the individual or the individual usurps the rights of the State there is generally born a system of special privilege. That system of special privilege constitutes in itself a monopoly, and the monopoly generally works to the hardship of the people. In the grain trade there exists a monopoly in the city of Chicago, the monopoly being the result of a usurpation of a public function by private individuals acting for their own interests in a private capacity against the interests of the public.

Further on Mr. Greeley says—and I can quote only a little portion of his testimony:

> Having possession of the public warehouse facilities, a system was introduced whereby those elevators would become profitable to the public warehousemen.

Now, I am going on to show how this manipulation is carried on—

> The system was that if the grain entering the city could be bought on the basis of the lowest possible grade, put through private elevators, mixed, and put into public houses, and made the lowest of the improved grade in the public house, it would result to the benefit of the warehousemen in this way. It then became the duty of the warehousemen to continue the manufactured grades of grain in storage, those grades being made up of such a poor quality of the improved grade that the public would not desire to remove it from storage. The aim was for the elevator man to sell it ahead for future delivery at a premium; and when the future delivery day came, when he was to deliver the receipts on his contract, the grain would be of such inferior quality—made from a manufactured article in what they term a "hospital," or a private elevator—that the man who had bought the grain would, as we term it in the trade, "liquidate," or sell out. The elevator people stood ready to buy at the depreciated price, and would then resell for another deferred delivery to another speculative bull or bear. He in turn would pay a premium for that next deferred delivery, and thus a tax would be added to the grain for the privilege of buying that future.
>
> Thus was introduced an endless chain, from month to month, of forced liquidations on the part of the people who bought this grain. That went to such an extent from 1887 to 1893, and the depreciation of the grain by the forced liquidations of the speculative public became of such enormous importance, that corn on these western prairies sold for 8 cents a bushel. I sold oats in the Chicago market myself for 13 cents and the best grade of corn for 19½ cents a bushel. That produced the panic of 1893, and it was all caused by half a dozen men in the city of Chicago. Then the people on these western prairies all cried, "We will seat Bryan in Denver if we don't seat him in Washington." It was the cry of discontent. The purchasing power of the people had been impaired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator agree with the statement of this witness that the manipulation of grain in the manner described by the witness could have reduced the price as he states? Does the Senator believe that testimony?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I can see how it would reduce the price. When you put a certificate on No. 4 grain of any particular species that calls it No. 2, and that grain is not taken because of its inferior quality, and is sold, simply to get rid of it, at a lower price, it is very easy to see that it brings down the price of all the grain that is sold upon that grade.

Mr. REED. That is not the question.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator asked me if I believed the statement that this manipulation would lower the price. I said "Yes," and showed him how it would lower it.

Mr. REED. No; that was not my question, exactly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, if the Senator means that that was the cause of the general low price over the country, certainly not.

Mr. REED. Of course we will all agree that a disturbance of market conditions might have some effect upon prices.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. REED. But I was trying to elicit the opinion of the Senator upon the statement of this witness that the manipulation which he describes reduced the price of corn to 8 cents a bushel, and if he did not think that was such a wild and wholly improbable statement that a man who would make it could not be entitled to very much credit.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not care about even arguing that proposition, because the Senator knows that these local conditions can not affect a world-wide condition—the general level of world prices.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Apropos of the question asked by the Senator from Missouri at the time the Senator was reading the method of manipulating grain, which was the first time my attention had been called to the specific manner in which it was done, I desire to state, in corroboration of that, that almost identically the same thing is done in the case of the overvaluation of low-grade cottons in our exchanges. They hold these low-grade cottons and overestimate their value in comparison with the standard. Let us take, for instance, a middling cotton. They will put in a grade four or five grades below that, overvalue it, invoice it to come to New York, and then, upon delivery, when specific fulfillment of the contract is made, certificate it just as this is certificated; and the party who receives the cotton delivery receives a grade so far below the basis upon which he bought, and so overvalued, that he immediately retenders that grade and settles upon margins, which reduces it to a mere gambling contract.

That influenced the price of good cotton to such an extent that it brought about the very conditions that the Government has obviated in part in the matter of cotton; but where they have taken the grades and standardized them they spin the grade to determine its spinning value and the amount of waste and the cost of conversion into the finished article.

Middling cotton that was in the market in New York, let us say, at 12 cents a pound in the spot market; that is, where they go into the warehouse and select middling and not buy it upon the basis of middling, and then have the seller to deliver to you any other grade he may see fit, while middling cotton on the board in the same market was 10 cents.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will right here ask the Senator what has been the effect of standardizing cotton?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It has just been completed. I have at my desk a most startling revelation in the Cotton World, issued about two weeks ago, where the Government has tested out the different grades of cotton and published their spinning value. The effect has been that this year, for the first time in the history of cotton throughout the entire South, it has been more uniform and steadier than ever before in my knowledge of the cotton business.

Mr. McCUMBER. How would that affect the producer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It has resulted in the producer at the primary market getting perhaps the best uniform price that was ever obtained in the history of cotton.

Mr. McCUMBER. The reason why I asked the Senator the question is because the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] yesterday suggested that the cotton planter would not know any more about grades than I do about them, and therefore, as I understood him, the planter himself is getting no benefit whatever from reducing some grades——

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Twenty-seven; and some have run as high as 30.

Mr. McCUMBER. The different grades of cotton and reducing the number?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. To four or five full grades.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to have the Senator's expression on that point, and the reason why I ask it is because my investigation leads me to the conclusion that exactly the same methods have been adopted throughout the country in handling your cotton that have been adopted in handling our wheat.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It sounded so familiar to me that if the Senator could have substituted the word "cotton" for the word "wheat" it would have been practically the same statement of fact. I was not in the Chamber yesterday when the Senator from Alabama made his remark. The Senator was right up to the standardization by the Government, because every little shipping point of any importance had its own system of grading, all of them pretending to conform to the Liverpool classification or the New York classification; but when the local buyer for an export house or representing New York stood on the platform and cut into a bale he would say, "This is middling," or "ordinary middling," or "strict middling," or "strict ordinary," the farmer stood there absolutely helpless. He had no legal standard of comparison by which to determine what was the grade that he was selling. When he sold that grade he had no means in the world of determining its spinning value. It might be off color; it might have a little foreign matter in it; and between middling and ordinary, just four grades, it made a difference of $15 a bale. According to the record which I have in my desk the difference is almost negligible.

The Senator from Alabama, perhaps, was right. The Senator from North Dakota is complaining of the same thing existing in wheat. What we want the Government to do for us is to fix the standard and then determine the relative value of the standard and see that it is complied with. The most costly luxury that the wheat growers of the West and the farmers of the South have had to put up with is the ignorance of what they have to sell.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say, in order that the record may be clear, that in the colloquy between the Senator from Alabama and myself I was discussing the conditions in cotton since the standardization.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes. The regulations have not yet been sufficiently promulgated. New Orleans has adopted the Government standardization. As soon as it is promulgated and a standard of comparison is put upon the platforms of the farmers of the South it will result in their getting full value for what they sell.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask another question of the Senator, because I think the two cases are so nearly parallel that the operation in one may foreshadow what the result may be in the other? In the first instance, as I understand it, all the cotton exchanges were rather opposed to standardization.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not in a position to answer that question. I can state that New York has not even yet adopted the standard. New Orleans has adopted it.

Mr. McCUMBER. The standardization, of course, is not enforced upon them by any law.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; it is not enforced by any law. The Government simply standardized all by taking numerous bales of so-called different standards until they have a type of each grade.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, if the Government should enforce it, the Senator thinks that immense benefit would follow to the cotton producer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think it would certainly cure most of the tremendous evils under which we now suffer.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina if he thinks the Government can fix the price of those standards as established?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not ask the Government to do it. All that we are working at is for the Government to fix the standard grades, to fix what shall constitute a grade, and then determine the relative value of each grade, as expressing its intrinsic worth, and leave it to the farmer having this knowledge in his hands to say whether a seller shall bunco him or not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to inquire further, does the Senator think that the market value of cotton would be affected so as to control prices?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. By having a Government standard?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes. Would that control the prices on the market?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; the Senator from Illinois is mistaken. What the Senator from North Dakota and I are complaining of is taking one grade and affecting the price of the other grades. We say there should be a uniform standard gradation, so that the seller will know what the grade actually is and will get the value of that grade.

Mr. SHERMAN. On the contrary, Mr. President, I have not misunderstood either of the Senators. I am inquiring whether, after those uniform standards have been fixed, they control the price on the market, and my inquiry has not been answered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will unquestionably answer yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; it does control the price on the market. If I am a miller and I want to buy wheat for grinding purposes and No. 1 northern is the kind of wheat I want to buy and No. 1 northern has a certain price in the markets of the country, I will pay that price if I know I am getting No. 1 northern. But if there is shipped to me under a certificate of No. 1 northern something that ought not to have been graded greater than No. 3 northern, the very next car that I order from that company I will pay a No. 3 northern price for a No. 1 northern certificate of grade, and that of itself will drive down the market price of the No. 1 all along the line.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator expect this uniformity of standards in grades to prevent anybody from breaking his contract?

Mr. McCUMBER. There is no law on the face of the earth that can be created that will prevent people from breaking a contract if they want to do it. I do not expect any kind of law we could pass to accomplish that.

Mr. SHERMAN. When there is a breach in a contract all the law can do is to give a remedy. If I buy No. 1 northern spring wheat, there is no law that can be obtained by the terms of Senate bill 120 that will prevent somebody from delivering to me a lower standard, provided I will receive it, or breaking a contract if I do not receive it.

Mr. McCUMBER. But what I want is a law that shall authorize the Government to fix a standard and certify that wheat at just what it is. I want not only uniformity but I want certainty. The Government of the United States does not send us out light weight in our $20 gold pieces. Every one of them rings true to its weight. I believe the Federal Government should give us a certificate that would be as reliable, that would be accepted by the general trade of the country as easily and quickly, as the gold dollars of the country. Confidence is the life of trade. Confidence that you are going to get what you order is always a buoyant influence that drives prices upward. Distrust of what you are going to get upon a certificate of grade is always depressing, and sends the price downward. Therefore certainty of grade must necessarily benefit both the producer and the consumer—the ultimate consumer, I am speaking of now—in giving them what they want.

I am borne out in this by practically all the millers of the country asking for a Federal inspection law. The only millers, so far as I have been able to ascertain, who are opposed to it are those who have had some experience in what they call the political fixing of grades by State laws, and they are opposed to it because they are afraid that too much politics will get into it under Federal inspection. On the contrary, we would be escaping the political influence by having Federal inspection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to inquire further if the power of Congress to fix the standard of weight and measure when exercised would not be uniform, and when so fixed uniformly whether that prevents deception on the part of dishonest people in both weights and measures. The query naturally follows whether the ideal condition which the Senator from North Dakota pictures will follow from a uniformity of grades in grain any more than from a uniformity in weights and measures. Everybody is in favor of the bettering of conditions. I do not think you will find any serious controversy with any Senator on that question. What we do controvert is whether

undertaking here to pull up by the roots the existing system and substituting for it nothing but a uniformity of grades or standardization will produce this ideal condition.

The uniformity of grades in grain when provided for under the purposes of this bill will not create any better men in the market. There will be no more honesty than now inherent in human nature. After these grades are fixed they still have to be operated under by men.

The query in my mind is whether it is not largely an ideal condition hoped for, and if the analysis of the bill in that spirit is not an interpretation of dreams. I have seen ideal conditions contemplated by bills before covering equally large subjects, but they must be operated by humanity, not by perfect people. It is the imperfect ones that make the trouble under any system.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, temptation is the basis of most human frailties. People fall in the struggle of life, not through an innate desire to do a wrong thing, but because of the reward that may follow it. If the Senator and I have a disagreement relative to our rights and duties toward each other, we submit our controversy to some one who is not interested, and that person will be able to render a decision between us closer to the line of exact justice than either one of us, because of our selfishness, could arrive at. Now, here is a system under which the buyer of the grain is also the weigher and the grader of the grain.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a minute. I have given the Senator time for his address. It makes no difference whether it is done indirectly, if the man who buys the grain dominates in any degree the man who inspects and grades that grain. In some of the exchanges there is the direct employment of inspectors by the grain dealers. Again, there is a State law, as in Minnesota, where they try to avoid this as much as possible. Yet the result shows the domination of the great buyers. In your State you have another system with a law governing it, and yet the influence of the great buyers in your city dominates and controls the exchanges in that city.

Now, what I want is that some one who is not interested in the purchase and sale of our grain shall fix the standard of that grain. That person is not as liable to commit a wrong as one who would be influenced by either the buyer or the seller. There is no complaint that the persons who mint our coins do not give full weight and measure. There is no complaint that our coins are improperly alloyed. It is, of course, possible to bribe an employee to make coins of underweight and thereby benefit the bullion owner, but it has never yet been done. We can not adopt any system that will always grade with exact certainty. The line of demarkation is so close between one grade and the other, and the grades so merge into each other, that absolute certainty is impossible. Yet we can approximate it with sufficient certainty to give confidence to the trade of the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me make an inquiry of the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Political influence is the power feared in the system of State inspection. If I interpret the Senator correctly, that is reached through the agency of State politics. Will not Federal politics in the large markets of the country be equally potent to reach in a malign way the inspecting authority?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think not. Let me give just one illustration. I was going to give it later, but I will give it right here. I want the Senator's attention to it.

A few years ago there was an attempt on the part of some of the great speculators in wheat to corner the market. It was impossible to break that corner with the grade of grain for the contract on which the corner was based. The grain could not be secured in the country to break the corner, yet some equally powerful grain dealers were interested in breaking it. The corner was so complete and the strife was so intense that I believe it made a difference of nearly 50 cents a bushel for a few days between the price of No. 1 and No. 2 wheat. This followed in a certain city, and I will not mention it here, but you will find it in the record. There were, I think, some 600,000 bushels of wheat graded, as I remember, as No. 2 or No. 3. An effort was made to get that grain certified as No. 1. It had already been graded as No. 2 or No. 3—I do not remember specifically—but it was graded under the contract grade. An attempt was made, as I say, to get that grain out and to use it to break the corner. The inspecting department refused to do so; an appeal was taken; their refusal was sustained; and the pressure continued harder and greater, until finally a reinspection was granted, when this wheat was graded up to the contract grade, and it was all dumped in to break that corner in the market. Now, I will ask the Senator if he believes that such a thing would be possible under Federal inspection?

Mr. SHERMAN. Equally so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, I do not. If a Federal inspector should do that, and the Government should be a party to it, I am inclined to think that I would want to move out of the country. The Federal Government would see that we had honest inspection in that respect. I am not a bit afraid that it would not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can cite operations of certain Federal officers in the section of country with which I am familiar that will equal that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Though there may have been some such instances, I think they are very rare.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not as much confidence in Federal officers when it comes to a matter of this kind as I have in the officers of a well-managed State-inspection department.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I want to go on for the remainder of my time and read into the RECORD the evidence of a neighbor of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Greeley. I take this from the testimony on the hearings before the Agricultural Committee:

Mr. GREELEY. The men whom I represent are stockholders in the farmers' cooperative elevators. Whenever there is any question which seriously affects large bodies of men, numbering in the thousands, it is generally the case that some relation exists between the State and the individual, or the individual and the State, by which either the individual usurps the right of the State or the State fails to perform a certain function for the individual. Wherever the State refuses to perform a certain function for the individual or the individual usurps the rights of the State, there is generally born a system of special privilege. That system of special privilege constitutes in itself a monopoly, and the monopoly generally works to the hardship of the people. In the grain trade there exists a monopoly in the city of Chicago, the monopoly being the result of a usurpation of a public function by private individuals acting for their own interests in a private capacity against the interests of the public.

Having possession of the public warehouse facilities, a system was introduced whereby those elevators would become profitable to the public warehousemen. The system was that if the grain entering the city could be bought on the basis of the lowest possible grade, put through private elevators, mixed, and put into public houses, and made the lowest of the improved grade in the public house, it would result to the benefit of the warehousemen in this way. It then became the duty of the warehousemen to continue the manufactured grades of grain in storage, those grades being made up of such a poor quality of the improved grade that the public would not desire to remove it from storage. The aim was for the elevator man to sell it ahead for future delivery at a premium; and when the future delivery day came, when he was to deliver the receipts on his contract, the grain would be of such inferior quality (made from a manufactured article in what they term a "hospital" or a private elevator) that the man who had bought the grain would, as we term it in the trade, "liquidate," or sell out. The elevator people stood ready to buy at the depreciated price, and would then resell for another deferred delivery to another speculative bull or bear. He in turn would pay a premium for that next deferred delivery, and thus a tax would be added to the grain for the privilege of buying that future.

Thus was introduced an endless chain, from month to month, of forced liquidations on the part of the people who bought this grain. That went to such an extent from 1887 to 1893, and the depreciation of the grain by the forced liquidations of the speculative public became of such enormous importance, that corn on these western prairies sold for 8 cents a bushel. I sold oats in the Chicago market myself for 13 cents and the best grade of corn for 19½ cents a bushel. That produced the panic of 1893; and it was all caused by half a dozen men in the city of Chicago. Then the people on these western prairies all cried, "We will seat Bryan in Denver if we don't seat him in Washington." It was the cry of discontent. The purchasing power of the people had been impaired.

Senator DOLLIVER. Do I understand that this stock of manufactured and inferior grain was kept there, practically the same mass of grain, to serve as the basis——

Mr. GREELEY. As a club to depress the values and drive out speculators.

Senator DOLLIVER. Was it to serve as an instrument to offer delivery on these speculative contracts?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir; it was.

Senator DOLLIVER. The same pile of grain?

Mr. GREELEY. The same pile of grain, often, from year to year.

Senator DOLLIVER. That is a very interesting statement.

Senator PERKINS. Did not the weevil attack it?

Mr. GREELEY. It might, and it might not. If the weevil attacked it and got into it, they would deliver to the public just the same.

Now, let me continue this little discussion, so that I may keep the thread of it.

The aim and object of the men in this combination is to make this grain of as low a grade as possible of the grade which is necessary for delivery—to make it not only low in grade but low in price; for the lower the price, the less interest and insurance they have to pay to carry it themselves in storage pending the day of future delivery for which they have sold to the future speculator. The whole basis of the scheme of the conduct of the grain in the public elevators was a depreciation of the price. The whole scheme was to buy the grain on the initial inspection from the country shipper at the lowest possible grade at which they could buy it, and then, having made it into the manufactured article in the public house, to make the grain in the public house as poor a quality of the increased grade as was possible to make it, to continue its life in storage, to earn the tax from the future speculators who bought it. In other words, it was a pawnbroker's game, the holding of the grain in pawn, subject to a tax which the speculative public had to pay.

That system has one very important ally. The important ally is the inspection of the grain.

Right here I want to get the connection between the inspection and the manipulator.

Previous to the usurpation of the public facilities in 1890, or about that time, there was existent in Chicago a system of public warehousing of grain whereby the aim of the inspection department and the aim of the public warehouse proprietor—he himself being not a dealer in grain—was to maintain a high standard of the grain in storage, in order that the public would buy the receipts of his elevator and keep the grain moving and attract it to his road and to his elevator and thus furnish him with a large amount of storage. Now the system prevails that instead of increasing the standard and protecting the buyers and protecting the shippers who send the grain to market, the scheme of these men is to depreciate the initial inspection and to appreciate the inspection of the poor grain into the contract grade in the public house.

In other words, it is the same proceeding that we have complained of in the Northwest in what we call the "rigid inspection in" and "liberal inspection out," giving the benefit in each instance to those dealing in the grain.

Senator DOLLIVER. Who makes this initial inspection at Chicago?

Mr. GREELEY. The State inspection department.

Senator DOLLIVER. Do you claim that that is an unreliable institution?

Mr. GREELEY. I certainly do.

Senator DOLLIVER. And who makes the inspection of this elevator grain?

Mr. GREELEY. The State inspection department.

Senator DOLLIVER. It is the same inspection?

Mr. GREELEY. The same inspection.

Senator PERKINS. Do the exporter and the miller purchase this grain on its merits or on what it rates in the market?

Here is an important question bearing upon the effect of false or unreliable grading.

Mr. GREELEY. There is not a grain man in the world familiar with the Chicago market who will buy a public-warehouse grain receipt and remove that grain from storage under any circumstances without an absolute knowledge of the grain he is going to get from that elevator.

That is a rather serious charge.

The standards of the public warehouse receipts in Chicago are in disrepute simply on account of this system and the inspection department which places the value on those receipts.

That is the result of improper inspection; the loss affects the producer, the purchaser, and the final consumer. If the miller has to keep a man at $125 a month at the Chicago terminal to inspect the wheat, instead of buying it upon a certificate which he can depend upon, somebody has to pay that man. It is not the miller; he will not suffer that loss; he will make an allowance to cover the amount he pays that man in the price he pays for the wheat; and that reflects back again upon the producer of the grain. I say the loss falls on the producer of the grain finally; in other words, it drives down the price of that grade of grain, the honest grade, the No. 1 sold generally on these certificates, to the price or real value of the inferior grain which is graded the same, because the purchaser will always have to take his chance, and he will always bid low, not knowing what kind of grain he will receive.

Senator DOLLIVER. You hold that those facilities for distributing grain have really become a hindrance to the commerce in grain?

Mr. GREELEY. They certainly have become a hindrance. In order to show you the magnitude of the forces at work under this system in Chicago I have prepared and printed a list of the Chicago public warehouses in control of what we in Chicago term this trust in the public facilities. Every elevator in Chicago is under the control of this system, with a total of 21,000,000 bushels of storage capacity, with the exception of one elevator.

Senator DOLLIVER. Why do you call it a trust?

Mr. GREELEY. I call it a trust because they are in a trust; in a combination. The articles of combination I shall be pleased to read you if you desire to have them in this discussion.

Senator DOLLIVER. I should like to have the whole thing.

Mr. GREELEY. The private warehouses in the control of this trust aggregate a capacity of 13,150,000 bushels. The total grain-storage capacity of the city of Chicago is in the control of five men. The five men I shall be pleased to name to you, so that we may have no misunderstanding in regard to the system, the men that work it, and the condition that exists.

I have handled tens of thousands of cars in the Chicago Board of Trade. I have stood in front of one sample table for 17 years as a handler of grain. I have sampled hundreds of thousands of carloads on the floor and noted the inspection. And I am free to admit that there is not a grain merchant of standing who is not either friendly to or affiliated with this organization in Chicago who will state, either under oath or otherwise, that a public warehouse grain receipt under the management of this public elevator trust and the State inspection department is worthy of the respect of any man in the trade.

That is a pretty strong indictment by one who has spent 17 years in buying grain in that portion of the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I should want to know whether there was any cross-examination of this witness, so as to ascertain whether he was caught on the wrong side of the market at some time or other.

Mr. McCUMBER. That may be; I will let the Senator draw his own conclusion as to the interest or integrity of the witness; but what he says so dovetails in with other matters that we know of that I think he is fully corroborated; and when he makes a charge of that kind it would be well for those who deny it to meet him, because he is here in the city to-day to reiterate those same charges; so that there will be an opportunity for cross-examination upon them.

If millions of bushels are hoarded at market centers for the purpose of accumulating a storage charge by the collection of those storage charges from the people who buy grain for future delivery, and the speculative public is constantly forcing liquidations at these future months when the time comes for the delivery of the grain, our contention is that it not only depreciates the price, to the profit of the trust (which is largely interested in the speculative market also and reaps a profit from that also), but the tendency is to depreciate that large amount of the crop which never seeks the market and places values upon the crop of the entire country which does not leave the farm.

That is a conclusion, but every man of any judgment whatever knows that it is a correct conclusion; that, so long as you sell by grades and you depreciate the price of a grade in the great central market, it fixes the price of every bushel of grain in every farm granary and elevator within the commercial radius of that market.

I am told that in the case of the corn crop not over from 10 to 20 per cent of the crop ever leaves the farm. But the operation of this system tends to the depreciation of the entire values of the crops, and it goes into the hundreds of millions of cents per bushel on that part of the crop which never seeks market.

If this condition did not exist, and if we had a fair inspection and a fair warehousing of grain at the market centers, and independent custodianship of the grain in the public elevators, the confidence of the people would be so thorough in the management of the elevators and in the quality of the grain that these stocks would not accumulate at the market centers and would not be an advertisement to the world that Chicago is overstocked in grain and we are overproduced in crops. Then the world would take from those public elevators the accumulations as it used to before these men became enthroned there, and the effect upon the speculative market—which is the great effect upon the market—would be that instead of the longs liquidating on account of the inferior load carried at the market centers the shorts would be obliged to cover, and the prices would be on the boom rather than on the decline on account of the effect of the accumulations, as now.

That certainly is sound logic, if the basis of it be true. I think I ought to read all of this testimony:

Senator PERKINS. You have anticipated what I was going to ask you. If I were a client of yours, or the client of any member of your Merchants' Exchange, in Chicago, and should buy 10,000 bushels of wheat for June delivery, when the time of delivery comes you have sold me something you have not got and something I do not want; but we settle on the difference, do we not?

Mr. GREELEY. That is entirely legal, and that is done to a large extent.

Here is a word put in by Mr. Bartlett, also from Illinois. I do not know whether the Senator knows him or not, but he is interested in the grain business. Mr. Bartlett interposes here:

Mr. BARTLETT. Contrary to the laws of the State of Illinois. They are usurping the rights of the public by permission of a continuance of the system by the State officials of Illinois, whose duty it is to prosecute them. It is not a question as to whether or not they have the privilege so to deal in grain, because we hold a copy of the testimony in full which was sent up to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, the suit costing about $20,000, the money being spent by the board of trade to secure the decision that a public warehouseman could not be a grain dealer. This is a copy of the testimony [referring to volume placed on committee table].

I have stated that these men deal in grain, and deal in such a way that it operates to the detriment of the shipper and to the detriment of the buyer and to the detriment of the speculative public, and that their ally and chief assistant is the State inspection department of Illinois.

That is the claim made everywhere—the alliance or close relationship between the purchasers and the inspection department, an alliance which we seek by this bill to nullify.

In order that you may be a little more certain in regard to those statements and that my statement may not be the only thing you have on the point, I will read a few brief paragraphs, which will only occupy two or three minutes.

In testimony before Judge Tuley in the trial of the case to prevent public warehousemen from dealing in grain the following testimony was given by Mr. Patten, who was then an independent grain shipper. He has since become a member of the firm of Bartlett, Fraser & Carrington, and is a members of the Chicago Grain Trust. This testimony before Judge Tuley, as an independent shipper of grain, reads as follows:

About the time I speak of—this was from about 1890 to 1894—I found difficulty in securing enough grain, and found the elevator companies were going around amongst the tables bidding one-eighth to one-quarter of a cent more than the price bid in the car-lot market.

They were giving up a portion of the storage.

I also found they were willing to resell that grain to me at a quarter of a cent less than they were paying for it. In the course of time I found I couldn't buy anything in the car-lot market and that I had to buy all my grain from the elevators. Then, again, in the course of time I found that I couldn't buy anything from the elevator companies only when they pleased to sell me. I found that they were offering grain in the East to my own customers at prices that they asked me. There was no money in it for me to buy grain and resell it at the same price. It grew worse from 1890 down to the time I quit the business. There is no car-lot trade left now.

He also stated at the same trial (this is a continuance of his testimony):

I said something about competition of elevators in the eastern markets. I was affected by competition to certain extent. The New England trade make a specialty of yellow corn.

Now, here is the system:

There are grades in our market of 2 and 3 yellow. These elevator companies also had private elevators which were not under the control of the State inspection. They would buy both grades to go to store and sell the No. 2 grade yellow in New England. I noticed from the inspection sheets that these companies very rarely inspected any yellow corn out of store. It always came out No. 2. And I noticed I had that competition to meet at the other end, from the elevator companies. In other words, they adulterated their goods, to be plain. They didn't give the trade East what they claimed to, although they gave them the inspection certificate of our inspection.

That is the testimony of Mr. Patten, one of the greatest wheat buyers in your State.

Mr. Bartlett goes on:

What better authority could there be in the world than Mr. Patten, then a large shipper and now a public elevator man? And Mr. Patten has come to the conclusion that it is better to get out into the elevator business and rob the people than to stay out of it and be robbed by them.

Also, in conjunction with that same feature before the Interstate Commerce Commission in this case, October 13 to November 23, 1906, Mr. John Stream, of the firm of J. C. Shaffer & Co., or, rather, its manager, also stated:

We generally buy grain on basis of futures.

Now, that is all right. All grain trade, as a rule, in its larger capacity is regulated upon the course of speculation and the influence of speculation. These men try to force speculation as the leading problem; and their larger profits are not on the grain that goes through these houses—a few millions—but upon the countless millions of forced liquidations and control of the market which they, having possession of the facilities, are able to turn either way to their own benefit [reading]:

We generally buy grain on basis of futures. The price of the future is established on the floor, and we base the price of the cash on the futures, so when we send out our bids to the country any acceptance we get we sell for future delivery. When the grain comes in, if it grades—that means, if it is up to contract—we sell it out and buy back the future.

There is a second chance for them. If it does not grade, we put it into the cleaning house; and if we can ship it to better advantage, we ship it without putting it into the public house. If we can not—that is, if it does not grade, and they can not ship it when they put it into the cleaning house—we make it into contract grade and sell to a member of the board, to go into a public house, immediately buying back our future.

Now, gentlemen, there is the system.

Senator PERKINS. Admitting that all you say exists (which we are not prepared to deny), will you be kind enough to explain how you think Senate bill 382 will cure these evils?

Mr. GREELEY. I will try to get to that in just a moment, because it will assist me to continue right along.

Senator PERKINS. I do not want to disturb the continuity of your argument.

Mr. GREELEY. No; but keep that in mind, as I intend to take it up as the closing portion of my address.

Senator DOLLIVER. Where does the man that actually wants grain in this country go to buy it? How does he get it out of the mess there in Chicago?

Mr. GREELEY. He does not take it, as a rule, if he can help it.

Senator DOLLIVER. Yes; but in the case of a man that is running a mill and has to have wheat, where does he get it?

Mr. GREELEY. He goes out of that crowd to get it; and they keep that grain there as a constant club to hammer the price down.

Senator DOLLIVER. Would any evil happen to the wheat business and the legitimate wheat trade if those speculative ventures in wheat were abolished altogether by Congress?

Then Mr. Greeley goes on with the statement of his opinion of the benefits of speculation in wheat markets, but I wish to confine myself to the testimony relative to the operations under the present systems of grading and handling.

Senator DOLLIVER. Who establishes the standards of grade?

Mr. GREELEY. The State.

Senator DOLLIVER. This bill seems to authorize the Department of Agriculture to do that.

Mr. GREELEY. That is proper.

Senator MONEY. In other words, it is a substitution of Federal for State inspectors.

Mr. GREELEY. Where do we come in. We are farmers. We are not here as a joke. We do not go and adopt a resolution—two or three of us—and say: "We will appoint ourselves a committee, and have some grievance, and go down to Washington and constitute ourselves somebody representing something." We had 1,800 men at Fort Dodge, Iowa, just wild on this subject, discussing it for hours. We took up every feature of it. We then adjourned over into Illinois and went to Bloomington, and we had a convention there, with 900 men present; and almost the chief subject of discussion at both those meetings was the same proposition that we have here. These men are determined upon this subject. When they ship a car into Chicago the dominating force existing there is to undergrade that grain so that this trust may buy it at the depreciated inspection; and we know it to be a fact, from the evidence which I have read, that when a man buys it and takes it out of storage he gets the depreciated value of the improved grade to such an extent that he does not want the property, and he goes and buys it by sample on the track in the country.

Senator BURKETT. I do not know whether you mentioned this before I came in or not, but you made a statement to the effect that "We are farmers; we are not jokes," and you spoke of how you had 1,800 of them. Of course you did not mean to say that you personally are a farmer?

Mr. GREELEY. No, sir; I was with them.

Senator BURKETT. I would like to have you tell just what you are and how you do come to represent farmers. I take it that you are here in a representative capacity. I would like to have that appear, so that when the evidence is read by others that do not see you they will know who you are.

Mr. GREELEY. I fought this Elevator Trust for 17 years. I have been defeated in the fight in every avenue where I have attempted to accomplish my purpose—that of securing an honest warehousing of grain in the Chicago market.

Senator BURKETT. Where was it that you fought them?

Mr. GREELEY. In Chicago—on the board of trade.

Senator BURKETT. And you were acting in what capacity then?

Mr. GREELEY. As a commission merchant—an independent commission merchant.

I pause right here in the reading of the testimony to say that members of the exchange in Chicago have seen me personally and have evidenced their keen interest and hope that such a bill would pass, stating that, while the majority of even that board secretly favor it, they are under the control of a few men who are able to destroy their business if they see fit to do so, and therefore they could not make an open fight against the system.

Senator DOLLIVER. Are there no commission merchants in Chicago, except yourself, that take your view of it?

Mr. GREELEY. Very few of them. You can find very few.

Senator DOLLIVER. How do you account for that?

Mr. GREELEY. They do not dare do it.

That corroborates what I have just stated to you about the testimony that was given me personally.

Senator DOLLIVER. There are thousands of them?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir; but they have not the courage.

Senator DOLLIVER. They are honest men, intelligent men?

Mr. GREELEY. These men are too powerful for them to fight.

I found that out on the floor of the Senate—that there was decidedly a powerful organization for the unorganized farmers to fight single handed.

I am going to read only a portion of this testimony:

Mr. GREELEY. To proceed a little to explain in regard to this bill. An evil exists. It is verified by any amount of testimony that you men will ever want, and we can obtain it. If it exists, then the proposition comes up as to whether this system of State inspection should be superseded by a national inspection.

We claim, first, that a national inspection of grain under the system of civil service inaugurated by the United States Government has a chance of producing the result of the education on similar lines in all States of grain inspectors who will be under the knowledge, control, and direction of a uniform set system of inspection. People in general, the country over and the world over, receiving our certificates will have it made known to them that United States Government inspection carries with it that kind of a description of each grade. That seems to be sensible and fundamental. We believe that instead of having an inferior quality of the men doing the inspecting, a system of training and education will be inaugurated which will bear good fruit.

We believe, secondly, that it will be more difficult to "fix" or influence inspectors if the authority is invested at Washington rather than at Springfield, if such "fixing" or influence exists at the present time; and whether it does or not, we believe it does.

That answers the Senator's question.

Thirdly, we believe that under a system of Government supervision which is regular and effective and along the same lines, a system may be introduced by the Government which will become general at all market centers, whereby governmental tests and governmental stamp of approval and education may be put upon the various kinds of grain raised in the country, so that the education and the stamp of approval and the improvement will lend dignity and standing to the receipts which have that stamp.

Further on he says:

Mr. GREELEY. Your farmers in the State of Iowa suffer every year, to the best of my belief, a depreciation of $250,000,000 in the value of their crops from the simple fact of the existence of the poor grain—as small a quantity as it is—that is carried and hoarded in the Chicago public warehouses in this elevator and grain combine.

I think the figure here is wrong. It says "$250,000,000," but I think it is meant for "$2,500,000."

The farmer has a crop subject to an increase in price or a decrease in price, according to what affects those open contracts of 150,000,000 bushels of grain. This is the way the game works: The contracts must mature, and those contracts all have to be filled by the delivery of a certain grade at a certain time in one of a certain number of warehouses made regular for the purpose. If those warehouses contain a certain amount of grain of a certain poor quality of the grade necessary for delivery when you approach delivery day, the buyers who have those contracts bought—that is, who are on the "bought" side of the market—will, if they fear the delivery of that poor grain to them, liquidate before the man who has it sold will purchase to cover his "short" sale. That throws the weight of the large amount of speculative "long" interest on the market on the selling side; and, as I tell you, month after month the preponderance of the evidence in this book shows that the liquidation of the "long" interest, forcing the decline in the market, is probable, rather than the covering of the "short" interest to increase the price.

Then, again, he says:

Mr. GREELEY. Admitting that, there is one thing in favor of this bill: The system is better. The establishment of the national classification in grades is better. It gives a better description for the entire country of what is expected of the grade and unifies it under one classification rather than having it, as now, under the classification of the various States.

Mr. President, I am going to follow this with the testimony of Mr. Ballard on the same subject. It now lacks but a minute of being 2 o'clock. I wish to give notice again that at the close of the morning business to-morrow morning I shall proceed to try to finish my argument, and that if the consideration of the unfinished business is concluded before the expiration of the day I shall ask to proceed with my argument at the close of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

## SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, who has been ap-

pointed by the governor of Georgia to the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States in the place of Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON, deceased, to serve until the people of the State shall fill the vacancy by an election provided by law.

Mr. President, the Legislature of Georgia last July passed an act following the provisions of the seventeenth amendment authorizing the governor in the case of a vacancy to designate by appointment a Senator until the next general election. This designation has been made by the governor in pursuance of an act passed since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment.

I call the matter to the attention of the Senate now, so that there can be no question about the credentials following the seventeenth amendment. Mr. WEST will reach the city on Friday, and if there is to be any question about the credentials I would ask that they be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that there may be a report before next Friday morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The Secretary read the credentials, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA.
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, ATLANTA.

*To the Senate of the United States:*

Whereas the death of Hon. AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON causes a vacancy to exist in the office of United States Senator from the State of Georgia for the term ending with March 3, 1919,

I, John M. Slaton, governor of the State of Georgia, by authority of the Constitution of the United States and the act of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia approved August 16, 1913, hereby designate and appoint Hon. WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, of the county of Lowndes, this State, to the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States, vice Hon. AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON, deceased, to serve until the people of this State fill the vacancy by election as provided by law.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Georgia to be affixed at Atlanta, the capital, this the 2d day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-eighth.

JOHN M. SLATON, *Governor.*

By the governor:
[SEAL.]
PHILIP COOK,
*Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 5th day of March, 1914, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TOMBIGBEE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. VARDAMAN. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13365) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss., and I submit a report (No. 311) thereon. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the immediate consideration of the bill. It has the approval of the War Department. This is a House bill, and it is very necessary that it should become a law at once. The people of that community have their material there, and the work is suspended until action by Congress can be had.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I have no objection whatever to the passage of the bill by unanimous consent, but I do object to it unless it is distinctly understood that it shall not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say to the Senator from Utah that I would not have asked for the consideration of the bill if I had thought that it would interfere with the regular order.

Mr. SMOOT. Technically it does, and therefore I take this means of having a distinct understanding.

Mr. BORAH. Merely granting unanimous consent does not interfere with the unfinished business.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). The Chair so understands.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Utah is in error. It is only a motion to take up a measure which can interfere with it.

Mr. SMOOT. I said unless the bill was considered by unanimous consent I would object.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have asked unanimous consent to have the bill considered. It will take but a moment. There is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 33) of the House of Representatives, which was read:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 5th day of March, 1914, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make them.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate concurs in the resolution.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That after June 30, 1914, the pay of substitute letter carriers employed in the places of regular employees absent from duty with pay and of auxiliary and temporary carriers employed at offices where the City Free Delivery Service is already established or may hereafter be established, and of substitute clerks employed in the places of regular employees absent from duty with pay, and of auxiliary and temporary clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall be at the rate of 35 cents an hour"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 9 and 10 of the amendment strike out the words "March 4, 1915," and insert in lieu thereof the words "December 1, 1914"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,521,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the amendment, after the word "postage," insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, by order, fix the

time within which all parcels of the fourth class shall be delivered"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
W. O. BRADLEY,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

JOHN A. MOON,
S. W. SMITH,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. POMERENE. If I may ask the Senator from Alabama a question, the amendments are referred to by number, and that does not advise me at present as to the contents of each particular amendment. May I ask the Senator what was done with the amendment giving fourth-class rates to seeds, plants, and so forth?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is agreed to in the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, the active movement for woman suffrage commenced about the middle of the nineteenth century. Among its most prominent and active promoters was Miss Susan B. Anthony, who spent much of her life in Kansas, and who, with the aid of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, of New Jersey, wrote the first authentic history of woman suffrage, and which in its present form is indeed the only great and exhaustive treatise on this subject in existence to-day. Miss Anthony spent nearly all of her long, brilliant, and noble life in the cause of woman suffrage. No more devoted, able, and convincing advocate of any reform ever lived than Miss Anthony in her life's struggle for woman's rights. No one ever suffered greater personal and financial sacrifice for any cause and no one was ever rewarded with greater success than finally came as a result of her struggles in the interest of women. She died in March, 1906, at the ripe old age of 86 years, loved and respected by all who knew her or knew of her good work.

In the introduction to Miss Anthony's great work on Woman Suffrage the story of the long struggle for the enfranchisement of women is beautifully told in the following language:

> The pioneers in the work for the redemption of women found an unbroken field, not fallow from lying idle, but arid and barren, filled with the unyielding rocks of prejudice and choked with the thorns of conservatism. It required many years of labor as hard as that endured by the forefathers in wresting their lands from undisturbed nature before the ground was even broken to receive the seed. Then followed the long period of persistent tilling and sowing, which brought no reaping until the last quarter of the century, when the scanty harvest began to be gathered. The yield has seemed small indeed at the end of each twelvemonth, and it is only when viewed in the aggregate that its size can be appreciated. The condition of woman to-day compared with that of last year seems unchanged, but contrasted with that of 50 years ago it presents as great a revolution as the world has ever witnessed in this length of time.

For the past half century there has been a steady but certain advance in the direction of equal rights for women. Enough has been accomplished in this comparatively brief period to make it certain that within a few years women everywhere in the United States will enjoy entire equality in social, civil, and legal rights. Woman's political equality with man is the natural outcome of the fundamental principles of our Government, clearly set forth in the Declaration of Independence and embraced in the Constitution of the United States. The majority of the leading statesmen of our country take the position that suffrage is a natural right that may be regulated but can not be abolished by State law. I have always believed that under the fundamental law and the supreme law of the land woman is justly and legally entitled to suffrage. The Declaration of Independence insured equal rights to all, which has been the watchword for Democracy throughout the long, proud history of the party.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution provides:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside * * *.

The fifteenth amendment provides:

> The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Therefore, under the plain terms of the Constitution, there is no distinction as to sex when it comes to citizenship. To deny women the right to vote is to deny that they are citizens of the United States. The principle of equality of rights underlies all human sentiments and forms the foundation of the greatest nations. The nearer the rights of the citizens are equal, the greater the strength of a nation; the more unequal the rights of the citizens, the weaker is the nation. John Emerson Roberts, in his lecture on "Woman and justice," says:

> In mind there is no sex. Reason is neither masculine, feminine, nor neuter. Truth is not a thing of anatomy. Justice is not distinguished by pantaloons or petticoats. Science has neither body, parts, nor passions. Liberty is sexless as the sky.

Kansas has been among the most prominent of the States in this as well as other great reforms. She was one of the earliest States to adopt woman's suffrage in a modified form. She has had this from the beginning of statehood. She was the first State to submit a constitutional amendment for complete woman suffrage. In 1867 the amendment was submitted to the voters of the State, but it was coupled with political complications in connection with negro suffrage and failed. The first woman's rights association was organized in the spring of 1859 by about 25 men and women, with the object of securing suffrage for women from the constitutional convention which met in July of that year to draft a constitution for statehood. They did not succeed in getting full suffrage, but they did succeed in getting the right to vote in all school-district matters, which was afterwards extended by constitutional amendment February 15, 1887, to municipal woman's suffrage. The campaign leading up to this successful conclusion was one of the most brilliant ever held in the State, many prominent women from all over the country taking part in the discussion throughout the State, among them being Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, Mrs. Helen M. Gougher, Mrs. Mary E. Haggart, Miss Susan B. Anthony, Mother Bickerdyke, Mrs. Annie L. Diggs, and Mrs. Lucy B. Johnston. The State Woman's Christian Temperance Union cooperated throughout the campaign with the suffrage association in this effort for municipal franchise, and they soon received their reward by seeing the government of the larger cities changed from unlawful, liquor-licensed, graft-ridden, lawless places to complete law enforcement by honest and faithful officials. After securing municipal suffrage, the work still went forward, the association meeting annually.

At the annual meeting at Newton, Kans., October 13 to 15, 1887, the yellow ribbon was adopted as the suffrage badge in honor of the sunflower, the State flower of Kansas—"the flower that follows the wheel track and the plow," as woman's enfranchisement should follow citizenship. In recognition of Kansas, then the most progressive State in the suffrage cause, the yellow, which among the ancients signified wisdom, was afterwards adopted by the national association as the official color. The fight kept up year after year, until both of the leading political parties in the State, in 1892, declared in their platforms for the submission of a suffrage amendment, and the legislature of 1893 passed a bill for this purpose. From this time on Mrs. Annie L. Diggs, one of the brightest and bravest little women in Kansas, and who became famous as a Populist orator and leader, organized the Kansas women, and with hundreds of Populist, Democratic, and Republican friends labored unceasingly for the success of the amendment. Nothing was left undone that human wisdom could devise or human effort could execute. Mass meetings were held in every city in the State, and in practically every township, and were addressed by the leading men and women of the cause, of both local and national fame. The amendment was submitted at the election of 1894, when the Republicans made a determined and successful effort to regain possession of the State from the control of the Populists, who had defeated them by fusion with the Democrats two years before. In the midst of political excitement and in the terrible scramble for power none of the political parties indorsed the amendment in their platform in this campaign. The battle, however, was waged by the women without the assistance of any party, but their cause was subordinated, bargained, sold, and traded off for every other concession by the Republicans in order to get votes to again place them in control of the State, so that the amendment proposed by the Populist administration was lost by about 35,000 majority. Defeated, but not conquered, the women kept up their courage and fought bravely on year after year for 18 more long years, when they were finally victorious by the submission of an amendment for equal suffrage at the last general election in 1912, which carried by 16,079 majority; 74 counties voted for it and 30 against it; one was a tie.

During the passage of the bill for municipal suffrage in 1887 a petition against the bill was sent in, supposed to have been signed by 19 women of Independence, stating that, in effect, women had all the rights they needed. On the morning when

it was considered a large beautiful bouquet of flowers was placed on the desk of Senator R. M. Pickler, a leader of the opponents to woman's suffrage. On a card attached to the bouquet was written these words, "From the women of Kansas who do not wish to vote. History honors the man who dares to do what is right." When the discussion was over, it was finally discovered that no woman had anything whatever to do with sending the flowers, but that they had been purchased and presented by the liquor interests, who have always opposed woman's suffrage or any other uplift toward civic righteousness. This fact alone should be one of the strongest arguments for woman suffrage.

The effects of woman suffrage in Kansas appeared very early. One month after municipal suffrage was granted to women the "age of consent" was raised from 10 to 18 years. In 1889 the divorce law was so amended as to give the wife all the property owned by her at the time of marriage and all acquired by her afterwards, and alimony being allowed from the real and personal estate of the husband. In the same year a bill was passed creating the Girls' Industrial School at Beloit, Kans., which separated the incorrigible girls from the boys; and this school was made one of correction instead of punishment and demoralization.

In about 1900 the women began in earnest to make their fight for the strict enforcement of the prohibitory liquor law, which had become more or less a farce by reason of failure to enforce the law in some of the larger cities of the State. It was claimed by those who were inclined to wink at the law and to defeat its purposes that it was impossible to enforce the law, and this belief prevailed for several years, and a sort of an illegal license-grafting regulation arrangement was carried on in some of the cities. From 1900 to 1910 the warfare against the liquor joints and dives was continued earnestly and vigorously until not a single joint remained in the State, and it was largely through the influence of women that the law which had been on the statute books for years and thought to be the hardest law to enforce was demonstrated to be absolutely the easiest law of enforcement when an honest and earnest effort was made to do so.

None of the objections raised against woman suffrage ever materialized in Kansas. Only a few of the women sought official positions, but when they did secure them, instead of making failures, as was predicted, they almost invariably made the best officers we had in the State. Several of the small towns put their entire local government into the hands of the women. It is conceded that they make our best county superintendents, and hence are naturally sought for this office by the various political parties. From 1887 to the present time there have been about 75 women aldermen, about a half dozen police judges, a few city attorneys, several city clerks and treasurers, and numerous clerks and treasurers of school boards. About one-half of the counties have women county superintendents of schools, and there are many women serving on school boards. A number of women in the last few years have been elected county treasurer, register of deeds, and clerk of the court. Probably one-third of the county officers have women deputies. About 25 women have been elected to the office of mayor in the smaller towns, and in several instances the entire board of aldermen have been women. The business record of these women has been invariably good, and their industrious efforts to improve schools, sanitation, morals, and safe, efficient, and economic public utilities of their towns have been generally approved and aided by the men of their community. The interest of the Kansas women in their political rights, so difficultly secured, has never abated in the least, as commonly predicted would be the result by those opposed to woman's suffrage. The proportion of their vote varies in about the same ratio as that of the men. As the years go by the general average of the woman vote grows larger.

When the character of candidates or the importance of the issue commands especial attention a great many women go to the polls. Their main interest, however, always centers in questions which bear upon the morals, education, and welfare of the children, the environment of their homes, and the purity and economy in the administration of the laws. Their part in municipal elections has completely demoralized the old stock objections to the presence of women at the polls. The polling places have been moved from barns and livery stables to the public halls, churches, schoolhouses, and other decent and respectable places, and instead of wading in tobacco juice and breathing the foul smoke from cigars and pipes you now walk upon carpets and breathe the fragrance from flowers appropriately placed in the polling places. Men have learned that women command influence in politics, and the best men are nominated for office because of the demand of the women for cleaner morals and higher and nobler standards.

One of the commissioners of elections in Kansas City, the largest city of the State, alluding to the much-mooted question as to what class of women vote, said:

> The opponents of woman suffrage insist that the lower classes freely exercise the franchise while the higher classes generally refrain from voting. As women in registering usually give their vocation as "housekeeper," it is impossible to learn from that record what particular ledge of the social strata they stand upon. Therefore, in order to locate them as to trades, business, etc., I give them the positions occupied by their husbands and fathers. I take the seventeenth voting precinct of Kansas City as a typical one. It is about an average in voting population of white and colored men and women and in the diversified industries. The 149 white women who registered in this precinct, as indicated by the vocations of their husbands, fathers, etc., would be classified thus:
>
> The trades (all classes of skilled labor), 32; the professions, 26; merchants (all manner of dealers), 16; laborers (unskilled), 15; clerks, 10; public officers, 8; bankers and brokers, 7; railroad employees, 7; salesmen, 5; contractors, 2; foremen, 2; paymaster, 1; unclassified, 16. Thus, if the opponents of woman suffrage use the term "lower classes" according to some ill-defined rule of élite society, the example given above would be a complete refutation. If by "lower classes" they mean the immoral and dissolute, the refutation appears to be still more complete, for the woman electorate in the seventeenth precinct is particularly free from those elements.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion right there as to the operation of the law in the State of Colorado with respect to the red-light district or the immoral district of the city of Denver.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The contention is made that good women will not vote and that the bad women will vote, when the fact is absolutely the reverse. The true situation in Colorado is that the good women do vote and the bad women will not vote unless they are almost compelled to go to the polls. The reason why this condition arises is because of the fact that they are in a business that they know can be closed, and they are afraid if they vote the wrong way the authorities who win will close them. Then, again, they are registered, and if they are registered under assumed names and are challenged they have to take an oath as to their names, which discloses in some way their true names. There is a great objection to that on their part.

So, as a matter of fact, the slum districts of the city of Denver do not poll the voters of that district unless some one in authority forces them out by sending a police force for the purpose of telling them that they must get to the polls. In that way, and somewhat in terror, they do vote, but left to themselves the immoral women will not vote, while the good women will vote. That is the experience in the State of Colorado.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his good suggestion in this connection. I think the example I have given from the commissioner of elections in Kansas City, the largest city in the State, clearly shows the same state of facts in Kansas where we have had municipal suffrage. So it is that the last objection, so frequently urged against woman suffrage, has been dispelled by experience; but whether we believe in woman suffrage or not, it is here and it has come to stay and to grow. It is difficult to find a prominent man anywhere in Kansas who openly opposes woman suffrage. The most eminent men and women earnestly advocate it. We usually find those opposed to prohibition also unfriendly to woman suffrage, and well they may be, for with the woman vote the last hope of the resubmissionist has been completely blasted.

It has been well said that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." Woman suffrage has worked successfully and satisfactorily wherever tried. Not a single State which has adopted it would go back to the old way. Not a single objection now urged against it has ever materialized in actual practice. Why one-half of the electorate of a free and independent Nation which glories in its freedom and equal rights for all should be denied the highest right of citizenship has never, to my mind, been satisfactorily explained. The women are to-day far more ready for franchisement than the men were when they first usurped the power. They would add more intelligence to the vote of the Nation than was ever added to the voting power of any Government at any one time. After all the intelligence of the Nation is given to its voting strength, then is the time to regulate the ballot and to eliminate the evils from ignorant and wrongful use of it.

I know of no better way to close my remarks than to use the words of Tennyson in defining this great movement in beautiful verse:

> The woman's cause is man's; they sink or rise
> Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free.
> If she be small, slight-natured, miserable,
> How shall man grow?
> The woman is not undeveloped man,
> But diverse.

Yet in the long years, liker must they grow;
The man be more of woman, she of man;
He gain in sweetness and in moral height—
She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind.

And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
Sit side by side, full-summed in all their powers,
Self-reverent each, and reverencing each;
Distinct in individualities,
But like each other, as are those who love.

Then comes the stateller Eden back to man;
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm;
Then springs the crowning race of humankind.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, when the State of Oklahoma was admitted into the Union the question of woman suffrage was brought up by an organization of good women in that State, and a poll of the constitutional convention showed that a majority of the members of that body were in favor of woman suffrage, although it had not been greatly discussed in the State. The natural sense of justice, the knowledge which men had with regard to the matter, however, had induced a majority of the members of that body to say that they favored woman suffrage. The moment that that fact was ascertained the liquor interests of the State of Oklahoma engaged in an active warfare against a favorable vote on woman suffrage and prevented it from being made a part of the constitution of the State. It will be remembered that Congress in carrying out the pledges made to various Indian tribes, that in territory occupied by them there should be prohibition, put into the constitution of Oklahoma a provision that the State of Oklahoma by a special ordinance should declare the establishment of prohibition in the eastern half of Oklahoma, which was occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes. The question then immediately arose whether the people of Oklahoma should not also by an ordinance establish prohibition for the western half of Oklahoma.

There were many saloons in western Oklahoma at that time. I recall in Oklahoma City counting 11 saloons on the principal block in the center of the city before this question arose and was determined by the people of Oklahoma in favor of prohibition. The saloon men raised a great cry in favor of continuing the open saloon in Oklahoma. The women were naturally opposed to the saloon, as they are always opposed to that which brings grief to their sons, to their husbands, to the men of their families, and thus to themselves. Because it was well known that the women would align themselves with the churches against the liquor traffic in Oklahoma the liquor interests made haste to impress their power upon members of the constitutional convention. By threats and by cajolery they changed enough votes to prevent the matter being submitted as a part of the constitution of Oklahoma. The dangerous enemies of woman suffrage are those interested in the liquor traffic, in gambling houses, in the white-slave traffic. The sentimental opponents of woman suffrage who are of pure purpose do not really amount to any serious opposition.

Before the constitutional convention in Oklahoma I made an argument in favor of giving the women in that State the right of suffrage. I did so because I desired to improve the conditions of government; I did so because I believed in the high sense of honor of women; I believed in their superior moral and ethical and intuitive sense, and believed that they would improve the tone and level of the suffrage. I had observed that about all that men seem to know of good morals, of religion, of good manners they had learned from women, and I desired that woman's spiritual force, woman's moral and ethical force, should be more actively engaged on the side of good government and that they should be given power to make effective their point of view.

The arguments in favor of woman suffrage are so numerous and so convincing to my mind that it is difficult for me to understand how it can be seriously opposed.

When we read our great fundamental law, when we take up the Declaration of Independence and examine its language, we find it begins in this way:

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another—

It does not use the word "men"; it uses the word "people"; and right through the Declaration of Independence runs the word "people"—not men, but men and women. The declaration is made in this great instrument:

That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Are not women governed by the law of the land? Are they not subject to the civil law? May not their property be taken from them by civil process, by trial by jury? Nay, Mr. President, may they not be denied liberty by the declaration of law, by the decision of a court or of a jury? May they not be denied life itself under the criminal code on the declaration of a jury and the decision of a court? Many a woman has had her life taken by the law of the land, but the history of this country records that where there is 1 woman convicted under the criminal law, in comparison there are 50 men who are convicted under the criminal law, because men, when compared with women, are about fifty times as bad, or, I should rather say, that women are about fifty times as good, so far as the criminal law is concerned. In truth, the men of the world are not bad; 90 per cent of the men of the world in reality endeavor to do justice, to live rightly, and to be good citizens and good neighbors.

In looking at this Declaration of Independence, all the way through is the declaration of the rights of the people—of "men and of women." When I look at the Constitution of the United States, the very first great words of that Constitution declare the rights of women, the power of women. It says:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The people means men and women; women are people.

The women of the United States had a part in establishing this Constitution; they had a part in fighting the battles of the Revolutionary War; they did their full share in that contest, just as they did their full share in the late war, and do their full share in every war that takes place.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma allow me to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In line with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, I want to call to his attention, and to have him discuss, the fact that, since we have no law of primogeniture in this country, practically one-half of all the property, personal and real, in the United States descends to women. By reason of that fact it is a manifest injustice that they are not permitted to make any laws with relation to their property, but are controlled solely as to the making of the laws by men.

I wish further to call attention to the fact that nearly every year in the municipal corporations of the United States improvement taxes are placed upon women's property to an enormous extent, almost equal in many instances to the value of the property itself. These special-improvement taxes are placed there without women's consent and in direct violation of the Declaration of Independence, which the Senator from Oklahoma has read, namely, that the just powers of government are derived "from the consent of the governed." I would thank the Senator from Oklahoma if he would dwell upon that subject.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will do that in due course, as I consider this matter; but, first, I want to call attention to the fact that the great original powers of our Government, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, proceeded upon the theory of the rights of the people, not the rights of some of the people, not the rights of men only, but the rights of men and women. I want it clearly brought forth in this debate that our great fundamental law does not contemplate denial to women of their rights, but recognizes throughout that these rights of the people ought to be enjoyed in common and equally. I remind you that New Jersey at the time when it came into the Union had woman suffrage, and it was on the authority of the women of New Jersey that the Constitution itself was ratified. And the Constitution was framed in such a way as not to deny woman suffrage. It failed to assert it, and so the rule was established by individual States.

Let me call attention to the language of the Constitution. Section 2 of Article I, where it refers to the House of Representatives being composed of Members, says they shall be "chosen every second year by the people." It does not say chosen by the men only, but shall be chosen "by the people"; and in apportioning Representatives and direct taxes, they are apportioned according "to the whole number of free persons," using the term "number of free persons," which means men and women.

And, then, when it refers to Senators the Constitution says that—

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The term "person," of course, is always referred to as a relative pronoun by the word "he"; but certainly woman is a person; certainly woman is a citizen; certainly woman is an inhabitant; and certainly woman is one of the people. She fills every requirement where the descriptive term is used.

When it comes down to the constitutional amendments, we find that Article I provides that—

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The people means men and women. If women are people and have all the acknowledged constitutional rights, why should a just man deny the vote which will protect these rights?

And the women, being people, are here now as petitioners praying for the recognition of their just rights; and, for one, I not only am willing to concede their just rights, but I insist, so far as I can, that their rights shall be recognized.

Article IV of the amendments to the Constitution provides that—

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.

And women should have the vote to enforce their guaranteed rights as people, because women, at least, are people.

Article IX of the amendments provides that—

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

That is, the rights retained by the men and women of the land.

When we come to Article XIV of the amendments, section 1, we find it reads:

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Women are therefore citizens of the United States.

Will any man deny that women who are "born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," are citizens of the United States and citizens of the State wherein they reside? Then follows this language in Article XIV:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

And women are citizens.

Mark the words "privileges or immunities." "Privileges or immunities" are terms not so strong as rights. A privilege would seem to imply some particular special grant, while a constitutional and natural right is a broad constitutional power vested indefeasibly in a person. You might take away a privilege or an immunity, but you can not take away the indefeasible rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," or of any of those rights which belong of necessity by nature to a man or to a woman. I hold that under the laws of nature and under the laws of God, written before man wrote his laws upon the statute book, a man and a woman have certain rights indefeasible, indestructible, not to be taken from him by his own hand, not to be contracted away, rights which are holy in their character—the right of liberty, the right of life, the right of the pursuit of happiness. These rights were vested in men before human law was written, and they were vested in women as well, and should not be denied; they can not be long denied and they must not be denied. If the Constitution thus forbids immunities to be taken from citizen women, how much more unjust to take the greater rights from women or to deny such rights.

The fourteenth amendment continues:

Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

In a high, true sense it is not due process of law to take the life, the liberty, or the property of women by law in which they have no part, where they are not allowed to nominate or elect those who write the law and execute the law, where their consent is not given in due form to the law.

When you deny a woman the right of suffrage, do you not, as a matter of good conscience, deny her "the equal protection of the law"? Answer that proposal with a conscientious, upright mind! When you deny women the right of suffrage, you do most emphatically deny women the equal protection of the law. Men can vote for or against the lawmaker; men can vote for or against the representative; men can vote for or against the judge who is to sit upon the bench; men can vote for or against the sheriff who is to select the jury; but when women are denied the right of an equal voice to select the judge who shall sit upon their rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," the women are assuredly denied equal justice and equal protection of the law.

When we come to read the other portion of the fourteenth amendment we find again repeated this recognition of the people in apportioning the number of representatives in determining who shall be chosen as the representatives; and in Article XV we find that—

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Under that amendment the right, even, of a negro to vote can not be denied. Shall it be maintained that our Constitution intended that this right should be granted a negro man and yet denied to white women? Is that a true interpretation of the rule of reason in interpreting the laws of this Republic?

Article XVI provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes.

On the incomes of men alone? No; on the incomes of women as well as of men. Shall women who pay their proper part of the income tax have no right to be heard in choosing those who shall pass the laws in regard to taxation or in selecting those who administer the laws of taxation?

On May 3, 1910, in a memorial of the National American Woman Suffrage Association demanding for the women of the United States the recognition by Congress of the right to vote the officers of the association laid down several good reasons which justify a modification of Article XV of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States so as to include the word "sex." Those reasons are very compact, and I call the attention of the Senate to them:

(1) The women of the United States are citizens of the United States, entitled by nature to an equal right to enjoy the opportunities of life.

Will that be denied? Can any man say that women are not entitled by nature to have an equal opportunity to enjoy life? And do they have an equal opportunity when they are not permitted to participate in government; when they are not permitted to nominate or elect men for office who are going to write the laws which govern them and their property?

The second reason is:

(2) Women perform half the work of the United States.

Will any man deny that? Would any man exchange with a woman or be willing to attempt to perform her allotted tasks? The woman who takes care of the house, who sees that the food for the family is provided and prepared, who sees that breakfast, dinner, and supper are cooked and served properly and in an attractive manner; the woman who looks after the servants in the house, cares for the children, and makes the home a pleasant place to live in performs a difficult task.

The woman must see that the house is kept in good order. It must be kept clean and free from dust, the furniture must be kept attractive, and the innumerable details which characterize the cares of a woman's life as a housekeeper, as a mother educating the children, caring for their manners, their morals, their health, justify the claim that women do half the work of the world.

I call attention to the fact that many activities formerly conducted by women in the home have been transferred to factories, and now women must enter the factories to do work which was formerly done in the home. In these recent days we find, however, that there are 8,000,000 women, outside of domestic service, engaged in the struggle to make a living in active competition with men in factories of every description, and we find women and girls standing at machines all day long outside of the home doing the hardest labor of the world.

It has been found that giving the right of suffrage gives women a better and more equitable wage for equal service performed. Upon that ground—the ground of common honesty, the ground of common justice, the ground of permitting a woman an equal opportunity to make her living in an honest fashion without being driven to vice by harsh, cruel treatment—the suffrage is justified.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In other words, woman suffrage opens up avenues and occupations for woman which now she has not?

Mr. OWEN. It does.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And, by reason of the increased number of occupations, it makes that much more of a demand for her labor, and therefore, according to the principle of supply and demand, would naturally increase her wages?

Mr. OWEN. Yes; and it makes the politicians pass laws that will require equal wages for equal work, and it has the effect of making the employer of labor more respectful and considerate to those who have additional power. If you take away power from a man or a woman, that person can be more easily imposed on.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. Did the Senator observe that the passage of the eight-hour law in the District of Columbia, prohibiting the employment of women for more than eight hours a day, has caused the loss of employment by a great many of them within the last few days?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, Mr. President, any law which you pass has some unavoidable accidents attending it. The number losing employment has been grossly exaggerated. It will ultimately increase the employment of women. In a forward movement of an army there are always a few individuals who may possibly be harmed, a few casualties; but an eight-hour law for the protection of the women and children of this land is justified and essential, notwithstanding the observations of the Senator from Florida. I think some sinister men have discharged some women in a spirit of resentment against the law itself and as a protest, but without real justification.

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the Senator concede it to be a fact that since this law was passed prohibiting the employment of women beyond eight hours many of the women who formerly worked longer than eight hours have lost their positions and men have been substituted in their places? In what way did that benefit the women of the District of Columbia?

Mr. OWEN. It will benefit the women of the District by preventing in future injurious and ruinous hours of labor, in the conservation of the life and efficiency of the working women of the District. The retirement of a few women from the employment of harsh taskmasters to engage in other activities is not really an unmixed evil.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wish to say that the fact that they have lost their positions is in no way a condemnation of the law. It only serves to accentuate the fact that men are willing, in business, to sacrifice women, children, or anybody else to promote their material interests.

I can not vote for this amendment, because of certain conditions which I shall explain here later; but there can not be any suggestion, there can not be a reason even thought of, that will condemn the law which prohibits the working of women and girls more than 8 hours out of the 24.

Mr. BRYAN. There would be no objection to the law if you applied it to all alike; but when you undertake to say that women shall not be employed more than eight hours a day, and leave employers free to employ men beyond eight hours a day, you put it in the power of employers to deny employment to women and to discharge those who are already employed. That is just what has happened.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the alleged facts in the case referred to by the Senator from Florida, in which the law prohibited women from being required to work over eight hours, and permitted their places to be filled by men because the men were not forbidden to work over eight hours, would only illustrate the defect of man-made law which does not deal equitably with the sexes. In my opinion there ought to be a rule which would prevent men being employed for over eight hours. I think human efficiency is best accomplished where eight hours is the limit of human labor for one day, whether on the part of a man or a woman; and the incident cited, if true, only illustrates that the law made by men alone is defective. If the law has unjustly injured women, it shows that women should have had more consideration. If they had the suffrage, their interests would be more tenderly considered.

But I think the facts have been seriously exaggerated to the Senator from Florida. I submit to the RECORD a statement of Constance D. Leupp, president of the Consumers' League, to which I respectfully call attention:

301 MUNSEY BUILDING, *Washington, D. C.*

Ever since the President signed the LA FOLLETTE bill prohibiting the employment of women in industry in the District of Columbia for more than eight hours a day, we have heard nothing but complaints as to the harm this humane and necessary piece of legislation is doing to the workingwoman.

Three years ago when California passed a similar law it was discredited in the same way. When the new child-labor law came into effect in Massachusetts five or six months ago the same thing happened there.

No thinking person will conclude that because the adjustment to a reform measure is difficult that therefore we must leave bad industrial conditions to continue forever.

Women and children must be protected. We have been very slow in getting this law onto the statute books in the District of Columbia. If we had left it still longer the adjustments would have been still more difficult.

The District Commissioners wrote last year to the chairman of the Committee of the District of Columbia, recommending the passage of the bill: "The employment of women is on the increase here as elsewhere and legislation enacted now will not only tend to correct such abuses as exist, but to prevent their further development." (P. 7, hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia, S. 7723.)

The fact is that the adjustment will not be nearly so difficult as the employers are giving us to understand.

Where work must be done for more than eight hours in any one day, we have pointed out that it can be arranged by a shift system—having some of the women come on a little later than some of the others.

After the eight-hour law had been in effect in California for two years it was voted a success by a large number of the employers who had originally opposed it. The records of the California bureau of labor show that very few women were replaced by men as a result of the law, but that a great many more women were employed where the shift system was put into effect.

The same thing, we have every reason to believe, will result in the District of Columbia.

CONSTANCE D. LEUPP,
*President Consumers' League.*

The third justification for granting to women the right of suffrage is the women bear all of the children of the United States, a labor of great anguish and pain, necessary, indeed, to the life of the Nation and outweighing any labor that men perform.

It has been said that women do not serve as soldiers, and hence should not vote. The answer to that is that the bearing of a soldier is more painful and dangerous than being a soldier. Every mother is entitled to a substitute as a just reward for this dangerous service, and the right to vote is not confined to soldiers. In fact, soldiers rarely vote.

The late "Poet of the Sierras" has thus epitomized the battle of motherhood:

The greatest battle that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where or when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not,
It was fought by the mothers of men.

Women have the courage, however, to go on the battlefield, and as nurses they do go on the battlefield with a courage that is as magnificent as men ever show. Their courage, both physical and moral, can not be denied. Every physician knows that women bear physical pain with more courage than men do.

The women not only bear the children of the Nation, they educate them. It is of the highest importance to the national interest that the children should be educated by mothers who are themselves educated, by mothers who understand government.

A fifth reason that justifies suffrage is that women inculcate in the children of the Nation lessons of morality, of religion, of industry, of civic righteousness, and of civic duty.

Is not this a great and important labor, performed in the interest of the Nation? Is suffrage too great a reward for such useful and honorable service to society?

Sixth. They deserve to be honored by the children of the country as entitled to equal dignity and honor possessed by men.

Should a son trained by a mother be given a dignity and power superior to his mother? Is a good son justified in desiring this right denied his mother?

Seventh. Women pay half of the taxes of the United States. Does not this justify suffrage? If "taxation without representation" justified our fathers in waging war, shall our mothers endure this injustice?

Eighth. Women possess half of the property of the United States, or at least they are entitled to possess half of the property of the United States by virtue of labor performed and duty well done. If they possess half the property, shall they be denied the power to protect this property? Is not suffrage necessary to protect property rights as well as other personal rights?

Their property and their right to liberty and to life are subject to law. The law controls the property rights of women and the rights of women to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Therefore they are justified in demanding the right to a voice in the election of the representatives who write these statutes and who execute them.

Mr. President, it has been well established, beyond any possible controversy, that where women have been given the suffrage there has been an immediate and prompt response to the feminine sentiment in passing laws more favorable to the protection of child life. In Colorado, immediately after suffrage was established, there sprang up in that State the most highly perfected school system that any State in the Union has. A woman is superintendent of schools there. There followed in that State the juvenile-court law for the protection of child life; laws establishing the curfew, to prevent children being exposed to temptation at night; laws raising the age of consent; laws taking care of defective children; laws punishing those who contributed to the delinquency of a child; laws taking care of the weaker elements of society, of the deaf and dumb, the

blind, the insane, the poor; laws beautifying the cities and improving many other conditions of life.

One of the strongest reasons, in my opinion, in favor of woman suffrage is that if woman suffrage were established it would be an important factor in putting an end to machine politics, which have corrupted the governing powers of this Nation to so large a degree and in so many instances. Women will not stand for a man known to them to be immoral and corrupt, even if he be the party nominee. Women can not be persuaded to favor the liquor traffic, the white-slave traffic, gambling, or others evils of society. There can be no community of interest between the evil elements of the State and the feminine vote. I think this is of very great importance in purifying and making more rapidly effective the improvements in government which we all desire.

When you examine to see who are the opponents of woman suffrage, outside of the sentimental class, outside of those who belong to the conservative class—a constantly diminishing number, so far as woman suffrage is concerned—you will find that invariably the active, real, true enemies of woman suffrage are those who are engaged in the liquor traffic, those who are engaged in corrupt transactions around the town, in gambling, in keeping disorderly houses, and those who are machine politicians. You will always find that the machine politician is vigorously against woman suffrage, that the liquor interest is against it, and that those who are engaged in improper conduct of affairs around town are against it.

I am acquainted with the sentimentalism which builds a halo around woman and places her upon a pedestal and bows down and extends courteous admiration, and sometimes, I fear, gross flattery to woman, and then denies her fundamental justice. With that sentimental nonsense I have no sympathy. I had rather be denied courtesy than justice, and so had every thoughtful woman.

There have been many arguments made against woman suffrage, such as that women would be insulted at the polls. That argument has been exploded. Instead of their being insulted at the polls, the polls have become decent places, where men do not insult each other.

It has been said that women would be corrupted by politics. That has been shown to be utterly fallacious. The character of women will not change. They go to church just the same. They are the backbone of the church. You may go to a church, and you usually see at least two or three women to every man, and sometimes a much larger number. The women are the custodians of religion and morality in this land. The charge that they will be corrupted by giving them an opportunity to put an end to corruption springs from a corrupt reason, or from a corrupt reasoning, as you please.

It has been said by some that women would vote with their husbands, and therefore there is no need of giving them the ballot. Others say they would vote against their husbands, and therefore that they ought not to be allowed to vote at all. Well, you may take your choice of these arguments. They nullify each other. Neither one of them has any merit. If they voted with their husbands, it would be perfectly right if they chose to do so; but with an Australian ballot they could do as they pleased about it. If the husband was a sot, engaged in drunken debauches, and was in favor of the liquor traffic, you may be sure his good wife, who was afflicted by his conduct, would vote against him in that matter.

It has been said that women would neglect their homes. Nothing of the kind has proven to be true. It does not take any length of time to cast a ballot. A woman going down town, about her ordinary shopping, can drop into the voting booth and deposit her ballot and go on in five minutes. There is no trouble about it.

One of the important results shown in Colorado when they granted woman suffrage was that immediately a very large number of books upon the art of government were sold throughout the State. It demonstrated to me the fact that women immediately undertook to discharge their responsibilities with intelligence, and that as a conscientious duty they got elemental works upon government and studied the questions which were involved. In that way it is evident that a very much greater public knowledge upon questions of government would be obtained by having women as well as men interested in such questions.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] enlarges upon the theory that there is nothing in the contention that women are subject to taxation without representation; and he attempts, by a fine-spun theory, to show that there is no merit in that contention in favor of woman suffrage. The only way you can avoid it is upon the theory that the woman's husband, as her representative, will vote for her if she have a husband; but if she have not a husband, if she be a widow with a large family of girls, should they be denied the right to express their opinion as to the selection of a mayor in the town, or the police officials? Are they not interested in the administration of the laws protecting the home against burglary? Are they not interested in a proper system of caring for the sewage of the town, for the health of the town, in the supply of water and gas and electric light and street car service and in the innumerable things that are done by the town administration? If they have no vote, many a town administration which is corruptly managed by the machine can neglect them, can ignore their rights, can impose unfair taxes on their property for street improvement, and can deny them an adequate remedy.

You may say that they could go to law about it and protect themselves; but the proper way to protect human beings is to give the right of suffrage to them, because any thoughtful student will agree that "the right of suffrage is the right protective of every other right." Men have fought for that right, they have died for that right, because of its importance, and no just man should be willing to deny this vitally important right to women. All generous men should insist upon freely giving this just right to women.

I want my wife and my daughter to have this right; and even if they have not studied the question and do not appreciate its value and do not ask for it or even want it, still I have studied the question, I do understand it, I know its value to them, and I know its value to honest, good government, and I insist upon providing them this right so necessary to them and so important to me and to the ideals of good government which I am anxious to see established.

The Senator from Florida enlarges upon the fact that the constitution of Massachusetts gave men only the right to vote. In the early days of Massachusetts they had self-governing town meetings. The citizens of the town would come together in a "town meeting," and they would make their law in simple, direct fashion, talking it over together and laying down the rules that should govern the town. It was not necessary for the women to come under such circumstances. There was no discrimination then that would affect their interests injuriously. The men did what was necessary. It was a primitive state of society. Now, however, with 90,000,000 people in this Republic, with conditions becoming more and more difficult all the time, with some of the States having as many as 10,000,000 people, it is absolutely necessary, if justice is to be dealt to women in this country, to give them the right of suffrage, so that they may protect themselves by their own votes, and so that they may do more—so that they may protect their children.

I think there is not in this Capitol a more pathetic speech than that engraved in marble by the State of Illinois upon the statue of Frances Willard as one of her great appeals to man. She said:

> Ah, it is women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune. Into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared, by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay, by the incense of ten thousand prayers wafted from their gentle lips to Heaven, I charge you, give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have so loved.

Mr. President, this Government is not based on brute force; it is based on intellect, on spiritual and moral forces directing the intellectual forces, which in turn can command material forces, and in the conduct of government women have a moral, spiritual, intellectual power which is of the greatest value to the Republic. These powers should be made as effective as possible in developing our great Republic and in speedily consummating its obvious magnificent destiny, and through the direct exercise of the suffrage alone can these powers of our splendid American women be made most effective.

Speed the day when American men shall fully appreciate the great service women can render society and government through the simple, dignified, direct power of the ballot.

It has been strenuously contended that woman's place is the home. Yes; we may all agree to that generous sentiment. We all know how splendidly women have cared for the home; how pleasant they have made it, how comfortable, how useful, how happy, when they have been permitted to do so by man-made laws, which unhappily have driven millions of them into the machine shops and factories.

Let us concede, however, that woman's place is the home, even if she has been driven by millions out of it into a labor market.

But what about the home, where woman's best place is? Does not the law vitally affect the woman's home and her happiness and her children and her health and her protection from crime?

Does not the law and its administration become of vital concern to her when in its hand is the safety, the health, and the welfare of her home?

Does not the law take charge of the teaching of her children, selecting the teachers of her children, building the schoolhouses, safe or unsafe, sanitary or insanitary?

Does not the law say when, where, and how the children—her children—shall attend the schools, the books her children shall use, the desks where her children shall sit, the water her children shall drink, the towels with which they may affect their eyes or their health if sanitary or insanitary?

Does not the law and its administration fix the social, moral, and intellectual administration in which her children are compelled to go?

Does not the law permit or refuse to permit the seduction of the open saloon to allure her sons to destruction?

Does not the law permit or refuse to permit the brothel which may destroy the chastity, the honor, and the physical powers of her sons?

Does not the law permit or refuse to permit the actual practice of white slavery to steal away the virtue of the daughters of the poor?

Does not the law determine whether the food which comes into her house shall be honestly measured to her or dishonestly measured to her?

Does not the law permit or refuse to permit impure food and impure drugs to be sold to her home, affecting the health and the happiness of her home?

Does not the law determine whether the streets in front of her home and in the town in which she lives shall be clean or unclean; whether the sewerage of the town shall be sanitary or insanitary, affecting the health of her home?

Does not the law determine whether the garbage and refuse of the home shall be removed or shall not be removed, thus affecting her health, her comfort, and her peace of mind?

Does not the law determine whether there shall be adequate police protection of her home against trespass, against nuisances, against assault or burglary?

Does not the law and the administration of the law determine whether the city water be abundant and pure and economical in her home?

Does not the law and the administration of the law determine whether the gas supply be abundant, pure, and economical in her home?

Does not the law control the electric lights in her home?

Does not the law control the telephone service in her home?

Does not the law determine whether the city she lives in shall be economically and efficiently administered and that the taxes exacted from her shall be honestly and wisely expended?

Does not the law in a broad way determine whether the town she lives in shall be made a pleasant place or an unpleasant place to live in?

No thoughtful man will deny that the powers of the law over the home are the powers which vitally affect the health of the home, the safety of the home, the pleasure of the home, the happiness of the home, the economy of the home; that it vitally affects the life of children, the health of children, the happiness of children, the protection of children from vice; and to say that the woman who is charged with the duty of making the home safe, pleasant, and happy shall be denied any voice in selecting men who shall wisely write the law and efficiently and faithfully administer the law that is necessary to the happiness of her children is to deny the obvious.

But in reality women are not only vitally affected in the home in all these ways and in many other ways, but absolutely her life and her liberty is subject to the courts, and the jury that may take from her her property, her liberty, and take from her her life, and to deny her the right of a voice in a Government which deals with her property, her liberty, and her life in this way is unjust to woman, an injustice to which I will never consent.

I should like to see a part of the energy of the human race diverted from pure commercialism into home building. I should like to see a restoration of society where woman could have a larger part in building real homes, in bearing children, and in raising them, in performing more fully the functions which have made them in so large a measure the custodians of homes and of children, and I do not doubt that this will be brought about much more speedily when women are given more power in electing public officers and determining with their vote questions of public policy.

Mr. President, this is a great moral question; a question of human liberty, of human rights. It must be settled with justice. I wish my wife and my daughter to have the same rights under the law which I myself enjoy and which I regard as essential to the preservation of my own life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and I am not indifferent in the matter. While I appreciate the fact that many whom I regard with great respect do not favor woman suffrage, and while it seems unpopular in many States where the reasons justifying it are not well understood, or where sentiment and conservatism still control on this question, I felt it my conscientious duty to defend what I believe is both the natural and constitutional right of women.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, as the author of the pending joint resolution it had been my purpose to discuss the subject at some length, but it has been so ably discussed by the friends of the resolution, and particularly by the distinguished member of the committee who presented it [Mr. ASHURST], that I do not feel I would be justified in taking very much of the time of the Senate in discussing a question which has been so fully presented by both sides. I feel that it is my duty, however, because I favor the joint resolution, to say a few words in its behalf, particularly as applied to my own State; and I think I may safely say that the conditions which prevail there are not essentially different from those which prevail in other States.

The agitation in Oregon commenced prior to 1880. I as a young man, new in the State, remember it particularly because it was all entirely new to me. I was born and reared in a Southern State and went to the western country with a feeling which many southern men had of antagonism to the propriety of enfranchising women. I soon overcame that prejudice, which was inborn in me, and which still lurks in the bosom of nearly every southern man, I am sure, and I became an ardent supporter of the doctrine of equal suffrage. As the youngest member of the Legislature of Oregon in 1880, I had become so far converted to the cause that I was one of the very small majority of that body which submitted the question of amending our constitution to the voters of the State. Under the constitution as it existed then, and under the constitutions of most of the States of the Union now, it is required that a resolution shall be passed by two separate votes at two sessions of the legislative bodies before it can be submitted to the people to be acted upon. So, although it was determined at that session of the legislature to submit the proposed amendment to the people of the State, it was not agreed by the subsequent legislature to submit it, with the result that the people did not have an opportunity to vote on it for a number of years after 1880. But agitation never ceased from 1880 until it was finally accomplished a year or two ago.

Much has been said about the corrupting influence of equal suffrage upon the good women of our land, and that, in the very nature of things, if suffrage is given to the latter it will result in the neglect of home and fireside. I can not resist the temptation at this time to say that the first address I ever heard delivered upon the subject of woman suffrage in Oregon was by a distinguished woman who is now living, who is loved and honored by every man, woman, and child in the State. I refer to Mrs. Abigail Scott Duniway. She was then a young woman rearing a family, and she found time in the numerous household duties which devolved upon her to devote much of her energy to the cause of woman suffrage.

In those early days, Mr. President, the home life was not an easy life, and whilst she was devoting her time to the training and education of her children, all the domestic affairs which are now done in many homes by hired help was done by this magnificent specimen of the western mother, and in her duties and in her efforts made in the cause of woman suffrage she found time to raise a splendid family of children. As an evidence of that I call attention to the fact that one of her sons, who has since grown to manhood, is the president of one of our western universities and is highly respected and honored wherever he is known. Another is a prominent lawyer in my own city, distinguished for his ability, his refinement, and his training. Another is a distinguished business man of the West. Another was elected State printer of Oregon on two separate occasions and discharged every duty that devolved upon him up to the very time of his death, as the son of a splendid woman should discharge those duties. Aside from that, the daughter attained the same distinction in her walks of life that the sons attained in theirs.

I simply state this, Mr. President, to illustrate the fact that there is nothing in the charge that if a woman is given the right to vote she is thereby compelled to neglect her domestic duties and the duties which she owes to her family. I feel honored in being afforded this opportunity to say this much of this distinguished woman, who lives to-day beyond the age of 80, loved, respected, and honored, and after having lived to see the cause in which she has battled so long finally prevail in the State of my adoption.

Oregon has been charged with being a sort of experiment station in legislation. I can remember the time, and it was not very far in the past, when it was suggested that Oregon was a freak State because it blazed the way for what I am pleased to call popular government. It was one of the first States in the Union to put to a practical test the doctrine of the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. Its example has since been followed by many States.

Since the adoption of these measures, let me say to you, the people have exercised a conservative judgment in everything that has been submitted to them. Our legislative bodies were charged with being corrupt. Our polling places were in many cases too disreputable for any woman, or even for any decent man, to go to exercise the prerogative of an American citizen. After the Oregon system was adopted we found at once that legislation was enacted by the people which the legislatures for years had refused to crystallize into the form of statutes. Amongst other things, there was the Australian ballot law; there was the direct primary law; there was the practical election of Senators by a direct vote of the people, which Congress has subsequently ratified by constitutional amendment. It is true it was not a legal obligation to vote for the popular choice for Senator under the Oregon method, but it was a moral obligation, and no member of a legislature felt that he could dare disobey it. Other beneficial and forward steps in government were had under the initiative and referendum, and every time an attempt has been made to enact a law which was inimical to the best interests of the people it has been defeated by popular vote.

With all these laws in force, Mr. President, giving to the people the right to do those things directly which in times past they were compelled to look to a legislative body to do, and with the elective franchise conferred upon the women of the State, I venture the prediction that from now on every step in legislation in Oregon will be a forward movement.

It does seem a little strange that there should be objection made to granting to women the right of suffrage on the ground that its influence is corrupting, when, if the statutes of the different States be examined, it will be found that in nearly all the Western and, possibly, in some of the Eastern and Southern States women have had the right to vote for 50 years or more in all questions which affect the schools and, incidentally, the home life. If they were competent to vote upon matters of this kind, if they were capable of exercising the franchise intelligently on questions affecting the school and questions affecting the home life, how can it be truthfully said that they will not exercise the same discriminating judgment in matters of greater public policy, if it is possible to place any policy above the training of the children of the country?

I can remember, Mr. President, in my own time when it was almost worth a man's reputation in my State, under the domination of corrupt political machines, to go to the polls for the purpose of voting. I remember—and I state it as a fact—that I once saw a thug sitting in a window near an election booth at a precinct where a distinguished ex-Attorney General of the United States was compelled to go and vote. He held a gun across his knees and intimidated many who dared to come to the polls for the purpose of exercising the right of voting. I mention this because it is a matter of local history with us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator what year this incident occurred in?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Somewhere along in the early nineties. I do not recall the year.

Mr. REED. When was it that the State adopted all its reform legislation except woman suffrage?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Somewhere along about 1902.

Mr. REED. Then the men themselves, without the aid of woman suffrage, had done away with this evil condition?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; they were beginning to do away with it.

Mr. REED. They had pretty thoroughly done it, had they not?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think they had pretty thoroughly done it. I am not going to claim here, I will say to the Senator, that when women are granted the right of exercising the voting privilege the millenium is coming and that everything is going to be purified. Human nature is the same in men and in women, and I am not making any such claim as the question suggests. I do make the claim, however, that as a fundamental proposition the women have a right to vote, and that, too, under the provisions of the Constitution that have been cited by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The conditions to which I call attention existed not only in Oregon, but they existed in other Western States. It speaks well for the men that many of those conditions have recently found a cure in modern statutes, like the Australian ballot law, the direct primary election law, corrupt-practices acts, and other statutes of that kind.

The women have voted only once in my State and that at the last election. Prior to the time when they were permitted to vote the men had so safeguarded the polling places that any woman, however refined she might be, could go to the polls without the least fear of insult or contamination from any source whatsoever. There is no thug sitting now at the polling place to prevent either men or women from voting. Not only that, but no one is permitted to approach within a certain distance of the polling place. I am the father of four daughters and I would not hesitate to let any one of them walk unattended to the polls in any place in the city of Portland, with its 300,000 people, and I would feel that she could return from the polling place to my home or to the home of her husband just as pure and just as refined as the moment she left her home to go there to vote.

The conditions of life will not be changed for the worse in our Government if the women are permitted to vote in other States in this Union. We will find that woman's influence will not only not be unrefining, but we will find that her influence will be purifying and beneficent. While there was a time when disreputable men were in the habit of frequenting the polls the very fact that women are present now keeps such individuals from attending the polls or going within a given distance of them.

I am not afraid to trust the women of Oregon nor am I afraid to trust the good women of my native State or any other State in this Union with the right of suffrage.

Mr. President, I favor this joint resolution, fundamentally because it is right, and, in the second place, I believe that there will follow in the wake of the granting of this right to the women the elevation of the home life. Who more than woman is interested in the proper training of our children? Who more than woman is interested in the proper regulation of the working hours of the young of our land? Who more than the women of our country are interested in protecting our sons from the unregulated saloon and other contaminating influences that surround them in early life? Who more than they will see to it that everything is done that will better the condition of the family and the home life? I for one am perfectly willing to intrust them with this great power and this great privilege, and I feel that because of their influence the benefits will be realized very much earlier in my State, at least, than it has been hoped for.

I felt it to be my duty to say this much because as the author of the joint resolution I did not want anyone to conclude that I was opposed to it or was afraid to express my convictions upon the subject. I would go into it at greater length but for the fact that my distinguished colleagues have covered the subject so fully and so well that very little is left for anyone to say except to express himself as in favor of or against the joint resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, it is not likely I can add anything to the information on the subject. I will be satisfied if I do not subtract from the sum total of human knowledge already available. If I were sure that the passage of the joint resolution and its ratification subsequently by the required number of States would result in no immediate improvement of either national or local conditions, I would still be for the resolution. I am not idealist enough to believe that instantly upon the ratification of this amendment there would be a general advance in the several States of the Union so as to create idealistic conditions. I am not that hopeful. Probably I have lived long enough to be somewhat skeptical about ideal conditions created by mere human laws. Laws are merely helps. They mark some sufficient advance, but are of not much avail unless they are backed by a condition of public sentiment that itself is the result of actual progress in the management of human affairs.

So, for me, I am not intent upon having proved to my satisfaction that this improvement will instantly occur. From my viewpoint I find it difficult to accept the conclusion that there is any inherent abstract justice in the denial of this right any longer to a large portion of the American people. The distinction now drawn is illogical. I do not think it is in keeping with any other distinction made by the laws of this country. It would be as sensible, from my way of looking at it, to limit the right to vote to men 5 feet 10 inches high or 6 feet in circumference, or blondes, or brunettes, or of a given weight and rotundity, as it is to limit the right by the mere physical dis-

tinction of sex. Are they not human beings? Are they not possessed of a sufficient degree of reasoning faculties? Are they not sensible to the ordinary influences of evidence, sentiment, business, the ordinary relations that subsist between one human being and another? If that is so, it is difficult, from my viewpoint, to resist the logical deduction that a woman has as much inherent right to vote as anybody else has.

There was a time when she could not own property. That was in English-speaking countries a sort of a development of the feudal tenure. It came from an age of force. It did not come from an age when human reason controlled the action of men or served as the basis of government. It came from a time when the government, such as it was in that primeval day, was based upon the sword. The remark has been made that there are but two kinds of government in the world. One is a government by force and the other is a government by law. Governments by force exist yet in many parts of the world. In some places where force can not intervene there is no government. That is the unhappy condition of the Republic across the Rio Grande. In my judgment, it would be the exact condition of the Philippine Islands if the strong hand of the United States were removed from that population as at present constituted. So we must choose, if we are to have a government at all, between the two kinds—government by law and government by force.

In the day when there was government by law, somewhat imperfectly recognized after the departure of the Dark Ages, a movement had begun to struggle out toward a better condition along the highway of human progress. It was well enough then for women to remain under the protecting hand of the physically stronger element of the population. In the days when the military chieftain, by individual bravery, gathered about him his hardy band of followers and made his forays upon the neighboring clans, or in later days, when more military discipline and greater instruments of human destruction were made available by the invention and wit of men, such discipline and instruments prevailed and the military leader became the great living embodiment of human government. Whether in the one age or in the other in those days, it perhaps would have been futile for women to have had the ballot, because the word of that military chieftain was the law of his land. He embodied in his person all the departments of government. He made the law, he executed it, he expounded it, and applied it in the rude form of justice when military law did not prevail in his country.

In that time, Mr. President, I can understand why a woman would not ask the right or privilege, whichever it may be denominated. I can understand why it would have been a failure, because woman does not reign, either in the years past, where her influence has been supreme, or now by physical force, nor does she ever grasp the sword and enforce her domination upon any part of the population by brute strength. Her empire has always been in gentler means, but she nevertheless ought not now be denied her vote. So in those early days I can understand why it would have been improper, useless.

I can not understand now why in the leading countries of the world it is so. We are properly indulging in a great deal of self-congratulation about our progress, about our love of justice, about our development of republican government. We must not forget that we are not the only republican government that has been on earth since recorded time began. History is full of them. They have departed. Few ancient republics exist in this world now. Hemmed in by her mountains, accessible only by rugged passes, the little Republic of Switzerland has existed, a neutral ground, being a place of refuge for those who have fled from countries where government by force prevailed. With a few of these, sufficient to reach back into an earlier time, along with them are hundreds of republican forms of government that have vanished from the earth and have left nothing but the melancholy example that they perished by their follies and their excesses.

This is a republican form of government. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] read from the preamble to the Constitution, written at Philadelphia in 1787, it does not say "We, the male people of the United States," but "We, the people of the United States." That is not of value from a lawgiving or a lawmaking point of view, save as it indicates what its framers had in mind. It indicates the spirit of the men who wrote it. Consequently, in a government by law it seems to me woman has some proper part.

I myself do not think that this Government can endure by mere force, whatever our history may have been. If it is finally to be backed up by military force and to be dependent upon that for its continuance, it is at least but a foundation of sand. I rather take the other view—that moral sentiment is the basis of enduring republican government. If that is so, I see no reason why woman herself should not participate in this government of moral sentiment. I do not think any good law ever existed—I do not care whether it was of a reformatory character or merely of a preservative character—to gather in rights that had already been developed by constant struggle; whichever it may have been, every enduring law of value possesses back of it the underlying substratum of moral sentiment. If it does not, it is only a temporary fiat; it is the fleeting edict of the multitude, born of excitement, born of some ephemeral issue that in the lapse of years must necessarily perish with the same mutable element that produced it. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems, this being a Government by law, it is a Government in which woman can properly participate.

This leads me to the further observation that government is created not to support people, but to protect people who support themselves and those who are properly dependent upon them for support. The latter are those who are disabled by age, by infancy, or by their physical or mental condition from being the responsible breadwinners or doers of things on the active theater of life.

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that eventually this will be a government that will support everybody. A government is primarily created to protect its people. Its province is to keep them from being interfered with by those who are physically stronger or more influential wrongfully to disturb or destroy them. Civil society existed before government was invented. Civil society is the ultimate end, and government is but a means to that desired end. Therefore, government being an instrument of civil liberty, woman, under a reign of law based upon moral sentiment, becomes a proper factor in the creation of those laws. I am not talking about moral sentiment in its restricted definition; I am taking it in its broader sense, not relating to personal conduct, but a broader foundation of things that are just and right in human affairs. If womankind has an underlying moral sentiment, if she can contribute by her influence to the passage of wise and just laws and their administration, she ought to be admitted as a voter.

I do not think government creates civil liberty. If it does, I have not read to any purpose or reflected in my moments of leisure to any purpose upon that subject. I do not think the Constitution creates any rights. I think civil liberty existed before man thought of protecting it by law; law only protected and regulated it. I think the great headlands that have been thrown up, the promontories that are built out into the rushing tide of human affairs, do not create any constitutional rights. They existed before constitutions were ever written and before civil rights were ever prated idly about by those who did not understand them. They only safeguarded and guaranteed those rights. They were inseparable from human life before any of the great historic charters were written. So it occurs to me that a woman has a right to participate in a government which regulates all those ancient rights by law.

If it were a government like Huerta's, of Mexico, like that of Carranza or of Villa, I would have my doubts about whether woman would exert any moral influence upon some or all of those men who seem to be governed solely by the power of the sword; but I am not talking of that country; I am talking of ours on this side of the boundary. Because that is so, I find it difficult to deny to woman the right to take part in governmental affairs.

As I see things, one of the most vital questions was raised by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]; that is, the subject of invading—if that term may be properly applied in this sense—the right of a State to regulate this subject. I am somewhat sensitive on the subject of taking away any legitimate power of a State. I think the State is a great training ground for American citizens. I would rather have a State do something that belongs to its local sovereignty than to transfer that power of the State to Washington.

I am opposed to any bureaucratic government where any local power inherent in the State can properly discharge the same duty. We have all the bureaus in Washington that I care to help create by any vote of mine. I have no especial sympathy for that particular brand of citizen who is continually looking to Washington for relief. Every time he stubs his toe he shrieks for help from the Capital. I would rather see a strong State acting within her legitimate province, discharging her powers to the full limit, with strong, capable departments taking care of everything that was left to her legitimate sovereignty when the Constitution of 1787 was ratified by the requisite number of States than to transfer a solitary one of those powers to the Federal Government. It is already exercising within its limits all that it can efficiently do; and if I would not be regarded as digressing or interfering with some-

body else's prerogative, I would suggest that, in view of the revenue reported by the Treasury Department of the United States, which shows now a constantly increasing deficit of $12,000,000 for the three months beginning with October and ending with the quarter—about $4,000,000 a month—instead of taking on additional duties, to become additional charges to the Government, instead of taking more powers, about which there might be some controversy from the States, and creating more bureaus at a cost of about a million dollars per bureau—for it never costs less than that to create a new bureau here; that is the initial cost—instead of doing that I would turn the tide back to the States and let the States perform some of these functions, and give supervision, if necessary, wherever that power can be properly exercised.

This is sentimental, it is true, but sentiment lies at the basis of these enduring laws which I have mentioned. This unpopular document known as the Constitution of the United States, that of late years it has become necessary to apologize for every time you mention it, has not fixed the limit on the qualifications of voters in the several States. It only says that in the election of Representatives in Congress the voter shall have the qualifications requisite for voting for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That is all you will find in that document on that subject. It leaves it to the State to fix the qualifications, excepting only the mandate of the fifteenth amendment.

Fifty-six years ago this fall there was a great discussion on what a State could do to destroy a national right by unfriendly police regulations. Well, we have reached it. I do not wish to discuss that question; it is foreign to this joint resolution to discuss the effect of the unfriendly exercise of the police power on a right regulated by the legislatures of the States. I know, however, just as well as do the people who dwell in those States, that they have successfully, by unfriendly police regulations, extirpated that right given to a certain class of citizens by the fifteenth amendment. But I shall not discuss that question here, because I regard it as entirely foreign to the merits of this particular joint resolution, though at some appropriate time I shall regard it a duty to give my views on it when it is before the Senate in some proper way.

I am only making that as a preliminary statement to remark that voting is always exercised locally. There is no way to get away from the local regulations. Every State must have registration laws; the voter must live at some place; there must be some limit to your residence, your precinct, your ward, or some other political subdivision in which you have "a local habitation and a name." These laws are made so that you will not get somebody else's name, if I may depart from a Shakespearean quotation, and be sure you only vote once. We are not sure of that in some places in the country. I am sorry to say that I hail from a country where this occasionally happens.

The conditions of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] spoke have prevailed for a long time. I think womankind would better them somewhat. Whether it would be a complete revolution, I do not know; but she would better them some; and if she did not make them any worse, as I remarked last summer, I see no adequate reason for denying her this right. So long as the right to vote is regulated by the legislatures of States by registration, time of residence, age, sex, understanding, education, or whatever you call it, poll tax, ancestry, color—although that is prohibited—still the details of which I am talking are police matters; and so long as that is so the State will be supreme, and there is no way to prevent it, except the public sentiment existing in that State, unless we radically depart from existing constitutional powers.

I am not prepared to say what the solution of that difficulty will be. It is an existing one. It only shows that if a national right to vote must be exercised under the domestic regulations of a State, which are embraced in police powers, using that term in the widest possible signification, that State can so regulate that right as to accomplish the purposes of the local sentiment in that State. That is what is the matter now in those States in regard to which some controversy has arisen in this Chamber as to the justice or injustice of such regulations. I see no way to settle it in the passage or defeat of this particular joint resolution. At least, its passage will not destroy the State's present right to do so. The exercise of that right being local, it will continue to be regulated both as to men and women, as to Americans either of Caucasian or of African birth or origin. So I do not see, for my part, any valid objection to the passage of this resolution on that ground. If it were a right that could be transplanted and held under a national regulation without being interfered with by the local police powers of a State, I could understand why it would instantly emerge from its local condition and become a national question involved in the passage or defeat of this resolution. At present it is not.

If it were a question like human bondage, where the individual subject to servitude was carried to any State or Territory in the Union with the same bonds attached to him in the territory to which he escaped or was removed, as in the State where the peculiar institution once existed, I could understand, then, why this controversy would necessarily be wrapped up in this resolution, but it is not. This right, if created under the Senate joint resolution, will be a right that will be exercised in the very nature of things under the local regulation of the State. It calls for the exercise of domestic discretion on the part of the legislature. I do not, for my part, see that any Senator from the territory affected by some criticisms that have been made here, which I will not discuss at all, should hesitate a moment to vote for this resolution because of any possible fear of that kind.

I have given some time in my leisure moments to thinking of the question whether if the Government, by constitutional processes, can enlarge the right to vote, it can not also restrict that right. This is a very pertinent inquiry. I think it can both enlarge and restrict the right of voting for any Federal officer. In an election that relates entirely to the domestic affairs of a State I do not think it can, because with that the General Government has no concern.

This question has been discussed here very largely as if the passage of this joint resolution amended the Constitution. It does not; it is only the submission of a proposed amendment. We submit it to the States for their action. Critics of this joint resolution have suggested that there be a referendum taken in the States, so that the people at some ensuing State-wide election hereafter may express themselves whether they are for or against it. That would be mere stage work; it would be a drama in a playhouse; it would accomplish nothing. This is a legislative process that is the initiatory step of a constitutional amendment. We are proceeding along lawful lines. When the proposed amendment shall be submitted 48 States in the Union will still have a fair choice on what they want to do. They must elect their legislatures who ratify or reject it.

I think the seventeenth amendment has helped this question considerably. Sometimes we travel so fast that we do not see the milestones and we do not know the distance traveled. I am inclined to think that we have lost sight of the seventeenth amendment. I believe we will have better State legislatures than we used to have, for they will have less to do of a nature to complicate and involve their work; they will not again elect Senators. I had, probably, a different motive from that of some of my associates in supporting for the last 10 years, as I have done, the proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. I favored it not so much as a matter of reforming the Senate—I do not think it will reform the Senate; I think the Senate will be about the same old body after all; not much better and, I hope, not much worse; I am not a very good judge of its condition, but only a casual observer, stopping here a little while, possibly—but I do think that the legislatures of the States, and especially of the larger States, where the right to vote has been a mooted one, will be better than they have been heretofore. I have seen whole legislatures nominated and elected, their committees organized, the chairmen of the committees selected, the membership of the committees determined, the speaker elected, and everything bartered, pledged, and peddled out, in order to elect somebody United States Senator; and when you got through what did you have? You had a machine that was framed to do something else, framed to kick a man out of his candidacy but not fit to make the shoe that kicked him.

That is why I supported the seventeenth amendment some years before it arrived. I thought the legislature had enough to do to take care of the ordinary business of the State; to take care of the great supply bills of the numerous departments; to settle the controversies that arise between the metropolitan cities and the rural population, the great questions of public franchises, the questions of revenue and taxation, of the development of social justice along sane and just lines, so that it would be no longer a war cry about which nobody had any particular information. I thought that was enough to engross the activities of the average able-bodied legislature, especially of the larger States, where these questions reached some time ago the acute stage.

So the change came. Therefore when this resolution is submitted to the 48 States of the Union they will have just as good legislatures at least as they had before, and I trust I am not too optimistic in hoping that they will be somewhat better,

because they will be less burdened. Every one of the States, when that happens, will have a chance either to ratify or reject the proposed constitutional amendment, so that it seems to me as if the State will have its rights fully preserved until 36 States adopt the proposed amendment. Then the 12 States, of course, if they oppose, must submit, but they are no worse off than the States have always been since the first amendment to the Constitution was adopted; they must submit to it; there is no way of avoiding the necessary effect of the form of government under which we are living.

The argument is made here—and I admit with some force—that the right of suffrage is now denied in 8 or 10 States; but is that a reason why we ought to reject the pending joint resolution? It does not impress me in that way. It does not argue that because a wrong may be committed in some States a right ought to be denied in all the States. I may not agree with the propriety of the police regulations of a State. It would be just as sensible for me to condemn a whole State because somebody committed a crime in that State as it would be for me to vote against the pending joint resolution because one or more of the 48 States of the Union had done something contrary to what I think is right. That does not affect the merits of this question. For instance, shall 38 States be denied the right of suffrage to their women residing within their respective limits because 10 States do something by a local police regulation which I think is not right? I fail to see the force of the argument.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I want to make a suggestion to the Senator. There is nothing in existing law that would prevent the 36 States from giving the franchise to women, if they so desired.

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Is the Senator aware that it is possible to take 36 States out of the 48 and yet have the 36 States show only a minority of all the people of the United States? In other words, is the Senator aware that there are 12 States in this Union with a larger population than 36 States that could be named? I want to ask, in that connection, if the Senator thinks it is fair for the 12 States, with probably a majority of the people of the United States, to be coerced against their will with respect to the functions which up to this time have been very properly regarded as State functions? I ask this question in no spirit of hostility, because with respect to the main principle involved I perhaps have looked upon it with as much favor as has the Senator from Illinois; but at the same time I recognize the right of each State to settle this question for itself, just as the nine States which now permit woman suffrage have settled it for themselves, but not under the pressure of any coercive influence of the other States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is that all of the interrogatory?

Mr. O'GORMAN. That is all.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is complete, is it?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well. The question is certainly an entirely proper one to ask, since, if it be properly discussed and examined, it must shed some light on the merits of this resolution.

First, if I get the viewpoint of the Senator from New York, not only 10 States or 12, but 8 States can politically dominate the country, if you have reference only to population, and especially to voting population. If you would spread a map of the United States before me, I could put my hand on 8 States in the Union that by returned votes will absolutely dominate 40 States if you will put the law in a certain condition. I will allude to that further on. The question is whether 8 or 10 States can possibly thrust upon the other 38 or 40 States woman suffrage against their will. The reply to that is, first, they can not. It will take 36 States to thrust it upon the remaining 12. I am talking about conditions and not about abstract theories. Those are the conditions under which it can be done. The established channels of constitutional amendment compel 36 States to ratify an amendment before it becomes valid as a part of this instrument.

That is one thing. I will state another: If it could be said that a minority of States had the power to thrust this amendment bodily into the Constitution and impose it upon the majority of States, I would say that is no more than has been done in the history of constitutional amendments. It was not done in that exact manner, it is true; but there was thrust upon them by way of constitutional amendment on the suffrage question a whole race of people, contrary to the wishes of some of the States.

That brings me, however, to a question that I do not care to discuss. I am only alluding to it as a constitutional condition we once faced. I do not regard that as an argument. I am only citing it as a condition.

Before this amendment can become valid as a constitutional provision 36 of the States must ratify it; so there is not a solitary one of the States left out that can complain. Every one of them, through its constitutional power, will be heard upon the question of ratification. On the other hand, the argument of control of the 48 States by 8 or 10 possesses some merit. I will only say in regard to it that I have taken the trouble—and I will give the figures before long—to take the election returns of 1912, and they show that eight States of the Union can absolutely dominate the whole Democratic Party under certain provisions.

What are those provisions? A nation-wide primary law, in which whole States shall be nothing more than mere provinces to foot up the returns of the vote, cast them up in a total column, and find out where the plurality is, abolishing the electoral college, abolishing everything else except a nation-wide primary; abolishing the convention of delegates, abolishing any means of communicating with the different States save through the agency of the press and the public magazines.

Who is in favor of the direct primary for nation-wide nominations? The President, the titular head of the Democratic Party. I am not in favor of it. Still, this argument urged against woman suffrage, if it applied on all fours to this resolution, Mr. President, would be no more than the President has already urged by way of message upon the Senate and upon the whole Democratic Party of the United States. I think, for my part, that it is an erroneous view that he holds. I do not intend to vote for any such act of Congress.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield further to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'GORMAN. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if he approves of the doctrine of a nation-wide primary?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir; I am opposed to it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. But the Senator does approve of the pending resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'GORMAN. May I ask why the Senator opposes a nation-wide primary?

Mr. SHERMAN. Because I believe the States have a right to preserve their relative importance in nominating conventions or other nominating processes.

Mr. O'GORMAN. And yet the Senator does not think a State has the right to preserve its relative importance with respect to the elective franchise?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, I do; and the fathers who wrote the Constitution in 1787 thought the same way or they would not have required 36 States to ratify an amendment or to act affirmatively upon it before it could be thrust on the remaining 12. Nine of the original thirteen States adopted the Constitution, and it became operative on the nine. The other four came in only because they did not want to stay out and be Uitlanders in the new Government.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Would the Senator favor an amendment to the Constitution by which the President and Vice President might be elected by popular vote?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir. I will get to that pretty soon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from New York seemed to think that three-fourths of the States of the Union could force this amendment upon the remaining 12 States, although the 12 States had a majority of the entire population of the United States. That would be theoretically possible, but only theoretically so. Practically it would be impossible, because the Constitution contemplates that before an amendment can be voted upon at all by any of the States it must be submitted by a vote of both Houses of Congress; in one House, the Senate, by a vote which represents to all intents and purposes two-thirds in number of the States, and in the other House, the House of Representatives, by a vote which represents two-thirds of the population of the country. So before this amendment can be even submitted to a vote of the States, two-thirds of the people of the United States must speak for it through their representatives. Therefore, while it is theoretically possible, it is practically an

impossible thing that 36 States of the Union, possessing less than one-half of the population, could force an amendment of this character upon the remaining 12 States.

Mr. SHERMAN. That arises from our double form of government. I think it was written in the Constitution in a very stable way. It preserves the States. It was intended to preserve them and to give them their relative importance, the small States with the large. I am aware that the Democratic Party is perhaps more zealous in its advocacy of that principle than is my party, but when it comes to a question of that kind, I think I am in full accord with the Democratic Party on the subject, because it is not a political question; it is governmental. It is not political in the partisan sense. It is purely a question of maintaining the system with which we began our national life.

We have had an opportunity to look upon the primary law in its operation in the city of Chicago. On the 24th day of February there was a primary election held in the city. I have the figures here, which I wish to add for the proper illumination of this subject. This is woman's first effort in a primary. In the 35 wards of the city of Chicago 158,524 women registered. There are in Chicago potentially 500,000 women of voting age. So, in round figures, about one-third of the total woman population eligible to vote registered for the city primaries of last February. The total men's vote registered 433,624 in the 35 wards.

A primary was held on the 24th of February, 1914, for the nomination of municipal officers. These are the nominations of candidates for alderman, of whom one is to be elected from each of the 35 wards, covering the whole area in which this voting population exercises that right.

It has been suggested several times that woman was not sufficiently interested to go to a primary or to an election. Let me preface this statement by what has actually happened in years past with men.

I have seen primaries in the early days of primary legislation when not 10 per cent of the voters of a given area voted. I have seen other primaries when 70 per cent of the total potential vote went to the polls. That was in 1912, when there was a strenuous contest between two opposing candidates in the Republican Party, and a somewhat animated struggle between two Democratic candidates, the present Speaker of the National House of Representatives and the President. That drew a very large percentage of the potential vote, the largest in the history of the State.

I wish now to recur particularly to the primaries held in the 35 wards of the city. Out of the total registered vote, as given, of the women 47,527 voted at the primary. The total number of men voting at the same primary was 126,916.

Of course there are more men registered voters. They and their predecessors have been voting since the State was admitted into the Union. This is the first time the right was ever given to a woman in the city of Chicago to vote at a primary.

Let me figure the percentages, not mere numbers. Mere milestones do not indicate the direction in which people are going. It is necessary to take the compass to find in what direction the toes of the traveler may be pointed; and that ultimately, in the course of years, will determine his destination.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if it is not true also that in Illinois the primary law provides that a person is compelled to vote at the regular election following it in the way that he votes at the primary, or for two years he is not permitted to vote differently than he voted in the primary? And is not that a condition which might easily preclude from voting at the primary those who wanted to be at liberty to choose between candidates in the following election?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the primary vote does not impose any obligation, legal or otherwise, upon any voter to vote for the candidate at the ensuing election. It does disable or restrict that voter from exercising the right to vote in any other party primary for two years.

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Unless the woman refrained from voting, she had to vote the Democratic or Republican or some other ticket in the primary, and she could not vote for two years in any other party primary.

Mr. OWEN. So that the women would be justified in not voting at the primary in order to leave themselves at liberty to choose between the contending parties at the regular election?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir; not at the regular election, but they could not vote at any other party primary for two years if they wished to change. Some misunderstanding, I think, arose——

Mr. OWEN. So they had full justification for not voting at the primary, which would tie their hands when it came to the election?

Mr. SHERMAN. It would not bind them in the ensuing general election, but would disqualify them from voting any other primary ticket for two years if they wished to change.

Mr. OWEN. Showing their superior sense.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir. That undoubtedly had great influence in keeping a larger number both from registering and from attending the primaries. The percentage, however, was what I was particularly solicitous about. The percentage of the registered women's vote at the primary is 29.98. The percentage of the total men's vote at the primary is 29.46. In other words, if it is reduced to the percentage test, the women have fifty-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent the best of the attendance at the primaries in Chicago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not quite understand the inquiry of the Senator from Oklahoma and the answer to the Senator from Illinois. Is it possible that if a voter in the State of Illinois participates in a party primary he is precluded from voting as he may desire at election time?

Mr. SHERMAN. No.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to ask if that were not true.

Mr. SHERMAN. He did ask that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Of course that could not be true.

Mr. SHERMAN. The reply I made to him, which I aimed to make as clear as I could, was that he could vote for any candidate he pleased at the ensuing election.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me illustrate it in this way: If he voted the Democratic ticket at the primary on February 24, 1914, he could not for two years thereafter vote at a primary as a Republican at any time within the two-year limit.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand that.

Mr. SHERMAN. But it does not affect the election itself.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But he can vote at election time for whomsoever he pleases. There is no party ballot there.

Mr. SHERMAN. He can vote for any person he pleases.

It has seemed to me that this two years' residence that is required in a party is a little excessive. I believe in a party primary being conducted by members of that party. I do not believe in my right to interfere in the nominating affairs of a party against whose candidates I intend to vote. I think party nominations ought to be made by men or women who are reasonably, and within proper restrictions, affiliated with that party. I have seen the time, in the days of soap-box primaries, when a large number of voters, or those claiming the right to vote, went to the primaries and nominated the candidate when they were not of that party. Sometimes they went from no sinister motive. Often, however, they went for the improper purpose of nominating the weakest candidate that could be selected. That candidate, when named on the ticket, was the easier defeated; so there was an influence that was entirely improper exercised by the outside voter on the party choice.

In order to protect against that, this provision was enacted in our present primary law. I think probably it administered a little too strong a dose of the medicine; nevertheless, I am in sympathy with it, when reasonably applied. I believe the present two-year limitation ought to be relaxed.

I wish to go a little further on this subject. I do not think extending to women the right to vote will interfere with the administration of justice. I think it will advance it. If I were a woman being tried for an offense of which I were guilty, I should greatly prefer to be tried by a jury composed of men than by a jury composed of women alone. Men have in countless verdicts acquitted a woman charged with crime when she was guilty. The guilt was lost sight of.

I wish now to take up particularly the effect of having women policemen in the city of Chicago. They have exercised that right.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall be glad to yield, however, if there is any other order of business.

Mr. REED. How many women policemen have you in Chicago?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know the number.

Mr. REED. About five or six, or something like that, have you not?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think there are eight.

Mr. REED. How many male policemen have you?

Mr. SHERMAN. Four thousand, approximately.

Mr. REED. That is about the number.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is manifest that it will be impossible to finish the consideration of the joint resolution this afternoon. Would the Senator from Illinois just as soon conclude his remarks to-morrow?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 5, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1914.*

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Edward Minor Watson, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, vice John T. De Bolt, term expired.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Phillips, of Boston, Mass., lately secretary of the embassy at London, to be Third Assistant Secretary of State, vice Dudley Field Malone, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Lieut. Col. James C. Sanford, Corps of Engineers, to be colonel from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Maj. Herbert Deakyne, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant colonel from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Maj. Charles S. Bromwell, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant colonel from February 27, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. James C. Sanford, promoted.

Capt. Edward N. Johnston, Corps of Engineers, to be major from December 6, 1913, vice Maj. Charles Keller, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry A. Finch, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from December 6, 1913, vice Capt. Edward N. Johnston, promoted.

Second Lieut. Howard S. Bennion, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from December 6, 1913, vice First Lieut. Henry A. Finch, promoted.

## WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn March 4, 1914.*

James M. Underwood to be postmaster at Farmerville, in the State of Louisiana.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

## WEDNESDAY, *March 4, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all souls, we draw near to Thee that we may be stimulated by the contact to think well, act well in all the relations of life, that we may reflect in our thoughts and acts Thy will as we know it in the heart of the Christ, and have the approving conscience and hear the "well done" singing in our hearts, which is the crowning glory of every task, the crowning glory of every well-ordered life. In Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has informed me that he desires to deliver a message to the Congress to-morrow. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to consider the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 33.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives Thursday, the 5th day of March, 1914, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roster of committees.

The Clerk proceeded with the call of committees.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia (when the Committee on Education was called). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House joint resolution 84.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education.

The SPEAKER. The House resolves itself automatically——

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pending that, I will be very glad indeed, if I am in order at this time, to have some time agreed upon as to the discussion of this resolution. It is a House resolution, and I think that 30 minutes will be a sufficient time. I ask unanimous consent that all general debate close in 30 minutes on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] asks unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution be confined to 30 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Fifteen minutes to be allotted to those in favor and 15 minutes to those opposed.

Mr. MANN. Why not make it 30 minutes on a side? Probably not all of that time will be required.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Very well; I will make that amendment—30 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution be closed in 1 hour, 30 minutes to be allowed on a side, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] will take the chair.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 84, with Mr. SLAYDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 84, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education.

*Resolved, etc.*, That the publications of the Bureau of Education, excepting the annual report of the Commissioner of Education, shall be published in such editions as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 12,500 copies for the first edition.

SEC. 2. That whenever the edition of any of the publications of the Bureau of Education shall have become exhausted, and the demand for it continues, there shall be published, on the requisition of the Secretary of the Interior, as many additional copies as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to meet the demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education has had under consideration this resolution and has carefully investigated it and has made a unanimous report in its favor. Under the existing law only 1,000 copies of a circular and 12,500 copies of a bulletin can be printed for distribution by the Bureau of Education.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the case of some of these publications the edition now permitted by law is not sufficient to meet the most urgent demands. In many cases a great many more copies are demanded. In the case especially of those publications relating to phases of rural education or secondary education or to school sanitation the maximum allowed is entirely inadequate, and the bureau is compelled to decline thousands of requests from the persons applying for those documents.

This resolution is similar to a law already in existence in the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau of Education exists almost solely

for the purpose of disseminating information, and this information is given largely through bulletins and circulars.

I sincerely hope that the House will pass this joint resolution. We believe it is right, and we believe it ought to pass.

Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wish to take any time? I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, so far as I could hear, has not yet told what the resolution does.

This is a resolution with a peculiar title, considering what is in the resolution. It is entitled "Joint resolution limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education." What in fact it is is a joint resolution removing the limit and allowing unlimited editions of publications of the Bureau of Education. This resolution is to confer unlimited authority upon the Bureau of Education, or the Secretary of the Interior, to publish unlimited editions of the publications of that bureau—a right which no bureau or department of the Government possesses to-day. Even in the Department of Agriculture, with the great demand for agricultural bulletins and other publications, there is no such thing as unlimited power to publish unlimited editions.

This resolution provides in the first section that an edition of 12,500 copies of bulletins, which is the present limit, may be issued, but when that edition is exhausted the Secretary of the Interior may order as many additional copies as he may deem necessary to meet the demand—the free demand. There is no limit now upon the authority to publish bulletins to be sold. People can buy all they want, but when it comes to issuing free bulletins, the authority of any department of the Government to issue unlimited editions is not now conferred. How are you going to draw distinctions between this and all the other departments of the Government?

We are publishing now, free, more literature than is published by all the other Governments of the world combined. But here is the first time in my knowledge when it is proposed to confer upon any department or bureau the authority to publish as many copies as it desires.

The Commissioner of Education in his report says that there are more than 1,500,000 teachers and school officials in the United States, and in the report in another place he practically says that unless you can send the bulletins to all those people it is hardly worth while to send them to any of them. Is it proposed to publish a million and a half or more copies of every bulletin issued by the Bureau of Education, to be distributed free throughout the United States at the expense of the Public Treasury? Where are you going to stop if you commence this?

This report comes from the Committee on Education, to which the gentleman's resolution was referred. That committee did not have jurisdiction of it. The Committee on Printing is the committee that has jurisdiction of any proposition for printing by the Government, and it endeavors to preserve some equality between the different departments and bureaus of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I do not know a single bureau of the Government, or a single department of the Government, that is not complaining that it does not have authority to issue sufficient copies of its publications, or that it does not have sufficient appropriations to print all that it wants to. I can see no reason why we should start in authorizing any department of the Government to issue unlimited editions of its publications. Some gentlemen say there is a great demand for this. I do not know, for I seldom receive requests for any of the publications of this bureau. I endeavor to glance over many of them; some of them are not worth publishing, some may be. I am not prepared to support any proposition that confers upon a department of the Government the right to publish millions of copies of their bulletins for their own distribution throughout the United States. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has forgotten the calf poem read the other day by the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MANN. I have tried to. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. The children are crying for copies of the calf poem.

Mr. MANN. If this resolution should pass, every child in the land would be urging the committee to publish millions of copies of that brilliant poetic effusion in order that they might recite it in all the schoolhouses in the country.

People suppose that it is the duty of the Government to publish everything free. The superintendent of documents will sell these publications to anyone who desires to buy. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending resolution is set out in the resolution itself, which provides that publications of the Bureau of Education, excepting the annual report of the Commissioner of Education, shall be in such editions as the Secretary of the Interior may recommend, but not to exceed 12,500 copies of the first edition, and that whenever the edition of any publication shall be exhausted and the demand continues there may be published as many additional copies as the Secretary may deem necessary.

In order to ascertain the present needs of the Bureau of Education in this matter of the publication of bulletins, it will be necessary to consider its powers, duties, services, and possibilities of development.

The law establishing that bureau was enacted in 1867. In the beginning it was an independent department. In 1868 it was made a bureau in the Department of the Interior. In the original act the powers and duties of the bureau are set out in part in this language:

> That there shall be established at the city of Washington a Department [bureau] of Education for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

In 1896 that act was amended as follows:

> The Commissioner of Education is hereby authorized to prepare and publish a bulletin of the Bureau of Education as to the condition of higher education, technical and industrial education, facts as to compulsory attendance in the schools, and such other educational topics in the several States of the Union and in foreign countries as may be deemed of value to the educational interests of the States; and there shall be printed one edition of not exceeding 12,500 copies of each issue of said bulletin for distribution by the Bureau of Education, the expense of printing and binding such bulletin to be charged to the allotment for printing and binding for the Department of the Interior.

It will be observed that the Bureau of Education is charged with the duty of disseminating the results of its investigations, and in the performance of this duty is limited to the publication of reports and bulletins.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman answer this question: Is not this a very dangerous precedent to establish, and would not the same reason lie for granting the request of other departments if you grant this?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will try to answer the gentleman in the course of my remarks. As I was saying, the Bureau of Education is limited almost entirely to the use of reports, bulletins, and circulars in the work of disseminating the results of its investigations. I submit that it is unreasonable and unwise to limit the operations of the bureau in this way and at the same time impose restrictions that virtually render it incapable of performing the duties required of it by law.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman know what this will cost? Has he figured on that phase of it at all?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I do not. I understand, however, that the amount available for such expenditures is limited by the appropriations made for the Department of the Interior. Besides, we can afford to be liberal in our expenditures for educational purposes.

The limitations contained in the existing law were fixed many years ago, when interest in educational subjects was not so great and widespread as it is to-day, and at a time when the demand for the publications of the bureau was unknown. Since that time we have made wonderful progress in education. Yet in many of the States the task is only begun. Much remains to be accomplished before adequate educational facilities have been provided for all of the people. In fact, to students of education it is coming to be evident that the task of providing adequate educational advantages for all of the people is beyond the power of some of the States to perform.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does the gentleman think it is wise to take off the limit and permit this bureau to publish in unlimited quantities, regardless of cost, any effusion they may desire to foist upon the people of the country?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I think it would be wise to give the bureau the power to respond to the requests of interested people, especially of teachers and school officials, for information per-

taining to such subjects as are investigated by the Bureau of Education.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman know that people request innumerable publications, not because they really know and want what they contain but because they are free?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. It may be true in some departments. I doubt that it is true of people interested in educational development.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is it not true in all? In 10 years' experience I find that I get requests for different publications from people who I am sure do not have the remotest idea of what the publications contain. I think it would be exceedingly unwise to take off the limit and permit this bureau to publish regardless of cost.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. It is not proposed to take off the limit of cost; that will be regulated by the amount appropriated to the Department of the Interior for that purpose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Not under the language of this resolution. We give them here express authority to publish millions and millions if the Secretary of the Interior will O. K. the order. There is no limit until you exhaust all the money in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The Secretary of the Interior is limited in his expenditures by the amount of the appropriation. This resolution authorizes the republication of bulletins only when the supply is exhausted and the demand continues.

Mr. HAMLIN. You give him unlimited authority and he would come in here and ask for the amount to be appropriated, and we could not refuse to give him the amount after giving him the authority to publish unlimited quantities.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. In answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] relative to the powers of other bureaus, I desire to call attention to the Bureau of Mines, another bureau in the Department of the Interior. Some time ago Congress gave to that bureau exactly the power that is proposed in this resolution for the Bureau of Education. In fact, the language employed in this resolution is the same language as that used in the act giving this authority to the Bureau of Mines. So far as I am informed no one claims that this power has been abused in the operation of the Bureau of Mines. Why should it be abused by the Bureau of Education?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. For a question.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman say that there is a demand coming from the people to have this publication privilege widened?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Indiana, I will state that under existing law the annual report of the Bureau of Education is limited to 20,000 copies.

Mr. COX. I understand that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The bulletin is limited to 12,500 copies and other publications to 1,000 copies. For a few of these bulletins the demand is less than the maximum allowed by law. For many of the bulletins and circulars the maximum number is insufficient; and for most of them the maximum allowed by law is very adequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. For instance, the bureau at present is unable to supply any copies of the 3 bulletins published in 1906; it can not supply at present any copies of the 4 bulletins published in 1907. Only 1 of the 8 bulletins published in 1908 is not exhausted. Only 6 of the 11 published in 1909, only 4 of the 6 published in 1910, only 5 of the 19 published in 1911, only 7 of the 33 published in 1912, and only 30 of the 60 bulletins published in 1913 are not exhausted. Yet requests for exhausted bulletins are received daily.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. For a question.

Mr. COX. I have not read the hearings upon this resolution, if the committee had any hearings upon it; and if they had, I would like to have the gentleman state in a general way what class of people throughout the Nation is making a demand for copies of bulletins. Whence comes the demand?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. In answer to the gentleman's question I would say that the requests come chiefly from school teachers and school officials, of whom there are about 1,500,000 in the United States. The subjects investigated by the Bureau of Education are important and of great interest to teachers, school officials, students in colleges and universities, and students of education generally. Some of the subjects investigated are school organization, school administration, courses of study, methods of teaching, and the policies and experiences of other countries in education. The present demand greatly exceeds the supply of bulletins relating to rural education, school sanitation, secondary education, and vocational training. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the Congress has recently authorized the creation of a Vocational Education Commission, and it is reasonable to suppose that for many years there will be an increasing demand for literature bearing on the subject of vocational education.

I called attention to the growth of education and the expansion of interest in educational matters. During the last year for which we have statistics the States of the Union expended for educational purposes $446,726,929. If all had expended as great a sum per capita as did the 10 States making the largest per capita expenditures the total would have been $692,875,664, or $263,086,255 more than was expended. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that since there is widespread interest in educational subjects, since there is a great and increasing demand for information of the character provided by the Bureau of Education, we can not afford to hamper that bureau in the performance of its work. If it is to render the best service of which it is capable it must be provided with the necessary means. I trust the House will adopt the pending resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield me some time?

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. SHERLEY. Four or five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, this resolution ought not to pass, in my judgment, and the precedent given as justification for passing it is the best reason why it should not pass. We are told that we ought to take off the limit because we did so for the Bureau of Mines. That is the very best illustration of the danger of a bad precedent that you can have. Take the limit off as to the Bureau of Education and then you will have a committee coming in in a week or two reporting a similar resolution and saying that we ought to take the limit off from, say, the Department of Agriculture; that because we have done it for the Bureau of Mines and for the Bureau of Education we ought to do it for the farmers of the land, and then some one will compute how many farmers there are in the country and how many bulletins each of these farmers needs and how absurd it is to fix a limitation of any kind; and if Congress is going to pursue this plan it ought to pass a general statute, to save time, giving to the departments the right to do what they please and then provide that we will arrange for a printing press to print the money to pay the bills.

It is all very pretty to come in and talk about the people's interest in particular things. There is an interest in some things, but there is no country on earth that wastes as much money in printing as does the Government of the United States of America. There is not a year goes by that we do not have statements made to us of the need to clean up the waste matter that we have printed at public expense and which has not been used. This material can be purchased for cost, and why the Government of the United States should undertake to furnish every person unlimited numbers of copies of any subject matter which he may wish passes my understanding. The Bureau of Education has the right now to print 12,500 copies, but it is proposed to take off all limit, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] remarked, here is a resolution that is designated a resolution to limit, when in point of fact it is a resolution to destroy all limit and to give to this bureau power unlimited. I believe in the zeal of an officer. I never knew an officer worth his salt who did not think his work was of great importance to the country, but the zeal of particular men run away beyond any other man's judgment, and we have an apt illustration in the case of the Commissioner of Education. If he pursues the same policy to get requests for his bulletin that he did to build a back fire on Members of Congress to increase his appropriation, I have no doubt any amount that we supply will be totally inadequate to the demand. But for us to undertake here simply to give him free rein is to violate every rule of safe legislation. In my judgment, what we ought to do is to go right to the opposite. We ought to do away with all free publications. England does not even distribute free a copy of a bill introduced into Parliament. Every document has to be bought. It is true they are bought for a very nominal sum, but the result is that those who want the document pay the tax for getting it, whereas in America everybody is taxed for much that nobody wants and for much that only a few want, and there is very, very great waste in our printing account.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he is in favor of offering any encouragement whatever to the promotion of education in America and to the Bureau of Education?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer that by saying yes, I am; but I am also in favor of teaching the very salutary lesson that it is the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the duty of the Government to support the people; and we are constantly going on the theory that in order to help somebody you must take away from him all expense and all effort on his own part.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Would you favor limiting the Bureau of Education in the future to the issuance of publications in order to reach the people? Would you favor that?

Mr. SHERLEY. I certainly favor a limit upon that bureau, the same as I do upon any other bureau. I do not think the work of that bureau is so unusual as to warrant its being made an exception and a favored child of the Government. Nearly all the work the departments do here is supposedly educational work. Why should we not take the limit off from farmers' bulletins? Why should we not take it off the bulletins of the Bureau of Public Health?

I hope the bill will be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], chairman of the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I concede the liberality and admire the spirit of enterprise which prompts the champions of this bill, but it seems to me that of all the bills that remove the "lid" entirely that I have recently encountered in the way of a printing measure, this reaches the limit.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no limit.

Mr. SHERWOOD. There is no limit to it.

Mr. BARNHART. So far as the departments are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that there is not a department head but what is insisting more and more all the time that he shall absorb the functions of the Government Printer. We have established and have in active operation one of the greatest printing establishments in the world. These departments insist on doing more and more of their printing. I do not know that this is true of this bill, for nobody can tell from the reading of the bill what it does mean except that the Bureau of Education shall have unlimited authority and power to issue such bulletins as it sees fit to publish from time to time.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield; yes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Does the gentleman claim that if this proposition is adopted the Bureau of Education will not be limited by the appropriations made to that department for that purpose?

Mr. BARNHART. The possibility is that it would; but nevertheless it would leave the matter entirely open to the bureau——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Within certain limits.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but in these bureaus the custom has grown up of really juggling appropriations. That is to say, they will take a fund appropriated for paper and apply it to printing, and vice versa; and they use these appropriations so that every dollar of every appropriation is absorbed each year, and a good deal of this stuff develops into junk.

Why, I have reliable information that one Member of Congress, in the not very distant past, gathered up a lot of this printed stuff and sent to one post office in the State of Ohio two carloads of printed matter that had been placed in the discard, and was all out of date. You can go about in the basement of this building and into the old car barns down here on B Street and find trainloads of this stuff which was printed, in many instances, at the suggestion and order of the head of some department, but never asked for nor sent out. My own State, and the gentleman's State doubtless, has its own bureau of education, and it engages, through the assistance of the legislature, in the printing and distribution of such literature as particularly applies to that particular State. In this instance, it is proposed to cover the whole United States with whatever the Bureau of Education might deem proper. Now, what might be proper literature to the school system of your State might not apply to mine, and I do believe that it is the duty of the State, just as far as possible, to take care of its particular interests in printing as well as in everything else.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Not a very great while ago there was taken out of the folding room or the document room a very large amount of printed matter which was uncalled for. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLINE. A year or two ago.

Mr. BARNHART. Every year it is done.

Mr. CLINE. And sold as junk, I presume. Anybody could take what he wanted out of it, but still there was a large amount left. Does the gentleman know how much was disposed of in that way?

Mr. BARNHART. I can not state that; but it is done every year. Each year there are condemnation proceedings to get rid of out-of-date documents at the instance of the Public Printer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question was asked whether the Department of Education could publish more of these bulletins than was provided for by the appropriations for that purpose. I will ask the gentleman if it would not be true under this joint resolution, if passed, giving them unlimited authority to publish bulletins, that if there did not happen to be enough money appropriated to pay the bills, at the next session of Congress they would be here with a deficit, asking us to appropriate money to pay it?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, I do not know whether they could do it or not, but that they would try it I have no doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to proceed?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Go ahead.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to let the gentleman proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I yield five minutes to my friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty sympathy with the purposes of this joint resolution, but I am inclined to think there is wisdom in the objection made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and by other members of the committee, that it would be unwise to pass the joint resolution absolutely taking the limit off the matter of publication; therefore, at the proper time I shall offer the amendment which I ask to have read now in my time for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the joint resolution?

Mr. WILLIS. I simply desire to have the amendment read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment in the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, after the word "copies," insert "not to exceed 12,500 in number."

Mr. WILLIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment, if adopted, will simply give the additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior to order the printing of 12,500 additional copies in case the original edition should be exhausted. It meets the objection of those gentlemen who think it unwise to absolutely remove that limitation. As I said before, I think there is some justice in that objection. Now, let me say I think there is need for some additional authority in this department for printing these publications of the Bureau of Education. Without making any invidious comparison, let me say we have never had a Commissioner of Education who is doing greater work for the common schools of the country than the present distinguished United States commissioner. He is bringing the work right to the common schools. Personally, time and time again I have been unable to get publications that have been requested by patrons of the common schools, by teachers in the common schools who are desirous of getting this valuable material that is already prepared in this bureau.

The Bureau of Education is not simply a bureau for the collection of statistics. They are doing splendid original research work in that bureau. As I said before, they are bringing the work right within the reach of the teachers in the common schools. Now, it seems to me it is shortsighted policy to appropriate large sums of money to employ experts to collect this information and write these bulletins and tracts and then not to make a sufficient appropriation to enable the people of the country to get this information. The amendment which I propose to offer will simply give authority to the Secretary of the Interior to print 12,500 additional copies in case the original edition would be exhausted.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman has not any doubt whatever that the Congress would always be ready to act on an emergency demand for bulletins that might serve any worthy purpose, has he?

Mr. WILLIS. I think the Congress will be ready to act, but here would be the objection to that. The Congress might not be in session, and, as the gentleman knows, sometimes it takes a good while to get perfectly meritorious bills and resolutions before the House. I think it a good deal safer to place this authority in the Secretary of the Interior in case there is a demand for some of these extremely valuable publications to print an additional 12,500 copies. I quite agree it would not be desirable to give him unlimited authority to print, but it seems to me that such a limitation as is suggested in my amendment is wise, and I hope when the time comes the amendment will be adopted and the resolution as amended will be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated here by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], in no department of the Government is there so much waste as in our public printing. We spend almost $6,000,000 annually for printing for the Federal service. The Department of the Interior for the current fiscal year, exclusive of printing for the Geological Survey and the Patent Office, had $295,000 for printing, and of that amount $51,900 was allotted to the Bureau of Education.

To illustrate how our money is wasted in public printing, I hold in my hand a copy of an annual report of one of the departments. I shall not name that department, because it is typical of what happens from time to time. It is the annual report. After it is read this year, except for libraries, it will be of no value. It is bound in handsome flexible calf. My name is on the report in beautiful gilt letters. It is an absolute waste of public funds.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, it ought also to be stated that most of those reports come in about a month or two months after the date fixed for their publication, and after the hearings are had on which they are proposed to throw light.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that this resolution does not refer to the annual report.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know it. We pay $25,000 a year to print the annual report of the Commissioner of Education, and it has, as a rule, been over two or three years behind; that is, we print a report two or three years old, as a rule. That illustrates how we waste money.

We have a superintendent of public documents. Any publication for which there is a demand can be printed by that superintendent and placed on sale, and the charge is fixed to cover the cost of the printing only. Any valuable publication, if there be a demand for it, will be printed by the superintendent of public documents, and should be paid for, because our great waste comes from the fact that there is such an avalanche of public printing continually coming to public officials and Members of Congress that it is not distributed to those who require it or would utilize it, but it is sent out indiscriminately. Perhaps not more than 10 per cent of the publications that are distributed in the country ever reach those who have any interest in them. If these publications were issued through the superintendent of public documents, with a slight charge for the documents, it would mean that whoever will apply for one of the documents, and pay the small charge required, would be some one who has some real vital interest in the publication.

The other day I referred to some of the bulletins issued by the Bureau of Education. Some of them are very valuable. Some of them can not be justified. I referred to the prospectus of the Farragut School in Tennessee, a beautiful, nicely illustrated bulletin, which, if prepared by those conducting that school for the sole purpose of advertising the school and securing pupils for the school, would not, in my opinion, be changed in a single iota.

These gentlemen are mistaken if they imagine the passage of this resolution changing the limit will confer any authority upon these officials to print bulletins in excess of the allotment of the money made to them. They can not print anything unless there be an allotment made out of the appropriation. I do not know whether the Bureau of Education was allotted sufficient money out of the $295,000 appropriated for the Department of the Interior. Two years ago the appropriation was $343,000, and it was ascertained that there was a very considerable unexpended balance of the appropriation made for the Department of the Interior. And so Congress for the current year appropriated only that sum that experience demonstrated would be used. If more be required out of the total appropriation of practically $300,000, it should be obtained by allotment from the Secretary of the Interior. But if this resolution should pass there would be a repetition of the experience had a few days ago. A bureau in a department will attempt to secure a separate appropriation for the bureau independent of the department and try to build up a separate printing allotment, so that the same gross extravagance which has existed for some time instead of being diminished will be greatly accentuated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the maximum editions now permitted to the Bureau of Education are entirely inadequate to meet the demand. The bureau can no longer supply copies of the 3 bulletins published in 1906 nor of the 4 published in 1907. It can supply copies of only 1 of the 8 bulletins published in 1908, of 6 of the 11 published in 1909, of 4 of the 6 published in 1910, of 5 of the 19 published in 1911, of 7 of the 33 published in 1912. And the supply of the 60 published in 1913 is already exhausted, although some of these were announced only a few days ago.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not, because I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TOWNER. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that this demand is a legitimate one. I venture to say that there are no bulletins issued by any of the bureaus of the Government for which the amount of special and particular and individual applications are so great as in this department. I venture to say that there is no other bureau of the Government in which the bulletins issued by it are more carefully used or where they exert greater influence or are of greater benefit to the people. Of course you can not say what is going to be the demand in any individual instance. The demand for some of these bulletins can not be supplied if 100,000 or 200,000 copies was the limit, because the demand is so great, but that should not be a reason why there should not be some discretion used by the chief of this department, because if the demand is great it is an evidence that the value of the bulletin is also great and will accomplish good. Perhaps there ought to be some limit, and I shall not object to a limit being placed.

But as large a limit ought to be given, or, rather, as large a discretion ought to be given, as can safely be given to the Commissioner of Education.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a particular credit to the Congress of the United States to maintain a position of excessive criticism toward our Commissioner of Education and toward our own Bureau of Education. I do not think it is particularly creditable to us as Congressmen that we should refuse to pass any legislation because in some particulars it does not meet with our ideas. Let us perfect those features that may be improper in form. If it is unwise to give no limit, let us make a wise and reasonable limit. Let us do what ought to be done, as sensible men, to carry out the purposes of this great bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, any bureau of the Government, any official of the Government, having authority to issue a bulletin, and having authority to issue an advertisement of the publication, and having authority to send the advertisement broadcast throughout the United States, telling that the publication is issued and will be sent free on demand, can raise a demand for any publication, no matter how unintelligible it may be, from millions of people. The desire to get something for nothing is very strong in the mind of every person, and when you offer a free piece of literature to anyone who will write for it the demand, of course, is created.

Gentlemen speak of the demand for these publications. That is the way the demand comes. The Commissioner of Education sends out a circular letter stating that he has published, or that the bureau has published, certain publications which will be sent on request without charge. Thereupon a great number of requests come in. The superintendents of schools send word to

the teachers to send in requests; and it is not uncommon, as every experienced Member of this House knows, for a schoolteacher to tell the pupils in her school to write to a Member of Congress or to the department for copies of certain publications. That is a method of instruction to the pupil in writing letters, and then you can obtain something free, which may possibly interest one person in a thousand who obtain them.

Now, if the Commissioner of Education or any of the other bureaus of the Government publishes a bulletin of special value, it is a very easy thing to have plenty of copies of it printed. Any Member of the House can introduce a resolution, as is frequently done, providing for the publication of an extra number of copies of that bulletin. That goes to the Committee on Printing, which has the privilege of reporting the resolution and calling it up at any time in the House; so that if the Commissioner of Education desires to have some of his bulletins printed in large numbers he certainly can interest some Member of the House to introduce a resolution. Then that Member can go to the Committee on Printing and show the importance of the resolution.

We sometimes order the publication of 50,000 or 100,000 or 1,000,000 copies of publications for distribution. But here is a proposition to permit a bureau of the Government on its own suggestion to fill a demand which it itself has created; to print millions of copies of its publications, whether there is any need for them, whether there is any real demand for them or not. We can not differentiate between the Bureau of Education and other bureaus of the Government.

The Smithsonian Institution, which publishes the best documents that are published by the Government, has a limited edition, a very limited edition, and it never has been able to supply the demand. It would not be able to supply the demand if the number of copies were increased from 10,000 to 1,000,000 copies of each of its publications, because with the increased publication would come added advertisement.

A few years ago the National Museum got out a little advertisement, which it sent to the papers of the country, stating that it had recently published a certain report or bulletin of popular information, which could be secured upon application free. From every part of the country thousands of letters were written to the Museum and to the Members of Congress, asking for this publication, because it was free, although if it had been sent to all who asked for it, 95 or perhaps 99 copies out of every 100 would have been thrown into the wastebasket or into the back yard and burned without having been read.

If we propose to have any economy in the administration of our Government, we can not afford to publish free all that people will ask for when the suggestion is made to them, and we can not afford to commence with one bureau of the Government and give it the power to publish unlimited editions of its works unless we expect to give the same power to every other department of the Government.

I do not think we ought to commence it; therefore I am opposed to the passage of the resolution. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the author of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, Congress by its action has created a Bureau of Education. Whether that action was wise or unwise, it is not for me to say at this time. This fact remains, however: If the Bureau of Education is to continue its existence, it is the duty of this Congress to give it liberal support. If you intend to destroy the Bureau of Education by this slow process of starvation, I for one would prefer to take the bit in my teeth and destroy it by repealing the act which created it.

The Bureau of Education was created for the purpose of gathering statistics and information touching education in this country and systems of education in other countries. It was charged with the duty of disseminating that information to the people of the country in aid of education, and the method of its dissemination has been limited to the use of the printed bulletin. Now, you gentlemen are willing to say that you are going to hamper even that process of reaching the people with these valuable bulletins touching education in the country.

Only yesterday morning I received a letter from the State superintendent of education of my State, a nephew of Senator TILLMAN, asking that he be sent a thousand copies of one of the bulletins issued by this bureau recently, in order that he might use it with the teachers of the rural schools of the State. This indicates what the educators think of the value of these publications, and proves that we should extend the facilities for getting them into the hands of the people. I called up the commissioner. The issue had been exhausted. He said he might be able to furnish me with 12 or 15 copies.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield. I am sorry, but my time is nearly exhausted.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman can get them by paying for them. He can have them printed in that way.

Mr. LEVER. Of course you can have them printed. You can have your farmers' bulletins printed, too, in any number you wish, to send out to Indiana in that way, but you are not doing it; and there is hardly a session of Congress when some of you gentlemen are not arguing for a proposition to enlarge the appropriations for farmers' bulletins. But let me tell you that your rural constituents are as much interested in the great problem of education as they are in the problem of agriculture. [Applause.] The two go together, and you can not separate them.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there a limit upon the number of farmers' bulletins that may be printed?

Mr. LEVER. You have an appropriation of $400,000.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but there is a limitation on the number.

Mr. LEVER. Give us $400,000 to print educational bulletins, and I will not complain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will report the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the publications of the Bureau of Education, excepting the annual report of the Commissioner of Education, shall be published in such editions as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 12,500 copies for the first edition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I am in order now, I wish to say——

Mr. SHERLEY. I insist on my motion, which is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Kentucky is to strike out the enacting clause of the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIS. Is not that a debatable question? I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia is entitled to speak on it if he desires to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in the nature of an amendment.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss this bill further, but I do wish to say that I think that one of the most important questions before this country to-day is education. I think it is the duty of the Members of this Congress to do everything in their power to promote that great cause. I want to say that the people all over this great Union are interested in this subject. The committee agrees to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]. I hope that this joint resolution so amended will meet with the approval of the House, and I believe it will. I think it is just and right that as much information as possible should be disseminated throughout the States and counties of this Union on this great question of education.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I will.

Mr. LEVER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what will be the effect of accepting the Willis amendment? Am I correct in my idea that it will increase the number of each bulletin to 12,500 that may be issued from the Bureau of Education?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. As I understand it, it also strikes out section 2.

Mr. HAMLIN. No; it amends section 2.

Mr. SHERLEY. The effect of it is to increase the issue of every bulletin 12,500.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. It makes that possible, perhaps.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. The effect of my amendment is not to increase the publication of every bulletin by 12,500. It simply vests the authority in the Secretary of the Interior to publish additional copies provided the original edition has been exhausted, and absolutely limits the additional number that he may publish to 12,500.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Under this resolution and the amendments proposed to it is it possible for the Commissioner of Education to send out a sufficient number of arithmetics for the use of all the schools in the country?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Oh, no.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would he be authorized to publish as a bulletin an approved edition of algebra and send it to all the common schools?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I do not think he could publish a treatise on algebra in a bulletin. It never has been done.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. When one of these bulletins is issued by the Commissioner of Education, if it carries something of great value, is it not largely reproduced by the magazines and educational journals of the country, and so carried to the whole body of the people?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I do not know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is it not true that it is?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. It may be. It can be done.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. And is done.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Willis amendment will only increase the authority of the Commissioner of Education to publish 12,500 copies of each bulletin?

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Additional copies.

Mr. WILLIS. Provided the original issue is exhausted.

Mr. MADDEN. Then when that print is exhausted he would have authority to print 12,500 more, and then 12,500 more when the second edition was exhausted.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. No; 12,500 additional is the limit.

Mr. MADDEN. He could print 12,500 additional copies as often as each edition was exhausted.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Not at all. I sincerely hope that this bill will pass as amended. I think it is due to the people of this country. I believe it is due to the children of this country, and I sincerely hope that it will pass.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] does not in any way tend to cure the defects of this bill. What does section 2 say?

That whenever the edition of any of the publications shall become exhausted—

then the Secretary of the Interior may publish as many additional copies as he may deem necessary to meet the demand.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] proposes to say that he can publish 12,500 additional copies, but whenever that edition is exhausted, then he can publish another edition of 12,500 copies, and whenever that is exhausted he can publish another edition of 12,500 copies, and he can certify that they are all exhausted on the same day.

We have before the House a comprehensive bill for the revision of the printing laws, which I understand is likely to be brought before the House before a great while. When we take up that bill we can determine what editions shall be printed by the different departments of the Government, and determine as among them how many shall be printed for each department, without attempting to do it piecemeal in this manner, granting one bureau autocratic power to publish unlimited editions.

Gentlemen need not think that they pose as special friends of education because they favor this bill against those who oppose it. We are just as much in favor of education as gentlemen who favor the bill, but we believe that common-school education is largely to be controlled by the States instead of being dominated by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, just a word in further protest. This bill comes in in an irregular way, so to speak. It ought to have been referred to the Committee on Printing, that we might have some means of ascertaining the cost and the needs of this amount of printing. Bills are presented like this one on the floor of the House from time to time without reference to the Printing Committee. The law requires that there must be accompanying specifications as to the probable cost. We of the Printing Committee are required to do this in all legislation in the matter of printing presented on the floor. In this and similar cases bills come in without any estimate. The bars are thus all down, and somebody is authorized to proceed as he deems fit, and no limit on his expenditures. I insist that the bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, there has been some question raised here as to whether the amendment suggested by myself will permit the publication of additional copies of bulletins after the first or succeeding edition may have been exhausted. When the proper time comes I shall offer an amendment, in line 8, following the word "the" and before the word "edition," inserting the word "original," so that it will read "whenever the original edition of any publication shall become exhausted," so that there can be only one additional edition of 12,500 copies.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does not my friend think that when it becomes necessary to offer so many amendments to a bill on the floor of the House, disclosing so many imperfections, that a new bill ought to be drawn and brought in instead of trying to correct the evils of this one?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, after a bill has been criticized by the gentleman from Illinois nobody else in any committee on earth could find any other flaw in it. These amendments of mine meet all the suggestions he has made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY) there were 36 ayes and 40 noes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The question of ordering tellers was taken, and tellers were refused.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That whenever the edition of any of the publications of the Bureau of Education shall have become exhausted, and the demand for it continues, there shall be published, on the requisition of the Secretary of the Interior, as many additional copies as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to meet the demand.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "the" and before the word "edition," insert the word "original."

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that instead of using the word "original" he should use the word "first," because the word "first" is used in the first section.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I will accept that suggestion, and I ask to modify my amendment in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "the" and before the word "edition," insert the word "first," so that the line will read: "Whenever the first edition of the publications," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, after the word "copies," insert the words "not to exceed 12,500 in number."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee arose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLAYDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 84, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## CONVICT LABOR MADE GOODS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the call of committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Education.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 1933) to limit the effect of the regulation of

interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison reformatory.

This bill is familiarly known as the convict labor made goods bill. Before proceeding to the discussion I would like to ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to one hour, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by whom?

Mr. SHERLEY. It seems to me that that is too little time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryand. How much time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. SHERLEY. If it is the bill I think it is it involves some nice questions of law, and we ought to have a proper time to debate it. I do not desire to handicap the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Nor do I desire that the bill should not be sufficiently discussed. How will an hour and a half suit the House?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is a question involved outside of that. The gentleman said "general debate." There is no such thing as general debate on this bill. This is not a Union Calendar bill.

The SPEAKER. This is on the House Calendar.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and there is no such thing as general debate, except that any Member who gets the floor would be entitled to an hour up to the time the previous question is ordered. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill, and I do not wish to have that right cut off.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to attempt that.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but if the previous question were to be considered as ordered at the end of the time suggested, there might be no chance to offer amendments unless that was agreed upon.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Let me ask the gentleman whether he does not consider it practicable that within an hour and a half we shall have sufficiently developed the general points of discussion so that we might go then to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MANN. But the bill is not considered under the five-minute rule. There is no five-minute rule in the House, unless it is by unanimous consent.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we let the debate run on for a while. There is only one matter in which I am interested. Generally I have no opposition to the bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Maryland understands that he has the authority to move the previous question at any time when anyone has not the floor, so that there is no trouble about limiting debate.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Then I give notice now to the House that at the end of an hour I shall reserve the right to move the previous question.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I withdraw the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SISSON. There is one matter which affects my State, in which I am interested, and I would like to have that matter explained, and I may want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman better proceed now.

Mr. SISSON. I want to get an understanding, if I can, before unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. But I have withdrawn the request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined wholly or in part by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory, transported into any State or Territory of the United States, or remaining therein for use, consumption, sale, or storage, shall, upon arrival and delivery in such State or Territory, be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory to the same extent and in the same manner as though such goods, wares, and merchandise had been manufactured, produced, or mined in such State or Territory, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced in the original package or otherwise.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I believe I now have the floor for an hour?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor for an hour, and the gentleman has the right to move the previous question in that hour, and if he does not move the previous question, any gentleman who gets the floor has an hour, if he desires to use it, and so on ad infinitum.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the House sufficiently understands the object of this legislation. In a great many prisons and reformatories of the country their unfortunate inmates are employed in manufacturing industries. There labor is at very low cost to the enforced employer, and because of the character of the persons employed the product is sold in the market at prices lower than legitimately made goods can be bought. Within the State and with reference to the sale of goods made within the State the State has always been considered as possessing ample authority to correct any such situation; but manufacturing in our days is not conducted mainly for the purpose of intrastate sale or commerce, but the much larger proportion of manufactures takes place with reference to interstate commerce. When an article takes on that character, it is well understood that State legislation and State methods are incompetent to control its transportation and sale, and the object of this bill is that Congress, the only competent power, shall release State legislation from the restraining rules of interstate commerce.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. With pleasure.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the chairman of the Committee on Labor that the point I have in mind is the situation in my State. We work the convicts in my State on a State farm, and I believe the entire Mississippi delegation will agree with me that, so far as the humanity of that method is concerned and the health of the convicts and good results to the State, it is a splendid system. It relieves the State of any expense attaching to the convicts, because the State farm makes a profit. That farm produces corn and cotton and such things as are usually raised on a Mississippi plantation. Does the gentleman think that his bill is broad enough to prevent the State of Mississippi from selling the products of that farm to the cotton buyers and the corn buyers, to be shipped out of the State?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. With this qualification: If those products were to go, say, into some State where an inhibitory law prevails they would be subject to the laws of that State in that event; but if they went to a State where no such inhibitory legislation obtains, they would suffer, of course, no interference whatever.

Mr. SISSON. For example, suppose the State farm in my State should sell its cotton to a Maryland cotton factory, could that factory buy the product of that farm and have it shipped into the State of Maryland from the State of Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Theoretically not, if Maryland had a law against the sale of convict-made goods.

Mr. SISSON. Is it the intention of the gentleman's bill to virtually destroy that humane system of working convicts that is prevalent in my State?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. No; the object of the bill is to subject the commerce, when it reaches the State, to the laws which that State itself shall apply to its own convict-made goods. The legislator in the matter, at last, is the State legislator. Congress merely releases or withdraws its technical rule as to interstate commerce, and leaves the State to determine for itself what shall be the disposition of these goods when they reach there.

Mr. SISSON. In order to call the gentleman's attention specifically to it, and I am not opposed to the principle and purpose which the gentleman is after, but I believe it will be conceded by everybody that the most humane treatment to a convict is that which is prevailing in my State, because it has been visited by the prison officials not only of the United States but by the prison officials of foreign countries, and it has been commended by everybody who has gone to look at it. Now, the language of the gentleman's bill is:

That all goods, wares, merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined wholly or in part by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory, transported into any State or Territory of the United States, or remaining therein for use, consumption, sale, or storage, shall, upon arrival and delivery in such State or Territory, be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Now, would the State law of Maryland, in general terms, prevent the sale of convict-made goods of cotton raised on the prison plantation in Mississippi worked by the State?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It would, if it had such a law.

Mr. SISSON. That is the only objection I have to the gentleman's bill, for this reason: If the system was an evil one, where we formerly worked the convicts within the walls producing wagons and various and sundry things, which was not conducive to the health of the convict, but there is no serious opposition to convict labor by the cotton producers, because the cotton produced on the convict farms is a mere drop of water in the ocean. I am not saying I myself am committed to the farm system, because I believe the better thing to do would be to work the convicts on the public roads, but we have that system now in my State. Now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] also tells me that in his State one of the principal

products of that production is cane, and that on their State farm they produce that product because it is a product that is raised in that country, and their system, as I understand, has proved entirely satisfactory; as a matter of fact, the convicts rarely escape from the penitentiary. There is no desire to escape, owing to the treatment that they receive there—good quarters, good food, and things which are conducive to good health and satisfaction. I am taking up too much of the gentleman's time——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. No.

Mr. SISSON. Would the gentleman object to an amendment to his bill which would exempt from it the transportation of these farm products?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I should have to object. And let me illustrate the practical side of this matter rather than the purely technical one with which we have dealt. As a matter of fact, a number of States have acted on this subject in the way of discouraging commerce in prison-made goods, but they have acted not in the way of a positive prohibition. The most favored method has been to provide that prison-made goods shall not be sold within the State unless marked "Prison-made goods," so that the buying public may know the moral circumstances involved in the transaction, namely, that an unfair element of commerce and competition is being introduced, and thus the ethical sense of the purchasing community may be employed as a method of protection.

Mr. SISSON. In order to have a concrete case, suppose a bale of cotton made on the convict farm in Mississippi should be sent to a State where a factory is located which has a law of which the gentleman spoke. How far would it be necessary to follow this question? Would it only be necessary to mark the cotton "Convict-made cotton," or would you have to go to the product and follow the finished product manufactured out of the raw material which was convict made?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Without perhaps being entitled to express an opinion so hastily as to a situation of that kind, I should say that the bale of cotton represented the form of product upon which the law would act.

Mr. SISSON. I would have no objection with the law which prevails, as the gentleman says, in many of the States. I do not know whether they have them or not. I have no objection to putting a label on a bale of cotton which goes from the State farm as "convict-made" cotton, but I would not like for a State institution, which has succeeded so well, and with which the State is so well satisfied, and by which we have to a very large extent solved the very vexatious question of convict labor in my State, and on which the State has expended a great deal of money in improving that beautiful farm and building and beautifying the houses—I would hate to have it disturbed by a law which was not intended, perhaps, to reach that character of convict-made products.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield one moment?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to inquire, as a matter of information—and I am sure the gentleman has it—how many States have such laws as the gentleman says Maryland has in respect to convict-made goods?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. About 16 States. He will find them set out in the report.

This bill comes from the Committee on Labor with its unanimous indorsement. Two bills, identical in form, were referred to that committee, one introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] and the other by his colleague [Mr. HENSLEY]. The committee carefully considered this measure, and in a previous Congress a like bill—indeed, identical in its wording—was passed by the House, but failed for want of proper parliamentary opportunity to secure the approval of the Senate.

Mr. MOORE and Mr. STEENERSON rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] first.

Mr. MOORE. This bill is in the nature of a protection to free labor against goods made by convict labor. It does not pertain to such convict labor itself as works upon the roads in certain States of the country?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It could not. That is not a product that could go into interstate commerce.

Mr. MOORE. It relates only to the goods made by convicts that come in competition with goods made by free labor? Has the gentleman given consideration to the goods made by foreign convict labor?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The tariff bill itself has a provision with reference to that,

Mr. MOORE. The Payne bill had a paragraph relating to convict-made goods, and it was carried over in the Underwood bill. There has been a suggestion that some convict-made goods have made their way into the country, and I wanted to know about that.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The committee has considered that.

Mr. MOORE. There should be effective protection against convict-made goods coming into the United States, if we are going to protect ourselves as between the States.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. I notice this bill provides that the law shall be suspended, so to speak, until the article is delivered. It says:

> Shall, upon arrival and delivery in such State or Territory, be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory.

Now, in Minnesota we have a bindery-twine factory in the penitentiary, and in shipping the twine to the place where it is consumed a large part of it goes through Wisconsin, and a part of it goes through North Dakota, and back again into Minnesota. Does the gentleman think this bill would interfere in any way with that kind of shipment?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], who will methodically discuss those features.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I have not had an opportunity to read the report here. Is this the substance of the bill, that it provides when convict-made goods are shipped into any State or Territory they will become subject to the laws of that State or Territory, and if such laws prohibit such sale, then such sale will be prohibited? If this is what the bill provides, I am in favor of it. Convict-made goods should not be sold in any State except under the laws of that State.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not want to give complete consent to that question, because I think it is inaccurate.

Mr. WILLIS. I am asking for information.

Mr. SHERLEY. This is almost identically a copy of the Wilson law which applied to alcoholic liquors, and which was a successful attempt to make such liquors subject to the laws of the State into which shipped, upon delivery. Now, this bill does not give the State the control until delivery.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Arrival and delivery.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, upon delivery. What it does is this, namely, to prevent a resale contrary to the State law. In other words, the Supreme Court held that as to interstate commerce the law of the State did not apply until not only delivery but sale in the original package by the consignee was made; but the Supreme Court in rendering that decision said Congress could, if it saw fit, take away from an article its interstate character at an earlier period than it would otherwise lose it. Congress thereupon passed what was known as the Wilson Act, which provided that liquor shipped from one State to another should be subject to the law of the State to which shipped, the same as if made there. The constitutionality of it was upheld in the case of In re Rahrer. Subsequently, in the Vance case, an attempt was made to so construe the language as to make it apply before delivery to the consignee instead of afterwards. The Supreme Court held it did not apply until after delivery to the consignee, and indicated if it had it would have been unconstitutional. This act is in verbiage the same as the Wilson Act, and makes the State law apply after delivery to the consignee, but before sale by such consignee, and to my mind is the furthest extent to which the law can go constitutionally.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] as much of the balance of my time as he may require.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Surely.

Mr. MANN. I heard a part of what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] said. Of course, there has always been a grave constitutional question involved in this proposition. The gentleman knows that in the last Congress the Judiciary Committee of the two Houses and the two Houses adopted what they believed to be a constitutional proposition in reference to the introduction of liquor into a State. Has the gentleman or his committee, in considering the constitutionality of the provisions of this bill as reported, considered the advisability of following the plan which Congress adopted in reference to liquor shipment?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The committee has very fully considered it, and if I am allowed to yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], we will have the subject methodically discussed. I insist on yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a moment. The gentleman has indicated his intention at the end of his hour to move the previous question. Now he is proposing to yield to another gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. To discuss the very questions that are being propounded.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is all right, too, but I think it fair to the House that we should have an opportunity to fully discuss the matter. I desire to express some views upon the legal phase of this matter in addition to hearing the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], who I know will enlighten us all on it, and for whose opinion I have a very proper respect. But I do think the gentleman ought to indicate to the House that he does not propose at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Virginia to move the previous question.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I do not. I mean to have the question adequately discussed. And I will say to the House that I have not fitted myself to discuss the constitutional niceties in this case. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] has, I believe, and I think the House will profit from his discussion more than from mine.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. All the balance of my time which he may wish to use. He says he will use about 20 minutes and will yield back the balance to me.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the statement that has just fallen from the lips of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has come so near to expounding my own view of the legal effect of this bill that I shall have to content myself in large measure with amplifying.

Every lawyer is familiar with the fact that under existing law there is no power in a State legislature to control in any way the commerce in goods transshipped from one State or Territory into another State or Territory. Under the Constitution the Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

At a very early period in the judicial history of the country our court of last resort laid down the proposition that this power on the part of Congress was exclusive, and that no power was left with the States to deal with a commodity when it had once become the subject of interstate commerce.

Now, as the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEWIS of Maryland] stated, for a number of years the legislatures of different States have sought to deal restrictively with intoxicating liquors and with convict-made goods. But they have always been confronted with the power lodged in Congress to regulate interstate commerce, which stood as a barrier against the execution of their will. It has been held in a series of decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States that an article when once becoming a subject of interstate commerce continues to be such and has around it the protecting power of the Constitution until it is delivered to the consignee in the State or Territory of its destination; and, still further, that until the consignee has taken it from its original package or sold it, it retains its interstate character and is exempt from any regulation which State law may undertake to prescribe.

It was said in the earlier decisions on the subject that the right to sell an article which had been imported from another State was an inherent right which attached to its importation; that the citizen, I will say, in the State of Kentucky, not only had the right to import an article of commerce from the State of Maryland but that he had a right to sell it after he imported it. In fact, Judge Marshall, in an early case, stated that the right to sell was an essential and an inherent element of the right to import; that if a man could not sell the goods after he imported them, it would do him no good to import them. So that in former days the right to sell was considered an essential part of the importation.

But everything changes, Mr. Speaker, in the course of time, and even so conservative a body as the Supreme Court seems to be cognizant of the changes of opinion which take place in the country. Somebody has said of that court, in a spirit of adverse criticism, that the window to its chamber looked out upon the great body of the American people and it sometimes took judicial cognizance of changes going on among them. I do not subscribe to the criticism in the sense in which it was uttered; but, as a matter of fact, judicial opinions change, and in regard to this subject the mind of the Supreme Court has changed in recent years.

A later distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a few years past said that the right to sell an article which was imported—which Judge Marshall had pronounced an essential right—was merely an incident of interstate commerce; but that the right was not one of the fundamental aspects of such commerce, and that it was within the power of the Congress to withhold from the citizen after importation this incident—the right to sell—and immediately upon delivery to subject the article to State law.

In the year 1890 Congress passed the bill referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky, known as the Wilson bill, which undertook to regulate interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors. The bill now before the House is an exact reproduction of the Wilson bill. The only difference is that the pending measure deals with convict-made goods, whereas that act dealt with intoxicating liquors.

The pending bill in substance is that—

> Goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined wholly or in part by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory, transported into any State or Territory of the United States, or remaining therein for use, consumption, sale, or storage, shall upon arrival and delivery in such State or Territory be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory to the same extent and in the same manner as though such goods, wares, and merchandise had been manufactured, produced, or mined in such State or Territory.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does the gentleman construe those words "upon delivery" as after delivery?

Mr. WATSON. I was just going to address myself to that proposition. Whereas the language of the bill provides, as did the Wilson Act, that upon the arrival in the State the goods shipped in interstate commerce should become subject to local law, yet the Supreme Court in construing the Wilson Act has held that "arrival in a State" meant "arrival at the point of delivery," and that there was no power in the State to stop an article of interstate commerce in transit before it was delivered to the consignee, but that the transportation had to be completed before any State law could affect it.

So, under existing law, not only has a citizen of one State the right to import articles of commerce from another State; not only has he the right to have them delivered to him, but he has the further right to dispose of them in any way he pleases, so long as the original package is unbroken. The legal effect of the pending measure, following the doctrine of the Supreme Court in construing the Wilson Act, is to lift from prison-made goods imported from one State into another the protecting hand of the Constitution the moment they reach the consignee, and thus to deprive the consignee of the right to sell in the original package if such sale be forbidden by local law.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does the gentleman hold that as soon as an article of merchandise has been delivered to a consignee in a certain State, and he proceeds to sell, the State law is not sufficient to protect the State against the sale of that article?

Mr. WATSON. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that but for the enactment of the Wilson law, or prior to 1890, had he imported into the State of Missouri intoxicating liquor the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution would have protected that importation throughout its transit and until the same was delivered to him, and would thereafter have protected him in the sale of it in its original condition, the law of the State of Missouri to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman believe we have any greater power to regulate interstate shipments of convict-made goods than of intoxicating liquors?

Mr. WATSON. I would not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman—unfortunately for us, because we enjoy his presence here now—was not here during the great fight, that lasted for years, over the question of interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors; but the gentleman is undoubtedly aware that the last Congress, as apparently the final word of Congress until the Supreme Court has passed upon it, framed, after many attempts, a law to prohibit or govern the shipment of intoxicating liquors between the States. Does not the gentleman believe it would be wiser for Congress now, having attempted to make as perfect a measure on that subject as possible, with all the ability of Congress directed toward it for years, to follow the same line in this bill that we followed in the intoxicating-liquors act?

Mr. WATSON. To follow the same line?

Mr. MANN. Yes; to follow the same language, except in so far as it is necessary to change it to meet the difference in the goods.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman kindly point out the diversity of language that he has in mind?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, it seems to me that, in connection with the question of the gentleman from

Illinois, this fact ought to be brought out: The difficulty that confronted Congress in dealing with the interstate shipment of alcoholic liquors was to prevent delivery to consignee; was to give to the States the power to seize the liquor before it ever reached the hands of the consignee. Now, as I understand this bill, it does not undertake to go that far, and, in the nature of the case, perhaps, does not need to go that far. This bill simply undertakes to prevent the sale after delivery to the consignee, and the right to do that was clearly upheld by the Supreme Court in the case of in re Rahrer, and this language does follow identically the language that was upheld in the Wilson Act.

Mr. MANN. But which proved of no value whatever.

Mr. SHERLEY. As to alcoholic liquors.

Mr. MANN. As to alcoholic liquors, and hence will prove of no value whatever as to convict-made goods.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that does not follow, for the reason that the sale of convict-made goods is made by the manufacturer to dealers, who in turn sell at retail; whereas the sale of alcoholic liquors could be carried on directly to the individual consumer in original packages.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but, if the gentleman will yield, convict-made goods can be sent from one State into another and delivered to the consignee, and the original package broken and the goods put upon the shelf, after which God Himself has indicated no way for a human being to know whether they are convict-made goods or not.

Now, as to the liquor business, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House worked on the subject for years. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate worked on the subject for years. It is the most hotly controverted constitutional question which has been before Congress in many, many years. Finally a bill was brought into the House from the Committee on the Judiciary. A bill was brought into the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary. They were not identically alike, or at least as the Senate passed the bill it was not identically like the House bill. There were some things in the House bill that the proponents of the bill feared were unconstitutional, and we finally took up the Senate bill and passed it. It was vetoed by President Taft, as I recall it, and then was passed over his veto. That is the law that prohibits the transportation into a State of intoxicating liquors which are intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, or in any manner used, either in the original package or otherwise, in violation of any law of such State.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman quotes the Webb bill, does he not?

Mr. MANN. Of course it was not the Webb bill that was passed, but it is practically the same thing. Now, I will say to the gentleman that I have prepared an amendment to this bill striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a provision along the same line precisely as that we adopted in reference to intoxicating liquors. If that is constitutional, which has not yet been determined, then this will be constitutional. I do not think the gentleman's bill is worth the paper it is written on. It was not worth anything at all as to intoxicating liquors.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman means practically.

Mr. MANN. I mean practically.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. With the consent of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], I want merely to say that in the three or four cases that have reached the United States courts this interstate liquor law has been declared unconstitutional. The case has not yet been submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States, but is being prepared now. Every court that has passed upon the case so far has declared the law unconstitutional.

Mr. MANN. From my committee assignments, I think I have had as much occasion to study the subject of interstate commerce as any man in either House of Congress, and in my judgment the Supreme Court of the United States is likely to hold the intoxicating liquor law constitutional. Certainly it is the best effort that Congress has made yet on the side of regulation of interstate traffic in goods.

Mr. SHERLEY. With the permission of the gentleman from Virginia, there is clearly one way to handle it under the lottery cases if you want to, and that is to prohibit the interstate shipment of all convict-made goods. The reason that was never suggested in alcoholic-liquor cases was not a question of power but a question of policy, because that meant national prohibition.

Mr. MANN. There is no effort in this bill to adopt any such policy as that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I see no reason why that may not cut the Gordian knot. If you want to abolish convict-made goods, try a law forbidding the interstate shipment of them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I did not have the advantage of being in Congress at the last session when this question was perhaps debated more elaborately than it will be on this occasion. Consequently I am loath to pit my judgment against that of the gentleman from Illinois when he says this bill is not worth the paper upon which it is written. I entertain no doubt, as a legal proposition, however much Congress may debate it and however much credit gentlemen may claim for such debate, that the Supreme Court will declare the bill which is pending a constitutional measure, because it is practically in the same words as the act of 1890, which has been sustained in two well-considered cases. (In re Rahrer, 140 U. S., 545; Rhodes *v.* Iowa, 170 U. S., 420.)

Now, as to the practical worth of this bill, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that it ought to be reasonably effective, and that there is no occasion to seize convict-made goods in transit. There was occasion to seize intoxicating liquors in transit, and hence the act of the last Congress on that subject.

As to the impracticability of following up convict-made goods after they have landed in a State and pursuing them into the channels of commerce, there is perhaps no law which can be enacted that will ever enable Congress to do that successfully.

The practical effect of this bill, as I understand it, will be to subject convict-made goods to the local State regulations as soon as they have been carried into the State and delivered to the consignee. And that is perhaps as far as we can go under the present state of the judicial mind.

The gentleman from Mississippi has asked whether the bill applies to the produce of farms operated by convicts. The chairman of the committee has stated that it does, and that is correct. The fact is, not much competition has ever arisen between the products of prison farms and those of free labor. The trouble which has arisen has been confined chiefly to certain lines of manufactures.

The most acute competition has been in the shoe industry, and after that certain lines of clothing and furniture have been most affected. As a matter of fact, the control of a large number of laborers under one management has had the effect of taking possession of particular lines of industry. There is one furniture company which is said to control the convict labor of seven State prisons. Eleven States directly or indirectly engage in the convict shoe manufacture. These are some of the lines along which trade has been disturbed by convict labor; but the principle is the same whether it be a barrel of corn made by convict labor and thrust upon the market or whether it is a pair of overalls or a pair of shoes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Suppose, in growing cotton or other farm products by convicts, the cotton is baled and sold in the State to a cotton merchant in that State. Would that end the convict feature of that product with the sale and delivery to the merchant within the State? Would not the merchant have a right to sell it anywhere in the country without its being under the brand of convict-made goods?

Mr. WATSON. Within the State where made the article would be entirely subject to State law. The State could forbid its sale if it saw fit to do so. The precise point at which convict-made goods cease to be such is an exceedingly difficult question, but I should say that as long as the goods retained their original form they would still retain their character.

What I was going to suggest in this connection was that in principle there is no more reason why convict labor should be permitted to enter into competition with the products of the soil, worked by free labor, than there is that prison-manufactured products should be allowed to enter into competition with manufactured products of free labor.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman argues that there is an analogy between the Wilson bill relating to intoxicating liquor and this bill.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; they are identical.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Hence he concludes that the Supreme Court would hold this bill constitutional because it held the Wilson Act constitutional. I wish he were right, because I am in favor of this bill and would like to see it become a law. But is the gentleman right; does not this bill go further than the original Wilson Act? The Wilson Act, as I understand the terms of it, permitted the sale of articles in unbroken packages.

Mr. WATSON. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Then I am mistaken.

Mr. WATSON. The legal provisions of the pending measure, in their constitutional aspects, are identical with the provisions of the Wilson Act. No man would undertake to guarantee that a court would not change its mind; but in all human probability the Supreme Court, having before it identically the same legal proposition, would again reach the same conclusion; and I entertain no doubt as to what in this case that conclusion would be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to renew my effort to define the time that shall be applied by the House to this subject, and would like, suggestively, to make a request for unanimous consent that at half past 3 o'clock this bill, with all pending amendments that have been introduced in the meantime, shall come to a vote of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that at half past 3 the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland reserve the 10 minutes?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should not delay the House by any speech touching this matter if it were not for the fact that perhaps no question that has been before Congress during my tenure here has had as much consideration at my hands as to its legal phases as has this question of the power of Congress over interstate commerce, and how far that power can be, if at all, delegated to the respective States. As has been said earlier during the debate by other gentlemen, this matter was thrashed out pro and con for many years before the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and the Senate and then on the floor of the two bodies.

The law, so far as it is involved in this bill here presented, is to my mind not only now plain, but well settled, and I join in the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] that there is not the slightest doubt as to the constitutionality of the proposed bill. As to its effectiveness men may have different opinions. The Supreme Court held, in the case of Brown against Maryland, that in regard to importations from a foreign country the right to import carried with it the right to sell. It subsequently held that that rule which it applied to foreign commerce did not apply to interstate commerce, and in the License cases held that the right to import from one State to another did not carry with it the right to sell. But the decision in the License cases was overruled by the Supreme Court in the case of Leisy against Hardin, in which the court held that the rule as to interstate commerce was exactly the rule as to foreign commerce and followed the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Brown against Maryland and held that the right to import from one State to another did carry with it the right to sell. In deciding that case the court went on to say, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia, that the right to sell was an incident to the right of such importation, but that Congress could, if it saw fit, take away that incident of interstate commerce and could declare that an interstate shipment should lose its character as such at an earlier period than it would otherwise lose it. In other words, it could lose it at the time of delivery to the consignee instead of losing it at the time of the sale by the consignee in the original package. Congress immediately took the hint and passed the Wilson Act. That act came up for consideration, and the Supreme Court, in the case of In re Rahrer, declared it constitutional. Subsequently an attempt was made to amend the act so as to make it apply to the interstate shipment of alcoholic liquors before delivery to the consignee instead of afterwards.

The court in deciding that case decided first—and that was all it actually decided, speaking in a technical, legal way—that the Wilson Act by its terms did not undertake to prevent delivery to the consignee or to permit on the part of the State any control until such delivery, but in deciding it the court went further and intimated that, in the judgment of the court, if Congress had undertaken to deprive an interstate shipment of its interstate character, prior to the time that it reached the consignee, the action of Congress would have been invalid. The reason for that distinction is very plain. It is perfectly apparent that you can have interstate commerce without the right in the consignee to sell, because the transaction can have taken place at the other end of the line between the buyer and the seller, or a man may bring in for his own use property already owned by him and thus create an interstate transaction. But you can not have an interstate transaction without the right to import, because the very meaning of interstate commerce is commerce from one State into another State, and if the State into which the article is to be shipped would have the power to seize it the moment it reached the border, it could thereby prevent the article coming into the State, and so prevent an interstate transaction, and you would thereby have the action of a State controlling an interstate shipment, giving to the State law an extraterritorial effect. It was that difficulty that confronted the advocates of the amendment to the Wilson law in regard to alcoholic liquors. They undertook to avoid that by a new departure, not as was attempted originally in the bills presented, by amendment of the Wilson law, by adding to it the words "whether before or after delivery," but they undertook to give to the States absolute control by making a qualified prohibition. They were not willing to go to the extent of prohibiting altogether, as was done in the law construed in the lottery cases, an interstate shipment of alcoholic liquors, but they said:

> We will make such an interstate shipment unlawful whenever the intent of the shipper or any party to the shipment is to violate the law of the State into which the shipment is to be made.

That bill was enacted into law at the last Congress, after being vetoed by the then President of the United States on account of what he believed to be its unconstitutionality. It is now going through the courts. Now, you have here three courses by which you can deal with this question of convict-made goods. You could either follow the position taken by the gentlemen of the committee and propose a law as to convict-made goods which is an exact counterpart of the old Wilson law as to alcoholic liquors or you could follow the position taken by Congress last year as to alcoholic liquors in what was commouly designated as the Webb bill, providing that whenever convict-made goods are shipped into a State with the intent to violate the law of the State that such shipment shall be illegal, or you could follow the lottery decision, upholding a law whereby Congress prohibited absolutely lottery tickets in interstate commerce.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the gentleman whether he thought that the Supreme Court would ever go as far in regard to convict-made goods as to declare them outlaws of commerce if Congress should so declare?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman had asked me that question 10 years ago I would have said no, but I am very much of the opinion the gentleman expressed, and as it was perhaps happily expressed by Mr. Dooley in his discussion of the insular cases. If the gentleman remembers, Dooley expressed some doubt to Hennessy as to whether the Constitution followed the flag or the flag the Constitution, and ended by saying, "But, Hinnissy, it is evident that the Supr-r-r-eme Cour-r-rt follows the illikshun r-r-returns." [Laughter.] In the true sense and with a deeper meaning than that so facetiously expressed, it is true, and the court should take such notice. The court is not a dead thing, but a living part of our Government, and it properly feels the effect and tendency of the time, and by so doing has made of our Constitution a living thing under which we have been able to grow and expand as we never could have done if it had held to the rigid, straight, narrow viewpoint of the people of a previous age and generation. I can not after reading the Lottery cases, and I have read them repeatedly, draw the line so as to be able to say where the court would say the power of Congress to prohibit ends. I have not the slightest doubt that historically the power over interstate commerce was given to the Federal Government for a directly opposite purpose than that for which the power was given as to foreign commerce, and while you find the power as to both foreign and interstate commerce in the same sentence and in the same language, yet the reasons that led to the enactment were just the opposite. We owe our Constitution largely to the fact of the quarrel between Virginia and Maryland touching boundary questions and touching matters of interstate commerce, and out of the convention called by them and the other convention that followed came the convention that adopted the Constitution and made the provision as to interstate commerce.

Now, the provision as to foreign commerce was put in there with the idea of enabling Congress to prohibit, to enable us to hit at foreign countries which were discriminating against us, and not only regulate in the ordinary sense of the term but to regulate, by prohibition, that foreign commerce, but the provision was put into the Constitution as to interstate commerce

to prevent the States themselves from prohibiting that commerce or discriminating against the commerce of sister States in favor of their own. Now, that I believe to be historically accurate as to the purpose, but we have long since passed the point where anyone having an appreciation of the law as it has been declared to be rather than what he thinks it should be can any longer say that the power over interstate commerce is a power simply of regulation and not a power of prohibition, because the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld laws where Congress prohibited interstate commerce of a certain character. It is true that all of those cases have been cases where the character of the commerce was so inimicable to the welfare of the country as to give a warrant for the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. WATSON. Will my friend permit me to interrupt him there, as I am very much interested in what he is saying?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman thinks that the courts construing an act of Congress on a question as to how inimicable a certain commerce was would take into consideration the judgment of the legislative body?

Mr. SHERLEY. That would naturally be the tendency—and the proper tendency—of the court. How can we to-day say that what, in our judgment, is a legitimate article of commerce shall not, in the judgment of those who are to follow afterwards, be considered an illegitimate article of commerce? And therefore I said what I did to the gentleman in response to his original question, that I was no longer prepared to make any hard and fast line as to the subjects that Congress could prohibit interstate commerce in.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. You have very succinctly stated the difference between the bill proposed, following the Wilson path, and the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. I want to ask you whether, in your judgment, there is not a difference of circumstances as to the individuals who manufacture intoxicating liquor on the one hand and the parties who manufacture prison-made goods? For instance, in the State of Alabama and in the State of Maryland, and in other States, the operators of the penitentiaries might not have a very substantial connection with this matter. The Mann amendment, it seems to me, implies that the offender, the man who would break the law, would be the party in the State of origin intending to violate the law and shipping his contraband matter into the State of consignment. In this case it may be the State of Alabama, it may be the State of Maryland, it may be some other State, that clearly might not be indicted, and the punishment thereof can not be made effective. I would like the gentleman's view on that phase of the matter.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I was first undertaking to outline what I thought could be done by Congress, and that brings me naturally to the question of what should be done.

Now, believing, as I personally believe, that the Webb bill was an unconstitutional proposal, and that the law will be so declared, I could not agree to the adoption of that plan; in other words, to making your prohibition dependent, not upon an express rule as laid down by Congress, but dependent upon the intent of a shipper, together with the action of various States from time to time as they might see fit. In other words, there is a difference between a prohibition of interstate commerce on the part of Congress for a reason and a standard established by itself and the prohibition of such commerce according to the varying standards of State legislatures as they may enact laws from time to time; and on that point, in my judgment, turns the constitutionality of the Webb bill. But, dismissing that, and taking up the two alternatives, you can either provide, as you do here, to give the State control the moment an article has reached the hands of the consignee or, following the lottery cases, you can prohibit altogether interstate shipment.

Now, I think the committee has adopted the wise course, for this reason: That while I personally am inclined to believe the court would follow the lottery cases and uphold a direct prohibition of interstate shipment of convict-made goods, yet that is a question open to some doubt. The proposal presented by the Committee on Labor is one open to no doubt as to its constitutionality by any man who has given sufficient study of the decisions to have his opinions entitled to weight.

Now, coming to the question of the efficiency of the remedy, I answer the gentleman by saying that, in my judgment, there is such a marked difference as to the character of alcoholic liquors on the one hand and convict-made goods on the other, in the method of handling them and the consumption of them, as to make the failure as to effectiveness of the Wilson law as to alcoholic liquors by no means like the result following the enactment of this law as to convict-made goods. And the reason for that is perfectly plain. The trouble with convict-made goods is not with the desire of a particular consumer to get convict-made goods, because that desire does not exist; but the trouble with alcoholic-liquor legislation was not only the desire on the part of the manufacturer, who made a profit out of manufacturing and selling, but the desire on the part of the consumer to get, irrespective of law, the alcoholic liquor for his personal consumption. And therefore you had a difficulty that they found in a large degree insurmountable in enforcing State law in communities where the sentiment of the community was not sufficient to make that enforcement easy.

But I differ with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in the belief that convict-made goods will not be subject to identification. It is true that after they have gotten upon the shelf, commingled with other goods, they may not be identified, though that does not necessarily follow, but the power of the State to control is not restricted to that remote period. The power of the State to control takes place the moment there is a delivery to the consignee, and whenever he undertakes to sell or dispose of them in any way the power of the State exists to come in and to control. It seems to me the committee has been wise in following what is clearly a constitutional plan, and then leaving to the actual test of fact, rather than to our theory, the effectiveness of the law as passed. If it should prove to be ineffectual, then we can adopt the other method of direct prohibition.

Mr. Speaker, I can not take my seat without expressing a personal view touching the whole question of the treatment of convicts themselves, and which is directly involved in the consideration of this bill.

I have hoped for some time to be able to present to Congress a concrete proposal looking to the treatment of Federal prisoners, and I still hope to find occasion to put in concrete form the thought that I have touching them.

Two things are unquestionably wrong, touching the present situation in many States: First, there is a wrong done to the community at large by enabling certain private contractors to exploit convict labor and to take the product of such labor and bring it into competition with free labor and its output; and, second, there is the very dreadful wrong to the convict himself. If there be any justification for penitentiaries, that justification must be found not only in shielding society from the criminal, but also in giving to the criminal an opportunity to reform and become a useful member of society; and to my mind it is barbarous to confine a man in a penitentiary, use his labor, and then turn him out with practically only a new suit of clothes and enough money to keep him from starving for a few days and with the brand of a felon on his back.

What I believe we ought to do—and it would help to solve this whole problem—is to put the convict at remunerative work, charge him with his upkeep, credit him with his labor, and the difference between what he earns and what he costs should go either to his dependent family or to himself at the expiration of his service. [Loud applause.]

That, in my judgment, is true humanity. That means to make of a prison something more than a prison—to make of it a reformatory as well.

We are to-day treating our Federal prisoners in a way that is beyond possible justification. We have been having them doing a lot of useless work in the erection of buildings in the penitentiaries, frequently having them take stones piled up in the courtyard on one side and carry to and pile them up on the other side, because they have nothing else to do; and it is destructive of all the hope and manhood of the men who are put to work of that kind, and the whole system is a constant inducement to architects and builders to build useless buildings in order that they may get the fees and profit from them.

Mr. CLINE. I have been able to follow the gentleman on this proposition to the point where the goods have been made. In the case of a State, after the State has the goods manufactured by the prisoner, and he has been remunerated, or his family has been remunerated for his labor, the question would arise, How shall the goods be disposed of? I would be very much interested in having the gentleman give his idea of how we should dispose of the goods.

Mr. SHERLEY. My idea, particularly as to Federal prisoners—and I have thought of that only—is to have the prisoners employed in the manufacture of goods used by the Federal Government. For instance, there is no reason why they could not be making, as one gentleman suggested, mail sacks for the Postal Service. There is a great deal of work, not only in connection with the Post Office Department, but also in connection with the Army and the Navy, that they could be em-

ployed in, and the output of their labor could be used by the Government without bringing it into competition directly with free-made goods outside, and without having the tendency of breaking the market, which is what the laboring people properly complain against.

Mr. CLINE. Of course, if the theory is good for the Federal Government—and I am in harmony with the gentleman's view—it would also be good for the States——

Mr. SHERLEY. Providing the States had the same activities.

Mr. CLINE. The question is, What will the State do after the goods are manufactured by the convicts?

Mr. SHERLEY. I presume it will be possible for the State to use the prisoner in the manufacture of equipment which it uses; for instance, desks for public schools, or to use them on the public roads, which is highly desirable, not only from the standpoint of good roads, but also from the standpoint of the convict himself, for it gives him an outdoor pursuit rather than an indoor one.

Mr. CLINE. But would not that come into conflict with private employment?

Mr. HAY rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. In one sense it does, and in another sense it does not. It comes in conflict with private employment in the sense that it supplies a certain quality of material that otherwise would have to be supplied with outside labor; but it does not come in conflict with private employment in the sense of beating down the price, and that is the chief complaint of the laboring people.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say there is a proposition pending in Congress to work Federal prisoners in the construction of certain Federal roads. What would the gentleman from Kentucky think of a proposition of that sort?

Mr. SHERLEY. I should favor that idea, without committing myself to it without knowing the details. The general proposition I would favor, as I favor in my own State the use of the prisoners there on roads, instead of the barbarous system that we now have of farming them out to a lot of contractors, who make a profit out of them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wish to say that the State of Georgia, after a very hard contest in the legislature by the governor, has succeeded in abolishing the old system that was fastened upon us of hiring out convicts to private parties. We have, at great expense, purchased a large farm, where the convicts are now employed. They produce various farm products, which are used partly in maintaining the other institutions of the State; but there are certain products that can not be consumed by the institutions of the State—for instance, cotton, which ought to be sold, either at home or abroad, to the people who manufacture cotton, in Massachusetts or elsewhere. Bills like this would prohibit the State of Georgia from selling that particular product if it happened to be in a State that followed this Webb law principle.

Mr. SHERLEY. My answer to the gentleman is this, that two courses are open. One is to exempt such agricultural products as he mentions, and the other is to let the lesser be swallowed up by the greater. There are a great many general laws that in their particular application work some hardship, and yet what Congress and the lawmaking body is to consider is not whether somebody will be injured or not, but whether the sum total of the result of the law is going to be good rather than evil.

Mr. BARTLETT. One more question.

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman applies his objection to the Webb bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the difference between the Webb bill and this bill lies in the fact that the Webb bill was unconstitutional and this clearly is not. That is my personal viewpoint. I think there is no doubt as to the constitutionality of this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not hear the gentleman's opening remarks. In what way does the gentleman distinguish this as being constitutional and the Webb bill not? I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I believed when I voted that the Webb bill was unconstitutional, and so voted against it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want to repeat what I said earlier. Briefly, I think this bill is in direct line with the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of In re Rahrer. The gentleman is familiar with that decision?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Whereas the Webb bill was an attempt to limit interstate commerce, not by prohibition of the Federal Government, but to make it legal or illegal according to the particular action of a State and the intent of the shipper, which brought into it an element of uncertainty and of foreign sovereignty that, to my mind, was beyond the power of Congress to make the test of the legitimacy of the transaction.

I beg to thank the House for its attention, and I will be glad to yield such remaining part of my time as I have. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I should like to take the floor in my own right. I understood that while I was out for a moment some arrangement was made for closing debate. Did that cover the ordering of the previous question?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It did.

Mr. MANN. That is unfair, and I shall ask to have that action of the House rescinded.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I shall have to oppose that.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is in order to amend now. The gentleman has the floor. It is in order for him to amend the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The previous question is ordered at half past 3.

Mr. MANN. I thought you had ordered the previous question already.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, no. You can amend it now.

Mr. MANN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, for over 100 years the question of the abolition of prison-contract labor has been before the people of this country, remedial legislation having been introduced at various times in the legislatures of the several States of the Union. The failure of this legislation to pass, in most instances, being due to the activities of well-organized prison-labor contractors and their allies, the prison warden and the so-called Prison Reform Associations.

For over 29 years the subject of convict labor, in one form or another, has engaged the attention of the Congress of the United States. Scores of bills have been introduced in both branches of this great legislative body. These have been considered by committees, extended hearings have been held, thousands of pages of testimony taken; and reports by the dozen have been submitted, practically all of them recommending favorable action.

Aside from the passage of laws prohibiting the employment of convicts on public buildings, and the purchase of convict-made goods for the use of any of the departments of the General Government, prohibiting the employment of Federal prisoners under the contract system, the prohibition of importation from foreign countries of goods on which convict labor has been employed wholly or in part, practically no headway has been made along the lines of eliminating the most vicious and insidious phase of convict labor. I refer to the system at present in vogue in 24 of our great States known as the contract system, whereby the labor—yes, the very lifeblood—of the convict is bartered away at so many cents per day. Not dollars! For in some of the Eastern States the convict's labor is sold to the contractor for as little as 8 cents a day, and as near as can be ascertained the average price per day paid by the contractor for the labor of these poor unfortunates is about 50 cents.

Under this contract system the State houses, feeds, clothes, and guards the prisoner, who after all is but a single unit of human energy in the hands of the contractor, who is careful to see that there is no waste of that energy, no lost motion, and that every hour—and these convicts work on an average nine hours a day—is made a productive and profitable one for the contractor.

It is small wonder that there has been a vigorous and an aggressive opposition to Federal legislation which has for its purpose the elimination—yes, the cure—of this malignant cancerous growth which has so firmly fastened its tentacles into the very vitals of our industrial life.

Who are the people who have most vigorously opposed this legislation? What was the real motive that actuated them? Do we find in the record of the hearings that have been held here in this great Capitol the testimony of any responsible executive official of any one of the States in which this contract system is in vogue favoring its continuance? No! The only voice of protest on that score has been that of the prison warden—the silent partner of the contractor—the despot: the power behind the throne. The reason for his opposition is so

obvious that comment would appear superfluous. The arguments which have been advanced by these wardens lack the soundness that accompanies sincerity.

But, coming to the question, Who are the people who have fought this legislation? Tearing away the masks and disguises, we are face to face with the prison contractor himself. We find him in his dual rôle. On the one hand an exploiter of convict labor, on the other a potent factor—yes; even a high officer—in the councils of the so-called prison reform associations.

The only real opposition and the only voice of protest has been that of the prison contractor, and he has been careful to cloak and to hide his opposition and to use as his mouthpiece either the warden or the so-called prison reform association.

The ramifications of this contract system are so great and the interests and joint interests of this "prison ring" so interlocked that I am unable in this brief reference to the subject to give you the details. However, they are all of record, and a careful perusal of the facts and figures, I am sure, will convince the most skeptical of you.

The fact remains that these contractors have until recently been in absolute control of the leading so-called prison associations of this country, which are ostensibly interested in prison reform, but in reality their true object is to exploit the unfortunate prisoner for their private gain and to oppose any form of Federal legislation tending to emancipate the convict from the shackles of this iniquitous system. Those are the only motives which have actuated their opposition.

One of the most energetic and aggressive opponents of legislation to abolish the prison contract-labor system was Mr. Edward Boyle, of Chicago. He repeatedly appeared before the committees of this House, ostensibly as the representative of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, of which organization he was the treasurer, but as a matter of fact he was here as the paid attorney of prison contractors who practically dominated the prison-labor market of the United States.

Another supposedly active worker in the cause of prison-labor reform was Frederick H. Mills, of New York, who was treasurer of the American Prison Association and a director in the International Prison Congress. Mr. Mills was known as one of the most prominent penologists in America, but it was not quite so generally known that in his private life he was a prison-labor contractor, or that he used his high public office in these so-called reform associations for the purpose of suppressing any discussion of the evils of the prison contract-labor system.

It was through such men as these that the prison contractor worked. That he was successful is attested by the fact that proposed remedial legislation seldom got beyond the committee to which it was referred.

The Ford-Johnson Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, the president of which was George B. Cox, political boss of Hamilton County, had contracts for years with a number of penal institutions for the manufacture of furniture, and got labor for as low as 8 cents a day in the New Haven (Conn.) county jail, and the average for all of their contracts was 34 cents a day.

The Bromwell Brush Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, makers of brushes, controlled for a number of years the labor of prisoners in the Ohio workhouse at an average of 30 cents per day.

Twenty-four States still have, or had until March 4, 1913, the contract system in vogue in their penitentiaries.

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS.

During these 29 years there have been four exhaustive investigations of the convict-labor question—three by the executive branch of the Government through its Bureau of Labor, one in 1885, another in 1895, and a third in 1904–5, and one by the legislative branch, through the Industrial Commission appointed in 1898.

The Bureau of Labor deals with the subject in its 1886 report in 612 pages; in its Bulletin No. 5, July, 1895, in 35 pages; and in its twentieth annual report, issued in 1905, in 794 pages; and the Industrial Commission devoted 166 pages to its review and report in 1900—in all, over 1,600 pages of authentic facts and figures. And in these reports practically every phase of this subject, so far as it relates to competition with free labor, is exhaustively treated. No thinking person could peruse those reports and escape the conviction that the subject of convict labor is one of vital concern to the welfare of our whole citizenship. It not only affects free labor, but the health and welfare of society at large.

So far as further investigation of this subject, either by congressional committees or commissions or by the Department of Labor, is concerned, practically nothing would be gained by such a course other than further delay. It would but prolong and hinder the action that must ultimately and necessarily be taken by the Federal Legislature.

The bill now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is the first vigorous and firm step toward the goal that must ultimately be reached—the absolute abandonment of the convict contract-labor system in all its forms.

The Committee on Labor, in submitting its report on H. R. 8716 (Rept. No. 2022, 50th Cong., 1st sess.), May 1, 1888—over 25 years ago—made the following observations with respect to the duty and the right of the Congress to pass remedial legislation of this character:

We can not admit that great evils, destructive in their effects and widespread, can exist in defiance of the National Congress, created by the whole people to establish justice and promote the general welfare. The safety and usefulness of the State, the prosperity and happiness of the people, depend upon the just observance of the cardinal political truth expressed in the familiar maxim, "So use your own as not to injure your neighbor." It applies with equal force to the State and to the citizen.

Your committee believe that free labor engaged in various important productive industries suffers great and serious injury from the unequal and unjust competition to which it is subjected by the prevailing systems of employment of convict labor by many of the States; that individual State legislation is incompetent to furnish adequate relief; that the necessary power is alone vested in Congress; that this power should be exercised to the end that capital invested, business good will long established, experience and skill acquired by years of industry may be protected and honest labor engaged in the productive industries involved may not be left without employment.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS.

Although we are profoundly impressed with the conviction that the autonomy of the State should be preserved so far as possible under our dual form of government, yet, nevertheless, we feel it to be the duty of the National Legislature to exert to the fullest extent those constitutional powers conferred by the wisdom of the fathers when they are invoked, as in the present case, by citizens exercising the sacred right of petition and who furnish convincing proofs that their individual rights are assailed and their property threatened with destruction.

* * * * * * *

Finally, your committee base the authority of Congress to pass this bill not only upon the right in the National Legislature to regulate commerce between the States, to establish justice, to promote the general welfare, as expressly conferred in the Constitution, but in that fundamental principle upon which all legitimate sovereignty rests, that the welfare of the people is the supreme law.

PRISON POPULATION AND VALUE OF PRISON PRODUCTS.

The latest available statistics on prison population, supplied by the Census Office, show that in 1910 there were 2,823 prisons in the United States, and that the number of inmates was 112,881.

In 1905 the Bureau of Labor investigated only those penal institutions where the value of the productive labor was $1,000 or more during the year preceding the investigation. Out of a total of 2,823 prisons, 296 were thoroughly investigated and reported on, and in these 296 penal institutions there was found a daily average of 86,036 convicts, 93.5 of which were males. So that out of a total prison population approximating 113,000 over 76 per cent were confined in and employed in these 296 prisons. The conditions have changed but slightly, if at all, since those figures were compiled, and the same general percentages practically hold good to-day.

Of the 86,036 prisoners, 59.5 per cent of them, or 51,172, were engaged in productive labor in 89 different industries. The total market value of their product was $34,276,205. Of this amount nearly $17,000,000 worth of goods were produced under the contract system in 54 institutions, located in 27 different States. Over $3,000,000 worth of goods were produced under the piece-price system, which is but another form of the contract system. Ninety-seven per cent of these goods were produced in penal institutions and 3 per cent in juvenile reformatories.

Based upon the data secured the Bureau of Labor estimated that 32,801 free laborers would be required for the same work. And, measured by the value of the goods produced, the contract system far outranks any of the other systems, as 49 per cent of all goods produced were made under that system. Since that report was made the contract system has been abolished in a few States by constitutional convention in Ohio, by statute in New Jersey, but in this latter case, by reason of the failure of the legislature to make the necessary appropriations, the convicts are still being let to contractors on a one-year basis. In Ohio the contract system is still in force in some of the workhouses.

VALUE OF PRISON PROPERTY.

It was also ascertained by the Bureau of Labor that the total value of all property owned and controlled by the 296 penal institutions and reformatories covered in the report was $105,378,999, while that owned or controlled by prison contractors and lessees was but $8,493,790.

THE BOOT AND SHOE INDUSTRY.

The industry which was most largely affected by this enormous convict-labor output was boots and shoes, for $8,527,596 is the value of that product, or 24⅞ per cent of the total output of all convict labor. This product was confined to the penal institutions in 11 States, and, the report shows, was greater by

39 per cent than the export trade in boots and shoes for the fiscal year 1905, the figures being:

| | Pairs. |
|---|---|
| Convict-made shoes | 7,389,354 |
| Exported (produced by free labor) | 5,315,699 |

THE HOLLOW-WARE INDUSTRY.

Thousands of skilled iron molders were employed in this industry in former years. This is the trade that I followed as a means of livelihood for 20 years, and I can personally testify to the fact that prison labor not alone deprived the molder of his means of livelihood, but drove all of the foundry men engaged in this line out of business. Even to-day, right in the heart of the city of Baltimore, a few miles from our National Capital, in the Maryland penitentiary, several hundred men are employed in the prison under contract as molders and a corresponding number of skilled free men are walking the streets and the foundry proprietors in the entire district are suffering from this unfair competition.

At the present time there is a bill pending in the Maryland Legislature to abolish the contract system, and the prison contractors are fighting this measure, as they have always fought any and all remedial legislation, using their allies, the so-called prison-reform associations, in their campaign.

Prison contractors, with 50-cent labor, dominate the market, fix prices, and drive the employer of free labor out of business, simply because there has been no law under which the sale of the products of prison contract labor could be regulated.

The 1905 statistics show that the leading prisons sent out 7,000,000 pairs of shoes, 21,000,000 cigarettes, 10,000,000 pairs of stockings, 2,000,000 pairs of overalls, 360,000 boys' knickerbockers, 5,000,000 shirts, and 500,000 petticoats. This wearing apparel was made under the poorest sanitary conditions and in many instances by diseased and tubercular convicts.

DISPOSITION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS.

As a general rule the State in which the goods are manufactured, either by law or through an understanding with the contractor, stipulates that the goods must not be sold within the State, but must be shipped out and sold in competition with free labor in other States.

Of the total amount of convict-made goods concerning which definite information was obtained by the Commissioner of Labor in 1905, only 34.7 per cent were sold within the borders of the State where produced, the remainder, 65.3 per cent, being disposed of in other States.

THE EFFECT OF COMPETITION.

Throughout the course of the several investigations and hearings which have been had on this subject during the past 29 years, manufacturers and others who have testified were unanimous in the opinion that the effect of convict-labor competition is most destructive. In the case of several industries, notably that of stove hollow ware, saddletrees, whips, and whiplashes, and cooperage in the Chicago market, prison-made goods have driven the products of free labor from the market.

Thirty-six years ago a special committee of the Ohio State Legislature, appointed to report upon "The effect of convict labor upon the manufacturing interest of the State," submitted the following conclusions:

The contract system interferes in an undue manner with the honest industry of the State. It has been the cause of crippling the business of many of our manufacturers; it has been the cause of driving many of them out of business it has been the cause of a large percentage of the reductions which have taken place in the wages of our mechanics; it has been the cause of pauperizing a large portion of our laborers and increasing crime in a corresponding degree; it has been no benefit to the State; as a reformatory agency it has been a complete, total, and miserable failure; it has hardened more criminals than any other cause; it has made total wrecks, morally, of thousands and thousands who would have been reclaimed from the paths of vice and crime under a proper system of prison management, but who now have resigned their fate to a life of hopeless degradation; it has not a single commendable feature; its tendency is pernicious in the extreme. In short, it is an insurmountable barrier in the way of the reformation of the unfortunates who are compelled to live and labor under its evil influences; it enables a class of men to get rich out of the crimes committed by others; it leaves upon the fair escutcheons of the State a relic of the very worst form of human slavery; it is a bone of ceaseless contention between the State and its mechanical and industrial interests; it is abhorred by all and respected by none except those, perhaps, who make profit and gain out of it. It should be tolerated no longer, but abolished at once.

That honest labor is injuriously affected and that the prison contract-labor system tends to pauperize free laborers is strikingly shown in the following paragraph from the special committee's report:

The testimony shows conclusively that the contract system carried on in our penal institutions is directly responsible for a large percentage of the reductions which have taken place in the wages of thousands of mechanics during the past four years. Nearly every manufacturer who testified before your committee attributed a large percentage of the reduction in wages to the system which enabled manufacturers who have prison contracts, and who employ large forces of convicts at cheap rates, to go into the market and undersell them. There is little or no room for doubt as to the evil effect of this system upon the interests of free labor. It not only tends to pauperize honest labor, but it is, in a great measure, responsible for the overcrowded condition of many of our penal institutions.

Mr. CLINE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLINE. I should like to inquire of the gentleman whether he would have convict labor employed at all, and if so, at what kind of work?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. There are six different systems in vogue at the present time: First, the lease system; second, the contract system; third, the piece-price system; and they are all of the same caliber. The convict is exploited. There is a different remedy. There is the public-account system. So far as the convict is concerned, that system is the same as the piece-price system; but the two systems that are secure and that can be used to advantage by the State and the convict employed, so that he may became a useful member of society, are the State-use system and the public-works system. Several States, including the State of New York, have that system. The State of New York in its eleemosynary institutions and through its municipalities consumes over $20,000,000 worth of products yearly. They have had the State-use system in vogue in New York since 1897; but owing to the fact that the prisons were under political control, and through the fact that this man Mills, to whom I have referred, was in control of the sale of these products, only $1,000,000 has been manufactured for State use under that system.

THE EFFECT OF THIS LEGISLATION.

The question has been asked, What beneficial use can be made of the labor of convicts after the passage of this law?

There are not 10 penal institutions in the country where the prisoners are taught useful trades so that on their release they may have a chance to become useful members of society.

At the most, a dozen or two of contractors are the only beneficiaries under the contract and lease system, as has been proven by investigation. Only in a few instances has the State itself benefited in the leasing or contracting of its convicts. So in the enactment of legislation of this kind the people at large are the beneficiaries; and if the States will take advantage of their opportunity to employ their convicts under the State-use system, our penal institutions will cease to be a heavy burden on the taxpayer.

The choice of occupations open to these States is extremely varied. Let me show what some States have already done in this direction. Permit me to quote from a series of articles published by Julian Leavitt in the Baltimore News last month:

THE A B C OF THE PRISON-LABOR QUESTION.

This has been a subject of discussion in hundreds of books, reports, monographs, and magazine articles, covering tens of thousands of printed pages, within the last 50 years or more, so that even a summary of it would be beyond the province of this series of articles; but it may be well to state briefly that students of the problem are rapidly coming to agreement upon certain general principles, which may be formulated as follows:

a. The fundamental conditions of the problem are these:
1. The prisoner must be employed.
2. He must be employed productively.
3. But he must not be exploited for private profit or in unfair competition with free labor.

b. There are six interests involved in this question:
1. The interests of the State.
2. The interests of the prisoner.
3. The interests of the prisoner's family.
4. The interests of free labor.
5. The interests of the employer.
6. The interests of the consuming public.

c. The system of prison labor which will serve all or most of these interests is some combination or variant of the following:

1. Work on the public domain which would not otherwise be undertaken with free labor, particularly road building, reclamation, irrigation, tree planting, and allied conservation work.

2. A penal farm, the products thereof not to be sold on the open market, but to the penal, correctional, and charitable institutions of the State at a normal price.

3. Prison industries conducted within the prison walls, the products not to be sold on the open market, but to State, county, and city institutions and departments at a normal price, the profits from such sale, over and above the cost of maintenance, to be devoted to the support of the prisoner's family or to be funded for the prisoners themselves.

It is apparent that a judicious combination of these three systems can be made to work successfully in any climate and with any class of prisoners. Moreover, it provides for the interests of each of the groups named above. The State may thereby reduce the cost of its prison administration and the cost of supplies for the other State institutions. The prisoner may be healthfully employed and provided with a small fund wherewith to face the world again. His family may be protected against destitution. The free workingman may be protected against the concentrated and unfair competition of the contract shop; the employer of labor is protected against the demoralization of his market by the cut-throat methods of the prison exploiter, and the public is protected against the spread of penal diseases, penal dependency, and penal criminality.

Now, let us consider some of these systems in detail. First in importance is:

THE STATE-USE SYSTEM.

Briefly, under this system the convicts are employed, not by contractors, but directly by the State, and the goods that they manufacture

are sold not on the open market, but exclusively to State, city, and county institutions and departments.

The sanity and simplicity of this system are apparent. As a rule each Commonwealth tends to have a penal population that bears a fairly constant relation to the general population and to the "institutional" population. A great State like New York will have a big prison population. But it will also have full orphan asylums, insane asylums, almshouses, and homes for the deaf, the mute, the feeble-minded, the epileptic, the lame, the halt, and the blind. The inmates of these institutions all need food, clothing, and shelter. What can be more simple than to employ the able-bodied prisoners in the penitentiaries and reformatories of the State in the manufacture of these necessities? And if this is not sufficient to keep all the prisoners busy, why not enlarge the output to include needs of the other State and city departments—such as office furniture, school desks, street-cleaning apparatus, and the other thousand and one necessities for which the local governments pile up such heavy budgets?

Obvious as the system appears to be, it took New York exactly 100 years to discover it. The first open manifestations against the exploitation of convicts took place in 1796; but it was not until a full century of bitter struggle on the part of organized labor, of employers, and of social workers that the State-use system was finally embedded into the constitution of the State and actually adopted in 1897. To-day the three prisons of New York—Auburn, Sing Sing, and Clinton—manufacture the following lines of goods, as described in a recent official price list:

Wearing apparel: Prison and hospital suitings, overcoatings, uniform cloths, cotton shirtings and tickings, sheeting and toweling, collars and cuffs, white duck coats, muslin shirts, overalls, wrappers, ulsters, underwear, suits, caps, bath robes, skirts, hosiery, mittens, and shoes.

Furniture: Office and arm chairs, school desks, office desks, tables, dressers, wardrobes, assembly seats, recitation seats, settees, and bedsteads.

Institution supplies: Blankets, sheets, mattresses, pillows, pillow-cases, strait-jackets, restraint sheets, hospital stretchers, and instrument and operating tables.

Street-cleaning supplies: Dump carts and trucks, refuse and garbage cans, street brooms, wheelbarrows, and street scrapers.

Miscellaneous: Baskets, brooms, brushes, matting, tinware, and ironware.

The total prison output is about $1,000,000 per year. These goods, as already stated, are sold only to State, county, and city institutions at prices fixed by the prison commission; and no purchasing agent may buy in the open market without first obtaining a "release" from the prison commission certifying that the prison department is unable to supply the goods specified.

It has been peculiarly unfortunate that this system should never have had a fair trial in the State of its birth. It happened that from the very first it was put into the hands of a man who was in secret a prison contractor and whose private interest conflicted with the success of the State-use system at almost every point. This official, known as the sales agent, knifed the system by using antiquated machinery or hand labor in some of the shops; by deliberately subjecting many prisoners to idleness and then permitting the circulation of newspaper stories showing that the State-use system could not keep all of its prisoners employed, when, as a matter of fact, the prisoners were supplying barely one-twentieth of the available market; by trading in "releases" and by organizing a company that directly competed with the prisons for the State market. After 15 years of such practices he was finally exposed and dismissed last February.

THE LESSON FROM NEW YORK.

But even under so unfavorable a trial the system demonstrated its superiority over the contract system.

The State-use system has reduced prison competition to a minimum which organized labor is willing and glad to endure. It has reduced the prison population by thousands every year, because to-day there is no longer any incentive to railroad men to prison for the benefit of a contractor.

And it is to be hoped that the recent clean-up of the penal institutions of the State of New York will be beneficial not alone to the convict but to the State as well.

STATE USE IN CALIFORNIA.

Through the strong recommendation of Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, supported by organized labor, the Legislature of the State of California adopted the State-use system in 1911, and under efficient management it has been a complete success.

I quote the following from a letter received under date of February 24, 1914, from Mr. J. A. Johnston, warden of the State prison at San Quentin, Cal., in reference to the successful operation of the State-use system in that prison:

Since the passage of the law of 1911, providing for the State use of the products of the penal institutions of California, the inmates of this prison have been engaged in the manufacture of various articles used by the other institutions of the State.

Of course you must realize that it is a little early to make a very great showing, but, nevertheless, I can say that the results have been satisfactory and the outlook is very promising.

The law became effective July 1, 1911, and it took a little time to get started, but about the latter part of that year, or the beginning of 1912, things got under way. In the beginning the articles manufactured were raw and crude, due largely to a raw, crude, and callow organization. During 1912 our cash receipts for manufactured goods sold to other institutions amounted to $53,894.55, and during 1913 our cash receipts for similar goods were $38,544.87. The falling off in 1913 was due to the fact that the prison did not, because of unpreparedness in organization, turn out orders promptly and some of the other institutions were permitted to give their orders to regular dealers. Right now we are pretty well caught up with orders, have perfected the organization and are growing in efficiency, and this year expect to do a larger business and with much more satisfaction all around than heretofore.

We manufacture furniture—particularly chairs, rockers, tables, chiffoniers, dressers, and beds for the State hospitals, and desks, tables, and filing cabinets for the State offices. For the State normal schools we make student chairs, etc. In the iron and tinware department we make garbage cans, pails, milk cans, cooking and kitchen utensils for the institutions, and also manufacture clothing and shoes for the inmates of the State hospitals.

If the point of inquiry is as to whether or not we can keep our convicts busy on State work, my answer is that we can, for I believe that up to this time we have hardly scratched our market, and that as we improve in methods and organization in the prison the amount of business to be secured from the other State institutions will increase. Then, of course, the provisions of the law make the field very wide, for it includes not only the State institutions but all subdivisions of the State government, including county governments and the school districts, and as fast as we can assimilate the work we can secure more. At the present time we have not touched any school furniture outside of chairs and desks for normal schools, but we are planning to make desks of the kind used in the primary, grammar, and high schools, and when we are ready to take orders have no doubt we can get them.

Up to the present time nothing in the way of manufacturing has been carried on at Folsom. When the bill was passed in 1911 the prison at Folsom was without funds that would enable it to get a start in manufacturing, while San Quentin had a State prison fund that could be used for such a purpose, and so got an early start. At the last session of the legislature there was an appropriation of $33,060 for the erection of shop buildings at Folsom in which to carry on the manufacture of articles for State use, as provided in the 1911 law. Before the close of this year, undoubtedly, Folsom will get started in the work of manufacturing, and next year both prisons will be turning out articles for State use, and my opinion is that there will be plenty of work to keep the inmates of both prisons busy.

Ohio, by constitutional amendment, adopted the State-use system in 1912. It has not been in force a sufficient length of time in that State to have been given a fair test.

The passage of this legislation will not deprive the State of the opportunity of employing its convicts in both useful and productive occupations.

It has been conclusively shown that where convicts have been employed by the State on public improvements, road building, and other outdoor work, the State has been the gainer financially and the prisoner physically. In this connection, let me quote further from Mr. Julian Leavitt's articles:

CONVICT ROAD BUILDING.

The movement for convict road building has now gained such headway that no legislature can afford to ignore it. It has been the subject of legislation in at least a dozen States last year, and to-day fully two-thirds of the State legislatures are committed to some part of the program.

Poor roads in the country mean a high cost of living in the city; for mud roads mean a high cost of hauling of farm products, and this is, in the last analysis, the most important single item in the total cost of handling farm products. It has been estimated that the average cost per ton-mile on our average country roads is about 23 cents, while on some of the good roads of Europe it is less than 10 cents. In the end it is the city dweller—that is, the ultimate consumer—who pays this difference, plus. Good roads will permit the increasing use of motor trucks instead of the expensive horse. Good roads mean a better free delivery and parcel post, an increase in farm values, a quickening of all the vital elements in the economic life of a State. That State, therefore, which can apply its convict-labor problem to the solution of its road problems achieves a double triumph.

The ideal system of convict road building has been developed in the West, where much of the work is done under the honor system. It must be admitted at the outset that there are essential differences between western and southern prisons, which make it highly inadvisable for Maryland, let us say, to follow blindly the lead of Montana or Colorado. But the experience of the West has been far too suggestive to ignore entirely.

THE HONOR SYSTEM IN COLORADO.

When Warden Tynan took charge of the Colorado State Prison several years ago he found a hapless crew of 500 idle creatures who were on the verge of melancholia. To-day the prison is the center of a system of scenic roads that are the delight of the tourist and one of the chief assets of the State. And they have all been built cheerfully by convict labor, operating hundreds of miles from the prison, generally without watch or guard.

"I select the men for outside work," Warden Tynan tells me, "by personal contact with them. I know each prisoner. Wherever possible I get in touch with his people and pledge them to support me in the experiment.

"As a result our convict labor has paid. Many States have found convict labor outside the prison walls unprofitable, because they have paid too much attention to guarding the convicts, the armed guards frequently costing more than the labor was worth. We are at present working 50 per cent of our prisoners on the honor system. They are eager for road work. We make it an object for them to do good work and attempt no escapes, by commuting their time one month for the first year's road work, two months for the second year, and so on up to six months for the sixth year."

In this way the Colorado convicts have built several hundred miles of roadway, much of it blasted out of the solid rock. During 1909 and 1910 they built 50 miles at a cost of only $56,700, which if done by contract would have cost fully $200,000. During 1911 and 1912 they built about 300 miles, and Warden Tynan estimates an average of 500 miles to be constructed annually for the next 10 years.

"But," continues this new type of warden, "we have made manhood as well as money by this healthy, hearty outdoor labor. During the last three years we have had over 1,000 individual prisoners in the convict camps. These men work without guards some 50, 100, and even 300 miles from the prison. Less than 1 per cent have violated their pledges by successful escape. Communities no longer fear to have our convict road camps established near them. We have built up our men both physically and morally. They do not have the prison pallor, the hang-dog appearance, of the average convict. They are bronzed, healthy, efficient laborers, and in demand as such."

FROM PRISON FOUNDRY TO THE OPEN ROAD.

A few years ago the Oregon State prison was one of the worst in the country. The prisoners worked under contract in a stove foundry, with the usual accompaniments.

"No thought was ever given to the prisoners," says Gov. West in speaking of that period, "nor to the economic waste of contract labor. The prison grounds were filthy, the hospitals were crowded, and the men broken when they left prison."

Gov. West ousted the contractors and installed a road-work system, offering the labor of the prisoners to such counties freely as would

undertake to supply the raw material for road building. "At first we made many offers, but had no takers. In order to prove the practicability of the work I was obliged to launch into road building myself. There being no funds and equipment available, I was forced to borrow idle teams and raise funds through private subscription to cover the cost of housing and feeding the men and teams. We got results. We demonstrated that we could build roads for about one-third of what it was costing the several counties. To-day, if every man were of the right class, every one could be used in the open on the roads. As it is, we have at times used 35 per cent of the entire population in this way, the men being away from the prison day and night entirely on their honor." Some of these will attempt escape, of course. Of the 200 on the road last year, about 20 made the effort, and more than once Gov. West led a posse and recaptured the fugitive himself. Sometimes they return, repentant, alone, only to find that their disloyalty is resented more keenly by their fellow convicts than by the governor. One man escaped from the tuberculosis camp and got as far as San Francisco. There he repented, surrendered to the police, and was permitted to go back to Oregon unaccompanied by a guard. At the prison he apologized for his flight as an impulse of a moment, long regretted. The warden accepted his apology and reinstated him, but the honor convicts themselves were less lenient with the man, who by violating his pledge had endangered the privileges of all. They ostracized him completely, and the warden, in sheer pity, was compelled to remove him from the honor group.

Finally it may be well to add that under the contract system the Oregon State penitentiary drained the treasury of $40,000 a year. To-day it is self-supporting, and the prisoners earn for themselves and their families at least 25 cents a day.

New Mexico, which claims to have been the first State to introduce the honor system, reports that the men are far more efficient without the guards than with them. "One armed guard is useless, and the presence of a gun in a camp is always a menace." Of the 150 men in the honor camps about 17 escaped last year, but most of them were ultimately recaptured.

Similar reports come from practically all the Western States. Coming nearer East, Warden Codding, of the Kansas penitentiary, tried out 110 men; but nothing happened to make the warden regret the experiment. At the New Jersey Reformatory Superintendent Moore reports that last year he had 356 of the inmates at work outside of all inclosures. "Boys have worked more than half a mile away from the institution all night without any guards. As drivers, they always go and come from Rahway, a mile and a half distant, on their honor. With us the system is an unqualified success."

THE PRISON FARM.

I have already considered two of the newer constructive ideas in prison work—the State-use system within the prison and road building outside of prison. A third idea, more vital than either of these, is to be found in the wide-spreading movement for prison farms.

MOST SUCCESSFUL PENAL FARM.

The most successful penal farm in the world is that of the Swiss Canton Berne, located at Witzwill. Here, on a tract of 2,000 acres, free of walls, stockades, or other signs of confinement, some 200 or 300 prisoners receive, in the course of their sentence a training in practical farming, which virtually changes the world for them. These prisoners are, for the most part short-term men, fully 80 per cent of them serving less than one year; yet this shifting and shiftless mass of labor has converted an ordinary farm into a great agricultural plant worth fully $500,000, with a yearly output of cattle and hogs to the value of $20,000, dairy products to the value of $12,000, and other farm products to the value of $40,000. These results, according to Prof. Fetter, of Cornell, who has published a most illuminating report on the subject, have been achieved by simple business sense and organization. There are no idle guards on this farm to eat up the substance of the land. Every guard is a practical instructor or foreman and, when necessary, joins freely in the hard labor of the prisoners. These prisoners are trained to responsible duties as far as possible individually and learn to work, for the most part, without supervision. In short, these men are treated not as striped beasts of burden but as responsible members of a civilized community, and they respond accordingly. They have helped to draw the plans of the buildings that house them and have erected these buildings out of the raw materials and with a minimum of supervision. They have shaped all the structural steel used in the buildings, forged the iron work, finished the plumbing, wiring, tinning, and roofing, and even made the lightning rods; they have made the furniture, the stoves, the agricultural tools, wagons, brooms and brushes, barrels and boxes—in fact, practically the entire farm equipment. Shop and field complement each other so effectively that on stormy days even the tailors and shoemakers work in the field, and on rainy days practically everyone works in the shops. Each man gets a small wage for himself or his family. As a result, escapes are few in number, insubordination is rare, and punishment practically unknown.

SOUTH LEADS IN FARM MOVEMENT.

In the United States the South has naturally led in the farm movement because its prison population is largely black, and hence far better fitted for work in the cotton field than in the prison factory. Mississippi has two immense plantations in the Yazoo delta and several smaller plantations, aggregating fully 25,000 acres. Its yearly output is from 4,000 to 5,000 bales of cotton, and the State treasury clears nearly $200,000 a year from its convict labor. Louisiana has six penal farms, covering about 15,000 acres in all, much of it in corn and cane. One of the farms has a sugar refinery worth $500,000. Most of the other Southern States also have farms attached to their main prisons, which are used as outlets for the labor of the weaker prisoners or for those who are unfitted for factory labor. Most of these farms turn in great annual revenues to the State treasuries. Unfortunately, however, this is the most that can be said for them. They make no serious effort to reform their prisoners. The parole system is generally unknown. The indeterminate sentence, the suspended sentence, the prison school—in fact, most of the instruments of progressive penology—are generally absent. Whatever improvement there may be in the prisoner's lot is due to the open air and the sunlight rather than to any design on the part of the State. On some of these farms the worst abuses ever uncovered in our sad prison history have been revealed within the last few years—notably in Texas, where a legislative committee discovered that some convicts had been literally beaten to death, others abused and outraged in nameless ways, and still others driven to insanity by the guards on the State farms. All of which merely goes to prove that where the sole driving force is money the State may at times be as terrific an exploiter as any private individual.

REAL REFORM IN THE WEST.

To find a farm system that is truly reformative in its nature we must turn to the Middle West, where several wardens have attempted great things and a few have succeeded. The best of these seems to be at the Ohio State Reformatory, at Mansfield, under the superintendency of Dr. James A. Leonard. This farm is a small one, covering less than 2,000 acres, but it is notable in two ways: First, it sells its products not on the open market, as the southern prison farms do, but only to other State institutions, and at prevailing market prices. The products netted the State about $20,000 last year. The second and more important fact is that Dr. Leonard conducts his farm largely on the honor system. During the 10 years that the farm has been in operation some 2,600 prisoners have been allowed to work in the open without watch or guard. Only 18 ever attempted escape. The rest preferred their work.

The example set by the reformatory is now being followed by the Ohio State Penitentiary. During the last two years Warden Jones placed some 18 or 20 groups of selected prisoners, averaging 10 or 15 to a group, for honor work on the farms of the various State institutions. Some of the men escaped, of course, but the loss was so small that the warden and the board of administration are determined, despite the risk, to extend the experiment until it shall include the majority of the prison population. The first step in this direction was taken by the legislature last year, when it appropriated $250,000 for the purchase of a site for a prison farm to replace the old "pen" at Columbus.

SIMILAR STORIES FROM OTHER STATES.

From Michigan and Kansas, from New York and New Jersey come similar stories of new ventures in this field. In New York particularly the movement to raze Sing Sing and to transfer the prisoners to the open country has gained tremendous headway because of the recent disclosures of abominable conditions in the century-old cell block, and, on the other hand, because of the immense success of the 1,000-acre farm at Comstock, known as the Great Meadow prison, where hundreds of the worst slum products of New York are demonstrating their eagerness to rebuild their lives in the open.

The example nearest home, however, is to be found at Occoquan, near Mount Vernon, in Fairfax County, Va., where the District of Columbia has a penal farm of several thousand acres, tenanted by the very same class of convicts that fills the prisons of Maryland. Last year these men put up buildings estimated at a value of $125,000 for approximately $37,000. They run a brick plant with a capacity of 20,000 per day. They operate a quarry and a stone crusher. They operate a central power plant and a water plant worth about $50,000. The institution is to-day less than five years old, but it is rapidly reaching a stage of self-support and may soon net profits to the District.

CONVICTS AND CONSERVATION.

Convicts have been used for precisely such work in practically every civilized country in the world. England has used its prisoners to reclaim the moorland at Dartmoor, to construct a breakwater at Portland Harbor, to enlarge the dry docks at Portsmouth and Chatham, and many similar enterprises. In Denmark prisoners have reclaimed the heath of Jutland. In Prussia they have drained the Gross Moosbruch and dug the Nordhorn-Almelo Canal. In Austria and Hungary they have straightened streams, reclaimed marshlands, built dikes, and removed rapids.

In the United States, although practically every State has its conservation problem and its convict-labor problem, not one has as yet combined the two systematically. If the convicts of Louisiana and the other Mississippi States can be conscripted at flood time to build levees and dikes, why can not the convicts of Maryland be conscripted to reclaim the shore? It is more than likely that conscription would be unnecessary; that most of the prisoners would gladly volunteer for the work. And it is particularly fortunate at this moment in having at the head of its penitentiary board a man who has had the widest practical experience in reclamation work and who also has the public spirit to give his best thought to working out the details of the project if once it should be indorsed by the assembly.

PRESENTS RICH POSSIBILITIES.

The forest problem of the State also presents rich possibilities for the utilization of convict labor. Convicts can do the work cheaply and well. They have disposed of over 600,000 young trees at the State nursery run by prisoners at Comstock, N. Y., and the State conservation commission is clamoring for more. Moreover, the prisoners could not only grow the trees, but also plant them. They have planted fully 22,000,000 trees in New Zealand within the last 10 years, converting a desert waste into a forest that will ultimately supply most of the timber requirements of the country.

A SIGNIFICANT EXPERIMENT.

A significant experiment of this kind was tried last year at Clinton Prison, Dannemora, N. Y., where the State has some 18,000 acres of badly neglected forest land. Impressed by the need of reclaiming this stretch, the prison department and conservation commission of the State put heads together and agreed upon a scheme of cooperation. The prison supplied the labor in the form of 12 prisoners and a guard and the commission supplied an expert forester to superintend the work. Fortunately this forester, R. Rosenbluth, happened to be more than an expert. He was human, and he interested himself not only in getting the most out of the men, but in getting the most for the men out of the experiment. As a result there was complete harmony in the camp. Although the work was done 4 miles from the prison, no man attempted to escape, and the guard as a guard proved altogether unnecessary. During the 39-day period of the experiment, half of which were rainy, this little group planted 108,000 trees. Here is an extract from a glowing letter by Mr. Rosenbluth:

"The men were very well behaved. They worked hard and enjoyed themselves thoroughly. All of them improved in health while on the job, because the work is free and bracing and man's work. When you consider that the State owns perhaps 200,000 acres of land which is now waste and barren, not even adequately serving its purpose as watershed protection, you can see what a wholesome, noncompeting way this is of making use of prison labor.

"Another point: Woods work is one of the very few vocations, especially in the East, where the password to a job is ability to do the work. A man drops into a camp, gets his supper and bunk and breakfast and goes to work. No questions asked. No references required. If he can work, he holds the job. And it's well-paid work, too."

This bill permits any State to say to the prison contractor of every State where prison contract labor exists that the product shall be treated exactly as the product of the prisons of that

particular State is treated. This is only fair. And if it had not been for court decisions many States would have long ago enacted this legislation. The courts in their decisions have decreed that the people of the State have no right through legislation to protect themselves against the output of diseased convicts of other States. The present bill gives each State the right to enact remedial legislation against this iniquitous system.

THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY PLEDGE.

The Progressive Party was the only party in the 1912 campaign that made the subject of the abolition of convict labor a national issue. The platform of that party declares:

We pledge ourselves to work unceasingly in State and Nation for * * * the abolition of contract convict labor, substituting production for Government consumption only, and the application of prisoners' earnings to their dependent families.

In line with the platform of the Progressive Party I introduced H. R. 7755 August 26, 1913. That bill provides for the absolute prohibition of the shipment of the products of convict labor in interstate commerce, and also provides that any contractor or dealer in the products of convict labor must register and label, under the convict-labor act, all of the products of free labor in which he is interested and which he desires to ship in interstate commerce. The enforcement of that law would be placed in the hands of the Department of Labor.

The absolute prohibition of the shipment of the products of convict labor in interstate commerce is the real solution of this problem, and I intend to secure, if possible, favorable action on my measure at the earliest opportunity by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House.

I stand for the prohibition of prison contract labor, believing it has a human as well as an economic side.

The unfortunate men and women in our prisons to-day are there not from choice but in many instances because they could not resist temptation or because of some crime committed in a fit of passion; and many have committed crime because of being in actual want due to our present social and industrial system, which casts so many working men and women adrift during periods of unemployment and for whom society makes no provision whatever, some of whom become desperate and find their way behind prison walls.

Only recently Gov. Foss, of Massachusetts, made the statement that—

Out of 27,000 sentences each year to Massachusetts jails and prisons, approximately 10,000 are not for any crime whatever, but only for poverty. This happens because the law has permitted judges to throw into jail persons who are too poor to pay small fines.

The prison contractor has exploited these poor unfortunates long enough. If any benefit is to come from their labor, let it come to the people through the State-use system, provision being made to care for the family or dependents of the prisoners by paying them a fair share of the profits accruing from the labor of the prisoner. Should he not have any dependents, this fair share of the profits of his labors should be set aside to his credit, so that at the end of his term he may have a competence to start fairly in his battle with the world to live down the past.

Our State prisons can be used to advantage in turning the prisoner out so that he may become a producer and a useful member of society. This can be accomplished through education where needed and the chance to learn a skilled trade, care being taken to have established diversified industries. This can readily be accomplished owing to the great variety of manufactured articles that are constantly in use by State, county, and city institutions.

Believing the bill introduced by Representative BOOHER to be a good measure, I am heartily in favor of its passage by the House, and trust it will not meet the fate that like measures have met in the Senate, but that speedy action will be taken by that body to the end that the States may have the right, wherever they feel so inclined, to take measures to stamp out this iniquitous system.

The Federal Government, it is true, consists of 48 political—not commercial—subdivisions. Commercially there are no State boundaries. For the purpose of trade and commerce the Nation exists as a single entity, and until a law is passed which shall apply uniformly to every one of the 48 States there can be no effective regulation of convict-labor competition and its consequent evils.

The following are a few of those who are interested in the abolition of the present contract system:

The American Federation of Labor, the National Prison Labor Association, the National Civic Federation, the National Free Labor Association, the Commerce Club of St. Joseph, Mo., the National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, the National Canners' Association, Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, the Merchants' Association of New York, General Federation of Woman's Clubs, United Garment Workers of America, and Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

We might add to this list thousands of organizations representing local, State, and National bodies.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would be in favor of this bill as reported if it amounted to anything; but it does not. It is of no value and of no effect. I shall offer an amendment as a substitute for the bill which is effective, if Congress in expressing its judgment on the intoxicating-liquor proposition got it right.

The Wilson law endeavoring to control the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors was passed, I believe, in 1890. It was sustained by the Supreme Court as constitutional by taking all of the meaning and effect out of it; and shortly after I came to Congress it became a live topic. The constitutional method of controlling the interstate shipment of liquors was discussed very thoroughly in the House and in the Senate, and in the committees of the House and Senate, from shortly after I came into Congress, in 1897, until the last Congress.

The Wilson law provided that intoxicating liquors when shipped from one State to another should, upon arrival and delivery in such State—I am reading the language of this bill which is identical—

Be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory, to the same extent and in the same manner as though such goods, wares, or merchandise had been manufactured—

And so forth—

in the State, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced in the original package or otherwise.

Anyone who looked at that law would have supposed it might prevent the shipment of intoxicating liquors from one State to another, or that if, when shipped, they arrived in the second State contrary to the laws of the State, they would be subject to seizure by the officials of that State. That is what the law apparently said. That was enacted under the commerce clause of the Constitution. When the case reached the Supreme Court it held it to be constitutional, and held it to be constitutional by taking out all the meat of it. They said the law did not apply until the liquor was delivered to the consignee. In all the prohibition States there never was the slightest trouble under that law in shipping any liquor from outside to anyone in the States. It became the practice of the people dealing in liquor, if they did not have some particular person to ship to, to ship it to John Doe or Richard Roe by the express company, with instructions to the express company to sell the goods to pay the charges and remit anything that was obtained over the charges, and with directions not to sell for less than the value with the express charges. That became the practice in every prohibition State in the United States. The law did not affect it in the slightest degree. You could sell liquor to anyone who wanted it shipped into the State or you could ship it to John Doe and order the express company to sell it.

Nobody could touch it. Nobody could touch it until it had been delivered to the consignee, and you could not do anything then unless you had an official standing over him to capture it immediately upon its delivery. That would be the case under this bill. You could not touch the convict-made shoes. When shipped from one State to another they go to the express company's office; they are delivered by the railroad company to the express company and then delivered to the consignee. After the goods are opened you can not tell whether they are convict-made goods or not. The merchant puts them on the shelves, and nobody can reach him. This bill, if enacted into law, will be no more effective as to the transportation in interstate commerce of convict-made goods than the Wilson law was as to intoxicating liquors.

What did we do as to the liquor question? The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was a member, worked on the subject a long time. Col. Hepburn, the chairman, was insistent that a law which would govern the subject and protect Iowa, as he said, should be enacted. The Committee on the Judiciary finally took jurisdiction of the subject, both here and in the Senate. Senator Knox gave an elaborate opinion in the Senate on the subject and concluded that Congress could not control the subject at all, so far as making it dependent on the legislation of a State.

But in the last Congress, after all the work of years had been carried on, the Committee on the Judiciary of the two bodies each reported a bill known in the House as the Webb bill. The Senate passed it slightly different from the bill introduced in the House. The Senate bill was agreed upon, and a part of the provisions of the House bill was left out. That bill contained no penalty clause, but it did prohibit shipment of intoxicating liquors from one State to another where it was contrary to the law of a State.

Now, that has not been finally passed upon by the Supreme Court, but up to date it represents the best combined wisdom of the two Houses of Congress on the subject of controlling interstate shipment of goods. Convict-made goods may be placed in the same category, so far as our power is concerned. If we are to pass a law to have any effect we ought to pass one following the one that was supposed to be the wisest thing we could devise as to intoxicating liquors, and prohibit shipment of convict-made goods from one State to another when it is contrary to the laws of the State into which they are shipped.

Mr. BARTLETT. That bill was vetoed by the President and passed over his veto.

Mr. MANN. It was vetoed and passed over his veto. It represents the best wisdom Congress has been able to give to this subject. Whether it will prove valuable in the end I do not undertake to say.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I will ask if the Webb law has not had practically the effect the gentleman has stated? In other words, does not the shipment of alcoholic liquors from a wet State to a dry State still continue?

Mr. MANN. I think not to any great extent. At least I am informed by people of my city who were formerly engaged in the business that they have gone out of the business. But that law has not been finally acted upon.

Now, I have prepared an amendment putting the proposition in the Criminal Code, which puts teeth into it, which were not in the Webb bill at all. There are no teeth in the Webb bill. My amendment provides that we shall add to the Criminal Code an additional section, which will read like this:

The shipment or transportation in any manner, or by any means whatsoever of any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined wholly or in part by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory, from one State, Territory, or District of the United States or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, into any other State, Territory, or District of the United States or place noncontiguous to the United States but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, which are intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, or in any manner used, either in the original package or otherwise, in violation of any law of such State, Territory, or District or place noncontiguous to the United States but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is hereby prohibited. And any person who shall knowingly ship or transport any goods, wares, or merchandise in violation of the prohibition of this section shall be fined for each offense not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

If what we did in reference to intoxicating liquors is of any value constitutionally, this provision, if enacted into law, would prohibit the shipment of convict-made goods from one State to another in violation of the laws of the State and would be of some value. But we know from our experience with the Wilson law that the bill as reported will have no valuable effect. I offer the amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following, which I send to the desk.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. What does the gentleman say about the proposal to make his prohibition direct, and not dependent upon anything—to simply prohibit interstate shipment of convict-made goods?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that subject has been up in respect to the intoxicating-liquor proposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. The question was not up there as to its constitutionality, but as to its policy.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I think it is a question as to policy.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment, to add the word "or" after the word "prison" in the title of the bill as a committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. That would come in after the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi). That would be amended after the bill is passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the amendment read, I wish then to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report, and which will be considered pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States,' approved March 4, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new section, to be known as section 245a, and to read as follows:

"'SEC. 245a. The shipment or transportation, in any manner or by any means whatsoever, of any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined, wholly or in part, by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory, from one State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, into any other State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to the United States but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, which are intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, or in any manner used, either in the original package or otherwise, in violation of any law of such State, Territory, or District or place noncontiguous to the United States but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is hereby prohibited. And any person who shall knowingly ship or transport any goods, wares, or merchandise in violation of the prohibition of this section shall be fined for each offense not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both.'"

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I can see by the clock that there is only time enough to prefer a request to print in the RECORD what I had intended to say, which I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 27, noes 48.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 78, nays 216, answered "present" 4, not voting 134, as follows:

YEAS—78.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adair | Gilmore | Kiess, Pa. | Pou |
| Ainey | Good | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Powers |
| Anthony | Graham, Ill. | Lafferty | Prouty |
| Barton | Graham, Pa. | La Follette | Roberts, Mass. |
| Britten | Green, Iowa | Langham | Rogers |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Greene, Vt. | Langley | Scott |
| Butler | Guernsey | Lenroot | Sells |
| Calder | Hamilton, Mich. | Lindquist | Shreve |
| Campbell | Hamilton, N. Y. | Madden | Slemp |
| Cline | Haugen | Mann | Sloan |
| Covington | Helgesen | Mapes | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Cox | Hinds | Mitchell | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Cramton | Humphrey, Wash. | Moore | Towner |
| Deitrick | Johnson, Utah | Morgan, Okla. | White |
| Donovan | Johnson, Wash. | Neeley, Kans. | Willis |
| Edmonds | Jones | Nelson | Wingo |
| Fess | Keister | Paige, Mass. | Winslow |
| Frear | Kelley, Mich. | Parker | Woods |
| Gardner | Kennedy, R. I. | Payne | |
| George | Kent | Phelan | |

NAYS—216.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Dent | Hensley | Moss, Ind. |
| Aiken | Dicklnson | Hill | Murdock |
| Alexander | Dies | Holland | Murray, Mass. |
| Allen | Difenderfer | Houston | Neely, W. Va. |
| Anderson | Dixon | Howard | Nolan, J. I. |
| Ansberry | Donohoe | Hughes, Ga. | Norton |
| Aswell | Dooling | Hull | Oldfield |
| Bailey | Doolittle | Humphreys, Miss. | O'Leary |
| Baker | Doremus | Igoe | Padgett |
| Baltz | Driscoll | Jacoway | Page, N. C. |
| Barchfeld | Dupré | Johnson, Ky. | Park |
| Barkley | Dyer | Johnson, S. C. | Patten, N. Y. |
| Barnhart | Eagle | Kahn | Peters, Mass. |
| Bartholdt | Edwards | Keating | Post |
| Bartlett | Elder | Kelly, Pa. | Quin |
| Beall, Tex. | Esch | Kennedy, Conn. | Raker |
| Bell, Cal. | Estopinal | Kennedy, Iowa | Rayburn |
| Blackmon | Faison | Kettner | Reed |
| Booher | Falconer | Key, Ohio | Reilly, Wis. |
| Borchers | Fergusson | Kindel | Rouse |
| Borland | Ferris | Kinkead, N. J. | Rubey |
| Bowdle | Fields | Kirkpatrick | Rupley |
| Brockson | Fitzhenry | Knowland, J. R. | Russell |
| Brodbeck | Floyd, Ark. | Konop | Sabath |
| Brown, N. Y. | Francis | Lazaro | Saunders |
| Browne, Wis. | Gard | Lee, Ga. | Seldomridge |
| Brumbaugh | Garner | Lee, Pa. | Shackleford |
| Buchanan, Tex. | Garrett, Tenn. | Lever | Sherley |
| Bulkley | Garrett, Tex. | Lewis, Md. | Sherwood |
| Burke, Wis. | Gerry | Lewis, Pa. | Sims |
| Bryns, Tenn. | Glass | Lieb | Sinnott |
| Candler, Miss. | Godwin, N. C. | Lindbergh | Slayden |
| Cantor | Gordon | Linthicum | Small |
| Caraway | Gorman | Lobeck | Smith, N. Y. |
| Carr | Gray | McAndrews | Smith, Tex. |
| Carter | Gregg | McClellan | Sparkman |
| Church | Hamlin | McCoy | Stafford |
| Clark, Fla. | Hammond | McDermott | Stedman |
| Claypool | Hardwick | McGillicuddy | Steenerson |
| Clayton | Hardy | McKellar | Stephens, Cal. |
| Coady | Harrison | MacDonald | Stephens, Miss. |
| Collier | Hart | Maguire, Nebr. | Stephens, Tex. |
| Connolly, Iowa | Hawley | Mahan | Stevens, N. H. |
| Cooper | Hay | Montague | Stone |
| Curry | Hayden | Moon | Sumners |
| Davis | Hayes | Morgan, La. | Taggart |
| Decker | Helm | Morrison | Talbott, Md. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Talcott, N. Y. | Thompson, Okla. | Vaughan | Watson |
| Tavenner | Thomson, Ill. | Vollmer | Weaver |
| Taylor, N. Y. | Townsend | Volstead | Whaley |
| Temple | Tribble | Walker | Williams |
| Ten Eyck | Tuttle | Walsh | Wilson, Fla. |
| Thacher | Underhill | Walters | Young, N. Dak. |
| Thomas | Underwood | Watkins | Young, Tex. |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adamson | Browning | Hughes, W. Va. McLaughlin |

NOT VOTING—134.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashbrook | Doughton | Korbly | Rainey |
| Austin | Dunn | Kreider | Rauch |
| Avis | Eagan | L'Engle | Reilly, Conn. |
| Bathrick | Evans | Lesher | Richardson |
| Beakes | Fairchild | Levy | Riordan |
| Bell, Ga. | Farr | Lloyd | Roberts, Nev. |
| Broussard | Finley | Loft | Rothermel |
| Brown, W. Va. | Fitzgerald | Logue | Rucker |
| Bruckner | Flood, Va. | Lonergan | Scully |
| Bryan | Fordney | McGuire, Okla. | Sharp |
| Burgess | Foster | McKenzie | Sisson |
| Burke, Pa. | Fowler | Maher | Smith, Idaho |
| Burke, S. Dak. | French | Manahan | Smith, Md. |
| Burnett | Gallagher | Martin | Smith, Minn. |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Gillett | Merritt | Stanley |
| Callaway | Gittins | Metz | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Cantrill | Goeke | Miller | Stevens, Minn. |
| Carew | Goldfogle | Mondell | Stout |
| Carlin | Goodwin, Ark. | Morin | Stringer |
| Cary | Goulden | Moss, W. Va. | Sutherland |
| Casey | Greene, Mass. | Mott | Switzer |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Griest | Murray, Okla. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Clancy | Griffin | O'Brien | Taylor, Ark. |
| Connelly, Kans. | Gudger | Oglesby | Taylor, Colo. |
| Conry | Hamill | O'Hair | Treadway |
| Copley | Heflin | O'Shaunessy | Vare |
| Crisp | Helvering | Palmer | Wallin |
| Crosser | Henry | Patton, Pa. | Webb |
| Cullop | Hinebaugh | Peters, Me. | Whitacre |
| Dale | Hobson | Peterson | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Danforth | Howell | Platt | Witherspoon |
| Davenport | Hoxworth | Plumley | Woodruff |
| Dershem | Hulings | Porter | |
| Dillon | Kitchin | Ragsdale | |

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. PLUMLEY (for amendment) with Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma (against).

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN (for Mann amendment) with Mr. STANLEY (against).

Until return from Colorado:

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

From February 6 until return from Colorado:

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. AUSTIN.

From February 6 until return from Michigan:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. HOWELL.

Until further notice:

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. VARE.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. TREADWAY

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. CARY.

Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BRYAN.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. FARR.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. HENRY with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. LLOYD with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. LONERGAN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. PETERS of Maine.

Mr. SHARP with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. SISSON with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

Mr. GOULDEN with Mr. DILLON.

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, we were reading the bill for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Why, the previous question went into effect at half past 3 o'clock. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANN. We have not got to that yet.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 2, answered "present" 4, not voting 121, as follows:

YEAS—305.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Dooling | Humphrey, Wash. | Nelson |
| Adair | Doolittle | Humphreys, Miss. | Nolan, J. I. |
| Aiken | Doremus | Igoe | Norton |
| Ainey | Driscoll | Jacoway | Oglesby |
| Alexander | Dunn | Johnson, Ky. | Oldfield |
| Allen | Dupré | Johnson, S. C. | O'Leary |
| Anderson | Dyer | Johnson, Utah | Page, N. C. |
| Anthony | Eagan | Johnson, Wash. | Paige, Mass. |
| Ashbrook | Eagle | Kahn | Park |
| Aswell | Edmonds | Keating | Parker |
| Bailey | Edwards | Keister | Patten, N. Y. |
| Baker | Elder | Kelley, Mich. | Peters, Mass. |
| Baltz | Esch | Kelly, Pa. | Peterson |
| Barkley | Estopinal | Kennedy, Conn. | Phelan |
| Barnhart | Fairchild | Kennedy, Iowa | Platt |
| Bartholdt | Faison | Kennedy, R. I. | Post |
| Bartlett | Falconer | Kent | Pou |
| Barton | Fergusson | Kettner | Powers |
| Bathrick | Ferris | Key, Ohio | Prouty |
| Beall, Tex. | Fess | Kiess, Pa. | Quin |
| Bell, Cal. | Fields | Kindel | Raker |
| Blackmon | Finley | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Rayburn |
| Booher | Fitzgerald | Kinkead, N. J. | Reed |
| Borchers | FitzHenry | Kirkpatrick | Reilly, Wis. |
| Borland | Floyd, Ark. | Knowland, J. R. | Roberts, Mass. |
| Britten | Francis | Konop | Rogers |
| Brockson | Frear | Korbly | Rothermel |
| Brodbeck | Gard | Lafferty | Rouse |
| Brown, N. Y. | Gardner | La Follette | Rubey |
| Browne, Wis. | Garner | Langley | Rucker |
| Brumbaugh | Garrett, Tenn. | Lazaro | Rupley |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Garrett, Tex. | Lee, Pa. | Russell |
| Buchanan, Tex. | George | Lenroot | Sabath |
| Bulkley | Gerry | Lever | Saunders |
| Burke, Wis. | Gilmore | Lewis, Md. | Seldomridge |
| Butler | Glass | Lewis, Pa. | Sells |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Godwin, N. C. | Lieb | Shackleford |
| Calder | Good | Lindbergh | Sherley |
| Callaway | Gordon | Lindquist | Sherwood |
| Campbell | Gorman | Linthicum | Shreve |
| Candler, Miss. | Graham, Ill. | Lloyd | Sims |
| Cantor | Graham, Pa. | Lobeck | Sinnott |
| Caraway | Gray | Logue | Slayden |
| Carr | Green, Iowa | McAndrews | Slemp |
| Carter | Greene, Vt. | McClellan | Sloan |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Gregg | McCoy | Small |
| Church | Guernsey | McDermott | Smith, Idaho |
| Clark, Fla. | Hamilton, Mich. | McGillicuddy | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Claypool | Hamilton, N. Y. | McKellar | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Clayton | Hamlin | McLaughlin | Smith, N. Y. |
| Cline | Hardwick | MacDonald | Smith, Tex. |
| Coady | Hardy | Madden | Sparkman |
| Collier | Harrison | Maguire, Nebr. | Stafford |
| Connelly, Kans. | Hart | Mahan | Stedman |
| Connolly, Iowa | Haugen | Mann | Steenerson |
| Cooper | Hawley | Mapes | Stephens, Cal. |
| Covington | Hay | Mitchell | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Cox | Hayden | Mondell | Stephens, Tex. |
| Cramton | Hayes | Montague | Stevens, N. H. |
| Curry | Heflin | Moon | Stone |
| Decker | Helgesen | Moore | Sumners |
| Deitrick | Helm | Morgan, La. | Taggart |
| Dent | Helvering | Morgan, Okla. | Talbott, Md. |
| Dershem | Hensley | Morrison | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Dickinson | Hill | Moss, Ind. | Tavenner |
| Dies | Holland | Murdock | Taylor, N. Y. |
| Difenderfer | Houston | Murray, Mass. | Temple |
| Dixon | Howard | Murray, Okla. | Thacher |
| Donohoe | Hughes, Ga. | Neeley, Kans. | Thomas |
| Donovan | Hull | Neely, W. Va. | Thompson, Okla. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Thomson, Ill. | Vollmer | Webb | Winslow |
| Towner | Walker | Whaley | Woods |
| Tribble | Walsh | White | Young, N. Dak. |
| Tuttle | Walters | Williams | Young, Tex. |
| Underhill | Watkins | Willis | |
| Underwood | Watson | Wilson, Fla. | |
| Vaughan | Weaver | Wingo | |

NAYS—2.

Hammond Volstead

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adamson | Browning | Hughes, W. Va. | Stephens, Miss. |

NOT VOTING—121.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ansberry | Dillon | Langham | Reilly, Conn. |
| Austin | Doughton | Lee, Ga. | Richardson |
| Avis | Evans | L'Engle | Riordan |
| Barchfeld | Farr | Lesher | Roberts, Nev. |
| Beakes | Flood, Va. | Levy | Scott |
| Bell, Ga. | Fordney | Loft | Scully |
| Bowdle | Foster | Lonergan | Sharp |
| Broussard | Fowler | McGuire, Okla. | Sisson |
| Brown, W. Va. | French | McKenzie | Smith, Md. |
| Bruckner | Gallagher | Maher | Smith, Minn. |
| Bryan | Gillett | Manahan | Stanley |
| Burgess | Gittins | Martin | Stevens, Minn. |
| Burke, Pa. | Goeke | Merritt | Stout |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Goldfogle | Metz | Stringer |
| Burnett | Goodwin, Ark. | Miller | Sutherland |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Goulden | Morin | Switzer |
| Cantrill | Greene, Mass. | Moss, W. Va. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Carew | Griest | Mott | Taylor, Ark. |
| Carlin | Griffin | O'Brien | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cary | Gudger | O'Hair | Ten Eyck |
| Casey | Hamill | O'Shaunessy | Townsend |
| Clancy | Henry | Padgett | Treadway |
| Conry | Hinds | Palmer | Vare |
| Copley | Hinebaugh | Patton, Pa. | Wallin |
| Crisp | Hobson | Payne | Whitacre |
| Crosser | Howell | Peters, Me. | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Cullop | Hoxworth | Plumley | Witherspoon |
| Dale | Hulings | Porter | Woodruff |
| Danforth | Jones | Ragsdale | |
| Davenport | Kitchin | Rainey | |
| Davis | Kreider | Rauch | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. L'ENGLE with Mr. PETERS of Maine.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. RAUCH with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. CARY.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. JONES with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. PAYNE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the title: Insert the word "or" after the word "prison" in the last line of the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended accordingly.

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence on account of personal illness.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11231. An act to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio; and

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property; and

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon.

### BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 10735.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Before going into the Committee of the Whole House I would like, if possible, to arrange the time for general debate. In order to raise the subject I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be restricted to two hours.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to that.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] that he let it run during the day and attempt to close the debate on the next Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Would it be in order on the next day to make the same request?

The SPEAKER. The House goes into the Committee of the Whole House automatically.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10735) entitled "A bill to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor," with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor safety plans and devices of all kinds, and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of all phases of the subject of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

SEC. 2. That there shall be erected a museum of sufficient size and capacity with grounds thereto annexed, in and upon which shall be exhibited approved devices for the safeguarding of machinery, the protection of employees from injury, the lessening of dangerous conditions which may exist in any industrial enterprise, and the methods of lessening, preventing, and controlling industrial diseases. All such appliances, devices, and arrangements may be exhibited at rest or in motion, as may best serve the purposes of such exhibit. That in addition to the museum hereinbefore referred to and in connection therewith there shall be established a laboratory, wherein may be examined and tested the relative efficiency of types of guards or other devices for the protection of machinery calculated to safeguard the employee or the general public from injury or industrial disease.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the object of this legislation is to supply some additional corrective, with a view to mitigate and reduce the accidents and occupational diseases which arise in American industries.

The Committee on Labor had two bills referred to it dealing with those subjects. One was the bill of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, and the other the bill of the late Representative Bremner, from the State of New Jersey. In the committee's deliberations upon the subject it reached conclusions as to the treatment that should be applied to the subject, involving the application of the ideas embraced in the bills of both of these gentlemen, and the bill now reported and before the House comprises the essential provisions of both of the bills as thus introduced.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably no subject before the public functionaries of this Nation calling so loudly for remedial attention on the subject of industrial accidents in our country as this. I do not know how fully the fact is realized by our people at large, but it is still a fact that the ratio of the number of deaths and the number of injuries tend to run from two to as high as five times the number in the older countries of the world in the same lines of industrial occupation.

How far these frightful ratios are attributable to positive negligence in the individual it may be hard to say. My own impression, however, after the best thought I can give the subject, is this: There is a distinctively American temperament, constituted of the most restless and aggressive individualities of the Old World, willing to break the bonds of their habitations after centuries and come here as strangers to a newly discovered continent. Such persons and their children are liable to be more impatient and aggressive in their actions than those more sedate and quiet spirits which have been left behind; and probably this world-wide selection of aggressive spirits composing our population, and resulting in this distinctive American temperament, supplies the explanation for our high accident ratios in the United States. However that may be, sir, the condition

is here. We are paying these frightful life-and-limb prices in the way of accidents year after year, and, I say with regret, that the recent accident tables do not seem to show up to date any improvement in that respect.

But an improvement, I believe, is due. We have now a line of legislation known as workmen's compensation already adopted by some 25 States in the Union, in some of which—I think in four-fifths of which—the method of direct liability is employed, thus penalizing accidents, or perhaps it is better stated by saying that the prevention of accidents is premiumized, for these workingmen's compensation laws provide in principle that the employer shall be liable in a given amount to the dependents of the employee killed, or to the employee himself when injured, irrespective of any question of negligence as a producing cause of the accident; and I believe there can be no question but that the effect of such legislation in this country must ultimately be what it has proved itself to be in Great Britain, namely, a remedial agency of the highest efficacy; for on the railroads in Great Britain accidents have been reduced one-third as the result of the preventive influences of the compensation laws of Great Britain.

Now, that, sir, leads me to the financial aspects of this question—aspects which I believe ought not to be ignored merely because the more precious consideration of life and limb is also first involved. Sir, if the workmen's compensation bill had been passed to which the House gave its sanction a year ago, and to which the Senate gave its sanction at about the same time—the sanctions, however, not meeting in the way requisite for legislative action—if that measure had passed and railroad accidents had not fallen off after its passage, computation shows that the bill would have cost the American railways some $50,000,000 per annum.

If we take the other accidents into account, namely, those in the perilous industries generally, it is probably not an exaggerated statement to say that the employers and the business of the country would be presented with an accident budget annually of not less than $200,000,000.

So, barring wholly the remedial possibilities in the way of saving life and limb, and looking at this matter in its merely fiscal or economic aspects, it may have the effect of greatly reducing accidents and would go to greatly reducing the charges upon the industries of our country.

And in that connection I only wish to suggest that the passage of these compensation laws in the several States will supply the motive to the employer to search out and to apply in the most assiduous way any devices or methods which may be discovered having a character to prevent the happening of these accidents to his employees. There ought, therefore, to be some central point—a bureau whose function it would be to collect all available information upon this subject and to act as a clearing house for such information and supply descriptions of the devices which have been found useful in this or in other lands in reducing the number of accidents.

That, sir, is the object of this bill—to provide a bureau in the Department of Labor whose business it shall be to collect all available information with reference to accident prevention and with reference also to the prevention and cure of occupational diseases, and have it in readiness for those who may wish to apply it in their different lines of employment.

And now, sir, I yield half an hour of my remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not do that under the rules. I submit that he can not yield his time under the rules, but he can reserve it.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Then, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. After half an hour's time he can yield time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield half an hour of my remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MADDEN. I object, Mr. Chairman, to anybody yielding time under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The uniform practice allows that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is clearly mistaken. It is against the rules to yield time in the five-minute debate, but in general debate a man can yield such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield half an hour to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Maryland yields the floor, as the chairman of the Committee on Labor, will he not yield to me for a question or two, asking the indulgence of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH]?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The second section of this bill is undoubtedly going to provoke some discussion. Is this the paragraph suggested by the late Mr. Bremner?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It is.

Mr. MOORE. Has the committee any data which will show the House what the cost of such a museum as is contemplated in that paragraph may be; what the extent of it would be, or where it would be located?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. No; we have not; but it is obvious that no sums could be expended under that section without the approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the thought of the committee to have the bill passed with that paragraph included so that the Department of Labor further on can take up with the Appropriations Committee the question of the cost of the project?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. With the wisdom of each one of the proposals, item by item.

Mr. MOORE. Did the Committee on Labor give consideration to the cost of this project at all? I understand a museum is contemplated in which is to be housed appliances having to do with labor, the extent of which is not explained, and the magnitude of which is unlimited. The House ought to be informed as to the cost, and I wanted to know if the Committee on Labor had informed itself, or intended to trust to the Department of Labor later on?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The Committee on Labor found the subject terra incognita as to cost; there were no definite data on that subject, and it thought there might be instances where the physical devices themselves ought to be displayed, and that the prudence of the Labor Department and the Committee on Appropriations might be trusted not to overdo it.

Mr. MOORE. The committee contemplates the purchase of ground on which the museum would be erected?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. We entered into no study of the cost of that museum.

Mr. MOORE. Did the committee consider the number and character of the devices that might be housed in that museum?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The committee concluded that it would be impossible to draw any precise conclusions from the information available.

Mr. MOORE. The purpose of the committee was comprehensive as to the museum? It was not to be confined to railroad devices, like couplings, or elevator devices, but to all factory and industrial devices?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It felt that this subject was under such disqualifications with respect to definite information that it would come to no particular conclusion.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is quite willing that great sums of money should be expended in opening channels of this country and in other river and harbor work, ought not to be so critical with respect to the expenditure of a small amount of money for the establishment and operation of this bureau of safety, which has for its object the safety of life and limb and the betterment of the condition of the great host of workingmen in this country of ours.

Mr. MOORE. I hope the gentleman from New Jersey is not going to oppose the opening up of the channels of commerce which will be in the interest of labor, simply because we inquire about a bill that contemplates the construction of a museum for the exhibition of safety devices without knowing anything about the cost or the real purpose to be attained. I hope the gentleman does not raise that question seriously, because if he does, I shall answer him when the time comes to do so.

Mr. WALSH. I am certainly not going to oppose the development of our waterways, because, as the gentleman knows, I am an advocate of them; nor do I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should oppose this safety bill on account of the comparatively meager expense involved.

Mr. Chairman, the bill on which I am about to speak has a significance quite out of the ordinary, due to the fact that it is a composition of two bills amended by the Committee on Labor, of which I have the honor to be a member. One of these bills was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN (Republican), and the other by the departed Member my esteemed colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Bremner (Democrat).

I consider it quite a distinction to have the opportunity of making my initial effort as a Member of this House in support of a bill which to a very great extent is the result of the work of "Smiling Bob" Bremner [applause], whose name deserves to, and I believe will, go down in the history of our National Legislature as that of a man who in the midst of constant and

excruciating physical suffering gave us all an example of fortitude and unconquerable good nature. [Applause.] We hear a lot, gentlemen, and we read a lot about the "brotherhood of man," but it is not often in actual life we have the pleasure of having known a man in whom the spirit of genuine brotherhood was so big and warm that he was eager and anxious under such circumstances as you know existed in his case to spend years of his life in devising and perfecting ways and means for promoting the well-being of our mighty army of American workers, among whom for so many years I was myself numbered. [Applause.]

This bill, Mr. Chairman, creates within the Department of Labor a bureau of safety and sanitation, for the purpose of investigating, studying, and helping in the development of whatever tends toward the greater protection of life and limb and the health of the thousands who labor. The bureau will have the power to put the result of their work on exhibition through the medium of a museum here in Washington, or in any great center of industry, for the instruction and benefit of employers of labor. And right here, gentlemen, I wish to emphasize a point which appeals to me forcibly in advocating the passage of this bill. While it is a measure which provides a new and very much needed source of blessing to the vast hosts of workers throughout the Nation, it will at the same time necessarily prove, in practice, of inestimable value to all employers of labor, for the existence and the workings of such a bureau at the expense of the Government will enable and encourage employers to keep in touch with the very latest improvements in methods of safety and sanitation, and help them also to reduce to a minimum the expense which they have to incur of necessity in rendering the conditions for their workers as safe and as sanitary as they possibly can.

I think the time is past when employers looked askance at any and every effort made for the improvement of labor conditions. The working of compensation laws in different States must have made it fairly evident that whatever makes for the benefit of the workers in health and safety makes also for the benefit of the employer by reason of the increased efficiency and the decrease in the number of industrial accidents, with their consequent unsatisfactory, costly, and long-drawn-out lawsuits, which helped to promote a feeling of class distinction, a spirit of antagonism, and a state of warfare in the industrial world which has more than once threatened serious disaster in the country. [Applause.]

Employers are coming to realize that the slogan of "Safety and sanitation" for the workers is also the slogan of economy and greater prosperity for themselves. I had some very practical experience in this regard during my time as a member of the legislature in my own State of New Jersey when I introduced and fought for the passage of a compensation bill under the leadership of the foremost of my constituents at the other end of the Avenue, who, by virture of his sterling worth, was lifted by the American people from practical political oblivion to the highest office in the land within three years.

We of New Jersey knew of Wilson what the rank and file of the people of the Nation now realize: That he is an eminent statesman, a scholarly gentleman, and what the poet calls the noblest work of God—an honest man.

Well, at the beginning there was bitter and intense opposition to the bill, as there was to all such legislation, but, notwithstanding this, I believe I am perfectly safe in making the assertion now that very few, if any, of the great employers of labor in my State would countenance the repeal of that law or any return to the conditions which existed previous to its enactment.

I do not know of a single instance in my State where an employer has failed to elect the compensation section of the law; on the other hand, the working people are satisfied as individuals and as labor organizations.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WALSH. With pleasure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The gentleman spoke of electing the adoption of certain features of the law.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman would explain just what employers were permitted to do in that respect, to adopt or not to adopt, if the gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, you know it would be unconstitutional to pass mandatory legislation compelling employers to pay so and so much to an employee for such and such an accident. You must give them their right of trial by jury; but if they want to waive that right of trial by jury and elect to adopt the compensation feature of that law, then, of course, it is absolutely legal and constitutional.

It was not essential that they should adopt it. They could have claimed the alternative of the right of trial by jury. I keep in fairly close touch with my State, and I do not know of one employer in that State who has not elected to adopt that compensation schedule. [Applause.]

You may remember how our great American railroads fought tooth and nail against the bill compelling them to provide air-brakes on their trains, and you know how they would now battle as a unit against any law which would even limit their use, because as a safeguard they have proved to be an effective remedy against accidents and consequent endless litigation and payment of damages.

The bill which is now before the House for our consideration, if enacted into law, is well calculated to promote industrial harmony and prosperity by bringing about the fostering conditions which will undoubtedly increase the percentage of efficiency among the workers, and thus benefit largely the employers. Every legislative effort which tends to promote such harmony between workers and employers is an effort in the right direction, and every law which will facilitate, as this one will, the efforts of employers to manifest a larger measure of consideration for their employees will prove a widespread benefit to the country and to the party under whose guidance it was enacted. It is a most encouraging thing to find that there are many employers of labor in this country who without the whip of compulsion by law have worked steadily to improve the conditions in their plants for the greater safety and comfort of their employees.

It is very gratifying to learn from a perusal of the testimony given before the Commission on Industrial Relations that many of our big business corporations, having plants located in cities where laws on this subject exist, have done vastly more on their own initiative than is requested by the law. In many European countries employers offer tempting premiums to those who by their inventive genius are able to improve existing methods of protection, and I am sufficiently enthusiastic about American ability to be of the opinion that under the stimulus of such a bureau as this bill provides our far-famed American ingenuity would soon succeed in furnishing thoroughly adequate means of protection at a minimum cost.

Thus far, Mr. Chairman, I have dwelt on the advantages which such a bureau will have for employers of labor. Naturally these advantages will be more evident in those States where compensation laws are on the statute books, and I am firmly convinced that such laws will very soon be in existence in every State and Territory of the Union. Now, if we take the other aspect of the matter and consider the value of this bill from the viewpoint of the workingman, I think it would be very hard to overestimate its advantages.

Reliable statistics show us that about 500,000 workers are killed or incapacitated in this country every year. The statement seems incredible, but even admitting the possibility of some error or exaggeration in figures which cover so wide a field, there yet remains enough to make the statement staggering. Think of it, gentlemen, almost half a million of our fellow beings every year either killed outright or through injuries brought face to face with that dreaded poverty which they are no longer able to avert!

Why, any war which would result in such a list of casualties as is reported in our industrial nation every year would go down in history as one of unexampled ferocity and horror. [Applause.] We cry out in condemnation of the atrocities of the war which is now going on in another land, and yet we practically stand stolidly by while this shocking and unnecessary and inexcusable carnage goes steadily on in our very midst, accompanied by horrors unsurpassed in war. In no other country does the accident rate reach such colossal proportions as in these United States. Oh, my dear friends and Members of this Congress, let me suggest to you that it is your duty and mine to see to it that through legislative means within our power the mighty hosts who labor are given an opportunity to reap the benefits which are theirs under the Constitution, which guarantees "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to all law-abiding citizens, and thus put an end to the deplorable destruction of human life and human agony which is being yearly offered up in the land on the altars of industry. [Applause.] It is very important for us to remember that we are here dealing with a class of people who, as a rule, have few, if any, resources to fall back upon in time of need. Their daily wage hardly admits of such provision. Multitudes of them struggle to make a home for themselves and enjoy its comforts, such as they may be, when the day's work is done. That home depends entirely on their earnings from week to week. Few of

us would be willing to change places with any of them; nevertheless it is their home, the result of their toil, and their only ideal of human happiness in a world which for them holds very few of the joys and comforts with which we may be familiar. What a tragedy, then, to take only one instance of this annual 500,000, where the sole support of such a home is either taken suddenly away by death or rendered "unfit for service" by some disabling accident.

I have not been insisting on these items, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of making an appeal to your sympathies, although the mere statement of the truly heart-rending details of continual industrial disasters throughout the country can not but rouse the sympathy and the indignation, too, of anyone with a heart of human kindness; but legislation on the question is a matter of justice and not sympathy. [Applause.]

It is for us as national legislators to use our opportunities to enact laws of such a kind as will persuade and encourage, where we can not compel, all employers of labor to do whatever is necessary to bring about the desired result.

Men will talk to you, and writers will appeal to you, and politicians will enthuse with you, about the conservation and development of our natural resources. Every time a bill is before this House which gives any excuse for conservation speeches you will hear them from all quarters of this Chamber. With this I have no complaint; in fact, I am glad to know that we have so many Members who are eager about our resources; for surely, in the interest of the country at large, the conservation and development of these resources are of the utmost importance; but, at the same time, many of these very individuals will stand idly by, year after year, and let this mighty army of our fine American workingmen go to untimely graves or be flung like refuse into the rapidly increasing ranks of the poverty stricken and miserable.

Our forests are important as a natural resource; why, of course, they are. Our streams and rivers and lakes are important; the conservation of all the resources of our American soil is important; but I submit to you, gentlemen, that our most important resource is the mighty army of men, women, and children who produce the wealth of the Nation. [Applause.]

Is it not chiefly through the toil of their hands that all work of conservation must be finally carried out—aye, even the conservation of the country itself among the great nations of the world?

Are we not bound, then, as patriotic citizens to keep at heart the best interests of these millions of workers who have too long felt themselves to be the victims of neglect in legislation or of legislation which was partial? Are we not bound to use the opportunities which they as voters helped largely to give us to make laws which will work for their greater safety and security while they toil, and thus put an end to this disgraceful annual sacrifice of life, limb, and health and enable them to reach some measure of comfort and stable happiness in their lives?

It is a bad thing for a country when legislation for which there is crying need on the part of a large percentage of the population is overlooked or ignored by those to whom they must naturally look for its enactment. It has been very well said that "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." It is just the lack of human and humane interest on the part of legislators, as well as on the part of employers, that has not only made "countless thousands mourn" in our own land, but has also developed in the hearts of other thousands a deep-rooted contempt for our laws and a correspondingly deep-rooted disrespect for our lawmakers, as being indifferent to the pressing needs of the laboring masses.

Now, it is very important for the continued stability and prosperity of the country that there be a widespread and sincere respect for its laws, but it is hardly possible that any such popular respect for laws can exist unless there be an equally general and genuine confidence in those to whom the making of the law has been intrusted. Nor can we ever hope for any very enthusiastic spirit of patriotism unless the people—the humblest worker as well as the greatest baron of industry—can feel assured that the lawmakers in State and Nation are working zealously and surely toward a fuller realization of the spirit of the Constitution for all the people. [Applause.]

The Democratic administration is in the limelight of national observation, and if we can satisfy the aspirations of the people for thoroughly representative government we shall have done much indeed to promote national peace and unity, patriotism and prosperity, together with respect for the law and for those who make it.

This bill represents no haphazard attempt at such legislation, nor it is anything in the nature of a sop to the working millions whose eyes are upon us and whose interests are at stake. It is a serious, well-thought-out, and determined attempt to place a law upon our statute books which will prove an incentive to the elimination of the conditions in the world of labor which have been and still are a disgrace to the country, a most fruitful source of misery and unrest and discontent and all the other ills that may afflict a people or work injury to a nation.

The two great measures already enacted into law have powerfully strengthened popular confidence in our administration. By such a law as this we reach out our hand, as it were, to the hosts of patient toilers and give them a hearty grip of an active and effective friendship, while at the same time speaking encouragement to every employer who has the interests of his employees at heart. And I believe that through legislation such as this the forces of discontent and possible revolt agninst law and order will rapidly lose their influence with the workers of the Nation, for all will feel satisfied that under the ægis of our Democratic administration there will be truly a government for the people—a reign of law and liberty. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman having charge of the bill how long he plans to run to-night? It is now nearly half-past 5 o'clock.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Labor desires to continue discussion until about 6 o'clock.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum or find out if we can not get one, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is understood we are not going to vote on the bill to-night?

Mr. KEATING. It is so understood.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10735, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 33.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives, Thursday, the 5th day of March, 1914, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon; and

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56).

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Thursday, March 5, 1914.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of northwest prong of Bay River to public wharf at dam in town of Bayboro, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 810); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion in the case of Charles F. Rockwell, administrator of the estate of James Rockwell, jr., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 811); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. O'LEARY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8593) amending the building regulations of the District of Columbia by providing for the better protection of persons engaged in and about the construction, repairing, alterations, or removal of bridges, buildings, viaducts, and other structures, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 336), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13296) for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 339), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 14189) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 14190) providing for purchase of site and for public building at Chatham, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14191) to establish a Bureau of Markets in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14192) to appropriate $25,000 to erect at some suitable place within the State of Florida a fitting monument to the memory of Osceola, the chief of the Seminole Indians; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14193) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Gainesville, Fla., two condemned bronze or brass cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 14194) providing for loan of disabled or obsolete cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14195) to prohibit the transportation of certain corporate stocks and bonds by the United States mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 14196) authorizing the Tuscarora Nation of New York Indians to lease or sell the limestone deposits upon their reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Resolution (H. Res. 433) providing for the consideration of S. 4437; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 14197) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. H. G. Lamar; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14198) granting an increase of pension to Calvin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 14199) granting a pension to Lucien D. Copin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14200) for the relief of George M. Kimball; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 14201) granting a pension to Charles Bruder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14202) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Mittelstnedt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 14203) granting a pension to Augusta H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 14204) granting a pension to America J. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 14205) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14206) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael J. Doyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 14207) granting a pension to James White Gillespie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 14208) granting an increase of pension to Helen B. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14209) for the relief of the estate of Epenetus Heath, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14210) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick Hensolt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14211) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Sleeker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14212) granting an increase of pension to Williamine M. Van Marter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14213) for the relief of Hiram Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 14214) for the relief of Joseph Giessner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14215) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 14216) granting an increase of pension to Jane Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14217) granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 14218) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Elcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14219) granting a pension to Edward Meyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 14220) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14221) granting an increase of pension to Fredus H. Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14222) granting a pension to Catherine M. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 14223) granting an increase of pension to John W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 14224) for the relief of the estate of B. F. Havens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14225) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Catholic Church in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14226) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Presbyterian Church in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14227) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 14228) granting an increase of pension to George R. Belcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 14229) for the relief of Henry La Roque; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 14230) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Niles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 224) authorizing the Dowsett Co. (Ltd.) and its sublessees to remove the buildings erected by them on the military reservation of Schofield Barracks, Territory of Hawaii, on the expiration of their leasehold interest therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of A. R. Lebu, of Pacific, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of various voters of Hamilton County, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Dr. Louis Grear and 700 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles Maffey and 278 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of the Union State Bank, of Everest, Kans., favoring amendment to income tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Walhonding Valley Grange, No. 1751, favoring a law limiting the service of fourth-class postmasters and rural free delivery carriers to four years; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Illinois against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-second Illinois congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of the eighteenth ward of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Association, favoring passage of House bill 12292, relative to child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Frederick W. Pfluger, of New York City, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14198) granting an increase of pension to Calvin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petitions of H. I. Storms and other citizens of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of sundry citizens of Beloit, Wis., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Southern Wisconsin Cheese Makers and Dairymen's Association, favoring amendment of act of March 3, 1913, relative to the manufacture of misbranded and deleterious foods, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, favoring New York City for the Army-Navy football game; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William C. Hawley, of New York, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for pensions for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Lutheran Minnesota Conference of the Augustus Synod, of Cannon Falls, Minn., favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Minnesota Retail Jewelers' Association, of New Richland, Minn., favoring legislation to prevent frauds in watchcases, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIXON: Petition of the National Bank and Deposit Bank, of Rising Sun, Ind., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ripley County, Ind., protesting against passage of the Columbus day bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ripley County, Ind., protesting against passage of the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ripley County, Ind., relative to the immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petitions of various voters of the forty-first and forty-second congressional districts of the State of New York, protesting against national prohibition (H. R. 168 and S. J. Res. 50 and 88) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions being inserted in all contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. A. Tator Relief Corps, No. 27, Department of Wisconsin, protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINLEY: Memorial of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to the naming of the military posts on the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to conditions to be inserted in cotton futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Robert Brucker Camp, No. 6, United Spanish War Veterans, of Westerly; Captain Allyn K. Capron Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, of Providence; E. R. Barker, sr., vice commander in chief United Spanish War Veterans, of Providence; and Sidney Hoar Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 13044, granting a pension to widows and orphans of men serving in the Spanish-American War and Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petitions of the Springfield (Ill.) Federation of Labor; Bartenders' Union No. 573; sundry citizens of the twenty-first congressional district of Illinois; Local Union, No. 147, Bakery and Confectionery Workers, of Springfield; and hotel and railroad employees of the twenty-first district of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions inserted in contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. G. Ally, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG: Petitions of various banks and bankers of Galveston, Tex., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, favoring House bill 9687, for betterment of headquarters clerks in War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Prairie Center (Kans.) Local Union, No. 640, favoring House bill 10076, relative to stock exchanges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Minneapolis, Kans., favoring continuance of city delivery service in Minneapolis, Kans.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twelfth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14211) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Sleeker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of the Portland (Oreg.) Bartenders' League, No. 339; Bartenders' Union, Local No. 142, Oregon; and citizens of Oregon, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of Edward M. Wheeler, of New York City, favoring passage of House bill 9292, the classification bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, the Railway Business Association, the American Locomotive Co., and the Manganese Steel Rail Co., favoring legislation for bureau for bill drafting and reference; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Scandinavian Hundred Men Society, of Brooklyn, favoring passage of bill for erecting memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of New York Mailers Union, No. 6, favoring passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Light & Schlesinger and Daggett & Ramsdell, of New York City, favoring passage of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of J. E. Hiller, of New York City, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of G. A. Beard & Co., Schultze, Waltman & Co., Sunnyside Coal Co., the American Pharmacy Co., and August Schmitt & Sons Co., all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of F. H. Hemker and J. J. Missett, of Hartford, Conn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. W. Backus, of New York, favoring legislation for claim of Volunteer officers of Civil War to be retired, to date from 64 years of age in case of each officer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of sundry citizens of the sixth district of Illinois, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Frank Hasselmann and others, of Catskill, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Hudson, Columbia County, N. Y., protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METZ: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring New York City for Army-Navy football game; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14220) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the Commodore Barry Branch of the American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging defeat of attempts to repeal clause in Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the John Paul Jones Branch of the American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cayuga County, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven County, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petitions of 126 citizens of the State of Kentucky, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of J. M. Faruseth, of Gully, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of P. N. Pederson, A. H. Erickson, and J. B. Erickson, of Moorhead, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of Hamill bill for pensions and retirement of aged civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, favoring rural farm-credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Lodge, No. 311, International Association of Machinists, relative to pay for overtime and longevity service of organized labor on Panama Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, approving action of the United States Government in dissolving the Central Pacific and Southern Pacific Railroad Cos.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Southern California Child Labor Committee, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 12292, relative to child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of members of the Young People's Christian Union Alliance of the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., and of Joseph Jackson and other citizens of Milford, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the John Hancock Branch of the American Continental League, of Worcester, Mass., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of various banks of Worcester, Milford, Westboro, Whitinsville, and Spencer, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, relative to New York City as the place for the Army-Navy football game; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Westhope and others of North Dakota, favoring amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### THURSDAY, *March 5, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, look upon us in Thy tender mercy as we gather to face once more the solemn obligations and duties of the Senate. Grant us the wisdom that cometh from above. When Thou hast spoken to us out of human history and taught us by human philosophy and inspired us by divine revelation, Thou hast not even then exhausted the treasures of Thy wisdom and power and Thy ability to guide us in the ways of truth. So do Thou speak to the heart of each of Thy servants this day that we may know God's will, that we may follow God's will, that we may do God's will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LAND IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA. (S. DOC. NO 434).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, suggesting the repeal of the provision contained in the Army appropriation act approved March 31, 1911, relative to the release to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., of a strip of land not exceeding 23 feet in width on the north line of Fort Marion Reservation for the purpose of restoring the street formerly known as Clinch Street, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS (S. DOC. NO. 436).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting for consideration in connection with the urgent deficiency appropriation bill estimates relative to public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF CONVICTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting in further response to a resolution of November 10, 1913, additional reports in regard to the employment of convicts in foreign countries. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Printing for determination.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Worcester, Mass.; of John Paul Jones Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Rochambeau Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and of Liberty Bell Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Menace Court, No. 16, Guardians of Liberty, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bloomington and South Bend, in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lignite, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was laid on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bowbells, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a memorial of the Grand Army of the Republic of Belding, Mich., and ask to have it read.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1914.

*To the Sixty-third Congress of the United States:*

Whereas certain bills have been introduced in the Senate and House for a change in the United States flag, we, the members of Dan. S. Root Post, No. 126, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Belding, Ionia County, Mich., at a regular meeting of said

post, held on the above date, number of members present, by unanimous vote, do most earnestly protest against any change whatever in the flag that we imperiled our lives to preserve, and which is known throughout the world as the emblem of liberty and equality.

FRANK R. CHASE,
*Commander Department of Michigan,*
*Grand Army of the Republic.*
W. R. OLDS, *Adjutant.*

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have had a number of letters concerning this subject. I have not found out that anyone has introduced such a bill. If such a bill has been introduced and any Senator knows of it, I wish I might be informed of the number of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been introduced in the other House.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not found any such bill introduced in either the Senate or the House. I will ask the Senator from Michigan if he knows positively that such a bill has been introduced in either branch of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have been informed that a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives having for its object a change in the character of the American flag, but I presented this remonstrance from the Michigan Grand Army of the Republic because it came to me in due course of business, and not because I regard any such change as imminent.

I do not know who introduced the bill, but I am informed that there is a bill pending in the House of Representatives having such an object in view.

Mr. McCUMBER. I imagine, Mr. President, that such a bill could get exceedingly little support in either branch of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It would not get any from me, I will state to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Souris, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Courtenay, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gaston, Oreg., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salem, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. POMERENE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Springfield, Canton, Clinton, Millsburg, Sandusky, Akron, Kingsville, Kent, Larue, Athens, and Massillon, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, New Haven, and Stratford, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fulton County, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Cloud and Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bangor, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a retired list of volunteer officers of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Lucy Hale Chandler Council, Daughters of Liberty, of Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Holyoke, Chicopee Falls, Springfield, Lowell, and Brockton, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of John Boyle O'Reilly Camp, American Continental League, of Springfield; of Anthony Wayne Branch, American Continental League, of Brockton; and of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of H. M. Warren Post, No. 12, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, of Wakefield, Mass., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Federation of Churches of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the chaplains in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Evansville, Fort Wayne, New Albany, Rushville, Muncie, Lawrenceburg, and Lake County; of Local Union No. 60, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Indianapolis; and of Local Union No. 382, Cigarmakers' International Union, of Rushville, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Laramie, Wyo., and a petition of Custer Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wyoming, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of White Plains, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the memorial of A. H. Meyer, of New York City, and memorials of sundry citizens of New York City, Geneva, Seneca, Waterloo, Victor, Canandaigua, Rochester, and Cooks Falls, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present the petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, to the honorable Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled.

Mrs. Bennett to the honorable Members of Congress *most respectfully showeth*: That the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, California, Oregon, Kansas, and Arizona, by removing the words "white and male" from their constitutions and laws as qualifications for voting, have enabled colored male and white and colored female citizens of the United States to have the same right to vote for Members of Congress, presidential electors, and United States Senators in them that white male citizens of the United States possess.

That some of our States, by having "grandfather" and other clauses in their constitutions and laws which directly or indirectly prescribe "white and male" as qualifications for voting, are preventing colored male and white and colored female citizens of the United States from having the same right to vote for Members of Congress, presidential electors, and United States Senators in them that white male citizens of the United States possess.

That these States, by doing the above-mentioned things, have made it appear that the right to vote for Federal officers is secured to citizens of the United States by the constitutions and laws of the States and not by the Federal Constitution.

After the Supreme Court of the United States decided in United States *v.* Reese, of 1876, that Congress had no constitutional power to make Federal laws that provided punishments for persons who hindered or prevented citizens from exercising a "right to vote" at any election that was secured to them by the constitution or laws of a State. And after the Supreme Court said in *ex parte* Yarbrough, in 1884: "If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections upon which its existence depends from violence and corruption. If it has not this power, it is left helpless before the two great natural and historical enemies of all republics—open violence and insidious corruption."

After thus declaring in the first part of its *ex parte* Yarbrough decision of 1884 that "the General Government must have the power to protect the elections upon which its existence depends from violence and corruption," the Supreme Court reversed the Minor *v.* Happersett and United States *v.* Cruikshank decisions of 1875 and 1876, in which it had decided that "the Constitution of the United States did not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone" by declaring in the

conclusion of ex parte Yarbrough that the "right to vote" for Members of Congress and presidential electors was secured to citizens of the United States by the Federal Constitution. And by deciding that sections 5508 and 5520 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—which were inappropriate legislation for the protection of citizens in exercising the new "right of exemption, etc." that the fifteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution had conferred upon them from their lack of the limiting words of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude"—were constitutional laws for the protection of citizens against the violence of private persons in exercising their "right to vote" for Members of Congress and presidential electors, because the first section of the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution had authorized Congress to make laws which provided punishments for private persons as well as for State officers who hindered or prevented citizens from exercising "rights conferred by the Constitution of the United States essential to the healthy organization of the Government itself."

The Supreme Court of the United States indirectly affirmed in its combined Minor v. Happersett and ex parte Yarbrough decisions of 1875 and 1884 that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution annulled the words "white and male" that were in the constitutions and laws of the States when they were adopted as qualifications for voting, and thereby left the colored male and white and colored female citizens of the United States in each State in possession of the same "right to vote" that white male citizens of the United States already possessed. But in its ex parte Virginia decision of 1879 the Supreme Court says that much of the force of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution is derived from that section which declared that Congress should have power to enforce their prohibitions by "appropriate legislation," and that some legislation by Congress was contemplated to make their provisions "fully effective"; that "it is not said the judicial power of the General Government shall extend to enforcing the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed. It is not said that branch of the Government shall be authorized to declare void any action of a State in violation of the prohibitions. Congress is authorized to enforce their prohibitions by appropriate legislation."

In consideration of all of the above-mentioned facts, Mrs. Bennett most respectfully petitions the honorable Members of Congress to declare that when the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution forbid the States to make or enforce any law which would deny or abridge any of the privileges or immunities of "citizens of the United States" they annulled the words "white and male" that were in the constitutions and laws of the State as qualifications for voting in so far as these words affected the right to vote for Federal officers, and left the black male and white and colored female citizens of the United States in possession of the same right to vote for Federal officers in the State in which they resided that white male citizens of the United States already possessed.

And she petitions Congress to declare these things by making Federal laws which say that white and colored male and female citizens of the United States are entitled and shall be allowed to vote for Members of Congress, presidential electors, and United States Senators upon the same terms in the States wherein they reside; and which provide everything that is necessary to enable them to exercise their constitutional right to vote for these Federal officers in the State.

In short, Mrs. Bennett most respectfully petitions the honorable Members of the present Congress to protect white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional "right to vote" for Members of Congress, presidential electors, and United States Senators upon the same terms in the State wherein they reside, by making Federal laws somewhat similar to those which the Congress of 1870 made to enforce the new "right of exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude" at public elections, that the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed in its ex parte Yarbrough decision of 1884, that the fifteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution conferred upon the white and colored male and female citizens of the United States when it was adopted in 1870.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a memorial of the William Riedlin Republican Club, of Covington, Ky., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Dayton, Ky., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State Council of Kentucky, Daughters of America, of Louisville, Ky., and a petition of the Ministers' Alliance of Owensboro, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the making of so-called future contracts in cotton, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### USELESS PAPERS IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on March 3 the Vice President laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce stating that there is in the Department of Commerce an accumulation of documents and files of papers not needed in the transaction of the current business, and suggested that it be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. I thought the communication referred to public documents and asked that it go to the Committee on Printing, which was agreed to; but I find that it refers only to documents and files of papers in that department, and therefore it should go, as the Vice President suggested, to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

I move that the Committee on Printing be discharged from the further consideration of the communication and that it be referred to the joint select committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken. The Chair appoints as members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, to which the communication shall be referred, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4689) to provide for the erection of a public building at Junction City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 4690) to amend an act of Congress approved March 28, 1900 (Stat. L., p. 52), entitled "An act granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing an experiment station of the Kansas State Agricultural College and a western branch of the State Normal School thereon, and for a public park"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 4691) for the relief of Minnie Holden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4692) granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4693) for the relief of the Port Graham Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4694) to further regulate canal tolls and to amend the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 4695) granting a pension to Sigmund Schlesinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Juan B. Gutierrez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 4697) granting an increase of pension to Willis M. Hatch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4698) granting an increase of pension to Libbeus C. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4699) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Ransom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4700) to consolidate national forest lands within the Florida National Forest, and to add to the timberlands included within that forest by the purchase of privately owned lands within the exterior limits of the Florida National Forest, State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to examine and report upon a route for the construction of a free and open waterway from St. Johns River to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $20,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry-Land Congress to be held at Wichita, Kans., during the year 1915, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $6,000 for the construction of a rostrum in the national cemetery in the Presidio of San Francisco, Cal., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the support and civilization of Indians at

the Flathead Agency, Mont., from $12,000 to $15,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment to carry into effect the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians, ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,715.50 to be credited to the accounts of Col. James L. Bright, disbursing officer, Organized Militia of Louisiana, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs from $5,000 to $7,500, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to including the schools on the Osage and Quapaw Reservations in the appropriations in aid of common schools, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation in aid of the common schools in the Cherokee and other Indian tribes in Oklahoma, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### BILLS AND DEBATES ON TRUSTS.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 286), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 147, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, "Bills and Debates in Congress on Trusts," for the use of the Senate.

### THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "The American Consular Service and commercial attachés," written by Mr. J. J. Slechta, of New York, who for four years was in the Consular Service. The article first appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce. It has been revised and rewritten, and since there is a House bill on the subject now pending and in view of the importance of the matter I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from South Dakota to allow the article to be referred to the Committee on Printing, so that the committee may decide whether it should be printed as a public document. I do not want to go into details now as to why this course should be adopted, but simply ask the Senator to let it go to the committee. The committee will report upon it in a very short time one way or the other.

Mr. STERLING. I have no objection to the course suggested by the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing. The Chair is of opinion that all such requests ought to go to the Committee on Printing.

### ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have here a very interesting address delivered by Hon. William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce, before the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., January 24, 1914. I ask that it may be printed as a public document.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The address will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

### THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have here a copy of an article by Barnett E. Moses, a member of the Memphis bar, on the problem of the Mississippi River. I desire to have the article printed as a public document, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, to determine if it shall be so printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

### PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN MEXICO.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, March 7, after the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the resolution (S. Res. 164) requesting the President to advise the Senate as to what measures have been taken to protect American citizens in Mexico.

### PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall call up Senate resolution No. 42 and ask for its consideration. It is the resolution proposing to amend the standing rules of the Senate to prohibit smoking in the Senate Chamber. I desire everyone to understand just what I am trying to do, and I give this notice as I do not wish to take snap judgment on anyone.

### PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) yesterday submitted by Mr. CUMMINS, was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the bill referred to in the resolution came into the Senate in April, 1913. Nearly a year has gone by, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections has not yet, as I understand, taken up the bill for consideration. Nearly two months ago I publicly called the matter to the attention of the Senate and of the chairman of the committee. The reply to my inquiry was that the committee had been considering the cases of Mr. LEE of Maryland and of Mr. GLASS of Alabama, but as soon as those cases were disposed of the bill would receive the consideration of the committee, and a speedy disposition of the matter would be made. I am informed that there has been no meeting of the committee since that time.

The subject is one of very great importance; it engages the public interest, I think, profoundly; and no matter what our opinions may be with regard to the proposition, it is high time that the Senate should take it up. I therefore have offered this resolution, and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I doubt if any committee of the Senate has done more assiduous work, to say nothing as to whether or not it has been good work, than has the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I had intended, as soon as the election cases referred to by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] were disposed of, to call the committee together for the purpose of taking up the presidential primary bill referred to by that Senator. I have refrained from doing so until recently because of the illness of some members of the committee and of the necessary absence of others, as I thought it important that there should be a full attendance of the committee to consider the subject. A meeting of the committee has been called for Saturday of this week, at which time the bill will be taken up. I presume it will then be considered and that it will be reported upon as promptly as possible.

With this statement I am entirely indifferent as to what the Senate may do with the resolution. If it sees fit, under these circumstances, to take the bill away from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I have nothing to say.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no criticism to suggest in regard to the conduct of the committee. I have assumed there were reasons that were sufficient which have prevented the consideration of the bill.

### THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS (H. DOC. NO. 813).

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.). The hour having arrived at which, in accordance with the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, the Senate is to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives and listen to a communication from the President of the United States, it will be necessary to dispense with the further discussion of the pending resolution until after that event has taken place. The Sergeant at Arms will proceed to execute the order of the Senate.

Thereupon the Senate, headed by the Sergeant at Arms and preceded by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

The address of the President of the United States, delivered this day to both Houses of Congress, is as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Congress, I have come to you upon an errand which can be very briefly performed, but I beg that you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. No communication I have addressed to the Congress carried with it graver or more far-reaching implications as to the interest of the country, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged in a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

I have come to ask you for the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls, and to urge upon you the justice, the wisdom, and the large policy of such a repeal with the utmost earnestness of which I am capable.

In my own judgment, very fully considered and maturely formed, that exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view, and is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal concluded on November 18, 1901. But I have not come to urge upon you my personal views. I have come to state to you a fact and a situation. Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a Nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing that we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, when we suspended I was remarking that I had no criticism at all to suggest of the committee. I understand it is somewhat difficult to get the committee together at this time, in view of the great amount of labor imposed upon all of us. I have a great desire, however, to see the bill reported, or to see some measure upon the subject reported. In view of the assurance of the chairman of the committee that it will now be taken up and disposed of, I ask that the resolution may lie over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, this is the so-called national primaries bill, is it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is one of them; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under the bill the idea is to vote directly for President and Vice President of the United States?

Mr. CUMMINS. The bill that I offered, and that is now pending before the committee, provides for a direct primary election in all the States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is there anything in the bill which provides for party platforms upon which candidates are to run for these high offices?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion of the merits of the proposal. When the time comes I shall hope to be able to convince the Senate, as I am sure the country has long ago been convinced, of the wisdom of making nominations in this way. Answering very briefly, however, the question of the Senator from Michigan, I will say that there is nothing in the bill to prevent the party convocation or convention from declaring principles or platforms.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I had rather hoped the bill precluded any such error. The binding effect of party platforms has long since been abandoned. A party declaration amounts to very little now. We have just listened to a distinct disavowal of the binding effect of a party platform, and I had rather hoped the bill of the Senator from Iowa contemplated the absolute abandonment of any declaration of party principles hereafter.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, Mr. President, while I sympathize with the grief which the Senator from Michigan now experiences, those questions are not connected with the bill I have introduced, and I do hope these party feelings will not be permitted at any time to enter into the consideration of a measure of this character. I am deeply serious about the proposal, and I intend to press it just as earnestly and persistently as I can.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have no idea of antagonizing the measure introduced by the Senator from Iowa, but at the appropriate time I hope the Senate may seriously consider whether we ought not to provide, either under the Constitution or otherwise, for a complete abandonment of the enunciation of political principles in party platforms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to laying aside the resolution without prejudice? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not understand just what the proposal is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has been discussing a resolution calling for the withdrawal from the Committee on Privileges and Elections of a certain bill with reference to presidential primaries. It is now requested that the resolution lie over without prejudice. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution goes over without prejudice.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if it would be equally agreeable to him to proceed after 2 o'clock?

Mr. McCUMBER. After 2 o'clock the unfinished business will be before the Senate. I have given notice from day to day that I would occupy time in the morning hour until I could finish my remarks.

Mr. SWANSON. I am very anxious that we shall proceed with the calendar at some time. I thought possibly it would suit the convenience of the Senator to proceed after 2 o'clock.

Mr. McCUMBER. This is a part of the business on the calendar, and I wish to complete my remarks on Senate bill 120 as soon as possible.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. I simply wish to suggest to the Senator that on the 27th of February I gave notice that I should submit some remarks this morning, and upon referring to the calendar I saw a notice that the Senator expected to proceed to-day. I should like very much to proceed with my remarks. I do not like to interfere with the Senator's bill, but I supposed its coming up would not preclude the notice I had given heretofore.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this bill, in some form, has been before the Senate for about 10 years. I rather think that in point of ancient history it precedes any bill the Senator from Washington desires to discuss. It has gone over again and again, and has been crowded out on account of appropriation bills; and I at least wish to get the matter before the Senate. Day in and day out, every time I have finished for the day, I have given notice for more than a week that I should take up the bill immediately after the close of the morning business. In closing my address each day on account of the time limitation I have stated that I should proceed the next morning after the close of the morning business.

Mr. JONES. I will state that I gave my notice before the Senator got his bill up for consideration. Of course, I can not make my notice effective while the Senator has the floor by taking him off his feet.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall not put myself in a position where any right I may have will make any Senator feel aggrieved, even though I have been for 10 years trying to get a hearing upon this bill. At the Senator's request I will yield to him in order that he may submit his remarks. I wish to state, however, that I shall pursue my argument as soon as the Senator has finished, if he does so before 2 o'clock. If not, I shall ask to-morrow morning to take up the bill immediately after the close of the morning business.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is another notice for to-morrow.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not give way to all the notices that may be given for the future.

Mr. JONES. I do not desire the Senator to yield any right he thinks he has. I do not ask him to do that. Of course I can take up this matter after 2 o'clock, and will do so at the first opportunity that I can get recognition.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, no; the Senator can go on, and I will follow him.

Mr. JONES. I will state to the Senator that I do not think I will take until 2 o'clock unless I am interrupted, as probably I shall not be. I appreciate very much the consideration of the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Washington.

WATER POWER ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on February 7 I introduced Senate bill 4415, to aid and to regulate the development, operation, and maintenance of water powers on lands of the United States, and for other purposes. I am not going into the bill in very great detail this morning, but simply desire to make some general statements in reference to the necessity of legislation of this kind, and also with reference to the terms of the bill I have introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the time has come when we must examine a most acute situation in our national life, which affects in many intimate ways every feature of our industrial and social condition. I refer to the matter of hydroelectric power. Throughout all of our daily concerns, from the cultivation, transportation, and the ultimate cost of our daily food, to those comforts and conveniences of everyday living which in the past few years have rightly come to be regarded as man's necessities, the element of hydroelectric power is always at the forefront. It is hydroelectric power to which, now and in the future, we must look for the operation of many of our greatest industries, for the pumping of water to many of our cities and to millions of acres of arid lands of the West, for the pumping of surplus water from the more than 20,000,000 acres of our low-lying but enormously rich swamp and overflow lands, for the lighting of our houses and streets, for the operation of our transportation utilities, and finally for a thousand and one uses in the home and on the farm. Our present state of progress is entirely dependent on the utilization of artificially created energy, and even now over great portions of our country, and in a few years over all portions, the source of that energy must be our water powers.

In the United States there is an abundance of water-power opportunity. Very conservative estimates of power development possibilities place the amount that can be developed in the North Atlantic States at 4,910,000 horsepower; in the South Atlantic States 5,107,000 horsepower; in the North Central States 4,370,000 horsepower; in the South Central States 3,342,000 horsepower, and in the Western States 44,049,000 horsepower; and, with practicable maximum storage, the total available horsepower in the United States is conservatively estimated at 200,000,000. Of this amount the present development in the United States is only about 6,000,000 horsepower. Go where we will, even into those regions where the river courses are relatively flat, we find water-power privileges which are either in immediate demand for service of the people or which in the future will find important use. This great resource is not, like many others, exhausted by use, but wanton waste occurs in its nonuse. Wherever in all of this land a water power is now being wasted which might usefully be harnessed one of two things must be taking place—either the people are going without its benefits, to the detriment of themselves and the prevention of the upbuilding of the country, or those demands are being supplied by the use of coal, a resource which is exhausted by use.

My purpose is to show that despite this overwhelming necessity for water-power development the laws of the United States have made it impossible to finance the development of this power or energy, and that without sacrificing even a minute part of the public interest, without depriving the people of a single element of sovereign control or subjecting them to even the smallest corporate abuse, we in this Congress have it in our power to cut away the fetters, and put our water powers to a beneficial use.

It will be impossible for me, or anyone else, at this time, to discuss this subject in all its branches. Therefore I am going to confine my arguments to two of the most important uses to which our undeveloped water powers may be put. Both uses are agricultural, viz, the manufacture of nitrogen from the air as the basis of agricultural fertilizer, and the pumping of water for irrigation purposes on the arid lands of the West. More than 1,000,000 hydroelectric horsepower has been developed in European countries during the past five years for use in the manufacture of nitrate of lime and cyanamide through the fixation of the nitrogen of the air. While Europe has been making gigantic strides through development of these new uses for electricity, not a single horsepower in the United States has been devoted to these purposes. There are nearly 200,000,000 horsepower possible of development in the United States, a fact which indicates that there is no scarcity of this resource. While the United States has been carefully guarding and preventing the development of its water powers, certain European countries have been encouraging the development of theirs. Because of the fact that these great industries have been unable to locate in this country under terms that make investment practicable, they are turning to such places as Canada and Labrador, and also to Iceland, where a project is now proposed for the development of 1,000,000 horsepower. The great expenditure and the enormous benefits that will result will be lost to this country. We imported during the year 1913 over $41,000,000 worth of nitrogenous products, all of which could be made in the United States if we were possessed of a rational water-power policy. Of this importation 625,000 tons, having a value of $22,000,000, consisted of Chilean nitrates, the price of which is controlled by a European monopoly. Congress and other official and public bodies have spent much time and money investigating the reasons for the increased cost of living, and in practically every report the main cause has been found to be reduced per capita and per acre production of food. In this connection it has been shown conclusively that with an adequate supply of nitrogen as fertilizer it will easily be possible, by intensive methods of agriculture, so to increase the yield of cereals per acre as to bring down materially the present cost of living, and set forward the danger line of shortage of food for the ever-increasing population of the earth far into the next century.

In Belgium, where the soil is of no better average quality than in the United States, the yield of wheat, rye, barley, and oats is over double that of the United States, owing entirely to the continued application of fertilizers, principally nitrate of lime. The exact comparison of average yield per acre of these crops in Belgium and the United States is as follows:

| | Wheat. | Rye. | Barley. | Oats. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belgium | 42 | 32 | 43 | 6 |
| United States | 14 | 15 | 25 | 3 |

German experiments have shown that by the introduction of 2,000,000 tons of nitrogen yearly into the soil the increased crop obtained in the German Empire would be 63,000,000 tons.

We well know that nitrogen is the basis of all explosives, and until it is manufactured in this country the United States will be dependent in time of war on foreign nations for its supply. This is surely a menace that can not be lightly considered. We can become independent producers of nitrogen if, by means of wise laws, we make it possible to establish a new industry in this country. This industry is to be obtained only through the development of the cheapest kind of electric power. Energy for this purpose must be furnished in great quantities at a price that will yield only a reasonable return on the investment, and which could not possibly absorb either direct taxation or indirect taxation in the form of forced amortization. Such being the case, the Government will fail of this beneficent purpose if it places even a small burden by taxation or restrictive conditions on the development of water power.

The second great use of hydroelectric power of which I shall speak, and which appeals particularly to the section of the country that I represent, is that of pumping water for irrigation purposes. Senators are all familiar with the irrigation of the arid West and the part that has been taken therein by the Government. Many of them probably do not know that such irrigation has, up to the present, been largely developed under gravity systems of water distribution, because this kind of development has generally been of lower cost than that involving the pumping of water. But the low-cost gravity systems are becoming fewer, if, indeed, there are any left. There still remain, however, many million acres of the best land of the West which for one or another reason can be reclaimed only through the operation of great pumping systems. These pumps can ordinarily be operated with success only by hydroelectric power. Thus will water-power development furnish homes and occupations for hundreds of thousands of people, and the high but fertile places which now seem destined to remain barren will bring into the store of national wealth their rich contributions. Right here let me say that the department's attitude on this matter of irrigation pumping furnishes one of the best illustrations of wanton waste of water-power resources and of

destructive governmental repression in water-power policy that could be cited.

It happens that under the right-of-way acts of March 3, 1891, and of May 11, 1898, Congress has clearly granted authority to construct water powers for the main purpose of irrigation and for purposes subsidiary thereto. But the department has, by construction, actually repealed these acts except in so far as they apply to irrigation. Any water power developed under that law must, by departmental stipulation, be devoted entirely to pumping purposes. If there is an excess of power over and above that needed for irrigation it must be allowed to pass on unutilized. Moreover, during the six to eight months of the year when no water is needed for irrigation the plant must lie idle, earning nothing and daily grinding out its toll of interest and maintenance charges, as well as those of depreciation and taxes. Manifestly the farmer has to pay those charges in extra water tolls. Usually, however, the project, because of this enforced idleness and waste of resource, becomes an impossible proposition from a financial standpoint. There is, however, one alternative. Right of way may be granted, revocable at will by the Secretary, under the act of February 15, 1901. It is this act of which I shall presently speak, and will anticipate my discussion thereof only to call attention to the fact that the department has in effect repealed this act of Congress and practically says to a community of prospective irrigators: "Unless you will consent to waste your surplus power and allow your plant to lie idle during all the fall, winter, and early spring seasons grant of right of way will be refused or you must take your power right of way under the revocable permit of the act of 1901." This is equivalent to a departmental ruling that unless an applicant accepts terms that will in 99 cases out of 100 make of his project certain financial failure he must withdraw and leave the land a desert. Can these consequences possibly commend themselves to a progressive people?

The only way by which a permit to use a water-power privilege on the public lands can be obtained, except when it is to be used for the sole purpose of irrigation, is under the act of February 15, 1901. As Senators are generally familiar with that act I will forbear reviewing it except to remind them that the permission given thereunder must be subject to such stipulations as the Secretary may prescribe and is revocable at will by the department without indemnity to the permittee. This is equivalent to a landowner saying to a prospective lessee: "You may take my land, place your factory thereon, and establish your business, but you must pay such rental as I from time to time see fit to impose, and whenever I decide that I want the land back you must move off." What is the result?

Hydroelectric systems are built with borrowed money and the money lender rightly demands security for his loan. There was a time when the real significance of a revocable permit was not so well understood and some large installations were made under authority of this act. But that day is passed. Except in the case of small subsidiary plants, attached to a great hydroelectric system, owned in fee, and which warrants the investment risk on the subsidiary plant, no investment banker is going to recommend to his clients and no wise investor is going to buy any securities based on so precarious a title as that which prevails under a revocable permit. The fact is not only self-evident, but is strongly testified to by our banking houses.

Good men, with excellent hydroelectric propositions, have gone from bank door to bank door in search of funds, only to be met with the reply, "Yes; your proposition is excellent, and we will recommend it to our clients on condition that you will furnish the most necessary thing of all, viz, a title that will make an investment secure." As a result of all this, water-power development, where the use of public lands is necessary, is at a standstill on account of the uncertainty and indefiniteness of the title that can be secured. Millions of horsepower could be made available if capital could be assured of a definite term of undisturbed investment and a reasonable return. It does seem that legislation can and should be enacted under which this development can take place and the rights of consumers to power at reasonable rates maintained.

The condition of stagnation of water-power development on the public lands is well illustrated by a statement of the Forest Service concerning the water-power permits issued for such developments in the national forests up to July 1, 1913. Permits covering the development of 783,600 horsepower had been granted. Of this amount 111,200 horsepower were constructed, and construction had been commenced on 122,500 horsepower. But on the remainder, covering 550,000 horsepower, or 70 per cent of the whole, no work whatever had been started, and examination shows that in all but a very small part of these cases the lack of development arises from the inability of the permittees to raise the money on such precarious security as is offered by the revocable permit. Examination of the financial history of the plants that were actually developed under this form of permit shows that more than 60 per cent of them have been financial failures. *Let it be understood, unconditionally and without the slightest qualification, that I stand for complete preservation of the public interest in all such matters. Every power development, made on the public lands or elsewhere, must be under complete control by the public through the State or Nation. I believe thoroughly in the proposition that the power sites now remaining in public ownership and control should forever so remain and be conveyed to States, to municipalities, or to their agents, the public-service corporations, under terms that will thoroughly conserve the public's highest good and which will yet be of a character that will attract investment and insure a reasonable return to capital. So far as I am able to find, no one denies the justice and equity of that doctrine. Therefore the question is, What form of grant shall be adopted in order that the public interest may be protected and water-power investment made attractive?*

There are those who insist that when a public-service corporation wishes to develop a publicly owned or controlled water-power site, it should be prevented from so doing, unless it will agree to give back to the public, free of charge, the property and improvements at the end of a definite period—say 50 years. It can not be denied that if the public eventually acquires a developed power site free of expense at the end of a designated period, said public must, in all equity, pay for it in extra rates during that period. Mark you, that during all the 50 years the public is to have absolute control of rates and service and must therefore penalize itself as to rates so that at the end of the period a future generation may absorb the plant.

*In any era of progress each generation is abler and more self-reliant than its predecessor. Unless we are anticipating American decadence, we are bound to believe that the average American 50 years hence will be better able to pay for water-power plants in a lump sum than we are now able to pay for them in installments. The gospel of conservation does not bid us make spineless beneficiaries of our descendants.*

A hydroelectric system can not be amortized. The concern is not like a mill or a factory. The mill stands as a relatively fixed investment with a definite capacity for production and a fairly determined earning power. When that capacity is reached a new mill is built which has the same definite investment characteristics as the first. The two mills are independent investment units. Burn one down and the other proceeds as before. Under such conditions the owner may amortize. Just the opposite is true of the hydroelectric system. The public demand for power constantly grows and the corporation is bound to supply that demand. The hydroelectric system is never completed and never becomes a fixed investment unit because every day sees some new line, connection, or instrument added in response to a new call. When the capacity of the power sources is reached, we do not build a new system as we would build a new mill, but we develop a new source of power and throw it into the same system. That new source of power loses its individuality and becomes a mere element in a large creation. A hydroelectric system is not the sum of its parts, but it is the whole thing, just as man is man and not the sum of sundry arms, legs, and organs. Could one amortize the value of a leg?

It would be easy enough to amortize if there were one power plant, one set of consumers, and the latter never demanded more than the former could furnish, but we are not considering peanut-stand propositions of that kind. Except in rare cases, the real hydroelectric system has several and sometimes many power sources. It usually begins with one or more sources in private ownership. Business grows, and then Government sites may be added, so that private and Government sites are merged and lose their identity in one great network. Now apply this 50-year surrender idea. After a while the time limit on one of these Government sites expires. Who is wise enough to amortize that improvement, or, in the final surrender to the Government, to determine what part of the distribution system is functional to that particular site? One may as well try to unscramble eggs.

Follow the idea to its logical conclusion and it will be apparent that the increase in utilization of power by the public will necessitate the progressive addition of new sites to the hydroelectric system. Therefore, it will certainly occur that at the very time when the public-utility company is acquiring a new site to meet a new demand, it would be surrendering to the Government, free of cost, a site acquired 50 years before and which is still needed in the system to supply current demand. Does the preservation of the public interest really require such a chaotic procedure?

It will probably be said in reply that the public will wisely adjust these difficulties in advance of their arrival. But this answer does not satisfy. *The present law is unsatisfactory, not because of any disposition to avoid public control or to deprive the public of its rightful property. The whole trouble goes back to the matter of investment—the investor demands not only security of title but also the unrestrained ability of his debtor to produce a rightful yield on his investment.* This involves stability of operation and such stability can not be achieved while chaos lies in the foreground. Brush away every complexity in amortization above described and there still remains this fatal uncertainty. Security of investment can not be accomplished by the assurance that the public will do the proper thing when the time comes. The prospective investor pertinently asks "Just what will the public do?"

Finally we are not obliged to speculate on probable events because a record of actual ones is at hand. The general dam act of June 23, 1910, involves almost the identical proposition from the investment point of view. Under the act there is a glimmering prospect that the grant may be renewed at the end of the 50-year period. Under the amortization plan this possibility is denied. Under the terms of the general dam act Congress has given consent to the erection of power plants on navigable streams in 18 cases. None has been built and only two have been started. The men who are backing the larger of these two are sorry they went in. The reason for this condition is that the public will not invest. How, therefore, can it be expected that a more restrictive proposition will be more successful?

Water-power developments intended to supply energy for the two purposes upon which I have concentrated my remarks could never be financed if the Government permit required the forced amortization of the property in order that it might be turned over to the Government free of cost at the end of 50 or 60 years, because the farmer could not stand the increased price for water to irrigate his land necessary to be charged for energy to operate pumping plants in order to provide for the amortization tax and the manufacture of nitrate of lime would be prevented because the addition of the amortization tax would make the price of power prohibitive for that purpose. Despite the assurance of those who advocate amortization that, under such conditions, no tax would be imposed, the fact remains that amortization is a tax of the most grievous and burdensome kind. If the property is to be turned over to the public at the end of 50 years the original investment must have been repaid in increased charges for service. Therefore the question is, What form of grant shall be adopted in order that the public interest may be protected, water-power investment made attractive, and the consuming public secure its power at the lowest possible rates?

After giving long study to these perplexing questions, I prepared and introduced into the Senate on February 7 a bill entitled "A bill to aid and to regulate the development, operation, and maintenance of water powers on lands of the United States, and for other purposes," to which I invite the consideration of Senators. It will be seen that under this bill the grant is made only to the State, a municipal subdivision thereof, or a duly organized public-service corporation. Before the grant becomes effective plans and specifications must be prepared and submitted to the Secretary having control over the lands to be used and are to be approved by him if he is convinced that the proposed development will promote "the highest and greatest practicable use of the water resources involved." When such plans are approved the fair market value of the Government lands to be occupied and used is determined, and the grantee is required to pay to the United States annually 5 per cent of such fair market value. At any time after 50 years the right to use such lands can be terminated and the property taken over by the United States, the State, or a municipal subdivision thereof, upon the payment of the fair value of the property, excluding the value of the right to use such Government land. It might well provide, too, for issuance of patent for such lands if the plant is taken over by the State or a municipality.

The work must be commenced within two years from the date of the determination of the value of the lands to be occupied, and within the further time of five years there must be completed and put in operation such parts of the ultimate development as may be determined necessary "to supply the reasonable needs of the then available market," and the ultimate development shall be made as required by the proper Cabinet officers. The rates to be charged consumers are to be reasonable and the service adequate and efficient, and the right to regulate the same is reserved to the United States as to interstate business and as to intrastate business if the State fails to do so. A most stringent provision is inserted against unnatural monopoly.

Mr. President, I have not made this bill applicable to navigable streams. Its fundamental principles can be easily made to apply to such development, and I would be glad if the whole subject could be covered by a single measure that may be enacted into law before the session adjourns. In this bill no tax is placed on the power developed, but an annual charge is made on the fair market value of the property of the National Government for its use. The right to do this, in my judgment, will not be disputed, and it would seem that if the National Government receives a fair return for the use of its property, no one would ask more. The charge exacted by the bill is 5 per cent of the fair market value of the land annually. The Government actually capitalizes its property at 5 per cent of its fair market value and will receive in interest three and one-half times the fair market value of its property. This is a fair return to the Government and will be no heavy burden on consumers, although it could well be made less.

Regulation of rates and service is left to the State. The only grantee permitted, aside from the State and a municipal subdivision thereof, is a public-service corporation, so there can be no question of the power of the State over such grantee. The people of a State can better control a local agency than anyone else. Different conditions in different States require different treatment and can be met better by those familiar with their varying conditions. Public sentiment will produce public-service commissions of able, faithful, and experienced men, and compel their retention in office, by which and through which reasonable rates and efficient service will be secured. To contend otherwise is to indict the people of the respective States for incompetency.

The right is reserved, however, to the National Government to regulate interstate rates, and if the State fails to do so to regulate intrastate rates. It might be well to provide in the law for some specified agency to do this. In my judgment it will never be necessary for the National Government to attempt to regulate intrastate rates even if it has the power to do so.

Water-power development is to a greater or less extent a monopoly, but unnatural monopoly is prevented by the express terms of the bill.

Provision is made for a definite term which it is thought is ample to encourage the investment of capital, and the consumers under proper regulation will not have to pay for the cost of the works. All they will pay will be a fair return on the investment. If the property is taken by any other agency the owner will then receive the fair market value, exclusive of the value of the permit or franchise.

Ample authority is given to the proper officers of the Government to compel the highest practicable development of any water-power resource and its development as rapidly as the needs of the people may require.

Security can not be found in a fixed term grant that involves a sacrifice of principal or amortization of investment. The amortization idea in public utilities is a relic of the days when the consumer had to pay all the traffic would bear. Public regulation of rates has changed the whole complexion of things, and amortization is now unnecessary, undesirable, and in the case of a hydroelectric system, impossible. Under an indeterminate grant, with a reasonable preliminary tenure of 50 years assured, consumers' rates can be reduced to the point of equitable return to capital, and when the public, in its wisdom, decides to recall its grant it will find no difficulty in paying the fair value of the improvements that it takes over.

Mr. President, the people of the entire West and South are looking to this Congress for some relief from the distressing circumstances that are now preventing their rightful and commendable progress. Each year in the past five they have hopefully expected that the Members of Congress would put aside their differences as to details of procedure and enact a law that would furnish both encouragement of investment and regulation of rates and service. The consequences of present inaction are all too grave to justify further neglect. May we not speedily proceed on a constructive course? The development and use of our water power is decidedly not a political question, but one which stands far above the level of partisan controversy. It is a great economic problem, the solution of which is a pressing matter of public duty. Let us solve it in a wise, practical way, with a due regard for the rights of the Nation, the powers of the States, and the interests of the people.

Mr. President, I have prepared here some memoranda with reference to the existing right-of-way acts, with some comments thereon, which I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD.

THE REPEAL OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1891, AND MAY 11, 1898, BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

For convenience, the text of the various acts which enter into this discussion will be given as follows:

Act of July 26, 1866 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 14, pp. 251–253):

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever, by priority of possession, rights to the use of water for mining, agricultural, manufacturing, or other purposes have vested and accrued and the same are recognized and acknowledged by the local customs, laws, and the decisions of courts the possessors and owners of such vested rights shall be maintained and protected in the same; and the right of way for the construction of ditches and canals for the purposes aforesaid is hereby acknowledged and confirmed: *Provided, however*, That whenever, after the passage of this act, any person or persons shall, in the construction of any ditch or canal, injure or damage the possession of any settler on the public domain the party committing such injury or damage shall be liable to the party injured for such injury or damage.

Act of July 9, 1870 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 16, pp 217–218):

SEC. 17. *And be it further enacted*, That none of the rights conferred by sections 5, 8, and 9 of the act to which this act is amendatory (the act of July 26, 1866) shall be abrogated by this act, and the same are hereby extended to all public lands affected by this act; and all patents granted or preemption or homesteads allowed shall be subject to any vested and accrued water rights or rights to ditches and reservoirs used in connection with such water rights as may have been acquired under or recognized by the ninth section of the act of which this act is amendatory. But nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, impair, or in any way affect the provisions of the "Act granting to A. Sutro the right of way and other privileges to aid in the construction of a draining and exploring tunnel to the Comstock lode, in the State of Nevada," approved July 25, 1866.

Act of March 3, 1891 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 26):

SEC. 18. That the right of way through the public lands and reservations of the United States is hereby granted to any canal or ditch company formed for the purpose of irrigation and duly organized under the laws of any State or Territory which shall have filed, or may hereafter file, with the Secretary of the Interior a copy of its articles of incorporation and due proofs of its organization under the same, to the extent of the ground occupied by the water of the reservoir and of the canal and its laterals and 50 feet on each side of the marginal limits thereof; also the right to take from the public lands adjacent to the line of the canal or ditch material, earth, and stone necessary for the construction of such canal or ditch: *Provided*, That no such right of way shall be so located as to interfere with the proper occupation by the Government of any such reservation, and all maps of location shall be subject to the approval of the department of the Government having jurisdiction of such reservation, and the privilege herein granted shall not be construed to interfere with the control of water for irrigation and other purposes under authority of the respective States or Territories.

SEC. 19. That any canal or ditch company desiring to secure the benefits of this act shall, within 12 months after the location of 10 miles of its canal, if the same be upon surveyed lands, and if upon unsurveyed lands within 12 months after the survey thereof by the United States, file with the register of the land office for the district where such land is located a map of its canal or ditch and reservoir; and upon the approval thereof by the Secretary of the Interior the same shall be noted upon the plats in said office, and thereafter all such lands over which such rights of way shall pass shall be disposed of subject to such right of way. Whenever any person or corporation, in the construction of any canal, ditch, or reservoir, injures or damages the possession of any settler on the public domain the party committing such injury or damage shall be liable to the party injured for such injury or damage.

SEC. 20. That the provisions of this act shall apply to all canals, ditches, or reservoirs heretofore or hereafter constructed, whether constructed by corporations, individuals, or association of individuals, on the filing of the certificates and maps herein provided for. If such ditch, canal, or reservoir has been or shall be constructed by an individual or association of individuals, it shall be sufficient for such individual or association of individuals to file with the Secretary of the Interior and with the register of the land office where said land is located a map of the line of such canal, ditch, or reservoir, as in case of a corporation, with the name of the individual owner or owners thereof, together with the articles of association, if any there be. Plats heretofore filed shall have the benefits of this act from the date of their filing as though filed under it: *Provided*, That if any section of said canal or ditch shall not be completed within five years after the location of said section the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to any uncompleted section of said canal, ditch, or reservoir to the extent that the same is not completed at the date of the forfeiture.

Act of May 11, 1898 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 30, p. 404, ch. 292). An act to amend an act to permit the use of the right of way through public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the act entitled "An act to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1895, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, to permit the use of right of way upon the public lands of the United States, not within limits of any park, forest, military, or Indian reservations, for tramways, canals, or reservoirs to the extent of the ground occupied by the water of the canals and reservoirs, and 50 feet on each side of the marginal limits thereof, or 50 feet on each side of the center line of the tramroad, by any citizen or association of citizens of the United States, for the purposes of furnishing water for domestic, public, and other beneficial uses.

"SEC. 2. That the rights of way for ditches, canals, or reservoirs heretofore or hereafter approved under the provisions of sections 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891, may be used for purposes of a public nature; and said rights of way may be used for purposes of water transportation, for domestic purposes, or for the development of power, as subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation."

Approved, May 11, 1898.

Act of February 15, 1901 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 31, pp. 790–791, ch. 372). An act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, to permit the use of rights of way through the public lands, forest and other reservations of the United States, and the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks, California, for electrical plants, poles, and lines for the generation and distribution of electrical power, and for telephone and telegraph purposes, and for canals, ditches, pipes and pipe lines, flumes, tunnels, or other water conduits, and for water plants, dams, and reservoirs used to promote irrigation or mining or quarrying, or the manufacturing or cutting of timber or lumber, or the supplying of water for domestic, public, or any other beneficial uses to the extent of the ground occupied by such canals, ditches, flumes, tunnels, reservoirs, or other water conduits or water plants, or electrical or other works permitted hereunder, and not to exceed 50 feet on each side of the marginal limits thereof, or not to exceed 50 feet on each side of the center line of such pipes and pipe lines, electrical, telegraph, and telephone lines and poles, by any citizen, association, or corporation of the United States, where it is intended by such to exercise the use permitted hereunder or any one or more of the purposes herein named: *Provided*, That such permits shall be allowed within or through any of said parks or any forest, military, Indian, or other reservation only upon the approval of the chief officer of the department under whose supervision such park or reservation falls and upon a finding by him that the same is not incompatible with the public interest: *Provided further*, That all permits given hereunder for telegraph and telephone purposes shall be subject to the provision of title 65 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and amendments thereto, regulating rights of way for telegraph companies over the public domain: *And provided further*, That any permission given by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act may be revoked by him or his successor in his discretion, and shall not be held to confer any right, or easement, or interest in, to, or over any public land, reservation, or park.

Approved, February 15, 1901.

Under the act of 1866 rights to the use of water for mining, agricultural, manufacturing, and other purposes, together with rights of way necessary for the construction of ditches and canals, was "acknowledged and confirmed," and in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Jennison v. Kirk (98 U. S., 453) it was decided that rights of way for ditches and canals incident to such water rights were also acknowledged and confirmed.

Except in the case of the act of July 9, 1870 (Rev. Stat., 2340), which confirmed and extended the act of 1866 and the desert-land act of 1877 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 19), in which Congress forever dedicated the use of the waters of the public lands for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes, the act of 1866 remained undisturbed until 1891.

For some time previous to 1891 it had been apparent that the very free appropriation of waters and rights of way under the act of 1866 was leading to the utmost confusion. There was no public register of these diversions, and the need for a clear record was great. It was also noted that, under the act of 1866, right of way was conferred only by construction and use. There was a need for protection of the prospective developer in a way whereby he might register with the duly constituted authority his intentions as to development and have his rights protected while he advanced his project to the construction stage. This need was clearly shown by letters of the department to Congress; so the act of 1891 was passed, clearly providing for all the foregoing difficulties. Reading of the act shows that its intention was to provide for orderly procedure. Section 19 confers on the Secretary of the Interior no powers except the implied one of receiving papers. Section 20 provides for the Secretary's approval. Approval of what? Manifestly, the things required of the appropriator by the act. There is no authority of the Secretary to disapprove if the appropriator does the things specified in the act. Sections 18 and 19 refer only to canal and ditch companies formed for the purpose of irrigation, but section 20 extends those privileges to all individuals, corporations, and associations and covers all canals, ditches, or reservoirs.

Between 1891 and 1894 there is nothing in the Land Office decisions to show that irrigation was considered the sole object of the act of 1891. This is clearly indicated by Land Office Regulations, viz, 1891, 12 L. D., 429; 1892, 14 L. D., 338; 1894, 18 L. D., 168.

Some time subsequent to 1894 a marked change took place. See the following cases:

H. H. Sinclair (18 L. D., 573; 1894). Sinclair's map was denied approval because of the statement that the stored water was to be used for generating electricity for city lighting.

South Platte Reservoir Co. (20 L. D., 154 and 465; 1895). Map not approved because a part of the water was to be used for irrigating gardens and lawns in the city of Denver and for general municipal uses.

Chaffee County Ditch & Canal Co. (21 L. D., 63; 1895). Map failed approval because the applicant desired to transport timber in this waterway.

William Marr (25 L. D., 344; 1897). This applicant requested relief from the requirement of certifying that the right of way was to be used for the sole purpose of irrigation, "upon the grounds that while the right of way is to be used chiefly for irrigation, yet a declaration to the effect that it was for that sole purpose would endanger his water right under the laws of Colorado; that as settlements that will be made along the line of the outlet will require water for domestic purposes, it is also claimed for such use; and that the applicant also desires to make use of the water for a limited period of time for manufacturing purposes in the operation of hydraulic mining machinery," and so forth.

This application was also disapproved.

It should be noted that applications had been denied, as above, for transportation, for domestic purposes, and for the development of power in connection with irrigation. In the very next session after the Marr decision aforesaid Congress passed the act of 1898, which reads in part:

> And said rights of way may be used for purposes of water transportation, for domestic purposes, or for the development of power as subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation.
> Approved May 11, 1898.

The specific things cited in the act indicate cognizance of what had gone before in the Land Office. Evidently Congress was not pleased with those Land Office decisions.

But the act of May 11, 1898, section 2, says much more than that above quoted. It provides that rights of way under the act of 1891 "may be used for purposes of a public nature"; (note the semicolon). That which comes after the semicolon is clearly additional to, and not in modification of, that which goes before. Adverse decisions of the Land Office (above cited), which had prompted Congress to include the last 31 words of this act, had referred to private as well as public cases. And so the clear, logical construction must be that Congress meant what it said in specifying purposes of a public nature and then added thereto the specifications above quoted, covering purposes of a private nature. It is apparent that for a short time the department thoroughly believed in the construction above recited.

Certain "General Regulations" (1898, 27 L. D., 200; 1900, 30 L. D., 325; 1902, 31 L. D., 503) show how the department construed the act of 1898 with respect to "purposes of a public nature." They state:

> Applications under the act of March 3, 1891, must include in the certificate (Form 4) the statement "And I further certify that the right of way herein described is desired for the main purpose of irrigation" or "for public purposes" as the case may be. If for public purposes, the applicant should submit a separate statement of the nature of the proposed use.

Form 4 referred to is true to the foregoing.

Now come the regulations of June 6, 1908. Contrast the following quotation therefrom with that quoted just above.

> Applicants under the act of March 3, 1891, must include in the certificate (Form 4) the statement: "And I further certify that the right of way herein described is desired for the main purpose of irrigation."

Form 4 in this case likewise faithfully adheres.

No new law was passed covering rights of way over public lands in the United States between the regulations of 1902 and 1908, yet "purposes of a public nature" have gone by the board. But this is not all.

In those same regulations of 1908, under the section dealing with the act of 1901, we find the statement that that act, in general terms, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant permission for every purpose contemplated by the acts of (1) January 21, 1895 (28 Stat., 635); (2) May 14, 1896 (29 Stat., 120); (3) section 1 of May 11, 1898 (30 Stat., 404); and so forth.

Please contrast the foregoing with the supposedly equivalent statement in the regulations approved August 24, 1912, and March 1, 1913.

This act, in general terms, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant permission for every purpose contemplated by (1) sections 18 to 21, act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat., 1095, 1101); (2) the acts of January 21, 1895 (28 Stat., 635); (3) May 14, 1896 (29 Stat., 120); and (4) May 11, 1898 (30 Stat., 404).

In this collection of dead statutes are now numbered that of 1891 and section 2 of 1898. By departmental order we find laws repealed. In the meantime Congress has passed no act which by any righteous or logical interpretation can be construed as repellant to the acts of 1891 and 1898. "Purposes of a public nature" still stand justified, and the law of every Western State defines just what such purposes are. But even if this were not so, the department's present policy with reference to water power, under the act of 1898, is based on an erroneous construction of the final clause of that act, namely, "subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation."

The word "irrigation" is a technical term, originally used to signify the process of artificially applying water to land. Like many other terms originally technical, it has by universal acceptance been broadened to cover not only the process but also the purpose and the final result. The main purpose of irrigation is agriculture, and the result of agriculture is to produce food. So it is that when one speaks of irrigation in its broad sense he means arid-land agriculture.

Section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stat., 404) reads in part:

> And said rights of way may be used * * * for the development of power as subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation.

If this language be construed strictly, according to the warrant given by the punctuation, the main purpose of irrigation, and not irrigation itself, is clearly designated. If, however, we concede a very doubtful and remote interpretation, namely, that the final words above quoted, "of irrigation," were deliberately inserted by Congress to explain or define the "main purpose," or, in other words, that a comma should rightly be placed after the word "purpose," we are still warranted in applying the customary definition of irrigation discussed in the previous paragraph. Therefore, the logic, the language, and the obvious intent of Congress point to the conclusion that the words "subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation" mean "subsidiary to arid-land agriculture."

What is the main purpose of arid-land agriculture? It is to produce food products and to market them—not merely to produce them and let them rot on the ground; the latter process is certainly not agriculture. The placing of agricultural products where they can be made available to the people dependent upon them is as essential a part of the purpose of agriculture as is the plowing, the seeding, or the harvesting. Agriculture would not be the dominant industry if any one of its essential processes were cut out. Therefore the use of hydroelectric power for transportation of agricultural products and of the people who have a part in the industry must of necessity be covered by the terms of the act of May 11, 1898. All of this applies to the main purpose of irrigation directly and is not forced to enter under the guise of a subsidiary.

Consider now that which may properly be regarded as subsidiary to agriculture. The word "subsidiary" means "furnishing aid," "assisting," "helping in an inferior position or capacity," and so forth. The use of hydroelectric power for pumping water to be applied to land is surely subsidiary; so also must be such use for making agricultural fertilizer, such as the fixation of nitrogen from the air. It surely extends to the lighting of rural roads and homes, for such service furnishes aid and markedly assists in agricultural maintenance by contributing to the contentment and welfare of the people engaged therein. There can be no question as to the subsidiary purpose of using hydroelectric power to drive agricultural implements.

If we may follow a precedent in the broad extension of a legislative term, we may also include as truly subsidiary purposes the use of hydroelectric power for the grinding of pulp and the making of paper for wrapping fruit; in the sawing of timber for making farm structures, implements, fruit boxes, and so forth; in the making of textiles for clothes, bags, tarpaulins, and so forth; in the making of cement for irrigation-canal linings, farmhouses, fence posts, and well curbs, or in a score of other purposes. Such a series of interpretations is admittedly remote and quite unnecessary to establish the present contentions, but it constitutes no greater stretch of original legislative intent than that which has been accomplished with the "commerce clause" of the Constitution under deliberate legislative acts and with judicial approval. It is more reasonable to assume that the framers of the words "subsidiary to the main purpose of irrigation" had in mind the making of cement fence posts than it is to assert that the framers of the "commerce clause" had in mind the prevention of child labor or the suppression of the social evil. Yet the latter is amply supported by popular as well as by judicial approval.

### THE CALENDAR.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I observe, by a glance at the calendar, that the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has given notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the close of the morning business, he will address the Senate on a specified subject; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is quite anxious that we proceed with the calendar for a short time; and I can not, with the time now at my disposal, complete my address on the subject which I was discussing yesterday before the expiration of the morning hour. Therefore I wish now to give notice that to-morrow, after the completion of the address by the Senator from California, I shall ask to proceed with the discussion of the grain-inspection bill, and will now yield that the Senate may take up the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota insists on that motion, I think we ought to have a quorum present. I do not raise the question at present, however. Could not the Senator from North Dakota proceed with his address until 2 o'clock, and if he shall not then have finished, go on to-morrow?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am willing to go on with the discussion at this time, even though I dislike in so important a case to speak to empty seats, and especially in the absence of those who are in opposition to the measure, because it is those whom I wish to reach.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Senator should express the desire, I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator from Connecticut would do so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Fletcher | Perkins | Smith, S. C. |
| Bankhead | Gallinger | Pittman | Smoot |
| Borah | Hughes | Ransdell | Stephenson |
| Brady | Jones | Reed | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Kenyon | Robinson | Swanson |
| Bristow | Kern | Root | Thomas |
| Bryan | Lane | Shafroth | Thompson |
| Burton | Lea, Tenn. | Sheppard | Thornton |
| Catron | Lodge | Sherman | Tillman |
| Chilton | McCumber | Shields | Townsend |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martine, N. J. | Shively | Warren |
| Cummins | Myers | Simmons | Williams |
| Dillingham | Norris | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| Fall | O'Gorman | Smith, Md. | |

Mr. REED. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE] on account of illness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PAGE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women was announced as first in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1240) to establish the legislative reference bureau of the Library of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1760) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURTON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

### DWIGHT MISSION SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA.

The bill (S. 2725) authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School, on Sallisaw Creek, Okla., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill, on a previous occasion, has been read and amended as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is not present, and I therefore ask that the joint resolution may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 2242) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3112) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain right of way near Engle, N. Mex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2651) providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, and other minerals within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 156) limiting expenditures for telegrams sent or received by Senators was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) providing that any Senator upon his own request may be recorded and counted as present in order to constitute a quorum was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that resolution be also passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) proposing an amendment to the standing rules of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

Mr. LODGE. Let the resolution be read. I should like to know to what it relates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested

The Secretary read Senate resolution 218, reported by Mr. CUMMINS from the Committee on Rules on December 5, 1913, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be a standing committee of the Senate known as the Committee on Public Documents. It shall be composed of three Senators elected in the same manner as the members of other standing committees.

No book, pamphlet, article, paper, address, or other matter requiring the consent or order of the Senate in order to be printed as a public document shall be so printed or an order therefor entered until the request or motion for such order shall have been referred to the above committee, and its report thereon received: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to interfere with the right of the Senate to discharge the committee from the further consideration of any such request or motion.

In making its report the committee shall describe the general character of the matter sought to be printed as a public document, and shall specifically state whether it is of such value to the country that it ought to be printed and circulated at the expense of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

The bill (S. 3403) to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., shall, from and after the 31st of December, 1913, be abolished and cease to exist; and that all the powers, duties, obligations, and penalties at that time lawfully imposed upon the receiver, and upon the register of the land office at Springfield, Mo., shall be exercised by and imposed upon the register, who shall, in addition to the duties thus imposed, have charge of and attend to the sale of public lands within the State of Missouri, as provided by law and official regulation, and shall be accountable under his official bond for the proceeds of such sales, and for all fees, commissions, and other moneys received by him under any provision of law or official regulation, etc.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

### LANDS IN HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

The bill (S. 3863) granting lands to Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Hot Springs, Ark., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in line 7, after the name "Arkansas," to insert "and that proper conveyance thereto be executed," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That lots Nos. 1 and 2 in block 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark., be, and the same are hereby, granted to the Hot

Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas, and that proper conveyance thereto be executed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer an amendment, in line 5, after the word "the," to strike out all down to the beginning of the committee amendment, in line 7, and in lieu thereof to insert "Grand Lodge, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, Grand Jurisdiction of Arkansas."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 5, after the word "the," it is proposed to strike out "Hot Springs Lodge No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas" and insert "Grand Lodge, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, Grand Jurisdiction of Arkansas."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. The title should be amended.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether there is any report on this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a report.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask whether there has been a communication from the Interior Department regarding the matter?

Mr. ROBINSON. In reply to the Senator from New York I will state that two or three years ago a bill passed Congress granting to the Masonic lodge of Hot Springs the right to the use of these lots for certain purposes, but reserving the title in fee to the United States. Subsequently the lodge raised $20,000 with which to construct the buildings contemplated. It was then tentatively arranged that the Grand Lodge of Arkansas should issue bonds and raise an additional $50,000 with which to complete the buildings. In order to do that it has been found necessary to vest in the lodge the title in fee. It is said by the authorities of the grand lodge that they are unable to float the bonds necessary to raise the additional sum unless the title in fee is granted.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to know what the authorities of the United States in charge of the Hot Springs Reservation say about this bill. I say that because there is no property of the United States which is not subject to a perfectly honest and sincere effort, by people who would like some of it, to take pieces which do not seem to be in present and immediate use and secure conveyances of them.

The Government is spending a large amount of money in maintaining the health reservation at Hot Springs, Ark. I do not think we ought to convey away any of the property that belongs to that reservation without having a mature and considered expression of opinion from the authorities of the Government who know all about it.

Mr. ROBINSON. In reply to the suggestion of the Senator from New York, I will say that when the former bill was under consideration it met with the approval of the department. This bill is intended only to give the title in fee and to remove the restrictions contained in the former act which have made it impossible for the lodge to carry forward the work.

The Interior Department did approve the passage of the former bill. This bill, granting the fee, has not been submitted to the department for the reason that the committee did not think it necessary to do so. I had a copy of the act before me on my desk, but have been unable to lay my hands on it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is in the report.

Mr. ROBINSON. My attention is called to the fact that the act is embraced in the report.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator where these lots are located? Are they on the margin of the reservation or in the central portion of it?

Mr. ROBINSON. They are not on the permanent reservation.

Mr. WARREN. They are on the margin of it, are they—adjoining it?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; they are not adjoining the permanent reservation, if my memory serves me correctly, but they are part of the Government reservation. I will state that a large number of lots belonging to the reservation, but not a part of the permanent reservation, were ordered sold by the Interior Department and the funds placed to the credit of the reservation. These lots were reserved from sale by the department, and subsequently Congress passed the bill a copy of which is embraced in the report on this bill.

Mr. ROOT. I will ask the Senator whether there is not a great difference between permitting temporary occupation, as the former bill did, and giving the fee to the property?

Mr. ROBINSON. No. I will say to the Senator from New York that the act already in force did not grant the mere right of temporary occupancy, but granted the right of permanent occupancy and use, and provided for a forfeiture when not used for the purposes specified in the grant. The reservations were designed to compel the lodge to use the property for the purposes set forth in the bill; that is, for the construction of certain buildings to be used by the lodge. The only effect of this bill is to remove those reservations, it having been found necessary to do so in order to raise the additional amount of money necessary to carry out the purposes of the original act.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he is certain that this bill was not referred to the Secretary of the Interior. I am a member of the Committee on Public Lands, and I understand that it was referred to him, and that all bills of that nature are referred to the department.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not recall that it was referred.

Mr. WORKS. I know the bill was very carefully considered in committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. The bill was very carefully considered by the committee, but I have no recollection that it was referred, and I think the memory of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] will confirm my recollection. It was not such a matter as the committee thought required a report from the department, considering the status of the present legislation on the subject.

Mr. ROOT. I think the bill had better be passed over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over, on objection.

## PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 4167) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection personally to the consideration of this bill, but I understand the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] wishes to be present when it is taken up. He is absent on account of sickness. I therefore should be glad to have the bill go over, and also the next one.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we have passed over these pension bills now two or three times. If the Senator insists upon the objection——

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no objection, except that I heard the Senator from Georgia say he would like to be here when the bills were called up. I do not know that he is going to make any contest over any of them. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not wish to move to proceed to the consideration of these bills notwithstanding the objection; but I will say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] intended to do that, if necessary, and he left——

At this point Mr. SHIVELY entered the Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Indiana is present now.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not going to make any objection. I simply wished to inform the Senate that I heard the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] say that he desired to be here when the bills were considered.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Isabella S. Snyder, widow of James A. Snyder, late captain, Third Regiment United States Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Louis E. Brusher, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Mounted Rifles, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles L. Stevens, late of Troop E, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, $16 per month.

Thomas W. Michael, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Broadwell, late of Company I, Third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

William S. Curtis, late of Company F, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Agnes E. Brown, widow of Alonzo L. Brown, late of Company A, First Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Oscar C. Shull, late of Company L, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Schuyler C. Pool, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $25 per month.

Jennie E. Howell, dependent mother of George E. Howell, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

George V. Shaffer, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Meade Sands, widow of James H. Sands, late rear admiral, United States Navy, $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Maria Howell, widow of Thomas C. D. Howell, late of Company E, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Barbara B. Haws, widow of William Haws, late of Capt. Robert Thomas's and Coleman Boren's companies, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian war, $12 per month.

Mary A. Connolly, widow of Thomas Connolly, late first lieutenant, First Regiment United States Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Edward G. Goodbub, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $16 per month.

George W. Robinson, late of Company E, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isabella Workman, widow of Oliver G. Workman, late of Company B, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James E. Embury, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $50 per month.

John Doughty, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Kate Sloan, invalid and dependent daughter of William H. Sloan, late of Company D, District of Columbia and Maryland Volunteers, War with Mexico, $12 per month.

Fred L. Bush, late of Company E, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Paul L. Bahr, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, $20 per month.

Mary C. Whitson, widow of Kaolin L. Whitson, late first lieutenant, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Kaolin L. Whitson until they reach the age of 16 years.

Otto Weber, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

A. Fannie Prevatt, widow of Joseph F. Prevatt, late of Capt. Coffee's independent company, Florida Volunteers, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary E. Perry, dependent mother of Herbert S. Perry, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Frank J. King, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Helen M. Gleed, widow of Charles W. Gleed, late of Company D, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Charles W. Gleed until they reach the age of 16 years.

Albina M. Williams, widow of Thomas S. Williams, late of Company D, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move to strike out, on page 2, lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, on page 2, to strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, in the following words:

> The name of Louis E. Brusher, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. I will state that the soldier is deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors."

The bill (S. 4168) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Caroline Adams, widow of Joseph W. Adams, late first lieutenant Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary Hammack, widow of Andrew J. Hammack, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alfred Lewis, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Minnie A. Thornhill, widow of French W. Thornhill, late acting assistant surgeon, Eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary U. Hull, widow of Frank Hull, late of Company C, One hundred and seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Cora H. Griswold, widow of Hamilton Byron Griswold, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Albert L. Church, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Franklin Ball, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel R. Billington, late of Companies G and H, Seventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret M. Cady, widow of William H. Cady, late first lieutenant Company I, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mahala M. Clark, former widow of George C. Clark, late of Company H, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Jerome P. Patten, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah A. Wess, widow of William Wess, late of Company E, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

George W. Shuck, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Ida Florence Baylor, helpless and dependent child of Leander Baylor, late of Troop K, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, $12 per month.

Alexander Patterson, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bella E. Timmens, widow of Benjamin Timmens, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

John Finegan, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment, and Company D, One hundred and seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Wells, late captain Company M, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ann E. McGrew, widow of William T. McGrew, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John J. Byrne, late of Twenty-ninth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lucy Lowry, widow of James Lowry, late of Company C, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary E. Murphy, widow of Percival Murphy, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Jacob C. Yorty, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ada Hess, widow of William H. Hess, late of Company B, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Angelia L. Shaw, widow of William H. Shaw, late of Second Battery Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Barney L. Bull, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah A. Higby, widow of Sidney C. Higby, late of Chicago Mercantile Battery, Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lucy M. Martin, widow of Alfred Martin, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry M. Tillinghast, late second lieutenant Company D, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin F. Havens, late first lieutenant Company F, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frances F. Godown, widow of John M. Godown, late first lieutenant Company K, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Norman P. Wood, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lydia A. Tinstman, widow of Henry O. Tinstman, late of Anderson Troop, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and first lieutenant Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George A. Marks, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Chapman, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and widow of James W. Chapman, late of Company C, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mahala E. Warmoth, widow of George M. Warmoth, late assistant surgeon Forty-first Regiment, and surgeon Fifty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elizabeth Garland, former widow of Elmer E. Starr, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Andrew F. O'Neill, late first lieutenant Company A, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Holland Myers, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia A. B. Andrews, widow of Warren Andrews, formerly Samuel A. Heath, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John W. Ferguson, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel Dickey, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henriettn B. B. Hayman, widow of Robert M. Hayman, alias Kelly, late of Second Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Edgar S. McDonald, late mate, United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George O. Colby, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Terence O'Dowd, late of the United States Marine Corps, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah M. Stone, widow of George F. Stone, late of Companies E and B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

David B. Ormiston, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Jameson, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Eagan, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lucie A. Hicks, widow of Robert W. Hicks, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Andrew Reese, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martin Parker, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Pinkerton, late of Company D, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cyrus Reiley Pennell, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Carpenter, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew P. Duff, helpless and dependent son of William Duff, late of Company D, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, $12 per month.

Harvey H. Carr, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nancy J. Sandusky, former widow of Sylvester K. Rollins, late of Companies I and C, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Irvine Carman, late of Company K, Seventy-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas F. Gardner, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harriet C. Spoor, widow of Austin O. Spoor, late of Company K, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Aniceto Abeytia, late first lieutenant Company C, Second Regiment New Mexico Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas H. Crapo, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles Newton Eddy, late of Companies E and C, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John F. Bennett, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Winding, late of Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

General Taylor Garrison, imbecile and dependent son of Jacob Garrison, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company G, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

William Axe, late of Company G, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gilbert A. Irons, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amelia H. Sawyer, widow of Leicester J. Sawyer, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of James Dowsland, late of Company I, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Peter Calnacy, late of U. S. S. *Great Western* and *Ibex*, United States Navy, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura E. Peavey, former widow of Daniel S. Bedee, late first lieutenant and adjutant Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $12 a month.

Asa S. Hugill, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment, and Company D, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sallie E. Patrick, widow of William H. Patrick, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William H. Gregory, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Graffam, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Caroline M. Wallace, widow of William L. Wallace, late of the U. S. S. *Colorado*, *Fearnot*, and *Glasgow*, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John How, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John J. Porter, late of Company A, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Custer, late of Companies I and B, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin McKimmy, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cremora J. Huffman, widow of Levi W. Huffman, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

William Jackson, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rebecca Harris, widow of Isaac Harris, late of Company F, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elinor F. Rodenbough, widow of Theophilus F. Rodenbough, late colonel Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William A. Rhoades, late of Company E, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah M. Pond, widow of Levi T. Pond, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary A. V. Sanger, widow of Austin T. Sanger, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eva E. White, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert C. White, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, $12 per month.

David N. Landers, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment Maine Veteran Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary C. Jackson, widow of Allen H. Jackson, late lieutenant colonel One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and major and paymaster, United States Army, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John W. Lively, late quartermaster sergeant Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Wilson, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Thompson, late of Company D, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Abby T. McCarthy, widow of Richard McCarthy, late of Company A, First Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John O. Ackerson, late second lieutenant Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anne E. Milliken, widow of Luther S. Milliken, late surgeon One hundred and twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lucy B. Hickox, widow of Chauncey Hickox, late second lieutenant Company A, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Caroline M. Ulio, widow of James Ulio, late captain Company K, Sixth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Vincent Knapp, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hiram Kibbey, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Armstrong, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry T. Peck, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maurice C. Stafford, late second lieutenant Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment, and captain Company D, Fortieth Regiment, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lucinda Holmes, widow of George Holmes, late of Company D, Seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Catherine Holbrook, widow of David R. Holbrook, late of Company H, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Nettie Jackson, widow of Andrew Jackson, late of Company B, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move to amend, on page 3, by striking out lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, it is proposed to amend, by striking out lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, in the following words:

The name of Margaret M. Cady, widow of William H. Cady, late first lieutenant Company I, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. The beneficiary in this case is dead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. On page 16, I move to amend, by striking out lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. In this case the beneficiary, Elinor F. Rodenbough, is also dead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, it is proposed to strike out lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, in the following words:

The name of Elinor F. Rodenbough, widow of Theophilus F. Rodenbough, late colonel Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3023) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to investigate the condition of trade in China, for the purpose of determining the desirability of establishing there a permanent exposition of the products of the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2425) to authorize the Roanoke River Development Co. to construct and maintain a dam across the Roanoke River in Mecklenburg County, in the State of Virginia, approximately 20 miles below the town of Clarksville, in said State, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. BURTON. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 1618) granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will ask what has become of Senate bill 3023. Was there an objection to it? I was speaking to another Senator just for a second.

Mr. LODGE. It went over on objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was passed over on objection.

Mr. MYERS. May I ask who objected?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that several Senators objected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order.

JOEL J. PARKER.

The bill (S. 2226) for the relief of Joel J. Parker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$400," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joel J. Parker, or his legal representatives, the sum of $400, as full compensation for permanent injuries received by the said Parker on the 24th day of July, 1909, at Fort Lawton, Wash., while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the United States transport service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2590) to reimburse Charles C. Crowell for two months' extra pay in lieu of traveling expenses was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object to the consideration of that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3971) to provide for a permanent exhibit of the resources of the States of the Union in or near Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2069) for the reimbursement of Jacob Wirth for two horses lost while hired by the United States Geological Survey was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have received a communication from the United States Geological Survey on this bill. I thought I had it with me this morning, but I must have left it over in my office. Therefore I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4200) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object to the consideration of that bill, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4261) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1759) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900 was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the time for the convening of Congress and commencement of the terms of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that be passed over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4352) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4353) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10138) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) for printing as a public document the publication of the State Department known as the Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that go over. It has been reported adversely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1980) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Fuller was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is an adverse report on this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I understand it was reported adversely.

Mr. GALLINGER. The question is upon its indefinite postponement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has been read as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I move the indefinite postponement of the bill if it is to be discussed to-day.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not see the Senator who made the report in his seat. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate joint resolution No. 1.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is recognized as entitled to the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator from California has any reason out of the ordinary to proceed at this time, I would be glad to yield to him.

Mr. WORKS. Not at all. I understood that the Senator had concluded his address yesterday. I do not want to interfere with him at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I resume at the point where I left off yesterday evening, when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. I had suggested that certain peace officers of the city of Chicago were women. I believe the very short experience they have had indicates that they would deal with women offenders quite as effectively, and perhaps with a more accurate result in justice, than when male officers deal with them. There is no gallantry shown by women to women offenders; they mete out the law; whereas the sterner sex as a rule do not set their jaw quite as firmly when they are dealing with a woman offender.

I wish to definitely place in the RECORD a matter that was suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. It was in effect that a primary law in Illinois prevented a voter who participated in the primary from thereafter voting any except the party ticket so voted at the primary; that that vote binds them in the ensuing election. It necessarily would make a much smaller number who would register or attend a primary if it were possible that they were to be so bound. The provision of the act of June 27, 1913, which is a reenactment of a prior law of 1910, contains the following:

No person shall be entitled to vote at a primary:

* * * * * * *

If he shall have voted at a primary held under this act of another political party within a period of two years next preceding such primary.

This in no manner binds the person who votes at a primary from voting any ticket he or she pleases at the ensuing general election.

I do not care to pursue in detail many of the subjects that have been suggested in the discussion of the pending joint resolution. It has been urged with some degree of force that a State has no right to fix the qualifications of a voter or to thrust upon another State voters that that State does not desire. California is cited as an illustration that States outside ought not to compel her to receive as citizens Asiatics, or that they ought not to interfere with the alien land law of a State. This could not be done, as was suggested yesterday, unless because of a required number of States ratifying an amendment. It could not be done in the matter of alien land laws unless in observance of a treaty obligation.

If I had any objections to the treaties of arbitration that were pending here it would be that they left the matter of the California statute on the alien ownership of land open to arbitration under the terms of that treaty when concluded. It is in effect, it is feared, and with some foundation, would submit to arbitration the interpretation of a treaty between this country and Japan. If an award should be made contrary to the act of the California Legislature, that treaty so interpreted would be the supreme law of the land. It would be binding upon every State. It would nullify every conflicting act of the legislature.

California is not the only State in the Union that would be affected in this way. There are numerous States having similar provisions. My own State, for instance, has had an alien land law for many years. No alien is permitted to hold beyond a fixed time the title to real estate lying within its borders. If they do not sell within the time fixed, public proceedings are provided under which the land shall be forfeited and sold, and the alien shall receive the money less the costs.

In other inland States they would feel as keenly upon this question as the citizens in California do. This is a matter of treaty obligation. If it comes to us in this body to ratify a treaty that would in effect nullify the alien land laws of a State, the proper time to object is on the ratification of that treaty. If we do not then have enough votes here to defeat it, it becomes the law and the States are bound thereby.

I wish to conclude here what I have to say on the woman-suffrage resolution especially by suggesting that at the outset yesterday I said in a government by law it was proper for women to participate as voters. If this is a government by law, and I am firm in the belief that it is, in fact as well as in theory, it certainly is obligatory upon every woman who contends the right ought to be extended to her that she shall obey the law herself, not only as it is now but as it shall be made hereafter.

I have no sympathy whatever with the militant suffragette. It is a mistake in any country where the law is the basis of the government, and it is equally a mistake here if it should ever be for a moment contemplated. It will result in nothing but unmixed evil. It will retard the cause by many years. It will lose useful labor done, public sentiment aroused, and postpone the ultimate triumph of the woman-suffrage cause by many weary years.

I see no difference, Mr. President, between militancy and any other form of lawlessness. I see no difference between the Industrial Workers of the World and the militant suffragettes. I see no difference between either and any other form of lawlessness, whether it be an individual outburst or an organized concerted effort to set aside the laws of the States or of the country.

I am for this resolution, and because I am for it I can say this, I think, without having my motives suspected. I urge upon every woman in this country that she array herself upon the side of law and order in the community. I urge upon them particularly, if they be disappointed in the adoption of this resolution by the necessary two-thirds vote or, in the event of its submission, even, if it be rejected by the States, that that disappointment do not lead them to despair and, so despairing, to lawlessness. Nothing will be gained by it. On the contrary, everything will be lost.

The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] yesterday asked if it were not possible under the end sought by this resolution to force upon unwilling States, by 8 or 10, possibly, who constitute the majority in population and electorial strength, such a resolution as this contrary to the wishes of many other States, or by 36 States having a minority from forcing the amendment on 12 States having a majority of the total population of the United States. I do not think it is possible under our present system of government. I replied briefly to that subject on yesterday. I desire more thoroughly to examine it today. It perhaps is not directly connected with the subject of woman's right to vote in this resolution. I shall assume, however, that what I have to say on a primary, as it may be controlled by 8 or 10 votes, in response to the query of the Senator from New York, is pertinent upon this resolution.

I have reflected somewhat on this subject since last summer. In that time several things have happened. To illustrate, a presidential message has been written that has given considerable impetus to thought on these questions. I have always regarded political parties as so intimately connected with the administration of government that the parties themselves are impressed with a public interest. I think legislation can be sustained on that ground alone. Primary laws are in effect in every State in the Union interwoven with the general election laws of that State, whether they be for local or general elections. Primary laws limiting expenditure of money and requiring publicity, prohibiting the promising of appointments as a means of influencing votes, have been passed in many States. Publicity laws, limiting the expenditure of money, have already been passed by Congress and have gone unquestioned through campaigns nation wide.

A political party is always a voluntary association. The results of that association, however, place candidates for public office before the voters. Practically every voter in this country is a member of some political party. State election laws recognize these underlying conditions at all times and places. The first party tickets were nominated by neither convention nor primary many years ago. I shall not go at length into this, but ask leave to print some tables to save time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. SHERMAN. The first party tickets were nominated neither by convention nor primaries. Before 1831 or 1832 the caucuses or the legislatures of the several States ordinarily were the nominating authority. In 1832 political parties had assumed form and power. In 1831 and 1832 tickets were nominated under the national delegate system for the first time. In the ensuing election the Democratic Party cast for Andrew Jackson fewer than 700,000 votes against 530,000 cast for Henry Clay. There were then 24 States in the Union. The total vote cast in all of the States was 1,250,000. In 1832 New York's total vote, in round numbers, was 323,000; Pennsylvania's was 147,000; and Ohio's was 157,000. Illinois struggled into the returns with 19,000 total, of which 14,000 were Democratic. Jackson was then and in 1836 the popular candidate. It may be presumed he drew out a very high percentage of the potential vote of the country. In 1836 his second campaign polled a total of 1,500,000 for all candidates.

Difficulties in preserving the purity of the ballot and accurate and honest returns were not so great or numerous as now, because dense populations and large cities were few. It may now be assumed without question that the large cities present the most difficult questions affecting elections. Stringent laws seek to minimize the dangers presented in densely populated cities.

| | |
|---|---|
| In 1832 the population of United States approximated | 13,700,700 |
| The total vote cast was | 1,250,810 |
| The per cent of the population to her voters was | 9.12 |
| Or a rate of nearly 1 voter to every 10 in population. | |
| Population per square mile then approximated | 6.4 |
| In 1912 the population of United States was | 95,410,503 |
| Total vote cast in 1912 was | 15,493,009 |
| Per cent of the population that are voters was | 16.17 |
| Or approximately about 1 voter to every 6¼ in population. | |
| The population per square mile approximated | 32.8 |
| Or over five times that of 1832. | |
| In 1830 the per cent of the population living in cities of 8,000 inhabitants or more was | 6.7 |
| In 1910 the per cent of population living in cities of 8,000 inhabitants or more was | 28.9 |
| In 1910 the per cent of population living in cities of 2,500 or more was | 46.76 |

The foregoing conditions show both the drift of population to cities and the settlement there of a large part of our immigrants. It furnishes the reason why the several States in which larger cities of the country are found have enacted many laws to regulate both primary and general elections. State legislatures and some State courts have treated the power to nominate as an integral part of the power to elect public officers. The time and place of residence, registration, and detailed provisions to guard against fraud, improper practices, and undue influences have been provided. The purity of primaries and elections, the fullest opportunity to the voter affiliated with a political party to express his choice, have been provided in many States.

After the old system passed away for many years the delegate convention system was the sole method of placing candidates in nomination on behalf of the several political parties either in localities in the States or in national politics. Then conditions changed. The great cities grew. Large numbers of voters and powerful business interests more or less connected with public affairs were concentrated in those cities. Questions vital to party control and equally vital to the public welfare mingled in the nomination of tickets. Under the stress of great temptation unfair practices sprang up. Sometimes tickets were defeated. Rancorous feuds were created as the result. The tendency for politics and business to blend became apparent in every State where a city of any size rendered the temptation sufficiently strong.

These elements produced discord. They produced in many instances evil legislation and sometimes equally bad administration. These conditions, not reforms but these conditions, coupled with a sense that the voters of a party were sometimes not

needed, gave strength to primary legislation. It was argued that the same power that elected those tickets ought to be permitted to nominate them.

It is not my purpose to enter into the merits or demerits of this controversy at all. Much of it is settled. I only wish to advert briefly to these conditions in this sketch. This direct primary legislation grew apace. Many States in the Union have enacted those laws. When they affect candidates local to the State, no controversy can arise between those laws and the nominations for Federal officers. When the nomination of candidates for Federal offices in general is affected congressional remedies must be sought. If any efficient remedy is to be procured, a national political party like a local one must be regulated by law. It now creates a nominating system and can alter, amend, and abolish it at pleasure. The organization is said to be the supreme court of party regularity. It may or may not heed the voters in whom rests the sole power of electing the candidates nominated. However, there is really but one supreme court in politics, and that is the ballot box at the ensuing election, and most of us have learned that.

The developments in the last 10 years are marked. Sometimes I think they are not fully noted or understood. Many States have already enacted primary laws not only regulating the nomination of candidates for Representatives in Congress, but have provided how the voters of such States shall elect delegates to the national convention. Some have provided, further, the method for nominating United States Senators, and they have anticipated by several years the adoption of the seventeenth amendment. Eleven States out of the 48 States of the Union now select delegates to a national convention on a blanket ticket by a State-wide vote, regardless of congressional districts. They are all entitled, under the last basis of representation, to 106 delegates in the Republican national convention out of a total of 1,078.

The call of the last national convention issued by the Republican national committee contained the following. I will not read it, but ask that it be incorporated. We are all familiar with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> The Republican electors of the several States and Territories, including the District of Columbia, Alaska, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, and all other electors without regard to past political affiliations, who believe in the principles of the Republican Party and indorse its policies are cordially invited to unite under this call in the selection of delegates to said convention. Said national convention shall consist of four delegates at large from each State and two delegates at large for each Representative at large in the Congress, two delegates from each congressional district, six delegates from each of the Territories, and two delegates each from the District of Columbia, Alaska, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. For each delegate elected to this convention an alternate delegate shall be chosen who shall serve in case of the absence of his principal.

Mr. SHERMAN. The congressional district is by this call made the unit of representation. It asks—

> The Republican electors of the several States * * * and all other electors without regard to past political affiliation, who believe in the principles of the Republican Party and indorse its policies, to unite under this call in the selection of delegates to said convention.

This call is in direct conflict with the statutes of the 11 States named. It is likewise in conflict with some of the State laws that prohibit one who is a member of the party from voting in a primary of that party.

The call of the Republican national convention in 1912, for instance, removes this limitation created by State statute. It requires all delegates selected except those at large to be by congressional districts. The congressional district has been the unit of representation in the Republican Party for more than 30 years. The State legislation enacted on the blanket-ticket plan was had, with the congressional district as the unit, in full force and effect under the rules adopted by political conventions.

The sole power now exists in a Republican national committee to prepare the temporary roll of delegates for the convention of 1916. The temporary roll so prepared for all practical purposes becomes and is the permanent roll, and so the permanent organization of that convention. Under present practices the Republican national committee, by the course of the 1912 convention, not only impliedly has the sole power to prepare this temporary roll of delegates but delegates to the national convention shall be chosen in such manner as the national committee shall provide. It may therefore, by the exercise of its power, unseat on the temporary roll such delegates as it thinks proper. It may unseat every delegate from the 11 States named because the statutes of those States are in contravention of the call for a convention. That committee may go further if the emergency of politics require it. They may nullify the qualification of party voters imposed by State statutes.

We have uniformly gone, in many instances, on the theory that a man ought to be affiliated with the party and have some known habitation within that party before he should be allowed to participate in the nominating of a ticket to be voted for by all the members of that party. This provision of many local statutes therefore may cause to be unseated delegates from States or districts in whose election voters of other parties may have been denied participation because of such prohibition in State laws. Either of these foregoing causes is a constant menace to party harmony.

I shall assume here that the sole question or purpose of nominating a ticket is to elect it. It is possible that other motives might at times influence, but generally that is what leads to a given line of conduct. It will be difficult to convince one who is familiar with his own State that a national committee of a political party can deliberately set aside the verdict of the people of that State expressed in a fairly conducted primary and expect to secure the electoral vote of the State by the candidates so nominated.

These State primary laws are surrounded by many safeguards. In many instances they are the product of a great deal of experience.

I only state these issues very briefly. I state them for the purpose of showing that the solution is by legislation. I do not think it can be safely left to party faction to decide in time of stress these questions. The temptation to wrest power from an adversary by unfair means in modern political warfare is too great to be resisted. I am not dealing with the ideal at all. That age has passed away in politics, if it ever did exist. Legislation upon this question applies itself to the practical side of public affairs. A national primary law, as I see it, is a fit remedy for these evils. In the absence of such legislation the danger is always present; the element of injustice may be injected into party affairs whenever the emergency is great enough to cause it.

There are three divisions on this question. One wants to leave it alone. I need apply no descriptive term to those who think that way. I am not a political scientist, anyhow.

Another school wish to enact legislation that will adapt itself to existing conditions, seeking, if possible, to correct the evils without overturning any of the conditions which now prevail in the jurisdictions where the election laws are in force. They recognize public sentiment in the States in almost every instance and seek to keep in line with that sentiment.

Many of those States where the sentiment is the strongest are those presenting sharp contrasts with the population in great cities and rural districts. That contrast makes inevitable intense political struggles.

One group wish to ignore any existing State laws with existing systems of taking public sentiment on the question and desire nation-wide presidential primaries.

The 48 States would merely be outlying election districts. The footings of the aggregate vote from all the States would stand in lieu of delegates under the convention system. Unless a second primary election should be had in the course of affairs, it is inevitable that a plurality shall nominate. That plurality may be a very small percentage of the total vote cast by the respective parties at the polls.

This plan is recommended by President Wilson in his message of December 2, 1913. I am opposed to it. I will vote against any such measure. The nation-wide presidential primary totally obliterates the State. The aggregate returns are massed in such way that the small State in voting population ceases to be a factor in party affairs.

Those who believe in this method go a step further. They almost universally favor the abolition of the present system of electing a President and the substitution of a direct vote of the people for the electoral college.

This introduces into the election in November the same principle as in the Nation-wide primary preceding it. That is a radical reconstruction of the present system of government. It destroys the relative importance of the small States. It multiplies the power of the large States. The Senate here is the equalizing power of government between the large States and the small, the adjustment of 48 sovereignties with an inadequate federation at the beginning into a union of enumerated powers surrendered by the States. The debates which preceded the formation of the present Government show what the purpose was. I shall not enter into that.

A representative Government was deliberately created. This system represents both population and States. The smaller of the thirteen States were induced to participate in and ratify

the unamended Constitution by preserving their relative importance. This guaranty is found in an oft-quoted paragraph of an article in this Chamber:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Under this guaranty the equal voice of the smaller States in the Senate has been preserved and the Constitution was ratified. It is a covenant between the thirteen original States and of the thirty-five that have been admitted on an equal footing with them since that time.

The power to elect a President and Vice President is found in the second clause of Article II of that document:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress.

It will be noticed that this clause is in entire accord with that portion of Article V already quoted. The right of the electors of a State to have at least two electors representative of its two Senators is secured by the Constitution. It is vital to the existence of the smaller States in their relative position to the larger ones guaranteed in the original creation of the Government. It is an enduring basis of the Union that the smaller States be not shorn of their strength in the election of a President. It was intended to be and is a vital element representative of the States in the original plan of our democracy.

Rhode Island, with its 1,250 square miles and population of 542,610, has an equal vote in this Senate with Illinois and its 56,650 square miles and population of 5,638,591. However great future populations of the several States may be, however territory may expand, this equal suffrage of the States must endure. The number of electors based on Representatives in the lower House increases or decreases with the population in the several States. It is responsive to mere numbers. The Senate is responsive in this particular to States, and to States only, without regard to population, area, or industrial, commercial, or financial strength.

I wish here to assert deliberately that those who in the name of progress desire to destroy a representative democracy and to convert it into a pure democracy are themselves retrogressive. The mere lapse of time does not prove that there has been any real progress. Everybody can grow old if he lives long enough. So can a government. The mere fact that it becomes old by lapse of time does not show that anything is out of date. The men who prepared the Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia knew something of the history of human affairs; they knew something of the experience of men who had framed governments in times past. With all that knowledge, with all the history of the republics that had been framed which had endured for a season and had fallen, they were familiar. Recorded time is full of pure democracies. They began as favorably as any governments; they proceeded along the lines of their development; but ultimately there was not a pure democracy in the world that grew to any dimensions, with any great population, that survived the strain and stress of the multitude in a tumultuous assault upon the citadel of human rights. So these men when they framed a representative democracy, it seems to me, were the real progressives of their times.

If it be sought to turn back the hands of the clock of human experience and try to convert this Government again into a pure democracy, then President Wilson is right, and those who are sponsors and sympathizers with the Nation-wide primary system are right. This originally was a federation of 13 States. Since that time 35 more have been admitted upon an equal footing with the original 13. Both are represented—the State and the population. It is not a pure democracy now and it was not in the beginning; it was not intended to be. The design was for something more enduring, more preservative of justice because more protective of minorities. They refused to reduce it to the terms of a pure democracy.

Another thing let me advert to here. It would be a gross breach of faith with the smaller States to change the method of electing the President and Vice President. It is desirable that a primary system and an election system be in harmony with each other. If there be a nation-wide primary, no sufficient reason would exist why, if the one is justified, the electoral college ought not to be abolished, and that we ought not to elect the President and Vice President in the same way, and take the high vote in the returns from all the States, and by that vote, without the intervention of an electoral college, choose our Chief Magistrate. I think that would be a breach of faith in more ways than in a moral one. It is a legal breach of faith. Forty-eight States in the Union now send 192 convention delegates; they, in addition, have 96 electors in the Electoral College. If there be a nation-wide election as well as a primary, the nation-wide election instantly destroys 96 electors; it takes away from every State in the Union, large or small, two electors representative of the two Senators. It is a violation of the governmental condition on which the Republic was founded.

Delaware, with its 2,050 square miles and population of 202,322, and Texas, with its 265,780 square miles and 3,896,542 population, are equal in votes in this body. Nevada, with its 110,700 square miles and 81,875 population, is equal to New York, with its 49,170 square miles and population of 9,113,279. The direct election of President destroys the equalizing influence of the States, and places it in mere population.

I have heard a good deal here, Mr. President, which seems to suggest that all human history began with the Declaration of Independence, and those who may not subscribe to that doctrine at least think it began in the valley down toward Lexington, or, at any rate, when the Constitution was written. I do not think either. I think human history and the history of this country, so far as it affects public affairs as a world power, began a long time before 1776 or 1787; it began 500 years before.

Direct democracies ended in ruin, and the fathers knew it as well as or better than some of us who can not subscribe to the doctrine of a pure democracy believe it now. I quote here from President Wilson's message of December 2, 1913, which I shall not read, but shall ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair hears no objection, and permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

I turn to a subject which I hope can be handled promptly and without serious controversy of any kind. I mean the method of selecting nominees for the Presidency of the United States. I feel confident that I do not misinterpret the wishes or the expectations of the country when I urge the prompt enactment of legislation which will provide for primary elections throughout the country at which the voters of the several parties may choose their nominees for the Presidency without the intervention of nominating conventions. I venture the suggestion that this legislation should provide for the retention of party conventions, but only for the purpose of declaring and accepting the verdict of the primaries and formulating the platforms of the parties, and I suggest that these conventions should consist not of delegates chosen for this single purpose, but of the nominees for Congress, the nominees for vacant seats in the Senate of the United States, the Senators whose terms have not yet closed, the national committees, and the candidates for the Presidency themselves, in order that platforms may be framed by those responsible to the people for carrying them into effect.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I think, under existing conditions, minority rule is sufficiently strong. As proposed by this amendment—on the theory, now, that this amendment might pass and the women participate in elections—instead of having 16,000,000 votes in the United States we would have double as many. The larger the vote grows the more the evils of minority rule become apparent. The evils of minority rule are, I think, sufficiently aggravated now without precipitating into the situation a nation-wide presidential primary.

Along with that comes the public thought stimulated to change the method of electing Presidents with the evils I have suggested.

I am moved to inquire here when the President wrote this paragraph on what authority he did so? Was he the spokesman of the organic body of the Democracy when he uttered it? Did he confine himself to something which had been embodied as a promise to the people at an election? I am quoting this. Had such a primary had the organic consideration of the Democratic Party? Did Mr. Wilson himself run on the Baltimore platform? Was the primary plank of that platform also juggled? Is his message his private view on primaries or is it his party's view? If so, what segment of the party? These questions were suggested on a certain recent occasion when the Baltimore platform was a refreshing shelter from "starting anything," to use the vernacular of the street employed on that occasion.

I am somewhat curious—I know I have often paid a high price for my curiosity; but it is a strong human trait—I am somewhat curious to know whether Democratic Senators will yield to this message or not, and whether any innocent Republican Senators will be seduced thereby. Democratic Senators know well where it leads, and especially those who have studied maturely the relation between their States and the National Government, and who know the dividing line. On very little, Mr. President, is there a twilight zone to students, to those who have examined these questions practically in either governmental matters or in litigation. Some here and there are in a nebulous state, but they are only matters waiting for judicial decision or congressional action. Democratic Senators know

where this leads. Once embarked on this swift current of direct and tumultuous discord, the States will be obliterated, and we shall return to the rejected system that the fathers put behind them in 1787, not because they were wiser than we—I shall not argue that; I shall not wound the sensibilities of any statesman; but concede that we know as much as they did; that Ben Franklin had no more experience than we have had; that Charles Carroll of Carrollton was just as circumscribed in his vision as are we; that George Washington was no more patriotic than are we; that Madison, too, had his limitations; that Hamilton penetrated the future no more than we—let us concede all that, and say we know just as much as they knew; but the fathers rejected pure democracies on historic evidence, because they had been tried in the balance and found wanting. No experience since then has argued to us to revert to the ancient pure democracy rejected by them.

They deliberately rejected pure democracy and wrote into this charter a representative democracy and preserved every one of the smaller States of the ancient confederation. The 35 States which have been added since that time have the same rights as had the 13 original States. A direct nomination of candidates for President and Vice President would result in a highly concentrated control. When the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] propounded the interrogatory on yesterday, Mr. President, he opened the gate to this interesting inquiry. Let me give the States. I do not think we shall ever have any more time, and I will be as brief as I can.

A direct nomination of candidates for President and Vice President would result in a highly concentrated control. Ten of the larger States of the 48 could nominate. In 1908 in the 10 States of California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania Taft had 4,452,532 out of a total of 7,637,636, or in those 10 States of the total vote in the United States 58¼ per cent. Bryan had 3,623,175 out of a total of 6,293,182, or in those 10 States of the total vote in the United States 52⅝ per cent.

In 1912 in the 10 States named Wilson had 3,284,901 out of a total of 6,293,454, or in those 10 States of the total vote in the United States 52⅛ per cent. Roosevelt had 2,541,835 out of a total of 4,119,538, or in those 10 States of the total vote in the United States 61.95 per cent. Taft had 2,050,397 out of a total of 3,484,980, or in those 10 States of the total vote in the United States 58.83 per cent.

In 1908 Bryan's total vote in the United States was 6,393,182. A nominating majority of this vote is 3,196,592.

The eight States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa, and Kentucky combined polled over 51 per cent, or 3,264,882, being 68,290 more than a majority of the total vote.

In 1912 Wilson's total vote in the United States was 6,293,454. A nominating majority of this vote is 3,146,728.

The nine States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, California, Kentucky, and Texas polled over 51 per cent, or 3,216,539, being 69,811 more than a majority of the total vote polled in the United States. It ought to be recorded here that Wilson's total vote in the United States was 99,728 lower than Bryan's vote in 1908 of 6,393,182, and lower than Bryan's vote in 1900 of 6,358,076 by 64,622, but the candidates received in 1912 the following per cent of the electoral vote:

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| Wilson | 81.92 |
| Roosevelt | 15.25 |
| Taft | 2.83 |
| Debs | 0.00 |

These returns show in a striking way the influence of the States in the election of a President. It is not a pure democracy. It was not intended to be such by its founders. Neither ought it to be. The relative importance of the individual State continues throughout. To ignore or weaken it is decay, not development. The influence of the State can be abated only by destroying its integrity as one of the original units of governmental creation.

It will interest our Democratic brethren further to note that in 1904 Parker's total vote in the United States was 5,079,041. A nominating majority of this vote is 2,539,522. With several candidates a plurality nominates and a much smaller number of votes than the majority given would nominate. The eight States of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, and Texas combined polled over 52 per cent, or 2,646,718, being 107,196 more than a majority of the total 1904 Democratic vote in the United States. With more than two candidates a much smaller number could nominate on the plurality plan.

The foregoing data show that control could be exercised successfully by the 8 or 10 States named. The other 38 or 40 States might have no decisive control in the nomination. Distance and geography vanish before modern transit and communication of intelligence. The tendency is among the larger States named to become affiliated by commercial, financial, and business ties. Politics largely follows the lines of interest. Territorial contact no longer unites neighboring States as in the early day. Primary nominations are influenced by personal acquaintance coming from association along the lines of mutual interest. The natural tendency in such a condition would be for the control to gravitate inevitably into the power of the large States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In connection with the statement which the Senator has made with reference to the proportion of the popular vote which would be represented by the 10 States named, can the Senator tell us what proportion of, say, the Republican national convention the delegates from these 10 States constituted?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not the delegate basis figured out; I could do that, but I have not investigated that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 25 or 30 per cent, I imagine.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would not be anywhere near a controlling number?

Mr. SHERMAN. Nothing like it; no, sir; because the smaller States, without regard to population, each have four delegates, corresponding to the two Senators. I should say, roughly speaking, that instead of the 10 States casting 52 to 61 per cent of the popular vote under the delegate system their voting strength in a convention would not much exceed in any instance, I should think, 40 per cent even if they were all consolidated on a single candidate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That very arrangement affecting national conventions tends to equalize the difference between the larger States and the smaller States and to prevent a few of the larger States controlling the smaller ones, just as a somewhat similar arrangement in the constitution of the Senate and the House of Representatives tends to do the same thing.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; that evidently was the purpose in framing the actual government on that basis. Political control, as it has existed to the present, has followed out very closely the government. This shows the harmony that results between the management of political parties and the actual administration of government.

It ought to be further recorded here that the total popular presidential vote in the United States in 1912 was 15,033,639, of which was received by Wilson, 6,293,454; Roosevelt, 4,119,539; Taft, 3,484,980; Debs, 900,000; or, of which was received of the popular vote by Wilson, 41.86 per cent; Roosevelt, 27.40 per cent; Taft, 23.18 per cent; Debs, 5.98 per cent. I cite these figures for the purpose of illustrating the equalizing power of the double system of government, showing where the balance was made between the representation of States and the representation of population. That balance exists; it is not always seen by the multitude, but it exists as a potent factor in the control of public affairs.

This is the electoral vote: Wilson, with 41.86 per cent of the popular vote, received 81.92 per cent of the electoral vote. There is a concentration represented in that percentage in the smaller States and the voting power given the smaller States in that system. Roosevelt received 27.4 per cent of the popular vote and got 15.25 per cent of the electoral vote. Taft had 23.18 per cent of the popular vote and got 2.83 per cent of the electoral vote. Debs had nearly 6 per cent of the total popular vote, but got nothing in the electoral vote, not carrying a single State.

This illustrates conclusively that this country at present is not a pure democracy. It was created on the other basis deliberately; there was a purpose in it; and it was to equalize these differences. The relative importance of the individual State continues throughout all these operations. To ignore or weaken it, it seems to me, is decay, and not development; it is not progress, but it is retrogression; it is not creative, but it is destructive. To my mind, it is taking the hands of the human clock of destiny and moving them back on the dial plate of recorded events. Nor can it improve or strengthen government, secure justice, or promote the public welfare. I do not think the influence of a State can or ought to be abrogated in any way by destroying its integrity as one of the original units of governmental creation.

There is another subject to which I desire to allude. I do not want to speak at length upon it, but just enough to put it in line here with the other matters. The electors chosen on the general ticket by a State-wide vote can vote for anybody; they are bound by no human law after they are elected. It will be found on examination of the State statutes that every State in the Union at present elects presidential electors by State-wide vote, and whoever carries the State takes the electors; but neither in the constitutions nor in the statutes of the States, nor in any law known to this country, is there anything to compel an elector to vote for the candidate who carries the State at the election at which the elector himself is elected. That has remained since this country began a matter of honor among men. It is like politics. I think human government would cease to exist; that party organization would be impossible if honor ceased to exist among men. So the electors, bound upon their honor, ordinarily vote for the candidate who carries the State, not because they are legally bound to do so, but because the higher law of human nature enforces upon them its obligation. The popular vote is solely advisory.

How does the name of a candidate for President get on the ballot in a presidential election? Is there anything in the Federal Constitution to authorize it? Nothing. Is there anything outside of the statutes of a State? No. Each State controls. It is provided by statute that candidates for President may have their names printed upon the ballot, so that an advisory vote is had under the forms of law, although it is extra legal in its operation.

It has been argued here—and I have heard it a great many times outside of this Chamber by men whose judgment I sincerely respect and in whose wisdom I have great confidence—that all primary legislation by Congress is unconstitutional and void; that there is no provision to be found in the Constitution to justify it. I do not know of any provision which refers to the voter except in the clause relating to the election of Representatives in Congress, and then, later, in the fifteenth and then the seventeenth amendments, providing for the popular election of Senators. When it comes to the election of President and Vice President the Constitution simply provides that "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives" from that State.

So, if we seek to justify the exercise of this power, I can see two grounds on which to base it. The one is the general police power of the General Government. The police power inheres in every sovereign. Courts decline uniformly to bind the police power by definition; they hesitate even to limit its application by general expressions; they are usually content to decide on a specific case of its exercise before them for adjudication. No sovereign can barter away the police power or absolve itself from the exercise of this salutary authority. It is of universal application. You will not find it in the Constitution. It springs from no specific enumeration of power; but it comes from the same high source from which government itself is derived. It ranges the whole vast field of the public welfare—the health, morals, good order, the regulation of property in both public and private hands, and in a numerous body of specific cases that promotes the common purposes of civil society. It is a reasonable interpretation to say it might be found in the list of enumerated powers in section 8 of the first article, which gives Congress power—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers—

If it stopped there, it would be questionable, but it continues:

and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

If it is valid for Congress or a State to take a popular expression on the election of the President, it follows that the power to regulate the nomination by primary laws exists. Congress may regulate primaries and elections of any elective Federal officer under its general police power, or in the case of Senators and Representatives under section 4 of Article I of the Constitution.

It was said by one Senator who discussed this matter in a very fair way, and who is opposed to the exercise of this power, that primaries have nothing to do with the purity of popular elections. It seems to me they have. It occurs to me that primaries lie at the root of the trouble. The threshold of political decency begins in primaries. If a man will stuff a ballot box in a primary, if he will forge a tally sheet, if he will repeat an organized horde of voters, if he will chalk-mark a voter between the shoulder blades and vote him once, take him down an alley, wash his face, take his coat off, put a different chalk mark on him, and vote him again—when he does that in a primary, whether it is a soap-box or a legalized primary, it is the same thing; it does not make a bit of difference. Fraud is no respecter of persons or regulations. It is the character of the act that stamps the character of the man. A man who will do that in a primary, with or without a law, has laid the moral foundation for evil citizenship in defrauding you or me at an election.

So I think decent primaries are at the threshold of decent elections. A man who swindles me in a primary I would not trust at the November election, because one is equally reprehensible with the other.

Again, Congress has legislated on this question. We have publicity laws. We have laws placing a limitation on expenditures. We must make oath whom we have promised to appoint to office, if anybody. I do not think there have been any promises made since those reports have been coming in here. Nobody ever promises to appoint anybody to office now to get his vote. Possibly they never did it before. I do not know. There have been grave suspicions, however, that it has occurred.

Congress has already recognized party committees, candidates, campaign expenses, the reprehensible feature of bartering away things we do not own, of contaminating the public welfare by plundering public office as a means of control. It has not been attacked in the courts. It has not yet passed the gamut of litigation, but it is in the hands of Congress. Some of us have run under those provisions. So, if it be said that this matter is one beyond the power of Congress, our reply is that we have actually exercised it without question.

I think upon both of the grounds named the power exists.

Now, I want to hurry along. I have a great deal of this matter. It has been growing a long time. It is not a subject that sprang up over night. There are some authorities here on the question of construction. I cite only one. I wish to insert various parts of the text without reading them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. The suggestion of the Senator will be accepted as acted upon.

Mr. SHERMAN. Construction of constitutional power is always permissible. The conditions attending the authors of the text and the developments of new conditions related to the whole are proper to consider. If the range of the text or the spirit of the purpose that animates it can reasonably include subjects which develop from subjects admitted to be within the letter of the text, construction will apply to permit the exercise of the claimed power. Constitutions are not codes of law. They declare and embody principles governing a wide sweep of governmental power. Enumeration of specific cases defeats their end. Human wisdom is inadequate to the enumeration of all cases. Constitution writers therefore limit themselves to the expression of principles. The spirit of the principle and not the letter of the text is the life of the law. Human wisdom can not foresee either cases or conditions in the distant future.

I quote from Lieber:

In the application of "ancient charters to cases arising out of entirely and radically new relations which have sprung up, and which cases nevertheless clearly belong to that province of human action for which the charter was intended."

Francis Lieber, in his "Hermeneutics," therefore defined "construction as the drawing of conclusions respecting subjects that lie beyond the direct expression of the text from elements known from and given in the text, conclusions which are in the spirit though not within the letter of the text."

Section 4 of Article I authorizes Congress to make or alter State statutes on the times and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. At the time its authors penned section 4 nomination difficulties did not exist; election difficulties did. It is not a violent construction with changed conditions to extend the operation of this section so as to cover primary elections for Senators and Representatives. Neither is it a departure from a sound construction to hold that public policy and the police power justify Congress in regulating the manner of nominating candidates for President and Vice President. The nomination imposes upon the presidential electors of the respective parties the moral obligation to respect and obey the popular choice on candidates so nominated who carry the State within which electors are chosen. The fact that such electors may lawfully ignore the popular verdict does not weaken the reasoning to justify the passage by Congress of a primary act; it rather strengthens it. The legislation of the 48 States, with few, if any, exceptions, provides for the election of presidential electors on a general State ticket. The same ballots on which the electors are chosen give them the instruction of their political party previously ascertained by primary or convention or both. The text of section 1, Article II, and the twelfth amendment to the Constitution concerning that article have in the history of this country been so universally subordinated to the popular will as of itself to place a practical

construction upon both the public policy and the police power of Congress.

If the text is itself a declaration of the fundamental principles which we are bound to follow in a certain sphere of action and of certain fundamental forms which are to regulate our actions in this case, constructions signify the discovery of the spirit, principles, and rules that ought to guide us according to the text, with regard to subjects on which that declaration is silent, but which nevertheless belongs to its province. If, for instance, a political constitution or charter has been adopted or granted to regulate our political actions, and a case occurs which has not been directly provided for but which is of an undoubted political character, we have faithfully to search for its true spirit and act accordingly in the case under consideration. Analogy, or rather parallel reasoning, in this signification of construction, is the essential means of effecting it.

In most general adaptation of the term, construction signifies representing of an entire whole from the given elements by just conclusions. Thus, it is said "A few actions may sometimes suffice to construe the whole character of a man."

The spirit of the Constitution is to create a representative republic and not a pure democracy. The preservation of the representative type of government is guaranteed by providing adequate means for public expression in peace and orderly procedure. The Constitution was written in the spirit of a just medium, a moderate course between arbitrary power and popular violence. Every congressional act that preserves this balance adds to the stability of the system. Every bill which speaks in the spirit of the Constitution is the genesis of progressive legislation. It is such legislation that keeps pace with the progress of succeeding generations. It prevents the living from being bound by the pulseless letter of the dead. It seeks rather the spirit that makes alive the text of the wise men of other generations and carries it by comprehensive construction to the affairs of the present. A charter of freedom so construed will never be burst by revolution nor lapse into unrestrained power of either popular caprice or executive despotism nor lose the respect and allegiance of its citizens.

In a bill submitted by the senior Senator from Illinois, known as Senate bill 3922, he has sought to work out a method of making national nominations that respects basic conditions. The figures on which delegates are based are susceptible of change. The bill may not be correct in detail, but it follows out the ideas I have advanced.

Let me tell you where I got most of my authority for writing this bill. The Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party, in 1912, contains the following, the only citation I shall read:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The movement toward more popular government should be promoted, through legislation, in each State which will permit the expression of the preference of electors for national candidates at presidential primaries.

We direct that the national committee incorporate in the call for the next nominating convention a requirement that all expressions of preference for presidential candidates shall be given and the selection of delegates and alternates made through a primary election conducted by the party organization in each State where such expression and election are not provided for by State law. Committeemen who are hereafter to constitute the membership of the Democratic national committee, and whose election is not provided for by law, shall be chosen in each State at such primary elections, and the service and authority of committeemen, however chosen, shall begin immediately upon the receipt of their credentials, respectively.

That is a plank in the Baltimore platform. It is flatly contradictory to the President's message of December 2, 1913. Which shall control—the platform or the President? For which plan will you vote, Senators on the other side of the Chamber? For the Baltimore platform, preserving the local right of expressing sentiment in States, preserving the integrity of the State respecting local conditions in the State under laws you either have now or may hereafter enact, or, if you have no such laws, under rules to be formulated by your State committee? Will you take that, preserving the right of the State to be heard within its own borders and by the terms of its own election law, or will you take the nation-wide primary contained in the President's message?

If you will take the method that respects the right of the State to be heard, I will vote for your bill. I do not care who draws it or who introduces it. There is no politics in that. It is respecting conditions that are as vital to my State as they are vital to any of yours. If, however, you ask me to throw all of the States into the melting pot of a nation-wide primary—Nevada and Rhode Island with Texas and Illinois, Delaware and Connecticut with New York and Pennsylvania—if you ask me to put them all together and obliterate in the management of party affairs the right of the smaller State to be heard, I am against your bill; I will vote against it and do what little I can to defeat it. I believe in respecting basic conditions.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I simply wanted to congratulate the Senator upon the expression of such strong Democratic doctrine. I commend him in his good work, and hope he will go on.

Mr. SHERMAN. I value the approval highly, not only because of its high source, which I respect, but because of its inherent soundness. [Laughter.]

I wish now to read from the platform of a party, or a mass meeting. I do not know just how to designate it yet. It is one of the things that nobody but the Lord and the future can tell.

The national Progressive platform of 1912, to be specific and earnest about it, contains the following plank:

Rule of the people.

That sounds familiar. We have all heard it.

The Progressive Party, committed to the principle of government by a self-controlled democracy expressing its will through representatives of the people, pledges itself to secure such alterations in the fundamental law of the several States of the United States as shall insure the representative character of the Government. In particular the party declares for direct primaries for the nomination of State and National officers.

Why, they did not have hardly a vote in any State of the Union where direct primaries had not been the law for a long time. In our State we passed a law on the 30th of March, 1912, to give them that right in an extraordinary session of the legislature. We were glad to do it. It cost, as I remarked here once before, $130,000; but the fellow that won thought it was worth the money, and the one that lost thought it was a horrible waste of public funds. [Laughter.]

In particular, the party declared for direct primaries for the nomination of State and National officers and for nation-wide presidential primaries. Now, get in line. Let the people rule. I am in favor of the people ruling, but I am in favor of the thinking people ruling. I do not believe in government by ungoverned impulse.

For nation-wide preferential primaries for candidates for the Presidency, for the direct election of United States Senators by the people; and we urge on the States the policy of the short ballot, with responsibility to the people, secured by the initiative, referendum, and recall.

I shall not discuss the last three, since that would be out of order and not pertinent to this inquiry.

This plank executed in legislation would create a primary system in discord with our election system. The enactment of such a measure providing for nation-wide presidential primaries, whether it is advocated by President Wilson in his message of December last or demanded by the Progressive Party platform, would be a reckless plunge into the gulf of experiment. I am saying that to the galleries to carry home with them. I think they can all hear me.

I believe in the maintenance of political parties. No more effective way of directing the operations of great multitudes of men who think alike on vital and elementary questions has ever yet been devised. Some time a better way may be invented, but any destructive critic that comes along must show me the way.

I have no use for a solely destructive critic. I have use for a constructive critic, who can destroy something that has served out its time and can substitute for it something better than the old. I had rather, myself, be the builder of a hut than the destroyer of a palace. I had rather keep political parties as they are now until something better can be devised by the wit of men, than to plunge into the chaos of an unrestrained pure democracy.

I believe in preserving the integrity and purity of political parties. I have no right to intrude myself into another party's affairs and seek to control the nomination of their candidates.

These are the platforms of two political parties. The Republican Party of 1912, in the platform of the Chicago convention, is silent upon that question; so on that subject I am at liberty to follow the Progressive plank or to vote the Democratic ticket, or to take to the woods. As already announced, on that subject I intend to vote with the Democratic Party in this Chamber if the question comes to an issue. I think on that subject they are right. I had rather vote the Democratic ticket on that subject than to vote either the Republican vacancy or the Progressive plank on it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Illinois is predicating his statement upon the idea that the Democratic platform is regarded seriously.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the Senator think that very recent revelations indicate that it is only a very temporary affair, intended to get into power on?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. KENYON. To what does the Senator from Michigan refer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa propounds a query to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I refer to the degree of vigilance with which the majority party are observing the tenets of their party faith. I have been very much surprised to find that they stand so vociferously for a principle to get in on, and abandon it so quickly at the behest of a single member of their party. I am referring particularly to the back somersault on the tolls question that we recently witnessed in another branch of Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the inquiry is certainly justified both by recent events and by some not recent. I confess that I have been sorely afflicted in spirit, in meditating over this question, to know whether the Baltimore platform were a sober document or one that was intended to be airy persiflage or a bit of dry humor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Illinois is a very well-informed and conservative and distinguished Member of this body. I should like to ask him what his present opinion is upon that question.

Mr. SHERMAN. After great travail of spirit I have arrived at the conclusion that it is like it was when Greeley ran for President—that there are irreconcilable differences in our midst. [Laughter.] Now, which is going to win I can not say to the Senator from Michigan. I have my sympathies. I am against the administration on the bill on that subject.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is, the Senator from Illinois does not recognize that all branches of the Government center around and are in absolute control of one man?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir. I might add here, in order to show that my opinions are not born of prejudice, that I intend to vote with the President on the recommendation for the repeal of the exemption-from-tolls clause.

I was not over to-day to hear his message; but I understand he recommended it, and I am in perfect accord with him. I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois failed to witness that scene. The historic Chamber where it took place has been the scene of many important events in the history of this Government. To-day the setting was particularly attractive. The main body of the hall was filled to overflowing with the representatives of the people. The galleries were rich in color and personnel. One particular gallery, however, attracted my notice more than the others. That was the diplomatic gallery, where the representatives of all European countries were assembled; and in their midst, as though by prearrangement, the author of the free-toll plank in the Democratic platform, the premier in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, occupied the most conspicuous place, amid surroundings so rare and so becoming for such a scene, rather than upon the floor, where Americans were gathered for the purpose of listening to an abandonment of an American policy.

Mr. SHERMAN. In order that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be translated into language which the common people will understand, what does the Senator from Michigan mean by "the premier"?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think I ought to change the term. I do not think I should have said "premier." I think I should have said "primer."

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not cavilling upon the pronunciation, but upon the gentleman who possesses the dignity. What is his name? I want it in the RECORD, as the lawyers say, to go up on.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think it is generally admitted that he is the author of the part of the platform adopted by the Democratic Party at Baltimore which has been so ingloriously abandoned.

Mr. SHERMAN. That sufficiently identifies the gentleman.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am quite sure that the very distinguished Secretary of State was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Michigan was in the House of Representatives. Otherwise he would have come down and would have sat beside him. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries must refrain from demonstrations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think that if he had known I was there he would have been quite content to remain away. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has rendered a most valuable public service. There would not appear in the future history of to-day's proceedings, unless it were preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the mad riot of color that prevailed in the diplomatic corps and the distinguished visitor that adorned the gallery as a fit frame to this magnificent setting. I am sure that we all appreciate that, and I am glad to digress long enough to make that acknowledgment. I am glad, too, to say that this is not one of the cases where it is an expensive frame and a cheap work of art. The picture probably is as valuable as the frame. That might arouse some sentiment of antagonism; but in view of the recommendation for the repeal of the law granting exemption from tolls to American coastwise shipping, I am inclined to think that the rich adornment was justified by the result.

To return to the subject in hand, as far as the Republican Party is concerned, we have reached the point where there must be a representation based upon the voting strength of the party. That involves a reorganization of the method of selecting delegates. I have sought to work that out in Senate bill 3922. The principles are elastic. There is no fixed way that we ought to fall out about in executing the purpose. If my first impression is not right, I am willing to take a second or a third or a further view in order to produce the needed results.

Let me generalize. I have some figures here that I will put in, if no objection is made, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mississippi cast for Representatives in Congress, out of her 7 districts, in 1908, not a Republican vote.

In South Carolina out of 7 districts 4 in 1908 and 5 in 1912 cast for Representatives in Congress no Republican votes.

Out of the 36 districts of Texas not a Republican vote for Representatives in Congress got into the returns of a single district.

In other words, there was not a Republican vote for Representatives in Congress in 1908 in 4 districts in Alabama, 2 districts in Arkansas, 9 districts in Georgia, 1 district in Louisiana, 7 districts in Mississippi, 4 districts in South Carolina, and 10 districts in Texas—a total of 42 districts in 7 Southern States entitled to 84 delegates. This delegate voting strength in conventions does not have behind it at the November polls the power of a solitary Republican vote for Representatives in Congress.

The vote for presidential electors in such States is nearly as insignificant. The delegate representation from some 10 States is grossly unfair and demands a radical change, so that voting strength and not mere population shall be represented.

These figures show that there are 42 congressional districts in the United States in which in 1912 there was not a solitary Republican vote cast for Representative. In 1908 there were a few. It is the general history of things political from that part of the Union that the Republican Party, or any party other than the Democratic Party, is conspicuous by its absence. These 42 districts sent 84 delegates. Forty delegates controlled in the last Republican convention. Many times, on controverted questions of nominations, the 84 delegates controlled the nomination. When it comes to the election of a President, not one of the States from which the 84 delegates came can furnish a solitary electoral vote; so it seems to me that it is eminently fit to have some reformation in that line.

Further, I spoke about the Baltimore platform on presidential primaries. I do not know whether that is going to be the end of the difficulties or not. There are several planks that are in discredit. Let us leave temporarily the nation-wide preferential primary, eliminating conventions, throwing everything into a pure democracy, converting every State into an outlying province as in the days of ancient Rome, serving only to foot up the return and send it to the Capitol, and the high candidate takes the nomination. The man with 15 per cent, 20 per cent, or any plurality, just so that it is more than the next high man, is the nominee.

I do not know whether it is going to end there or not, but it is sufficient to say that the Baltimore platform is now in process of dismemberment. Candor would induce me to say that the more it is torn to pieces the better it looks to me. How much of this platform was made by "select spirits," to quote from a senatorial friend of mine, "active, ingenious, and strenuous"; how many planks crept in; and how many detailed suggestions not fully digested procured a lodgment there no one, not even

its responsible authors, seems to know. If the disintegration of this historic document continues, ultimately every plank instead of being a life preserver will become a millstone around the neck of the party which, amid great enthusiasm, before the tumult and the shouting died and the captains and the kings departed, hailed that document as proclaiming the new charter of freedom.

I read in the same platform: "Death to the trusts! Away with the judicial interpretation put upon the Sherman anti-trust act by the judicial tribunal sitting a few feet from this Chamber!"

Then we have a bill for a trade commission, one of the five brothers affectionately so called by those who hate them. What will the trade commission do? It is to investigate, to find out things, to search into the vital organs of the trust and see whether it is framed right, whether it is behaving itself, whether it is a good one, in other words, or a bad one.

The antitrust plank criticizes the decision of the Supreme Court on that subject. Then this bill that comes in here, to my profound, unspeakable astonishment, as I read it, creates a perambulating commission to go to and fro upon this continent selecting the good from the bad. Upon whom will its maledictions fall? Upon whom will the lightning descend? Upon bad trusts? Who will decide the bad trusts? From what high authority does the commission spring? From the same one that recommends nation-wide primaries and sets aside the Baltimore plank on the same subject. It is his recommendation. It is executive legislation proposed. His will governs every appointment on that commission.

For my part, as a believer of the judicial system framed by the men in Philadelphia, if this much-criticized document called the United States Constitution is preserved, I prefer that whether a corporation be a good one or a bad one shall be decided by the judicial tribunal a few hundred feet from here, in accordance with the law and order that prevail in representative democracy. I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court, commonly known as the rule-of-reason decision, is a safer code under which the business of this country may be conducted than a perambulating commission of the President's appointment, who rise and fall with the fluctuations of successive campaigns. So there is another plank out of gear.

The publicity plank I turn to in that same platform. That was good reading at the time it was first written. It fell like a refreshing shower upon the agitated multitude in pit and gallery. The publicity plank favors giving the world the recommendations, verbal and written, upon which presidential appointments are made.

If you want my private opinion about that, I think it is unadulterated moonshine. Of course the Senators on the minority side undertook to give them some of their own medicine. They must justify themselves that way whatever they may believe. But I do not think anything of the original merit of the principle. I suppose Senators were a good deal like Tom Sawyer was when his aunt's cat came into his room. The cat curled his feline tail and squalled and let on like he wanted something. Tom was playing sick and was home that day, and his aunt had put him to bed. She had taken him at his word. She had located the scene of trouble some place down in the digestive tract and had been giving him pain killer. Tom construed the cat's conduct to mean that he wanted some of the pain killer. He said, "If you don't want the pain killer don't you ask for it," but the cat continued, and he slipped a tablespoonful down the cat's esophagus with tremendous results.

If you did not want it, why did you ask for it? It is fine to run a campaign on, but it is most uncomfortable to make an administration out of. You know it is not practicable. There is not a Federal judge fit to be appointed who would likely favor that those who recommend him be published to the world. That is the province of the Chief Executive, and I want to talk to some of the people in the gallery who listened to his message. You conduct a campaign on one plank, but when you are elected it is repudiated as impracticable.

I drop down a little further and I come to another horrifying spectacle that adds supremely to the gaiety of nations, a single presidential term. It has not made a bit of progress. The silence on that subject is something that borders on the abysmal depths of the boundless infinite.

The canal-tolls exemption I come to. I agree with the President on that. I do not agree with his party platform.

That plank seems to be what sailors call up in the lake country a stowaway. I do not know what they call it on salt water. I am not a salt-water sailor. But this plank seems to be a stowaway. It got into the platform and away it went over the high seas of American politics flying the befitting flag of economy and reform. Nobody discovered it until the party craft arrived in port at the following November election, and now to-day there is an effort to throw the stowaway overboard and to execute every member of the crew who mutinies on board. There is where you are drifting to now.

As I said yesterday, sometimes we travel so fast that we lose sight of the milestones; and I think some of my Democratic friends are a little color blind. [Manifestations of laughter and applause in the galleries.]

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will turn this way—there are a large number of Democrats present who can not hear him with his face toward the east.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to hear the Senator, because he always speaks entertainingly and instructively. I can not understand him when his back is turned toward me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries must refrain from demonstrations. Under the rules it is absolutely incumbent upon the presiding officer to preserve order in the galleries, and order will have to be maintained. The Chair hopes he will not have to call attention to it again.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not taken very much time, and I speak with becoming modesty, I think; but I am remembering that they declared in favor of an income tax. Well, we got one at last. How does it work out? Let me tell you. Most of us have made our returns by this time and sent them to the internal-revenue collector of our district. I have helped some of my friends, by correspondence and otherwise, who did not have that lucid understanding of the law that the general public is by force of circumstances compelled to have. Everybody knows the law, but nobody knew what this law was—not even a lawyer. So I went to figuring it out about exemptions. A man running a grocery shop over here in the northwest part of Washington, where I live, has a horse and a delivery wagon and a stock of groceries. He can insure his stock, he can pay the rent on his house, he can pay the plumber's bill and the clerical help and the driver of the wagon, and insure the wagon, and get a live-stock policy on the horse, and take every dollar of it out as a deduction. He may have half a dozen children and as good a wife as ever lived, and if he has a $5,000 insurance policy on his own life he can not take out a penny of the cost of the insurance. That is the way it works. It promotes the insurance of horses and discourages the insurance of human beings.

I do not think I ought to take any more time, Mr. President, and I will not, except to state that the Republicans had a great factional struggle in 1912. Our Democratic friends have been talking consecutively for many weary months about the rule of the people. The votes of 41 per cent of them, 6,300,000, went into the ballot box in November, 1912. The votes that were not Democratic, coming from the two wings of the Republican Party, aggregated nearly 8,000,000, against the six million and nearly three hundred thousand Democratic votes. When the rule of the Democratic people is considered, therefore, it is the minority rule. I can understand why the President is in favor of a presidential nation-wide primary. It will promote and continue minority rule instead of a rule of the majority of the people.

I want to refer briefly to the Republican national convention held in Chicago in June, 1912, and its result, a remarkable instance of a divided majority defeated by a united minority.

Of the 7,604,518 voters who separated on that day, practically all believed alike on every vital permanent public issue before the American people for 52 years then and to-day. All are protectionists. All resisted free silver. All believed in the anti-trust laws and reasonable changes in them when needed. All believed in the just regulation of the common carriers of the country, in the great elementary acts that safeguard the life and health of the people seen in pure-food and meat-inspection laws. All believed in an efficient national health service. All believed in the conservation of our resources by reasonable laws. All believed in adequate public defenses on land and sea, in the building and maintaining of a Navy, in the adequate development and maintenance of the Regular Army. They believed in stable government for our island possessions and in extending to their people self-government only to keep steady pace with their ability to wisely exercise it. The wage earners had received at their hands legislation that kept step with the progress of events. Safety appliance and inspection laws, the limitation of hours of labor, and the liability law marked acts of Congress within its constitutional power. Many Republican administrations and many Republican States, through their legislatures, had given laws to safeguard, to sanitate, and compensate labor. Publicity provisions and child-labor laws had worked out social justice of a practical and progressive character. Constitutional amendments, both State and National, were then and are now in a fair way to be adopted that will sufficiently relax undue delay or difficulty in amending the Constitution. The

law-abiding people who compose both elements of the Republican Party do not wish constitutional amendments to be made so easy and expeditious as to lose the necessary stability and useful permanence that gives value to our Constitution in this country.

Impeachment proceedings were then and are now the subject of investigation, with a view of relaxing somewhat the rigid practice under which procedure is now had. The party had uniformly in itself for more than half a century of its existence been keenly responsive to every practical progressive movement.

In the regulations of interstate commerce both elements are in substantial accord. A corporation, though State created, if it engage in commerce among the several States or with foreign nations becomes an instrument of such commerce and subject to its laws. All believe and know that the Constitution of the United States designedly carries general powers, national in character, within its grasp and was and is not a code of laws. It was a comprehensive charter of national life. Its principles, not burdened with enumerated details, carried in their sweep all unenumerated, but necessary, and incidental powers. These express powers written in the Constitution have been construed, interpreted, and applied by wise and just decisions of Federal courts. Many acts of Congress have exercised in detail the great sovereign powers conferred upon that department of Government. The spirit of the Constitution has been kept and its vital powers administered with singular fidelity by each department as distributed to it. In peace and in war it has stood the strain and steadily met the purposes intended by the fathers who wrote it and the people of the original States who ratified it. Seventeen amendments testify to the responsive character of its structure to organic change.

It emerged from a great Civil War unimpaired, with its vital forces undiminished. All the 35 States that have since been admitted on the same footing as the Thirteen Original States have but added strength to this indispensable bond of our national life. No departure from constitutional lines is justified by any seemingly imperative wants of the hour. All of the voters of the Republican Party, of both elements, believe in following the established channels of procedure in adopting constitutional amendments. All believe if the great expansion of national life has produced problems with which the States can no longer successfully deal, the Nation will assume that authority in a lawful way. The interval of sober reflection, when the saving second thought has been taken, will, however, reject impatient haste to destroy these wise safeguards of civil liberty by ignoring the salutary restraints that constantly attend constitutional amendment.

The Republican voters believe that wherever a corrupt union of business and politics has interfered with the proper powers of Government the voters themselves, acting as a united party, can remedy it by union more speedily than by division, and the resulting success of the Democratic Party. The publicity law, limiting the expenditure of candidates for the nomination and election of Representatives and Senators in Congress, and requiring the sources of contribution to be published, was originally passed by a Republican Congress. Such laws are an aid in reforming the abuses complained of. There is no more invisible government possible in the one element of the Republican voters than in the others. The voters of neither element believe in an invisible power behind public officers. Government is public. Republican voters united can be depended upon to make it and keep it public, so that all may know to whom public officers owe their allegiance. Political parties do exist now and always have to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people. They are instruments to promote the general welfare. The Republican voters, united by such common beliefs, can not promote that public welfare by dividing their strength and placing the Democratic minority party in power to administer the Government and deal with current issues.

The destruction of the protective system in the recently enacted tariff law is a heavy blow to the wageworkers and producers of our country. Under the pretense of reducing the high cost of living the Democratic Party has cut our pay rolls in two and reduced nothing but the ability of American labor to earn a living. The industrial depression we now feel is the result of our division in the last election. The injurious effect of the Democratic practice of giving our markets away and transferring our pay rolls to foreign countries is now plain. Nearly 8,000,000 voters who oppose such Democratic legislation have it in their power to repeal it and restore our industries and pay rolls to more prosperous conditions. The nearly 8,000,000 voters believe in an income tax properly imposed. They do not believe in the present income-tax law, that is impracticable, vexatious, and unreasonable. Its classifications are unjust. The method of its collection is burdensome and annoying. The cost of its administration is excessive.

The civil-service laws, State and National, have been enacted by the Republican Party. Such measures have been stamped with the approval of the Republican voters. Such laws have been broken down in national affairs by covert attacks by a Democratic Congress and in a Democratic administration.

The internal-revenue employees of the income-tax section of the new tariff law are by express provision removed from the operation of the civil-service laws.

The appointments provided for in the currency bill are exempted from the civil-service law and made party patronage. In the Senate there was a tie vote on an amendment placing such employees under the civil-service law, which was broken by its ex officio presiding officer, whose vote exempted all those appointments from the law.

All questions of industrial and social justice can be advanced much more speedily and with greater certainty by a union of those who think alike. If there be evils in party management, the Republican house can be cleansed from within more certainly and much sooner than to pull it down and undertake to build a new structure that will prevail against a united but minority Democratic Party.

These considerations appeal to the nearly 8,000,000 voters who cast a divided vote in the ballot boxes in November, 1912. The ambitions of those who assume to be leaders, who seek to serve personal ends by continuing this division, ought to be disregarded.

Certain methods of the Republican national convention in Chicago in 1912 can be justified by an appeal to neither fairness nor justice. Neither can those who attempt to make this a basis for the destruction of the Republican Party in the future justify that course if they persevere. Shall the quarrel of alleged leaders disrupt and destroy the union of 8,000,000 voters? Whose party is it—the organization's party, the candidates', their managers and lieutenants'? Is it owned by officeholders, by those who dispense or wish to dispense patronage, by those who are ambitious of place or power? Is the national committee the party?

Every man in active politics in the Republican Party to-day, or between 1908 and 1912, knows that the same rules governed the convention of 1912 that governed the convention of 1908. They were useful to the candidate or persons who were able to invoke the rules for their purposes. Those rules were wrong in 1908. They were equally wrong in 1912.

The Republican Party is too vitally interwoven with the fortunes and destinies of the American people to be destroyed by a single defeat or a series of defeats. Its record is the most illustrious in the field of American politics. Its legislation and its administrations have been the most potential for good and the most progressive since constitutional government began on this continent. It can not be hoped by those once or yet of the Republican household who have raised their hand to destroy that they can succeed. They can reform, quicken, and make more efficient agencies for good within the party structure. To go beyond means many years of weary defeat, of delayed purposes, of hindered progress, of continued minority rule of the Democratic Party, and ultimate failure. Party life, like government, reorganizes, reforms, readjusts itself and its instrument of service to new ends and new issues born of changing time.

Republicans who are Progressives, or Progressives who are Republicans need not spend time in fruitless controversy about whether the division of the 1912 election will or will not destroy the Republican Party. What both want is results. Can we produce them by separating and electing Democrats? It will be useless to discuss whether separation will create a third party which will eventually become a victorious one. Politics, like history, repeats itself. The Democratic Party met its great division and disaster in 1860. It, too, is an ancient party. It divided on the vital questions of disunion and slavery. The convention at Charleston, S. C., split asunder. In the ensuing election Douglas received 1,375,157 votes. Breckinridge received 847,514 out of a total Democratic vote of 2,222,671. Reduced to percentages, Douglas received 62 per cent and Breckinridge 38 per cent of the total Democratic vote. As stated, Roosevelt had 54 per cent and Taft 46 per cent of the total Republican vote. Breckinridge had but a little over 60 per cent of Douglas's popular vote, while Taft had nearly 85 per cent of Roosevelt's vote. Douglas had 24 per cent more than Breckinridge, and Roosevelt 8 per cent more than Taft. This division, great as it was, did not destroy the Democratic Party. Breckinridge, while receiving but 18 per cent of the popular vote, had 72 electoral votes to 12 electoral votes for Douglas. Even John Bell, Constitutional Union Party candidate, received 39 electoral votes, although he had but a little over 12

per cent of the popular vote as against nearly 30 per cent of the popular vote cast for Douglas and nearly 40 per cent cast for Lincoln, who received 180 electoral votes, while Taft had over 23 per cent, Roosevelt over 27 per cent, and Wilson 41 per cent of the total vote cast in 1912, with 15, 81, and 435 electoral votes, respectively. All of the States that gave their electoral vote to Breckinridge passed ordinances of secession save three. Even this terrific chasm in the Democratic Party by a civil war did not destroy it. The rebellious States did not participate in the subsequent election of 1864. The tremendous influence of union sentiment solidified the loyal States for many years. Gradually that sentiment relaxed as the danger of disunion became more remote following reconstruction and rehabilitation of the union on a stronger, broader basis.

The Democratic Party, however, survived the cataclysm and is to-day in this Senate, the House of Representatives, and the administration, the same Democratic Party as in 1860 and prior years, save that it has disowned and repudiated disunion and slavery. The party organization, its spirit and party name, survived a series of defeats and a mighty rebellion. Is not this lesson of party vitality and solidarity instructive to those who propose to destroy the Republican Party? Those who seek to lay fratricidal hands on the party life ought to reflect that its great organic principles have not materially varied since the days when Lincoln inspired it with purpose and a long line of Republican Presidents has illuminated its path with splendid achievements. Such a party with vital principles of government as its basis and a capacity for future good is not destined to perish by a single defeat or a series of defeats. Political history does not justify such a prediction nor present issues or conditions warrant such an assertion.

It is for us to say whether we will so conduct ourselves that nearly 8,000,000 voters in this country who are anti-Democratic to the core will again unite their differences, compose their divisions, and march to the ballot box in sufficient numbers to overwhelm minority government and restore government that will permit business to be done under the decisions of the Supreme Court; that will permit business in this country to be done by our own people and not transfer pay rolls to another country; that will not land 8,000,000 bushels of corn from Argentina at New York City in the last two months breaking the price of corn in this country 10 cents a bushel. That is the only reduction in the high cost of living that has been made up to this time. They mention reform and economy in a platform, and then after having changed the fiscal system of the country show a deficit of $12,000,000 in three months; and the only way it can be met is to promise that on the 30th day of next June there will be enough of this income tax collected to make good the deficiency. That is the only thing that is promised up to this time.

I thought, Mr. President, so long as woman suffrage was under discussion and it was proposed to extend to her one of the sovereign rights of an American citizen, it would be proper to give information along with this question about a little practical politics and what a plank means. If you do not mean to keep a platform you ought not to write it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not quite agree with the Senator on the extent of three months' deficit. It certainly amounts to more than $12,000,000. Perhaps the Senator would welcome a correct statement.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator has a correction, I would be very glad to have it. It is about $4,000,000 a month, as I figure it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In December, 1912, we sold $29,000,000 worth of products to Canada. In December, 1913, we sold $26,000,000 worth to Canada. In December, 1912, we sold $40,000,000 worth of products to Germany. In December, 1913, $33,000,000. Meanwhile we were buying $17,000,000 from France in 1913 compared with $14,000,000 in December, 1912; and we were buying $18,000,000 from Germany as compared with $14,000,000 in December, 1912. In other words, the balance of trade is running against us at both ends of the line, and the second promised advantage of near free trade fails utterly to materialize.

Our customs receipts for December, 1912, were $24,000,000, as compared with $21,000,000 in December, 1913, a loss of a little over $3,000,000. Our customs receipts for January, 1913, were $29,000,000, and for January, 1914, $23,000,000, a loss of about $6,000,000. The policies that our political opponents have seen fit to put upon the country in practical legislation have not only destroyed our selling market but have increased our purchasing market in Europe, to the great detriment of our domestic producers.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator's statement is undoubtedly correct. It refers to the balance of trade between imports and exports and the customs duties collected. I refer to the Treasury account, the bank book of the Nation, what is taken in each month in cash and what is paid out; and in November, December, and January the expenditures exceed the income, in round numbers, by $12,000,000. In other words, there is a deficit in the cash account of about $4,000,000 a month, making about $50,000,000 if it runs that way in the course of 12 months, unless the prophetic insight of the income tax will be sufficient to meet it on the 30th day of June, 1914.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That does not take into account the reckless indifference to the domestic sugar industry, which has not yet felt the full blighting effects of the new free-trade bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is certainly true and material. So, it seems to me, in view of the appropriation bills pending and of the deficit——

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Illinois is making a very comprehensive speech, and I am sure he wants to be not only accurate but desires to cover the whole ground. He suggested a moment ago that corn was the only product or article which had been reduced in price by the tariff law lately enacted. I want to remind him that not very long ago, according to the newspapers, a very distinguished member of the administration was challenged to point out some article the price of which had fallen since the enactment of the tariff law, and he very promptly replied that he could think of but one article upon which the tariff had had such an effect, and that was golf balls, it having been generally understood that we can buy golf balls a little cheaper now than we could before the tariff law was passed. I want the Senator from Illinois not to overlook that very important item in his review of the situation.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a splendid addition to my repertoire. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I call his attention to another matter?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator says that the price of corn has gone down. Has the price of corn meal gone down? Has the dear, ultimate consumer gotten any benefit? The price of barley has gone down. Does the ultimate consumer get his beer any cheaper than he did before? The price of oats has gone down. Are Quaker Oats less at the retail store than they were before? So we can take all the things the Senator has mentioned and we will find that the ultimate consumer has not got anything cheaper.

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir; it is absorbed between the consumer and the producer some place. At least there is no material difference to the man who pays the bill at the last end of it.

Now, there were many highly entertaining avenues which I desired to explore, but I am reminded by looking at the clock that I have already exceeded the limits of senatorial courtesy. At some future occasion, if I am spared by an indulgent Lord, I will complete my chapter.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am an earnest believer in woman suffrage. I was an active participant in the campaign in California which resulted in granting to the women of my State the suffrage. I have never had reason to doubt the wisdom or the justice of that course. I have never yet heard what seemed to me to be a legitimate, reasonable, or even persuasive argument against the right of women to vote.

Women are American citizens. They are just as intelligent and just as well educated, and probably better educated, than the men. They have just as much interest in the welfare of the country as the men. They have a greater interest in the preservation of the home and the protection of the children of the country. They are allowed to own and do own property under the laws of every State in the Union, and they are entitled to have it protected the same as is the property of men. Then why should they not be granted the franchise? The only answer is that they are women.

Some maintain that politics is so corrupt and the elections are such that women can not go to the polls and participate in the politics of the country without contamination. Is it not a humiliating confession for the men of this country to make that they have made politics so corrupt that a respectable woman can not participate in an election without contaminating her?

If that be the condition of things, then we men had better step aside and turn over this Government to the women.

One of the things that has been accomplished by allowing the women to participate in elections has been to elevate and purify the politics of my State. Where we formerly held our elections behind livery stables and, in some parts of the State, behind saloons, our election booths are now in the schoolhouses or in tents; and any woman of my State can go to the polls and be treated just as politely and with just as much consideration as she would be treated in her own parlor.

Some people maintain—among them, I am sorry to say, some of the women—that women are too good to participate in the politics and the elections of the country. I want to say that there is no one man or woman who is too good to be an American citizen with all that that means.

I am not going to detain the Senate by any lengthy discussion of this question. It has been thoroughly discussed by others. The women of my State can speak for themselves much better than I can speak for them. I had printed in the RECORD a few days ago an address from a committee of women in my home city dealing with this question. I do not know whether Senators have taken the time or have had the opportunity to read what they say on the subject. I know all these good women. I know them personally. They are women of high character, splendid American citizens capable of dealing with a great question like this. I want to read to the Senate some extracts from what they say on the subject. Under the head "Results of woman suffrage," they say:

Suffrage has given a new interest, purpose, and effectiveness to the thousands of women's clubs throughout the State and has brought scores of new organizations into being for the express purpose of equipping the women with a knowledge of government and civics.

Women have registered and voted at regular and special elections in practically the same, and in some instances larger, proportion than the men.

Equal suffrage has stimulated the men as well as the women to a greater interest in civic affairs.

It has resulted in putting better, cleaner, and more public-spirited men into office.

It has given us more convenient and respectable polling places.

It has been the means of accomplishing what male suffrage alone never has accomplished and probably never would accomplish—the recall of an unfit judge.

It has resulted in the enactment of laws concerning health, morals, child welfare, and female civil rights, for which the women while unenfranchised had for years pleaded in vain.

It has not resulted in a scramble for office on the part of women; on the contrary, the women, as a class, recognizing their lack of political training, have so far deliberately refrained from seeking office.

It has not resulted in corrupting the women; it has resulted in bettering the men, precisely as men always are uplifted and strengthened in any field of endeavor in which women are permitted to share with them their labors and problems.

It has not resulted in breaking up the home; it has strengthened the home ties by reason of a broader mutuality of interests.

It has not caused the women to neglect their duties; both as citizens and as mothers, it has enabled them to meet their responsibilities with greater intelligence and efficiency.

Further than this brief summary of results, it is right that some of the lessons of the suffrage campaign and the consequent enfranchisement of women should be further developed.

Further along, under the head "What women want," they have this to say:

Women are asking simply for the right to fulfill their traditional duties, to do those things for which they are fitted by their natural instincts and long training as protectors of the home and the guardians of children. They are citizens, they have responsibilities, and yet the right to do their duty and fulfill these responsibilities is denied them.

It is proper to ask what are the results of suffrage, what women are doing with the ballot, and whether they are using it. But these things are, after all, only incidental to the main issue, which is that responsibility develops character and that the strength of a democracy rests on the intelligence, morality, and character of its citizens.

Suffrage is the right of every citizen in a democracy, and it belongs to women by every right of reason, logic, and justice. Women, as human beings and as citizens, should have the right to every possible means of education, every developing experience, every avenue of self-expression, and the opportunity of service.

Verily, the woman of California has found in the ballot an added responsibility. But the responsibility born of her being, as she earnestly believes, is one to which she promptly responds. Instinctively she welcomes it as a means to a broader and more effective expression of life. Never in the history of the world has woman asked for any right, any privilege, save only that she might make of it a responsibility for the better discharge of her duties to the race. In the evolution of government, the State has been gradually taking unto itself the duties that the Creator Himself has labeled as feminine—the care and education of the child and the preservation of the purity and health of the home. Therefore it is that the woman of to-day is demanding a voice and a place in the political household; and therefore it is that the woman of California rejoices in spirit that this new civic responsibility is truly hers.

To her sisters throughout the Nation and the world she extends the hand of fellowship and of good cheer, and the glad assurance that in this larger significance of life she is finding increased strength and power and manifold possibilities for good, and she hopes that her own political life will be such that it will make the entrance into political equality easier for all other women. She does not wish to take man's place in the world, but because she is a woman and man's complement, she wishes to be his comrade and coworker for the good of the community and the uplift of the race.

Mr. President, women who can present their case as these women have done ought not to be compelled to plead with the men of this country to allow them the privilege of taking on the responsibilities of American citizenship; and we have thousands of such women in the State of California. There is no more intelligent class of citizens anywhere in this country or anywhere else, better educated, better fitted to take on the duties and responsibilities of citizenship than the women of my State.

Some women do not vote, and neither do some men, Mr. President. They have not yet learned the duties and the responsibilities of citizenship in a country like ours. That, in part, accounts for the condition of apparent neglect on the part of women to respond to this duty; but there are other reasons, for which the men themselves are responsible. There are too many men who, after the franchise had been granted to women, used their influence with their wives and their daughters to prevent them from going to the polls, and much of the lack of interest on the part of the women in my State and many of the cases where they have not gone to the polls and voted have been the result of this sort of influence on the part of the men of the State. Whatever may be said in defense of the man who opposes woman suffrage, there is absolutely no defense that can be made for him, after suffrage becomes a part of the law of his State, if he undertakes to influence his wife or his daughter or anybody else to stay away from the polls. He is to that extent a traitor to his country, and is violating its laws. I have no sympathy and I have no respect for the man who uses his influence upon anyone, whether it be his wife or not, to induce her to neglect the duties of citizenship.

Mr. President, I have had but one doubt in my own mind in dealing with this question. I have no doubt of the justice of granting the franchise to women; I do not believe that the men of this country can justify themselves upon any ground for withholding it, but I have had my doubts about the wisdom or the propriety or the justice of reaching this question by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which we propose, if it has its full effect, to practically force woman suffrage upon States where neither the men nor the women desire it; but, looking at it from the legal standpoint, there is no reason why this may not be done. The Constitution provides for it. The separate States came into the Union under the express provision of the Constitution that three-fourths of their number might modify or change the Constitution after such a proposition had passed the Congress of the United States by the requisite number of votes. A good many amendments to the Constitution have been made that were distasteful to some of the States in the Union; that will doubtless be so in this instance, but the right can not be questioned. It is only a matter of propriety as to whether it should be done in this way or not. While I have doubted about that, I have concluded, notwithstanding, as I believe so sincerely in the principle of woman suffrage, that I shall for that reason support the joint resolution proposing this amendment.

Mr. FOMERENE. Mr. President, in the few remarks I shall make this afternoon I want it distinctly understood that I speak as a friend of woman suffrage, but I am unalterably opposed to this joint resolution. I do not believe that it is proper for the people of any State to deny to the people of another State the right to vote if they want it. I do not believe that it is the right of one State to force upon another State the obligation to vote if that State does not want it.

Probably 10 or 15 years ago in my own State of Ohio the women were given the right to vote on all school questions. Since that time not 2 per cent of the women of that State have exercised that privilege. When the law was passed I felt that it was simply the first step toward complete suffrage to the women of my own State. In my judgment, they have shown by the fact that they do not exercise it that they do not want the right to vote. If there can be any doubt about this proposition, it seems to me that there was a very clear expression of opinion in 1912, when the people of my State voted upon the question of amending the constitution. During that fall 42 amendments to the State constitution were submitted. Thirty-four of those amendments were adopted and eight were defeated. Those votes were discriminating in character. Some of the amendments were defeated by a very large vote; some by a very small vote; some were adopted by a very large vote and some were adopted by a very small vote.

There were less than 600,000 votes cast out of a total voting population of over 1,250,000. For those amendments which were carried the highest majority was 220,584 and the lowest majority 4,069. For those amendments which were defeated the highest vote against an amendment was 87,455 and the lowest was 1,079. On the woman-suffrage amendment, after a very

strenuous campaign throughout the State, the vote was for the amendment 249,420, the vote against the amendment was 336,875. The majority against it was 87,455. In that campaign I had the privilege, because of engagements here in Washington, to speak only once, but I spoke in favor of woman suffrage and I voted in favor of woman suffrage; and if it is proposed again to amend the constitution of my own State I will vote for any amendment granting to the women of my State the right of suffrage; but because the people of my State have voted against it, do the people of some other State claim the right to say she shall have it? As one of those who voted for woman suffrage and on behalf of the 249,420 people who voted for it, I deny to Mississippi or any of the other Southern States the right to say that we shall not have it. On the other hand, on behalf of the 336,875 men who voted against it, I deny the right of Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, or any other State to say that we shall have it, whether we want it or not.

I recognize the fact that the Congress has the right to pass this joint resolution if we consider it from the standpoint of power alone; but if we are to consider it from the standpoint of policy, I deny that it should be done. If because it is requested of Congress we shall say that no State shall discriminate against woman because of her sex, then, likewise, if some one sees fit to do it, a similar resolution could be presented denying to the States the right to grant women the suffrage. I would not do that; I do not believe that any Senator would present such a resolution; but if it were presented, what an outcry there would be from the States which have already granted the right of suffrage to women; and they would be justified. If they have the right—and they do have the right—to declare what shall be their own policy within their own boundaries, they ought not to claim the right to say what shall be done in other States where the environment and conditions may be entirely different.

Mr. President, there are, I believe, nine States that have granted to women the right of suffrage. In those nine States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Arizona, Kansas, and California there is a population in round numbers of 7,800,000. If the proposition were to submit an amendment of this character to a popular vote in the United States, and it could be done under the Constitution, it would not be so objectionable; but let us analyze the figures for a moment and see what justice there is in it. None of us know it to be a fact, but I believe if it had been suggested at the time the Federal Constitution was adopted that the Government at large should control the right of suffrage and other local matters in the several States, the Constitution would never have been adopted.

In the 12 smallest States of the Union—North Dakota, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Montana, Utah, Vermont, New Mexico, Idaho, Arizona, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada—there are 3,943,009 people, according to the census of 1910. In the 12 largest States—New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Michigan, Indiana, Georgia, New Jersey, and California—there are 50,775,616 people, according to the census of 1910, out of a total population by that census in the 48 States of 91,972,266; so that the 12 States last referred to embrace more than one-half the population of the entire country. In the 12 smallest States to which I have referred there are less than 4,000,000 people. In those 12 States, with 3,943,009 people, they would have 12 votes in determining whether or not an amendment should be attached to the Constitution.

In the State of New York, according to the last Federal census, there were 9,113,614 people. In other words, the Empire State has about two and one-half times as many people as the 12 smallest States which I have named, and yet, when it comes to engrafting upon the Constitution of the United States an amendment of this momentous importance we are giving to less than 4,000,000 people twelve times the voice that we are giving to the more than 9,000,000 people of the State of New York.

Let us go further with this. Suppose, for the sake of the argument, that the people of the State of New York were unanimously against this amendment, with her 9,000,000 people, she would be powerless against the less than 4,000,000 people in the other 12 States. But, more than that—I am speaking now of the people as a whole—when it comes to this amendment, the people as a whole have no voice. There is no way by which we can count heads on this proposition. In the State of Nevada, the smallest State in point of population in the Union, where, according to the last Federal census, there were 81,875 people, there are, I am told, 75 members of both branches of the general assembly of that State. It is possible for a mere majority of a quorum in each house in the General Assembly of Nevada to adopt this amendment. In other words, a quorum of 75 people in both houses would have the right to say that the women of New York shall have the right to vote; and New York can not determine that question for herself, even though the voice of that State would be unanimously against the proposition.

Let me suggest, if we are to assume that this is a movement for moral uplift, that there is no movement in favor of morality at any time that dares or can afford to adopt unfair measures or unfair means to obtain it. I hope that my own State shall soon be added to the number of those that will give to women the full right of suffrage.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. POMERENE. I hope that the movement of woman's empire will be eastward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. POMERENE. In just a moment; but I hope that each State will have the right to determine that question for itself.

I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. Would not the argument the Senator is making against amending the Constitution in this way apply to all amendments? If 12 States contain a majority of the people of the United States, then the smaller States may force upon those 12 States an amendment upon suffrage or anything else that will be obnoxious to them.

Mr. POMERENE. Undoubtedly the Senator's statement is correct from the standpoint of law.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then does the Senator think the majority which the Constitution requires for an amendment to the Constitution is not great enough? Does the Senator think a smaller number than 12 States ought to be able to prevent the amendment of the Constitution?

Mr. POMERENE. I do not. When it comes to matters which are national in character, I have no objection to the present form of amendment provided for in the Constitution; but when it comes to matters which address themselves particularly to a locality or to a State, the situation is quite different. It is now within the power of the people in every State to give to her women the right to vote if they see fit; and I hope they will see fit so to do. It is not necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States in order to secure suffrage to women within the limits of any State. Each State can do that now for itself.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I venture to suggest to the Senator that since the people of Ohio select Members of Congress and United States Senators who pass laws to control the remainder of the people of the United States, it would imply an interest on the part of the other people of the United States in the manner in which these representatives are selected. I will ask the Senator if that is not really true?

Mr. POMERENE. I am not sure that I catch the import of the Senator's question.

Mr. OWEN. The import is that the remaining parts of the Union are much concerned in the manner in which Senators and Members of Congress are elected in Ohio or in New York or Pennsylvania, because those Representatives and those Senators vote upon the rights and interests of other parts of the Union, and therefore other parts of the Union have really a genuine interest in their election.

Mr. POMERENE. Undoubtedly there is an indirect interest in everything which pertains to the welfare of the people; but we have not arrived in this country at the point where we are willing to blot out State lines. We are forty-eight sovereignties, joined together in the Federal Union; and when a question relates to matters which apply so peculiarly to each of the States, as the right of suffrage and kindred subjects, in my judgment, the States should control them.

Mr. President, I have heard during this discussion many stock arguments against woman suffrage and many stock arguments in favor of it. I do not attach any weight to the arguments of either class. We have heard Senators on the floor of the Senate speak of the splendid laws that have been adopted in their various States where there is woman suffrage. I am glad they have been. I am particularly glad they have woman suffrage if they can not get those laws any other way; but if we will examine the record, I think we will find that for every good law that has been passed in a woman-suffrage State a correspondingly good law has been passed in nearly every other State.

I may not be entirely exact in this statement; but I dare say that an examination of the statute books of the State of Ohio will show a good law, one for the betterment of womankind and for children and for men, for every good law that

was passed in Oregon or Colorado or Wyoming. As an abstract proposition, I am for woman suffrage for this reason alone—that I do not ask any political privilege which I do not want my good wife to have.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. If I understand the position of the Senator with reference to the right of the States to preserve their individuality, I do not disagree with him; but I wish to say to the Senator with reference to the passage of laws in woman-suffrage States, that there are a number of instances in which laws bearing upon particular subjects were sought to be passed for years prior to the adoption of woman suffrage in those States the passage of which followed immediately after the adoption of woman suffrage. It demonstrates the fact that there is a class of laws, very important in these days, that pass through the legislative halls much more rapidly where there are women voting in the State than where they are not.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator's statement is entirely correct, but it does not state the whole truth. In the other States, where man suffrage exists alone, for years and for years efforts have been made to get through good laws; and all at once the scales seem to have fallen from the eyes of the legislatures, and bills that were pending became laws. In the United States Senate, time and time again, efforts have been made to pass laws, but because there was some mysterious influence at work or perhaps because there may have been a change of viewpoint these laws later were passed; and yet there was not woman suffrage here.

I think we are nearer the truth when we say that the average of both man and woman is advancing, and that the good legislation we are now getting is the result of that advanced opinion. It is not due to one sex more than to the other. It is due to both.

Mr. President, shortly after I came to the Senate there was a joint resolution pending for the purpose of admitting to the sisterhood of States the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona. The Federal administration at that time used every effort to exclude those Territories because they insisted upon having in their constitutions a provision for the initiative and referendum. Those who were friendly to the admittance of the States and favored that doctrine insisted that that was a matter which addressed itself solely to the people of those Territories.

I can imagine, when that campaign was going on, the righteous indignation which filled the breast of the present Senator from Arizona as he pleaded for the right of that Territory to control her own internal affairs. Yet now that the State of Arizona is admitted to full sisterhood with the other States of the Union she has a doctrine which is dear to her heart which she is seeking to enforce upon other States, willing or unwilling.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Ohio believe in the referendum?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why not, then, allow the people of this country to determine the question the Senator is now discussing?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, that is a very pertinent question. When I spoke as I did of the referendum I was speaking of it as we have adopted it in the several States by the States. The people now in each of the States of the Union have the right to adopt woman suffrage if they wish; and, in my judgment, they will adopt it in most of the States at a very early day if left to themselves to do it. If the proposition here to-day, as I said in the opening of my remarks, could be left to a popular vote, it would not be so objectionable as in the form the resolution has taken.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio further yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unfortunately, our Constitution does not provide for the initiation of an amendment to it through either the action of State legislatures or the petition of the people.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Ohio really believes in the referendum, does he not think a sufficient number of the people of this country desire an opportunity to vote upon this amendment to warrant its submission to that vote?

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator's question is a purely hypothetical one. He prefaces his proposition with the statement that there is no way of submitting the matter to a vote of the people. If it is a vote of the people that the Senator from Iowa wants, he can not have it by the amendment which is pending before the Senate now.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unfortunately, no; but we can have a vote of the several legislatures of the States, and we must assume that in their votes they will embody the desires of the people whom they represent. My view of it is—and I should like to have the Senator's comment upon it—that inasmuch as there is no way of initiating amendments to the Constitution save through the action of Congress, whether the Senator believes in woman suffrage or not, if he believes in the referendum and also believes that there is a sentiment in this country that is fairly equivalent to the petition that would be required under the ordinary operation of the referendum, he ought to vote for the submission of this amendment without regard to his opinion as to its merits. We ought not to stand in the way of the advanced thought of the age, and deny to the people of this country the only opportunity they possibly can have to determine what kind of Constitution they want.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the trouble is that the Senator is not entirely consistent when he speaks of the referendum. He speaks of getting a vote of the people by a referendum to the legislatures. With all due respect to the legislatures, I am bold enough to say that the legislatures very often do not represent the voice of the people. Each State can now have a referendum vote on this question if it desires. It can order its house on this subject now as it sees fit. It ought to permit this same right to other States.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I rise simply to suggest to the Senator from Ohio, in answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Iowa, that this is not the only method by which woman suffrage may be obtained. The States in the Union could act separately and independently; and in less time than it would take to adopt this amendment woman could be given the suffrage in every State in the Republic, if the States so desired.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield to me for just a moment longer, that may or may not be true. I do not know. I know that there are a great many good people who believe that the qualifications of voters in the several States are of national concern, and that there ought to be a uniform rule with regard to this matter. I know that they want an opportunity to determine whether or not this amendment shall become a part of the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that if we believe in the referendum we ought not to interpose our own view with regard to the wisdom or policy of the resolution, and thus prevent the people, through their legislatures, from enjoying the opportunity to determine whether the rule shall be uniform or whether it shall vary according to the views of the several States.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in my own State we have had a referendum; and by that referendum, by a vote of more than 87,000, this proposition was defeated. I dare say that if there were a referendum of that kind in the State of Iowa on any proposition, no one would feel more obligated to be bound by it than the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I see nothing whatever inconsistent between the vote to which the Senator has referred in his own State and his vote in this body in favor of the submission of this amendment. I am entirely unable to see any inconsistency between the two.

Mr. POMERENE. I think I have made myself entirely clear; and if the Senator is not in accord with my views we shall have to differ upon that proposition. I am convinced of one thing—that the very moment it becomes known in the great State of Ohio that the majority of her women want to vote that right will be accorded to them by the men of the State. I know that in very many instances women have said to their husbands and their brothers and their fathers and their sons that they did not want the right to vote; and the vote in the State indicates that that is the prevailing opinion.

Mr. President, we have heard Senators speak of "the privilege of voting" which is accorded to man. It is a privilege when it is granted to man, and it will be a privilege when it is granted to woman; but in my humble judgment the minute it is granted it ceases to be a privilege and becomes an obligation. With the majority of the women in my own State, as I believe, not asking for it, I am not willing, until they shall register their votes or their voice or the majority of the men of my State shall register their votes or their voice in favor of it, to impose that serious obligation upon them.

If it were within my power in my own State to prescribe the conditions of suffrage, I should say to every man: "This is an obligation, and unless you exercise it you shall be penalized." When that privilege is granted to woman I hope all womankind in the State to whom it is accorded will regard it as an obligation. I believe the majority of men and the majority of women are good men and women, actuated by the best of impulses and the most intense desire for the elevation of citizenship. When we have bad laws, or when we have bad men on our tickets, it is because the good men have not gone to the polls. If at our primaries all of the Republicans would go and vote, or all of the Democrats, or all of the Prohibitionists, we should not be confronted by the spectacle, as we sometimes are, of having men on either of the tickets who do not deserve the confidence of their party associates.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me that if the very good women who are interested in the proposition now before the Senate would devote their influence and their energies to cultivating a desire for suffrage among the women of their respective States they would be advancing the cause of woman suffrage much more rapidly than they can by seeking to amend the Federal Constitution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am placed in rather a unique position in the consideration of this great question. I am not of those who share the apprehension that woman will be injured by giving her the ballot; nor do I believe that her participation in politics will lower the standard of citizenship or result detrimentally to the country. The truth about the matter is, I believe, the inherent virtues and superior qualities of woman will necessarily improve anything with which she has to do. I think we are indebted to her more for what has been accomplished in America than we are to man. I would rather rely upon her intuition to lead me right—I would rather trust her heart than the ratiocinations or the painful logical processes of man. The woman usually thinks in straight lines because her mind follows her heart. In matters involving the welfare of human beings the maternal instinct, the mother heart, seldom deviates from the way of truth. Nor am I of those who regard her as the weaker vessel—

For I tell you at this hour
The worth of this world's future depends upon her power;
And down the stream of ages, as life's flood tides are told,
The record of its excellencies will be marked by the place that women hold.

Man has never done anything—he has never accomplished anything or achieved anything—worthy of being remembered, but that he had behind him, sustaining him with her prayers, encouraging him with her love, and guiding him with her unerring intuition, some good, true, noble woman.

That she will become a voter in all the States of this Republic in the very near future I have no more doubt than I have that to-morrow's sun will rise. That the ballot will be purified, that the influences surrounding the polling places will be improved, that the moral sentiment her sacred presence will generate will write more just and wiser laws, I have not the slightest doubt, because her influences are always elevating, always purifying, always ennobling. When the time shall come that women want to vote, when the women of the different States desire the ballot, as has been stated upon this floor, it will be placed into their hands.

In some of the States in this Republic, however, a large majority of the women do not care to vote at this time. That is, in some of the States the conditions are such that women would not go to the polls if permitted by law to do so. In the settlement of this question I would much prefer, and I think it would be infinitely better and more in accord with the original plan upon which our Government is builded, to leave this matter with the States. It is my great privilege to represent in part in this Chamber a State where conditions are such that the women who ought to vote in the very nature of things could not and would not go to the polls.

A decent white woman will not put herself in a position where she is to be elbowed, pushed around, and insulted by a vulgar, vicious, and ignorant negro woman who has no more conception of the importance or the significance of the elective franchise than the chimpanzee is capable of comprehending or understanding the nebular hypothesis. The question may be asked why, if negro men are capable of voting, why not negro women? To one who understands the nature of the negro an answer to that question would be superfluous. Neither the man or the woman are capable of performing properly the supreme function of citizenship, but the negro man is much more easily controlled, less turbulent, and more tractable. Verily, "the female of the species is more deadly than the male" in this instance. I think the most lawless and abandoned creature on earth is the drunken, insolent negro woman.

And, further, the white man has the physical strength and ability to command obedience and defend himself.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that when an economic or governmental question is presented the people of the South are confronted at once with that overwhelming, monumental, Apennine, paramount problem, the race question, which has been discussed at some length in dealing with this resolution. This question has resulted in the political isolation of the Southern States. The white people can not divide at all on economic issues in those States. There are probably 50,000 more adult male negroes in Mississippi than there are white men and fully 60,000 more negro women than there are white women. A large majority of the negroes, as stated a moment ago, are congenitally, eternally, racially, and unalterably incompetent and unfit to perform the supreme function of citizenship. You can not educate them so as to make them capable of governing the white man, either.

That accounts for the fact, Mr. President, that our white women naturally shrink, involuntarily recoil, from participation in those public or civic functions which usually belong to men. It is the overwhelming influence which prevents them from considering even the question of participating in government at the ballot box. Remove that barrier, take that impediment away, and then the women of Mississippi, the women of Arkansas, and the women of the other Southern States, where this great problem is in its most acute, intense, aggravated, and difficult form, may consider the question of participating with their brothers, their husbands, and their fathers in matters of government.

I wish to say, in addition to what I have already said about woman's capacity to govern, that the governments in ancient and modern times where women have exercised the largest element of control have been the greatest governments, and their civilization has progressed further and higher, and grander achievements wrought, than in the other governments where she had less power.

This is particularly true of ancient Greece. It is said that no Spartan citizen ever thought of performing a public duty without first consulting his wife. You will remember the story of Gorgo, the wife of Leonidas, who was taunted on one occasion by the statement that "Sparta was the only country where the women ruled the men. Her apt and pertinent reply was that "Spartan women are the only ones who give birth to men."

Mr. President, I regard the home as the realm over which woman is best fitted to reign. I think motherhood the supreme function of woman. In that realm and in the performance of that function she does her greatest work, because her influence there begins with infancy and ends only in eternity. If you will give me the influence of the mothers, I will write the laws of the land, I will preserve our institutions in all their pristine vigor, and I will transmit them unimpaired in their usefulness to posterity. As the better expression of my own thoughts:

They talk to me of woman's sphere
As though it had a limit;
There is not a place in earth or heaven,
There is not a task of mankind given,
There is not a blessing or a woe,
There is not a whispered yes or no,
There is not a life or death or birth
That has a feather's weight of worth
Without a woman in it.

But that influence, Mr. President, can be felt, it can be exercised, and the end sought to be attained by this amendment can be reached without forcing it upon States that are not ready for it. If Illinois, if Iowa, if Pennsylvania, if Georgia, if Mississippi, if any State in the Republic wants to give women the right of suffrage equal with the men, they have a right under their State constitution to do so. There is no difficulty about that.

One of the Senators in this Chamber on yesterday asked a Senator who was opposing the amendment: "If you favored the election of Senators by the people, you could not insist upon it here, for the reason that it takes from another State the right to elect Senators by the legislature if it so desired." But the cases are not analogous at all. No State could elect Senators by the people without an amendment to the Federal Constitution. You had to change the Constitution of the United States in order to permit any State that wanted to do so to elect its Senators by the people. But that is not the case with reference to conferring the right of suffrage upon women. My State or your State, without regard to the will of the other States, can confer that right upon her just as soon as the measure could be passed by the legislature and referred to the people and approved by them.

There is another thing, Mr. President, the importance of which we all understand and appreciate. We understand the influence of environment and the heterogeneous element in our population. The framers of this Government understood that when they

gave to the States the right to regulate this very thing. What will suit the people of one State may not be adaptable to conditions in another State. If you are going to preserve the Federal Union, if you are going to preserve that harmony so essential to perfect government, you must maintain, you must preserve inviolate, the autonomy, the sovereignty of the States by permitting them to exercise the sovereign power of regulating the suffrage, giving to men, and giving to women if they see fit, the right to vote.

Mr. President, I am going to propose an amendment to the joint resolution. While I am very much in favor of the States exercising exclusively this peculiar function, if the amendment which I send to the desk shall be adopted I will vote for the joint resolution. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I am almost prepared to say that I will vote for a measure reducing the representation of Mississippi in the Congress of the United States to two Senators and two Representatives if I could thereby remove that horrible, that soul-terrifying incubus upon the moral, material, and intellectual progress of the Southern States—the race question.

I would rather have Mississippi represented here by 2 Senators and 2 Representatives with the race problem solved by eliminating the negro from politics by repealing the fifteenth amendment and modifying the fourteenth amendment so as to make this country what it ought to be and what its founders intended that it should be—a white man's Government—a Government by white men, of white men, for all men—than to have 4 Senators upon this floor and 16 Representatives in the other House of Congress.

The fifteenth amendment was not adopted for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the negro. It was one of the cruel, remorseless acts which resulted from war, designed to punish the white man and to use the negro as a pliant tool by which the country was plundered and the people of the Southland humiliated. It was the child of hate. Mr. President, it has no place in the economy of this Government. It has outlived its usefulness, if there was ever any use for it. The question was asked on the floor of the Senate "if it could ever be repealed." The answer of the shortsighted pessimist is that it will not. I do not agree to that view. I have faith in the honesty and patriotism and intelligence of the American voter. I have hope for the permanency of our Government. I have hopes for the future of this Republic. I believe the American people are agreed that an error was committed when these amendments were adopted, and I believe that when the question is properly presented to them that they are going to correct that error. My views on this question have been sneeringly referred to by certain mole-minded statesmen, men with the voices of counsel that roar like the bull of Bashan, but with the voices of vision that are no louder than the chirping of the cricket. They call it a dream. It may be. I think it is. The dream has always been the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to lead peoples out of the wilderness of difficulty.

> The dreamer stands within the shadow of the night
> And looks beyond it toward the coming light,
> And sees far off with trance-prophetic eyes
> The consummation of the centuries.

One of the most interesting lessons that history teaches is the unmindfulness of what is taking place on the part of those who were prominent actors in what have proven to be the turning points of time. When the crisis of the late Civil War was upon us many talked of the breeze that would blow over in 90 days. When Luther nailed his thesis to a church door at Wittenberg, Europe saw only one disaffected monk, and little thought that really the modern world had roused itself to shake off the dogma-drugged sleep of the Middle Ages. When Copernicus died after one look at his speedily forgotten volume, few understood that the old heaven had folded away like a scroll, that a new earth was given to man, and that former things had passed away. And after the self-sufficient dollar-hearted Pharisees, whose representatives are still with us, had gotten rid of the troublesome meddler from Nazareth and lay down to their triumphant sleep, they little thought that they had pulled down their own temple about their ears and turned the disgrace of the cross into the symbol of a world-conquering religion.

Somebody has said that "the dream of the philosopher to-day is the creed of the persecuted minority to-morrow, the next day to be the faith of a nation."

Revolutions come suddenly in Republics for the reason that law is but public opinion crystallized, and the public opinion emanates, grows out of—in truth it is the composite will and the wish of the voter.

I repeat, Mr. President, we of the South are isolated. No question of economics, no governmental scheme can be presented to the Representatives from that section in the consideration of which they are not forced up against this grave problem, a problem which to me and to my people overshadows all other problems that confront the civilization of this century. Oh, that I might make you feel the gravity, the importance, of the issue.

I wish to assert again upon the floor of this Chamber that my attitude on this question does not grow out of any hostility, hatred, or animosity to the black man, but I know from reading history, I know from my knowledge of him—morally, mentally, ethnologically, and every other phase of his being, that it was never intended by the framers of this Government, it was never intended by the Supreme Ruler of the universe, that the two races should live together on terms of equality in this or any other country.

One of the Senators said here on the floor the other day he "knew" that the two races would never live on terms of perfect equality; that while the two races existed the white man would rule. That is true, but I want to say to him, Mr. President, and the Members of the Senate, we rule in the South. The white man rules there and he has ruled up to this time without violating the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment. And he will continue to rule regardless of whatsoever law this Congress may enact. There is no doubt about that.

When Mississippi, the protagonist in the movement to get around the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments in 1890, passed a law which legislated against the moral qualities and intellectual acquirements of the negro race and thereby eliminated him from politics by law, it did so by the employment of an expedient. Expedients at best are only truth-veneered falsehoods. When the people of the United States forced the South to resort to expedients in order to preserve white supremacy, in order to preserve the civilization which really was the product of the genius of your father and mine, glorified by their patriotism and cemented with their blood, you did us an infinite injustice. You know, as I know, the effect of a law upon public morals. It is the prototype—the model—after which private character is formed. While the white man, because of his superior power, because of his superior mentality, because of his capacity, may rule the black man, you know, as I know, that he has been forced to resort to methods which only serve to injure him and work harm upon the black man.

If the Congress of the United States would only look this question squarely in the face, view it in its due proportions, understand it as you ought to understand it, and have the courage to let your votes here register your honest convictions, without regard to partisan political advantage, you would not only be doing a service to your brothers of the white race in the South, but you would at the same time be doing a great service to the black man in the South, who should be looking to the white man to lead him onward and upward—I should speak more accurately probably if I should say—save him from the inherited backward tendency to which 10,000 years of uninterrupted savagery subjects him.

Mr. President, I desire in this connection to pay the tribute of my respect and gratitude to my friend the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] for the sentiment expressed by him a day or two ago, which manifested a disposition not to crowd and pile up other difficulties upon the white people of the South. He understands, as all other thoughtful, patriotic men ought to know, that there is enough black virus in the body politic in the South already to greatly impair the health of the patient without injecting any more. I thank him for his generous consideration.

Mr. President, if I thought the passage of this joint resolution would promote the settlement of this great problem, as I said a moment ago, I would vote for it; I would vote for anything.

I ask that the amendment may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 12, after the word "sex" and before the period, insert a comma and the following words:

> But in all other respects the right of citizens to vote shall be controlled by the State wherein they reside.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I can not understand how any Senator from the South can fail to support the amendment. While I believe the right ought to be left to the States to regulate suffrage, yet we are willing to take this as a compromise; and I submit the amendment to the Senate, hoping that it may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLAPP. In the first place, I call for a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Fall | Martine, N. J. | Sherman |
| Brady | Gore | Myers | Shively |
| Brandegee | Gronna | Newlands | Simmons |
| Bristow | Hughes | Overman | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bryan | James | Pomerene | Smith, S. C. |
| Catron | Kenyon | Reed | Smoot |
| Chamberlain | Kern | Robinson | Swanson |
| Chilton | Lane | Root | Thomas |
| Clapp | Lea, Tenn. | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Dillingham | Lodge | Shafroth | Williams |
| du Pont | Martin, Va. | Sheppard | |

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 6, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *March 5, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all, whose providence has shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic from its inception, continue to guide us to a happy solution of all the problems, national and international, which confront us. We can afford to err on the side of right, truth, justice, mercy, but we can never afford to err on the reverse side, for right is right and wrong is wrong in the life of the nation as in the life of the individual. If we should ever be called upon to defend our honor, then we shall be sure we have honor to defend, and Thy strong right arm will uphold us and bring to us victory.

Take the lead of our thought, that we may be the instrument in Thy hands for yet greater achievements and thus demonstrate to the world the efficiency of popular government. And Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to withdraw the conference report on the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, for the purpose of making a correction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the conference report on the Alaskan railroad bill, S. 48, in order to correct a typographical error. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the conference report on the bill H. R. 11338, the Post Office appropriation bill, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reserve a point of order on the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the report. The Clerk will read the statement.

The conference report is as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 338).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That after June 30, 1914, the pay of substitute letter carriers employed in the places of regular employees absent from duty with pay and of auxiliary and temporary carriers employed at offices where the city free delivery service is already established or may hereafter be established, and of substitute clerks employed in the places of regular employees absent from duty with pay, and of auxiliary and temporary clerks employed in first and second class post offices, shall be at the rate of 35 cents an hour"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 9 and 10 of the amendment, strike out the words "March 4, 1915," and insert in lieu thereof the words "December 1, 1914"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,521,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the amendment, after the word "postage," insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, by order, fix the time within which all parcels of the fourth class shall be delivered"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN A. MOON,
D. E. FINLEY,
S. W. SMITH,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

J. H. BANKHEAD,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
W. O. BRADLEY,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

### STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in the accompanying conference report on the Senate amendments, viz:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment is a limitation on the amount to be expended. The House agrees with amendments for the purpose of making it permanent law.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $250,000. The House agrees.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $25,000. The House agrees.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment provides for the payment of substitutes for letter carriers and post-office clerks in first and second class post offices at the rate of 40 cents an hour instead of 30 cents an hour. The House agrees with an amendment, making the rate of pay 35 cents an hour.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $300,000. The House agrees.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment increases the amount of the appropriation $225,000. The House agrees.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment provides for the continuance of the personnel of the membership of the committees and commissions created and provided for in sections 1 and 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, viz, Commission to Investigate the Pneumatic Tube Post System, Joint Committee on Federal Aid in Construction of Post Roads, Joint Committee to Investigate General Parcel Post, Joint Committee on Postage on Second-Class Mail Matter and Compensation for Transportation of Mails. The House agrees with an amendment.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment to appropriation for screen wagon service reads as follows: "*Provided*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to use such amount thereof as may be necessary for the purchase and maintenance of wagons or automobiles for and the operation of an experimental combined screen wagon and city collection and delivery service." The House agrees.

Amendment No. 9: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation for railway mail pay $1,000,000. The House agrees.

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 13: These amendments provide for increases in the salaries of the division and assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents, and chief clerks of the Railway Mail Service; the House agrees with amendments.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $39,800 on account of amendments 10, 11, 12, and 13; the House agrees, with an amendment reducing the amount $19,900.

Amendment No. 15: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $280,000; and the House agrees.

Amendment No. 16: This amendment reads as follows: "For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the service of the Postal Savings System, office of the director, $500." The House agrees.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18: These amendments are transfers from one bureau to another; the House agrees.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment strikes out of the paragraph items provided for in another bureau; the House agrees.

Amendment No. 20: This amendment decreases the amount of appropriation $100,000; the House agrees.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment increases the amount of appropriation $4,350,000 on account of amendment No. 22, which provides: "That on and after July 1, 1914, letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding $1,200 per annum." The House agrees.

Amendment No. 23: This amendment reads as follows: "That seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants shall hereafter be embraced in and carried as fourth-class matter, and for the same rates of postage." The House agrees, with an amendment as follows: "*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, by order, fix the time within which all parcels of the fourth class shall be delivered."

Amount of appropriation:

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount of appropriation, 1914 | $283,444,171 |
| Correct amount by items, 1914 | 285,406,271 |
| Estimate for 1915 | 306,953,117 |
| Amount carried in House bill, 1915 | 305,401,767 |
| Correct amount, 1915 | 307,013,867 |
| Bill as passed by Senate, 1915 | 311,772,067 |
| Increase over amount appropriated, 1914 | 26,365,796 |
| Increase over estimates, 1915 | 4,818,950 |
| Increase over House bill | 4,758,200 |

The bill as finally agreed upon in conference carries $311,752,167.

JOHN A. MOON,
D. E. FINLEY,
S. W. SMITH,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the statement is perhaps a sufficient explanation of the bill, except I might say that the various amendments by the Senate to which the House agreed, as set forth without amendment, were increases in the amount of appropriation reaching the amount of estimates made by the department and not, I believe, in excess of them, except in one instance. And in another there was quite a reduction. So, as a matter of fact, most of the items of disagreement between the two Houses were finally settled on the basis of the estimates of the department.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does that statement which the gentleman has just made apply to the item of inland transportation by railroad routes?

Mr. MOON. The item of $55,000,000; yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What was the change made in regard to the provision as to commissions? Was it a mere change of date?

Mr. MOON. The conference committee on the part of the House was largely disposed to abandon the commissions, but after a full consideration we found that a great deal of valuable work had been done by all of these commissions, and they would be ready in a short while to report. The Senate amendment to the bill provided that a report should come by the 1st of March, 1915, but the House conferees thought that that was a little too long and that they ought to report before the meeting of the next Congress, so that they would expire by limitation of law if they did not report before that time. So we changed the date to the 1st of December, 1914.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman in regard to a change in the law in that connection. The language in the Senate amendment is to the effect that these commissions shall continue with the same authority, powers, and provisions for expenses, and so forth. If no action had been taken at this session of Congress toward continuing these commissions, when would they have expired?

Mr. MOON. They would have expired at 12 o'clock yesterday.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, can we continue a commission after the passing of that hour?

Mr. MOON. I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. Although that would be subject to a ruling?

Mr. MOON. It is in effect a new enactment of the statute.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the commissions really did expire yesterday at noon, then could we "continue" them in the statute?

Mr. MOON. This is a new enactment continuing them. I think the commissions have expired now.

Mr. MURDOCK. We can not continue them after they have expired?

Mr. MOON. Yes; we can continue the law under which they operated. We refer to the law and the section, and revive it by this act.

Mr. MADDEN. All of the commissions have been doing a large amount of very valuable research work that they have not completed. They have done so much of it that is of great value to the Government that it would be unwise to discontinue them until they have completed what they have undertaken, and they would have completed the work before the time limit fixed in the law if it were not for the fact that some of the information which they thought essential was not obtainable until a month or so ago. And inasmuch as none of the members of these commissions is drawing any compensation from the Treasury, it would be unwise to discontinue them and fail to get the very valuable information which they have obtained as the result of their efforts up to the present time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD].

Mr. SHERWOOD. How does the bill as agreed upon in conference compare with the estimates of the department? How much more or how much less?

Mr. MOON. The department's estimates were $306,953,117. The bill as finally agreed upon in the conference carries $311,752,167. The increase over the estimates was $4,418,970. The increase over the House bill is $4,758,200.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes; that is what I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my reserving the point of order as to the conference report—and I believe the conference report is subject to a point of order—was to obtain information as to the provision contained in amendment

numbered 23, which was added in conference, and which is as follows:

*Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, by order, continue the time within which all parcels of the fourth class shall be delivered.

So far as I can recall, neither the Postmaster General in his report nor any of his assistants has made any such recommendation, nor has any such recommendation been made in the hearings of the committee. I would like to have the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads explain to the House, inasmuch as there is nothing in the statement submitted and just read that elucidates that provision, the reason why the conferees inserted that provision in this conference report.

Mr. BUTLER. Which amendment does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. STAFFORD. Amendment numbered 23.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman said "numbered 3."

Mr. STAFFORD. Numbered 23.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. The Postmaster General, it is true, made no suggestion along that line either to the House committee or to the Senate committee, but when the conference met he did make the suggestion and furnished the language that is now incorporated in this section; and the conferees agreed to it. The reason of it is this, that while the parcel post adds but little to the rural carrier's duties in the greater portion of the country, yet there are portions of the country now where a very large amount of heavy goods is being delivered at one time. For instance, 4 tons of flour in 50-pound sacks were presented for delivery at one place in one zone in one day, and a number of tons of ore, and things of that sort.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the chairman of the committee to say that the instances he cites are actual cases of delivery for parcel post of these large quantities at one place in a single day?

Mr. MOON. The proposed delivery. The gentleman will recollect the speech of the gentleman from Montana on this floor with reference to the immense deliveries in his district. While there has been little of that so far, the weight having been increased to 50 pounds, the department is apprehensive that there may be such heavy deliveries of large packages at particular offices at a particular time that they will be incapable of moving them in the interests of the shipper, and this is to give the Postmaster General the power, when he has an accumulation of matter in the office that can not be moved for some time, to indicate to the shippers that the matter can be delivered within a certain time by order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask the chairman this question: Suppose the shipper deposits in the post office a large quantity of parcel-post matter which the postal facilities are unable to handle and which the order of the Postmaster General indicates to the shipper the department can not handle expeditiously, and the shipper nevertheless leaves it for delivery. What is the purpose of the Postmaster General in dispatching by mail that amount of parcel post?

Mr. MOON. Well, the Postmaster General, having the discretion, may notify the shipper that the Government can not move it except in a designated time, or he may make provision for the removal of it within a specified time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it contemplated that the Postmaster General under this authority may refuse to accept the mail for delivery in case it can not be dispatched within a certain time?

Mr. MOON. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. My inquiry was prompted by my acquaintance with the conditions that beset the Postal Service around the Christmas holidays. Then the service is taxed to the limit, and it is impossible for the Postal Service to dispatch all the mail immediately, as is usually the case when conditions are normal.

Mr. MOON. Under normal conditions sometimes the removal can not be had within a given time, and it is a great advantage to the shipper if the Postmaster General shall have the power to notify the shipper that the matter can not be moved except within a fixed time. The shipper under those circumstances, if he desires, may change the mode of transportation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Nothing in this provision states that the Postmaster General is to notify the shipper as to whether it can be carried or not.

Mr. MOON. Of course not; but he fixes the time, of which the shipper takes notice. In general words it is an enlargement of the discretion of the Postmaster General as to the time of delivery, in order to expedite the removal of mail matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought under this provision the Postmaster General might be authorized to employ outside facilities for emergent cases for the shipment of this heavy mail.

Mr. MOON. He may, under other sections of this bill, do that, perhaps; but this does not confer any additional power along that line, I think.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, with the explanation furnished by the chairman of the committee, I will withdraw the point of order that I made previously. I would like to have the gentleman at a later time yield me some time.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. MOON. I shall be glad to yield to any gentleman. I will now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The SPEAKER. How much?

Mr. MOON. Ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the question later.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the bill as agreed upon in conference carries the largest sum ever appropriated in the history of the Government not only for the Postal Service but for any branch of the governmental service, the total amount being $311,752,000. This amount is nearly $5,000,000 in excess of the estimates, the estimates for the fiscal year being $306,953,000.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Has not the Postmaster General stated that under his estimate it would exceed the revenue by four and a half million dollars?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Postmaster General may have made that estimate, but the increases have been continuing so rapidly that perhaps he will later revise his estimate. It is only fair to say to the House that $4,350,000 of this increased estimate of nearly $5,000,000 has been occasioned by the increase of the salaries of rural carriers from $1,100 to $1,200. As the gentleman knows, there are some 42,900 carriers in the service, and it is contemplated that, with the extension of the service, there will be 1,200 more added during the next fiscal year.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Twelve hundred?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; making a total of 44,000 carriers in the service at the end of the fiscal year, which will occasion an increased appropriation, as estimated by the department, of $4,350,000 for increases of rural carriers' pay alone.

The other increases in the conference report have been largely the substitution of the amounts of the estimates of the department. For instance, the House committee cut down the railway-mail pay $1,000,000. There was no testimony before the committee to warrant the reduction, but the committee, in their judgment, thought it was an inordinate increase, and so reduced it; but the department has shown clearly that this increase has been brought about largely by the introduction of the parcel post, and their estimate has been finally agreed to. I believe that the estimate of the department will not nearly be adequate, even with the increased appropriation carried here, to meet the cost of this service when the full returns are made.

As the House knows, the weighings of the mails on the railroads were taken in the first contract section, a year ago last fall, in the New England States, and that before the parcel post was established; and last spring in the Middle Atlantic States. The returns there show that in the middle section, comprising New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Virginia, and West Virginia, the increase over the average increase of railway-mail transportation was more than $2,000,000, which is largely traceable to the establishment of the parcel post, and this when it was hardly established and before the weight limit of parcels had been increased to 20 pounds and later to 50 pounds. The weighing of the mail during the present season is in the Far Western States, that weighing having just begun and will continue for the period of 105 days. There the parcel-post mail is not so heavy as in the great middle section, known as the third contract section, where the weighings of the mail will take place next year.

I venture the assertion—and I have made it before—that when the railroads receive their full return for the increased tonnage of parcel post, when all the weighings have been completed three years hence, it will result in an added appropriation of more than $10,000,000 for railway mail pay, provided the same basis of pay is followed as now exists.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does the gentleman claim that the parcel post under the present system is going to pay?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Ohio asks me whether the present parcel post will pay. We all recognize that the parcel post, so far as cost of service is concerned, is in the experimental stage. During the consideration of this bill in the House I took occasion to make some remarks on the question of the revised rates that had been established by the Post Office

Department. I then stated that those revised rates took no account whatsoever of the cost of the service by the railroads or the cost of handling on the railroads; that to carry a parcel weighing 1 pound 150 miles for 5 cents and allow for the cost of collection, cost of carriage on the railroad, cost of handling on the railroad, and cost of delivery was absolutely impossible; that it was absolutely impossible to carry a 1-pound parcel for that low rate without a decided loss.

Now, the excess rate for longer distances, where the rates are higher than those charged by express companies, may compensate for the loss on the short-distance hauls, and in those instances there may be a profit, but it is largely problematical. Everyone agrees that the railroads are not receiving any additional compensation for the carriage of the parcel post except the sum of $1,700,000 which was authorized under general terms in the last Post Office appropriation act, authorizing the Postmaster General to grant increases of 5 per cent on their total pay to those railroads whose weighings took place after January 1, 1913, and that average increase was only 3.7 per cent and the total allowance a little more than $1,700,000.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I have heard it said that the weight is increasing very rapidly. As one instance I was told of a mail carrier who was required under the parcel post to carry 6 hogs which had been cut up and wrapped in 50-pound packages. I am told that some of the rural-mail carriers are contemplating the purchase of automobile trucks, and that one of them is keeping 6 horses to do the increased work. I will ask if that will not require an increase of pay and if it is a common occurrence?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question but that if you are going to allow 50-pound packages to be carried in the mails, in some instances it is just going to swamp the rural carrier, and he will not be able to carry the mail with one team. He will be required to have two teams to carry it, and there must be some means devised to carry this excess weight. If they are going to be swamped with this freight matter from the department stores, from commercial houses, and the like, instead of the rural carriers receiving $1,200 a year, in a short time they will be before us asking for $1,800 compensation, and this item of $53,000,000 will increase rapidly to $100,000,000, and then what will be the condition of your surplus? In my brief service here I have seen the rural carriers' salaries raised $100 a year on three successive occasions, directly traceable to the parcel post. We raised it three years ago in expectation of the establishment of the parcel post, that increase being from $900 to $1,000. A year ago we raised it $100, and at this time we are raising it $100 because of the parcel post. There are instances where the burden is being increased on these rural carriers, where they will be obliged to have two horses to do the work, and in some instance not one team but two teams. If this increased burden is to be placed upon them, you can readily understand how this appropriation will mount into great amounts until it will virtually swamp the Government. Now, I have been one of those who thought it would have been wise——

Mr. BUTLER. Will not the compensation from the parcel post pay the Government?

Mr. STAFFORD. As I have just stated in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio, under the revised rates of 5 cents for a carriage of a pound 150 miles and under it is absolutely impracticable and impossible to collect parcels, carry them on railroads, and pay the proportion of cost for handling by the railway mail clerks and for delivery for 5 cents.

Mr. BUTLER. Could not that be rearranged and the rates fixed?

Mr. STAFFORD. As to heavier parcels and for long hauls the rates are higher than the revised express rates and very likely are profitable to the Postal Service. But there is demand to-day from many to have these rates reduced. If all the rates are going to be reduced so that they are not compensatory, there is going to be a deficit and a tremendous deficit. I am one that thought it wise to proceed slowly in this matter. I have been for a long time a supporter of the parcel post and the zone system. But when you jump at one leap to a 50-pound package, with no reliable data as to the cost of the service, without having anything to determine what that additional expenditure will be by reason of the additional weight, I think it is, to put the matter mildly, going at high speed.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman believe that the rates now fixed by the department will be compensatory?

Mr. STAFFORD. As I stated in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD]—and this is the third time I have answered it—I believe some rates are not compensatory. There may be other rates that will pay a profit, but these rates are for long hauls, which are higher than the express companies' rates. The express companies are carrying heavy packages at a less rate than those of the Postal Service, and they will get the traffic. It is in the experimental stage, but it seemed wise to the Postmaster General to do it, and the responsibility is his. He claims to have figures that warrant him in doing it. I have examined those figures, and I find that he has not taken into consideration the cost of the service of transportation and handling on the railroads and other items of cost. It is true that we are not now paying the railroads anything for this additional service, except an allowance of $1,700,000, whereas the increased tonnage entitles them to more than $5,000,000. With the 50-pound limit in universal use in the first two zones, it will entitle them to $10,000,000. It is mere guesswork as to the extent this service is going to cost the Government. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this bill carrying $311,000,000 as a total appropriation will double in another 10 years. In another 10 years it will be $600,000,000, and it would not be a rash prediction to say that in 15 years it will reach the billion-dollar mark.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] 10 minutes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House it carried an appropriation of $307,013,867; when it passed the Senate it carried $311,772,067. The bill as finally presented to us to-day carries an appropriation of $311,752,167.

The increase over that of 1914 was $26,345,896. The increase over the House bill is $4,738,300.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, if this money is wisely and honestly expended, as it will be, that, as large as the appropriation seems to be, it will be entirely satisfactory to the people of the country. I know of no money that is expended in behalf of the people that is more appreciated than that which is expended through this committee.

During the brief time I have at my disposal I desire to present to the House some remarks with reference to the committees or commissions that are provided for on page 14.

There are four commissions affected by this amendment. The first commission is on the Government purchase of pneumatic tubes. The chairman of it is the Hon. HOKE SMITH, Senator from Georgia. I desire to say with reference to that commission that it is expected that they will report in the near future, and that of the $25,000 appropriated they have expended in investigating this matter, in round numbers, $10,000.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman state what the nature of their investigation is?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I understand that $10,000 has been largely used in paying engineers and experts.

Mr. SHERWOOD. For what purpose?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. For the purpose of ascertaining the utility and value of the pneumatic-tube service. The gentleman will understand that this service is in the great cities. This committee expects to be able to report in about 30 days.

The next committee is the joint committee on Federal aid in the construction of post roads, which is presided over by ex-Senator Jonathan Bourne, jr., of Oregon. This committee has expended so far $7,750, in round numbers.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. How could they expend $7,500 in making investigations of this sort—as to the wisdom of the expenditure of public money to assist in maintaining public roads?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. This has been expended for clerical hire, postage, engineers, and so forth. I desire to say to the gentleman that they have made an investigation into the road systems throughout the civilized world. I understand they have a large amount of data which I hope will be collected, put into print, and that the volumes will be put into the Congressional Library. It is the most valuable collection of data on this subject the country has ever had.

Mr. BUTLER. How can that help us to determine whether we should expend public funds to assist in the maintenance of roads over which the mails are carried?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I suppose they will make recommendations later on.

Mr. BUTLER. But the conditions in our country and Europe are not the same. I have no criticism to make of it, but I was wondering how they could expend that much money on a subject which the most of us now know something about.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the next committee that is to be affected by this amendment is the joint committee on postage on second-class mail matter and compensation for transportation of mails. This committee is also presided over by ex-Senator Jonathan Bourne, jr., and this committee has expended so far, in round numbers, $4,000. The next is the joint committee to investigate general parcel post, presided over by JOSEPH L. BRISTOW, Senator from Kansas. This committee has expended $460. It is hoped it will report soon.

I know that there are some in the House who feel that these committees or commissions ought to have reported by this time. I am not saying that they should not have reported, but I want to say this, in behalf of at least one or two of these commissions, that they have collected, as I said a moment ago, a great amount of data and information which they have not yet put in shape in the form of a report, and they are not ready to report to Congress at this time. I want to say another thing in this connection, that there is no member of any of these commissions or committees who is receiving any salary. It is not as though there were some retired Members of the House or Senate who had been placed on these commissions or committees, receiving salaries, who were drawing out and extending the life of these commissions for the purpose of getting the salary. Nobody is receiving a dollar of salary, and I undertake to say whatever money is expended is honestly, judiciously expended in making these investigations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman with reference to the item about the District of Columbia, appearing on page 19 of the bill, beginning with line 3:

For rent, light, heat, fuel, telegraph, miscellaneous and office expenses schedules of mail trains, telephone service, and badges for railway postal clerks, including rental of offices for division headquarters, and chief clerk, Railway Mail Service, in Washington, D. C., and rental of space for terminal railway post offices for the distribution of mails when the furnishing of space for such distribution can not under the Postal Laws and Regulations properly be required of railroad companies without additional compensation, and for equipment and miscellaneous items necessary and incidental to terminal railway post offices, $770,000. That the Postmaster General may hereafter make leases for terminal railway post offices for terms not exceeding 10 years.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I see the chairman of the committee is desirous of answering that, and I will yield to him.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, is that on page 19?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; beginning with line 3 and ending with line 16. The bill as it passed the House carried $490,000.

Mr. MOON. That does not mean that this is to be expended altogether in Washington City. The reason for that is this, that it is very much cheaper to rent terminal railway facilities than it is to retain the mail in storage cars.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee will permit, the gentleman from Texas in his question intimates that he thinks this money is to be expended wholly in the District of Columbia. I do not understand that to be the case.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I have just stated to the gentleman that that was not the case.

Mr. MANN. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Where are the other expenditures?

Mr. MOON. Wherever there are terminal stations, and the department estimates they will save four or five dollars to one by this increase. So far as the saving of money in the bill is concerned, perhaps this is the very best section in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the chairman of the committee to yield me one minute more.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask why it was found necessary to increase the expenditure for inland transportation on railway rates, being lines 17 and 18, page 15, the increase being from $55,188,000 to $56,188,000?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the increase made by the Senate just goes to the estimates made by the department. The House cut that million off the bill, not for the purpose of keeping it off permanently but for use in conference with the Senate.

I now yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion, with reference to these commissions, a word respecting ex-Senator Bourne. As I have said, there is no member of these commissions or committees who is receiving a dollar of salary, and I am informed that ex-Senator Bourne is not only receiving no salary whatever, but he is so deeply interested in the work of these commissions, two of which he has the honor to be the chairman, that he is paying his own expenses.

I think the Congress and the country will be amply repaid by granting further time for these committees and commissions to report. They have all been very busy with practically no vacation for a long time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the conference committee would agree upon an earlier date for the report of these four commissions, and I was particularly anxious that an earlier report should be made by the parcel-post commission. I believe that there is no present need for the parcel-post commission, and I think there is adequate proof of that in the inactivity of that commission since its appointment months ago. I am very much in favor of lodging with the Postmaster General a wide latitude and discretion in the control of the parcel post.

This morning I had occasion to look into the postal documents to find out what the revenue to this Government is from first-class postage. It is now running close to $200,000,000 a year. It is one of the greatest items of revenue in the Government, and it is possible for us to have that income from the circumstance that 70 years ago we as a Government asserted our right of monopoly in the carriage of the first-class mail. For the first 40 years of the postal history of this country we had as competitors in the carriage of first-class mail the express companies, and by the time we had reached 1840 there were more letters transported by the express companies than by the Government. About that time we took over a monopoly in the carriage of letters, and on that monopoly we built up the magnificent postal system of to-day. We have not asserted our monopoly over other classes of mail matter, and in our failure to do that we must take the other alternative, which is to give the Postmaster General or some other administrative officer, or a combination of administrative officers, such as the Postmaster General and the Interstate Commerce Commission, power to give flexibility in parcel-post rates. Otherwise, in this class of mail matter, we will have for our competitors, and always to our detriment, the express companies. If you leave it to Congress to establish rates, fixing rates by statute, necessarily stationary, you give the express companies on the remunerative short hauls the chance to undercut the Government's rates and get the business, and leave to the Government on the longer and unremunerative hauls an unprofitable monopoly. There is only one way out of that situation if you are not to assert your monopoly, and that is to give power and latitude to the Postmaster General in fixing parcel-post rates.

Recently a very serious and almost successful attack has been made upon that right. The movement, if successful, would have hamstrung the system. Now, I do not believe that the continuation of the parcel-post commission is a good thing for the parcel post. I think it is to the distinct injury of the parcel post, for I fear that out of this commission, which this bill is continuing until December 1, is likely to come an attack upon the Postmaster General and his right to fix parcel-post rates, when in the period of formation in this splendid system he ought to have a free hand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. No, I will not; I want to say another thing. Now, I happen to have served upon one of these commissions—the pneumatic-tube commission. Its work is finished; it is prepared to report. It would not be just to the Government or to anyone else for that commission to continue its labors longer. It has thoroughly examined the subject; it had engineers examine the systems to ascertain their physical value; it has examined witnesses galore, and there is no reason at all why the life of that commission should not terminate within a month.

Mr. MANN. I will say if the gentleman from Kansas made the report right now that would terminate it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am prepared to report on that and the rest of the members are. I do not think there is any question at all that the commission on second-class matter and railroad transportation could report within a month or two, and I think that is also true about the other commission incorporated here, if it has not finished its labors, the roads proposition. Now why should this parcel-post commission be continued? Why should not the commission report within even a month's time?

Mr. MANN. Under the existing law when do these commissions report; take, for instance, the pneumatic-tube commission?

Mr. MURDOCK. The law says at as early a date as possible, which, of course, does not mean anything. Now, let me say

this to the gentleman from Illinois: As a matter of fact, these commissions expired yesterday at noon.

Mr. MANN. That is it; but they have not made a report.

Mr. MURDOCK. No.

Mr. MANN. And therefore it must be extended.

Mr. MURDOCK. But why extend it to December 1?

Mr. MANN. I do not say——

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think there is any reason for it.

Mr. MANN. If they have finished their labors, why do not they make a report?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think there is a distinct menace in the continuation of the parcel-post commission.

Mr. MOON. The reason is the members of that commission are busy at work in the House, and they assert that they have not the time aside from their other duties to finish the work. This just gives them a vacation in which to do that.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Tennessee understands these commissions are ready to report, all except the parcel-post commission, which has done no work virtually at all.

Mr. ROUSE. When does the pneumatic-tube commission expect to report.

Mr. MURDOCK. Right away. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee this: Is it a fact the parcel-post commission has been preeminently inactive since its appointment?

Mr. MOON. I have had no connection with it, but I presume that is true.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the gentleman any assurance that December 1 next we will not have a request from the parcel-post commission for a further extension of time?

Mr. MOON. I have the assurance that Congress will not meet until the first Monday in next December, and this commission will have expired by that time, and it will take another act to revive it, as it did to create it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUTTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield one minute additional to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TUTTLE. I do not know in regard to the other commissions, but I want to say the commission on railway-mail pay and rates of postage on second-class postal matter will be ready to report upon the first half of their work within probably the next 30 or 60 days at the outside.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I thought, and all these commissions save one are ready to make immediate report. The only commission which is holding back is the parcel-post commission.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. No; they say they will not report until the last half.

Mr. TUTTLE. I want to say we are not prepared to devote the time necessary to go into rates on second-class mail matter, and that is the reason we want the extension of time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman think that commission needs an extension until the 1st of December next?

Mr. TUTTLE. I am inclined to think that it needs an extension. It is a very important matter, and Congress will be in session probably well into the summer, and if it is extended, why, we will be able to report upon the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. This commission of which he speaks was created in August, 1912.

Mr. TUTTLE. I want to say the commission itself has worked diligently. It has taken a mass of testimony of all kinds.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not deny that; but that is not true of the parcel post commission.

Mr. TUTTLE. I want to say the delay in our report has been due to the delay on the part of the Post Office Department, which has had an immense amount of work to do in establishing the Parcel Post System.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOON. Then I can not yield more than five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible in five minutes to go over in detail the various items that are covered by this conference report. I want to say that I believe that no more money is appropriated than is necessary to give the people of this country a proper and efficient mail service for the ensuing fiscal year. The bill as agreed upon by the conferees amounts to $311,752,167.

Now, I am one of those who believe in stating what I believe to be true. Some time ago I came to the conclusion that commissions and joint committees were largely created for purposes of delay. I believe that. And I have tried in every instance where I could to place as short a limitation on the life of a joint committee or joint commission as was possible, and, generally speaking, I have been against their creation.

I propose only to speak of one, but before I do that I will say, in a general way, that I think some of these joint committees have worked faithfully. I refer to the one on good roads. I think that the one having in charge railway mail pay has worked, and what the results of their labor will be I do not know. And I could mention one or two others. But for more than a year I have been satisfied that the joint committee on parcel post should die as speedily as possible. I am a member of that joint committee. I know what it has not done. I know what the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from South Carolina, the two Members of the present House, have tried and wanted to do. I know that we have not succeeded. I know that since August, 1912, when this joint committee was created, there has been one meeting lasting about 30 minutes. At that meeting it was organized by the election of a chairman and a vice chairman, and the chairman Senator BRISTOW, appointed the clerks. Since that time that joint committee has been, for all practical purposes, so far as being a committee goes, substantially dead. I do not believe they are going to do anything.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my opinion of one of these committees, the one of which I am a member.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Have the clerks been drawing their salaries in the meantime?

Mr. FINLEY. My recollection is that the compensation of clerks has not yet been fixed. As I remember, a motion was offered by me that that would be fixed later on, and it has not been fixed yet. That is my recollection. So, Mr. Speaker, I have done what I could to end the life of the joint committee on parcel post. I regard it as useless. I think it has done nothing and will do nothing; that it cumbers the ground, and its continuance can only be a clog to the proper development of the parcel post. I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

CHANGE OF VOTE.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, on page 4303 of the RECORD of March 4, 1914, I am recorded as voting "nay" on the convict-goods bill. I want to say that I came in on the floor of the House and voted under a misapprehension. While the Clerk correctly recorded my vote, I want to ask unanimous consent of the House that my vote be recorded in favor of the bill. I thought the bill should add the provision "before delivery to the consignees." Inasmuch as it does, I want to vote for the bill and want to have the permanent RECORD corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] asks unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal shall be corrected in such a way as to show that he voted "yea" on the convict-labor bill instead of "nay," he having voted "nay" under a misapprehension. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Georgia—although I regard it as a bad and dangerous precedent—because the vote which was had was practically all one way. I hope the gentlemen will not regard this as a precedent for coming in and asking the privilege of changing votes in the future.

Mr. HARDWICK. If that had been true, I would not have made the request. There was no opposition to the bill, and I voted under the misapprehension of what it contained.

Mr. MANN. Well, many Members of the House vote under a misapprehension and change their mind after they vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I want to congratulate the House conferees on the expedition with which they have been able to settle the questions involved in this great supply bill and the manner in which they have been settled. Now, there has been some question raised here as to the

propriety of continuing the commissions. It has been stated that the time certainly ought to be limited to within about 30 or 60 days from now.

The report of the committee of conference provides that the time shall be limited to December 1 next, and it seems to me that that is a reasonable recommendation. Many of these commissions will be able to report before; but if, perchance, they are not able to, the time ought not to be so limited as to prevent a report from any of these important commissions. They have given a great deal of time to their work. They have accumulated a large amount of very valuable information. It has cost the Government very little. The information, when submitted to the House with the recommendations of these commissions, will be the foundation upon which we can base salutary legislation for the future conduct of the departments affected by the work of these commissions. For example, the commission appointed to examine into the propriety of Government cooperation with the States in the construction of good roads has accumulated information from all over the world. This information is now being tabulated so as to be presented to Congress, and a recommendation will be made within the next 30 or 60 days, without doubt, upon which we may be able to base legislation for Federal cooperation with the States in the matter of constructing good roads that will lead to the enactment of laws that will be of infinite benefit to the people of the Nation in the future.

Now, as to the commission investigating the question of railway mail pay, that commission has been constantly at work every day since its appointment. I believe that it has accumulated more valuable information than has ever been accumulated before by any like commission, and from the advance information I have as to what it has done and what it will report I believe that we shall be able to enact laws for the payment of the railroads for the transportation of the mails in the future that will save the Government a vast amount of money and at the same time expedite the movement of the mails.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] moves the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

### RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit for printing under the rule the conference report on the Alaskan railroad bill as corrected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee submits the corrected conference report on the Alaskan railroad bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is ordered to be printed under the rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] whether, the conference report having been printed, it is his expectation to ask unanimous consent to consider it to-day or whether it will go over until later, under the rules?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think perhaps later in the day I shall ask unanimous consent to take it up to-day.

Mr. MANN. I raise the question now because there is quite a considerable membership present in the House, and I think if the gentleman intends to prefer that request at all it ought to be preferred now, to see whether anybody objects while the membership is fairly full.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee intends to prefer the request for the consideration of this conference report to-day, I serve notice that I shall object.

Mr. HOUSTON. Then I shall not make the request, Mr. Speaker.

### RECESS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The House stands in recess for 10 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

### JOINT MEETING OF SENATE AND HOUSE.

At the expiration of the recess the House resumed its session and was called to order by the Speaker.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will resume their seats. On the part of the House, the Speaker appoints the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a committee to wait on the President and escort him into the House. The Vice President will make his own announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate, the Vice President appoints the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

At 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk, amid applause on the floor and in the galleries.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the Senate and the House, I introduce to you the President of the United States. [Applause.]

### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 813).

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Congress, I have come to you upon an errand which can be very briefly performed, but I beg that you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. No communication I have addressed to the Congress carried with it graver or more far-reaching implications as to the interest of the country, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged in a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

I have come to ask you for the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls, and to urge upon you the justice, the wisdom, and the large policy of such a repeal with the utmost earnestness of which I am capable.

In my own judgment, very fully considered and maturely formed, that exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view, and is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal concluded on November 18, 1901. But I have not come to urge upon you my personal views. I have come to state to you a fact and a situation. Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much-debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a Nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing that we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure. [Applause.]

At 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m. the President retired from the Hall of the House.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The message of the President just delivered to the House will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 13679, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

[Mr. DICKINSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], a member of the Committee on Agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the specific bill under consideration appropriates the sum of $18,947,232, an increase of $960,287 over the appropriation for last year. This, with the fixed appropriations, will make the total appropriation about $25,000,000 for agriculture for the coming fiscal year. In view of the great interests with which this bill deals, I do not believe it needs any defense by me or anybody else; but, if it ever needed any, I am sure it does not need it now, since the eloquent and forceful speech delivered by the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. LEVER] on this floor a day or two ago, taken in connection with the very elaborate and full report which he made when this bill was presented to the House. [Applause.]

The difficulty oftentimes with reports that are made in reference to bills is that they do not explain the bills and do not give information in reference to them. The report submitted by this distinguished chairman went into the details in reference to the provisions of the bill, called attention to the appropriations, and even pointed out the page and line where they could be found. Hence anybody who desired to know anything in reference to the bill could be informed by reading the report, which gives full, complete, and detailed information in reference to it.

I have had the honor to serve upon this great committee during several terms of Congress. It is true that a few years ago, in a Republican House, by reason of my activity, as I understood it, in reference to certain matters concerning which the Speaker at that time [Mr. Cannon] did not agree with me, he saw proper to remove me from this committee, because he said I was too aggressive and too active; but I am glad that when the Democrats came into power they promptly put me back on this committee, and not only restored me to the committee, but restored me to my place upon it. [Applause.] That action was taken by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Committees, composed of 14 Democrats of this House, and I know it met the approval of our distinguished Speaker, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. Not only did I receive the unanimous vote of the committee and the approval of the Speaker, but I received the unanimous vote of the Democratic caucus and the unanimous vote of the House of Representatives. That demonstrates I was all the time for the people. [Applause.] I have served on this committee since then and prior to my removal with the gentleman who now has the honor of presiding over this, in my judgment, one of the greatest committees of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Owing to the noise in the galleries, we have difficulty in hearing the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. We are always anxious to hear him, and he never fails to interest the House.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and I feel sure order will soon prevail.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am only asking for order so that Members of the House may hear the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman from Mississippi will address himself to this side of the House, we shall be very much obliged to him. He seems to be addressing himself at the present time to the Democratic side of the House. We all want to hear him, as we have great confidence in his ability and capacity to give information.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank my good friend from Kentucky. Although a Republican, he is a good enough friend of the farmer to come over here, where he can hear me. But if he and other gentlemen will be patient for a little while, until the natural exodus from the galleries on the part of those who came only to hear the President is concluded, I am sure they will have no difficulty in hearing me. The Members on the floor are kindly giving me their attention, and for their kindness in this regard I am grateful.

Having served on this committee during these years with this distinguished gentleman, I have had an opportunity to observe how he does things. This committee has never been presided over in its existence by a more distinguished, patient, able, or energetic chairman than it possesses to-day, and I assert that he has as much constructive legislation to his credit as any man on this floor of the same length of service. [Loud applause.]

I want to call attention on this occasion to one of the constructive features of legislation of which my friend is the author. You remember that in 1862 there was passed what was known as the Morrill Act for the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college in each State where the leading object should be the teaching of such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts. In 1887 there was passed what was known as the Hatch Act, which provided for the establishment of experimental stations and scientific investigations and experiments respecting the principles and application of agricultural science. Then there are subsequent acts, one known as the Adams Act, which enlarged the appropriation for experimental stations.

Then followed what is known as the Lever bill, for the purpose of carrying the knowledge which had been accumulated and acquired through the other sources to the public. The essential idea of the Lever bill is to bring to the farmers on the farm this information of scientific truths and to teach them the better methods of agriculture which the colleges and experiment stations have during these years been gathering. Past legislation had resulted in the accumulation of very valuable information. This bill proposes to disseminate it in the most practical and far-reaching manner through the men in the field.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is the author of that bill. He drew it himself, introduced it into the House, it was referred to the Agricultural Committee, referred to a subcommittee of which he was chairman, and of which I had the honor to be a member; that subcommittee unanimously reported it back to the full committee, which unanimously reported it to the House, and he stood by it through its vicissitudes, and when it came to a vote on the floor of the House it received practically the unanimous vote of the House and went to the Senate of the United States and there received practically the unanimous vote of the Senate.

As was remarked by the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, in a speech the other day on the soil of the State of South Carolina, that with a man who can formulate and present a bill such as the "Lever bill," procure its unanimous passage on the floor of the House of Representatives and the approval of the Senate of the United States, it is not necessary to go back to the days of John C. Calhoun to find a statesman within the borders of the State of South Carolina, but in Mr. LEVER, the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, you must recognize a constructive statesman who will always live in the history of this country. [Applause.]

I have watched his course with admiration, with pleasure, and indeed with affection, and I predict that as the days go on his record will grow brighter and brighter and rise higher and higher, and will only approximate its zenith when South Carolina does that, when occasion comes, which it ought to do, elevate him to the position of Senator of the United States. [Loud applause.]

As I stated Mr. Chairman in the outset, I do not believe this bill needs any special defense at the hands of anybody. I desire, however, to call attention to some of the features of the bill to show the benefits which will be derived from it and the interests which are involved.

As I stated, the appropriation in this specific bill is a little more than $18,000,000, which, with permanent appropriations, runs it up to about $25,000,000. The appropriations for the past years, beginning in 1900, run from $3,009,727.73 up to about $25,000,000 at the present time. When I became a Member of the House of Representatives the appropriation in the bill of that year was, in round numbers, $3,000,000. I have contended from that day until this that the appropriations for this great business of agriculture should be increased from time to time in proportion to the development of this great interest in the country.

I have made a speech on the floor of this House almost if not every session of Congress whenever the bill was under consideration, calling attention to the development throughout the country of the agricultural interests and showing the value and extent of it and the necessity for enlarged appropriations to meet the increasing necessities of the people and to carry to them the scientific knowledge and teaching which they should have, not only in their own interest but in the interest of all the people throughout the country. [Applause.]

In other words, I believe whenever you help agriculture you help all the people. I have said on previous occasions that I believe in my heart that whenever you help the farmer you

help every other calling, every other trade, every other profession. You help the lawyer, you help the doctor, you help the preacher, you help the merchant, you help the banker—you help everybody when you help the farmer, because he is the bulwark and the mainstay in the prosperity and development of this great Republic. [Applause.]

My friends, have you any definite idea as to what the value of the agricultural interests of this country is? In 1900 it amounted to $20,439,901,164. In 1910 it amounted to $40,991,449,090. It increased in value a little above 100 per cent in 10 years. The value of agricultural products last year was about $9,000,000,000, and still some people complain, as was called attention to by the distinguished chairman a few days ago, of the appropriations for agricultural interests when we spend $18,000,000 to $25,000,000 a year. Why, Mr. Chairman, the total appropriations for agriculture since 1839 up to now is only $217,265,368.51, as follows:

*Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture since its organization to the present time.*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1839 | $1,000.00 |
| 1840 | |
| 1841 | |
| 1842 | 1,000.00 |
| 1843 | |
| 1844 | 2,000.00 |
| 1845 | 2,000.00 |
| 1846 | 3,000.00 |
| 1847 | 3,000.00 |
| 1848 | 4,500.00 |
| 1849 | 3,500.00 |
| 1850 | 5,500.00 |
| 1851 | 5,500.00 |
| 1852 | 5,000.00 |
| 1853 | 5,000.00 |
| 1854 | 10,000.00 |
| 1855 | 50,000.00 |
| 1856 | 30,000.00 |
| 1857 | 75,000.00 |
| 1858 | 63,500.00 |
| 1859 | 60,000.00 |
| 1860 | 40,000.00 |
| 1861 | 60,000.00 |
| 1862 | 64,000.00 |
| 1863 | 80,000.00 |
| 1864 | 119,770.00 |
| 1865 | 150,604.05 |
| 1866 | 167,787.82 |
| 1867 | 199,100.00 |
| 1868 | 279,020.00 |
| 1869 | 172,593.00 |
| 1870 | 156,440.00 |
| 1871 | 188,180.00 |
| 1872 | 197,070.00 |
| 1873 | 202,440.00 |
| 1874 | 257,690.00 |
| 1875 | 337,380.00 |
| 1876 | 249,120.00 |
| 1877 | 194,686.96 |
| 1878 | 198,640.00 |
| 1879 | 206,400.00 |
| 1880 | 199,500.00 |
| 1881 | 275,460.31 |
| 1882 | 363,011.05 |
| 1883 | 456,396.11 |
| 1884 | 416,641.13 |
| 1885 | 655,930.25 |
| 1886 | 677,973.22 |
| 1887 | 657,641.81 |
| 1888 | 1,027,219.06 |
| 1889 | 1,134,480.60 |
| 1890 | 1,170,139.11 |
| 1891 | 1,372,049.21 |
| 1892 | 2,478,655.75 |
| 1893 | 2,540,060.72 |
| 1894 | 2,603,855.58 |
| 1895 | 2,507,148.74 |
| 1896 | 2,584,013.22 |
| 1897 | 2,448,763.53 |
| 1898 | 2,468,551.56 |
| 1899 | 2,856,861.60 |
| 1900 | 3,009,727.73 |
| 1901 | 3,303,500.00 |
| 1902 | 3,862,420.00 |
| 1903 | 4,503,960.00 |
| 1904 | 5,258,160.00 |
| 1905 | 5,942,040.00 |
| 1906 | 7,112,690.00 |
| 1907 | 13,079,523.98 |
| 1908 | 13,037,802.62 |
| 1909 | 16,153,534.74 |
| 1910 | 17,115,410.35 |
| 1911 | 20,888,449.28 |
| 1912 | 22,405,016.00 |
| 1913 | 24,743,044.81 |
| 1914 | 24,105,314.61 |
| Total | 217,265,368.51 |

This Government spends more than $217,000,000 every two years for the Navy and about that much every two years for the Army, and then some people complain that we have spent that much since 1839 to date—a space of 75 years—for agriculture, without which we would have neither an Army or a Navy or anything else. [Loud applause.]

When the valuation of the farm values in this land is over $40,000,000,000 and when our yearly crop is about $9,000,000,000 it is idle to talk to me about spending the insignificant sum of $25,000,000 to take care of this great and far-reaching interest, extending as it does throughout the length and breadth of this land, an interest which enters into every neighborhood and every home of every citizen in the land. Instead of complaining about appropriating $25,000,000, I say without hesitancy we could well appropriate a good deal more and then not be extravagant. No reasonable appropriation in the interest of agriculture could be extravagant, because all money spent for this purpose benefits all the people. [Applause.] The items composing farm values which I mentioned consist of farm lands, buildings, implements, machinery, and live stock. The five items combined make this enormous sum of $40,991,499,090. The truth of it is that everybody else in the country, every business interest in the land, has had special attention at the hands of the law makers from the foundation of the Government up to the present time. The great banking interests, the great mercantile interests, the great railroad interests, the great shipping interests—every interest in the land has been looked after in legislative bodies, and they have especially been looked after and taken care of by the Congress of the United States. In my judgment the time has come, and now is, when the people who produce the wealth of this land, who produce the prosperity of the Nation, who not only take care of us at home, but produce the balance of trade abroad, should receive the very best consideration of the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] The time has arrived and now is when we should look after the man behind the plow, when we should look after the interest of the man who makes the land to blossom like a rose, the man who in the sweat of his face brings forth the wealth of the land and the prosperity of the Nation. [Applause.] The statistics show that the balance of trade in farm products from 1894 up to and including 1913 is as follows:

*Foreign trade of the United States in farm products, 1894–1913.*

| Year ending June 30— | Excess of exports over imports of farm products. | Exports of domestic— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Grain and grain products. | Packing-house products (meat, etc.). | Cotton (raw). |
| 1894 | $281,060,304 | $166,838,415 | $143,617,952 | $210,869,289 |
| 1895 | 193,203,991 | 114,715,103 | 132,998,681 | 204,900,990 |
| 1896 | 194,285,587 | 141,483,935 | 133,702,945 | 190,056,460 |
| 1897 | 298,591,507 | 198,034,511 | 134,721,831 | 230,890,971 |
| 1898 | 555,136,498 | 334,199,716 | 162,494,627 | 230,953,219 |
| 1899 | 449,431,120 | 274,379,021 | 172,434,687 | 210,089,570 |
| 1900 | 435,740,495 | 263,021,542 | 179,898,782 | 242,988,978 |
| 1901 | 570,990,325 | 275,844,717 | 192,485,205 | 315,165,947 |
| 1902 | 453,677,282 | 213,401,238 | 196,743,099 | 291,598,355 |
| 1903 | 435,786,575 | 221,495,083 | 179,412,354 | 317,065,271 |
| 1904 | 410,350,439 | 149,366,054 | 177,441,554 | 372,049,264 |
| 1905 | 285,370,088 | 108,075,761 | 170,308,231 | 381,398,939 |
| 1906 | 432,728,121 | 187,067,354 | 207,673,774 | 401,005,921 |
| 1907 | 439,182,127 | 184,399,150 | 203,456,136 | 481,277,797 |
| 1908 | 488,004,797 | 215,462,142 | 196,187,091 | 437,788,202 |
| 1909 | 274,210,364 | 160,076,479 | 169,991,850 | 417,390,655 |
| 1910 | 198,118,937 | 133,320,418 | 135,959,373 | 450,447,243 |
| 1911 | 365,254,018 | 124,262,836 | 157,302,666 | 585,318,839 |
| 1912 | 279,277,316 | 123,095,651 | 161,434,714 | 565,849,271 |
| 1913 (preliminary) | 322,674,000 | 210,309,555 | 162,483,127 | 547,357,195 |
| Total | 7,363,073,891 | 3,798,848,684 | 3,370,748,679 | 7,084,401,523 |

That $7,363,073,891 is the balance of trade in farm products alone. The truth is that if you take into consideration all other articles of every kind and description that enter into our export trade and exclude farm products, and take that in comparison with the imports that come into the country, we will all the time be indebted to foreign nations, but by taking into consideration all of the exports from this country of every kind and description, including farm products, there is a balance of trade in favor of the United States of billions of dollars. That does not come from manufactures; it does not come from the other sources of trade in this country or other sources of business, but for this balance in trade we are indebted to the farmer alone, the producer in this land. [Applause.] So, as I said a moment ago, we ought to look after his interest, we ought to continue to do what we can to help him along, as he is helping along everybody else and benefiting everybody in the country.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. With great pleasure.

Mr. QUIN. Can the gentleman suggest some way to extend the Bureau of Markets so as to bring the producer of the farm product and the consumer of that product together, and cut out all of the waste and stealage of the middleman?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I will state to my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] that that is one subject I intended to discuss a little later on in my remarks, but I shall be glad to respond to his inquiry now. He is always on the alert for the farmer and the producer has no more faithful friend in this House than he has proven himself to be since he entered Congress. I will state that there is a provision in this bill making an appropriation of $200,000 for this purpose, in order to give to the bureau of markets sufficient money to study this question and to carry out the work and research which they have now begun. The bureau has been organized only a short time, but it is at work in earnest and I am sure will materially help the farmer and the people generally by working out this complex question of markets.

The following statement, furnished me by Dr. Charles J. Brand, Chief Office of Markets, shows the work and purposes of the Office of Markets of the Department of Agriculture:

THE NECESSITY FOR THE WORK.

The agricultural operations of the United States have reached the point where further production waits upon more economical and efficient distribution. In the case of some of our staple crops we have already been confronted with the anomaly of a small crop selling in the aggregate for more money than a large crop. In other words, our arrangements for supplying the consumer with what he needs are so inadequate that he is often forced to pay more in the aggregate for an insufficient supply than he pays in other years for an abundance of the same article. This is not primarily a matter of freight rates or legitimate transportation charges, nor does it necessarily imply an unwillingness upon the part of the middleman to perform his legitimate functions, but it does indicate that the relations between middlemen are not properly adjusted and that the service which they render is often so manipulated that an immense amount of food materials are permitted to spoil before they are offered to the consumer at a price which will tempt him to increase his purchases. In other words, ruinously low prices to producers are not accompanied by corresponding advantages to consumers. The distributing system, though it may be fairly well adjusted to provide for normal conditions, breaks down utterly under the burden of marketing an exceptionally large crop and lends itself too readily to speculative manipulation when crops are short.

LOSSES UNDER PRESENT METHODS.

Producers sustain enormous losses under present methods from a number of causes. In the case of perishable products primarily, perhaps, because the greater part is sold to middlemen who are not directly answerable either to the growers themselves or to the consumers, there is a very general belief that the average commission merchant would rather swindle a consignor and take his chances upon catching a new victim than to do a strictly legitimate business, confining himself to the commission which he is supposed to charge. There are in the country certain producing organizations which have their own selling system and which establish certain grades for their products, decide upon the prices to be asked, and determine a minimum below which price the products will be allowed to rot at home thus avoiding the possibility of sending out shipments which will not pay freight charges. The lack of any general accepted system of grading for farm products which is understood and applied by the producers themselves is another source of immense loss. In the case of the cotton crop the failure to receive proper credit for his grades is perhaps the greatest loss which the grower sustains, but in the case of practically all perishable farm products the promiscuous and ungraded consignments which comprise the bulk of receipts are slaughtered in price in favor of the carefully standardized products of a few growers or localities.

BETTER CONDITIONS HOPED FOR.

We see to-day apples from the Pacific Northwest, the citrus fruits and fresh grapes of California in practically every eastern market. Potatoes and truck crops from the eastern shore of Virginia find their way to 40 States. This looks as though our distributing system were efficient, but as a matter of fact in each of these cases the distribution is under the control of a thoroughly organized body of producers who have their own selling system and who have some assurance as to what the price will be before the goods arrive at destination, usually before they are even shipped. Instances of such effective cooperation among producers are, however, all too few in this country. We must multiply our existing cooperative activities at least by 10 before we will make a serious impression upon the food-distributing business of the country. Every possible legitimate encouragement should be given our farming community in the adoption of efficient methods in marketing and distribution as we have educated and assisted it in production. To study the methods of these successful producers' organizations and to give practical advice and assistance to such others as may be operated in less efficient fashions is one of the prime missions of the office of markets.

A general study of those problems of supply and demand, of the consumptive power of our principal markets, a study of the natural division of territory as between the various sections of the South which produce early fruits and vegetables are all among the activities which should tend to prevent useless and ruinous competition between producers, which, when it occurs, is the more to be regretted because our retail system is so lacking in elasticity that the price of the individual cabbage in the green grocery is but little reduced when carloads of cabbages are being dumped into the river because the commission houses can not move them.

The office has taken up the interests of the consumer in a direct fashion by making a study of city distribution and marketing facilities, the organization and efficiency of municipal markets, etc., and at the solicitation of various municipalities has undertaken to advise on the more general problems relating to the municipal food supply, such as the location of terminal wholesale markets, retail producers' markets, municipal market buildings, and the like.

Coming closer still to the individual producer, experiments and demonstrations are under way to bring out the greatest possible extent to which the parcel post may be used as a method of direct marketing and to increase the number of products which can be economically handled thereby. This field of investigation promises immediate result and is possibly of as great importance to the average small farmer and to the average consumer as any other one feature of this work.

The following are a few specific instances showing the necessity for the study of the question of markets.

GRAPEFRUIT.

In the case of a particular consignment of grapefruit from Cuba, consumed in Boston, the price paid to the producer was $2.75 for a box of 48s. The Boston consumer paid at the rate of $6 for the box of four dozen, so that $3.25 was distributed between the various agencies handling the product between the producer and the consumer. This difference went into the following charges and profits: Freight, 60 cents; duty, 65 cents; hauling, loss through deterioration, and retailer's profit, $2. In other words, 50 cents more than the producer received was distributed to intermediaries.

LETTUCE.

In the case of a shipment of lettuce from Charleston, S. C., consumed in the New York market, the price received by the producer was $2.44 per hamper of from 30 to 40 heads. The price paid by the consumer was $4.37½ per hamper, making a difference between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer of $1.93¾ per hamper. As nearly as could be determined, the following represents the distribution of the "spread": Commission, 15 cents; freight, 25 cents; refrigeration costs, 16 cents; hauling, loss, and profit to retailer, $1.37½.

POULTRY.

In the case of a shipment of poultry from eastern Massachusetts for consumption in Boston, the price received by the producer was 26 cents per pound. The price paid by the consumer was 60 cents, leaving a difference of 34 cents for division between the transportation and handling factors. The difference was actually divided up as follows: Transportation charges and commission, 7 cents; wholesaler's participation, 11 cents; retailer's share to cover costs and profit, 16 cents.

PINEAPPLES.

Florida pineapples shipped to Boston for which the producer received $1.65 per crate of 2 dozen cost the consumer $3.60 per box, a difference of $1.95. Sixty cents of the difference was consumed by transportation charges, while the retailer received for the services that he performed $1.35 per box. In other words, the producer who took all of the risks through a long season and furnished all the labor received only 30 cents more than the retailer who had a small investment in the product for a very short time.

MILK.

The milk situation varies with practically every center of population. Milk produced at Delphi, Montgomery County, Pa., and consumed in Philadelphia returned 4 cents per quart to the producer. The consumer paid 8 cents per quart. The difference of 4 cents is distributed over selling charges, freight, hauling, cooling, bottling, delivery, and retailer's profit.

PEACHES.

Elberta peaches produced at Paonia, Colo., and sold by the producer at 26 cents per flat sold in Boston at 90 cents. It is not possible to account for the distribution of all the difference, but the commission charges were 3½ cents, wholesaler's share 30 cents, retailer's share 15 cents.

In this particular case, which may not be considered the rule, the wholesaler received more for the short time that the product was in his hands than did the producer who took all the hazards and costs of production.

CABBAGES.

Early cabbage produced at Beaufort, S. C., for which the producer received $4.29 per 100-pound crate, sold in New York at only $5 per crate, a "spread" of 71 cents. As the price received by the producer was a delivered price in New York, the 71 cents is divided between a commission of 21 cents and retailer's cost and profit of 50 cents.

HAY.

Hay produced in Wyoming and sold in the field at $5 per ton sold to the consumer in Denver at $18 per ton. The difference, $13, between the producer and the consumer.

STRAWBERRIES.

Strawberries produced at Hempstead, Long Island, and consumed in Brooklyn, N. Y., yielded 14 cents per quart box to the producer and sold to the consumer at 25 cents per quart. The difference of 11 cents was divided between the commission man, who received 4 cents, and the retailer, who received 7 cents.

Individual instances of the character given above could be multiplied greatly, but what has been given is sufficient to show the possibilities of economy as well as the comparatively small percentage of the retail price that ultimately goes to the producer in the case of many products.

In addition to above statements, I have some remarkable figures here that are taken from a speech made by Mr. Yoakum a few years ago—I do not remember the exact date—to which I invite attention. Mr. Yoakum says:

The consumer pays a dollar for food; the farmer gets less than 50 cents for it. Who gets the balance?

On a crop worth $9,000,000,000, farm value, of which the farmer sells produce worth $6,000,000,000, and for which the consumers pay $13,000,000,000, by diverting 20 per cent of this $7,000,000,000 from an unnecessary economic waste to the pockets of the farmers would mean $1,400,000,000 additional a year.

A bushel of beans for which the producer in Florida receives $2.25, with the transportation 50 cents for the 800-mile haul, should not cost the consumer in New York $6.40 a bushel. The producer receives 35 per cent of what the consumer pays, the transporter 8 per cent, and the dealers 57 per cent. This is not a fair division.

A bale of cotton, which sells for $60 at the southern gin, should not become a speculative article costing the spinner $70 per bale, with the transporter receiving only $4.50 per bale for the thousand-mile haul from the farms of the South to the cotton mills of New England. The cost to the spinner should be the farmers' price with the transportation cost added. Any additional profit should go to the farmer.

The average price of eggs to the consumer in New York throughout last year was 30 cents a dozen. The average price paid to the farmers in the States of Arkansas and Missouri for eggs was 15 cents a dozen. The railroad charge for the 1,300-mile haul was 2 cents a dozen, including breakage, which the Government estimates at 10 per cent. The men who receive the eggs in New York in the morning and deliver them during the day take 13 cents a dozen profit, equal to 43 per cent.

The rice farmers of Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas can not sell their rice for more than 2½ cents a pound. The consumer in New York is paying 10 cents a pound for rice. It costs to transport rice from

Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas to New York one-half cent a pound. If the rice farmer was paid 3½ cents a pound and the dealer received 1 cent a pound, which is 25 per cent profit, rice could be sold in New York at 20 pounds for a dollar.

The appropriation in this bill is $200,000 for the bureau of markets. Last year it was $50,000, and we have increased it in this bill $150,000, for which increase I voted in subcommittee and in full committee and will cheerfully vote for it on this floor, and would vote for more if necessary to do the work, because I believe this bureau of markets has a great field before it and that it can help the people a great deal in finding out why it is that the products when they leave the producer sell for but a very small proportion of the value in accordance with what they bring when they reach the consumer. There is too much difference between the price obtained by the producer and the price paid by the consumer, and if we can find out where this waste goes, or, as my friend from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] called it a while ago, stealage, it will help the people very much. We want to discover that if we can, and the bureau of markets is trying to do that, and I think is succeeding wonderfully well. Therefore I am heartily in favor of the work; and there is another great work in which I think we can help the farmer, and that is to give him a system of farm credits. [Applause.] Just exactly what this system should be must necessarily be worked out by proper investigation and by full and free discussion, but there is no question in my mind but that we can help the farmer along this line, and that we should do so without delay. Practically every business interest has received attention at the hands of Congress. When the banking and currency bill was before us, when it was in committee, it was given very serious and very careful attention, and the banking interests throughout the country were consulted and were heard and given opportunity to present their views, and it was sought to frame a law along lines that would be beneficial to that interest and be beneficial also to the people, and as a result the currency law was framed and passed, for which I voted with pleasure.

Now, I want to make the appeal that when we come to consider the question of farm credits the farmer ought to have the opportunity to express his views and state what he wants and tell us what will best subserve his interests and the interests of the people.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In that connection, is it not a fact that the expenses of some of the witnesses who appeared before the committees in connection with the banking and currency bill were paid by the Government; and if so, should not the present joint committee investigating the facts and conditions having to do with farm credits throughout the country have farmers represented in the hearings before that committee, even if at the expense of the Government?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Witnesses before the Money Trust committee and other investigating committees were paid, but I do not know whether any witnesses who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee were paid by the Government or not.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If so, ought not the same facilities be extended now in reference to those interested in farm credits?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Certainly, when a committee is considering a question of such vital importance to the agricultural interests of the country, if it becomes necessary to bring witnesses here to get full information, they should be paid their expenses and a reasonable per diem, just like witnesses before any other committee. [Applause.] If it is necessary to secure information in behalf of the farmers and for their benefit, so far as I am concerned I will be glad at any time to vote for an appropriation for that purpose.

The farmers of this country in the past have borne more of the burdens of government and received less returns for their labor and capital than any other class of our citizens. Their work is more important to all of us than any other. If the day shall come when our very national life shall tremble in the balance, their treasure and their blood will be our Rock of Gibraltar. The fife and drum never sounded in vain a the farmer's gate when our country was in danger, and in this new day when the streams of nativity are diluted with hordes of immigrants in our congested cities we must more and more look to the farmers, who produce our national wealth, for the sustaining strength of our free institutions. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's speech is very interesting, and therefore I yield him five minutes more. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes additional.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this extension to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I did not expect to occupy as much time as I have, but there is one matter to which I want to refer before I close, and that is the charge of sectionalism made against this bill a few days ago by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. I am surprised that anybody from any part of this country or from anywhere would for one moment charge that this bill is in any sense of the word a sectional bill, because it goes into all of the ramifications of this country from one end of it to the other, and there is not a single solitary section of the country which is not interested in it and which is not represented in its appropriations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, take for example, as an illustration, the total expenditures in this bill, which are a little over $18,000,000, and the appropriation in the Secretary's office for administrative work, which is $329,830. This is for the general work. For the Weather Bureau the appropriation is $1,668,270, and the Weather Bureau does work throughout the country in every part and section of it. The Bureau of Animal Industry appropriation is something like $5,000,000, and this work is done throughout the whole land. The appropriation for plant industry is a little over $3,000,000, and that work is done throughout the country. Take the appropriations together, and go through this bill from one end of it to the other, and you will see they cover the whole country and there is no sectionalism about it. I regret at this late day, when the clouds have rolled away and when the sun shines bright over this land and over all its people, and when peace is in every heart, anybody upon the floor of the House of Representatives, I do not care who he is or where he comes from, should charge that there is sectionalism in this bill, which is intended to help agriculture in every section of this country. [Applause.] There is no East, no West, no North, no South, no sections, when it comes to the agricultural development of this country. [Applause.] We have a common country which we all love, an indissoluble Union, a galaxy of indestructible States all clustered around and bearing allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of liberty, our country's glory—a country our ancestors fought to secure, a country for which we would, if necessary, die. [Applause.] I am glad to-day to be an American citizen, and from the time I entered Congress up to the present hour I have done what I could to advance the interest of every part of this country, and will do so as long as I remain here. [Applause.]

I have devoted all the talent I had and what ability I possessed to trying to build up the country from one end of it to the other, and I have labored as best I could to build up the great agricultural interests, because I believed in building it up—I would help to build up every part of the country and every substantial interest underneath the prosperity of this great Republic.

I thank you, gentlemen of the House, for your very kind attention. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD so as to include some data to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY], a member of the committee.

[Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the Agricultural appropriation bill from a standpoint from which I have never yet heard it discussed, asking the questions: Have we a national agricultural policy? If so, what is it? How do we purpose to realize it? What is being done from year to year to carry it out? What more should be undertaken and done?

These are the questions to which I desire to call the attention of the House and the country. The expenditure of some $20,000,000 of the public funds in connection with so important an interest should be made in pursuance of a well-defined policy, consistently followed out.

The items in the Agricultural appropriation bill are, for convenience in making the appropriations, arranged under the titles of the different bureaus, divisions, and offices. This arrangement, however, conceals rather than discloses the system of agricultural development upon which the bill is based.

It is my intention to reconstruct and explain as far as possible within the limit of time at my disposal the general system embodied in the bill, but resolved here into its elements. It is not a system struck off at one time by the brain and purpose of man, but a gradual evolution, which for a period grew with the development of the country, but within the past 15 years has aimed at agricultural leadership, sometimes voluntarily assumed by the department, sometimes urged upon it by the country and the Congress; incomplete in many of its phases, limited by the funds under which its work must be done, and the scientific and constructive ability which can be secured, but which is steadily developing into a great and invaluable system, growing with the growth of the country and destined, I believe, to become the greatest agricultural program in the world.

Under our system not all the appropriations or legislation which relates to agriculture, directly or indirectly, comes from the Committee on Agriculture, and to present a complete statement I shall need to include a few matters not in the Agricultural bill. I hope also in a measure to forecast the future expansion of our agricultural policy, and to state the ultimate object at which it aims, and to point out in friendly criticism the opportunities for improvement. But on the whole I shall accept the policy as I find it in the bill, reassemble it, and reconstruct it into an ordered whole.

Of the six purposes stated in the Constitution of the United States, the fifth is "to promote the general welfare," whether it be taken in a political or economic sense. Since the Committee on Agriculture eschews politics, the millions appropriated in this bill are for the economic benefit of the people, and while the work done generally relates to the farmer and his activities, everyone is interested in the character, quality, and quantity of his production.

Our general prosperity is dependent upon the fortune attending the work of those who appeal to the soil, whether they produce grain, vegetables, fruits, or meats; and as a body they are the most important business section of our people, since their $10,000,000,000 or more of annual production exceeds very materially the results of the labors of any other portion of the population.

The difficulties attending successful agriculture, horticulture, and stock raising are many and serious, and are not confined to small areas, generally; nor are they capable of being limited in extent except by the most expert investigation and general cooperation. That is, a local outbreak of plant or animal disease tends to become nation-wide; soil problems repeat themselves, with variations, over the whole country; and the successful solution of a difficulty in one place will probably apply with equally favorable results elsewhere with proper adaptation. And while many of the items in this bill make appropriations to deal with localized problems, the country is benefited as a whole either by the prevention of the spread of diseases of plants or animals or by having the production of a certain locality protected and increased, or by the solution of soil or other problems that have a country-wide interest or occurrence.

If all of the hundreds of different kinds of pests had as great an activity nation-wide as they have in certain localities, the day of agriculture would be nearly over. Our hope is, as Napoleon said, in keeping our enemies scattered and defeating them in detail. At my request the department has kindly furnished me the following statement:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, March 6, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. HAWLEY: Referring to your letter of February 28, 1914, requesting a list of the bugs, beetles, spiders, etc., and of the fungi and other pests that make life a burden to the farmer, I am sending you herewith two memoranda—one from Dr. Howard, in reference to the insects, and the other from Mr. Taylor, in reference to the fungi.

Very truly, yours,

B. T. GALLOWAY,
*Assistant Secretary.*

---

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,
*Washington, D. C., March 5, 1914.*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: It is estimated that there are about 600 diseases of cultivated plants in the United States which are of economic importance. A list of the most important is attached hereto. These are arranged by host plants, for convenience of reference.

Yours, very truly,

WM. A. TAYLOR,
*Chief of Bureau.*

*List of common names of plant diseases.*

DISEASES OF FRUITS.

Apple: Bitter-rot, black-rot or canker, blackspot canker, blight, brown-rot, crown-gall, European canker, fly-speck, fruit-blotch, hairy-root, Illinois canker, leaf-spot, physiological fruit-spot, powdery mildew, rot, volutella rot, rust, scab, scurf, spray injury, winter injury.

Pear: Blight, leaf-blight, leaf-spot, rust, scab.

Quince: Black-rot, blight, leaf-spot, rust.

Cherry: Black-knot, brown-rot, leaf-spot, powdery mildew.

Peach: Black-spot, brown-rot, crown-gall, die-back, frost injury, frosty mildew, gumming disease, leaf-curl, little peach, powdery mildew, pustular spot, root-rot, rosette, rust, yellows.

Plum: Black-knot, black-spot, brown-rot, leaf-spot, plum-pockets, powdery mildew, rust.

Blackberry: Anthracnose, crown-gall, leaf-spot, rust.

Cranberry: Anthracnose, hypertrophy, rot, scald, blast.

Currant: Anthracnose, cane blight, leaf-spot, powdery mildew, rust, knot.

Gooseberry: Leaf-spot, powdery mildew.

Grape: Anthracnose, black-rot, downy mildew, crown-gall, powdery mildew, root-knot.

Raspberry: Anthracnose, crown-gall, leaf-spot, rust.

Strawberry: Leaf-spot.

Avocado: Anthracnose.

Citrous fruits: Anthracnose or wither-tip, blight, die-back, frenching, gumming, root-rot, scab, scaly-bark.

Fig: Fruit-rot, root-knot, rust.

Loquat: Anthracnose, or blossom blight.

Mango: Anthracnose.

Papaya: Fruit-rot.

DISEASES OF VEGETABLES AND DRUG PLANTS.

Asparagus: Rust.

Bean: Anthracnose, bacteria. spot, blight, downy mildew, leaf-spots, rust, stem and pod rot.

Beet: Crown-rot, curly-top, leaf-blight, nematode disease, root-rot, root-knot.

Cabbage: Black-rot, club-root, downy mildew, wilt, root-knot, black-leg, soft-rot, malnutrition, white-rust, leaf-blight, powdery mildew, damping off.

Cassava: Leaf-spot.

Cantaloupe: Anthracnose, downy mildew, leaf-blight, wilt, root-knot, powdery mildew.

Cauliflower: Black-rot, spot disease.

Celery: Leaf-blight, leaf-spot, heart-rot.

Collards: Leaf-blight, black-rot.

Cucumber: Anthracnose, damping-off, downy mildew, mosaic, scab, wilt.

Eggplant: Anthracnose, blight, fruit-rot, leaf-spot.

Ginseng: Blight, stem anthracnose, Bordeaux injury, mildew, papery leaf-spot, damping-off, wilt, root-gall, rust, soft-rot, white-rot, black-rot.

Golden seal: Alternaria blight, stem rot.

Horse-radish: Leaf blight, leaf spot.

Lettuce: Anthracnose, downy mildew, drop, rosette, tipburn.

Okra: Root knot.

Onion: Brittle, downy mildew, smut.

Parsley: Crown rot.

Parsnip: Leaf spot.

Pea: Ascochyta blight, powdery mildew.

Peanut: Leaf spot.

Pepper: Anthracnose.

Potato: Blackleg, dry-rot, early blight, leaf blotch, late blight, common scab, russet scab, powdery scab, potato wart, silver scurf, wilt, internal brown spot, celworm, leaf roll, curly dwarf, rosette, mosaic.

Roselle: Powdery mildew.

Salsify: White rust.

Spinach: Downy mildew.

Squash: Bacterial wilt.

Sugar cane: Eyespot of leaf, pineapple disease, red rot of stem, rind disease, ring spot of leaf, clathrus root disease, ithyphallus root disease, marasmius root disease.

Sweet potato: Black rot, dry-rot, soil rot, soft rot, stem rot, white rust, foot rot.

Tobacco: Bed rot, mosaic disease, root knot, wilt.

Tomato: Anthracnose, bacterial blight, leaf mold, leaf spot, mosaic disease, point rot, root knot, western blight, wilt.

Turnip: Downy mildew.

Watermelon: Anthracnose, downy mildew, root knot, wilt, leaf blight, other leaf-spot diseases.

DISEASES OF CEREALS.

Barley: Ergot, leaf rust, stem rust, scab, covered smut, loose smut, yellow leaf disease.

Corn: Dry-rot, leaf blight, rust, smut.

Millet: Spot, smut, leaf blight.

Oats: Leaf rust, scab, smut.

Rice: Black smut, blast, green smut.

Rye: Ergot, rusts, scab.

Sorghum: Blight, head smut, kernel smut.

Wheat: Powdery mildew, leaf rust, stem rust, scab, loose smut, stinking smut.

DISEASES OF FORAGE CROPS.

Alfalfa: Leaf blight, anthracnose, bacterial blight, dodder, downy mildew, leaf spot, rust.

Blue grass: Rust.

Clover: Anthracnose, black spot, dodder, leaf spot, rust, winter injury.

Cowpea: Wilt, leaf spot, root knot.

Quack grass: Smut.

Timothy: Rust, smut.

Vetch: Spot.

DISEASES OF FIBER PLANTS.

Cotton: Angular leaf spot, anthracnose, aerolate leaf spot, root knot, Texas root rot, wilt.

Flax: Wilt.

DISEASES OF FOREST, NUT, AND SHADE TREES.

Alpine fir: Heart rot.

Ash: Rust.

Aspen: Leaf blight, heart rot, sap rot.

Balm of Gilead: Leaf spot.

Balsam: Sap rot.

Black walnut: Leaf spot.

Bull pine: Heart rot, leaf blight, sap rot, damping off, root rot.
Butternut: Heart rot.
Catalpa: Leaf spot.
Cedar: Rust, root disease, leaf blight.
Chestnut: Anthracnose, sap rot, bark disease.
Cottonwood: Rust, sap rot.
Douglas spruce: Sap rot, heart rot, root rot, freezing.
Elm: Black spot, leaf spot.
Engelmann spruce: Rust, heart rot, sap rot, frost injury.
English walnut: Blight.
Green ash: Rust.
Hemlock: Heart rot, sap rot.
Hickory: Leaf spot.
Hornbeam: Heart rot.
Horse chestnut: Leaf spot.
Jack oak: Sterile fungus.
Jack pine: Leaf blight.
Locust: Heart rot.
Lodgepole pine: Heart rot, sap rot.
Lowland fir: Heart rot.
Maple: Anthracnose, leaf spot, sun scald, leaf scorch.
Mountain maple: Heart rot, sap rot.
Mulberry: Leaf spot, root knot.
New Mexican locust: Heart rot.
Oak: Leaf curl.
Oregon maple: Leaf spot.
Osage orange: Rust.
Paper birch: Sap rot.
Pecan: Rosette, scab.
Pitch pine: Leaf blight, heart rot.
Privet: Anthracnose.
Red juniper: Rust.
Red oak: Nut rot.
Red pine: Twig blight.
River birch: Heart rot.
Rocky Mountain maple: Leaf spot.
Sassafras: Heart rot.
Scotch pine: Damping off, leaf blight.
Scrub pine: Rust.
Silver maple: Heart rot, leaf spot.
Striped maple: Heart rot.
Sugar maple: Heart rot, sap rot.
Sugar pine: Sap rot, heart rot.
Sycamore: Anthracnose.
White ash: Heart rot.
White birch: Sap rot.
White elm: Leaf spot, heart rot.
White pine: Damping off, leaf blight, root rot.
White spruce: Heart rot, sap rot.
Willow: Rust, black spot.
Yellow birch: Heart rot.

DISEASES OF ORNAMENTAL PLANTS.

Aster: Rust, wilt, yellows.
Carnation: Bud rot, fairy ring disease, root knot, rust, stigmonose.
Chrysanthemum: Leaf spot, rust, ray blight, powdery mildew.
Dahlia: Powdery mildew.
Hollyhock: Leaf blight, rust.
Lilac: Powdery mildew.
Lobelia: Root knot.
Peony: Wilt.
Rose: Crown gall, leaf blotch, leaf spot, root knot, rust, powdery mildew.
Sweet pea: Anthracnose.
Violet: Leaf spot, root knot.
Virginia creeper: Leaf spot, powdery mildew.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY,
*Washington, D. C., March 3, 1914.*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ACTING SECRETARY.

[To accompany letter from Congressman HAWLEY.]

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: The inclosed letter from Mr. HAWLEY includes plant diseases, and this memorandum will simply cover the entomological part of the answer to his letter. I have called him up by telephone and find that he does not wish a complete list, but wishes to know about how many there are of these drawbacks to the farmer. The following paragraph will serve as an answer:

It is estimated that there are about 400,000 different kinds of insects in the United States, and that about half of these are injurious to man. Of insect enemies to farmers' crops in this country there are about 500 species of first-class importance, the combined work of which seriously reduces the value of our crops every year, while there is an army of additional species which together bring about great loss but which individually are not so dangerous. It is estimated that we lose every year from 10 to 15 per cent of our crops through the work of insects. Some of our principal insect enemies are the cotton-boll weevil, gypsy moth, brown-tail moth, codling moth, chinch bug, Hessian fly, army worm, San Jose scale, plum curculio, Colorado potato beetle, tussock moth, tent caterpillar, the pine-bark beetles, rice weevil, Argentine ant, the white fly, Mexican range caterpillar, alfalfa weevil, clover-seed midge, clover-seed chalcis, corn root worms, the bollworm, cotton caterpillar, horn fly, ox warble, red spider of cotton, pear thrips, grape phylloxera, grape root worm, grape berry moth, the purple scale, the red scale, the black scale, white grubs, cabbage worm, onion thrips, cabbage and onion root maggots, the fire worm of cranberries, round-headed appletree borer, flat-headed appletree borer, peach borer.

Yours, respectfully,

L. O. HOWARD, *Chief of Bureau.*

The Agricultural appropriation bill has two distinct purposes—to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States and to discourage the activities of pestiferous bugs. The larger mammals which roamed this country have mostly yielded to the encroachments of civilization and have faded away into the dim land of dreams. High-browed and earnest scientific experts are trying to rehabilitate some of them and to induce them to bear a part of the white man's burden. For instance, take that midnight-coated chap with the lightning stripe down his back whom we as country boys used to chase away from our hen palaces at dead of night and transform into a fragrant memory. We are now earnestly desiring him to multiply and replenish the earth so that, after a blameless life, he may yield his integument to adorn my lady's person as lordly sable or marten.

But the little bug and his numerous kin are not easily discouraged, and refuse to fade away into gentle memories.

It is the little bug that gets the farmer's goat; also his sheep, cow, horse, pig, wheat, oats, corn, barley, apple, pear, peach, potato, and all that the farmer has, including the farmer himself sometimes. In almost every instance said little bug is a foreigner, a most undesirable immigrant, who carries on a competition, un-American in character, against the farmer. Since it is to be hoped that from the American farmer the American people will always derive their principal food supplies, we think our Democratic friends, who historically "view with alarm," can find something in this situation to justify a fear; yet I think I ought to say that just now the American farmer appears to be viewing the Democratic Party with alarm. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

And the little bugs have dangerous allies. Some of our good citizens are greatly exercised over what seems to them to be the early disappearance of our forests. I am, however, just now more troubled by the rapid increase of fungi and other growths of small size, short life, and great persistence, which, like Attila's hordes, blast alike the farmers' crops and hopes. The farmer has other troubles. The experts in the Weather Bureau, speaking in fun, have so mixed the elements that it rains now on new-mown hay and shines with fervent heat on cabbages freshly set. Damp weather prevails and keeps Mrs. Honey Bee at home when the fruit trees ought to be pollenized; but when thirsty crops sigh for water a summer sun shines from an untroubled sky, while Fifth Avenue dudes say to each other in passing, "Fine growing weather, old chap," in their blissful ignorance, not knowing that useful things are not as freshly green as they are.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOHER). Does the gentleman from Oregon yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman in all fairness why he did not raise those objections in the committee? If he had, they would have been arranged for in the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. I refer the whole subject to the able gentleman from Nebraska. [Laughter.]

The farmer's days and nights are spent in labors to improve his crops and stock, or in fighting the pests that rob him of the results of his toil.

The agricultural advance in this country began many years ago. Among the causes for it, in addition to the instinct of the American to make progress, were the so-called wearing out of the soils, the increase of pests, need of new crops for lands already under cultivation, and crops for lands for which this country had none suitable, small returns from crops and farm animals, and the diseases that attacked farm animals.

The solution of the difficulties in which agriculture was involved included, for fruits and plants, the study of the factors of soil composition and fertility, better seed, new varieties of old crops, rust and drought resistant varieties, acclimatization, new crops from abroad, rotation of crops, diversification of agriculture, better methods, fertilizing used lands, drainage, and irrigation; and for animals improving the breed, quality, and numbers of the stock, and eradicating or restricting disease.

It is impossible to break the bill up and rearrange it so that any arrangement of headings will have under each only one particular matter, as many of the items deal with several phases of a problem or with several problems. The arrangement given below presents, I believe, the best systematic statement of the purposes and policy of the Government in matters relating to agriculture in all its forms. Some items in the bill will necessarily be omitted without comment. Nor will it be possible to state in detail all the work that is being done, interesting and useful as such detail would be. Details will be used, however, when they are illustrative of the general policy.

INVESTIGATION AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

The work of the department may be divided into two parts—investigation and practical application, which are the two phases in the solution of any problem. The research work in general is done with a definite purpose in view. It arises out of the problems connected with practical agriculture. The application of the results of the research work is kept constantly in view. That is, the department does not do its work as if it were an organization for pure scientific investigation only, interested alone in solving problems, but takes the wider view

that such solutions are undertaken for the benefit of agriculture and incident to the attainment of such benefit. That purely scientific work is subordinated to the promotion of the public welfare does not impair, but rather enhances its value.

Because the bill is made up on a "project" basis and many items contain provisions for several different kinds of work, I have not found it possible at this time to give the amounts expended under each division. But in a discussion of the policy of the bill it is hardly necessary to give these amounts.

I have made, after careful consideration and an experience of several years on the committee, the following systematic arrangement in elucidation of our national policy for the promotion of agriculture in all its forms as essentially contained in this bill, bearing in mind that investigation and practical application are the beginning and the end of the work under each heading with many processes and stages of progress between such beginning and end:

PREPARING FOR THE CROP.
I. THE SOIL ITSELF.
II. SELECTION OF THE SOIL—THAT IS, CHOOSING THE PROPER CROP FOR EACH SOIL.
III. COLLECTING AND SELECTING THE SEED.
IV. IMPROVEMENT OF THE CROP IN CONNECTION WITH PLANTING.
V. PREPARING THE SOIL AND PLANTING.
GROWING THE CROP.
I. CROP ENEMIES: PESTS AND DISEASES.
II. STOPPING THE IMPORTATION OF PESTS.
III. WEATHER RELATIONS.
GATHERING THE CROP.
DISPOSING OF THE CROP.
I. FINDING THE MARKET.
II. PREPARING THE CROP FOR TRANSPORTATION TO MARKET.
III. TRANSPORTING THE CROP.
WASTES—PREVENTION OF WASTES AND UTILIZING WASTE PRODUCTS.
USING THE RESULTS FROM THE CROP.
FROM PRODUCER TO CONSUMER.
NEW FIELDS FOR THE FARMER.
UTILIZING THE CROP.
TAKING THE RESULTS OF INVESTIGATIONS TO THE FARMER.
COOPERATION.
ANIMAL HUSBANDRY.
EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL AREAS.
DAIRYING.
MEAT PRODUCTION.
POULTRY AND EGGS.
OTHER PRODUCTS—WOOL, HIDES, AND SO FORTH.
MISCELLANEOUS.
THE FARM HOME.

At every stage in the process of producing all of the general and practically all of the special crops the department is prepared to obtain and supply expert information concerning the nature and solution of the problems as they arise, and to furnish the practical application of the remedies determined upon.

That is, the department performs certain investigational work under every subject and every subdivision, and goes into the matter very exhaustively, obtaining through its own experts and the experts in the agricultural colleges and the experts of every other country in the world all the knowledge they have on any given problem, digests it, arranges it, and then transmits it to the farmer, either by bulletins or through the press or other publications or by sending men directly from the department in Washington, in the case of a very important problem, or by cooperating with State agents or county agents or with other people who are interested in carrying the information to the farmer; so that there is, in connection with all the above topics, a most systematic and thoroughgoing investigation and solution of problems, and then an equally careful and detailed application of the solutions.

I have studied this bill with a great deal of care for many years. When I first became a member of the Committee on Agriculture it appeared to me, upon reading the Agricultural bill, with the items under the different bureaus, that it was without a system; that problems were taken up because somebody urged or because some scientist was especially interested in the discussion of other problems, or because it was a matter submitted by some State authority; but after many years of hearings and careful investigation and an examination of the expenditures, and, in the district I have the honor to represent, a personal investigation of the work done, I have found in this bill a great agricultural policy, in the carrying out of which great industry and learning have been gathered in Washington or have been assembled in the various State agricultural colleges and other institutions for the promotion of agriculture; and that there is general cooperation and general extension of the work all along the line. For, as has been said many times here and elsewhere, if we can not induce the farming population to increase with the growth of the country, a farming population which owns its own homes, but are to have rather a system of tenant production and tenant farming, the day of our agricultural advance is nearly over. [Applause.]

It has been proven by history, and I think it will still be the fact of history, that governments finally rest upon a foundation of people who make the first appeal to the soil.

I wish I had the time and you the patience that I might speak at necessary length upon each of these subdivisions and point out the character and the nature of the work undertaken by the department. Not having that time, I shall discuss the topics briefly, beginning with the first:

PREPARING FOR THE CROP—FIRST, THE SOIL ITSELF.

The place of beginning is with the soil itself. The Bureau of Soils is making a comprehensive soil survey of the entire United States so that in time our whole area will have been scientifically investigated, determined, and mapped, first by reconnoissance and then by detail surveys. In conjunction with this work, physical and chemical analyses of the soil are made—the physical analyses to ascertain the important properties of the soil that are determining factors in production, including moisture relations, aeration, heat conductivity, and texture; the chemical analyses to determine types, composition, minerals, solubility, texture, and productivity of soils. Soils are frequently deficient, and the organic causes of infertility must be ascertained and its capacity to produce be established, first, by investigating the problem of the properties and composition of humus already in the soil, its transformation, and the formation and increase of soil humus by soil organisms; second, by explorations to discover sources of supplies of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, including city garbage and the taking of nitrogen from the air by electrical methods in order to supply the natural deficiencies of soils.

The Bureau of Plant Industry makes investigations of soil bacteria to determine the distribution, kinds, numbers, and functions of microorganisms in soils (and distributes to farmers for experimental purposes pure cultures useful in the growth of legumes), and plant nutrition to ascertain what may be called the feeding qualities of plants and the results of their feeding habits.

The Office of Experiment Stations investigates the problems involved in removing the surplus waters from swamp and other wet lands preparatory to their use for agricultural purposes.

This, in brief, is the work done in and upon the soil to find out what qualities it has for sustaining plant life, its excellencies and its deficiencies, and how it may be improved, so that when all the investigations are concluded and the problems solved, the soil of our country, the fundamental basis of our prosperity, may be kept in an efficient state continually, if those who use it will do for it the things necessary to be done.

II. SELECTION OF THE SOIL.

The second step in preparing for the crop is the selection of the soil; that is, choosing a proper crop for each soil. It would be of great advantage to every farmer to have a soil survey made of his farm, so that he might know what every acre of it contained, and from that information given by competent authority he could tell what crops to plant for the most profit upon any given acre; if the chemical and physical effect of the growing of the crop of this year upon the content, texture, and condition of the soil is known, the succeeding year a crop may be planted which will tend to counteract any evils which the present crop in growing may have produced, keep the soil in good condition, and measurably prepare the soil for the succeeding crop.

If the proper relationship of crops to one another is observed and the succeeding crop properly chosen, the capacity of the soil to produce will be conserved and production increased.

Then there are questions of water drainage, and in fruit growing the important question of air drainage.

III. COLLECTING AND SELECTING THE SEED.

The third step in the preparing for the crop is collecting and selecting the seed, and in the word "seed" I intend to include plants, scions, and so forth, as well as seeds, using the word in the wide sense. It has been the practice sometimes to plant poor seed and to sell the best seed, because it would bring a greater price in the market. The head of the herd in the stockyard is no longer a mongrel bull, boar, stallion, or buck, possibly of large size but without the qualities of stamina and long-established race.

In the general stock raising of the country more attention has been paid to getting good stock animals for the increase of the herd than has been paid to getting good stock seed for the increase of the crops grown from the soil. The hardy, vigorous,

well-grown specimens from the crop from the proper seed to be sown for the succeeding crop. A vigorous seed will produce a vigorous progeny. A well-bred seed having an ancestry that goes back several generations true to type, of established productivity, able to withstand pests and drought and disease and inclemencies of the weather, will produce a greater crop on the same soil and with the same care than poor seed will. Mr. Burbank, a justly celebrated citizen of the United States, laid emphasis on the breeding of plants for seed and for variety. He bred a potato called the Burbank seedless, and after years of work established a strain that, having been planted for many years, now reproduces itself practically the same as the original strain that he put into commerce, just as Hereford bulls and Percheron stallions will reproduce in their posterity the valuable qualities they have in themselves.

But while less has been heard about it, the experts in the Department of Agriculture have pursued the same plans with, I think, equal success and with a wider intention. The experts in the Department of Agriculture have the opportunity of attacking every problem that affects agricultural development in the United States; and if as much publicity had been given to the results of their investigation and practical application of their work as has been justly given to Mr. Burbank, the value of that department and some of the men in it would be greatly increased in the public mind. They are breeding varieties, for instance, for localities. Corn in the early history of this country was a crop that was confined to small areas. By breeding it has been extended over all the United States. It was said out in certain portions of the West where there is considerable moisture and cool nights in summer that corn could not be grown; but within the last few years, to my own personal knowledge and at my instance, there has been bred in the western part of Oregon corn that will mature within the season, will stand the coolness of the nights, and will produce a profitable return.

Besides breeding for locality, they have been breeding to resist disease. Take the case of the boll weevil. When that pest appeared it looked as if the entire cotton industry of the South was to be destroyed in time. The coming of the boll weevil and his multiplication in enormous numbers, and with no natural way to limit his activities, seemed to indicate to the southern farmer "the day of your cotton agriculture is over." But the experts in the department took up the problem first from the standpoint of investigation. What can be done? What has been done? The most important problem in all the growth of the crop was involved. There are two things that go side by side. First, there is an investigation of the strength of the seed and of the sprouts that the seed sends up, their developing vigor, until the day when the plant comes into flower, and by the succeeding changes to the maturity of the crop. Side by side with that is the development of pest or disease. The pest, for illustration, may begin as a microscopic egg. What can be done to destroy the egg? What is the vigor of the little chap that emerges from the egg? What particular transformations does he go through in his life history? Where is the place in his growth that you can hit him the hardest? Does his vigor correspond with the vigor of the plant or is he weak at some time when the plant is strong? If it is found in the investigation that the pest has a weak spot in his life history at a time when the plant is strong, then plant at such a season as to get the plant to a condition of strength while the insect is in his position of weakness. That is, plant early or plant late.

It may be that the feeding habits of the pest afford an opportunity of attack. If so, use sprays; and in order to make the spray successful there is an appropriation in this bill for the testing of sprays offered in the commercial market to see that when the farmer applies them to the plants in order to destroy the activity of the pest they will accomplish the result it was intended they should accomplish. A study of both the life history of the plant and the pest individually and in their relations to each other is essential. The plant may have a stage in its growth when it will become immune to the ravages of the pest; if not, and the pest can not be eliminated, it will probably mean the growing of new crops. But the pests have weak places in their life history. It may be in connection with feeding habits, and sprays will prove effective, or it may be in connection with reproduction or seasonal conditions; whatever and wherever it is, it is the duty of the scientist to discover the stage of its existence most open to attack. This involves the painstaking and unremitting study of, we might say, every hour of the pest's life, from the earliest infancy, through a ravenous youth, up to the period of reproduction and death.

I should have said a moment ago that there is an appropriation in this bill under which the department goes out into the general market where seeds are offered for sale and buys them unknown to the dealer and tests them in the laboratories of the department to see whether the seeds furnished to the farmer, where he does not grow his own, are of the quality, character, and kind that they profess to be.

But one of the most valuable activities in this field of the collection of the seed is that of the agricultural explorer. There is no land he has not visited. There is no sun that he has not seen, no winter that he has not experienced. There is no parallel of latitude along which he has not traveled. There is no day of the year that he has not or will not view foreign countries and their products. There is no crop that he has not found or is not now seeking to find.

Mr. SLOAN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Has this explorer gone through all the wilds and jungles of far-off Oregon?

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman from Nebraska may be pardoned that question, in view of the fact that he has never seen that glorious country.

But if he will come to Oregon, he will find that there is no land under the shining sun that would so delight his heart, fire his imagination, stir his emotion, or fill his purse.

Mr. SLOAN. I accept the invitation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAWLEY. We who have lived in Oregon love her. It reminds me of a story of a little boy who was very naughty. His mother said, "Johnny, to-morrow you must behave yourself." He said, "What is that?" She said, "To-morrow you must behave yourself, and I will show you how to do it." In the morning at 8 o'clock she called him up with an armful of switches—hazel branches, I think; at least, they are the educational branch in Oregon—and she said, "Johnny, I am going to call you up every hour, and if you have done anything naughty, I will punish you." She called him at 9 o'clock, and he had painted old Deacon Brown's white cow red and blue in honor of the Fourth of July, which was the next day. She whipped him. At 10 o'clock, "Had he been naughty?" He had. He had thrown the kitten down the well. She whipped him. At 11 o'clock, "Had he been naughty?" He had, and so she punished him again. And at 12 o'clock and at 1 o'clock and at 2 o'clock she gave him a rehearsal, 3 o'clock a matinee, and 4 o'clock a full-dress rehearsal with orchestra, and Johnny furnished the orchestra. Wearied with the apparently fruitless labors of the day, she threw her last switch behind an old-fashioned perforated cardboard motto, worked in crewel yarn, in which was the motto, "God bless our home," and said with discouragement, "You are the worst boy in town." Our mothers would admit that to us when they would not to the neighbors. Johnny rubbed the spots that hurt him—he was not seriously injured—and said, "Mother, don't put that switch behind that motto which says 'God bless our home'; put it behind this one on this side which says 'I need Thee every hour.'" [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the switches that he mentions grew on the stumps for which we provide an appropriation in this bill for the removal?

Mr. HAWLEY. Those stumps produce good switches; that is true.

Mr. Chairman, before the interruption by the gentleman from Nebraska I was endeavoring to picture one of the most important activities of the department. What have these agricultural explorers done? Have their travels into Africa and its desert, into Asia and her deserts, into Europe and into Siberia, and to islands and all foreign lands been of any value to the farming population of the country? As a result of them we have the Algerian, durum or macaroni, wheat. The appropriation for the investigation of that grain made a few years ago was some $10,000, as I recall, and two years ago the output of that wheat in this country was valued at $50,000,000.

There are vast areas in the West that have insufficient quantity of moisture, and the Siberian alfalfa or the Turkestan alfalfa are proving exceptionally valuable. For places where rust strikes the grain, rust-resistant grains have been found and are now being introduced here in sections where grain has had to contend with rust for centuries, as well as with drought. In all the activities of the department, this activity, for the amount of money expended, has made as valuable returns as any.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAUGEN. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he suggests that there should be greater cooperation in the departments he has referred to—the Soil Survey and Bureau of Plant Industry. Does the gentleman suggest that there should be greater cooperation in the two bureaus with a view that the

two bureaus should determine what plants are best adapted to certain soil and what soil is adapted to certain plants?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think the gentleman's suggestion is sound. There should be a systematic development of work in the department, viewed as one enterprise, and then the results of their investigations would admit of practical application and should be distributed among the farmers and to the agricultural experiment stations and other people active in farm work for distribution among the farmers.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. I just heard a part of the gentleman's remarks. He said that they had discovered, as I understood him, a preventive of rust in small grains, or some preventive measure.

Mr. HAWLEY. I said that they are endeavoring to find rust-resistant grains.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is not rust due to climatic conditions, to an excess of moisture?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. If we can find in an older country, where they have rust-resistant grains that have been growing under similar climatic conditions for centuries, a grain that has established itself so that it will mature and develop in spite of the rust—such a grain introduced here would doubtless be rust-resistant.

Mr. ANTHONY. The same way the department discovered the durum wheat from the Mediterranean that withstands the drought.

IV. IMPROVEMENT OF CROPS.

Mr. HAWLEY. The increase in yield in quantity and quality is as possible in agricultural products as in stock raising by solving the problems of their physiology, breeding possibilities, and adaptation to soil and climate, as in the case of corn, flax, broom corn, sugar beets, dates, and so forth. By a study of wild plants, lands chiefly valuable for grazing may be recovered by the natural plants or plants suitable for such conditions when the diseases which causes their failure to persist are discovered. Plants which resist alkali and drought, or which will grow profitably upon semiarid or dry lands, are being found, and the studies of farming under such conditions are rendering habitable large areas.

V. PREPARING THE SOIL AND PLANTING.

The investigations made in such problems as plowing and other mechanical treatment of the soil, cover crops, green manures and other fertilizers, early or late planting, freeing the seed from disease, use of machinery for planting, fertilizing, and cultivation are extensive, but so well known as to require no further comment.

VI. GROWING THE CROP—PESTS AND DISEASES.

Probably no problem is more serious than that involved in saving the crops from pest and disease. Special methods of cultivation will promote the growth of the plant and its power to resist and destroy some of its enemies. A change in times of planting will, so to say, outwit the plant's enemies and give it an advantage. Fungicides and insecticides anticipate their ravages or destroy them. But they number millions of individuals, with varying powers of resistance and vitality, and their activities are never ended. When I asked for a complete list of these crop and stock enemies I was informed that while they now number many thousands of species, the list is never complete, but continually growing.

The lines of work carried on cover the diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug plants, ginseng, fruits, vineyards, nuts, cereals, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, beets, oranges, lemons, grapefruit, mango, and all other products, and insects attacking all the above. We are threatened continually with the importation of new pests and diseases. Some of the most dangerous have not yet secured entrance into this country, but only the most stringent measures and greatest watchfulness can prevent their entrance. We have enacted a plant-quarantine act and authorized the establishment of quarantines against foreign localities from which importations might introduce pests or diseases into the United States, including diseased live stock; and the law relating to insecticides and fungicides authorizes the department to take necessary steps to protect the purity and efficiency of these articles when offered in commerce.

DEALING WITH PESTS.

Why should the Government appropriate money to aid in the solution of these problems? Because their solution in the last analysis will demand the knowledge and training of scientific experts, and practically as many kinds of experts as there are different problems. The scientists in the several bureaus, offices, or divisions that deal with these problems might be called plant doctors, animal doctors, soil doctors. Each must and should confine his work to a very limited sphere, so that as his sphere of activity decreases his knowledge of what is involved in his work and his efficiency will intensify. For instance, take the gipsy moth, cotton-boll weevil, or any other insect pest. What method shall be used to combat and to destroy it? Spraying, rotation of crops, improved cultivation, new crops, or early planting, and how? And after the scientist has solved these problems the next step is to get the information to those who must eventually make use of it and to show them how to use it effectively. Shall it be by printed matter or personal demonstration? The former was first most generally used, and is now in use, but it was found some years ago that the department had accumulated a vast amount of invaluable information which was lying like unminted gold in its bureaus. A policy of farm-demonstration work was inaugurated some years ago and is being developed and extended in cooperation with the States by which this information can be conveyed to the farmer, fruit grower, stockman, and others by demonstrators in person and by actual exemplification to show how to put the results of scientific investigation to work.

This farm-demonstration work is provided for in a number of items in the bill. Sometimes the pests have natural parasites which attack them. Frequently it is necessary to send an expert to the place from which the pest came to find the natural parasites, and then to import them, acclimatize them, breed them, and distribute them to combat the pests. Scientific work to ascertain how to attack pests of other kinds is needed along the lines above given. It is manifest that generally the farmer, fruit grower, or stockman has neither the time, opportunity, nor means to do such work, although many farmers and growers have rendered valuable service in their localities and to the country by special work and experiments. The pests may come suddenly, spread rapidly, or develop new pernicious activities. The farmer does his full share in the work when he intelligently and diligently uses the methods and processes discovered by the scientists for the restriction of the damages done by the pests or for their destruction. He is earnest in his demand for definite information, intelligent in its use, and as I know him he is progressive in his methods. The pests and diseases are hundreds in number. Some of them work openly, some in secret. Frequently the activities of a pest or disease are known only by its ravages becoming apparent. Parts of their life histories can hardly be ascertained in the natural wild life of the pest or the natural course of the disease, and can only be discovered by laboratory methods. They infest or infect the soil. Hundreds are so minute that recourse must be had to the microscope in dealing with them. It is a great battle to stay the invasion and plundering of hungry hordes. If what the farmers lost last year from the attacks of pest and disease could have been saved, it would more than have sufficed to feed and care for the needy all over the United States during the winter.

II. STOPPING THE IMPORTATION OF PESTS.

The pests and diseases are mostly imported. Some were brought in by the curiosity of experimenters or collectors, others on nursery stock, fruits, grains, and vegetables. We have enacted a plant-quarantine act and given authority to quarantine against importations from infested districts in foreign countries. There are several exceedingly dangerous pests which we do not yet have, but which can be kept out only by great vigilance. Action has been and is being taken to maintain the purity and efficiency of commercial insecticides and fungicides and the ingredients for making them. Animal pests and diseases were brought in on infested or diseased stock, which there is now power to prevent, and importations of animals are carefully examined.

III.—WEATHER RELATIONS.

While the work done by the Weather Bureau is useful to others than the farmers and special services are done for others its services to agriculture are important. By the aid of the telegraph, telephone, maps, and mails it advises concerning the movement and incidence of storms and their probable continuation, or of periods of drought and heat, of frosts and sudden changes in temperature during all the cropping season. It enables the farmer in a general way to anticipate favorable or unfavorable periods and to make his plans accordingly. This information also has an important relation to seasonal variations in prices.

GATHERING THE CROP.

The gathering of the crop involves the questions of what use it can be most profitably put to, whether for silo, hay, grain, and so forth, and the use of implements for harvesting and utilizing the crop; methods of harvesting; in the case of fruits and berries methods of gathering and the proper stage of

growth at which fruit should be picked, especially for distant delivery; and all related questions.

I. DISPOSING OF THE CROP—FINDING THE MARKET.

There is proposed in this bill the expansion of a work already in progress, and its segregation into a separate office of markets, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products, and there is hereby appropriated the sum of $200,000.

For many years the work done by the department along these lines has been growing. The department, the Committee on Agriculture, and the farmers have thought that this work should be further extended and its activities increased.

It appears that the increase in price paid by the consumer over that received by the farmer for any given product was too great; careful examination convinces me that it is; and that either some one between was taking from both an undue toll or else our marketing methods were inefficient, wasteful, and expensive. Probably both things are true. In any event a reform of our methods of marketing should be made. The products should be taken from the producer and delivered to the consumer with only such increase as is reasonable for the work of distribution. This will result in the farmers receiving more and the consumer paying less.

The farm products are generally produced in comparatively small quantities by each farmer, but aggregate great quantities of certain commodities, which coming on the market at one time makes it comparatively easy to subject the price to artificial fluctuations by those interested in profiting thereby.

The office of markets can render many special services, as, for instance, in the case of seasonal products, by keeping producers advised as to what markets are not overstocked.

II. PREPARING THE CROP FOR TRANSPORTATION TO MARKET.

Under this title are included the handling, cooling, freezing, drying, precooling, packing and packages, moisture content, grading of cotton, grain, corn, and fruits, storage, and other similar questions of all crops, and meats, dairy products, poultry, and eggs. These investigations seek to ascertain the cheapest and most effective methods of dealing with these problems and of getting products to market with as little change in character, deterioration, and loss as possible. Experimental shipments are made illustrative of the practical application of the principles determined upon or large shipments are made under the supervision of the department.

III. TRANSPORTING THE CROP.

When the crop is ready for market, the public road becomes an essential factor. A good road decreases the cost of getting the crop from the farm to place of initial shipment.

So far as the department is concerned, its work in matters of transportation is chiefly confined to the service rendered by the Office of Public Roads. But so far as the agriculture of the country is concerned, it is interested not only in public roads but all forms of transportation, railroad and rate regulation, river and harbor improvement, shipping, and the Panama Canal.

The Office of Public Roads has undertaken investigations into the systems of road management; into the varying conditions of moisture, soil, and use; into road construction, available materials, and costs; into the several kinds of roads that may be built, especially ordinary sand-clay and dust roads, and the ability of any locality to bear the cost of road construction and maintenance; into the physical and chemical character of road-building materials and their wearing qualities; road building equipment; and, in brief, into every question affecting road construction in this country and abroad. It proposes to make practical application of the results of its investigations by giving expert advice, in person or by printed information; by constructing experimental roads; by aiding localities in constructing roads with expert supervision of actual construction; and by other field demonstrations. I wish to say in passing that I believe in national aid in road construction and Federal appropriations for this purpose, and have so voted on several occasions.

I shall not at this time comment on railroad-rate regulation other than to emphasize its importance and to say I have actively given my support to it in several acts passed by Congress for this purpose; or on river and harbor improvements, further than to say that in this, too, I have taken an active interest, especially, of course, in those affecting the first congressional district of Oregon.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

But the present crisis in the matter of Panama Canal tolls calls for more extended notice. The canal is a part of our coast waters, as much as any of our harbors are. Our policy has been to give the free use of our harbors to our vessels doing a coastwise traffic, and our coastwise vessels alone are affected by the proposed repeal of free tolls. Our vessels going from the United States to foreign ports, or returning from them, are to pay tolls. We own the canal and have exclusive national control of it. We pay for its construction. So far as to our own ships using it, it is a question of policy for the United States alone to determine. We might charge our coastwise vessels tolls in order to raise a revenue, and so depart from our historic policy. But we do not have to charge them tolls at the instance of any other nation. I do not believe the national honor is at stake in this question, or that in order to preserve it we must charge our coastwise vessels tolls. There is national honor in upholding the inherent rights of the American people.

But hear the evidence.

The treaty of December 22, 1815, between the United States and England provides:

> No higher or other duties or charges shall be imposed in any of the ports of the United States on British vessels than those payable in the same by vessels of the United States; nor in ports of any of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe on vessels of the United States than shall be payable in the same ports on British vessels.

That is very clear and explicit. Are coastwise vessels exempted by the language of the treaty? Apparently all vessels are included; and if coastwise vessels use ports of the United States or England free of pilot, tonnage, or other charges, the vessels of the other nations are entitled to a like free use.

But that is not the case. The practice under that treaty for nearly a century is that it has no reference to coastwise vessels, and no question was ever raised about the matter.

The treaty known as the treaty of 1901, approved and published February 21–22, 1902, relating to the Panama Canal and which is now in dispute, reads as follows, so far as it relates to the question of tolls:

> The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

The question of coastwise ships is not referred to. There had been a practice of 86 years under which coastwise vessels were held not to be concerned in treaties which regulated international shipping relations. If England had wished to have them included in the treaty of 1901, she should have raised the question and insisted on having the treaty provide that they should be subject to the terms of the treaty as well as vessels engaged in foreign trade. But she did not have them included in the treaty and is now estopped from demanding a construction of the treaty that will include them in its terms. It can not be held to have been overlooked, for here was a practice of 86 years, followed daily, which showed that the coastwise trade of a nation is a matter for its exclusive regulation. I do not believe we have any reason on treaty grounds for repealing the free-tolls provision for our coastwise vessels.

The Pacific coast has long waited for an isthmian canal. We have borne a serious handicap in transportation charges, and I am unwilling to surrender our just and agreed rights. I have been informed that certain transcontinental railroad lines, domestic and foreign, are active in urging that our coastwise ships be denied free passage through the canal. If that is the case, there is all the more reason for letting the law stand as it now is.

WASTES.

Inquiry is made into the possibility of finding some use for products that are not used on the farm, either by discovering some market for products for which no market exists in the places where they are produced; by using them as fertilizer, or using them in mixture as feed. What use can be made will depend upon the nature of the product.

USING THE RESULTS FROM THE CROP.

This involves the improvements to be made on the buildings, for sanitation, for feeding stock, for better stock, drainage, home comforts, and a large number of similar matters for the improvement of the farm and conditions of farm life.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS.

In order to enable the farmer to secure the funds needed to carry on his business at low rates of interest, two kinds of national banks are proposed:

A bank for long-term loans, the money for which is to be obtained by the issuance of bonds based on farm lands. There is no security better than the farm, and by this plan the credit of the farmer becomes a liquid credit. The bonds will find a ready market. They will be paid off through a long series of years, or in a shorter period, at the option of the farmer.

Also a cooperative bank for short-time loans and savings.

It is the intention to use local existing institutions as far as possible, if they wish to take up this business. I favor such legislation properly worked out, and expect to speak at length on it later.

FROM PRODUCER TO CONSUMER.

It will have been observed from the preceding that at all stages of the processes of producing crops the department has been keeping step, finding out difficulties, providing a solution, supplying the practical information to the farmer, discovering advantages, demonstrating their utility, and distributing the information.

The farms must produce wholesome products, or, under the meat-inspection act or pure-food law, animal and dairy products may prove unsalable. To overcome these dangers, remedies are found and their use exemplified.

The office of markets proposed in this bill will not only enable farm products to be more readily disposed of but will bring producer and consumer closer together, whether in the home or foreign market.

NEW FIELDS FOR THE FARMER.

By introduction from abroad, by breeding, and in other ways, new crops are constantly being added to those already grown. A crop that is old in one section may be, for some reason, a new one in another; as, for instance, the bill provides $50,000 to enable the department to make investigations and demonstrate to cane-sugar planters, who will abandon cane growing for sugar under the new tariff law, how to produce live stock on their plantations. Demonstrations are being made on reclamation projects, where problems new to those not accustomed to irrigation have arisen; also in the breeding of hardier and better range sheep, cattle, and horses.

UTILIZING THE CROP.

Under this heading would be placed such investigations as those in the ginning, grading, and determining the spinable qualities of cotton; testing flax straw for paper making; inquiries into the milling of grains and the slaughtering of animals; the nutritive values of products as food for man and animals; new uses for wastes; and many such questions. This work is followed, as in every case, with the dissemination of this information. Dissemination of information, in spite of press, bulletin, book, and speech, is an exceedingly difficult matter. It must be clearly presented, it must impress the reader or hearer, he must be moved to act, he must clearly understand what to do and when, he must do what he does effectively, else all the laborious work of investigation fails to produce results.

TAKING THE RESULTS OF INVESTIGATIONS TO THE FARMER.

The end and justification of all work of investigation, so far as production is concerned, is that the producer, as speedily as possible, be informed of the results obtained and how to make practical use of them; and the growing opinion is that the most effective method of conveying information is the contact of man with man—explanations and demonstrations to groups on the ground of remedies for diseases and preventive measures in the case of pests.

Through the Division of Publications the scientific experts seek to convey the results of their work in available permanent form. Many bulletins, circulars, and so forth, are in print, covering every subject in which definite results have been attained.

The Bureau of Agricultural Forecasts, in addition to making crop and live-stock forecasts and estimates, periodically collects, compiles, abstracts, analyzes, summarizes, and interprets data relating to agricultural industries.

Nearly $800,000 will be available for farm-demonstration work on improved methods of farm management and practice; and this, in addition to the provision made for experiment stations and farmers' institutes. Settlers on reclamation projects are to be shown how to solve their problems. Irrigation questions receive attention.

The teaching of agriculture in the schools, and especially the development of agricultural high schools, affords an avenue of transmitting information to the coming generation of farmers.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

In passing, I wish to speak a word in favor of vocational education. It is a legitimate development of our policy and is intended to fit the youth for his life's work while he is receiving his mental education in the public schools.

COOPERATION.

Cooperation is used in two senses: First, that the States, counties, towns, or other civil units shall provide funds to be used with appropriations made by Congress in carrying out specific work or works. And the policy of the committee has been to enlarge the sphere of such cooperation. Cooperation also means that the producers shall make the practical application of the results attained by the scientific investigation of the experts. Unless they work together little can be accomplished. That the farmer is eager to cooperate every Representative from an agricultural district, as well as the officials of the department, knows. Under the Hatch and Adams Acts $1,440,000 are appropriated for the support of the experiment stations in the several States.

There has been a growing willingness on the part of the States to assist in the agricultural development within their borders by the appropriation of considerable sums. The committee have considered this a most encouraging indication of practical interest and have regarded such cooperation as wise and to be encouraged.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL AREAS.

When the forest reserves were created considerable areas of agricultural lands were included within their exterior borders. Under the act of 1906 such agricultural land was made available for settlement. There is in this bill an appropriation of $100,000 to be used for the selection, classification, and segregation of these lands in order that they may be surveyed out by metes and bounds for homestead entry and settlement; and a further amount of $20,000 to be used by the Soil Survey to examine and classify these lands in case questions as to their value for agricultural purposes should arise. All the agricultural lands in the forest reserves should become available for settlement so that the homesteader may know where they are situated and to enable him to make entry without difficulty or delay. The homesteader has difficulties enough arising out of natural conditions without putting upon him avoidable burdens. In this connection I wish to say here, although I expect to discuss this whole subject a little later at some length, that the methods of the General Land Office and the Department of the Interior, in dealing with entrymen on the public lands, should be modified to conform to the practices of natural justice. The right of appeal to the United States courts should be allowed the entryman and he be given his day in court before he is deprived of his property and the work of years.

USE OF NATURAL FORESTS FOR PURPOSES OF RECREATION.

There is included in this bill the following item: "That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, when necessary for the purpose of increasing the public benefits or public use of the national forests, rent or lease to responsible persons or corporations, for periods of not to exceed 20 years, suitable spaces or portions of ground for the construction of summer residences, hotels, stores, or any structures needed for recreation or convenience."

LOGGED-OFF LANDS.

Lands formerly covered with timber, which have been cut over for lumber purposes, include large areas, especially in the West. Considerable portions of these areas are valuable for agricultural purposes. Clearing them for stock growing and dairy purposes is expensive, both in labor and money, but where they are to be cleared clean for meadow or grain or fruit the cost under practices formerly used was burdensome. There has been included in the present bill and in former acts, at my instance, an item of $5,000 for the purpose of studying the problems involved in clearing these lands, in whole or in part, and to see what could be salvaged in the process of clearing to reduce the cost. The results thus far obtained justify this small expenditure. The greatest value of this work, in my opinion, will be to show how these lands can be most quickly and cheaply cleared. The ship's knees, firewood, posts, turpentine, and so forth, that may be salvaged in clearing will aid the home maker, but unless there is a good near-by market the amount received from them will be small. In the West for many years lands covered with logs have been cleared by boring and burning the logs, and small stumps could be burned by charpitting. But to get rid of the large stumps and snags, sometimes very numerous, with their large and wide-spreading roots, and of large and numerous logs, was very difficult. The large amount of this land and its value when cleared has caused the inventor and associations of men to apply natural genius to the solution of the problem. Many methods have been evolved, with varying degrees of cost and efficiency, which expert investigation can improve, and I believe make cheap and practicable. For instance, the method of boring large stumps and burning them in place by confining the heat, either with or without a forced jet of air, has worked well so far as experience to date shows. The necessary machinery, including a small gasoline engine, is not expensive, and the settler can use the process in all kinds of weather, and with only his own labor can destroy the stumps as far below the plow as he wishes, and can burn them with comparative rapidity. When it is understood that

the lands of the West already or to be logged off soon equal in area practically all the arable area of New England, and include some of the most fertile soils, capable of large and diversified production, the value of this work will appear.

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY.

Promoting the production of dairy products, of meat animals and fowls, and the raw materials for clothing are its chief purposes. These first should be so produced as to bring a profit to the grower. The product should be clean and wholesome in the case of foods, and free from any taint or disease that makes it improper for or dangerous as food. Such protection to it is a benefit both to the producer and consumer. The foundation of the work is good stock animals, and educational work is done in breeding both for dairy products and for food. The elimination of the unfit and unprofitable animal, and the substitution in its place of the useful animal is a serious and difficult problem, because the former is everywhere and in large numbers. A similar situation exists in regard to horses and mules. The difference between the cost of producing a poor animal and a good animal is negligible when compared with the returns which each will bring. The substitution is necessarily gradual, but it is being made. Investigation is being made and the resulting information distributed on feeding, breeding, and housing animals.

The work under this heading may be divided into four general parts, each presenting its particular problems in production, handling, and marketing.

First. Dairying.

Second. Meat production.

Third. Poultry and eggs.

Fourth. Other products, including wool, hides, and so forth.

All the questions involved have been and are being carefully investigated, and the results are being conveyed to growers by bulletins, the press, personal information, through the experiment stations, farmers' institutes, fairs, stock shows, and other agencies.

Prevailing high prices of meats, an apparent diminution in the country's supply, and the importation of meat products free from abroad make the question of our domestic supply and its continued profitable production a vital one.

In the solution of the problems connected with the improvement and increase of domestic animals the American farmer has been especially active and successful. Individuals and breeders' associations have rendered useful service. But animal diseases still present many dangers. To detect them, find the remedy, prevent their spread or recurrence, and to eradicate them require the labors of the scientific experts. Some of the largest problems, both in kind and extent, are those connected with the eradication of the southern cattle tick, hog cholera, dourine, tuberculosis, scabies, inspection, and quarantine, and questions arising in the use of toxins, serums, and viruses.

FOR CAREFUL CONSIDERATION.

The Department of Agriculture is divided for administrative purposes in bureaus, divisions, and offices. There is a tendency, I think, to lay stress on the maintenance of the integrity of these and the individuality of their operations. In my judgment the department should be organized so as to secure the greatest efficiency from its personnel and the greatest result from the appropriations made for its support. Its organization should be so flexible as to avoid duplication of work and to enable its higher officials to use its men and money in any combination of effort any emergency may require. That is, instead of its several subdivisions being separate organizations, connected loosely together by subordination to a single head, they should be regarded as the parts of a single army capable of having the men used in small or large combinations, detached and assembled in new forms, so as to cooperate together, not as members of a subdivision, but as members of a single great organization.

I believe it is the desire of the department to do this, and the criticism does not lie that they do not earnestly endeavor to enable their men to render the greatest service and the money to accomplish the largest amount of good possible. A realization by the department, the committee, the Congress, and the country that there is being developed a systematic policy for the promotion of agriculture, so that every appropriation bill shall not only provide for the support of the projects undertaken, but also be a consistent step in the development of a great system, will not only give encouragement and support to the responsible head and leaders in the department in their endeavor to formulate and carry out the policy as the work develops, but will also result in great good to the country. Bureaucracy is a vice that always threatens every form of administration, and bureaucracy is harmful and expensive.

In the development of our national agricultural policy and work, and its maintenance, during recent years, I have taken an active interest—and think I can also claim to have had a useful part in its upbuilding and extension. As the only member of the committee from the Pacific coast, I have given the interests of that section especial attention to make sure the welfare of the part of country most distant from the seat of government was not neglected and that all proper attention was given and provision made for its thriving and vigorous agricultural industries.

Its recent development has been most gratifying, and the industries of Oregon, with which I am naturally most familiar, have shown remarkable activity and increase.

THE FARM HOME.

The American citizen has the right to choose what his occupation shall be in life, according to his opportunities, natural aptitude, and preference. One occupation competes with another in attractiveness. The city lures the farmers' boys and girls and the farm appeals to city people. Comfort, convenience, freedom, and income are important factors. Our rural population and those who have come from it, more than any other one class, have been the substantial foundation of our national prosperity and character. In aiding in solving the farmers' problems, and in making farm life comfortable, profitable, and attractive, as in the establishment of rural free delivery and the parcel post, we are serving all the people not on farms even more than the farmer. The food and clothing which he produces in the raw state are indispensable. I do not regard appropriations made for agricultural development as made especially in the interest of the farmer. They are based on sound economic policy and with the patriotic motive of promoting the general welfare of all the people.

Mr. Chairman, no speech on agricultural development would be complete without a tribute to the farmer's wife and the farmer himself.

I suppose if men and women, good and great, were called upon from all times and places to state to whom they owed the fundamentals upon which they builded, more would look back with loving reverence to a place beside the chair of some farmer's wife than to any other one class of mothers. The most important crop ever produced on this green globe is its well-trained, well-mothered boys and girls. [Applause.] The farmer's wife had to combat all sorts of pests and diseases and bring her sons and daughters to full flower and maturity unblasted and sound. Her boys and girls as a body have conquered our wild domains, fed the people, built and sustained the cities, bridged the spaces with roads, fought our wars, and kept sweet on earth the savor of justice, piety, and patriotism. [Applause.] Her daughters have her virtues and, moreover, are America's glorious womanhood in full bloom. And I would praise all other women who have done well. [Applause.]

THE END TO BE ATTAINED.

Herein is a great policy for a great nation. Its final accomplishment may be in a somewhat distant future; but in due time, if we faint not, it will be reached. Comfortable, well-furnished dwelling houses will appear in endless vistas on all the arable land of our wide domain. There will be well-built barns, silos, pig houses, hen houses, and machinery sheds as adjuncts to the dwelling house. Stock of good blood and pedigree will be the rule. Efficient roads will traverse the country. In each community there will be a conveniently located civic center, with schoolhouse, church, town or grange hall, and agricultural credit bank, making a social center. Each farmer will know every acre of his land and how to treat it when remedy becomes necessary to counteract some deficiency. There will be no idle acres. He will know how to cure his stock when sick. He will know his trees and plants, their possibilities, their diseases and the remedies. Through cooperation he will market his products more directly than at present and will receive on the whole a more adequate compensation for the work he does. As other business men, he will be able to have office hours and work reasonable hours. Nor is this a picture of something earnestly to be desired but in the nature of things unattainable. If it can not be in some measure realized, where will we get our farmers in another century? A republic can not exist under a system of tenant farming, and under conditions as they have existed there has been a tendency for the country born to leave the farm. But the farmer as I know him is capable of doing what I have outlined.

To picture the modern farmer as a booted, bewhiskered individual with an oat straw in his mouth is a caricature. He has become a business man, with the capacity and instincts of a shrewd man of affairs. The difficulties under which he labors are due to the conditions at present surrounding farm life rather than to himself. Pests by the thousand attack everything he

grows—plants, fruit, stock. Soils are largely unknown quantities. Roads are not efficient. He has no comprehensive organization, although granges, societies of equity, and similar organizations are bringing into a union of sentiment and endeavor a body of men and women who have so much in common and can derive so much good from cooperation. The millions the Federal Government is spending, that the States are spending, that counties and farmers are spending to analyze the farmer's problems, find their solution, and carry the knowledge of the remedy to every farm, all are hastening the coming of that day. The country has no more useful man than a good farmer, and when you multiply him by millions there is reason to confide in the perpetuity of the Republic. So I say to the scientific experts in the Department of Agriculture and in the agricultural colleges and to the great American farmer, yearly growing more expert:

Go to your work and be strong,
Halting not in your ways,
Balking an end half won
For an instant's dole of praise.
Stand to your work and be wise,
Certain of brain, hand, and pen,
Who are neither children or gods,
But men in a world of men.

[Applause.]

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY].

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, the conservation of our soil and the development of our agricultural resources are matters so vital to our national prosperity as to forbid their being ranked second in importance to any question that can be presented for our consideration. And it is a matter, Mr. Chairman, that I regard as so correlated to and to a large extent so dependent upon our immigration policy that I desire to discuss briefly that question with a view to showing the effect upon our food supply that will inevitably result from forbidding those aliens willing to work to land on our shores.

There is a quite general acquiescence in our now settled policy to refuse admission to undesirables, but there exists a great difference of opinion as to what class of immigrants come under that category. Our present laws exclude all idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all government, or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials; prostitutes, or women or girls comnig into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons called contract laborers, who have been induced or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, expressed or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; those who have been within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States deported as having been induced or solicited to migrate as above described; any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes, and that said ticket or passage was not paid for by any corporation, association, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; all children under 16 years of age unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe.

It is now proposed to enlarge the list of mental, moral, and physical defects on account of which aliens are to be excluded, to provide for a more rigid enforcement of the exclusion features of the law, and in addition to deny admission to those unable to read, and thus to erect a new barrier to immigration, wholly indefensible as a test of fitness, but potent to further restrict the number of those who would otherwise come to us—the admitted purpose of the adoption of this arbitrary standard.

There is undoubtedly a very strong sentiment in many parts of the country in favor of greatly restricting immigration. Some of our best and most intelligent citizens believe we are rapidly approaching the time when our population will be as great as our resources will support, and that many of the immigrants now coming to our shores are nonassimilable, remain segregated in congested quarters, and injuriously affect our own people by the example of a low standard of living.

It is also true that the ranks of unskilled labor are largely recruited from immigrants, and the fear is expressed by some that this class of labor is being so rapidly augmented that the demand will not keep pace with the supply.

I received several requests to support the Burnett bill when it was up for consideration, but upon giving it careful study found myself unable to do so, so long as it contained the literacy requirement.

Literacy is not a test of character, of honesty, of industry, of integrity, of a man's desire to improve his condition, of his purpose to make a home for himself and his family, or of his intention to become a useful and law-abiding citizen. If he possesses these qualities, he is a producer of wealth and is by no means a menace to our institutions.

In those States which have the largest immigrant population you will find the greatest commercial enterprise, the largest manufacturing establishments, the most prosperous agricultural sections, the best-paid labor, and the most wealth. The State of New York has by far the largest immigrant population of any State in the Union, and exceeds all others in the magnitude of its business activities and in wealth. Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio follow in the order given in immigrant population, in industries, and in wealth.

What a man knows is of less importance than is his desire for knowledge. Inability to read is usually because of lack of opportunity, and at most is only a temporary disability that opportunity will ordinarily cure.

Experience has shown that the children of illiterate immigrants are most eager to learn and enthusiastically take advantage of our free educational institutions.

Statistics show that in those States where so many so-called illiterate foreigners have settled the percentage of illiteracy is very low as compared with the States which have the smallest immigrant population. Also that the percentage of illiteracy in the different sections is due not so much to the number of illiterates coming into a State as to the efforts put forth to decrease illiteracy. In New York, where 30.2 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.5 per cent; in Pennsylvania, where 18.8 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.9 per cent; in Massachusetts, where 31.5 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.2 per cent; in Illinois, where 21.4 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 3.7 per cent; in Wisconsin, where 22 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 3.2 per cent. In the State of Alabama, in which only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 22.9 per cent; in Georgia, where six-tenths of 1 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 20.7 per cent; in Kentucky, where 1.8 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 12.1 per cent.

In justice to the Southern States it must be said that the very considerable colored population materially increases their illiteracy percentage, and that there has been a most gratifying decrease in the percentage of illiteracy in the South during the last decade. But excluding this colored population from the calculation, and taking into consideration the great handicap of the ravages of the Civil War, the percentage of illiteracy is extremely high when compared with those States which have absorbed and are still absorbing a large immigrant population. In fact, the greatest percentage of illiteracy is in the mountain sections, where schools are not convenient of access and where enterprise is stagnant for lack of new blood.

The proof is far from satisfactory that the literate immigrant is a more desirable acquisition than the one unable to read. Illiteracy does not necessarily mean ignorance. Many men of at least average intelligence and good business ability can not read.

In some of the foreign countries from which we draw the most of our immigrant population, if a man's condition is such that he has the opportunity for acquiring an education he is usually well enough circumstanced so that he will not emigrate to a foreign land unless there is some very good reason why he should leave his native country. The immigrant is usually a sturdy son of toil from the rural districts, and to whom no schools are available.

Grover Cleveland, than whom no clearer-headed or more correct thinker ever occupied the White House, vetoed an immigration bill on account of a literacy-test provision, and in his message used this language:

The ability to read and write, as required in this bill in and of itself affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry and

supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship or of a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged.

President Emeritus Eliot, of Harvard, said on the same subject:

The only questions which are appropriate are: Is he healthy, strong, and desirous of earning a good living? Many illiterates have common sense, sound bodies, and good characters. Indeed, it is not clear that education increases much the amount of common sense which nature gave the individual. An educational test is appropriate at the time the foreigner proposes to become a voting citizen. He ought then to know how to read.

Cardinal Gibbons is on record as follows:

I am not in favor of any educational test as applied to immigrants desiring to enter the United States. Such a law if passed would, in my judgment, work great harm, for illiteracy is by no means always ignorance. If the immigrant is industrious and thrifty, he will make a useful citizen, whether he be literate or illiterate. The educated schemer is in more ways than one more dangerous than the honest workman, even though he be illiterate.

Another great educator and great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, has said:

I think that this country can afford to use and ought to give opportunity to every man and woman of sound morals, sound mind, and sound body who comes in good faith to spend his or her energies in our life, and I should certainly be inclined, so far as I am concerned, to scrutinize very jealously any restrictions that would limit that principle in practice.

It is acknowledged that we have reached our present preeminence among the nations of the world only through the aid of those who have come to us from foreign shores. But the restrictionists claim that the present-day immigrant is from the lowest strata and is an undesirable acquisition. That claim is not borne out by the reports of the Immigration Commission, as appears from the following extract:

The present movement is not recruited in the main from the lowest economic and social strata of European populations. In European countries, as in the United States, the poorest and least desirable element in population, from an economic as well as a social standpoint, is found in the large cities, and as a rule such cities furnish comparatively few emigrants. Neither do the average or typical emigrants of to-day represent the lowest in the economic and social scale even among the classes from which they come, a circumstance attributable to both natural and artificial causes. In the first place, emigrating to a strange and distant country, although less of an undertaking than formerly, is still a serious and relatively difficult matter, requiring a degree of courage and resourcefulness not possessed by the weaklings of any class. This natural law in the main regulated the earlier European emigration to the United States, and under its influence the present emigration, whether or not desirable as a whole, nevertheless represents the stronger and better element of the particular class from which it is drawn.

The history of the immigrant in this country is a continued story in evolution. Take, for instance, the German, than whose descendants none among our people occupy a more honorable place. Although they came from highly educated Germany, many of them took humble positions, often performing menial labor and for modest pay; but they were intelligent, frugal, thrifty, and ambitious. They acquired property, embarked in business enterprises on their own account, and were soon able to furnish positions for and otherwise assist those of their countrymen who followed them.

Only a few years ago ninety-nine out of every hundred men seen in a ditch were knights of the pick and shovel from the Emerald Isle. Now these gallant sons of Erin are conductors, motormen, engineers, fire fighters, guardians of our public safety, and managers in chief of our ship of state, and scarcely is one permitted to land before his welcoming brothers have him put on the force.

Formerly the Jew immigrants were peddlers, old-clothes men, and shoe-string vendors. To-day they are our bankers, prosperous merchants, successful manufacturers, skillful physicians, and able attorneys. Though continuing to come in large numbers, the recruits are looked after, given employment, and otherwise aided by those of their own race already established here.

The vast majority of those who are coming from Italy are industrious, eager for employment, quick to learn, frugal, with a strong desire to become citizens, and ambitious to own land and build for themselves homes in this new and great country. It is within my personal knowledge that they are succeeding. They are barbers, shoemakers, and tailors. They have vegetable gardens and fruit stores. They are brick and stone masons, builders, contractors, and bankers. They own houses for themselves and to let, and their children are becoming educated and entering the learned professions.

And what is true of the above nationalities is true of all. In my district are many Poles, Hungarians, Slavs, and other aliens. They are industrious, frugal, and anxious to get ahead. There is that in the free air of America that inspires all who breathe it to higher ideals and a desire for a higher standard of living.

It is a curious fact, abundantly shown by noting the supporters of measures that seek to restrict immigration, that the opponents of immigration are from those sections which most rarely come in contact with the immigrant. And, further, that of all immigrants they regard the most highly those of that nationality of whom they have seen the most. So here again the rule is established that prejudice and suspicion vanish when knowledge and information arrive.

What any nation is and what she becomes depends upon those who do the real work of extracting from mother earth the wherewithal by which we are nourished.

The present high cost of foodstuffs is due in a large measure to the scarcity of farm laborers. The sons of our farmers are entering other vocations, and it is to the immigrants who seek an opportunity to earn their bread by the sweat of their brows that we must look to take the places thus left vacant by our farmer boys and do the hard, rough work of tilling the soil.

There appears to be a very general impression that immigrants do not go on farms. It is true many of them remain in the cities where there are others of their own nationality until they become accustomed somewhat to their new environment and learn something of our language. But figures taken from reports of the Bureau of the Census show that in the great agricultural States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California from 31 to 42 per cent of the farming population are of foreign birth or foreign parentage.

There is, unfortunately, prevalent an impression that a difference in religious beliefs is partly responsible for the continued and growing agitation over this immigration question. I should be sorry to believe any of those interested in this matter are being influenced by any such consideration. The only persons I should be willing to have excluded on account of their religious beliefs are those who have none.

Some of the labor leaders of the country favor greater restriction of immigration, but I do not believe those who hold this view have considered the matter in all its aspects. They formerly took the same view with reference to the introduction of machinery, but soon found the use of machinery increased the demand for high-priced labor.

The industries of the country require the labor of the foreigner, and the immigrant is not a harmful competitor of our American labor. His employment creates a demand for a better grade of labor and is productive of better wages for the American workingman. The work performed by the immigrant is of the hardest kind, and to do which it is almost impossible to secure American labor, but it is work which, nevertheless, must be performed.

The foreign element are by no means antagonistic to organized labor. They know the market value of their work and insist on getting the highest wage prevailing. They are quite ready to join the unions, and a large proportion of the membership of labor organizations in this country are immigrants or their descendants.

The most usual and perhaps just complaint of the representatives of labor is that labor does not get its just proportion of what it produces, partly because capital takes too large a share of what is produced and partly because there are too many drones to support.

It is an increase in the number of our population who will not work that we should try to prevent. There is much wisdom in the philosophy of the old darky who objected to an aristocratic gentleman from another State buying a farm in Georgia on the ground that "there is more white men down here now than we colored men can support."

The necessaries of life are all produced by labor, and the adding to the number of toilers lessens the burden borne by each in producing the necessaries for all.

We have millions of acres yet uncultivated and untold wealth unmined.

Since the foundation of this Government we have opened our doors to those who have come to us to escape religious, political, and industrial oppression and to carve out for themselves a niche in this great monument we have erected to freedom, justice, tolerance, and equality of opportunity. They have come from all quarters of the globe, and with their help we have made this the greatest Nation of all time. They have aided us in extracting the riches from mother earth, in constructing our

transportation systems, in building up our great manufacturing industries, in extending our commerce, in advancing the cause of education, in promoting the arts and sciences, and with us have laid down their lives on the field of battle in defense of our common country. I do not believe the time has arrived when we should selfishly close our doors to those mentally, morally, and physically sound who would yet come.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, carrying more than $18,000,000 appropriation for the encouragement of agriculture, has been very carefully prepared and reflects great credit on the committee reporting it. While we are considering the subject of agriculture it may be well to recall some recent political history and legislation affecting agriculture, which is our basic industry.

Three years ago last month, while the Agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration, I made a speech and called attention to the Taft reciprocity proposition which had then just been sent to Congress for approval, and I took occasion to say at that time that if the proposition which contemplated free trade in farm products with Canada should be adopted, it would reduce the income of the farmers of my State by a sum of more than $20,000,000 annually, a great deal more than the total appropriation for the encouragement of agriculture made by Congress. That proposition, notwithstanding the opposition of a majority of the Republicans in the House, was, under the leadership of President Taft, forced through by a combination of a minority of Republicans and an almost solid Democratic Party in the House; but it failed of action in the Senate because it was delayed, and the Sixty-first Congress expired on March 4, 1911. One would have thought that this would have been the end of that proposal, and that President Taft, who had been elected upon a platform pledged to the protection of manufacturers, farmers, and producers alike, would have taken heed of the fact that he was without support of a majority of the Republicans in both Houses of Congress, but by some strange obsession of mind he persisted, and if we may judge from the newspaper accounts of the frequent conferences between him and the Democratic leaders who were to control the next House of the Sixty-second Congress, which had been just elected, he made an arrangement or agreement with those Democrats under which he would call an extra session if they in turn would ratify the reciprocity proposition. In this way the Democrats could gain the advantage of coming together early in the spring of 1911, and have a year and a half in which to make campaign material, and the President would get his way, notwithstanding the opposition of a majority of his own party as represented in Congress. The bargain went through. Congress was called into extra session in April.

The Democrats quickly passed the reciprocity bill through the House, and after several months of debate in the Senate it was also passed there by a combination of Democrats and minority Republicans. It had not been ratified by Canada, and it was there made a party issue. Under the customs of that country the opposition party was entitled to go before the people on that issue, and it was submitted at a special election held in September of that year, and, to the surprise of everyone on this side of the line, it was defeated. During the protracted discussion in and out of Congress it had been urged on the part of the friends of reciprocity, both Democrats and Republicans, that somehow free trade in farm products would cheapen the cost of living for the city people without reducing the price of farm products, while, on the other hand, it was claimed by Republicans who opposed the reciprocity that it would reduce the farmer's prices and would not result in cheapening the cost of living, because the difference would be absorbed by the middleman. The Representatives in Congress from the Northwestern States, where wheat and other grains are the staple farm products, claimed that Canadian competition under reciprocity would tend to reduce their prices, while the Democrats and the Republicans representing large manufacturing districts said that that could not be true, because the United States was a heavy exporter of wheat and other grain, and therefore that the world price, the export price, governed all domestic markets. This was an important question and attracted wide attention.

The Canadian election afforded an object lesson and a demonstration which farmers of the boundary States will not soon forget. As I said, everybody on this side of the line was sure reciprocity would win, and the grain exchanges of Chicago, Minneapolis, Duluth, and elsewhere proceeded to discount the effect of the change. The premium on spring wheat at Minneapolis over the export price, which for years had ranged around 12 cents per bushel, disappeared almost entirely, and the day after reciprocity was defeated in Canada wheat jumped 9 cents per bushel, in Minneapolis and Duluth, and barley 11 cents in two days, flax about the same. All the market news in the papers carried the only possible explanation of this phenomenon, and that is that it was due to the result of the election in Canada and the rejection of reciprocity, and that the theorists who had argued so strongly here in the House and elsewhere were mistaken, and they remained silent—at least for a while.

This was in the fall of 1911, and the Democrats, who by this time had the Republicans badly divided and disorganized, proceeded at the ensuing session to pass their popgun, schedule by schedule, tariff bills, a method shrewdly adopted to bring out the weakest point in the then existing tariff law, but which was promptly abandoned as soon as they gained control and assumed actual responsibility. You have never heard anything about schedule-by-schedule revision since the Democrats came into power. They recognized the power of combination and compromise to the fullest extent, and by that power they reached agreements. The campaign that followed in 1912 was fought mainly on the tariff issue, and a reduction in the cost of living, the destruction of monopoly, and general prosperity were the benefits promised the people in case of Democratic victory.

The result of the election, however, showed that the farmers of the Northern States refused to vote for Taft who had betrayed them and the doctrine of protection and had secured the nomination of his party, although in doing so he had split it in two, and although the platform on which he sought reelection studiously avoided even the mention of Canadian reciprocity which he had made the principal issue of his whole administration. But they, the farmers, also refused to vote the Democratic ticket because free trade in farm products was clearly foreshadowed as one of the promised reforms. Now, we come to the actual performances on the part of Democracy. They enacted the Underwood law, reducing most of the schedules on manufactured goods, but not on all of them, but placed most of the farm products upon the free list.

Wheat is on the free list with a countervailing provision that if any country imposes a duty on exports from this country there shall be a duty of 10 cents per bushel, and gives a drawback of 99 cents on the dollar for imported wheat ground into flour and exported, with a 10 per cent duty on the by-product of feed. The effect of the Underwood law upon the prices of farm products has already been felt. It has wiped out to nearly 3 or 4 cents the premium on spring wheat in Duluth and Minneapolis, as will be shown in the figures I here insert:

*Average prices of wheat, per bushel, in Minneapolis and New York for 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911.*

[From Yearbook of Agriculture for 1912, p. 575.]

| | Minneapolis. | New York. |
|---|---|---|
| 1908 | $0.98 | $0.95 |
| 1909 | 1.25½ | 1.28½ |
| 1910 | 1.14½ | 1.12½ |
| 1911 | 1.02 | .97½ |

The export freight rate on wheat from Minneapolis to New York is 25 cents per hundred, or 15 cents per bushel; without counting cost of handling and insurance therefor there ought to be a difference of at least 15 cents per bushel between Minneapolis and New York. On this basis we can figure the premium on our spring wheat that we have received in the Minneapolis and Duluth markets as follows:

| | Minneapolis. | New York. | Minneapolis premium. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1908 | $0.98 | $0.95 3 — | 18 |
| 1909 | 1.25½ | 1.28½ 3 + | 12 |
| 1910 | 1.14½ | 1.12½ 2 — | 17 |
| 1911 | 1.02 | .97½ 4½ — | 19½ |

Here is the quotation of prices for this year—that is, of corresponding grades, taken from the Northwestern Miller—which shows that we are now within 3½ cents of an export basis: February 21, 1914, Duluth, $0.92½; New York, $1.04; 11½ plus 3½ premium.

It might be asked why, if there is a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat, it does not enhance the price to that extent at Minneapolis. If our theory is correct, it is this: Under this countervailing clause Canada can at any moment and without notice to us take off the duty. Wheat is purchased by the big

millers many months in advance of its manufacture into flour, and therefore they must take into consideration this contingency. The Minneapolis miller who buys a million bushels of spring wheat for manufacturing it into flour knows that within a month or six weeks, or perhaps two months, the duty may be wholly removed and Canadian wheat come in free, and therefore he must allow something for that contingency, and he does allow for it; and that is the reason that the premium over the export price on spring wheat at Minneapolis to-day does not exceed 5 cents.

What I have said in regard to wheat is true in regard to barley, only to a greater extent, and also as to flax. The privilege of importing wheat for export milling enables the miller to get in the feed which results from the grinding at the low duty of 10 per cent, and this has a depressing effect upon the price of the feed that the farmer has to sell.

But how, you ask, is it possible to export wheat when the price is higher here than abroad? The answer is that very little hard spring wheat is exported, if by that term is meant shipped out of the United States. The total wheat crop of the United States in 1912 was 730,267,000 bushels, and exports were 59,843,584 bushels, or only about 8 per cent, while 92 per cent was consumed at home. The wheat is the raw material of the miller, and he is in that sense the consumer of wheat.

Minnesota in 1912 produced 67,038,000 bushels of wheat, but Minneapolis alone produced 17,031,935 barrels of flour, equivalent to 76,643,606 bushels of wheat, or more than the total production of the State. There was required at least 14,000,000 bushels for food and 6,000,000 bushels for seed in the State. The mills of Minneapolis in 1912 only exported a little over 6 per cent of their total output to foreign countries, and in 1911, 7 per cent, and in 1910, 8 per cent. There are extensive flour mills in St. Paul, Duluth, Crookston, and other places in the State which probably produced nearly as much as the Minneapolis mills, so that the milling demand for wheat in Minnesota is more than twice as great as the surplus produced.

The 196 pounds of flour (when not subdivided called "straight") produced from 4 bushels and 40 pounds of hard spring wheat, is in our mills usually subdivided so that 70 per cent is patent, 22 per cent clears, and 8 per cent low grade. Patent is the highest grade flour, and sells for $1 per barrel over clears, and more than that over low grade. The rest is mill feed, and sells for from $20 to $22 per ton. The patent flour of Minnesota is almost entirely consumed in the United States, but the clear is exported, and is used abroad chiefly to mix with rye flour or to make bread. Low grade is sold to the arts, and used for making molds for castings and the like. The flour trade of Minneapolis especially is highly developed, and special brands are extensively sold in almost every part of the United States. It will thus be seen that while statistics show foreign exports of spring wheat in the shape of flour, it is in reality simply a by-product, and the principal part is used in domestic consumption. In reality Minnesota is a heavy importer of domestic wheat and an exporter of flour, not abroad, but to the other States of the Union. For these reasons the foreign, or export price, as long as the hard spring wheat of Canada is kept out of the domestic market by a tariff, while it influences, does not and seldom has controlled the domestic price. For the same reason in 1912 the farm price of wheat varied greatly according to locality, from $1.22 per bushel in Georgia, $1.13 in Alabama, $1.01 in Virginia, to 64 cents in Montana, 69 cents in North Dakota, and 73 cents in Minnesota. The high price in the first three named States was due to the fact that the local consumption exceeded the local supply.

Next to demand for actual consumption, the demand for manufacture and resale—the milling demand—influences local price. If Montana, for instance, should so develop its enormous water power as to become a milling center equal to Minneapolis, the Montana price would probably approach the Minnesota standard, and competition between these two centers would tend to raise the farm price in both States.

That the cry of the Democratic Party that they were going to reduce the cost of living by giving the people free trade in farm products has been a failure it is, then, perfectly fair to say. They have hit the farmer without helping the consumer. The reasons for this are many and I will explain some of them a little later on.

They promised a free market basket, and of course the things that went into the market basket came from the farm. They did not carry out all the doctrine of their party as expressed in their platform, but they did give it to the farmer.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman regard that as a promise or a threat?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know; probably both. They promised that they would free list the articles that were controlled by monopolies and trusts. Gentlemen, who can not remember the eloquent speeches in which they promised to kill monopoly by free listing trust-made goods? What did they do? When they passed the Underwood bill, why, one of the worst and most abominable and tyrannous trusts in the United States—the Tobacco Trust—defied this great Government in its prosecutions. Did they reduce the duties on Schedule F? Oh, no. They said in their report that those duties which had been adopted by the Republican Party for years, many years ago, were all right, although that is absolutely one of the most extraordinary protective tariffs that was ever written on paper; some of them got up to 600 and 700 per cent. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, leaf tobacco is taxed $1.85 per pound, and it does not cost more than 20 or 30 cents to raise it, and probably not that. It is imported, I believe, for 20 cents, but it is taxed $1.85. Cigars are taxed $4.50 a box and 25 per cent in additional ad valorem. They had for years repeated the assertion of Mr. Havemeyer, president of the Sugar Trust, that a high protective tariff was the mother of trusts, and yet they protected this trust by imposing these extraordinary duties. In England they have some sense; they impose a high duty on raw tobacco for revenue only, but to prevent the duty going to the raiser of tobacco they prohibit the growing of tobacco in the British Isles.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentelman yield for another question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Simply for a question.

Mr. SLOAN. Do I understand, then, the promise to break up the Tobacco Trust has gone up in smoke?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is a very witty remark. It is worthy of the gentleman from Nebraska. But if I may be permitted to proceed without interruption I will elucidate this feature of the political question, however, in a more prosaic way. Why is it, gentlemen, the Democratic Party has placed upon the free list the products of the toiler in the only industry which it is impossible to form into a trust and retained high protection duties to shield the monopolies and trusts? That is the question that the people of the United States will ask them. When you promised that you would free list trust-made goods and turned around and free listed the farmer's products, what answer can you make? But you say: "We had to do it. We did not have the heart—and many of them said it with tears in their voices—to tax the bread of the poor; we did not have the heart to tax the meat of the hungry." Very good. That might, perhaps, be an excuse for violating the principles of your platform and party, provided it turned out to be correct. [Applause on the Republican side.] But is it correct? Here we strike at one of the greatest questions of modern times; not a local question to the United States, but universal throughout the world, and that is the cost of living. The Democratic Party has hit at the farmer because he furnished the food to the people, and they said they wanted to reduce the price of the food to the people, and that, of course, is the principal item in the cost of living. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture stated that the farmer only received 43 per cent of the price of farm products paid by the consumer, and in some instances he does not receive 20 per cent. Well, now, suppose you cut the farmer's price. Is it passed on to the consumer? That is the important question. I might offer some explanation, but the fact remains. Take, for instance, the most common principal article of food in the world—take bread. How is it about bread? I have some very interesting comparisons. One barrel of flour—4 bushels and 40 pounds—No. 1 hard, weighs 280 pounds, out of which we get 80 pounds of mill feed, which is bran and middlings, and the flour which is left is 196 pounds.

Sixteen ounces of flour will absorb 4 ounces of water. One hundred and ninety-six pounds of flour will make 300 to 320 loaves of bread.

We therefore have this situation: That the farmer who sells his wheat for 70 or 80 cents a bushel—and that is the top price in Minnesota this year—if he buys his bread from a bakery, will sell 15 bushels of wheat and get the money for it and turn around and buy with the money received bread made from 4½ bushels of wheat, less the feed, which would be 80 pounds and worth 80 cents. In other words, he would sell for $3 what the baker gets $15 for in the form of bread.

Now, what about the baker? I was curious to know, and I went to a baker and told him that I wanted information. He told me that here in Washington they use Minnesota flour, patent spring-wheat flour, the highest priced flour in the world,

and the best flour in the world, of course, because it comes from the North Star State.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Except North Dakota.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will include North Dakota, which at one time was a part of Minnesota, in territorial days. It is the greatest wheat State in the Union, and Minnesota comes next.

This baker told me that he paid $3.25 a day, for a day presumably of eight hours. He said that they make a 16-ounce loaf, and they sell it to the wholesaler or storekeeper for 4 cents, and they retail it at 5 cents a loaf. There are from 300 to 320 loaves of bread in a barrel of flour, and, therefore, the final consumer pays about $15 or $16 for the barrel of flour in that form. The miller that I talked with stated that flour fluctuated according to the price of wheat, and that is generally true. There is quite a good deal of competition in the flour-mill business. There has never been a trust. Usually when wheat goes up 1 cent a barrel of flour goes up 5 cents. It requires 4½ bushels to make a barrel. So that 10 cents a bushel makes a difference of 50 cents on a barrel of flour. But how is it about the fluctuation of bread? Why, the baker told me that the price of bread has been the same right in this city for 20 years, with this qualification, that sometimes the loaf was a little larger and sometimes a very little smaller; but it was a very slight difference—only an ounce or two.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MOORE. I want to say to the gentleman that the retail price of bread in all the large cities has been substantially the same, just as the baker said it was, for 20 years, and that the consumer in the cities has derived no benefit whatever from any reduction in the duty on grain or flour.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is undoubtedly correct.

Now, then, let us see about this bread business. The baker stated to me that when flour went up they were sure to decrease the loaf if it went up more than 50 cents; but if anything less than 50 cents, he said they never changed it or raised the loaf until, forsooth, other bakers competing would advertise that they would increase the loaf. I asked him if the trade was organized, and he said it was. The employees are all members of labor organizations, and there is an organization, I am told, of master bakers throughout the whole United States. The master bakers are the proprietors of the bakeries. They hold their conventions. Now, this is simply the same thing that is done by all other middle men. You have your retail grocers' associations, your wholesale grocers' associations, your retail drug associations, your wholesale drug associations, your retail shoe and clothing dealers' associations, and your textile associations, and your department store or retail store organizations. Throughout the whole list, from one end to the other, there is combination. I asked the very intelligent representative of the baker's trade that I talked with what were the purposes of this organization. He said that one of the principal subjects that was discussed at the last annual meeting of the master bakers' convention was the subject of how to get people to discontinue making their own bread. Why, the terrible thing in the eyes of the master baker was that 60 per cent of the housewives of the United States were making their own bread. I asked him if that was true in Washington. "Oh, no," he said, "not in Washington, because we have here a population that is composed of good livers and light housekeepers. They are mostly clerks who are paid higher wages than people in ordinary vocations; and we have colored people who do not make bread, but make corn pone and some kinds of flapjacks. Not more than 10 per cent of the bread is homemade here in the city of Washington. Ninety per cent of it is furnished by the baker." And he thought it ought to be so throughout the United States. And so the principal thing with the National Master Bakers' Association was to discourage the housewives of the country from making their own bread, because, he said, it was plain that if they would quit making their own bread there would be more work and more profit for the bakers. It costs the people of the United States who buy bread more for bread than any other people on the face of the earth.

I went to the Bureau of Labor and they pointed out the fact that they had investigated this question. They had gone to Europe. On page 522 of that bulletin of retail prices in this country and in England and in Wales they show—and I will print the table in the RECORD—that the price of bread in the United States was 223 per cent higher than in England—more than double.

The table is as follows:

*Predominant retail prices of food in England and Wales (exclusive of London) and in the United States compared.*

| Commodity. | Unit. | Predominant range of retail prices. | | Ratio of mean predominant price in the United States (February, 1909) to that in England and Wales (October, 1905), taken as 100. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | England and Wales, exclusive of London (October, 1905). | United States (February, 1909). | |
| Sugar | 1 pound | $0.041 | $0.050–$0.051 | 144 |
| Cheese | do | .142 | .203 | 143 |
| Butter | do | [1] $0.243–.264<br>[2] .284 | .324–.355 | 126 |
| Potatoes | pounds | .054–.071 | .117–.167 | 233 |
| Flour | do | .192–.203 | .233–.274 | 139 |
| Bread | 4 pounds | .091–.112 | .278–.333 | 223 |
| Milk | 1 quart | .031–.031 | .026–.026 | 159 |
| Beef | 1 pound | [1] .152–.172<br>[3] .101–.122 | .122–.162 | 104 |
| Mutton | do | [2] .152–.183<br>[3] .081–.101 | .132–.167 | 116 |
| Pork | do | .152–.172 | .117–.147 | 81 |
| Bacon | do | .142–.183 | .172–.203 | 116 |

[1] Colonial or foreign. [2] Danish. [3] British or home killed.

I said to the Bureau of Labor, "Can it be possible? Is it not a mistake?" They said, "Oh, no; there is no mistake." Then I commenced to figure myself. I went back to my own farm. I know what I get for the wheat, and I can tell that the wheat that made the flour that went into a loaf of bread costs very little, if any, more than 1 cent. The raw materials in a loaf of bread cost 1.85 cents. That includes the milk, lard, and the sugar, and the salt, and the other things besides the flour, but not the cost of distribution and delivery and advertising and all those other things.

Now, if the materials in a loaf of bread right here, of the highest-priced flour in the world, cost 1.85 cents, it stands to reason that you could make a loaf of bread of equal size of a little cheaper flour, such as they use in England, and sell it at a profit even at 2 cents a loaf, which would be only two-fifths of the price charged here, and therefore the Bureau of Labor is probably correct in the statement that we pay in the United States 223 per cent more for bread than the working people of England who buy their bread.

And it is not only a question of bread, it is all along the line of the cost of living. I remember some years ago when we had an investigation of the ship subsidy. I instituted it myself. One of the witnesses was Hermann Sielcken, the president of the Coffee Trust. He testified that his firm imported millions of bags of coffee from Brazil, not only here, but also to Germany, exactly the same coffee; that they bought it at from 8 to 12 cents a pound; and that the coffee sold at retail in this country ready for use, roasted and prepared, at from 30 to 35 cents per pound, and the same coffee, equally roasted, after paying import duty of 7 cents a pound in Germany, was sold at retail there for 1 mark, or 24 cents a pound; so that the Germans got their coffee imported by the same firm that we did for half the price.

I can remember, and some of you can remember, the day when every housekeeper in the land went to the store and bought the coffee in the berry. Every family had a coffee mill. They ground the coffee by hand and roasted it in the family stove—fresh coffee.

Mr. YOUNG of South Dakota. And good coffee, too.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; it was good coffee, too. And you bought that coffee at from 12 to 15 cents a pound, and the man who sold it to you made a profit. What has happened? It is simply the development that explains the high cost of living. The first thing done was that the people who got the coffee roasted it, and they secured an arrangement with the railroad companies to charge a higher rate on green coffee than on roasted coffee. Ordinarily the roasted coffee was the finished product, and the raw coffee was the cheaper. But they reversed the rule and charged a good deal higher freight on the raw or green coffee than on the roasted coffee, and consequently the people in the trade quit buying the green coffee where the freight rate was high and bought it roasted. They would grind it, but they made you pay 35 cents a pound for it, whereas it used to cost you 15 cents. Thus the power of the middleman was increased. That is one of the ways by which we have increased the cost of living. It may be easier to have your coffee already roasted, but it is more expensive.

Now, I mention to you these two instances, and there are many other instances. It shows that the Democratic Party is

on the wrong track when it tries to reduce the cost of living by cutting the duties on the farm products alone and leaving the duties on other things. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The farmer asks for no privilege, but he wants a square deal. If he pays a duty on his dress goods and textiles and articles of clothing of from 30 to 50 per cent, and on other manufactures 15 to 25 per cent, and on "luxuries," like tobacco, up to 700 per cent, he wants something of a protection himself; not so much, but so as to give him the preference in his own markets.

Do you know that the farmers of the United States help to pay the $1,000,000,000 a year that we appropriate in Congress to support the Government? It costs the people of the United States $10 per capita to support the Federal Government—the Army and the Navy and all these things that serve us and protect us. It costs the people of the United States, every one of them, equally as much to support the village organization and the municipality and the school district at home. Is he not, after paying these taxes, entitled to the market of the people that he has been supporting by paying protective duties on their manufactures? Is it a fair deal that he should be singled out? Is he not entitled to a little advantage in his own market?

Why should you put the poor poultry raiser in the United States, of whom there are so many that they can not combine into a trust, up against the competition of a Chinaman, who pays labor 6 or 8 cents a day, without making that Chinaman contribute something to the support of our institutions? [Applause.] I ask you why should these men, who do not pay taxes in the United States, have the benefits of our markets without cost? Why should they not have to contribute something to the Common Treasury if they want to come in here?

The question may be asked, but I have never yet heard it answered upon principles of justice. No; the Democratic Party is far afield in attempting to answer and solve the problem of the high cost of living. They have not hit upon the right way.

They have punished the wrong man. I once read a story of a village in some old country in Europe where there was only one blacksmith. He was a good blacksmith, but he had a violent temper, and he also had an enemy. They met in a tavern, and the blacksmith, being intoxicated as well as angry, struck his enemy upon the head and killed him. He was arrested and brought before the judge to be tried for a capital offense, and the people, who I think must have been the progenitors of the Democratic Party, petitioned the judge unanimously and said, "We have only one blacksmith. We need him, and we ask you to spare his life. We have two bakers, and we can spare one. Therefore we ask you to execute one of the bakers in place of the blacksmith." The judge, wanting to be popular, turned the leaves of the law book from one cover to the other, and studied and pulled his hair, and finally rendered judgment, saying, "I see nothing in the law prohibiting the doing of what you ask me to, and therefore your petition is granted, and the baker will be executed as a well-deserved punishment for the horrible crime committed." [Laughter.] Are not the Democratic Party doing just that thing? They are executing the baker for the wrongdoing of the blacksmith. They are stripping farmers of their protection because of the offense of these combines that have raised the cost of living and reduced the price to the farmer at the same time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Briefly.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman was in the House when the Democratic Party was not in full control, was he not?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Did not the gentleman hear very many professions from the Democratic side of friendship for the farmers of the country, of a devotion that would never die, of a longing desire to help and uplift the farmers of the country?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but I think the farmers have learned better now. They have learned, in the first place, that the party to which they were loyal, the Republican Party——

Mr. ANSBERRY. Progressive, or what?

Mr. STEENERSON. I said the Republican Party, whose principles were for the protection of all alike. The farmers found that they were threatened with free trade in farm products through the reciprocity proposition of President Taft. When they turned that party down by voting for the new party, they found that the Democratic Party gave them a dose a great deal worse than reciprocity with Canada, because we got not only Canadian products, but farm products from Argentina and China and the whole world.

They have read the Scriptures, and they probably now recall the story that is found in Second Chronicles, where King Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, was about to be inaugurated. He held a council with the old men, who advised him to lighten the burdens of the people that had been imposed upon them by King Solomon. Then he counseled with the young men, and they said, No; have a strong administration. Carry on public works and add to the glory of your reign. Make the burdens heavier. So, in his inaugural address—if, with all due respect and reverence, we may so term it—he followed the advice of the young men, and said to the people: "My father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions."

It was first sought to chastise the farmer with the whip of reciprocity, but the Democrats have succeeded in chastising him with the scorpion of free trade in farm products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. If I can get some more time, I will yield.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Would the gentleman go back to the old Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman. I have not the time.

Mr. ANSBERRY. I submit that the Payne-Aldrich bill——

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say, gentlemen, that you have tried your best to slander the Payne-Aldrich bill, but it will not go. You have failed to solve the problem of the high cost of living. You have failed to bring prosperity. Go and ask the newspapers that report 350,000 idle men in New York and idle men in Lost Angeles, in San Francisco, and from Portland, Oreg., to Portland, Me., and the latest news is that an army has been organized in the State of the gentleman from Ohio by Gen. Coxey that will march to Washington to give visible evidence of the deplorable lack of prosperity in the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, anent the subject of the President's Mexican policy, I desire to read an illuminating article upon that subject, which appeared in the Public Ledger of Philadelphia to-day, written by former major of Engineers, United States Army, Cassius E. Gillette. I ask leave to print that in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] asks permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], a member of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], who has just spoken, ventured, in a way, to defend the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. He is too wise to come out squarely for that old stand-pat Republican doctrine. Gentlemen are criticizing a law not yet six months old. It has not had time to cut the old white whiskers from the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. Gentlemen over there are not willing to give it a chance.

In order to deceive the farmer into voting the Republican ticket again they are shedding crocodile tears over an imaginary injury done the farmer in the Underwood law. O, how you fleeced the farmer when you lulled him to sleep with the soothing sirup of high protection!

Mary had a little lamb;
Its fleece was white as snow;
It followed her to Pittsburgh one day,
And look at the little thing now.

[Laughter.]

After 16 years of your protection the farmers of the country rose en masse and drove you from place and power in the country. They are tired of your protective theory; they are tired of a system of taxation which enriches one class at the expense of another.

These gentlemen would woo the farmer back into the tariff fold again. Oh, you fleeced him so long and so successfully you want to get hold of him one more time. [Laughter.] If you could get in again, you would fleece him again. A wounded Indian at the battle of the Horseshoe Bend said to the surgeon who was trying to save his life, "Cure Indian and kill him again." [Laughter.]

Politically speaking, you farmed the farmer for 16 years, but he has slipped out of your grasp at last. He refuses to longer submit in silence to your oppression. Here you are trying to deceive him again. He is too intelligent to follow you any longer. You threatened the country with a panic if we dared to take the hands of greed out of the pockets of the American people. [Applause.]

It is not six months since President Wilson signed the tariff bill, but no panic came to gratify these prophets of evil. You told the people in the South that cotton would go to 5 cents a pound just as sure as Wilson was elected President. You said, "Just as sure as you tamper with the tariff cotton will go to 5 cents a pound." We did tamper with it; we cut the claws and broke the jaws of that Republican monster, the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and cotton sold around 12½ and 13 cents per pound. And, Mr. Speaker, cotton did not go to 5 cents per pound. You said we would have a panic if we dared to touch the banking and currency law. Puck had a good cut on that threat of yours. It had Uncle Sam standing gazing at some red letters saying, "If you dare touch the tariff you will have a panic." Uncle Sam was looking at it with an inquiring expression on his face, and he seemed to be wondering if you really believed that. After we passed the tariff law they had two red lines run through the lines that the tariff would produce a panic, and just above that was "Currency legislation" will produce a panic. We have given you a currency law and you have not produced a panic yet. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I am sorry, but my time is limited. The tariff law and the currency law both followed. Your banking and currency system was the most oppressive in the history of the Government. Both your tariff law and your currency law have been removed by a Democratic administration.

You said that we could not do that. Well, Col. Marchbanks tells about a fellow in the Confederate Army who was gagged. They found him by the path side down in the woods, gagged, and they said: "Who did that?" He said, as best he could, "Some privates." They said, "You are a lieutenant, and privates can't gag a lieutenant." He said: "Well, by gosh, they did do it." [Laughter.] So you said that we could not reduce the tariff tax and pass a banking and currency law in the interest of the people, but we did do it. [Applause.]

With war on one side of us in Mexico, the President is holding to the wise policy of "watchful waiting," because he does not want to expend millions of the people's money and sacrifice thousands of American lives. [Applause.] Big interests in this country are urging us to go to war because they have large mining interests in Mexico, because they have large ranching interests in Mexico [applause], and they want to protect their property. Widows' weeds and the cries of mothers whose sons are sacrificed in battle do not appeal to them. What care they for the wrongs and crimes? It is the dimes and dollars and dollars and dimes that interest them. [Applause.] No, gentlemen; my colleague from Alabama [Mr. DENT] said truly here the other day that no purely protective tariff bill will ever be written again in this country. If ever again, it will be after this generation of farmers are dead and after their offspring are dead. I did not expect in this Congress to see anyone on that side undertake to defend a tariff tax in the name of the farmer.

But the imposed-upon gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] was inveigled into the difficult task of showing how the tariff tax benefits the farmer. Every time you have given to the farmer 10 cents in tariff sop you have plucked from his purse 90 cents of hard-earned money. [Applause.] I lay down the proposition that, at all times, whenever you have benefited the farmer of this country by 10 cents on something he had to sell you have taken back from him, in what he has had to buy, 90 cents. [Applause.] That is a fine business proposition; but it is not so good for the farmer—to spend 90 cents in order to get 10 cents. So it fell to the lot of the gentleman from Nebraska to revamp and present the old argument—that it benefits the farmer to tax him on all he has to buy. Do you know how you deceived the farmer in the outset? Well, the big manufacturer flourished like a green bay tree under your tariff system. The farmer looked at that tree and said, "Something is wrong in this system." The farmer was restless, and the Republican Party, with its ear to the ground, said, "We have to get that class of people into this protection game somehow. How shall we do it?" "Why, go and tell them that you are going to lay a tax on the people for their benefit." "But he would not believe it." "Well, you keep on telling him until you believe it, and after a while he will believe it, and when he does you have got him in." [Laughter.] So they tried that process, and they deceived lots of them with it. There was a farmer out in Texas who got a little tariff tax on hides. He had a few yearlings, and because of the tariff tax he gathered up $4.32 from the hides that he sold in one year; but his taxes in tariff tax and trust profits in one year on harness, saddles, boots, and shoes was $55.70. So he paid $51.38 in order to enjoy the blessings and benefits of a tax on hides. [Applause.]

That is the way that benefits accrue to the farmer from the Republican tariff tax. But the gentleman from Nebraska is the only one who has had the gall to try the old trick and to proclaim the old threadbare and repudiated doctrine that the tariff benefits the farmer. If he could substitute the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot tariff law for the Underwood law it would be the greatest affliction that he could bring upon the farmers of his district.

But somebody on that side had to go through with the farcical performance of trying to make believe that the tariff benefits the farmer, and, Mr. Speaker, it fell to the lot of the gentleman from Nebraska. I am reminded of the fellow who had never seen a circus, but who determined to go to one. On Saturday he started into the city, and as he was going by a large brick church he heard music within. He looked up at the building and said, "This looks like a pretty good place for a circus, and I will just go in there and see it." So he went in. He went into the vestibule and he listened, and again he heard music. After a while the music died away and he heard some one talking. He opened the door just a little and listened. The preacher had just announced his text about the separation of the sheep and the goats at the last great day, and just then the preacher said, "In this congregation I wonder on that final day who will be the goat." This little fellow heard that talk about animals. The preacher repeated it in a louder voice. "I repeat, who will be the goat?" Nobody stirred or made answer, of course. The little fellow hurried down the aisle and said, "Mister, I didn't expect to take any part in this show, but rather than see it break up, by gosh, I will be the goat." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if that was one of those angora goats that are under the protected list of the Underwood-Simmons law?

Mr. HEFLIN. So, Mr. Speaker, upon the principle that the burnt child dreads the fire, the old standpatters sidestepped the invitation. The situation was serious. One by one the older ones shook their heads and folded their arms and walked away, and finally the gentleman from Nebraska said, "Well, I would rather not do this, but rather than see this show of tariff protection to the farmer break up and this farcical performance end, I will be the goat." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said a good deal about tariff protection benefiting the farmer. It is most appropriate and fitting to answer one Republican with the statement of another Republican. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. CUMMINS, had occasion to say a word or two on this subject six months ago, and this is what he said:

> I know that my friend from North Dakota does not agree with me in respect to these things, but I do not believe that we in Iowa receive any direct benefit for the 400,000,000 bushels of corn we raise every year. I do not believe that we receive any direct benefit from the duty on 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 hogs that we market every year. I do not believe that of the $700,000,000 of agricultural products that we pour every year into the channels of trade, protection advances the price of a tithe of them. We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with a product that will surpass in value $700,000,000, and it is idle for even an enthusiast to assert that the price of these products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

[Applause.]

That statement is from a Republican Senator from Iowa, answering the gentleman from Nebraska, who proclaims to the farmer that high protection is of vast benefit to him. Let me show you what you have done to the farmer. Under your Payne-Aldrich law he could not take a hundred bushels of wheat or corn across over the line into a foreign country and exchange it for the value of that hundred bushels in machinery and bring that machinery right back to his farm without paying half the value again of the machinery to get it over the border line. That is some of your treatment of the farmer. What else under that Payne law? If the farmer owned a plantation in Canada and owned one in the United States and took his sheep over to graze in Canada and kept them over there more than three months you would not let him bring his own sheep back to his American plantation unless he paid a tax on every one of them. That is some of the evidence of your good treatment of the American farmer. The gentleman comes from out in Nebraska, close to the great old State of Kansas. Let me read to him what a Kansan said out there when you were raising money for your campaign funds:

> We have been invited to send a dollar contribution to the Republican campaign fund that is being raised by popular subscription and to which President Roosevelt recently subscribed—

This was before Roosevelt jumped off the elephant and mounted the bull moose. [Laughter.]

> We would like to have our dollar in such select company all right, but we have done all the contributing we intend to do this year. We recently have completed building a house at a cost of something over $4,000, and for every foot of lumber, every pane of glass, every sack

of cement, every pound of nails, and, in fact, for nearly every bit of material that went into it we made a good liberal contribution through the trusts that controlled them, and we guess we have done our share.

It may be treason for a Republican newspaper to talk this way, but facts are facts, and it sorter relieves our conscience to tell the truth about the trusts once in awhile. Well, just let the several trusts to which I have had to pay unwilling tribute in the past year pay our dollar for us. We need it and they do not.

[Applause.]

Now, these are some of the fruits of protection for the farmer. Why, see him as he goes out to work. Under the Payne-Aldrich law you taxed his plow and his plow stock; you taxed the singletree and the iron upon it; you taxed the trace chain, the backband and its buckle; you taxed the hames and collar, the bridle, and the plow lines. But you did not stop there.

When he took his horse out to hitch him to his one-horse wagon you had taxed the bridle that he puts on his horse then and the leather in his harness. You taxed the brads in the harness, and the buckles, and even the thread with which the harness was sewed together; and you also taxed the tires on the wagon. You taxed every rod and bar in that wagon; you taxed the wood taken from the forest where God Almighty intended trees to grow to furnish lumber for man's use and benefit and to build houses to shelter him. That is what you did. Now, you are the pretended friend of the farmer, and you boast of prosperity that you have given him. I am reminded of another story: An old fellow had the rheumatism and he could not get around very well, and so he stayed at home. Finally a peddler came along and told him that if he would put bees on his legs and let them sting him that it would cure him. He tried that remedy. They applied bees, and that old fellow ranted and yelled and said he was worse off than ever. One day a friend came and said, "Uncle Jake, John Jones is coming here to preach and you must come and hear him; you used to know him in the old days." He said, "I would like to hear John Jones, but, to tell you the fact, I am a miserable man and I do not like to go anywhere at all and talk and be talked to." Well, finally they got him to agree to go, and he went and took a seat back in the rear, where he would not be disturbed. The old fellow sat down with his stick and crutch by his side. The preacher began by saying: "It has been a long time since I was here. I see a lot of people that I know. Providence must have been exceedingly good to you all. I want to ask you," speaking to a merchant there, "I knew you in the years gone by. What has Providence done for you?" The merchant stood up and said: "Well, Providence has been exceedingly good to me. I have sold a lot of goods this year. I have got a good line of customers, and they all pay me well," and he sat down. "Good," said the preacher. "Doctor," he said, "what has Providence done for you?" "Well, I have a good line of patients, who pay me well, and Providence has been good to me." "Good," said the preacher. "Now," he said to the lawyer, "what has Providence done for you?" The lawyer said: "Providence has been very good to me; I have had a good many cases, and have been very successful in them." "Yes," said the preacher, "that is good." Then he said, pointing to the old farmer sitting back: "You old fellow, sitting back there all humped up, what has Providence done for you?" The old fellow, gritting his teeth, struggled to his feet and said: "Parson, he's durn nigh ruint me." [Laughter and applause.] That is what you have done to the farmers of this country. [Applause.] Let me tell you another thing. You built a tariff house on the roadside and you put an ear of corn by the side of the door and a shock of wheat and a bundle of oats and you wrote the words, "Protection for farm products; come in." And deceived by your sign the farmer went in, and what happened to him? You have read about the fellow who went to Jericho and fell into the hands of robbers. That is what happened to the farmers in the house of Republican protection. You said to him, "Do you want to buy a watch?" and he said, "Yes; I would like to have a watch." "All right; here is one we will sell you for $40." "All right." He took it and went to his home. And when he got home his wife commenced to read the catalogue about watches and other things, and she said: "John, do you know that the watch they sold to you for $40 they sell abroad for $15, the very same watch, made by the same company and shipped over land and sea thousands of miles? They sell it to the foreigner, competing with him in a foreign country, for $15, $25 cheaper than they have sold it to you, who support your Government, and are compelled in time of war to bear arms in its defense." This is some of your beneficent treatment of the American farmer.

Well, in this house of protection they said to the farmer, "Don't you want to buy a sewing machine?" "Yes; I need a machine." "All right, Uncle Johnnie; we will sell you a machine for $15." And he bought it. When he went home, his wife said: "John, that machine that you paid $15 for they sell in Europe for $7.50. They pay the freight over thousands of miles and sell it in successful competition with the pauper labor of Europe." That is the character of friendship that you exhibit for the American farmer. That is the fruit of the tree of high protection, and "By their fruits ye shall know them." [Applause.]

What else did you do? The farmer said: "I want some agricultural implements and some machinery to use on the farm." "All right; we will sell to you this machinery for $100." He goes home, and his wife says: "Don't you know that they are selling that machinery abroad for $50?" He said: "No; I did not know that. I guess they are treating me that way to show their friendship for me." [Laughter.]

Yes; all that shows your friendship for the farmer. Everything that you manufactured that he needed you sold abroad, under the Payne law, cheaper than you sold it to him in the home land. That is the fruit of high protection.

What else do you do to him in this House of protection? He says, "I am going to build me a barn," and then what do you do? Why, you tax every foot of lumber he puts in the barn to house the produce that he digs from the soil, and you tax every rod and bar and bolt and nail that he puts into that building. What then? You even tax the hinges he puts on the door, and the lock and the key which he uses to prevent thieves from breaking through to steal. [Applause.]

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the fruits of high protection. But you do not stop there. As this Kansas editor said, for every pane of glass, for every foot of lumber, for everything he uses in building his dwelling house you tax him. You tax the window curtain in his house. You tax the towel that hangs upon the nail by the side of the water bucket on the veranda. You tax everything. And when a child is born unto him you tax the swaddling clothes of the infant of the farmer. You tax his wearing apparel up to youthhood and manhood. You tax all he wears on through life. You do not stop there. You tax the winding sheet of the farmer's dead. And you do not stop there. You taxed the tombstone that stood over his resting place—all this as an evidence of your lasting friendship for the farmer. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like if the gentleman would yield me five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. I have some statistics and other matter here that I will include in my remarks, but I will not have time to refer to them now.

The gentleman hints at hard times. Why, Republican newspapers have said that our export trade has been greater than last year. A Republican paper in Pennsylvania says that the gross earnings of railroads month by month, from February last year to November last year, were greater than the year before. Traffic has not been so great on steamboats and railroads as since Woodrow Wilson went into the White House and we took complete control of the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

In conclusion, gentlemen, I want to appeal to your patriotism. You stop this political whining about hard times that do not exist. You know that we performed a surgical operation on a mighty sick patient last year—a patient that has needed attention for a long time. The operation was successful, and the patient is feeling fine. He is sorry that he ever fell into your hands and grieved that you ever took him to your hospital. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has not been here long. He comes here pleading for a high protective tariff for the farmer, when that old doctrine is dead, dead. The farmers laugh at your performance up here when you talk about protecting them by taxing them. The gentleman is not representing the farmers in this plea. Rip Van Winkle slept for 20 years, and when he went back to the little village of Falling Water everybody he knew before had moved away. And I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the farmers who once lived on the old reservation of high protection have all moved away. They are now occupying the high ground where open markets and competitive buying fix prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This talk of protecting the farmer when we are sending our produce to compete in the markets of the earth is the sheerest rot, and, gentlemen, you can not deceive the farmer any longer. The American people have great confidence in President Wilson, the great leader of our party. They are coming more and more to believe in the Democratic Party. It has kept the faith and is fulfilling its pledges to the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to print some statements here.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, said, September, 1913:

The Republican Party has secured the support of the farmer for the protective system by the maintenance of these agricultural duties and has made him the instrument of his own spoliation. The high duties placed by the Republicans on manufactured goods not only compel the farmer to buy his supplies in a domestic market dominated by combination and monopoly, while he must sell his own product in competition with the world, in spite of the meaningless duties on the insignificant volume of competing imports, but also impedes the sale of his surplus abroad, by reason of the high rates levied by other countries against all American products in retaliation against our own exorbitant tariff charges. Thus the farmer is fundamentally outraged by the Republican protective tariff. In view of these conditions, what could be more amusing than the spectacle of Republican Senators weeping for the farmer whom Republican tariffs have robbed for 50 years? What really grieves them is not the removal of these deceptive duties from the farmers' goods, but the fact that the Democratic tariff bill will enable the farmer to see that his pretended friends are his enemies and his exploiters. If this bill does no more than demonstrate the true character of most agricultural tariffs with which protection for manufacturers has been so cunningly buttressed, if it does no more than reveal to the farmer the protective conspiracy against him, it will have justified its enactment a thousand times over.

A recent investigation by the Department of Agriculture developed the fact that the farmer receives on the average only 50 or 60 per cent of the prices paid for his product by consumers in the towns and cities. Already the new Democratic Secretary of Agriculture has begun a comprehensive study of marketing conditions to the end that the farmer may obtain a larger share of the price paid for his product by the final consumers and that through the elimination of unnecessary expense and unfair handling charges the consumer may obtain a better article at a lower price.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky, who led the fight for free sugar, said September 8, 1913:

Mr. President, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] said in the Democratic conference, sugar production in Louisiana has been civilized out of existence. Unless you will do away with your antiquated machinery, unless you will supplant with modern machinery for sugar manufacture those old, open-kettle mills, you can not hope to compete with the world. Sugar is produced in Cuba for 2 cents a pound. It is produced in Java for a cent and a half a pound. It is produced in Hawaii for about 2 cents a pound. It is produced in Porto Rico at about the same figure. How much does it cost in Louisiana? It costs 3½ cents a pound to produce it. Why? Because the sucrose matter of the sugar cane of Louisiana is but 6 or 7 per cent, while the sucrose matter of the sugar cane of Cuba is from 11 to 14 per cent. What you want is a tariff that will make the sucrose matter of your sugar cane, which is only 6 or 7 per cent, bring as much as the sucrose matter of the sugar cane of Cuba brings, which is from 11 to 14 per cent. What the Senator from Louisiana wants is not a tariff that will equalize the cost of production, but one that will equalize the amount of the sucrose matter in the cane of Louisiana with that of the cane of Cuba. And why does that difference exist? In Cuba the cane has to be planted only once in every 10 years. In Louisiana it has to be planted once every year. Why? They have to cut the cane early in Louisiana, because they fear the frost. They do not have to do that in Cuba. What the Senator desires is that we shall write upon the statute book of this land a tax which shall be paid by the people who consume sugar, so as to make sugar-cane growing as profitable in a temperate climate as it is in a tropical climate. Nature itself has decreed, and its decree is beyond the effect of all law, that sugar is more easily and cheaply produced in tropical climates than in temperate climates. I am unwilling to deny the sugar-consuming millions of America the natural advantages that God gave to the soil of the world in the cheapness in the production of sugar. God Himself made Cuba, as He made Louisiana. He made Cuba a tropical climate, where the production of sugar is indigenous to its soil. The production of sugar in Louisiana is not indigenous to the soil to the same extent that it is in Cuba. That is the trouble in Louisiana. They have to cut their cane early for fear of frost. In Cuba it is allowed to stand, and the sugar content in the cane is greater. I am unwilling, Mr. President, to make the sugar consumers of my country pay a protective tariff on sugar that is produced in a tropical climate as it comes in competition with sugar produced in a temperate climate.

But let us see further. My friend spoke of Thomas Jefferson. He spoke of him kindly. I am glad to hear that whatever may have been the waywardness of my friend from the highway of the old party of Democracy, he still has a hankering after Thomas Jefferson. [Laughter.] He tells us that Jefferson would have said practically that a tariff upon sugar was a proper tariff. Mr. President, I only know what Jefferson would have said, and here is what he did say: "Taxes upon consumption, like those upon capital or income, to be just must be uniform. I do not mean to say that it may not be for the general interest to foster for a while certain infant manufactures until they are strong enough to stand against foreign rivals, but when evident that they will never be so it is against right to make the other branches of industry support them."

But I desire to call my friend's attention to the fact that President McKinley, too, said something upon sugar. Here is what he said in a speech in the House of Representatives:

"Last year we paid $55,000,000 out of our pockets to protect whom? To protect the men in the United States who were producing just one-eighth of the amount of the consumption of our sugar. Now we wipe this out, and it will cost us to pay the bounty $7,000,000 every 12 months, which furnishes the same protection at a very much less cost to the consumers. So we save $48,000,000 every year and leave this in the pockets of the people. Sir, when we lift from the American people the vast sum of $48,000,000 of taxes, they can put up every 12 months 48,000 houses costing $1,000 apiece."

So, in the language of the lamented and departed McKinley, I say to-night that we want to lift from the backs of the consumers of America, not $55,000,000, but $140,000,000, and that vast sum saved to them will give them an opportunity to erect 140,000 houses that cost $1,000 each.

HOW A HIGH PROTECTIVE TARIFF IS EATING UP THE FARMERS.

[By Daniel W. Voorhees, of Indiana.]

It is not possible that the fraudulent and monstrous policy of taxing the farmer into poverty in order to make another class of people nabobs and millionaires can much longer delude and mislead anyone fit to manage his own affairs and have the care of a family. The farmers of the United States sell abroad and feed the world. Every pretense of protection for their home markets is a fraud; every duty laid on such articles as wheat, corn, cattle, horses, eggs, poultry, and other like productions of farm life and farm labor is a cheat and a sham, and is so intended.

One-third of his time the American farmer is a toiling serf for the payment not of revenue to his Government, but of naked tribute to those who are protected in charging him from 25 to 100 per cent more than it is worth on every article his wants compel him to buy.

Under the old Payne law the farmer, the householder, the consumer in general paid tariff duties upon articles which he consumed at the following rates:

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| Glassware | 60 |
| Knives and forks | 50 |
| Salt | 104 |
| Sugar | 63 |
| Rice | 65 |
| Cutlery | 65 |
| Carpets | 66 |
| Furniture | 96 |
| Blankets | 93 to 140 |
| Flannels | 91 |
| Ready-made clothing | 65 |
| Knitted goods | 95 |
| Shawls | 96 |
| Window glass | 80 |
| Files | 68 |
| Building stone | 50 |
| Iron chain | 183 |
| Machinery | 45 |
| Screws | 128 |
| Women's clothing | 74 to 92 |
| Men's clothing | 78 |
| Cotton goods | 60 |
| Woolen goods | 87 |

In the Underwood bill the duties on all these articles are either removed entirely or are reduced from 33⅓ to 50 per cent. In some instances the reductions are as high as 75 per cent.

The Underwood bill has exposed the humbug and fraud which the Republican Party has imposed upon the farmers for half a century.

Here is a part of the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee in 1909:

There are articles left in the bill on which the rates are as prohibitive as under the Dingley law, allowing very little of importations, raising practically no revenue, and barring out competition. Notable among these are rivets, screws, fence and other wire rods, axles and axle bars, blacksmith's hammers, sledges, track tools, wedges, crowbars, bolt blanks, cast-iron vessels, stove plate, sadirons, muskets, shotguns, rifles, nails, spikes, tacks, needles, steel plates (engraved), stereotype plates, electrotype plates, hooks and eyes, and many other articles named in the schedule.

Again, under Schedule G, the minority view says:

The treatment of the farmer by this bill is along the same lines as have characterized Republican methods in the past. He gets practically no relief, and the laborer and producer have greater burdens imposed upon them. The cost of living for the average man is increased; the advantage of wealth and power is also increased. Heavy taxes are laid on tea, coffee, and substitutes for coffee, which, with cocoa, butter, mustard, pepper, cinnamon, and all sorts of flavors for food, are declared to be luxuries, while figs, lemons, etc., are raised in price without hope of increasing the revenue, etc. Every article of food the laborer must have to live comfortably is heavily taxed; even the salt on his table is not exempt. This schedule was evidently prepared by the same mind which has dominated this bill—a mind certainly not unfriendly to the great trusts.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] yields back one minute.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] is recognized.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the eloquence of my eloquent friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I would like to be able to make a speech like that he has just finished, but I would not like to have my ability and eloquence lead me to such utter and absolute disregard of the facts as was shown by the gentleman from Alabama.

I noticed that in speaking of the farmers he did not say a word about the ruin of the farmers of Louisiana who raise sugar. I noticed he did say that a farmer could not take 100 bushels of wheat and go over to Canada and get machinery for it without paying over again half the value of that machinery in duties. Now, as a matter of fact we make all the agricultural machinery used in Canada in this country, or it is made by our companies. I have the honor to represent a district which has in it one of the largest agricultural-machinery factories in the country, and during the consideration of the Underwood bill the owners of that factory did not say a word to me about the tariff. They are perfectly willing to have free trade. They manufacture for export largely. That is how much there is in that farm-machinery talk. The farmer got no benefit from free farm machinery.

Whether protection is right or wrong, everybody knows that the farmers of this country believe in it, and they voted against President Taft because they thought his Canadian reciprocity treaty was going to deprive them of a part of the protection which they had enjoyed; and I think there was some reason in that, because to a certain extent the farmers' market would have been affected. But if reciprocity had gone into effect, the farmers in the United States would have gotten something back in return from Canada, whereas now, under the present tariff bill, the farmers are getting nothing back.

The gentleman from Alabama said that the Democratic Party had passed a currency bill without producing a panic. I want to say that, in order to make that bill panic proof, they had to tack onto it a Republican measure, fathered by Senator Aldrich himself, namely, the Vreeland-Aldrich Act. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for the opportunity he has given me to address myself to this very important bill. I feel that as a representative of Illinois, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, agricultural States in the Union, I am entitled to be heard, and possibly I have some facts that may be of value.

I not only represent the greatest of all agricultural States, but am directly interested in agriculture. My entire youth was spent on an Illinois farm, and it has been my good fortune to acquire some Illinois lands, which it is a pleasure as well as a profit to manage and operate as a side line to the legal profession. Except for a short interval between the time when I left the farm and took up the law as a profession and the time when I became interested as owner in farm property, I have from infancy been directly interested in and a close student of agriculture and feel qualified to speak upon this subject.

I approve of this legislation. I agree with what was said in the opening speech by the chairman of the committee, that sufficient attention has not heretofore been given to the agricultural interests of this country by Congress, and that the recognition has not been given to this great industry that its importance deserves.

It is only a few weeks ago—two or three weeks ago—that I heard a very remarkable statement made on the floor of this House by a gentleman who is not present, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. It is not my purpose to make a tariff speech, but in connection with my remarks I desire to refer briefly to what he said. He was decrying the fact that the Democratic tariff had ruined the farmer; and, speaking as the Representative of a border State, he took the position that we had opened the markets of our country to the products of Canada, and that we had ruined the home market, and incidentally had struck a fatal blow to the farmer. He quoted with a great deal of relish the importation of oats from Canada since the present tariff law went into operation. I asked him this question—I quote it from the RECORD:

What was the price of oats in October and November, 1912, and what was the price in October and November, 1913?

Those were the months that he was using in comparing the importations of 1912 with the importations of 1913; and here is his remarkable answer, and to my surprise it appeared in the RECORD as he stated it:

Oats were 14 cents per bushel lower in 1913 than they were in 1912.

That stands in the RECORD to-day as the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, that oats in October and November, 1913, under the present tariff law, were 14 cents per bushel lower in the market than they were the year before, under a protective tariff.

I went to the pains of securing from the Department of Agriculture the facts and data with regard to prices, and here are the figures furnished me by that department:

*Oats.*

| | Cents. |
|---|---|
| Nov. 1, 1912 | 33½ |
| Nov. 1, 1913 | 42 to 42½ |
| Nov. 8, 1912 | 33½ |
| Nov. 8, 1913 | 42½ |
| Nov. 15, 1912 | 32 |
| Nov. 15, 1913 | 71½ to 71½ |
| Nov. 22, 1912 | 32½ |
| Nov. 22, 1913 | 41½ |

Oats were 10 cents a bushel higher under the present tariff law than they were under the preceding tariff law, and yet the statement stands unverified in this RECORD by the gentleman from Michigan that oats were 14 cents a bushel lower in 1913 than they were in 1912.

I also took the pains to secure the corn prices for the same months and on the same dates:

*Corn.*

| | Cents. |
|---|---|
| Nov. 1, 1912 | 50½ |
| Nov. 1, 1913 | 70 |
| Nov. 8, 1912 | 49½ |
| Nov. 8, 1913 | 70½ to 70½ |
| Nov. 15, 1912 | 47½ |
| Nov. 15, 1913 | 71½ to 71½ |
| Nov. 22, 1912 | 48 |
| Nov. 22, 1913 | 70½ |

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Has the gentleman examined the prices of corn in November and December of 1913 and in January and February of this year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have; and I want to say to the gentleman that in a home paper which I received last week there was the report of a large public sale in my county, one of the corn-producing counties of Illinois, and corn sold at that sale, two weeks ago, in the crib, at 81 cents per bushel. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the local price in the greatest corn-producing State—Illinois. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SLOAN. Has the gentleman examined the public market reports? I have examined them myself, and I wondered whether the gentleman's information corresponded with mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have; and I find that the price last week was about the same as it was in October and November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have some data here, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the valuation of farm products, to which I desire to call attention by way of impressing upon the committee the importance of legislation favorable to agriculture.

Figures were given here to-day as to the amount of corn, oats, cotton, and other farm products in the year 1909, as shown by the census of 1910. I do not know whether it has been given or not, but I have the valuation of these same products for that year, the market price applied to the amount of production. Eleven of the leading crops in 1909 showed a total aggregate value of $4,813,280,000, or approximately 90 per cent of the total value of all the crops of the United States, which amounted to $5,487,161,000. The farm products in one year, five years ago, amounted to the enormous sum of $5,500,000,000. Of these leading crops corn was the most valuable, followed by hay, forage, cotton, wheat, oats, vegetables, potatoes, tobacco, barley, and apples in the order named. The value of the corn crop alone was $1,438,554,000. Cotton came second, its value being $703,619,000; wheat third, $657,657,000; vegetables, $216,257,000; tobacco, $104,304,000.

I said I represented one of the largest, if not the largest, agricultural State in the Union. Perhaps I represent a greater agricultural interest here than any other Member of this body. Representing the State of Illinois at large, with two Members at large, and apportioning to myself one-half of the population of 6,000,000, I properly speak here for 3,000,000 people, largely engaged in agriculture.

The relative rank of the first nine States in regard to value of crops showed that Illinois led with a total valuation for all farm crops of $372,000,000; Iowa was second with $315,000,000; Texas third with $298,000,000, followed by Ohio with $230,000,000; Georgia, $227,000,000; Missouri, $221,000,000; Kansas, $215,000,000; New York, $209,000,000; and Indiana, $204,000,000.

The State of Illinois ranked first in its production of corn, followed by Iowa and Missouri in the order named, and first in the production of oats.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to be conceded by all members of the committee that agriculture is the first, the

prime, and the greatest industry, the one upon which we must all rely. This bill, as I understand it, carries with it a total appropriation of about $18,000,000. Compared with the appropriation bills which have been and will be reported to this Congress, it is a very trivial amount, indeed, for the greatest industry in the country.

It carries with it appropriations for the maintenance and operation of a Weather Bureau, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Plant Industry, Bureau of Soils, Bureau of Entomology (plant insects), experiment stations, and miscellaneous appropriations for numerous branches of the Department of Agriculture, all designed and intended to afford to the farmer extensive and valuable information which he could not otherwise obtain except at great individual outlay. I have found a great demand among the farmers of Illinois for farmers' bulletins and am impressed with the readiness and avidity with which farmers read these publications and profit by them. This is a day and era of progress in every branch of industry and undertaking, and I find the farmers as ready to seize upon and avail themselves of new and advanced methods in agriculture as enterprising and progressive as any other class of citizens, and none appreciate the aid afforded them by the Government more than this great body of our citizens. I find our farmers gladly avail themselves of the distribution of seeds and ready to utilize to the fullest advantage the benefits flowing from the distribution and exchange of seeds throughout the various sections of the country. Scientific farming is materially aided by the investigations conducted by the Government through its Agricultural Department and the dissemination of information derived through its various experiment stations and other branches.

One of the purposes and objects of this bill is to make farm life not only more remunerative but more interesting and attractive to people who plow the fields and produce the foodstuffs for the millions engaged in other enterprises. Much has been said in this debate about young men leaving the farm and going to the cities, and we read in the papers the cry, "Back to the farm." Farm life is becoming more attractive than in former years. Improved facilities, labor-saving machinery, together with rural mails and the telephone and interurban roads, are fast improving conditions on the farm and rendering farm life more endurable than in years gone by. When I was a boy it was my mission to go 2 miles to the country post office once, and then later twice, a week for the mail. At that home is today delivered by the rural mail carrier the daily paper and other mail, and the telephone connecting with the neighbors and near-by towns; and certain it is that existence there is much more to be desired than it was when, astride bare back, it was my mission to carry the weekly mail for the one household. I feel that it is a part of the functions of government, and a duty Congress owes the people, in the liberal and sometimes reckless expenditure of the people's money, to devote some of it toward the betterment of conditions among those who till the fields and produce the necessities of life for a great, growing, and prosperous people largely concentrated in urban centers.

There prevails in my section of the country—Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and other States in that region—a terrible disease or pestilence—the hog cholera—which destroys annually millions of dollars in value of hogs. It was a pleasure to me to vote here recently for an appropriation made with a view to stamping out that most terrible disease. That appropriation was a just recognition of a great industry. I favor appropriations which will bring into play the facilities of this great Government and the learning of its experts to stamp out such diseases as hog cholera, the cattle tick, scab among sheep, and similar enemies of farm products. I favor all such appropriations as a legitimate, honest, and necessary expenditure of the public money, and I stand ready to support this bill with all my might, and only wish that this committee, in the exercise of wisdom as well as economy, had seen fit to make more liberal appropriations for the very many necessary requirements of agriculture in order that this great interest might be further promoted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. In these discussions, Mr. Chairman, I desire to stick as closely as possible to facts, and for that reason I shall answer the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] when I have ascertained certain facts which I think exist.

In answer to the gentleman of the great agricultural State of Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], I hold in my hand the greatest paper published in that great State. Referring to the greatest product of that great State, the last quotation that I have before me is that of February 28, which shows that on that date corn No. 4 was valued at 59½ to 60 cents; No. 3 white, 63 cents; and so it ranges as the present price, which seems to be a better authority than that quoted by the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. In a moment. I do not believe that the farmers of the great State of Illinois represented by the gentleman [Mr. WILLIAMS], raising, as they do, corn, wheat, oats, and meats, should be placed in open competition with Canada, Australia, and the Argentine Republic, while the rice, the mica, the tobacco, and the peanuts of the South are richly protected. And as to protection, I want to appeal to the greatest authority in the gentleman's party, the President of the United States, who believes in it so thoroughly that he saw to it that 80 per cent of the products of his own State of New Jersey were kept upon the protected list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the gentleman give the quotation for No. 2 corn?

Mr. SLOAN. No. 2 is probably here. I suppose it is here. It is cash corn. I can give the gentleman the quotation for May. May corn is only 67.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We want the February quotations.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not see any No. 2 quoted here; but it is probably here, and probably is somewhere around 64.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a material difference in the price of corn this year and a year ago, also of oats. How does the gentleman account for that, in view of this very destructive tariff that he talks about?

Mr. SLOAN. The comparison is not between what it is now and what it was a year ago, but the course of prices as they run from the 4th day of October last up to the present time, since which over 6,000,000 bushels of corn have been shipped in open competition with the corn of this country, and driven the price down from 10 to 15 cents a bushel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why is the price of corn and oats higher now than it was a year ago?

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know; I know why they have gone down in the last four months—on account of the competition of the multiplied millions of bushels of corn and oats that have come in from other countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A year ago we had a protective tariff, and notwithstanding that fact corn and oats are higher by 10 or 15 cents than they were a year ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PLATT. I want to say that proves conclusively that the Democratic Party has failed to reduce the cost of living. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know which horn of the dilemma the Democratic Party is going to take.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. If I have time.

Mr. BOOHER. Under what administration, under what tariff law, was it that you burned corn in Nebraska because it was cheaper than coal?

Mr. SLOAN. It was under Grover Cleveland's second administration that we burned corn in Nebraska because it was cheaper than coal.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman did not live in Nebraska at that time. It was in 1882 and 1883, before Cleveland's first administration, as I remember, and under a Republican tariff law.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I did live in Nebraska during the second administration, and that was when we burned corn, and I know that to be a fact. My colleague at my side knows it to be true, too.

Mr. BOOHER. I think you burned in it in 1882 and 1883, too.

Mr. SLOAN. We suffered at the hands of the Democratic Party, whether it was under the first or second administration of Grover Cleveland, and we will continue to suffer during the rest of the Democratic administration, under which our prices are going down and men are out of employment.

Mr. ADAIR. Then, let me say, you are likely to suffer for a good many years, because the Democratic Party is going to stay in power. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I want to tell you, my friend, that from that chair to-day your President made it certain that we will not have to suffer more than three years. Because when he repudiated one of the great planks of his platform, giving no reason for it, only the fact that he was in a hole and asked Congress to pull him out, he settled that question. He may be as effective with the other platform plank that has been debated, whether or not there should be a second term attempted, that other plank that for a long time it has been lese majesty to mention at the

White House and high treason to question at the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the burning of corn in Nebraska because it was cheaper than coal.

The people of Nebraska and Kansas suffered for some years from the most severe drought that ever afflicted the country. They had so much corn in some years that it was cheaper than coal and they burned it. Then talk about the tariff law making the prices! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am going to read some figures from the gentleman's own speech given the other day on the floor to convince him that the tariff has nothing to do with the importations of goods into the country. Here are the figures he gave you in the speech: In 1897, the last full year of the Wilson tariff bill, the value of the importations under Schedule A, the chemical schedule, was, in round numbers, $19,000,000. In 1911, under the Payne-Aldrich bill, the value of the importations was $48,000,000, more than three times the value of the importations under the Payne-Aldrich bill than under the Wilson bill. Now, did the Payne tariff bill bring about that large importation under the chemical schedule? No; it was the demand of the people for goods, and they got them notwithstanding the high tariff.

Now, take the metal schedule. In 1897 the value of the importations was $23,000,000. In 1911 the value was $58,000,000 under the Payne-Aldrich bill. Did the tariff bring about this large importation; did it destroy the industries of the country? No; the demand of the people required the importations and they got them, and you made them pay twice the tariff tax on them that they ought to have paid.

Take Schedule D, the wood schedule. The value of the importations in 1897, according to the tables that the gentleman furnished, amounted to one and a half million dollars. In 1911 it was $24,000,000, tariff under the Payne law.

Mr. HENSLEY. More imported under a high tariff?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes. Yet the gentleman says that under the present tariff law the manufacturing industries of this country are going to be ruined, because the importations are so great, when under the last low-tariff bill we had in this country the importations were not nearly so great as under the Payne tariff law.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I was making no defense of the manufactured article. You have taken good care of the manufactured articles of the East and the South. My complaint in that speech is that you have placed the products of the farm upon the free list.

Mr. BOOHER. Let us see. The gentleman gave us in a schedule the farm importations. He tells us that under Schedule G, agriculture, under the last year of the Wilson bill, the following, in round numbers, was the importation, namely, $33,000,000. In 1911 the value of agricultural imports was $105,000,000, and that under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. What were you doing for the farmer? Did you protect him? Not in proportion as you protected every other industry. Under the Wilson tariff bill how was agriculture protected? Will the gentleman answer that? What was the change between the Wilson tariff bill in respect to agriculture and the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill?

Mr. SLOAN. Under the Wilson bill the agricultural products were largely on the free list.

Mr. BOOHER. If that is true, then the lower the tariff upon every manufactured article and farmer's products the less importation there will be, and the greater the importation will be under a high protective tariff. Why, the gentleman simply got his wires crossed, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, take wood and wood pulp. These figures which the gentleman placed in the RECORD are interesting. I believe they are correct—they are, at least, for my purpose. Under the wood and pulp schedule under the last year of the Wilson bill, 1897, the value of the importation was $5,000,000, and under the Payne-Aldrich bill it was $25,000,000. Whom are you protecting? The great trouble with the high protectionist is that he had an eye for one thing and but one purpose, and that was for the benefit of the manufacturing industries of the country, and they fooled the farmer by putting a pretended tariff upon his products; and it did not do him one particle of good, and they know it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My friend, Mr. FORDNEY, of Michigan, the other day stood here and bewailed the fact that the price of potatoes up in Michigan was 43 cents a bushel, and the price had been ruined, he said, because there had been so many potatoes imported from Canada. Why, the very day he made that speech potatoes were selling at 90 cents a bushel in my home town. When we get to the bottom of this whole thing you have got to get back at last to the law of supply and demand, and that will fix the price of the farmer's products, as it ought to fix the price of the manufactured products. When you get away from that you are getting into the realms of speculation, and when you begin to speculate on the farmer's product and put him alongside of the manufactured industry of this country and say that you are protecting him as you are the manufactured products, look at the figures you give yourself on your own importations and you will find your pretended protection of the farmer is a fraud. The farmer has at last seen that; he has awakened to the fact that protection that protects the manufacturer is a tax on the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the conclusion of my genial friend from Missouri that the importations were not increased by reason of reduction or the removal of the duties, I want to call his attention to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee in each case made a prediction as to the amount of importations that would probably follow during the 12 months following the passage of the law, and I want to treat of five different articles that the gentleman and his State are largely interested in.

Mr. BOOHER. Just one moment. Is the gentleman going to give us the predictions or give us figures from statistics?

Mr. SLOAN. I am going to give statistics, but I am going to quote the predictions from his leader.

Mr. BOOHER. Under what law?

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman's party law—the party with which he is affiliated and in which he is in good standing.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, I am in pretty good standing.

Mr. SLOAN. In the matter of cattle the prediction for the year was $5,000,000 worth. The actual importation in four months following the passage of the Underwood bill was $10,000,000, so that the importations would be $30,000,000 during the year instead of $5,000,000, as predicted, which $5,000,000 was greater than the importations under the last year of the old tariff act. The same is true with regard to horses. The prediction was $612,000, and that was a large increase over the last year's importation. For four months the actual statistics show that the amount of importations was $993,000. In other words, 50 per cent in four months more than was predicted would come in in a whole year. In the matter of oats the prediction was $945,000, and the actual importations for four months were $5,628,405.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me those figures again?

Mr. SLOAN. They are right there before the gentleman.

Mr. BOOHER. But I want to take them from the RECORD and see how they compare.

Mr. SLOAN. They are right in there.

Mr. BOOHER. No; the gentleman stated some figures, and I want to take them down.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to repeat this unless my time is extended. The gentleman can find the table on page 4231 of the RECORD.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SLOAN. I can not yield. I want to finish this one point——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. SLOAN. If, as a matter of fact, the importation of all these farm products is not increased, I would like to hear some intelligent reason from the other side why the duties were removed, when, as a matter of fact, Schedule G, or the farmers' product schedule, was one of the best competitive tariff schedules we had in the whole list. The farmers were fairly protected; no duty on any farm product was prohibitive. But in order to bring about this increased importation they have sacrificed from fifteen to twenty million dollars per year out of the National Treasury; and if as a matter of fact we did not reduce prices of the products of the farm, what was the purpose of the legislation?

Mr. STEENERSON. To reduce the cost of living.

Mr. SLOAN. To reduce the cost of living! If they want to take that view of it, then our farmers will understand you want to reduce the cost of living at their expense, and on that proposition we are willing to go to the country.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to quote from the gentleman's figures again. The gentleman gave dollars for the importation of oats. In the figures the gentleman put in the RECORD the other day he gave the number of bushels of what he gives in dollars to-day, so that is the only difference there is between the two statements. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, he says if we did not legislate to reduce the cost of the farmer's product what did we legislate for. We took the old foolish tariff off in order to let the farmer know that he had been fooled. We can reduce the cost of living in this country without taking that reduction out of the farmer and his products, and that is exactly what the Underwood bill proposes to do and it will do.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be fair, and I desire the gentleman to properly quote me. On page 4227, I gave the number of bushels imported in the four months, and I gave also the values.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield for a minute? That is the reason I tried to get the gentleman to restate his figures a moment ago. The gentleman stated it was $5,000,000, in round numbers. I thought the gentleman made a mistake, because it was 7,004,159 bushels in his figures, as I understood.

Mr. SLOAN. It is not 5,000,000 bushels; it is $4,656,216, and 16,000,000 bushels.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no.

Mr. SLOAN. There are two tables given. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it might not be amiss to remind the House that it is the Agriculture appropriation bill we are supposed to be considering to-day. The debate which has been running along this afternoon has been entertaining and perhaps to some extent instructive. It looks a little as though the tariff question is still an absorbing one. I have noticed to-day that when a speaker began to take up the schedules of this bill and discuss the merits of it these seats were quickly emptied, and when the spellbinders were turned loose on the tariff the retiring rooms were quickly emptied.

During the first session of this Congress I introduced a resolution to provide for printing 500,000 extra copies of Farmers' Bulletin No. 513, "Fifty common birds of the farm and orchard." This bulletin contains much valuable information and pictures showing the colors of the birds. Written descriptions of birds furnish, at best, a poor and uncertain means of identification, so this bulletin is valuable alike to the lover of birds and to those who would know from the economic standpoint those birds which do harm and those birds which are beneficial to farms, orchards, and forests.

The bulletin is generally believed to be the finest ever issued by the Department of Agriculture. The entire original edition was soon exhausted, and I presume every Congressman has received hundreds of requests for additional copies.

The Committee on Printing gave sympathetic consideration to the resolution and had decided to report it favorably, when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is said to have objected to the cost, which was estimated at $83,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did that end the matter?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That ended the matter, so far as the consideration of the Committee on Printing was concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. We did not get the extra bulletins?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No, sir.

Mr. Chairman, birds are of value to the Nation from the economic standpoint for the services they render in (1) eating harmful insects, their eggs, and larvæ; (2) in eating the seeds of noxious weeds; (3) in devouring field mice and other mammals which injure the crops; and (4) in acting as scavengers.

The bird bulletin was designed to help our farmers, fruit growers, and foresters and their boys and girls to identify the birds which frequent the farm, orchard, and forest. The Nation's material prosperity depends chiefly on agriculture, and any agent which increases the yield of crops or insures their certainty is of direct interest and importance, not only to the farmers but to every citizen. Birds constitute the most valuable of these agents, since they depend chiefly for their food on insects and noxious weed seeds, which are among the farmer's most dreaded enemies.

Authorities agree upon the estimate that insects yearly cause a loss of $700,000,000 to the agricultural interests of the United States. Were it not for our birds the loss would be very much greater, and without them perhaps successful agriculture would be impossible. Therefore a knowledge of the birds which protect his crops is as important to the farmer as a knowledge of the insect pests and noxious weeds that destroy them. Not all birds are beneficial, but nearly all of them. Of those usually classed as harmful there are very few which do not possess some redeeming qualities. The crow destroys the eggs of young and useful birds, but on the other hand he eats many insects and destroys many field mice, so that scientists agree that in much of the region he inhabits, though not all, the crow must be considered as more useful than harmful.

Hawks and owls have also been classed by those lacking knowledge as harmful. No birds have been more misunderstood than these birds of prey. Because one hawk has been seen to catch a chicken all hawks are considered chicken hawks and consequently to be killed whenever opportunity offers. Not only is there a lack of protection afforded to these birds by law but in some States a bounty has been given for their destruction. Ignorance of the economic value of birds is well illustrated in a law passed by the Legislature of Pennsylvania in 1885, alleged in the title to be for the benefit of agriculture, which provided a bounty of 50 cents each on hawks, owls, weasels, and minks.

The report of Dr. Merriam, Chief of the Biological Survey, for 1886 is illuminating. Referring to the Pennsylvania law, he said:

> By virtue of this act about $90,000 has been paid in bounties during the year and a half that has elapsed since the law went into effect. This represents the destruction of at least 128,571 of the above-mentioned animals, most of which were hawks and owls.
>
> Granting that 5,000 chickens are killed annually in Pennsylvania by hawks and owls, and that they are worth 25 cents each—a liberal estimate in view of the fact that a large portion of them are killed when very young—the total loss would be $1,250, and the poultry killed in a year and a half would be worth $1,875. Hence it appears that during the past 18 months the State of Pennsylvania has expended $90,000 to save its farmers a loss of $1,875. But this estimate by no means represents the actual loss to the farmer and the taxpayer of the State. It is within bounds to say that within the course of a year every hawk and owl destroys at least a thousand mice or their equivalent in insects, and that each mouse or its equivalent so destroyed would cause the farmer a loss of 2 cents per annum. Therefore, omitting all references to the enormous increase in the number of these noxious animals when nature's means of holding them in check has been removed, the lowest possible estimate of the value to the farmer of each hawk, owl, and weasel would be $20 a year or $30 in a year and a half.
>
> Hence, in addition to the $90,000 actually expended by the State in destroying 128,571 of its benefactors, it has incurred a loss to its agricultural interests of at least $3,857,130, or a total loss of $3,947,130 in a year and a half, which is at the rate of $2,631,420 per annum. In other words, the State has thrown away $2,105 for every dollar saved. And even this does not represent fully the full loss, for the slaughter of such a vast number of predaceous birds and mammals is almost certain to be followed by a correspondingly enormous increase in the numbers of mice and insects formerly held in check by them, and it will take many years to restore the balance thus blindly destroyed through ignorance of the economic relations of our common birds and mammals.

Owls, because of their nocturnal habits, are even better mousers than hawks. It is their habit to discharge in the form of pellets the fur and bones of their prey, and in 675 such pellets taken in one of the towers of the Smithsonian Institution at Washington Dr. Fischer found the remains of 1,119 field mice, 4 pine mice, 452 house mice, 134 rats, and several other species of small mammals.

In the face of all these benefits conferred by birds as insect, seed, mouse, and rat eaters, we perhaps can view with more charity the thefts of the crows and blackbirds in our corn and grain fields. The tarring of corn proves an effective means of making it unpalatable to crows. It is to be hoped that some means will be discovered for protecting grain fields from the ravages of blackbirds. At present I fear they must be classed as enemies.

Other birds sometimes classed as harmful are the sparrows. It is a great mistake. They are modest in appearance, but the quantity of weed seeds they devour is tremendous. It is practically their only diet in the wintertime.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I am very glad to hear what the gentleman had to say about this foolishness of destroying birds that some people think are harmful, birds which, when carefully studied, are generally found to be really beneficial. I think the Department of Agriculture encourages the destruction of the English sparrow. It may possibly be a good thing in some towns to destroy English sparrows, but if you go and look at the average small boy shooting sparrows you will find that he is shooting perhaps five other kinds of sparrows than English sparrows out-

side of the cities and villages, because English sparrows live mostly in the towns. There are 15 or 20—I have forgotten how many—different species of sparrows, and a good many other sparrows are shot than English sparrows. I went walking out near Chevy Chase not long ago, and I saw a great many sparrows, perhaps 150, looking a good deal alike, but which were not English sparrows. Most of them were tree sparrows. They do no harm, but come from the North to spend the winter in the vicinity of Washington, possibly to dodge taxes or something of that kind, and then go back again.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Do not call them tax dodgers. Too many unjust accusations have been made against them already.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PLATT. Besides those, there are the well-known white-throated sparrows, which are known in New England as "peabody birds," and field sparrows and song sparrows, both of them among our most delightful songsters; and fox sparrows and Savannah sparrows and grasshopper sparrows, all common enough at some seasons, but not easily recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I understand the gentleman spends all of his Sundays in the country studying birds.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say that there is not one country boy in a hundred who knows the difference between these sparrows.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Well, why not help along a campaign of education?

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] if it is not a fact that the English sparrow is driving out our native birds?

Mr. PLATT. I think there is a little truth in that, but not very much. I think there are some wrens and bluebirds that are driven out by the English sparrow around suburban houses, but as a rule field birds disappear for some other reason than that. Some years ago bluebirds became very rare in my section of New York State, and it was afterwards ascertained that a hard winter had killed them during migration far south of New York. For the past few years they have greatly increased. I may add that, according to John Burroughs, English sparrows are gradually decreasing in our cities, and this is perhaps because horses are decreasing, as automobiles displace them, and perhaps also because there is greater activity in street cleaning, depriving them of their food.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the gentleman from North Dakota going to touch on the use of the migratory duck?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I did not intend to do so, inasmuch as I have only a few minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What purpose does the migratory duck serve, if any?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Well, he does not do any harm, and he helps to clean up the waters of ponds and sluggish streams and rivers. Perhaps the gentleman from New York, who spends all of his Sundays and nearly all of his time investigating the subject of birds, and carries a bird book in his pocket, can satisfy the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. PLATT. Well, the gentleman knows that this congressional life is so strenuous that I get little time to study birds, and I know nothing about the Kansas duck.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas that it is intimated that his love for corn is one of the reasons for corn going up. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that there is an effort being made to protect the migratory duck in my State.

Mr. BOOHER. Where does the duck find any water in Kansas?

Mr. MURDOCK. He alights in our cornfields, which he can not find in Missouri, as a rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LEVER] hinted, a few minutes ago, that sparrows are somewhat harmful in that they are nest wreckers or drive out better birds. I think, however, that is very greatly magnified. In defense of the much-abused sparrow, I want to quote from an authority. Dr. S. D. Judd, who made a special study of seed-eating birds, reported that 700 seeds of pigeon grass were found in the stomach of a sparrow; and the investigations of Prof. Beal, of Iowa, showed that this species of sparrow destroyed annually 875 tons of weed seeds. That is a great quantity of noxious weed seeds for the one State of Iowa. I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in his address yesterday, placed the total value of all crops last year at nine billions. If we estimate the total consumption of weed seed by the combined members of the sparrow family at 1 per cent, which the Department of Agriculture officials declare is not a violent assumption, the sum saved to the farmers last year amounted to $90,000,000. Little wonder that a kind Providence notes the fall of the sparrow. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN rose.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the $33,000 asked for would be about one-tenth per cent of the duties paid under Schedule G under the old law. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the demand for the reprint of the bird bulletin is great. I presume every Member of Congress can testify to that. It is reflected not only by letters requesting copies, but by the press. Mr. Charles W. Sibley, editor of the Rolette (N. Dak.) Record, declares that the preservation of bird life is a greater question than the tariff question, the currency question, or the Mexican problem, and in an editorial he quotes the Fargo Forum as follows:

BOYS AND BIRDS.

The Fargo Forum is to be commended for its earnest appeals for the protection and preservation of bird life and its protests against the violation of the laws of God and man in that relation. An editorial article in that newspaper rebukes the semicivilized young criminals who destroy one of man's most valuable assets and rightly places much of the responsibility on parents and guardians. The Forum's article is as follows:

"It is a lamentable fact that boys are killing song birds in the vicinity of Fargo. The worst feature is, that it is such an unnecessary evil, for the boys who are killing song birds could get just as much fun, and far more good, out of studying and protecting the birds than in killing them."

Note particularly what the Forum editor says about the responsibility of parents:

The boys who are breaking the law in this way, and thus putting themselves in the way of arrest and punishment, are not to be too severely censured. They are but following the natural instincts of the boy. But the parent who allows the boy to take his gun out and slaughter the beautiful and valuable song birds is much more to blame.

The editor follows this with a wise suggestion:

The Forum offers this suggestion to parents: Instead of buying him a gun, get your boy a pair of good field glasses, or even a good pair of opera glasses will do. Then write to one of the North Dakota Representatives in Congress or to the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington and request them to mail you a copy of Farmers' Bulletin No. 513. This bulletin is entitled "Fifty Birds of Farm and Orchard." The name gives a good description of the book. It contains some very valuable information of about 50 of the most common birds which inhabit the United States and almost all of them are common to this part of the country. The book is illustrated with colored pictures of each one of the birds described.

This little book also contains a very compact statement of the value of birds to the farm and fruit land owners of the Nation. It is said that insects yearly cause a loss of upward of $700,000,000 to the agricultural interests of the Nation. The bulletin makes this statement: "Were it not for our birds the loss would be much greater, and indeed it is believed that without the aid of our feathered friends, successful agriculture would be impossible."

A Fargon who is greatly interested in birds and bird life made the statement recently that it would be a good thing if every school child in America could have a copy of this bulletin placed in his hands. It should at least be possible to have a copy in the hands of every schoolteacher in the country. The bulletin will be furnished free by the Department of Agriculture.

I hope this editor had the gift of prophecy, and that extra bulletins will be printed, thus making it possible for the department to supply the bulletins to those who request them. Unlike many other Government publications, the bird pamphlets, with their rich colorings, are never thrown away. But, to quote the editorial further:

Having armed the boy with this book and a pair of good glasses, the parent should take a little interest in the game. Send the boy out to see how many of the birds described in the book he can find. And when he comes back encourage him to discuss the trip.

It is surprising how many birds can be found in almost any clump of trees or bushes with the aid of a pair of glasses. And it is not only far more fun than shooting birds, but it is fun that is instructive, and, what is of far more value, will instill into the boy a love for the great out-of-doors, with its natural and abounding life, that will make him a better man and a better citizen.

It is suggested to the local Audubon Society that this boy menace to the bird life of the locality could be turned into an asset by a little organized effort to direct the boys into habits of bird protection, rather than bird destruction.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee chairman is reported to object to a reprint of the bulletin because it will cost $33,000. Too much money? Why, the much-abused little sparrow saves the Nation $90,000,000 annually. I presume if the appropriation were asked for the purpose of killing something that it would find a ready and favorable response. One hundred and forty millions for the Navy, to kill, but not a dollar to teach the boys to save life.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not the fact that of all the bulletins sent out to your constituency that bulletin is the most popular one and the one that you have the most requests for?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and very often from boys and girls, too.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not also true that the school-teachers ask for these books to supply the school children with information, so that they may become acquainted with the birds of this country?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is true.

Mr. BARTON. It has been so in my experience. I would like to ask you again what you think your chances are to bring that out from the committee?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think it all depends on you gentlemen. If there are enough here who wish to have the bulletin reprinted, I do not think $33,000 will stand in the way. I do not think that such an amount of money could be spent to better advantage.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman say that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture objected to the printing of that book or the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I said the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I do not want the gentleman to understand otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I have been talking chiefly from the economic standpoint, which is perhaps a minor consideration. The pleasure which birds bring to the human family can not be measured. Poets have sung of them in all the ages. I appeal to all whose parents taught them to love the birds and nature to help spread the gospel of protection to bird life. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], a member of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have listened with much interest to the tariff discussion here this afternoon, and I for one am glad that it has occurred. I believe that plenty of material has been placed in the RECORD to enable us to show by the arguments of those upon the other side of the House that we are right in our contention that the so-called protective-tariff scheme, which has been held out to the farmers of this country for 16 years or more, is wrong; that it has not increased the price of farm products, and that the farmers have received absolutely no benefits from it. I desire to say, however, that politics should have nothing to do with agriculture, the subject now under discussion, and I am glad to testify that while the members of the Committee on Agriculture are divided politically they are always united when it comes to legislating for the upbuilding of the great agricultural interests of this country. I will go even further than that, and say that Congress is the friend of the farmer. Members of this House realize the importance of the development of this great industry, and not one of them would knowingly cast a vote that would be injurious to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a little while this afternoon some phases of agriculture, that great calling known and recognized by all men in all ages as the oldest, most honorable, as well as the most important vocation ever followed by mortal man. [Applause.] We are to-day in the midst of a great awakening in the study and development of agriculture. Never before in the history of our country has the importance of the farming industry so impressed itself upon the minds of men in every walk of life as at the present time. The banker, merchant, manufacturer, railroad man have all awakened to its importance. They have at last come to realize that under present conditions it is not only desirable for the success of their own business, but they have concluded that agriculture and the success of agriculture is for the benefit of all, and upon it depends the happiness and prosperity of the entire Nation. [Applause.] To-day if you will go with me to the meeting of any banking association, I care not whether it be an association of bankers in their national convention or whether it be an association of bankers in their State convention, you will find upon an examination of their programs that they are devoting a very large part of their time to the discussion of the subject of agriculture. They are striving earnestly to bring about increased prosperity among the farmers and to improve the general conditions of rural life. Railway officials are constantly sending out over their lines specially equipped agricultural trains fitted up with exhibits of farm products and modern machinery. These trains are accompanied by the best agricultural lecture talent that can be obtained. Their coming is heralded weeks in advance, stops are made at important stations, and everything possible done to arouse the people to the importance of agricultural development. In almost every city and town of importance in the land commercial clubs have been organized and earnest efforts are being made by them to secure hearty cooperation between the city and the country.

Why this awakening? In the early days of this Republic our population was small, the amount of rich, fertile land available for cultivation was great. The farmers in those days paid little or no attention to methods of cultivation; they cared nothing about rotation of crops; the question of soil fertility did not bother them. When a piece of land, by reason of long use, became less productive, they simply cleared up another to take its place. The rich, virgin soil brought forth abundant harvests, the farmer had plenty and to spare, and his surplus went to feed the people of other lands. To-day we are face to face with new conditions. Our population has reached nearly the 100,000,000 mark and is increasing by leaps and bounds. Our chairman stated in his opening speech that within 30 or 40 years there will be 200,000,000 people in this country, and the question will then arise, how are they to be fed and clothed? The amount of good land suitable for farming purposes is growing less and less. With the growth of population has come the development of other industries—mining, manufacturing, and commerce. There is an ever-increasing population in the cities and a consequent decreasing population in the rural communities. Production has not kept pace with increasing numbers and how we shall feed and clothe our people will soon become the all-important question.

The chairman of our committee [Mr. LEVER] in his very eloquent address the other day pointed out to us how the decrease in the number of cattle, sheep, and hogs year by year threatens our meat supply, and how the decreased production of grain threatens to take from us our daily bread. These are serious conditions which confront us. People all over the land have come to realize the gravity of the situation, and this accounts for the increased activities in behalf of better farming and for improved conditions of country life. How to make the farm more productive, obtain a better quality of products, conserve the fertility of the soil, bring the farmer better returns for his labors, make country life more attractive, keep upon the farm those who are already there, and induce still others to take up this noble calling. These are the questions which confront not only us but the people everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land.

It is a deplorable fact, Mr. Chairman, and one to be greatly regretted, that in this country of ours thousands upon thousands of bright, intelligent country boys and girls leave the farm every year to engage in other vocations. How can this great exodus be stopped? These boys and girls constitute the most important factor of farm life, and if they can be kept on the farm the future success of agriculture will be solved. How can it be done? Let us consider this question for a moment. The boy should be made to feel that he is an important factor in the development of the farm. He should be taken into partnership and should have an interest in the grain, live stock, and, where possible, in the farm itself. He should be encouraged to study agriculture and to familiarize himself with improved methods of farming.

A little more than a year ago, Mr. Chairman, I stood in a great assembly hall in the historic city of Columbia, S. C. All around me were hundreds of boys and girls, representative of the flower of the youth of that fair land. They were the winners of the boys' corn clubs and the girls' canning and tomato clubs. As I looked into the bright, upturned faces of those boys and girls my mind went beyond them; I saw in my imagination the great army of boys and girls, numbering thousands, who had contested with them for the prizes, and I said to myself, here indeed is an illustration of what can be done to arouse the enthusiasm of the youth of the land. These boys and girls will not leave the farm to fight their way in unknown and untried vocations. They will stay where they are, and in the future years they will be the men and women who will stand for better agriculture and advanced farm life throughout all that great Southland. [Applause.] What has been done in the South is being done in other parts of this country. We have clubs in the North, East, and West, and they are doing wonderful work to encourage boys and girls to remain on the farm. Corn clubs, poultry clubs, pig clubs, canning clubs, tomato clubs, potato clubs, organized among the boys and girls in every community will instill into them a love of agriculture and will solve the question of keeping them upon the farm.

Last summer more than 200,000 boys engaged in the corn-club contests. All could not win a prize, but the efforts put forth by each one of them will not be lost. Let us see what has been accomplished. The world's record was won by a 14-year-old boy from Alabama, who produced 232.7 bushels of corn on 1 acre. The average production of corn for the whole United States is about 30 bushels to the acre. In the corn clubs of the North and West the average production was nearly 114 bushels, while in those of the South the average production was 154 bushels to the acre.

Fortune did not favor all. The drought struck the crops of a boy in my own State, and when he was asked by the agent of

the Department of Agriculture to report the results of his efforts he penned his reply in poetry, as follows:

MY CORN.

No use for a boy to look forlorn
When it's too dry in the Ozarks to raise good corn.
He can feed the fodder to the goats
And throw the nubbins to the shoats.
I have done the best that I know how—
I used the harrow, then the plow.
I plowed it deep and close at first,
Then plowed it shallow to quench its thirst;
But it remained dry as dry could be.
I looked and looked and looked in vain—
If I do not succeed, I'll try again.

Improved roads, improved schools, especially the consolidation of districts and the organization of country high schools, will do much to make country life more attractive and keep the boys and girls at home. How many well-to-do farmers with large families have you known, who felt compelled to move to town to educate their children. The farmer who moves to town for the purpose of educating his children weans the boys and girls away from the farm; they become enamored with city life, and rarely, if ever, return to the farm. We have in almost every city and town a number of farmers who have retired from farm life and with their families have moved to town. The farmer who thus retires from farm life and takes the boys and girls to the city strikes a deadly blow at the great industry which he has so long pursued.

The best place on earth to raise a boy is upon the farm. High schools should be established in the country. We should take the high school out to the boys and girls in the country rather than bring the boys and girls to the high school in the city. [Applause.] Keep them upon the farm, educate them upon the farm; if necessary, in order to educate them, send them from the farm to the near-by city school. What if the boy does have to walk 2 or 3 miles to school; it is good for him; will make him sturdy, robust, and healthy. The happiest days of my life were those when as a boy I walked 2½ miles from the farm to the city school. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what is being done in the States to encourage the boys and girls upon the farm? My friend from South Carolina, Mr. LEVER, can tell you what they are doing in his State. My good friend Mr. CANDLER, of Mississippi, who spoke here this afternoon so eloquently, can tell you what they are doing in his State. Let me tell you briefly what is doing in Missouri to encourage the poor boys who live out upon the farms. A few weeks ago one of our great daily papers, the St. Louis Republic, began the task of raising money with which to send 12 poor boys from the farms to the State agricultural college. It was proposed to pay the entire expenses of each boy at the college for one year. Money came in rapidly, subscriptions came from bankers, merchants, lawyers, and men in every vocation of life, and in a very short time they raised enough to send 12 boys to the agricultural college. But the work did not stop there. It was taken up by the country press all over the State, and country editors are to-day raising money with which to send one poor boy from each county to the State agricultural college. The result will be that when the agricultural college opens next September there will be from 100 to 200 poor farmer boys there to receive the advantages of a year's study in agriculture. When their work has been completed and they have returned to the farms each one of them will not only be better prepared for the work himself, but he will spread information and increase the enthusiasm for advanced agriculture in the community in which he resides.

Right here, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize one thing, lest we forget: We must not neglect the man upon the small farm. The man away out yonder at the head of the hollow, with 40 acres of land, striving earnestly and manfully to earn a livelihood for himself and family, is entitled to our consideration and our encouragement. [Applause.] We want to remember that man as well as the man who lives upon the thousand-acre farm. [Applause.] The small farmer should be encouraged and helped by both State and Nation. Take care of the small farmer and the large one will take care of himself. It is far more important in this great country of ours that we should have a large number of small farms, well cultivated, than a fewer number of large farms. [Applause.] The tenant should be encouraged to become a landowner; we should in every way possible discourage farming by proxy and encourage the man to own the land which he cultivates. [Applause.]

While we are endeavoring to secure increased production, improve country schools, build better roads, develop country life, we must not forget that one of the most important questions to the farmer to-day is the question of the best means of marketing his crop. Until within the last year the attention of the Government has been given to the question of production, and little or no attention has been paid to the question of distribution. In 1912 it is estimated that the crop yielded $6,000,000,000 to the producer, but when the same crop reached the consumer it cost him $13,000,000,000. In other words, the farmer received six billions and the consumer paid thirteen billions, a difference of seven billions, which latter sum went into the pockets of those who distributed the crop. Clearly, it has been more profitable to distribute than to produce.

Millions of dollars worth of farm products go to waste every year because the farmer does not know where to sell, although these products are in demand at reasonable prices at many of the market centers of the country. Fruit falls ungathered from the trees and vegetables rot upon the ground while within reasonable distances they are in demand at good prices. If we will take up the question of distribution of farm products and deal with it with the same energy and enthusiasm with which we have dealt with the question of production, we shall equalize the great difference in the prices received by the producer and those paid by the consumer, and the enormous waste now prevalent throughout the country will be turned into profits for the farmer, and the sum total of the Nation's wealth will be thereby greatly increased.

A year ago we created in the Department of Agriculture a Division of Markets and appropriated $50,000 to start it. In this bill we have increased that appropriation to $200,000. The work of the Division of Markets bids fair to become one of the most important functions of the Government, and when it has been fully organized and put into complete operation it will save annually hundreds of millions of dollars. Both the producer and the consumer will be benefited by this great saving.

The Department of Agriculture has been doing a great work for the upbuilding of the industry throughout the length and breadth of the land, and in this work it has been receiving the hearty cooperation and the earnest support of every State in the Union. While the amount of money carried in this bill for direct aid to agriculture is comparatively small, being a little less than $10,000,000, yet the scope of the work is broad, and great good will be accomplished. Here are a few important items in the bill: We are appropriating $375,000 to aid the Southern States in fighting the boll weevil; nearly $300,000 to prevent the spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moth in the New England States; $400,000 for the extermination of the cattle tick; $625,000 for the quarantine work and eradication of diseases of cattle and sheep.

A few days ago we passed an emergency bill appropriating $500,000 for the eradication of hog cholera and $100,000 for the suppression of a disease which has recently developed among the horses of the West. It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that the annual loss from animal diseases alone amounts to $212,850,000. How important it is, therefore, that these diseases should be checked and, where possible, eradicated. The Department of Agriculture not only seeks to acquaint the farmers with the best method of cultivating and caring for the crops, but it also comes to his relief in fighting every known insect and blight which is injurious to crops. Over $600,000,000 is lost every year as the result of ravages of insects and blights upon the various crops of the country. What a field for labor here. Much of this loss can be saved if proper methods are used.

Mr. Chairman, my time is passing; I must conclude. The Congress of the United States is the friend of the farmer; this Congress, as well as preceding ones, has done much to develop country life and give to those residing upon the farm at least some of the modern conveniences.

A few years ago $50,000 was appropriated to experiment in the matter of the rural free delivery of mail. This year the appropriation for that purpose amounts to more than $50,000,000, and all over the country farmers are having their daily mail delivered at their doors. The last Congress gave him the parcel post, and to-day he is receiving not only his mail, but he can receive or send by mail packages, within certain limits of size, weighing as much as 50 pounds. This House has twice gone on record in favor of assisting in giving the farmer good roads. The Shackleford road bill, appropriating $25,000,000, passed the House only a few days ago by a vote of 282 to 42. We have only recently passed the Lever agricultural extension bill, which, in my humble opinion, is the most important law looking to the future development of agriculture that has been enacted for a quarter of a century. One more important measure and we shall have, in part at least, done justice to the great agricultural classes. We must establish a rural credits system. The farmers have been paying excessive and exorbitant rates of interest; they must be placed upon the same plane with other interests, so that they can obtain money at reasonable rates. I feel quite certain that such a bill will receive the approval of this Congress before we adjourn. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS].

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have hitherto felt disinclined to interject into the debates in this House any discussion of matters pertaining to the Philippine Islands, for two reasons: First, I did not think the time was yet opportune for consideration of these matters. Second, it has been my earnest desire that the present administration should have a fair and free opportunity, unhampered and undisturbed by criticism, to make a fair and honest trial of the system which it has established in the islands.

However, recently there has been published abroad in this country a statement which requires some attention at once. The present Governor General of the Philippine Islands a short time ago sent a telegram to the President of the United States, which telegram, with the response of the President and some comment thereon, constitute the publication referred to. The two telegrams are as follows:

For the first time in three years general appropriation bill passed legislature to-day, demonstrating harmony in the government here. The bill effects saving of over $1,000,000 in the current annual expenses, without in any respect impairing efficiency. This and other economies will avert treasury deficit impending on my arrival. Bureau of health and bureau of education were granted substantially amounts recommended by their directors. New accounting features introduced, greatly improving old system. Receipts of bureaus hereafter to revert automatically to general treasury, instead of allowing chiefs of bureaus to spend such sums in their discretion for purposes not specifically authorized.

Salary cutting was confined to higher officials. No salaries of $3,000 or under were cut; thus of 9,000 officials and employees only about 100 have salaries reduced. Salaries between $3,000 and $5,000 cut 5 per cent; salaries over $5,000 cut 10 per cent; salaries of judges, scientists, and engineers not cut at all; Commission and Governor General cut 10 per cent.

Bill passed both houses unanimously, and, in my opinion, is an extremely wise and conservative measure.

FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON.

—

FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON: My sincere congratulations on the appropriation bill.

WOODROW WILSON.

This correspondence presents two features requiring consideration. In the first place, there is a felicitation upon the legislature of the islands and upon the present policy of the Government for a happy outcome of insular legislative activities. Second, there is conveyed the suggestion that when the present administration took charge of affairs in the islands it faced a deficit of a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am forced to the statement that neither of these views is correct. First let me direct attention to the question of a deficit. Gov. Gen. Forbes, who retired in August last, was one of the most capable, efficient, and experienced financial experts that has ever been charged with duties in the Philippine Islands. All the years he was in private business in America his work and training were of such a character as to make him an expert in the matter of audit, account, and general finance. With the aid of his advisers he prepared with great care, greater than ordinary care, the budget for the last year of his office. Careful account was kept of the revenues of the government, and estimates and expenditures were shaped to keep them well within those revenues. After the American election of 1912, when the Democratic Party was victorious, there soon followed a falling off in the revenues of the Philippine Islands, due to causes later to be considered. Mr. Forbes, with almost microscopic care, kept expenditures down in harmony with the declining revenues, and when he left office there was a certainty that at the end of the year there would be a surplus in the treasury, making allowance for all expenditures, of a million pesos. This fact had the certainty of mathematics.

In this telegram Mr. Harrison suggests a possible deficit of ₱1,000,000. In this he is honestly mistaken. The mistake is due to the colossal blunders, to call them nothing else, of the man the present administration selected as its financial adviser and that of the Philippine Assembly. It is open and notorious that this adviser got all muddled up on his figures, misadvised the government there, and is solely responsible for the statement of a deficit in the Forbes administration. His report was at first accepted, but lately has been found to be ridiculously and outrageously at variance with the facts. He is no longer the financial adviser of the government there, and is no longer in the Government service. Gov. Harrison's mistake, therefore, is the mistake of this man and the Forbes administration, instead of being open to the criticism suggested, should be given unmeasured and enthusiastic praise for the scientific care exercised in financial administration. These facts of incompetence and radical error on the part of the financial adviser doubtless, when he wrote his telegram, were not known to the present Governor General, and I hope indeed that the committee will understand when I say this telegram contains a misstatement that it is not an intentional one but an unintentional one, made because of misinformation or misunderstanding of the facts.

But this is the minor one of the features that I would call attention to. Is the present condition in the Philippine Islands legislatively one upon which the American people and the Philippine Islands can be felicitated? I am driven to the necessity of quoting from home authority in the islands in this regard and to the presentation of certain facts of a most astounding nature.

The last night I was in the islands I made a visit to the Philippine Assembly in regular session in the historic room of the ayuntamiento. I was most graciously received, and treated with a dignity and courtesy reflecting great credit upon the members of that body. In the address I delivered on that occasion I congratulated them and America upon the existence of the assembly and upon the character of the work of the assembly. I told them in my judgment they had worked nobly and gave great promise for the future. I meant every word. They have done nobly. Not, indeed, if compared with legislative bodies of modern advanced countries; not at all. But such a comparison is unfair to the Filipino. The tottering steps of the child may be feeble compared to the vigorous stride of the athlete, but they are splendid achievements, perhaps, in the light of that child's age and experience. So with the Philippine Assembly. In estimating the work of this institution do not let their mistakes fill your vision, but consider how this representative assembly sprang from nothing and how it has had to labor, without previous training or experience. Until the American flag was raised above them, the islands of the Philippines had never witnessed a decent government or beheld a decent governmental institution. There was no heritage of political thought, governmental experience, or ideas. There was no governmental instinct in the fiber of the people, because it had never been permitted to grow there; nor were they aided by lessons gained from their neighbors, because they have never hitherto had neighbors capable of teaching anything in the way of representative government. So when we have in mind the conditions under which this assembly was instituted and under which it has continued to exist, we can say its record is a credit to its people. It has done well if it has been able to do anything at all.

So I trust it will be understood that what I now have to say respecting the work of the present assembly does not proceed from hostility to that institution, but is the comment of a sincere friend, one who is eager to help whenever he acts, and who will be a supercilious, canting critic never.

There are many papers published in the Philippine Islands, some in the dialects of the people, some in Spanish, and some in English. It has been stated on certain occasions by natives of the islands that some of the English papers have not manifested sufficient cordiality toward the aspirations, ideas, and activities of the Filipinos. This charge has not been made against all the papers but against some. Of the editors of English papers or English-Spanish papers published there, I have no doubt that the editor of the Philippines Free Press is nearer than any other to the Filipinos, understands them better, mingles with them more intimately, and is regarded by them more highly. While fearless and outspoken, this editor is inherently a friend of the Filipino people. In the last copy of the Philippines Free Press which has come to the United States I find this editorial:

THE FAILURE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

From the day of the inauguration of the assembly, the Free Press has stood up for it, defended it, commended it, befriended it.

From the first we have tried to see the good in it and look with a lenient eye on its shortcomings.

However, even benevolence and indulgence have their limits, and those limits have been reached in the present appropriation bill.

That the assembly was misled, in the first place, by its financial misadviser, Mr. Phipps, and his tale of woe about a depleted treasury, will be admitted. It will also be admitted that the assembly was

acting under great pressure in the matter of time. Nevertheless, after making due allowance for those unteward circumstances, the fact remains that the appropriation bill as it left the hands of the assembly was a disgraceful piece of legislation.

There seems to be a disposition on the part of some assemblymen to find absolution for their delinquency in the final responsibility for the bill resting with the commission. Which is nothing but a feeble evasion of their plain duty, which is to prepare an appropriation bill as perfect and flawless as human effort can make it.

Nor can refuge be sought in the plea that they are not experts in dealing with facts and figures, for the experts are at their disposal, and there is nothing humiliating in calling upon them. During the recent tariff discussion in Congress the services of scores of experts were requisitioned.

At this serious juncture in the affairs of the Filipino people, when they are on trial as never before, it might have been thought that their representatives would have done their utmost to acquit themselves creditably. But the reverse has been the case. And what Gov. Gen. Harrison, fresh from a committee which has been handling appropriation bills amounting to ₱2,000,000,000, must think of the assembly is something which may best be left to the imagination. Nor is his opinion of that body likely to be enhanced from the fact that in the final analysis on him must fall the burden of the work which the assembly shirked.

The assembly can do better. And next year we trust it will do better. In the meantime it might not be a bad idea to adopt Chairman Adriatico's suggestion and appoint a committee which shall be empowered to conduct an investigation into the various departments of the Government and their workings with a view to submitting recommendations at the next session.

That is the opinion of one who has long lived in the islands, who is friendly to the Filipinos, and who has watched the deliberations of this body day by day. Not much like the Governor General's telegram. Pretty severe arraignment of the native legislators. Rather pessimistic over the whole situation. Truth is, the bill as it left the hands of the assembly and went to the commission was a most unscientific mess of appropriations of public money. There had been real effort to reduce expenditures, commendable in itself, but there had been a severe lack of appreciation of the real needs of the Government, and had the bill as it left the popular assembly been approved by the upper body, or commission, governmental suicide would have followed. The commission practically made the bill. It rearranged the expenditures, provided for the fundamentally essential necessities, and raised the amount carried in the bill more than ₱3,000,000. There has been general effort to cut down expenditures, an effort born of the direst necessity. When the present insular legislature and Governor General aimed at retrenchment they aimed at a splendid thing. More than that, Mr. Chairman, they aimed at a necessary thing. To avert impending and imminent calamity they have been forced to cut their expenditures down to the last peso. They have been forced to do it by a condition of things in the Philippine Islands that demands the serious consideration of the American people. It is not too much to say that at this hour in the Philippine Islands there is absolute business stagnation, the revenues of the Government have fallen to an extent producing national calamity, and there is hopelessness for the immediate future.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has neglected to say what I think he should say, that he has been recently in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MILLER. I am very glad to be able to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have traveled through all the Provinces and regions of the Philippine Islands and have conferred with the various peoples resident in the different parts of the islands, and have personally observed conditions there.

Mr. MURDOCK. How recently?

Mr. MILLER. I spent five months in the journey, beginning last July and ending the latter part of December.

This business depression is the occasion for the financial condition of the Government, demanding that the expenditures be cut to the quick and then some.

I want to direct the attention of the committee for a moment to the state of business in the islands since the American occupation. I find that in 1899 the exports and imports of the Philippine Islands together amounted to $27,756,729. In 10 years they leaped up 100 per cent, amounting to $58,838,940. In 1909 the tariff law enacted by Congress gave to the Philippine Islands free admission into the United States of certain of their great commodities. Instantly business in the Philippine Islands boomed everywhere. Business prosperity suddenly sprang into being. Never had such an incentive been given to industry in the history of the archipelago, and in three years thereafter, or between 1909 and 1912, the total exports and imports had leaped to $105,869,816. It may be interesting to note what part of this business was with the United States. I find in 1899 the United States had a trade with the Philippine Islands amounting to the insignificant sum of $4,691,507. Ten years later it had gradually grown to $14,847,918, but immediately after these favorable provisions in the bill to which I have called attention became a law it leaped up to $42,390,222, the amount in 1912.

It may be that some consideration ought in addition be given to the collections from internal-revenue sources. In 1906, the first year available, we find total collections of internal revenue amounting to $4,434,364. In six years this had leaped up over 100 per cent, to $9,035,922. One further item may properly be considered in anything like a picture of the wonderful growth of business in the islands. There exists in the islands a tax upon the gross business conducted by merchants and manufacturers. The first year of this tax for which we have figures was 1909. The figures of that year show a total business of $190,000,000, and three years thereafter, in 1912, that had leaped up to $286,000,000. So, from the standpoint of exports and imports, from the standpoint of internal-revenue collections, from the standpoint of internal business of the islands, there was marked progress during all of those years. True, indeed, it is that there has been a regular growth in business prosperity in the islands from the hour of American occupation, a growth steady and progressive always; expanding enormously after the tariff act of 1909. There was national and individual prosperity in the islands. Business was developing, Government revenues were increasing, public works and education were being liberally supported. But, my friends, the picture of prosperity must stop there. The election of 1912 resulted in a Democratic victory; in December the Democratic President-to-be made his Staunton speech in favor of Philippine independence, and instantly business paralysis followed. The decline was gradual at first, but has been precipitate since the institution of the new administration in the Philippines. No sooner had the present administration taken charge in Washington than the business of the islands began rapidly to fall until in the last few months since the new system was put into practice they have fallen until the condition is appalling. It is not a theory, but it is a serious condition that confronts the islands to-day. Let me state the figures. During the last year the imports into the islands have declined ₱17,000,000, or $8,500,000. The exports from the islands have declined ₱14,000,000, or more than $7,000,000. During the only three months for which we have figures following the institution of the present administration in the islands—I mean since the inauguration of the present Governor General—we find that the exports from the islands have declined more than ₱7,000,000 in these three months, the first of the present administration. In the single month of October they fell from $6,544,564 to $4,246,001, and in the last month, December, they fell from $4,051,381 to $2,506,476, more than 40 per cent.

That means that the revenues of the insular government are being cut almost in half, due to business stagnation, and the decline is accelerated as the months pass. Let them heroically cut expenses then if they would not instantly plunge into national bankruptcy. No wonder, then, economy has been the watchword; no wonder economy has been exercised. It is the economy a man out of work is forced to practice in buying fewer shoes for his children, having less to eat in the house, and eliminating all the comforts of life. It is bare existence they are struggling for. It may be said that collections of internal revenue may give some relief, but here again is the same story, because internal-revenue receipts are intimately interlocked with business in the islands. During the last four months for which figures are available I find that the deficit over the preceding period of last year amounts to 271,000 pesos, or $185,000. And so it is all along the line.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the tax on gross business, say, for 1912?

Mr. MILLER. Two hundred and eighty-three million dollars' worth of business in 1912 taxed at the rate of one-third of 1 per cent. This is a part of the internal-revenue receipts. There are no figures for 1913 available.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are no figures?

Mr. MILLER. None obtainable now. I quote again from the Philippine Free Press, a paper in the Philippine Islands. I might bring in scores of published editorials and expressions stronger in their terms than this, but I prefer to be conservative and to present the most temperate statement. In the issue of January 17, 1914, this paper editorially speaks as follows:

For here, as elsewhere, we have that linguistic paradox, but commercial axiom, of political agitation breeding economic stagnation. It is true that agriculturally the country, due largely to favorable climatic or weather conditions, is better than ever before; but money is tight, and that enterprise which makes for expansion and upbuilding is practically at a standstill. In business nearly every one is marking time. As a result no large stocks are being laid in, few or no real estate transfers are taking place, no unnecessary purchases are being made.

and generally among those who own land or other property—on the part of the Americans at least—there is a headlong disposition to sell rather than buy. Everywhere retrenchment is the word.

Now, it may naturally be inquired, What reason is there for this business stagnation? What reason is there for it after a period of 15 years of general upbuilding, the last three years of which became a tremendous crescendo in business activity? Why, instead of the hitherto onward progress, has there come this sudden and complete collapse? It is because the policy of this administration in the islands has destroyed the safety and efficiency of the Philippine system of government and the islands are suddenly confronted with the thought that there might be Philippine independence. This is the reason for the present chaos; this is the reason for apprehension over the future.

The possibility of Philippine independence is sufficient in itself to drive business terror stricken from the islands; but there is something more immediate that has stopped the wheels of industry. When the recent change of administration occurred it seemed necessary, apparently, on account of the exigencies of American politics, and also on account of the long-repeated promises to the Filipinos in Democratic platforms, to give something immediately to the Filipinos. Blinded by partisanship and in Egyptian darkness, as far as any true knowledge of the islands and the people is concerned, the present administration gave a majority of the commission to the Filipinos. This looks mild, but it is revolutionary. It destroys the check and balance of the Government there and gives opportunity for the happening of every conceivable calamity. It will work as long as there is no strain and every commissioner obeys absolutely the will of the American President; but that makes of it little else than a despotism. Such a scheme of government instituted there must of necessity bring serious injury to business.

Then, in addition, the efficient and experienced heads of departments, bureau chiefs, and employees have been all at once removed, to the serious and lasting detriment of the Government.

No sooner had the present Governor General taken his oath of office than he inaugurated a policy of discharging the tried and trained officials of American origin then in the Philippine service. Now, we expected that there would be many changes, and it was natural to expect that they would occur, but no human mind ever dreamed that changes would be made in the way they were or in the wholesale manner in which they occurred. And in passing I may be permitted to observe that up to the present hour the policy of the administration at Washington—I say up to the inauguration of the present administration, the policy has been to deal with the islands on a nonpartisan basis. More Democrats than Republicans have been named by Republican Presidents of the United States as Governors General of the Philippine Islands. In appointing to less important positions every one conversant with Philippine matters knows a man's politics were seldom inquired into, the only consideration being a man's fitness for the office. This was right. Partisan politics in America should have no bearing in the Philippine Islands. So in the commission of the last administration there were some lifelong Democrats; so in the bureaus there were many who were Democrats at home; so in the less important offices there were many, many Democrats; so in the American judiciary of the islands there were many Democrats. The reason for this is simple. Most of these Government officials and employees were citizen soldiers who responded as volunteers to their Nation's call and as soldiers went to the islands. The South, ever gallant in the hour calling for heroism, had responded most enthusiastically, and a large portion of the volunteer regiments which reached the Philippines were full of sons of Dixie land. These men found the climate more nearly like their own part of America than did their no less gallant brothers from the North, and in consequence many remained to enter the Government service.

As I journeyed from Province to Province, meeting both native and American officials, I found, to my surprise, more of those who expressed their politics at home said they were Democrats than said they were Republicans, but invariably added: "I do not know the home politics of any of those with whom I am working; we here are Americans, doing the work of Americans as we understand the duty of America." These men in truth have felt they were something more than governmental employees, whether their office was high or low; that indeed they were missionaries of good government, manhood, and public ideals, living illustrations of the lessons America is trying to teach the Filipino people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I understand the present Governor General, when on his way to assume the duties of his office, at Hawaii gave out an interview, in which he said it would give him sardonic pleasure to remove all Republicans who were in office in the Philippine Islands. I do not know whether he said that or not. At all events, he did not take occasion to deny it. Whether he said it or not, it appears from his conduct ever since he reached Manila that he indulged himself in a way that can be adequately described only as "sardonic." He made a great mistake, however, in thinking that those men who were officials in the islands were all Republicans, because a large part of them were not. The wholesale removals he made soon took the character of an anti-American movement, and the belittling of all the work of previous days gave further reason for the feeling, which soon became general and now quite universally exists, that the present administration in the islands is actually hostile to Americans and American interests in the Orient. The present Governor General never intended such a result, but that result has inevitably followed from the program adopted by this administration and the manner in which the Governor General has carried out that program. As a matter of fact, the American government heretofore existing in the Philippines has been the most efficient and economical government ever maintained by Americans, either in their own country or elsewhere. It has not been a partisan Republican government; it has been absolutely and purely American, with the noblest upholding of American ideals yet attained by Americans anywhere.

To wipe out this structure, root and branch, in the twinkling of an eye; to deprive the Government of practically all its tried and well-trained men in a moment of time; to kick out of office with positive brutality honorable men who have rendered honorable and distinguished service to the Filipino Government, and thus to give opportunity for decrying governmental acts theretofore made and for the growth of an anti-American sentiment; to do these is indeed ample to stop the wheels of industry, paralyze business, and create grave apprehension for the future.

It was expected a change of administration would result in a change of many prominent officials. That would be proper. But he who beheld the brutal methods employed in making the changes blushed for the honor of his country in the far-away Pacific. No one dreamed further that the whole governmental structure would be gutted. It would take hours to discuss the number and importance of the changes made. For the present I can do no more than call attention to the program—how it has destroyed efficiency, removed the check by America on Filipino legislation and administration, and developed a most unfortunate and unwholesome sentiment. Consequent upon this created condition business and industrial development, which for years had been booming, suddenly collapsed, and unless a decided change in system and policy occurs the future is full of horror. But I can dwell no longer upon this phase. There are some other things I think we need to know about and we need to know about them now. The impression has gone out that these Americans who were removed from the service in the Philippine Islands were highly paid officials. That is true with some, but they were relatively few in number. We are not in the least concerned about them save as to the method of removal.

But nothing has been said of the hundreds of men who were holding minor positions throughout the islands and who have been discharged without a moment's warning. Now, possibly that does not appeal to you particularly strong, but it will in a minute. These men have long been employees of the Government; they are ex-volunteer soldiers, who first fought for their country and later did their country's work in establishing good government in the islands. Their services were needed, and they have served their country well.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Were those who were discharged without warning Filipinos or Americans?

Mr. MILLER. Americans. In its wisdom this administration might have seen fit to discharge these men; but, if so, it should have been done with decency and in a way to give them a chance. Could they have had a few months' or even weeks' warning, the result would not have been so full of calamity. These men were suddenly kicked out upon a community that was being taught to abuse them, one where business had collapsed, where no employment was available, and their consequent suffering has been extreme. One of the greatest of the papers in the Philippine Islands, the Manila Times, on January 20, 1914, startled the islands—and it ought to startle the world—with the condition of these discharged men and their families, which they found by a careful investigation carried through many weeks. I will read a part of it:

Scores of Americans in Manila, in Pasig, and in Malabon, separated from the Government service to permit of Filipinization, and dumped upon a community unable to provide them with employment, are facing the possibility of privation and want. Ninety per cent of these men are old soldiers, and as such are entitled to free transportation to the United States; but many of them have Filipino wives and children, and honorably prefer to stand by their families.

Here, briefly and baldly, is the result of an investigation which has been conducted by the Manila Times. It discloses a condition which in

a month or two must become acute, and already in many individual instances is such as to be pitiable. These men in some cases are without the necessities of life, living on a little rice and fish, seeking vainly for the means of earning money.

Several men, whose position is well-nigh desperate, have talked with a Times man, and in every case there has been an earnest request that their names be withheld from publication. "If the Government gets hold of our names, a constabulary man will be sent after us, and we'll be deported," they said, "and what will become of our wives and children then?"

All attempts to dissuade them from this belief were unavailing. There is deeply rooted in the minds of all of them the conviction that the government of the Philippines as now constituted "has no use for Americans," and they point to the fact that Gov. Gen. Harrison has given assurances that old soldiers should not be allowed to suffer, while, nevertheless, they, who came out here with the Army, are reduced well nigh to starvation.

The life stories of these unfortunates read about alike. Here is one which can be taken as a type of all the rest:

"The fact is," he said, "that I have held out as long as I could, but it's getting beyond me. I don't want to exist on charity; all I want is a job which will make me enough to support my wife and children. I've always played the game; I've helped others when I could; and the result is that now I find myself without anything put by. Doctors' bills have something to do with it, of course.

"Now, to be honest with you, I have nothing in the house but a little rice, and I don't see where I am going to get any more. I have spent days in the search for employment, and everywhere I go they tell me that they are laying off Americans and taking on Filipinos. Of course I could make a getaway on a transport, but I won't do that. My wife has been a good wife to me, and I have my children to think of. I've got to stay by them.

"Right where I live there are plenty more like me. Out in San Lazaro, in Santa Mesa, in Tondo, in other places I could take you where there are dozens.

He prefers to stand by his wife and his children. Thank God that those soldier boys of days gone by, who left the sunny Southland and the rigorous Northland of America to drive a tyrant from the Orient and give relief to a suffering people, and who remained to establish good government in a land that knew it not, however humble the part they played, were men to the end and revealed to the world the possibilities of American manhood. Thank God that these American boys were true to the cause of humanity in their soldier days, and thank God they are true to humanity as citizens under the flag. Easy for them to leave, because the American Government will carry them back to the shores of America free; but if they come, they must come alone. They prefer to continue in starvation and want, if need be, with their wives and their children, rather than repudiate their sacred domestic ties, leave their families a public charge, and get free rides home to America. [Applause.]

From an editorial in the same paper I quote the following:

To many Americans the story that the Times prints to-day of the condition to which scores of their countrymen have been reduced will come with a shock of painful surprise. Here are soldiers of the days of '98, men who fought faithfully through the stirring times that followed Dewey's coming, in pitiable circumstances. They are tied to the land in which they remained by the bonds of wife and children, and they have honorably determined that they will not desert those dependent on them. Many of them are on the brink of actual want, and every day that passes must make the condition more acute.

This is not the time for discussion of how or why these men are here. In Cleveland's words, it is not a theory, but a condition, which faces the Government and the community. Of the hundreds of Americans who are out of work a proportion do not deserve help; that is admitted. But there remain scores of men who are worthy, decent, respectable citizens. These have a claim on us all—the claim that is voiced by our common humanity—and they have a special claim on a government which is still American and whose recent activities have had much, if not all, to do with their plight. They do not ask for charity, but for the honorable employment which will enable them to support wives and children, and they have a right to receive it.

There is not an American who, seeing what the Times man has had to see, hearing what he has had to hear, would not demand that something should be done, and done at once. There is no time to waste when men, women, and children are facing starvation in our midst.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not understand what the gentleman means by "deporting" these men.

Mr. MILLER. They have no visible means of support, and not having employment, and not having any money, under the law of the land they could be made to leave the islands and brought back to the United States.

Mr. SLOAN. Is that law ever enforced?

Mr. MILLER. I am unable to say definitely, but think it is. I do know that they keep vagabonds from America out of the islands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand your point. Is it because they are removed on account of political reasons?

Mr. MILLER. I have not so stated. I do not say. All I have to say is that they are removed, and were removed without a moment's notice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You do not mean to say the administration is not removing Democrats?

Mr. MILLER. I have no complaint to make in respect to that, and do not wish to enter into a discussion in respect to that. I state the bold facts as they are here.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MILLER. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the gentleman any information as to why they were removed?

Mr. MILLER. Why, yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman give it?

Mr. MILLER. They are removed, as the article says, to permit the Philippinization of the administration of the affairs of the Philippine Islands. That is, they were removed in order that Filipinos might be put in their place.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In other words, the present administration is trying to give the government of the Philippines to the Filipinos?

Mr. MILLER. That is not my complaint at all. My complaint is that the present administration found some upright, honorable American citizens in the Philippine Islands, who had nobly done their duty under the flag when the bullets were flying and who had given these people a good, honest administration of their public affairs since, and kicked them out like dogs, without bread to eat and without a word of warning. [Applause.]

I will read further:

Their want and their helplessness are a standing disgrace to the community while they are allowed to perish, and a reproach to the Government which should permit those who have faithfully served it thus to fall on evil days. Of the worthy among these men, more than 90 per cent are old soldiers. They came to the Philippines at the bidding of a clean, honorable impulse—patriotism it may be, or youthful love of adventure—or they received orders and obeyed. Those who say that there was self-seeking in the coming of those men of fighting days are fools or liars, for there was hardly an American of that time who did not believe the Philippines to be a fever-stricken, pestilential, white man's grave. They were mustered out here—no fault of their own—and they settled down to work. Now, after 15 years, many of them find themselves destitute; and if there is no bitterness in their hearts that this should be so the more honor to them! Honor, too, to those who have determined to stand by their helpless dependents rather than desert them when the pinch comes.

Mr. Chairman, another great paper published on the islands, the Cablenews-American, at a later date has this to say—and it is the last paper that has come from the islands:

Gov. Gen. Harrison yesterday authorized the Cablenews-American representative to issue meal tickets to several Americans, single men, who have signified their desire to return to the United States on the next transport. These men have all decided to go home because they realize that the usual avenues for securing employment have been closed in these islands, and they are desirous of grasping this opportunity of getting back to the United States in comfort and safety with the promise of a small sum of money when they arrive at their destination.

Last evening four more men signified their intentions of accepting this offer, and they also will be taken care of to-day. Many applications have been received at the office of the Cablenews-American from Americans with families dependent on them for support. These men have no employment and no means of livelihood. They have no food in their houses, so money and provisions were meted out to them.

You and I are glad to know that a beneficent Government is handing out to these heroes of 1898 and 1900 and 1901 meal tickets until they can get free transportation back home.

In years to come, when Columbia teaches American youth of the deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice that give American history a splendid chapter in human events, deeds which have inspired humanity and constitute our chief heritage, will she in pride or shame unfold the picture of these American soldier citizens in the distant Orient, whose bravery and whose sacrifices have been requited by a brutal discharge from public service and their protection from starvation secured by issuing meal tickets.

I am obliged, Mr. Chairman, at once to leap to the consideration of another item. The new Governor General having felicitated the legislature upon its work, it might not be improper to call attention to one or two things that the legislature has done, and I now do it, not in a spirit of hostility, but in order that the facts may be known.

One of the last things they did on the last night of the session was to pass an act giving a franchise to the Marconi system to erect 40 or 50 wireless stations in the Philippine Islands. As the bill passed the assembly it contained a provision that in case of war the control of those wireless stations in that system should be placed in the hands of the United States. But as it finally passed, by reason of an amendment made by Commissioner Ilustre, it provides that in case of any war the control of the wireless system shall be in the hands of the Philippine Government. In other words, here is an enacted law taking out of the hands and control of the United States this entire system of telegraph in the event the United States is at war

with Japan or any other country. This is positive and open hostility to the United States; this contains all the spirit and almost the elements of treason. It is a bold, audacious affront to the United States—one of the early fruits of this impossible system of government established by this administration. In passing, I beg to observe that Commissioner Ilustre, recently appointed by this administration to his high office, is a notorious anti-American agitator.

That is mild, however, compared with one or two other things. I find that business—dead generally—is being stimulated in quarters other than American. A timber concession has just been made under the law to a large lumber company of England. This concession covers 150,000 acres, includes 2,000,000,000 feet of the most valuable timber in the world, is exclusive in its nature, and covers the best present timber concession in the islands. I personally investigated the area covered by this concession, and am, in general, familiar with it. It is true that under the law other concerns could have bid on the tract, but as a fact no other bid was received. There was therefore no competition. Chief significance must be attached to the fact that at this time no other concern was able to or did bid on the concession. This vast timber wealth, therefore, goes under the control of a great British concern.

However, there is one other thing that in the last few moments of my time I wish to call to the attention of the House, and I sincerely hope that every man within the sound of my voice will get the full import of what I mean. There is in the islands a government monopoly, or practically so, in the manufacture of ice, although there are some independent manufacturers. It was desired on the part of many Filipinos that the government should go out of business in that line. The legislature passed an act authorizing the Governor General to sell or lease the government ice plant. There was then passed by the Philippine Legislature the following monstrous joint resolution:

*Resolved by the Philippine Assembly (the Philippine Commission concurring)*: That it is in the public interest and contributes to the well-being of the Filipino people, as well as to the stability and security of the interests legitimately established or in future to be established in the Philippine Islands, that the Governor General be, and hereby is, requested that in making use of the authority conferred upon him by law for selling or leasing the Government ice plant he require from every applicant for purchase or lease, as the case may be, the following:

"That the purchaser or lessee state in writing that he is informed of the message of the President of the United States addressed to the Filipino people and communicated to said people by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands on the 6th day of October, 1913, and of the reply message of the Philippine Assembly, made in the name of the Filipino people and approved and sent on October 16, 1913; that said purchaser or lessee bind himself not to engage in or aid, by means of contributions in cash or otherwise, any propaganda directed against the policy of the Government of the United States outlined in such message of the President and the aspirations of the Filipino people set forth in said reply message of the Philippine Assembly, whether under the pretext of vested interests or under any other pretext, and that said purchaser or lessee shall further bind himself to exact a similar engagement from his administrators, agents, successors, and assigns."

Adopted January 14, 1914.

Students of legislative bodies, pause here. You can never find elsewhere the equal of this. Human experience has no parallel. Bold, defiant, brazen partisanship! Or is it the puerile prating of an infant mind? This was passed by the entire legislature, therefore has the approval of the assembly, the commission, and the Governor General. If the Governor General was opposed to it, he was powerless to stop it. Significant fruit of the new system!

This resolution makes one particular expression of political ideas the law of the land. It reveals a trait of character that exists and destroys government in Central America, Mexico, and other Latin countries—complete intolerance toward the views of the other side; determination by tyrannical use of power to crush out opposition and destroy opponents; and a complete misconception of the responsibility of the temporary majority that is vital to the existence of free institutions.

This resolution not only binds the present but the future. All who ever participate in the ownership of this ice plant must take this solemn vow. People yet unborn must sometime pledge their allegiance to a political idea that in one year may be as dead as the dead ever become.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, when a lumber company recently took a timber concession under the general law, they were required to sign a statement similar to this. There was no warrant in law whatever requiring this. The act was actually unlawful, and is of such a serious character as to constitute full ground for impeachment. It has also been announced that in the future no person, partnership, or company shall be granted by the legislature or secure from the Government any franchise or contract unless a sacred pledge, such as this, is duly signed.

Oh, we need to go hence to learn politics. You gentlemen on the Democratic side have a great majority here. Let me commend this to you: Pass a law that hereafter no bidder on a Government contract, no beneficiary under a permit to build a dam, no man doing business for the Government, shall be allowed to do it unless he subscribes to the Democratic platform and says so help him God that he will always fight the Republican Party and the Bull Moose. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, with the main purpose of this measure I am in full sympathy. We can not carry to the farmer too much information regarding his great industry. The extension plan of education is in the highest degree admirable. University extension has been a blessing to the masses who might never have had any benefit from university training otherwise. And now the same idea is to be applied in carrying to the farmer the latest word in agricultural science. But I must confess that I am just a trifle old-fashioned and that instinctively I am inclined to shrink from widening the sphere of influence of the Federal Government. It has seemed to me that education was properly a function of the State, and I have been greatly interested in the work done by many of our States, notably by Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Ohio, and my own State of Pennsylvania, in raising the standard of agricultural knowledge. The figures given in the report accompanying this bill are indeed impressive. They show that in the growing of corn the excess production under the demonstration method over the average production for the entire State of Texas during the year 1912 was 47 per cent; Oklahoma, 98 per cent; Arkansas, 62 per cent; Mississippi, 126 per cent; Alabama, 156 per cent; Georgia, 157 per cent; South Carolina, 132 per cent; North Carolina, 134 per cent; and Virginia, 75 per cent. In cotton the excess of production under demonstration methods ranged from 39 per cent in Texas to 174 per cent in Georgia; the excess in Oklahoma having been 77 per cent; in Arkansas, 79 per cent; in South Carolina, 100 per cent; and in Alabama, 147 per cent. No one can take in the significance of these figures without agreeing with the committee that the value of demonstration work is fully vindicated in the results.

There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that it would be well to bear in mind in going along. We are proposing to spend a good many millions of public money on this work. Fortunately, it is a good work, which will bring substantial returns, in this differing from the frightful expenditures which we have been making and are proposing to continue on Army and Navy, these expenditures bringing no returns except the necessity of still further expenditures and an ever-increasing anxiety regarding the safety of our country and the perpetuity of its institutions. The larger our Army has grown, the more our naval equipment has been expanded, the greater has become the nervous tension of our jingo friends; and were we to believe them there would be no such thing as peaceful sleep. Our days would be filled with anxious dreads and our nights with unspeakable alarms. Happily no similar pathological effects can be expected to follow the expenditure of public money for the extension service provided for in this bill. No rest will be broken, no nerves stretched to the breaking point, no thrill of alarm sent through scare headlines from ocean to ocean when we mobilize the great teaching force we are about to send forth on its mission of light and leading. So we may look upon this expenditure with quite a different regard from that called for by those expenditures for "preparedness," which but aggravate our fears and stimulate our painful anxieties.

Yet the millions called for in this great measure must come from all the people and we are proposing to return it in benefits to some of the people. The money that is to be used in this extension work will come largely from taxes laid upon the necessities of the masses. We are going to tax the miners, the men working at the forge, the day laborers, the artisans, the scrub women, the clerks, the clergymen, all the hosts of Americans who herd in the centers of industry; and we shall take the money thus derived for the purpose of carrying the knowledge of better methods to the men on the farm. Doubtless they will return an equivalent in the form of an increased production of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs which will reach the mass of consumers at lower prices. This is the theory. Will it become a demonstrated fact? Will this any more than a thousand other advances and improvements ameliorate the condition of the farmer or the people as a whole?

More than a third of a century ago the late Benjamin Butler computed that with a given amount of labor the farmer of that day produced two hundred times as much wealth as the farmer of 100 years before. He pointed out to farmers that the real problem confronting them was, not how to produce more corn and wheat, hay and hogs, cattle and horses, but how to secure a larger benefit from their toil. He rightly held that if the farmer of his day produced two hundred times as much as the

farmer of a century before he ought to be two hundred times better off; and, if he were not, he held that there must be something wrong; the farmer in some way must have been the victim of a robbery.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it will be pretended that the farmers, as a class, are to-day two hundred times better off than the farmers of a century ago. Of course, the farmer in this year of grace has advantages and can enjoy certain things that the very richest farmer in the early years of the nineteenth century never so much as dreamed of having. The humblest farmer can to-day cut wheat with a machine that automatically performs the work of a dozen or more men. He can ride as he plows. He can do work with steam that formerly was performed with horses or oxen. He can wear store clothes. When he visits the circus he can travel by rail or in an automobile. The things that were luxuries to the rich of a hundred years ago are now common necessities.

IS THE FARMER BETTER OFF?

But what proportion does what he gets bear to this vastly increased production? Is the farmer relatively better off? That is the question. The farmer is undoubtedly free from certain hard conditions that his forefathers had to face. His children have schools at their doors. Clothing is cheaper and more easily procured. Labor has been lightened by more improved machinery. Nature has been taught to yield more generously to his better methods. The markets of the world compete for his products, and steam and electricity have become his servitors. Science has run to his aid and divulged to him secrets that pour riches into his lap; but, strangely enough, these riches slip through and slip away. He toils as long and as hard as ever; the mortgage is as hard to lift; the taxes press as burdensomely as ever; the bills are not easier to meet; the savings grow as slowly as they grew for the farmer who turned the sod with a wooden plow and thrashed his grain with a flail. He plants vineyards, but too often others eat the fruit thereof. He raises chickens and turkeys and ducks, but mostly for the market. When these things bring good prices he does not have them on his table—except, perhaps, when the preacher comes.

I am persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that most of the farmers devote the larger part of their inquiries at the institutes held under extension methods to the question of how to increase the sum of their products. Certainly all the scientific investigation at the experiment stations and agricultural colleges is in that direction, and I note that in farmers' journals practically all the discussion tends toward the one end of getting more out of the ground. If I were speaking to them directly, I should ask them to consider how to get more of what they get out of the ground into their pockets or into their stomachs or upon their backs or into their homes or into the development of those higher faculties that must too often be stunted by the mere struggle for existence. It seems to me infinitely of less importance to increase production than to secure an equitable distribution. There is really no lack of good things in this rich, teeming world of ours. Nature is generous to us. We plant a single seed and reap a hundred or a thousand from it. With a pair of fowls we may soon have a barnyard full of chickens. Our hogs and sheep and cattle multiply rapidly. We plant a tree to-day and to-morrow it showers golden fruit into our laps. Sun and wind, rain and snow, all work for us. The very dews of heaven and the frosts that nip the schoolboy's nose are our ministers. If we are poor, it is not because our common mother earth is a niggard.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FARMER.

The problem, then, Mr. Chairman, is not how to produce more but how to get the benefit of what we produce. Do you think that if farmers generally could increase their production they would be generally better off? It is quite clear that if the individual farmer increases his production, production in general remaining the same, he will be better off. But we are talking now of the farmers as a body, not of a particular farmer. Individually the farmer may by attending an agricultural institute for the purpose of learning how to increase the results of his individual labor. Those farmers who do not attend and who thus miss the valuable hints, suggestions, and instruction there available must obviously fall behind in the race. They will not understand as well as the other when to plant, what to plant, and how to plant. They will not know much that he will be able to turn to account in the care of stock, in the marketing of crops, in the cultivation of fruits, in the making of butter, and in the enrichment of soils. He will have an advantage over them. With the same effort he will be able to obtain better results. But if all the farmers were equally informed, if all equally availed themselves of the advantages which the agricultural institutes offer; if all employed the best machinery; if all were instructed in the scientific mysteries of soils and fertilizers; if all knew equally the values the farmer is taught to appreciate in such institutes, what difference would it make to farmers as a whole? The sum of their production would be greater. But would their relative condition be improved?

THE CASE OF LORD SCULLY.

If it would be improved, then it should have been improved by the enormous increase of production noted during the last century. The farmer at the opening years of the twentieth century should be two hundred times richer on the average than the farmer at a corresponding period of the nineteenth century. But no one will contend that he is. This observation applies only, of course, to the farmer who farms a farm, not to the farmer who farms the farmers. The farmer who farms the farmers in many instances is more than two hundred times better off than his predecessor of 100 years ago. Lord Scully, for example, who farms nearly all the farmers of one of the richest agricultural belts in one of the greatest agricultural States of America, does not feel the need of attending farmers' institutes. He fixes his rents so high that the farmers he farms are spurred by hard necessity to increase production to the last limit in order to meet his inexorable demands. They do all the scheming and planning; they study, or should study, scientific methods; they invest, or should invest, in improved machinery; they exhaust, or should exhaust, their resources in experiment; they make all the hazards and bear all the losses. His business ends with the collection of the rent.

However, we are not talking of the farmer who farms the farmers, although he is becoming steadily a more important factor in American social adjustments. The tenant farmer and the farm laborer are relatively less rare than they were before. The farmer who owns the ground he tills is gradually yielding to a pressure that must eventually take away his cherished independence. But as yet the independent owner is an important factor in our social organization. Of the farmers of the country most of them still own their own land and are improving their farms, with the expectation that they and their children will reap the benefits of the labor and care they are bestowing.

It is by no means certain that they or their children will do so. There are forces silently at work that are tending to undermine all their efforts and all their labors. The thing that has kept the farmer of to-day from being two hundred times better off than the farmer of a hundred years ago is still busy. The farmer acquires the secret of making two blades grow where but one grew before, but there is an alchemy whereby the second blade is taken from him and made serviceable to some one who did nothing whatever to produce it. And this is the matter to which I wish to call most earnest attention. I would not discourage the farmer from fitting himself in the largest possible measure for the individual effort he must make if he would succeed. But while seeking thus to advance himself as an individual farmer is it not important that he should seek not less strenuously to advance the welfare of farmers as a whole? I think it will be seen from what has been said already that increase of production does not necessarily imply increase of wealth for those who produce. And possibly I may make this a little clearer if I refer to locomotive engineers. They are now among the best paid skilled workmen. They get from $3 to $5 per day. But suppose the number of persons qualified to run locomotives was doubled or quadrupled? Can it be imagined that engineers would still get the wages now paid? Engineers now get comparatively good pay because by comparison they possess superior skill; and so the individual farmer who possesses unusual knowledge makes more money than the farmer less happily equipped. But the best equipped farmer makes less money than he ought to make, because there are invisible taxes which eat away his substance and compel him to labor without reward.

FARMERS AND THE TAXGATHERER.

Farmers as a class are watchful of the taxgatherer. They do not pay taxes with much greater cheerfulness than they pay that other inevitable debt. At the best they regard a tax as a necessary evil. It is seldom they can see that it is a payment for value received. The farmer who does not hesitate to pay any other obligation will grumble when his tax bill is presented. He often regards the assessor as his natural enemy—and not without reason. County officials he looks upon as birds of prey—as many of them are. A mill added to his tax is heavier than a millstone about his neck.

Yet the least part of the tax he pays is that handed over to the county treasurer. There are other taxgatherers whom he wots not of—taxgatherers who levy tribute upon him at every

turn from the cradle to the grave and render him no equivalent whatever. These invisible taxes are, indeed, the ones which suck away his lifeblood. If the county commissioners were to make even an attempt to get from him a tenth of what he yields to the invisible tax takers without a murmur and unconsciously now, he would head a mob, as was done in Macoupin County, Ill., some years ago, and tar and feathers and rides on a rail would become fashionable.

The least part of the taxes the farmer pays is those he sees. A prime minister of England told the King that a 3 per cent tax would provoke a revolution. "But I can tell you a method," he said, "whereby you can tax the last rag off the back of nakedness and the last crust out of the mouth of hunger without creating a murmur. Let the tax be indirect, so that it shall be paid unawares, and you may levy a tax of 10 per cent and no one will protest. They will merely complain of the 'hard times.'" That this is as true now as it was when Pitt formulated a policy which eventuated in untold misery in Great Britain we have only to look around us and see.

The hand of the taxgatherer falls upon every farmer in America every time he sweetens his coffee or eats a wedge of pie. He feels it again when he fills his pipe or lights a cigar. He can not even step in with a friend to "see a man" without also inviting the invisible taxgatherer to "take something." The invisible taxgatherer meets him when he comes with a wail into the world and follows him relentlessly through all the vicissitudes of life until he retires with a sigh into that green tent whose curtain never outward swings.

THE FARMER AND THE PRIVATE POWER.

How much thought has the farmer ever given to these invisible taxes? Has he ever thought that perhaps the bulk of the charges he pays for freight and for passage on railways is not for service, but for tribute? The railways enjoy a private taxing power. They exercise a function of the State and compel those who ride upon them or ship goods over them to render tribute. Probably very much more than half the income of railways is really tribute. And this is true of telegraphs and telephones and other public services controlled by private monopoly. The secret of their tremendous power lies in their almost unchallenged exercise of the functions of the State, which only the people themselves should employ. The people complain of the water in monopoly stocks. What does this water mean? It is simply the measure of the tax the monopolies are able to collect. Incredible millions thus go annually into the pockets of a few people, not as payment for service rendered but as forced contributions. These millions represent an invisible tax upon the farmers and other producers of the land. It is lost to them as much as though it had been taken from them by highway robbers instead of by legal process.

Mr. Chairman, there are some 4,000 taxgatherers in this country outside those visible ones which present themselves to the farmer in the guise of local collectors. The farmer can hardly purchase a thing to eat or to wear or to work with that has not concealed in it one or more of these 4,000 taxgatherers. Each takes a little out of his pocket. Some of the little goes into the Public Treasury—and perhaps it is devoted to the purchase of armor plate at $450 per ton. Some of it goes into the coffers of private persons he has never seen and perhaps will never know. For when a dollar goes by means of these invisible taxes to the Government at least $5 has gone under the old high-tariff system to enrich private concerns. Under the old, beautiful Republican régime the farmer bought a barrel of sugar. It cost him about $18. Of this $18 about $12 was sugar; the other $6 was tax; and that tax went to the Sugar Trust. Happily, the Democratic Party, under Woodrow Wilson and the leadership of OSCAR UNDERWOOD, has put a quietus on this particular gatherer of invisible taxes, as well as on some others.

Gigantic sums have been drained and are being drained out of the pockets of the workers of this land for the maintenance of a great army and the exploitation of distant peoples. Not so long ago we were startled by a billion-dollar Congress. To-day a two-billion-dollar Congress has become commonplace. Whence is all this money—this labor—to come? Are the Morgans and the Rockefellers and the Carnegies going to pay it? No; they are going to get it in one way or another. It was not so long ago that Mr. Carnegie made some $40,000,000 in a single year in steel. Almost every dollar of this enormous sum represented a tax on labor and industry. The working people of every kind have paid it. He spent some of it in courting the good opinion of the robbed by building a library here and there to perpetuate his name. Mr. Rockefeller has cleaned up no one knows how many millions from Standard Oil alone. Little of it was legitimately earned by him. He squeezed it out of workers by means of a private tax.

The workers did not see the tax when they paid it; but it came out of their pockets, nevertheless, and they got nothing in return save the comfort of gloating over such evidences of prosperity as Mr. Rockefeller is pleased to reveal in gifts to universities where economic truth is not permitted to be taught. No one knows what the income of the late Mr. Morgan was; but, big or little, it practically all represented the power of private taxation. He controlled railroads and banks and coal mines, and through all these he levied tribute upon labor in various forms. He rendered no service, unless extortion were such. But he was a great financier, and when at the zenith of his power he squeezed Uncle Sam into a hole he was willing to help Uncle Sam out—on Mr. Morgan's terms.

HIGH TAXES AND HARD TIMES.

Mr. Chairman, I could deluge you, if I chose, with figures showing how these invisible taxes eat away the substance of the farmer and of the people at large. The farmer quarrels with the county commissioners if they add a single mill to the tax rate. But when a dollar or $5 slips through the farmer's hands by invisible means into private coffers he merely complains of "hard times." Hard times! Why should there be any "hard times" save when a famine visits the land? And when has a famine visited the land? Was it in 1873? Was it in 1893? Was it in 1907? There were "hard times" then, but the crops were good; there was no pestilence abroad; there were plenty of men able to work and willing to work; and there were millions of people wanting the things which men were anxious to produce. But somehow the men could not get work; the people who wanted things could not get them. Women and children starved because there was too much grain; farmers in the West burned their corn while idle miners in the East suffered for bread; little feet left trails of blood in city snows because there were too many shoes; thousands of shivering wretches went in tatters because there was an overproduction of coats; two or three families huddled miserably and indecently in a single room because there was an oversupply of houses; and tramps camped in vacant fields because there was no work.

Mr. Chairman, was there ever more monstrous nonsense? The colt which swam the river to get a drink was bright in comparison with the man who accepts the notion that "hard times" result from an oversupply of good things. You could not make a bird believe it had to die of starvation because there were so many worms. And you know a bird has less sense or at least a smaller brain in proportion to its size than any other vertebrate. The horse in the pasture could never be convinced that he ought to jump over into the big road and starve because there was too much grass inside. But we men, we lords of creation, we men who sit in Congress or elect Members of Congress and rain makers for high office, we the august and the unapproachable, we who go to the other side of the world to teach the heathen and grab anything not nailed down, what have we to say when we are told that plenty causes famine? Why, we say that is so; that explains the whole mystery; we starve on account of the big crops; we freeze because of all the coal that has been mined; we go barefoot by reason of the surplus of shoes; we wear a ragged coat or no coat because there has been so much wool grown and so much cloth woven; we crowd into noisome tenements or live in cramped houses because too many buildings have been put up; there is no money to be had because the banks are bursting with it.

Of course if one of us should go home and tell his little boy about this sort of thing the boy would think his papa had broken his temperance pledge. For there is no little boy, I hope, in this broad land who is fool enough to believe any such rot—at first. He must associate with grown-up folks and read able Republican speeches and learned professorial articles in magazines and hear the plutocratic orators go up and down the land telling us how we grow rich by shipping more things out of the country than we get back before he can master the idea. By the time he is old enough to vote he has had his natural perceptions so blunted, his common sense so perverted, his reasoning faculties so debauched by following the devious logic of economic dream books, and the ignis fatuus of our PAYNES and our MANNS and our FORDNEYS, that he is quite capable of believing anything except the truth. And then he is fully prepared to cast his ballot for some more invisible taxes.

HOW FARMERS SAVE AT THE SPIGOT.

It would be worth the while of our farmer friends to hold at least one institute a year, to find out how to keep what they produce. The professors who visit the institute to instruct the farmer might with profit give a little attention to this very great concern of the farmer. For what shall it profit a man if he double his crop and some fellow get it without rendering an

equivalent? The farmers save at the spigot in the matter of taxes. I am constrained to believe that the county officials generally will bear watching. But if our local officials were twice as extravagant as most farmers believe them to be; if they were twice as reckless in applying taxes to private uses; if they junketed and jaunted twice as much as they have ever done at the expense of the taxpayers; and by these excesses required the farmer to pay twice the taxes he now must turn into the county treasury, the farmer would still be able to drive a fast horse and take his annual holiday at the seashore if he could unload all his invisible taxes. His increased product goes through these. I have not named all of them, and I could not name all of them in twice the time at my disposal. Every monopoly in the land of whatever name or nature is engaged in levying invisible taxes. You get them wrapped up in the dress you buy for your wife, in the hat you purchase for your daughter, in the jackknife you get for your boy, in the gewgaw you get for the baby. When the latter cuts its teeth it does so on a rubber ring that is more tax than rubber. You can not get medicine for it without getting a dose of tax along with the drug. And if the little one should die the Coffin Trust extends an invisible hand for tribute.

But these taxes, Mr. Chairman, are not all. They are not the most important. The purely private taxes, the collectors of which you do not know, these are enormously more in the aggregate and they are more oppressive. You do get something for the taxes you pay the Government. The people get something back from the Government, but what do they get back from the horde of trusts which still flourish in spite of trust busting and in spite of all restrictive legislation?

If I could speak directly to the farmers of the land, I would ask them to look after these invisible taxes. I would say: "Do not forget them. They are sucking out your lifeblood. You must stop them or they will destroy you. Do not think that this is mere pessimism. Do not consider me an alarmist. There are tendencies in this country which no thinking man can observe without disquiet. We are traveling a road which has led other nations to death. May we hope to travel it to a happier goal? We already have a great armament afloat, and we are proposing this year to spend $150,000,000 more on this establishment. What is the occasion of this stupendous armament? What enemy is threatening us? On militarism, in one form or another, we are spending $500,000,000 a year. What does this all mean? What does it mean to the farmer, to the artisan, to the laborer, to those who do the work and pay the taxes? It is a fine thing for the steel makers, the gun founders, the powder manufacturers, and the shipbuilders. Their fortunes grow till a million seems less to them than a dollar to the man in the furrow. Where is it going to stop? The common people are bending under their burdens. Taxes, visible and invisible, are pressing them to the ground. Of every dollar they earn perhaps more than half goes in some sort of tax. The average of our tariff taxes alone, until the adoption of the Underwood bill, was approximately 50 per cent. The tax may or may not have gone into the Public Treasury. In some instances it went into the dividends of the textile trust."

Mr. Chairman, the trouble with most of our taxes is that they do not stay where they are put. Take the tax on merchandise, for example. The merchant does not pay it. He collects it from his customers, with a percentage, and merely turns it over to the State, less his percentage. Or, take the tax on whisky, beer, and tobacco; it is not paid by the distiller, the brewer, the tobacconist.

THE CONSUMER PAYS.

The consumers of these articles pay it. And so with nearly all other taxes on commodities, businesses, and the like. They do not fall at last on those who seem to pay them. They fall upon the consumer. Happily the Democratic Party has written into the law of the land an income tax, a direct tax, a tax that will stay where it is put, a tax which can not be shifted and which will tend in some degree to equalize the burdens of government. But this is only one step in the right direction. We should not pause until direct taxation is the rule and not the exception; and as the very simplest tax, as the tax that will stay where it is put, as the tax which will discourage nothing but monopoly, as the tax that God himself has provided for and that is infallibly collected, if not by the Government for the people, then by individuals for their own private gain, I beg this House and the people of this country honestly and candidly to consider what is called the single tax—the tax on land values only, on the value of land, irrespective of improvements. This tax would fall only upon valuable land; it would not rob farmers of their land; it would merely prevent speculation in land; and it would relieve labor and labor products from all burden; it would encourage industry; it would check forestalling; it would wipe out invisible taxation; it would destroy monopoly; it would raise wages; it would restore industrial independence; it would eliminate the trusts; and, above all, it would make men free.

Mr. Chairman, I can not undertake in the time allotted me to go into a discussion of the single tax, much as I would like to lay its merits before this House; but let me implore you not lightly to dismiss it from your consideration. Sir, you can not investigate it with an unprejudiced mind, it seems to me, without accepting it as a solvent for the muddle in which the early years of the century find us. Do not imagine that it involves a scheme for the placing of all the burdens of government on the shoulders of the farmer. Remember that this is a tax on land values, not on land. And where do we find land values? Where land is worth $10, $20, or $50 an acre, where corn and wheat are grown, or where it is worth $5,000 or even $15,000 a front foot, as in New York and Chicago? Bear in mind that the farmer would not be taxed on his improvements—his houses, barns, fences, drains, live stock, growing grain, orchards, and implements; only upon the value of his bare land. There would be no other tax save this land-value tax for him to pay; no indirect or invisible tax, no private tax, no tax that did not represent to him a benefit received. I am fully persuaded, after years of honest study and investigation, that under the single tax the farmer would pay less directly than he pays now; indirectly he would pay nothing at all.

This question, Mr. Chairman, is fundamental, and I consider it in the broadest fairness and candor. Let no small prejudices blind the farmer's vision. He is being done to death by invisible hands. There is but one escape. He must stop these secret and insidious taxing agencies or he will perish by the same forces that worked out in the destruction of the people of old Rome and that are sapping away the vitality of the United States. It took Rome 500 years to die. Will it take so long for America to pay the penalty of injustice if she shall continue her course? Remember that we live in an age of telegraphs and steam. We stride over the road that Rome traveled in 7-league boots.

[Mr. LLOYD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party's future is assured by the devotion of the rank and file to its mission to secure for all the people the largest exercise and enjoyment of the rights and fruits of citizenship. The party of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley, whose history is the record of the most marvelous prosperity of all the American people known to history, will not brook disintegration over quarrels between aspiring leaders. Whatever may separate the aspirants for place, the rank and file will stand by the tenets of their party.

The mass of voters, whether partisans of Taft or Roosevelt, will ultimately act from the dictates of judgment rather than prejudice for or against a leader or leaders. This will be done neither from dislike of the one nor admiration for the other.

The future of the Progressive movement as a third party must wholly depend upon whether its autonomy is necessary to secure needed reforms. From this point of view it is well to recall the various efforts of third-party organizations.

The first was in 1805, known as the "Quids," a third something. This movement was headed by John Raadolph, of Roanoke, in his opposition to Jefferson. It was personal and factional and inevitably short lived, never reaching beyond a local significance.

The second effort was in 1828–1836 by the Anti-Masonry Party. This party swept many State elections, and in 1832 cast the electoral vote of Vermont for its presidential candidate, William Wirt. Its weakness as an organization consisted in its being purely negative. Its platform consisted of two planks—opposition to all secret orders and forcible suppression of the Masonic order. The movement caught such leaders as John Q. Adams, Henry Clay, and William H. Seward, and passed away as suddenly as it appeared.

The third movement was in 1834–35, known as the "Loco-Focos." This was but one expression of an unrest that had appeared among native Americans in various cities. It was noticed from 1820 to 1840 in a labor movement in which Robert Dale Owen was so prominent. At its first appearance it cast 6,000 votes, and was then lost in the Anti-Masonry movement. Its second appearance was the Loco-Foco episode, which was soon lost in the more famous American movement, in opposition to the Catholics. This campaign was fought upon a platform of three planks: (1) America for Americans, (2) anti-Catholicism, and (3) regulation of immigration. It was in this movement where the public-school question was made an issue. Its first convention was held in Philadelphia in 1845, with 140 delegates from 14 States. At this time it had four Members in Congress and was active in all the Northern States. It named no candidate in 1845. A second convention was held in 1847 in Pitts-

burgh, but adjourned to meet in Philadelphia in September, 1848, when it recommended Zachary Taylor for President. The one result of this movement was the defeat of Henry Clay for President in 1844. When it coalesced with the other parties it had six Congressmen in the lower House. This same movement was revived in 1853 under the name of "Know-Nothing" Party, which held its first national convention in 1856 in Philadelphia and nominated Millard Fillmore for President, who was also indorsed by the Whig Party as its standard bearer. This party again appeared for the last time in 1860 under the caption of "Constitutional Union" Party, with John Bell as its candidate, who carried but three States. To recapitulate it will be noted that this Nativist movement, elements of which are always present, began in 1835 as a revulsion against the influence of foreigners, and bore a religious coloring. It was revived in 1843 as the "American Republican Party," and again in 1847 as the "Native American Party." Its next appearance was in 1853, almost as a secret order, and 1856 took on the name "Know-Nothing Party." In 1860 it again appeared as the "Constitutional Union Party," and was lost in the issues of Civil War. Since the war it has appeared infrequently and only once as an organized movement—in 1888—when its convention ended in dissension.

The fourth third-party movement grew out of the slavery agitation. It is known successively as (1) (1833) National Anti-slavery Society, (2) (1836–1844) Liberty Party, (3) (1848) Free Soil Party. This movement is historically known as the "Abolition" agitation, and must not be confused with the Republican Party of 1856. William Lloyd Garrison, its greatest tribune, battled with all his mighty power of voice and pen against making it a political issue, much less a partisan one. But he lost the fight. Its first candidate, James G. Birney, received 7,069 votes in 1840 and 62,300 in 1844. In 1848 it dropped the name of "Liberty" for "Free Soil" and nominated Van Buren, the Democratic ex-President, who polled 291,263 votes. In 1852 it dropped back to a little over one-half, when it gave Hale but 155,825 votes. This is the last campaign it conducted as a party. By the next campaign it was absorbed by the newly organized Republican Party, which drew from all ranks, not upon the platform of abolition of slavery but upon that of opposition to further extension of slavery. In this connection it is interesting to note the bitter attacks upon such leaders as Lincoln by such abolition advocates as Wendell Phillips, who charged the Republican leaders as making a covenant with the evil one and denominated Lincoln the slave hound.

The Republican Party owes its rise and virile growth to no single issue. While opposition to further extension of slavery was its slogan, yet it took a broad national view and drew from every party its very lifeblood. The Democratic Party, its chief opponent, lost to the Republicans the very best ability it possessed in its ranks throughout the Northern States. It also took most of the rank and file of the old Whig organization, as well as the Native American movement. Its very inception made it cosmopolitan as well as virile, with the essential winning contest grounded in moral conviction against the inherent wrong of traffic in human beings. The issue that compelled settlement, so fundamental to the life of the Nation, and which had been compromised in the spirit of cowardice, had not only disintegrated the Whig Party, the chief opponent of the party of slavery, but it had hopelessly split the Democratic Party, as well as confused the floating element seeking a lodgment outside of both parties.

The rise of the Republican Party was totally due to the attitude of the leading parties toward the all-embracing issue before the people. Had either party taken a rational stand on the slavery issue, the Republican Party would not have arisen. But, on the contrary, both parties in convention assembled resolved that the slavery agitation must cease. It would have been as sensible to resolve that the tide should cease to flow. Since the rise of the Republican Party it has held continued sway of the Government save the two terms of Cleveland (1885–1889, 1893–1897) and the present administration (1913).

During this period the dominant issue, after reconstruction incident to the war, has been industrial rather than political or moral. The party in power responsible both for what is done and what is omitted is made the target of attack by third-party advocates. This explains the attitude of the third-party prohibition leaders, who succeeded in encompassing the defeat of Blaine in 1884. Throughout its checkered career it has had little to say against any but the Republican Party, from whose ranks its members came. It also explains the rise of the Liberal Republican movement of 1872, led by such men as Horace Greeley, Carl Schurz, Charles Sumner, George W. Julian, Murat Halstead, and men of like note. It will be recalled that this movement which polled nearly 3,000,000 votes to the three and one-half million votes cast for Grant was conducted against the Republican Party as a protest against the leaders and leadership under Grant. It did not succeed in defeating the leader, and naturally coalesced with the party after this protest, although its total vote in the only election it held approached that cast for the regular nominee.

Another source of third-party agitation since the war is found in the soft-money advocates, so prominent in certain quarters to-day, notwithstanding the decisive repudiation in 1896 and 1900. Aside from the numerous spasmodic efforts prior to and during the war, the most prominent is that known as the "Greenback" agitation of 1878. This grew out of opposition to the effort on the part of the Government to resume specie payment. This craze for soft money, or paper money, is with a certain class the "cure-all" for industrial stagnation. It stirred the country in 1878, and again in 1896, under the slogan of "free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1," it swept the country as with a cyclone. In the former case it went no further than a third-party movement, but in 1896 it encompassed the Democratic Party under the leadership of the present Secretary of State. In neither case was it sufficient to defeat the sound-money principles of the Government. In 1896 the soft-money advocates within the Republican Party withdrew to favor either the Democrats or the third party. While the sound-money element of the Democratic Party withdrew, some to join the Republican Party under the lead of McKinley, while others to form a second third party.

Still another source of the third-party movement is found among Socialist thinkers. This movement is rapidly encompassing the disaffected labor parties. Its phenomenal growth is to be expected in a democracy, where a free field is opened to all agitators, and where the ballot is the natural weapon of public as well as private opinion.

An analysis of these movements will reveal these various elements which are prominent in most third-party propaganda.

A democracy is the training ground of popular leadership. It is the fertile field of aspirants for place and power. Naturally places to be filled are less numerous than aspirants. Few are chosen, many are left; hence disappointment. Those on the outside are dissatisfied with the machine, and not infrequently many on the inside fret at its operations; hence new organizations are sought. Among these elements so prominent will usually be found, first, the young man, who must not only win his spurs against odds within his party but most frequently under the withering scorn of the "standpatter," who bitterly resents any and all suggestions of the "butter-in." Often the younger man, who knows his ability, and frequently discerns too truly the motives of the leaders, prefers to fight in a new party rather than to suffer surveillance to the old. Hence the prominence of this element of young men in a new party. Second, the reformer will invariably make his appearance in the new party. This is due to two things—first, party lines never hang heavily upon reformers, either because he does not see the necessity of party influence in legislation, or else, seeing it, he prefers to be independent for the sake of his cause; second, to the average man reformation and allegiance to party are incompatible. This element will return to the party with the ease it left it when the cause is won, for party to such is a means, not an end. Third, closely related to the reformer stands both the clergy and the scholar in politics. The clergy will readily leave party to join a new movement the moment it is convinced that moral issues demand it. Like the reformer, the clergyman will not refuse to realign with the party of choice the moment he is convinced the issue for which he contends can be reached by so doing.

The scholar is most likely to join a new movement, since the very character of his profession leads him to resent dictation for party sake. He is apt to look upon party fealty as evidence of mental weakness. He is also inclined to deal with matters as they ought to be rather than as they are. His mind is fixed upon the ideal more than the real. He is a theorizer who regulates conduct by codes, rather than a doer who meets a condition as he finds it. In his impatience with the tardiness of the party leaders he leaps at the remedy of party abandonment and makes the common blunder of failing to distinguish between party leaders and party principle. In this class will appear many of the moralizers, who are deeply concerned about a higher standard of citizenship, and who leap at one bound from one set of undesirable leaders to follow, often blindly, another imbued with like domination. (4) Still another very prominent element to make up third-party movements is the discredited leader. In the very nature of leadership in a democracy the discredited leader is inevitable. The position of leadership, from the nature of the case, involves selection, which presupposes rejection. No matter how prominent the head of any

movement is to-day, he will inevitably become second to-morrow if the movement is growing. This is noted in every walk of life, both private and public. It is not confined to politics, but extends to life socially, industrially, religiously, sociologically, and to every activity. The leader of every popular movement must see that his tenure must be limited. If he meets the situation by withdrawing voluntarily, nothing more is heard. If he does not, he is displaced and frequently discredited. Most often in the political field he seeks a third party as outlet for his activities. This element is most significant in all third-party episodes. (5) Closely associated with the last class is what is popularly known as the "sorehead." He does not necessarily belong to the former class, since he may not have reached the position of leadership, although he often does. He is the voter who is a chronic knocker, whose chief business is to find fault with the existent situation. He sees no good in his party and takes peculiar pleasure in announcing his determination to leave it for another, not because he wants to especially, but because his conscience (?) compels it. His motive is not so much to help the organization to which he goes as to hurt the one from which he comes. He seeks coalition with his former enemies in order to cripple his former friends. All third-party movements have many voters from this source. (6) Closely allied to this last class is another class, whose chief motive is to punish his party for what he regards as a dereliction of duty. His observations lead him to conclude his party no longer represents the principles for which it once stood and for which he now stands. He becomes dissatisfied with the leaders of his party. He does not discriminate between the fundamentals of his party's principles and the attitude of temporary leaders. His unsettled mind is a fertile field for the cheap or popular magazine with its penny-a-line articles of protest.

In his desire to do the right thing he looks for a guide. While his devotion to his party is strong, he will follow a leader in whom he has confidence, even to the abandonment temporarily of his party. At such a time the appearance of the popular leader, especially when there is the semblance of injustice done him, is the opportune moment. To the cause of such leader there will not be wanting men in every part of the country who, as former leaders in the party and especially if displaced by others, rightly or wrongly, will rally to the standard. At such juncture the quiet citizen, who has fed his distrust upon the food of the popular magazine, stimulated by mutterings of suspicions of his neighbors, decides to at least deliver what he calls a rebuke. This element furnishes the larger portion of all third-party movements. When the rebuke is once delivered, he stands ready to return his allegiance if opportunity offers.

A failure to properly judge this element, to discriminate between the leader with a grouch and the rank and file in its interest, is the item of disappointment in all third-party movements, both to those who go out and those who remain. Leaders of third parties and their lieutenants invariably fail to discriminate between the vote for their standard bearer when the fight is at its heat and definite abandonment of their own party for a third party. The rank and file, in spite of professions of leaders, in time will discover that the third party will not successfully promulgate their views simply because their own party will do so if such views are worthy.

This is the history of every third-party movement known to our Nation. It is true of the "Quids" (1805), the Anti-Masonry (1828–1836), the Native American (1835, 1843, 1853), and the various parties since the war. It will be true in the case of the Progressive Party. No student of the past could fail to see the similarity of this movement to other movements in our past. Most of the principles contended for by the Progressive Party are Republican, not by inference but by actual enactment. If there are men in the Republican Party adverse to such principles, they must not be confused with the party. The common error is to judge a party's principles by the men we call leaders rather than by the consensus of the rank and file. This is never true in a rational democracy. The people do not reflect the opinion of leaders, but the leaders invariably reflect the conviction of the people. Likewise a newspaper reflects the sentiment of its readers, else it would be without them.

Here is to be observed the real value of third-party movements. If from indifference, bad influence, or whatever reason a party's representatives neglect or actually refuse to take up measures of common weal, a third party can compel it so soon as it reaches the place where it holds the balance of power. If the contention is worthy, the issue will be indorsed by one or both of the contending forces in a popular government, and the cause of the third party being satisfied the party passes away by absorption. If the cause or issue is unworthy, it dies because of its unworthiness. Most third-party propaganda have resulted in such an awakening as to redound in good to the nation, whether by clarifying the issue or riddance of predatory and intolerable leaders.

The honest citizen whose ruling desire is to vote right will be little actuated either by desire to vindicate his leader or to punish his party. In the present instance, as soon as he rightly discerns the inevitable consequences of the Progressive movement to be what has always been the results of such movements he will refuse to be further led by leaders who have gone too far to return. Such men as gathered in Ohio on the 4th of January and again in Lima on the 12th of February of this year, including some of national reputation, have placed themselves outside of the party they recently left by unnecessary and unfortunate utterances against the party of former attachment. They are left to the alternative of maintaining their new organization or openly embracing the Democratic Party or suffer the humiliation of eating their own words spoken in heat. It is too much to expect them to do the latter at once, although it was done by Charles Sumner, Carl Schurz, Murat Halstead, and others after 1872. However, they declared they had won by compelling the party to assert itself. It is too early for the Progressive leaders to enter the Democratic Party, as that would weaken the Democrats by the gain to the Republicans at once of the rank and file of the Progressives who are being used by their leaders in the interest of the Democrats by dividing the Republican vote. Whatever may be the agreement between the Progressive and Democratic leaders, it can not apply to the rank and file. The mass of voters who supported Col. Roosevelt are still loyal to Republican principles. Many of them voted for Col. Roosevelt as Republicans. They will rebuke the Progressive leaders the moment they fully understand the real purpose of keeping up the Progressive organization. With them Democratic success is not the purpose. Even Republican defeat, the purpose of their leaders, is not their purpose. When they rightly comprehend that their allegiance to the new party is the price paid the Democrats for the appointments already delivered as so much consideration, they will register their protest, as has always been done in the past. Third-party propaganda can take but one course. Note the record:

The purpose of the Quids in 1805 led by John Randolph was the defeat of Jefferson. The purpose failed, and the Quids evaporated. The purpose of the antimasonry movement in 1828 was to elect Andrew Jackson against J. Q. Adams. Jackson would have been elected without their efforts. The anti-Masons coalesced with other parties, mostly the Whigs. The purpose of the American Party in 1844 was to defeat Henry Clay. They succeeded, and the party discontinued. The purpose of the Liberal Republicans in 1872 was to defeat Grant. It failed, and nothing more was heard of the movement. The purpose of the third party—Prohibitionists—in 1884 was to defeat Blaine. In this they succeeded, and as a party it is pitiably weak at the very moment when the temperance sentiment is growing by leaps and bounds. The purpose of the Silver Republicans in 1896 was to defeat McKinley. In this they failed; nothing more is heard of the movement. The purpose of the Gold Democrats of the same year was to defeat Bryan. He would have been defeated without their influence, and they evaporated. Now, what was the purpose of the third party—Progressives—in 1912? The defeat of Taft. In this they succeeded. What is now their purpose? To defeat the Republicans in State and Nation. This purpose, as in the past, is confined to the leaders. Will it win the rank and file? Not if history has any lessons for the hour. Few people will seriously contend that the Progressive element of the Republican Party had no ground for their contention. But the method chosen to correct the mistakes is the grievous error. It results in little more than a mere scramble for place by political leaders whose all is wrapped up in the continuance of their new party organization, which must be short lived at best.

Party success must never be measured by the enthusiasm of a convention of interested delegates or formal statements of party leaders. It must be gauged by the sentiment slowly forming about the quiet firesides where judgment rules rather than personal sentiment. It will be interesting to watch the history of this Progressive movement and note how history repeats itself, simply because the rational issues of the Progressive movement are tenets of the Republican Party. The vote in 1912 was an expression of personal attachment to a leader rather than dissatisfaction with their party or opposition to its principles.

The Republican Party takes its stand upon its record of the past. It was born of a moral awakening and came as the champion of freedom. It rallied to its ranks under the leadership of its first great President, Abraham Lincoln, who became

the savior of the Nation, elements of all parties who took an uncompromising stand against slavery. It conducted the affairs of the Nation through the most mighty civil war known to man. After sealing in blood the covenant of an "indissoluble union of indestructible States" it began the work of rehabilitation. It wrote into the Constitution the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and has done its utmost to make them mean what they say. Out of a distracted credit it promulgated sound money which up to this very hour sees every dollar, whether specie or paper, worth a dollar in gold in every country of the world. It inaugurated the system of protection to American capital for the sake of the employment of American labor at American wages, which it consistently maintained. It stands by the policy of endeavoring to make two blades of grass grow where before only one grew. Instead of opening our markets to European goods, it prefers to open the American mills to American workingmen. It believes in building up an American market as against a foreign market. It jealously guards that home market, knowing that next to the producer must stand the consumer. To this end it believes in buying American-made goods from firms employing American labor rather than European goods made by European labor. It is not a question of maxims but one of markets. It believes in the policy of the protection of sugar at home, made in the mills of Ohio and Michigan, of Colorado and California, established by American citizens, investing American capital, employing American labor; mills whose products are supplied by American farms, and in turn sold as a finished product to American homes at a cheaper rate than it will be sold later in Europe. Such a policy is wiser than to close up the mills, drive out the capital, displace our labor for the sake of Europe. In a word it denounces the cry of buying in the cheapest market, which simply means to go to Europe for goods made by cheap labor at the expense of our better-paid labor here, until our people are at the mercy of the foreign price. It declares such a doctrine unpatriotic and demands the right to buy in the market in which you can pay the easiest. This American policy which has built up our industries involves some problems which need adjusting. But destruction of industry is not a rational procedure for social and industrial adjustment. These problems will be solved by the Republican Party, and solved aright.

If, for any reason, evils grow out of a system, the rank and file of the party will compel correction, even though party leaders may hesitate. This correction will not come by an attack upon the party policy, but by a reformation of the evil. The existence of trusts is not due to the system of protection, but to the modern economic doctrine—where combination is possible, competition is impossible. The Sherman Act, a Republican measure which bears the name of one of Ohio's greatest Republicans, which was allowed to be dormant under Cleveland, but which was given vital meaning by McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, at this very hour is commanding the support of the present Democratic President, who has asked Congress to sustain the law. The Republican Party to-day stands committed to the greatest task in its history. By an unfortunate dissention of the leadership, not shared by the rank and file, the common opponent, the Democratic Party, was permitted, by a minority vote, to direct the affairs of the Government. It is headed by a man of ability and sincerity, who looks upon his office as a position of command. He ordered the deed. By direction of that section of country consistently opposed to stimulating American industries we have seen a reversal of our American policy in the interest of a foreign one. We now face the once most marvelous organization of industry ever known, employing the most skillful labor yet known, at the highest wages ever known, distracted and distressed. Industries are closing their doors, others reducing time; business stagnant; armies of men walking the streets of great cities demanding work, and only one year since the inauguration of the much-flaunted "New Freedom" and less than six months of its application to our industries. When these theorists were cautioned against this attack upon our country's ability to employ our labor, invariably we were met by the demogogic reply, "Oh, you are speaking for the interests while we are legislating for the people." And this at a time when any man in America who wanted work could find it, and at good wages.

How like the days of 1894 under the only other free-trade law of our history. Then amid suffering from distracted industries, Democratic protests were heard, denouncing every man who reminded the country that the fruit of a reversion of national policy was being experienced. The man who was bold enough to call things by their right names and place the responsibility where it belonged, was denounced as unpatriotic. The country was informed that the soup house and bread line were due not to Democratic administration but to a world-wide condition. When the Republicans went before the country in 1896 with a pledge to restore prosperity, the Democratic Party headed by the present Secretary of State ridiculed "general prosperity" and declared the cause of the suffering was a monetary one, and offered the free coinage of silver 16–1 as a remedy. As they, in 1896, would not dare to go before the country upon the free-trade propaganda under which the country was suffering, so in 1916, they will be looking for another issue, for no man will likely be bold enough to ask the country to indorse a policy that in less than six months promises to duplicate the situation of 20 years ago.

Utterances of Democratic statesmen and Democratic editors are to-day most similar to what was heard then. Whenever a Republican calls attention of the country to the industrial situation under the "New Freedom," we hear the charge that such statements are not patriotic. The author is stigmatized as a "calamity howler." It is not infrequent to hear a statesman (?) declare how prosperous is the country, and that in the face of the appealing calls from charity associations in the cities for aid for the needy.

When the head of the Industrial Commission, a Government bureau, innocently gave out the facts that in New York alone 350,000 men were unemployed, the desire of Democratic leaders to suppress such information was disclosed by the furious criticism they offered against the informant. In due time a made-to-order explanation was forthcoming. To bolster up the courage of the proponents of this un-American policy, which has reversed the American policy for a foreign one, we are informed that the commission is to institute an investigation, with a promise of a social peace through experts. "Social peace" is akin to "new freedom," and will have the same effect. Catch phrases sound well to the ear, but are a poor diet upon an empty stomach. Instead of taking joy junkets over the land and to other countries to learn how other lands care for their unemployed it would tally with a higher degree of statesmanship to remove the cause of unemployment. Unemployment is the condition of lack of industry. It is due to the demagogic folly of attacking the producer, who alone employs labor, in the imaginary interest of the consumer. It is the farcical practice of Democratic administration to strike down the employer of labor upon the cheapest of the cheap profession that such legislation is on behalf of the people as against the "interests."

But we are told times are growing better. Strange statement. When less than 18 months ago the country was promised that no legitimate business would be injured, but greatly benefited, now we are daily given the promise that the depression cotemporary with Democratic success will soon be relieved.

Let us see what the prospects are, according to Bradstreet.

Bank clearings continue to decrease 9.3 per cent below the corresponding period in 1913. Industrial failures last week were 26 per cent over the corresponding week in 1913. Building activities in 125 cities were about 15 per cent less in January, 1914, than January, 1913. The decline in the steel industry, which is a fair barometer, is most pronounced, notwithstanding the promise, loudly proclaimed, that the "new freedom" would make better times. Last month, when the steel industry was operating about 60 per cent of its capacity, which ran full until the election of the Democratic Party, we were assured that this branch of industry would be revived. But the promise of the revival with the approach of spring has not come, and little hope is entertained that it will come under the present régime. Over 100 more furnaces are idle than in 1912. Over 1,000,000 men are idle in this industry alone and 1,000,000 more in allied industries. We were promised cheaper food, cheaper clothes, and a lowering of the high cost of living, because we were going to buy in the foreign markets. We are buying from Europe, South America, Mexico, and Canada, instead of from our own country. What is the result? Have we captured the markets of the world?

The imports of last December were nearly $30,000,000 more than one year ago. The exports were nearly $17,000,000 less than a like period of a year ago; that is, the balance of trade this December was nearly $47,000,000 against us; or, plainly speaking, we deprived our own producers of that amount of business to favor the foreign producer. That is the item for but one month under this new policy.

The gold movement of that period showed that we were over $16,000,000 worse off in that valuable commodity than a year ago. If that gold movement is kept up it will not be difficult to foretell what will be done in the financial situation that confronts us. From Canada alone the increase of agricultural imports for December was $17,000,000. What effect will displacing such stupendous bulk of products of our own have upon our

farmers? The same trend is seen in other lines. Imports of cotton clothes increased 60 per cent over like period in 1912. A similar situation is seen in woolens.

What effect will this ultimately have upon the American workingman when we cease to purchase the product made by him and buy from the foreign country the product made by foreign labor? The same lesson is to be learned in every line of industry. But why should we affect surprise? Did not the Democratic leaders declare upon this floor that they would buy in the cheapest market? They did this to liberate business, they say. That is the "new freedom." They propose to reduce the cost of living. This they will ultimately succeed in doing. The cost of living will fall when the million American workingmen are displaced for the sake of the foreign laborer at work in a foreign country. If this Nation chooses to go to a foreign country to buy its goods, it is as certain as twice two are four that the American labor will not be employed in at least that degree. Every dollar's worth of product made by a foreigner displaces that amount of labor in this country. When the millions of workingmen and the many millions more dependent upon them have no wages with which to buy the necessaries of life the cost of living will come down. But how can such a policy of cheap prices benefit a man without work? Thus far the cost of living has had no reduction, although millions of dollars' worth of foodstuffs are coming from Canada, South America, and elsewhere.

Dun's report showed last month that about 50 changes in price were noted, of which there were advances in price of over one-half of the articles. This is easily explained and was repeatedly declared upon the floor of the House. It is because we do not eat wheat, but bread. We do not eat cattle, but steak. Twenty-five cents tariff on a bushel of wheat is enough to prevent the Canadian farmer from displacing American wheat. Take off the tariff and at once the Canadian wheat comes across the line to displace that amount of our own. That amount measures the loss to our own producer. Do we get bread cheaper? No. The reduction of cost on a loaf of bread might be one-twentieth of 1 cent. Does the consumer get it? No. We will pay the same for the loaf. Who gets the profit lost by our farmers? The importer, as is always the case. We place hides on the free list because we want cheaper shoes. Did we get the cheaper shoes? No; shoes went up. The importer is the man to advantage. We place wool on the free list. Do we get cheaper clothes? No. The cheap wool is sufficient to cripple for all time the American wool production. Who benefits? The importer. We place sugar on the free list. Do we get cheaper sugar? No. We will by this act cripple, if not dismantle, the sugar factories of the country in the benefit of the Sugar Trust. What is to become of the laborers under these circumstances? They are to become subjects of investigations by governmental industrial commissions, to be fed in soup houses and bread lines, to be housed in public lodging houses, to be organized into Coxey armies, to be fomented into bands of lawless I. W. W. associations—in a word, to become our most serious problem.

Democratic Congressmen and Democratic newspapers may continue to whistle to keep up courage, to denounce as unpatriotic the men who dare to call the country's attention to the folly of Democratic legislation, to stir up the dust in the hope of blinding the country to the real cause of our unfortunate industrial situation, but no such professions will close the eyes of the Nation to the real situation.

Not only is the country's industrial situation unfortunate, but the condition of the National Treasury is becoming alarming. Let the Washington Post, an independent newspaper with Democratic leanings, speak on this point.

In a recent issue this Democratic authority said editorially:

> The Treasury's estimate, based on reports from internal-revenue collectors covering returns from more than 400,000 persons, that the income-tax law will yield about $50,000,000 at the outside, is not as flattering as the more optimistic reckoners figured on by $10,000,000 or more, but it tallies closely with what was claimed for it at the time that section of the tariff bill was before Congress.
>
> The Treasury's calculation of results is for a full year, whereas the first collection is for a 10-month period only, or one-sixth less than the estimated $50,000,000. Thus reduced, the total available for Treasury purposes beginning July 1 will be under $42,000,000. This, be it understood, is aside from the increased receipts expected to be derived from the amended corporation-tax provision, probably $5,000,000, or a total of $47,000,000, wherewith to offset the heavy cut in customs receipts, which source of revenue has yet to feel the effect of putting sugar on the free list.
>
> The partial reduction of the sugar tariff put into force March 1 will not cause a loss this year in excess of $4,000,000, but eventually it will aggregate $50,000,000 a year, which item alone offsets the income-tax revenue. Treasury officials who a few months ago confidently held that the loss in customs would be cared for by the income tax now decline to discuss the effect of revision on articles other than sugar, and which totaled $10,000,000 in February, but they cite internal-revenue returns as showing a gain warranting them in saying that "the bureau is coming to the rescue" of the Treasury.
>
> But how much comfort is derivable from a gain of $2,370,000 in internal revenue as against a loss of $24,000,000 in customs? Besides, internal revenue is decreasing at this time. The increase over last year, which rose in November to $5,000,000, had dwindled to $1,500,000 on March 5. For that matter, the Treasury receipts from all sources decreased at the rate of $800,000 a day during the first days of March, compared with the same time last year. A surplus at this time last year of $10,500,000 has been turned into a deficit of $26,500,000—a difference of $37,000,000.
>
> The showing is alarming, and certainly demands more serious consideration than the unsupported claim that the gap in customs is closed by a bulge in internal revenue. The receipts are growing beautifully less and the expenditures are mounting gloriously higher from month to month. And now comes the decision of the Board of General Appraisers declaring that the 5 per cent discount on all imports carried by ships of American registry is valid. The decision, if sustained by the higher courts, means a further loss of $20,000,000 in customs and opens our markets wider than ever to foreign competition.
>
> The revisionists, in reply to criticisms, declare that the new law has not been in operation long enough to achieve the things predicted for it by its authors, and they repel every suggestion as to amending it; and in that view of the matter, it is to be assumed that they are quietly canvassing some plan of new financing for the relief of business and the Treasury pending the development of conclusive results as regards the advantages of downward revision.

Can there be any doubt of the course the friends of a truly American policy, as against the present foreign policy, will take at the earliest moment? They can not be blind to the deadly parallel with the former Democratic administration of 1893–1897. Within two years after its beginning an army of 3,000,000 men were unemployed. At the present gait, this army will be more than duplicated very soon. Then the Coxey army was regarded as a novelty. To-day the first sound of its march upon Washington is looked upon as most ominous. Then all sorts of explanations were offered; to-day the professional politician is just as fertile in his explanations. Then a man who warned against the assaults upon American enterprise was denounced as a believer in a robber tariff. To-day he is denounced as truckling to the interests. Then a man who reminded the country of the distress of Democratic times was called a calamity howler; to-day he is styled both the calamity howler and unpatriotic. The country's answer of that day to all these charges was the expulsion of the Democratic Party from power for 16 years. The answer to-day to the like flimsy, cheap talk will not be different. The anxiety of the average citizen to vote again is sufficient ground for this assurance. In the face of such startling facts need anyone doubt as to the ultimate action of the advocates of an American system as against this foreign policy?

The believers in a system of protection as against the policy of the "new freedom," the nearest approach to free trade, vastly outnumber the latter. Whatever may be the decision of leaders, the rank and file of the Progressive Party will be in the line with the rank and file of the Republican Party, demanding a policy in the interest of the American people as against the Democratic policy in the interest of foreign nations. This is not mere prophecy; it is the rational conclusion to be drawn from occurrences within the past six months. Division among Republicans is synonymous with Democratic success and continued depression. A union of the rank and file of Republicans, of whatever name, is equivalent to a return to an American policy with the prosperity of our people as we knew it under Republican rule, prosperity which Democrats promised not to disturb or destroy, a promise they have signally failed to keep.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 52 minutes remaining and the other side have 39 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I should like to suggest to the gentleman that it is getting pretty late and we have had a long day. We can not possibly finish the general debate to-night.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

### LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

Mr. CLINE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, no adverse report having been made thereon, the papers in the following pension cases:

Peter S. Hess, guardian of John E. Hess, Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, H. R. 21914, Sixty-second Congress;

John W. Paulus, Company D, Thirty-fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, H. R. 20687, Sixty-second Congress; and

Levi D. Bodley, Company E, Seventh Indiana Volunteer Mounted Infantry, H. R. 27511, Sixty-second Congress.

GOOD ROADS.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a memorial passed by the Mississippi Legislature on the Shackleford good-roads bill.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman that it is very unusual to print memorials of different legislatures. Every Member receives many of those things. However, if the gentleman will ask leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert the memorial in that way, I will not make any objection.

Mr. QUIN. I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. And also for the cotton tax.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can print in his speech anything he wants to that is not obnoxious to the rules of the House.

Mr. FARR. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. On the speech the gentleman made the other day?

Mr. WALSH. On the safety bill.

Mr. MANN. The Bureau of Labor safety bill?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to go ahead with the Agricultural bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How much time remains for general debate?

Mr. LEVER. Fifty-two minutes on our side and thirty-nine minutes on the other side.

The SPEAKER. An hour and a half.

Mr. MANN. I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11338. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss; and

H. R. 11331. An act to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, March 6, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. THACHER, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 342), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HELVERING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14234) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 340), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12018) granting an increase of pension to William M. Orr, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 14231) to increase the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14232) to authorize the payment of the tribal funds of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians to the members of the tribe entitled thereto; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14235) to increase the limit of cost of public building and site therefor at Southbridge, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14236) to increase the limit of cost of public building and site therefor at Leominster, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 14237) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 14238) authorizing the construction of a post-office building at Newburgh, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 14239) to provide for sale of portion of post-office site in Gastonia, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEITRICK (by request): A bill (H. R. 14240) for the retirement of civil employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: A bill (H. R. 14241) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station between North Scituate Beach and Point Allerton, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 14242) to increase the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States Federal building at Harrisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. QUIN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting Congress to return to the State of Mississippi a pro rata share of the cotton tax collected in 1866 and 1867 as a war-debt claim; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, indorsing House bill 11686, providing Federal aid in the maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14234) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 14243) granting an increase of pension to William Dellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14244) granting an increase of pension to Eli Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 14245) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 14246) granting a pension to Emeline Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 14247) for the relief of the Chettimanchi Band or Tribe of Indians in Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 14248) granting a pension to Thomas Comerford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14249) granting a pension to Mary E. Mullen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14250) granting a pension to Mary J. Phinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14251) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14252) for the relief of John Coughlan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 14253) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14254) granting a pension to Allison F. Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14255) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Steffen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14256) granting an increase of pension to William S. Nail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14257) granting an increase of pension to David Secrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 14258) for the relief of Col. James L. Wright; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14259) granting an increase of pension to William L. Reece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14260) granting a pension to Calvin Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14261) granting a pension to Phillip S. Suttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 14262) granting a pension to Albert Whitener; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: A bill (H. R. 14263) granting a pension to Simeon D. Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14264) to correct the military record of John Ousler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 14265) granting a pension to George H. Duffany; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14266) granting an increase of pension to George White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 14267) granting a pension to Charles W. Faux, alias Charles M. Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14268) granting a pension to William G. Yeager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 14269) granting an increase of pension to Hulda E. Bickham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14270) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Foil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14271) granting a pension to Carrie Castile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14272) granting an increase of pension to David S. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 14273) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 14274) granting a pension to Ora Garner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 14275) granting an increase of pension to Juan F. Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14276) granting a pension to Charles H. Gorsuch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 14277) granting a pension to Asa T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14278) granting a pension to Edwin T. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 14279) granting a pension to Guss Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 14280) granting a pension to William A. Boyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14281) granting a pension to Owen R. Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Wayne County, Pa., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), petition of Bartenders' Local Union No. 257, of Sayre, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Wayne County, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

My Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 231 citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Memorial of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Manila Merchants' Association, relative to passage of the ocean mail subsidy act to Philippine Islands and Porto Rico; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of various members of the St. Paul Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Napoleon, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of Newark, Ohio, commending the investigation of the Colorado and Michigan strikes and praying for certain legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Illinois, relative to rating as second-class matter certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of the Crafton (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the twentieth ward of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petitions of sundry citizens of Walkerton, Laporte, Hamlet, North Judson, Plymouth, Argos, Bourbon, North Liberty, Etna Green, Knox, Mishawaka, Claypool, Rochester, Warsaw, Winamac, New Carlisle, Syracuse, Pierceton, and Milford, all in the State of Indiana, in support of tax on foreign mail-order shipments of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Marshall County, Ind., relative to game laws; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of various Sunday schools of Marshall County, Ind., and of sundry citizens of Fulton County, Ind., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the German Alliance Societies of South Bend, Ind., and vicinity, and of Bartenders' Union of the thirteenth Indiana district, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the New York State Drainage Association, favoring passage of House bill 8189, for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions to be inserted in all contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessmen. on real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COX: Petition of 123 citizens of the State of Indiana, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 530 citizens of the State of Indiana, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Vallejo, Solano County, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against the increase of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions inserted in cotton future contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the fourth congressional district and Local Union No. 527, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, of Connecticut, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of officers of K Company, Second Regiment, Connecticut Division, United Boys' Brigade of America, relative to uniforms similar to United States Army uniforms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, protesting against any change in Sunday closing law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the civil-service employees' local branch and the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring the Hamill bill, a retirement measure; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Local Union No. 256, United Brewery Workmen, of Hudson County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of 100 citizens of La Crosse, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Presbyterian Church of La Crosse, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of the Massachusetts Veterinary Association, favoring passage of House bill 4541, to increase the efficiency of the Army veterinary service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Central Labor Union, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Business Committee of the Easton Club, of North Easton, Mass., favoring an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission allowing New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad to continue to operate its Sound line service between New England ports and New York City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Federation of Labor, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, favoring passage of House bill 12740, relative to adjusting wages of machinists; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of John Dilger, Anton Bosler, Frank P. Dilger, Peter Jochim, and Joseph Bettag, all of Mariah Hill, Ind., and the Legeman Printing Co. and the Crown Chair Co., of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, of Washington, D. C., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 12873, providing that all real estate in the District of Columbia subject to taxation shall be assessed annually at its true value; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against legislation increasing the postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. METZ: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against extension of Parcel Post Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of Edward J. Gallagher, Hugh McClarin, Joseph J. Mars, and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cayuga County, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to cotton futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, favoring rural farm credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the San Francisco Labor Council, indorsing action of Government in dissolving merger between Southern Pacific and Central Pacific Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Southern California Child Labor Committee, favoring passage of House bill 12292, relative to child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of William Lambert and Charles F. Becker, of Sacramento, Cal., and E. M. Wallace, of Eureka, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the General Contractors' Association, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Ernest D. Patterson and P. J. Griffin, of New Haven County, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Memorial of the National Jewelers' Board of Trade, protesting against amending the Sherman Act and favoring amending the national stamping act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Red Bank and Sayreville, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Red Bank and Sayreville, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMS: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14275) granting an increase of pension to Juan F. Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, to investigate Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 6, of New York City, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Orcutt Relief Corps, No. 110, Department of Michigan, Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, against changes in the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany the bill (H. R. 14278) granting a pension to Edwin T. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: Petition of F. A. Bower, F. A. Sherman, L. F. Hayner, J. H. Burnap, J. H. Wood, H. F. Brokaw, H. E. Hanford, J. R. Grove, H. Smith, and J. F. Speel, all of Albany, N. Y., relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Troy, N. Y., relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Frank McCormick and other citizens of Bath, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions to be inserted in all contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Clinton, Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Dewey Lodge, No. 283, International Association of Machinists, of Clinton, Iowa, for back longevity and back overtime pay of members of organized labor on Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Clinton Commercial Club, that the authority of the Postmaster General to make changes in the administration of the parcel-post law should be limited, and that changes in said law should only be made by congressional action; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the August Wentz Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, with reference to changes in the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. S. Wells, Herman Wesenberg, Henry Ketelsen, Nick Diecksel, and 221 other citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Friendship Grange, of Kenton, Hardin County, Ohio, in favor of House bill 11897, relative to farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Bank of Horton, Horton, Kans., suggesting an amendment to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in favor of House bill 12873, relative to the taxation of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the legislative committee of the National Grange, favoring passage of bill for system of farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York City, protesting against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Otto J. Ekwald and other citizens, of Worcester, Mass., for an investigation of the aim and purpose of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, *March 6, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee that we may put our feet upon the eternal granite of Thy righteousness. There is but one law in all the ages and one Supreme Ruler in all the universe. If there seems to be a break in the continuance of Thy rule, it is because of our own distorted power of human reasoning or because our sense perceptions are held in bondage unto sin. Ever from Thy throne there goeth forth the one law of human conduct, ever continuing, ever consistent, full of love—the revelation of the divine mind to men. We pray that this day we may square our lives by the divine order and live to glorify Thy name, to extend the interests of the kingdom of truth and righteousness in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon;

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property;

S. J. Res. 90. A joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56);

H. R. 11331. An act to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio; and

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Moorhead, Pelican Rapids, Farwell, and St. Cloud, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Scandinavian Christian Church, of Compton, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Hennepin County Lodge, No. 175, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit immigrants seeking refuge from religious or political persecution to enter this country without any educational test, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of the Central Bureau of the Central Verein, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries or occupational diseases in the course of their employment, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Worth, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Union Sunday School, of Cochran, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of Lynchburg, Va., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baker, Oreg., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Decatur County, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Ida McKinley Council, No. 5, Daughters of America, of Lynn, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston and Springfield and of Local Union No. 90, Bartenders' Union, of Lawrence, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Captain John M. Pettingell Camp, No. 52, United Spanish War Veterans, of Amesbury, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers of the Spanish-

American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Bedford, Dartmouth, Acushnet, and Mattapoisett, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling employees in the Postal Service to work on Sundays, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the John Hancock Branch, American Continental League of America, of Lynn, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Harlan and of sundry citizens of Fulton County and Culver, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 412, of Kokomo, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Fifth Division, Railway Mail Association, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the demotion of certain railway postal clerks by reason of reduction in force and car space, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Honey Creek Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vigo County, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BRADLEY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Jefferson County and Kenton County; of the German-American Alliance of Louisville; of sundry citizens of Covington, Lexington, Louisville, Frankfort, Shively, Chapeze, Newport, Paducah, Owensboro, and Early Times, all in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of French, Charity, Stephens, and Dobins, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Sunshine Council, No. 97, Daughters of America, of Bromley, and of Banner Council, No. 7, Daughters of America, of Louisville, both in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Connecticut State Branch, Post Office Clerks' Association, of Bridgeport, Conn., and a petition of the Civil Service Employees' Association, of South Norwalk, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Granite State Dairymen's Association, of Durham, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to standardize the sale prices of drugs, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Olympia, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of Willapa Harbor, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 450, Cooks and Kitchen Helpers' Union, of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clarkston, Prescott, College Place, and Farmington, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed a bill adopting some regulations in conformity to a treaty made between this country and Great Britain in reference to international boundary matters. When that legislation was up I did not object to its consideration, because I had been assured by parties who claimed to represent some of the fishing interests of our country that, while they had some objections, they would not oppose the passage of the bill.

I received a telegram this morning asking that the legislation be delayed and setting out the objections these people have to the regulations. I simply ask to have the telegram, in the nature of a petition, printed in the RECORD so that the RECORD will show the objections they make to the regulations.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 5, 1914.*

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Puget Sound fishing interests will be vitally and injuriously affected by passage of any bill containing regulations for Puget Sound as set out in Root Senate bill 4437 or Flood House bill 13005. Respectfully request all congressional action be deferred until after new satisfactory regulations for Puget Sound can be agreed upon by international commission. This should be accomplished within reasonably short time after a hearing. If American commissioner will cooperate, we would not oppose bill with proper regulations, but must seriously object to regulations contained in pending bills. Regulation 62 prohibits fishing for all salmon from August 25 to September 15 each year. This will destroy entirely humpback-salmon industry on Sound. Regulation 63 provides for a 48-hour weekly close season. State law provides 36 hours, which is ample. The provisions in regulation 64 prohibiting use of jigger on fish traps will diminish efficiency of trap by approximately a third to a half and will put many traps out of existence altogether. This will benefit no one except British Columbia fishermen. There are also other serious objections. If proposed regulations are adopted by Congress they can not be changed for four years, and then after one year's notice by either Government except by agreement of the two commissioners ratified by Congress and Canadian Parliament, which is highly improbable. See article 6. Treaty regulations should be made right before Congress acts. We believe that Prof. Prince and Dr. Smith could be gotten together and easily adjust the matter, so as not to cripple a great industry. A printed protest by salmon fishermen of Puget Sound was furnished to all Members of the Sixty-first Congress. Please examine such protest. Full letter follows.

E. A. SIMS,
T. J. GORMAN,
KERR & MCCORD,
DORR & HADLEY.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have not attempted to encumber the RECORD with the large number of letters, petitions, and telegrams respecting Senate joint resolution No. 1 that I have received, but I have this morning received a telegram here from an excellent lady, which telegram I ask may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, *March 5, 1914.*

Senator H. F. ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

If you allow suffrage amendment to go to vote now, I shall consider you false to our interests and shall not hesitate to make that fact known in important places. Those who have asked you to push the amendment to vote now are not genuinely interested in its immediate success. They are progressives, and are using you. Beware of their advice. We expect you to represent us, not them.

Mrs. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. Is the sender of the telegram a member of the general board on woman suffrage?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know. She is a very excellent lady, who has taken great interest in woman suffrage. I have just received this telegram, to which she expresses some objections to a vote at this time, and says if the resolution goes to a vote she will feel it to be her duty to say to the country that I have not been diligent or pursued a wise course. I have so much

respect for her I feel that her views ought to be incorporated into the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that as I understand it she is not on the general board of woman suffrage located at New York, which wants a vote on Senate joint resolution No. 1, introduced by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, as to that I do not know. The joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and reported by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST].

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, my information is that Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont is one of the recognized leaders, if not the leader, of the movement for woman suffrage.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am not aware as to that, and that is the reason why I asked the Senator from Arizona if he knew whether she is a member of the board or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I have a telegram here in the shape of a petition, and as it pertains to matters which have been discussed in the Senate I will ask to have it read. It is short.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *March 5, 1914.*

Hon. P. J. MCCUMBER,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The following resolution was passed to-day by the Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of North Dakota in convention assembled:

"*Resolved*, Realizing that at this time a spirit of unrest exists among the citizens of this State in regard to the marketing of farm products, and recognizing that the sentiment exists among producers that there are injustices and irregularities practiced by the grain exchanges of the country detrimental to the producer, therefore we respectfully ask the Congress of the United States to make a thorough and impartial investigation of the grain exchanges of this country, and in particular the Duluth Board of Trade, the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, and the Equitable Cooperative Exchange of Minneapolis, Minn., to the end that the truth will be known and remedial legislation be enacted if necessary."

S. W. UNKENHOLZ,
*Mandan, N. Dak.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VARDAMAN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9318) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 316) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 278, authorizing and directing the Sergeant at Arms to appoint James F. Sellers additional messenger at $1,200 per annum, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution 282, authorizing the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine to hold hearings, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution 285, authorizing the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to employ temporarily a clerk, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 318) thereon. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill to-morrow after the morning business is concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT SARTELL, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 13545) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town of Sartell, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 315) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CHILTON. I report back from the Committee on Printing Senate resolution 280, with amendments. The committee reports it favorably. I would call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who submitted the resolution, to it, but he is not in the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator that in making these reports from the Committee on Printing it would be well to ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. CHILTON. I was thinking of doing that. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments of the Committee on Printing were, in line 15, to strike out the word "and" before "report," and at the end of the resolution to insert "and the views of the minority of the joint select committee to frame a government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 572, 44th Cong., 2d sess.)," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That there be reprinted in one volume, for the use of the Senate document room, 500 copies of Senate report entitled "Memorials of Authorities of City of Washington," etc., by Mr. Southard (23d Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 2, 1835); report of the joint select committee of Congress appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Government of the District of Columbia (S. Rept. No. 453, 43d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 1 to 29, inclusive); report from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on "Legal relations of the District of Columbia and the United States" (H. Rept. No. 627, 43d Cong., 1st sess.); report of a joint select committee appointed to prepare a suitable frame of government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 479, 43d Cong., 2d sess); and the views of the minority of the joint select committee to frame a government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 572, 44th Cong., 2d sess.).

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CREEK EQUALIZATION FUND (S. DOC. NO. 439).

Mr. CHILTON. I report favorably from the Committee on Printing the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], submitted on the 3d instant, to print the memorial of R. C. Allen on the Creek equalization fund, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. OWEN said: Mr. President, I have a memorial from R. C. Allen, national attorney of the Creek Nation of Indians with regard to the Creek equalization fund, giving the data and reasons why it should be disposed of by the Senate. I think the memorial ought to be printed as a Senate document for the information of the Senate. I do not know whether or no the Senate has adopted a rule requiring such matters to be referred to the Committee on Printing. If so, I should like to ask a reference of the memorial to the Committee on Printing and to request a prompt report on it, because the Indian appropriation bill is now before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order as read.

The order was agreed to.

NATIONAL AID TO GOOD ROADS (S. DOC. NO. 438).

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably an article by Jonathan Bourne, jr., on the subject of national aid to good roads, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] on the 20th ultimo. I am directed by the committee to request that the article be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. DOC. NO. 437).

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I submit a report (No. 317), accompanied by an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1913, together with the accompanying appendices, illustrations, and report of the semicentennial anniversary of said academy, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4701) for the relief of Edwin Price; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 4702) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the

Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 4703) for the relief of the heirs of Granville S. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4704) to amend an act entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," approved May 30, 1908 (with accompany papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4705) granting a pension to Eli Ziegler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4706) granting a pension to Caroline E. Stevens Van Wormer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4707) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4708) to authorize and provide for the investigation and survey of swamp, wet, and overflowed lands in the Mississippi Valley susceptible of drainage, and to devise plans and systems therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 4709) to repeal the several acts authorizing an internal tax on cotton and relating to the same and providing for the payment to the treasurers of the respective States wherein said tax was levied and collected the amounts so collected for the use and benefit of the common-school fund of said respective States and for purposes of general education; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4710) appropriating money for improvement, extension, and repair of the Army and Navy Hospital, at Hot Springs, Ark.;

A bill (S. 4711) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct a new bathhouse on the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., for the accommodation of indigents;

A bill (S. 4712) to authorize the sale of certain lots in the Hot Springs Reservation for church and hospital purposes; and

A bill (S. 4713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made certain improvements on the Government reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States,* That the President be, and he is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Senate what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls, what representations have been made regarding the same, and copies of all communications received from foreign countries relating thereto together with copies of answers submitted by the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

### TOLL-EXEMPTION PROVISION OF PANAMA CANAL ACT.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The resolution (S. Res. 289) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States,* That the President be respectfully requested to inform the Senate, in so far as not incompatible with the public interest, what "other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence" are referred to in the President's message of March 5, 1914; and to so inform the Senate what connection such matters have with the proposed repeal of the toll-exemption provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that the resolution had better go over for a day. I object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with the resolution.

A few days ago I noticed printed in the Washington Post, of this city, a purported interview with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], to which I desire to call attention, in connection with the President's message of yesterday, and particularly that portion of it which is quoted in the resolution I have just introduced.

In this purported interview the Senator from Louisiana stated that he had just had an interview with the President; that he had previously been very strongly in favor of the exemption of American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls for passing through the Panama Canal, but that on account of the statement which the President had just made to him he had changed his mind. I desire to read this language from the statement of the Senator from Louisiana as it is reported:

> But I recognize now, as I always did, the substantial difference between our right of exemption and our enforcement of that right.
>
> Understanding through newspaper reports only that the President believed our national interests would be subserved by the repeal of the exemption clause in the present law, I have appealed to him directly for an expression of his views. He has answered that the repeal of the exemption clause is necessary for the continuance of our present friendly relations with foreign powers and the success of our foreign policies.
>
> FEELS IT HIS DUTY TO ASSIST.
>
> Considering the canal tolls exemption law previously enacted to be a question of policy and not of principle, and recognizing the great responsibility resting on the President for the successful conduct of our foreign relations, and also the delicacy of the present trying situation in regard to those relations, I feel it my public duty to assist the President in carrying out his wishes in this matter.

Mr. President, it occurs to me, if the situation referred to in matters not named is so delicate, and the success of whatever foreign policy the United States at the present time may have depends upon the repeal of the Panama tolls exemption clause——

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment, that the Senate ought to be informed what that matter is and in what this delicacy consists which impels Senators to promptly change their expressed attitude upon this great question.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is not present to-day; he has been ill for several days. Does not the Senator from Washington think it would be better to delay his remarks until the Senator from Louisiana is present and can respond?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have nothing further to say with reference to the Senator from Louisiana, and I have said nothing with reference to the Senator which in any way involves him further than to give him an opportunity, if he sees fit to do so, to make a statement, which he can do at any time.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Washington has introduced an interview, and he does not know whether it is accurate. I repeat, the Senator from Louisiana is not present, and it would seem to me the better course would be to wait until that Senator is present, as the Senator from Washington desires to comment upon a quoted interview with the Senator from Louisiana. Mr. President, I call for the regular order this morning.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I have the floor, Mr. President. I desire to occupy it only very briefly.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if I mistake not, the regular order——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Virginia insists upon the regular order, morning business must be proceeded with.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well, Mr. President.

### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurrent or other resolutions are still in order. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) yesterday submitted by Mr. CUMMINS was read, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] who submitted the resolution is not present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that, by unanimous consent, the resolution is to lie over from day to day, without prejudice, at least until after the Committee on Privileges and Elections had met upon Saturday next. The Chair thinks he is correct in that understanding. If so, the resolution will again go over without prejudice.

LIGHTHOUSE TENDER FOR GENERAL SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2876. It is a very short bill. I have a letter from the Secretary of Commerce urging speedy action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2876) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota one question. I ask was the original transmission from the department based as to cost upon the estimate of the department?

Mr. NELSON. It was based on an estimate made some years ago, but it is found that a suitable tender can not be constructed for the amount originally estimated.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. How many years ago was the estimate made, I will ask the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NELSON. I can not recall at this moment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does not the bill state it?

Mr. NELSON. The estimate was made before the appropriation was made, and the department has urgently recommended this increase. It is insisted that a suitable tender can not be built for the amount of the original estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after the words "Secretary of Commerce," to strike out "and Labor," so as to make the section read:

That the authorization in the act approved March 4, 1913, to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to construct a lighthouse tender for general service at a cost not exceeding $250,000, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost provided in said authorization from $250,000 to $325,000; and the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to have constructed a lighthouse tender for general service as provided in said item in said bill to cost not exceeding $325,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. WORKS obtained the floor.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gore | O'Gorman | Smith, Md. |
| Bankhead | Gronna | Oliver | Smith, Mich. |
| Bradley | Hughes | Overman | Smith, S. C. |
| Brady | James | Owen | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Jones | Perkins | Stephenson |
| Bristow | Kenyon | Pittman | Sutherland |
| Bryan | Kern | Poindexter | Swanson |
| Burton | Lane | Robinson | Thomas |
| Catron | Lea, Tenn. | Root | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | Lewis | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Chilton | Lodge | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Clapp | McCumber | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martin, Va. | Sherman | Walsh |
| Cummins | Martine, N. J. | Shively | Warren |
| Dillingham | Myers | Simmons | Williams |
| Fall | Nelson | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| Gallinger | Norris | Smith, Ga. | |

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday evening I gave notice that I would this morning call up the antismoking resolution. I was out of the Chamber when the morning business was closed, and as the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has the floor and desires to go on, I give notice that I will call up the resolution to-morrow morning immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

"ONE YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC RULE."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, we have now had a year of Democratic rule and Democratic legislation. It is an appropriate time to take account of what has been accomplished. The judicial department has remained practically as it was, unaffected by the change of administration. Therefore we must look to the executive and legislative departments of the Government for any achievements for good or evil as they affect the common weal. There has been much boasting of the accomplishments of Democratic management of public affairs. I should like the attention of the Senate while I review in a friendly way the sum of these achievements. I say in a friendly way because what I shall say will not be said in any spirit of animosity, however much I may differ from some of those who sincerely believe, as I do not, that the legislation enacted by this Congress and the conduct of the executive department thus far under Democratic rule have been in the public interest and for the common good.

My review of the events of the year just closed will be in a spirit of personal good will, and I shall hope to make it as fair and just as one can who speaks from the standpoint of a political antagonist and disbelieves, in a great degree, in the principles and policies of the Democratic Party. From that standpoint I shall deal with the question frankly and without reservation.

When the Democratic national convention met in Baltimore it declared for certain principles and announced certain political policies, and upon these declared principles and policies nominated and elected Woodrow Wilson President of the United States and secured control of both branches of Congress, thus placing the party in full control of the Government in all its departments. But the platform of the party was not approved by a majority of the voters of the country, and its candidate for President was elected by a minority of the electors, resulting from a division in the Republican Party. Therefore any change in the policies or principles of government can not be attributed to the people of the country or founded upon public approval. They are the acts of the Democratic Party only, founded on the Democratic platform, rejected by a majority of the voters of the country, and brought about in important particulars mainly by the coercive power of the President, avowedly acting as the head of the party in furtherance of the principles and pledges contained in its political platform. So the Democratic Party should justly be credited with anything good that has been accomplished during the year and held responsible for any wrongs or errors that have been committed.

Now, Mr. President, what has been accomplished by this administration, and how much of good and how much of evil has or is likely to come from it?

For the year the Congress has been almost continuously in session, at enormous expense to the Government. Nothing like it has ever been known. And what has all this been for? Mostly for the political advantage of the Democratic Party. It was conceived that there was a great public demand for a revision of the tariff, and to enact a new tariff law would at once bring the party into public favor. So a special session of Congress was called to enact such a law. Everything else must give way to this purpose. Other important legislation, more important in the public interest than the tariff, was crowded out and neglected. The committees of both Houses, with their calendars full of bills, many of them of great importance, were compelled to remain idle for months because of the desire of the Democrats to force through the tariff bill. Nothing was allowed to stand in its way. It was supposed that when this bill was passed Congress would be allowed to adjourn. But the tariff bill was not well received; it was feared that its passage was going to injure instead of help the Democratic Party at the coming election. Our Democratic friends were in a panic; their efforts had miscarried; something must be done to restore confidence and the party to public favor. It was believed that there was a universal public demand for a new banking and currency law and that to enact such a law would avoid a panic and thus save the Democratic Party from certain disaster. Congress was ready and anxious to adjourn; but this could not be allowed with this cloud of public disfavor resting on the party. The President again came to the rescue. He demanded in no uncertain terms that Congress remain in session and pass a banking and currency bill. Again all other legislation, however important, was subordinated to this supreme effort to restore the Democratic Party to favor. The session was prolonged through the entire summer and fall for the sole purpose of passing this

one bill. It met with unexpected opposition. Prolonged hearings were had upon it. As it was proposed it was not pleasing to Wall Street and the bankers throughout the country. Some way must be found to satisfy the money power. This was not easy to do and still satisfy the people generally. As a result, the entire balance of the special session, from September 9, when the tariff bill was passed, until the beginning of the regular session, the 1st of December, was wasted in waiting for action on the currency bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Never before had there been such waste of time and public moneys.

Mr. President, I am going to comment on these two bills and their effect before I have finished, but before doing so I want to point out in a general way what else has been done by Congress in the way of enacting laws.

During the year Congress enacted 63 bills. Of these, 18 were bridge bills simply granting the right to various corporations to construct bridges across navigable streams, none of which were contested and passed as a matter of course; five were appropriation bills that must be passed each year; two related to the Panama Exposition to be held at San Francisco; one to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy; one providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between employers and employees; three to limit the cost of certain public buildings; one to provide for representation of the United States in the Fourteenth International Congress on Alcoholism; one authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Spain; one providing for the acquiring of station grounds by the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington; one extending to the port of Dallas, Tex., certain privileges in the matter of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise; one to provide a method for opening lands restored from reservation or withdrawal; one to fix the times and places of holding district court in Arizona; two to amend the Judicial Code; one to create an additional land district in the State of Nevada; one extending the privileges of transportation of dutiable merchandise to the port of Perth Amboy, N. J.; one granting permission to the city of Marshfield, Oreg., to close Mill Slough in that city; one to enable the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to employ additional clerks; one authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to comply with the law and make proof on desert-land entries in certain counties in the State of Washington; one to amend the statute relating to mining claims; one authorizing the appointment of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Paraguay and Uruguay; one fixing the term of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps at four years; one granting the city and county of San Francisco certain rights of way over public lands; one to provide for expenses of representatives of the United States at the International Maritime Conference for Safety of Life at Sea; two amending the law relating to the importation and use of opium; one amending the law relating to the liability of postmasters; one granting the Emigration Canon Railroad Co. the right of way over public lands; one to regulate the payment of postal money orders; one to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, and so forth, commonly known as the "red-light" act; one authorizing the changing of the names of certain steamships; one providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; one to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia; one appropriating funds for the eradication of hog cholera and dourine; one regulating the hours of employment of women in the District of Columbia; one authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a tract of land to the city of Lawton, Okla., for watershed and water-supply purposes. Then follow the only bills of real public importance passed during the year other than the appropriation bills, namely, the tariff act and the act establishing Federal reserve banks.

THE TARIFF BILL.

For the tariff bill as it passed and became a law the President is responsible. But for the coercion used by him to compel action by Congress it never would have passed. It is not approved by the judgment or conscience of a majority of the Members of Congress in either House. It probably would not have received a majority of the votes of the Democratic Members of the Senate. His demand was for free wool and free sugar. The Members of his party submitted unwillingly to this demand.

There were many other provisions of the bill that were objectionable to Democratic Members of both Houses. In this emergency the demands of the President were supplemented by the secret caucus that stifled the consciences and closed the lips of Democratic Members of Congress who opposed the bill from conviction. As it finally passed it was inimical to the best interests of my State and almost all of its industries. Other States suffered in the same way. The reduction of duties so reduced the revenues of the Government that direct taxation became necessary to make up the loss. So the people are having a taste of direct taxation in the form of an income-tax law, made necessary by the Democratic policy of free trade or a tariff for revenue only. It was openly avowed on the floor of the Senate that no account was taken of the protection of American industries in framing the bill, and that it was framed purely as a revenue measure. Some Democratic Senators declared in positive terms against any legislation designed to protect our home industries by tariff duties. The Democratic Party committed itself, by the passage of this bill, as opposed to all such legislation. Its most injurious and destructive provisions were directed at the farming industries of the country, but the manufacturing and other industries have not escaped the effects of this blighting legislation. Not only so, but the laboring man, who is dependent upon the success and prosperity of the home industries of his country, has not escaped. By taking off the tariff—in many instances placing our products on the free list—the Democratic Party has taken away from our own people their home markets and opened them up to the products of the cheap labor of foreign countries for a reduced duty, or none at all, thus jeopardizing our home industries, cheapening and degrading labor, turning thousands of workmen out of employment, and, at the same time, depriving the Government of needed revenue that must be made up by direct taxation.

Mr. President, what was all this for? Ostensibly for the benefit of the ultimate consumer by cheapening our own products. But has it done so? Quite the contrary. While the importers and foreign producers pay less money to gain entrance for their goods into our markets they have pocketed the difference, and where there has been any reduction in price to our own producers it has not reduced the price of the same goods to the consumer. If the imported goods can be sold for less than will produce a profit to our own producers it only means the surrender of our markets to importers from other countries, leaving them to impose their own prices when they have crowded out our own people. Now, sir, that is just what is being done. Reports from the Departments of Commerce and of Labor show two things beyond dispute, namely, that the tariff bill has brought about largely increased importations, particularly of farm products, with increased prices to the consumer. These are not matters of speculation. They are clearly demonstrated facts.

I submit for the information of the Senate comparative tables of imports covering the months of October, November, and December of the years 1912 and 1913, showing the imports for the corresponding months of the two years. They cover sugar, grapes, olives, walnuts, raisins, lemons, almonds, eggs, oats, wheat, corn, cattle, and fresh meats.

*Comparative table of imports.*

| | 1912 | | 1913 | | Per cent increase, quantity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Values. | Quantities. | Values. | |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Sugar: | | | | | |
| Beet, lbs., dut | 110,708,202 | $2,667,790 | 40,000 | $1,838 | ¹99.00 |
| Cane— | | | | | |
| Product of Philippine Islands, lbs. free | 61,360,000 | 1,301,529 | 10,049,612 | 232,837 | ..... |
| All other, dut | 201,036,875 | 5,493,253 | 114,741,212 | 2,455,681 | ..... |
| Total cane | 262,396,875 | 6,794,782 | 124,790,824 | 2,688,518 | ¹52.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Sugar: | | | | | |
| Beet, lbs., dut | 12,629,022 | 295,867 | 114,900 | 3,246 | ¹90.00 |
| Cane— | | | | | |
| Philippines, free | 40,162,881 | 877,011 | 14,672,000 | 317,203 | ..... |
| All other, dut | 18,624,483 | 463,502 | 129,626,023 | 2,559,093 | ..... |
| Total cane | 58,787,364 | 1,340,513 | 144,298,023 | 2,876,356 | 145.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Sugar: | | | | | |
| Beet, lbs., dut | 23,300,206 | 478,971 | 50,000 | 1,371 | ¹99.00 |
| Cane— | | | | | |
| Philippines, free | 34,943,747 | 897,993 | 1,120,000 | 23,910 | ..... |
| All other, dut | 33,299,438 | 802,344 | 93,939,719 | 1,996,091 | ..... |
| Total cane | 68,243,185 | 1,700,337 | 95,059,719 | 2,019,001 | 39.00 |

¹ Decrease.

*Comparative table of imports*—Continued.

| | 1912 | | 1913 | | Per cent increase, quantity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Values. | Quantities. | Values. | |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Grapes, cu. ft., dut | 533,814 | $620,026 | 485,632 | $572,370 | [1]0.09 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Grapes, cu. ft., dut | 522,714 | 619,572 | 674,262 | 793,603 | 29.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Grapes, cu. ft., dut | 29,244 | 37,603 | 94,634 | 117,590 | 223.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Olives, galls., dut | 541,931 | 273,745 | 62,043 | 26,732 | [1]88.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Olives, galls., dut | 159,789 | 78,360 | 292,407 | 121,201 | 73.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Olives, galls., dut | 286,969 | 139,152 | 369,597 | 163,719 | 30.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Walnuts, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 1,104,502 | 85,189 | 3,104,532 | 286,555 | 181.00 |
| Shelled | 519,406 | 91,210 | 604,361 | 125,985 | 16.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Walnuts, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 8,161,024 | 702,592 | 10,982,207 | 961,937 | 34.50 |
| Shelled | 967,182 | 197,290 | 515,540 | 112,094 | [1]46.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Walnuts, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 3,353,785 | 270,407 | 6,991,658 | 568,349 | 108.00 |
| Shelled | 1,093,345 | 257,369 | 1,060,325 | 219,244 | [1].02 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Raisins, and other dried grapes, lbs., dut | 705,166 | 82,270 | 1,122,434 | 101,473 | 59.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Raisins, etc., lbs., dut | 695,937 | 83,185 | 794,873 | 89,773 | 14.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Raisins, etc., lbs., dut | 255,256 | 21,607 | 675,357 | 39,678 | 165.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | *Per cent increase value.* |
| Lemons lbs., dut.[2] | 3,430,756 | 100,148 | ..... | 304,368 | 204.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Lemons, lbs., dut.[2] | 2,910,820 | 72,128 | ..... | 163,174 | 126.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Lemons, lbs., dut.[2] | 4,428,163 | 97,831 | ..... | 435,124 | 344.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | *Per cent increase, quantity.* |
| Almonds, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 737,086 | 57,377 | 2,383,849 | 271,431 | 223.00 |
| Shelled | 2,185,131 | 518,668 | 2,262,487 | 665,528 | 3.50 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Almonds, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 555,398 | 38,470 | 1,470,722 | 163,776 | 164.00 |
| Shelled | 2,248,005 | 528,440 | 1,855,020 | 559,226 | [1]17.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Almonds, lbs., dut.: | | | | | |
| Not shelled | 591,863 | 61,250 | 566,127 | 66,186 | [1].04 |
| Shelled | 2,068,640 | 489,716 | 2,253,855 | 688,717 | 8.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Eggs, doz., free | ..... | ..... | 21,594 | 5,322 | ..... |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Eggs, doz., free | ..... | ..... | 165,263 | 36,500 | ..... |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Eggs, doz., free | ..... | ..... | 1,514,296 | 334,315 | ..... |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Oats, bush., dut | 379 | 186 | 2,524,793 | 886,994 | 666,[illegible]72.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Oats, bush., dut | 4,266 | 2,052 | 5,132,308 | 1,821,789 | 120,207.00 |

[1] Decrease.
[2] Dutiable partly by package and quantity not stated after Oct. 4, 1913.

*Comparative table of imports*—Continued.

| | 1912 | | 1913 | | Per cent increase, quantity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantities. | Values. | Quantities. | Values. | |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Oats, bush., dut | 8,984 | $3,060 | 5,577,656 | $1,918,985 | 61,998.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Wheat, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 118 | 207 | ..... |
| Dut | 52,213 | 29,510 | 233,099 | 213,276 | ..... |
| Total | 52,213 | 29,510 | 233,217 | 213,483 | 346.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Wheat, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 6 | 16 | ..... |
| Dut | 2,187 | 2,152 | 127,033 | 107,011 | ..... |
| Total | 2,187 | 2,152 | 127,039 | 107,027 | 5,708.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Wheat, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 40 | 48 | ..... |
| Dut | 151,616 | 117,579 | 149,264 | 124,734 | ..... |
| Total | 151,616 | 117,579 | 149,304 | 124,782 | [1].01 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Corn, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 473,259 | 378,011 | ..... |
| Dut | 226,471 | 114,796 | ..... | ..... | 103.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Corn, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 1,632,643 | 1,182,672 | ..... |
| Dut | 25,819 | 21,567 | ..... | ..... | 6,223.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Corn, bush.: | | | | | |
| Free | ..... | ..... | 2,343,444 | 1,485,397 | ..... |
| Dut | 637 | 415 | ..... | ..... | 367,787.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Cattle, number: | | | | | |
| Free | 34 | 3,710 | 130,639 | 3,398,[illegible] | ..... |
| Dut | 27,662 | 575,133 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total number | 27,696 | 578,843 | 130,639 | 3,398,067 | 371.00 |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Cattle, number: | | | | | |
| Free | 32 | 2,975 | 123,118 | 3,306,723 | ..... |
| Dut | 43,726 | 826,383 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total number | 43,758 | 829,358 | 123,118 | 3,306,723 | 181.00 |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Cattle, number: | | | | | |
| Free | 73 | 10,225 | 87,470 | 1,911,882 | ..... |
| Dut | 40,449 | 600,344 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total number | 40,522 | 610,569 | 87,470 | 1,911,882 | 115.00 |
| OCTOBER. | | | | | |
| Fresh meats: | | | | | |
| Beef and veal, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 5,677,461 | 466,987 | ..... |
| Mutton and lamb, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 60,047 | 5,452 | ..... |
| Pork, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 14,699 | 2,218 | ..... |
| Total pounds | ..... | ..... | 5,752,207 | 474,657 | ..... |
| NOVEMBER. | | | | | |
| Fresh meats: | | | | | |
| Beef and veal, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 10,856,516 | 900,296 | ..... |
| Mutton and lamb, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 32,385 | 3,445 | ..... |
| Pork, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 109,832 | 17,332 | ..... |
| Total pounds | ..... | ..... | 10,998,733 | 921,073 | ..... |
| DECEMBER. | | | | | |
| Fresh meats: | | | | | |
| Beef and veal, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 15,483,670 | 1,227,937 | ..... |
| Mutton and lamb, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 441,308 | 34,396 | ..... |
| Pork, lbs., free | ..... | ..... | 104,211 | 14,321 | ..... |
| Total pounds | ..... | ..... | 16,029,189 | 1,275,955 | ..... |

[1] Decrease.

Mr. President, these are all farm products. I have not gone into any others. The tables show the quantity and value of the importations in the same months under the old and new tariff laws and the percentage of increase or decrease for the months following the enactment of the new tariff law commencing with the month of October.

The decreased importations of sugar is significant. The reduction of the duty on sugar did not take effect until March of this year. Therefore no more than absolutely necessary importations of sugar have been made. Foreign sugar will be withheld from shipment or in bond until the lower duty takes effect, when the accumulated supply will be loaded on our markets. The comparative statement as to the other products show a marked increase in nearly all of them, and in some of them the increase is enormous. Take for examples: Grapes, the increase runs from 29 per cent in November to 223 per cent in December. Olives, the greatest increase is in November, and reached 73 per cent. Walnuts, the duty is different on not shelled and shelled. On the unshelled the increase has run up to 181 per cent. On shelled walnuts there has been a decrease, greater in November, being 46 per cent, reduced in December to one-fiftieth of 1 per cent. Evidently importations will increase soon in this case as in the others. In the case of raisins the increase has run up to 165 per cent. Lemon importations have increased 344 per cent. This increase of importations was inevitable. In a speech made by me here when the tariff bill was under discussion I said, after a showing of the facts:

> This shows that it costs the California grower $1 more to grow a box of lemons and prepare it for shipment than it costs a grower in Italy. If we add to this the difference in the freight rate of 84 cents a box that our people must pay with that of 30 cents net that is paid by the importer of lemons from Italy, we have a difference of $1.52 as the cost of production and freight on lemons to New York in favor of the foreign producer.

The duty imposed by the new tariff law is something less than 50 cents a box. The effect of this must be to give over to the importers of foreign lemons, so far as they are able to supply it, the entire eastern market of the country, and enable them to dictate prices when the domestic producer has been driven from the field. This will leave the home producers a limited market, that will prevent further extensions of the industry and render it unprofitable.

In the case of almonds, the increase for the three months has run as high as 223 per cent, depending on the season of the year. The tax of 5 cents a dozen on eggs was entirely taken off and this commonly used food placed on the free list. Under the 5-cent duty no importations were made. Since it was taken off large quantities have been imported, amounting in the month of December to 1,514,296 dozen, valued at $334,315. Of these, in a letter received by me from the Chamber of Commerce of Petaluma, Cal., it is said:

> There have arrived recently in the markets of the coast cities large shipments of eggs imported from China. These eggs cost the importers, we are informed, about 15 cents per dozen at this season of the year, enabling the importer to market them freely and at a handsome profit. They have been selling in San Francisco, Portland, Los Angeles, and other coast cities at a few cents under the price of American eggs, and are used largely by restaurants and bakeries.
>
> The continued importation of Chinese eggs at the low cost quoted will, we are convinced, seriously affect, if not entirely destroy, the very great poultry industry of this section of California. Poultrymen in the Petaluma district alone produce annually upward of 12,000,000 dozen eggs, having a market value of $3,000,000.
>
> Our poultrymen have established the fact that the average cost of producing 1 dozen of the highest quality, large white eggs is 18 cents. To this cost must be added profit for the poultrymen as well as for the retailer. Thus it will be seen that whenever the producer has to sell his eggs under 20 cents he is losing money. He therefore can not compete with the Chinese eggs, and unless some means is found of preventing their importation the California poultrymen must face bankruptcy.
>
> Our information is that the Chinese eggs are produced under conditions that render them unfit for human consumption. The object of this letter is to invite your cooperation in an investigation of this allegation, the purpose being, if the Chinese eggs are found to be unfit for use by the white race, to invoke the pure-food laws and have their importation prohibited.
>
> This is a matter that affects the people of this community vitally, and your active cooperation in the movement here outlined will be fully appreciated.

Shipments of eggs from China have amounted up to January 1, 1914, to 177,935 dozen, and doubtless, as the market is now open, millions more will follow. This is a matter of serious consequence, not only to the State of California, but particularly to the Middle Western States, where this is an important industry.

In the case of oats, the increase in importations has ranged from 61,998 per cent to 666,072 per cent. Wheat has gone to 5,708 per cent; corn from 25,819 bushels to 1,632,643 bushels in November and from 637 bushels to 2,343,444 bushels in December. In the case of cattle, as shown by the statement above, the increase has ranged from 115 to 371 per cent; and in the case of fresh meats of the various kinds, the importations have advanced from nothing under the old tariff to a total of 16,029,189 pounds under the new.

This shows a very serious surrender of our markets to foreign importers. If it were justified by a decrease of cost of these products to the consumer there would be at least a show of justice in the legislation that has brought this about. But there is no such justification or excuse.

Now, Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the other side of the question. Has the consumer benefited by these losses of the home producers or does he pay as much or more for what he gets, to the greater profit of the foreign importers? The conclusive answer to this inquiry comes from the same source. Bulletin 138 of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, comparing the months of September and October, 1912 and 1913, and summarizing prices of food from 1890 to 1913, is as follows:

> RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, 1890 TO OCTOBER, 1913.
>
> Bulletin No. 138, soon to be issued by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows retail prices of the principal articles of food in each of 40 important cities throughout the United States. This bulletin is one of the bureau's regular series on retail prices. It shows actual prices for September and October, 1913, and September and October, 1912, and also summarizes retail prices for the period from 1890 to October, 1913.
>
> Comparing retail prices on October 15, 1913, with prices on the same date 1912, 13 of the 15 articles for which quotations are given advanced and 2 declined in price. Potatoes advanced 42.3 per cent, eggs advanced 14.2 per cent, round steak advanced 12.9 per cent, ham advanced 10.6 per cent, rib roast advanced 8.8 per cent, sirloin steak advanced 8.3 per cent, bacon advanced 8.2 per cent, hens advanced 7.5 per cent, pork chops advanced 6.3 per cent, butter advanced 3.7 per cent, milk advanced 2.7 per cent, corn meal advanced 1.7 per cent, and lard advanced 1 per cent. Sugar declined 8.8 per cent and flour declined 2.6 per cent.
>
> When the price of each of the articles of food is weighted, according to average consumption in workingmen's families, retail prices were at a higher level on October 15, 1913, than at any other time during the last 23 years and 10 months. Retail prices of food on October 15, 1913, were 70.9 per cent above the average price for the 10-year period, 1890 to 1899; 7.9 per cent above the price on October 15, 1912, and 16.9 per cent above the price on October 15, 1911.
>
> The cities for which actual prices are shown are Atlanta, Ga.; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Charleston, S. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; Fall River, Mass.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Kansas City, Mo.; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Cal.; Louisville, Ky.; Manchester, N. H.; Memphis, Tenn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Newark, N. J.; New Haven, Conn.; New Orleans, La.; New York, N. Y.; Omaha, Nebr.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Providence, R. I.; Richmond, Va.; St. Louis, Mo.; St. Paul, Minn.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Francisco, Cal.; Scranton, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.; and Washington, D. C.

Bulletin 140 of the same kind and from the same source, but covering comparison of prices at retail for the months of November and December and containing the general summary as before, contains the following:

> Comparing retail prices on December 15, 1913, with prices on the same date in 1912, 12 of the 15 articles for which quotations are given advanced and 3 declined in price. Potatoes advanced 43.7 per cent, fresh eggs advanced 21.9 per cent, pork chops advanced 16.8 per cent, round steak advanced 13.1 per cent, rib roast advanced 10 per cent, sirloin steak advanced 8.9 per cent, ham advanced 7.9 per cent, hens advanced 6.7 per cent, corn meal advanced 6.6 per cent, bacon advanced 4.5 per cent, milk advanced 1.9 per cent, and lard advanced 0.7 per cent. Sugar declined 8.6 per cent, butter declined 2.9 per cent, and flour declined 0.6 per cent.
>
> When the price of each of the 15 articles of food is weighted according to average consumption in workingmen's families, retail prices were at a higher level on December 15, 1913, than at any other time during the 24 years preceding, with the single exception of November 15, 1913, when they reached the maximum of 72.8 per cent above the average for 1890 to 1899. Retail prices of food on December 15, 1913, were 71.7 per cent above the average price for the 10-year period 1890 to 1899; 9 per cent above the price on December 15, 1912; and 14.5 per cent above the price on December 15, 1911.

I have been unable to trace the comparative prices to consumers of all of the articles mentioned in the tables I have presented. No account of them is made in any of the departments of the Government except those mentioned in the above bulletins. But I have ascertained the effect of the low tariff on lemons and the consequent increased importations of that fruit. The tariff was reduced more than two-thirds. The duty was made so low that, so far as the markets of the eastern cities are concerned, they might just as well have been put on the free list so far as it affects the home producers. The above tables show that it has brought about an enormous increase of importations. The alleged reason for reducing the duty on lemons was to reduce the price to the consumer. But just the opposite effect has been produced, as might have been known. We were unwise enough to give up our own markets to foreign importers and thus place our own producers and the consumers at their mercy. The result so far is that a comparison of the retail prices of 27 representative cities for the months of October, November, and December, 1912, and the same months of 1913, the former under the old tariff law and the latter under the new, shows that instead of reducing the price of lemons to the consumer the price has increased 3 cents a dozen. I have no

doubt that if the data could be gathered it would show a like effect of the reduction of duties on other fruits and other articles produced in California.

So, Mr. President, we have an increase of importations by which our people are losing their home market and prices to the consumers steadily increasing. This proves that what is taken from domestic producers does not go to consumers, but redounds to the benefit of the importers of foreign goods, or middlemen, and ultimately the evil effects of such legislation reaches the man who labors to produce the domestic article in the form of lower wages and often the loss of employment. It is not a pleasing prospect.

But to make matters worse, while our home producers are being rapidly crowded out of the market and prices to the consumer are climbing higher and higher instead of being reduced by the reduction of the tariff, as the people were promised, the Government is losing millions of dollars of revenue on account of the reduced duties on foreign goods. The following figures furnished by the Treasury Department tell the melancholy story:

| Customs: | | Customs: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Oct., 1913 | $30,138,049.37 | Oct., 1912 | $30,216,824.02 |
| Nov., 1913 | 21,173,627.85 | Nov., 1912 | 25,666,353.25 |
| Dec., 1913 | 21,510,139.99 | Dec., 1912 | 24,248,161.30 |
| Jan., 1914 | 23,528,079.83 | Jan., 1913 | 29,334,124.09 |
| Total | 96,349,897.04 | Total | 109,465,462.66 |

This shows that for the four months following the enactment of the new tariff law the Government lost the considerable sum of $13,115,565.62. At this rate, which will grow greater rather than less, the Government stands to lose $39,346,696.86, not including the loss from putting sugar on the free list.

But this is only a small proportion of the loss in revenue that will result from the act. The revenue derived from the duty on sugar in 1912 was $50,951,199. It is estimated that reduction in the duty on sugar, which has now taken effect, will reduce the income from sugar to $40,196,000, making a loss of $10,755,199. The revenue derived from duty on wool from 1912 was $48,361,374. The estimate of receipts under the present law as now in force is $35,745,000, making a loss of $12,616,374. But wool did not go on the free list until December, 1913, and therefore the figures of the Treasury Department, showing a loss of $13,115,565.62 for the four months, includes only two months of the loss on wool. With the full amount of the loss from placing both wool and sugar on the free list, we shall have a total loss upon those two articles of $99,314,573, and the total loss of revenue will amount to $130,598,907.86.

So, Mr. President, while this law is in force no one will be benefited in the least by this great loss except foreign importers, and both our producers and consumers will lose even more; and Democratic politicians are actually trying to make the people of the country believe this is a good law and in their interest. They might hope to succeed but for the actual figures that can not be disputed.

THE INCOME-TAX LAW.

The income-tax law was made necessary by the reduction of the duties on foreign goods. In other words, the people of the country are compelled to make up in direct taxation what the Government loses by a reduction of the duties. This proves the insincerity of the Democratic doctrine of a tariff, not for protection of our home industry, but for revenue only. If the tariff is for revenue, it should be made to produce the revenues needed. There was no excuse, in this view of it, for placing on the free list articles that produced revenue and could not in any way affect the price of the articles to the consumer, or for reducing duties that worked no injury to anybody at home. This was done in many instances. The taxpayers of the country do not relish the idea of making up in direct taxation for the mistake of a Democratic administration of a useless reduction of tariff rates that does no one any good except the importers of foreign goods. The provision requiring the withholding of moneys due to taxpayers, without their consent, at the source is peculiarly offensive and has caused much unfavorable comment. The whole act was made so complicated and unsatisfactory that Democratic officials have been busy ever since it was enacted trying to explain its provisions sufficiently to enable people who desired to comply with its requirements to make the necessary statement of their incomes. These complications, difficulties, and embarrassments will not be kindly tolerated by people who are, without reason, called upon to assume the burdens of direct taxation only because of the reduction of tariff duties.

It is too early to say whether the amount realized from direct taxation will make up the deficiencies resulting from the tariff reductions. It is being whispered about that the actual collections from incomes will fall far short of the estimates on which the bill was founded and that the loss of tariff revenues and the shortage under the income-tax law will result in a deficiency in the Treasury. The great falling off of revenues derived from tariff duties is a certainty. The effect upon this condition of collections under the income-tax law can not now be determined. If the people shall be compelled to bear the burden of income taxes and the revenues still fall short of the needed amount, their dissatisfaction at being thus unnecessarily burdened will be increased.

The imposition of an income tax is attempted to be justified on the ground that the man who makes more than $4,000 a year should bear a greater share in proportion of the burdens of taxation than the man who makes less. That is true if we have reached a time in this country when we are willing, and believe it to be just, to penalize a citizen for being frugal, enterprising, and prosperous. I believe we have reached a point where immense incomes, not acquired by thrift and industry, but by the mere accumulation of millions without effort, should be penalized. Such vast accumulations of wealth should be discouraged and prevented if possible. But this does not apply to the smaller incomes produced by legitimate industry and enterprise and right business or other pursuits open to an American citizen. Such efforts should be encouraged, not penalized. With such, as compared with those realizing a lesser income, the burdens of Government should be equal. Whether an income-tax law is justifiable or not under a Government like ours, where it is necessary to increase the revenues, may be a matter of doubt. But in this case it was only made necessary by a reduction of tariff revenues that was entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable. And everybody knows that an additional burden of taxation imposed on any business is carried on to the consumers or the employees of the business. So at last the latter are compelled to carry it.

THE CURRENCY BILL.

The banking and currency bill was another sore disappointment to most of those who really understood its provisions. The people generally do not understand it or how its passage was brought about. The interests, the bankers and others, who succeeded in having their way about it, have seen to it that the newspapers, generally subsidized by these interests, make it appear to be in the interest of the general public. Some legislation on this subject was demanded chiefly for the purpose of freeing the public from the domination and control of Wall Street and the national banking interest. This law, instead of having this effect, so generally desired, has placed the country more firmly in the grip of those interests, by placing in their hands and under their management and control the immense power of the regional banks with their millions of capital and deposits.

Whether this law results in any benefit to the people must therefore depend entirely upon the conduct of bankers who manage them. The Government is given no adequate or efficient control over them, and the people none at all. Private individuals are allowed to take stock in the banks only in case the existing banks do not take it all, and even then their stock is denied any voting power. They have no right to participate in the election of the directors or other officers of the banks. This power is given over completely to the banks, to the exclusion of the private holders of stock. One of the leading magazines, speaking in commendation of the bill, very truly said:

> They will be banks of banks—banks owned by banks, conducted primarily by banks, and doing business only with banks.

They are not Government banks. They are not people's banks. They are banks' banks. If that is what the people of this country want, then the law is a good one that gives them what they want. But it was not what Congress wanted. The passage of it was an abject surrender to Wall Street and the banking interests. A Democratic Senator, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, declared on the floor of the Senate, when the bill was on its passage, that unless it was passed in that form the banks would not support it. It could not have been passed except under the coercion of a secret caucus. The issue between Government and bank control was sharply drawn. The Committee on Banking and Currency, composed of 12 members, was evenly divided on the subject, 5 Republicans and 1 Democrat reporting in favor of Government control with the right of the people to subscribe the stock, and 6 Democrats for bank control and the denial of the right of the people to subscribe for the stock. A majority of the Senate was undoubtedly opposed to bank control, but in a caucus a majority of the Democratic Senators could be induced to support it. Why? Because if they did not the banks would not come into the system, and the Democratic Party must pass some kind of a banking and currency bill to satisfy the public demand. A majority of the Democrats could bind the others in a secret caucus, and, thus bound, the bill could be and was

passed. It was in this way that they surrendered completely to the banks, and the banks have come into the scheme with the greatest pleasure.

The people are deceived into the belief that the banks will be under the control of the Government because a reserve board is provided for, to be appointed by the President. This is a fallacious belief. The law provides specifically that "every Federal reserve bank shall be conducted under the supervision and control of a board of directors." It also provides how the board shall be selected. They are divided into classes A, B, and C. "Class A shall consist of three members, who shall be chosen by and be representative of the stockholding banks. Class B shall consist of three members, who, at the time of their election, shall be actively engaged in their district in commerce, agriculture, or some other industrial pursuit." They also are selected by the banks. It seems to be supposed that to require the three class B directors to be engaged in commercial business "at the time of their election" will in some way safeguard the public interests. I do not see how. They are not forbidden to be bankers, and need not continue in commercial pursuits. They are selected by the banks and will no doubt be controlled by them. "Class C shall consist of three members, who shall be designated by the Federal Reserve Board." That is to say, the banks have two-thirds of the members of the board of directors and the Government one-third. Not much Government control in that situation. It should not be overlooked that one of the directors chosen by the reserve board is required to be a banker, or, as the bill says, "of tested banking experience." It is too evident to need comment that these provisions of the act were made in the interest of the banks and at their dictation. The provision giving the banks full control of the regional banks was forced into the act by the threats of bankers that they would not come into the scheme if they were not given control of the new banks and the Democratic Party bowed to the will of Wall Street and the interests, and gave them control.

The Federal Reserve Board is composed of seven members, two of whom are the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Currency. The other five members, two of whom must be, and all may be, bankers, are required to give their whole time to the work. The powers of the reserve board are specifically stated in the law. I undertake to say that they are no greater or more effective than the power and control of the Secretary of the Treasury and Comptroller of the Currency over national banks under the national banking laws. The board has a general supervision of the reserve banks and may suspend and reorganize any one of the banks for cause, but this is no more than the comptroller can do in the case of national banks. The fact still remains that the business of the banks, their daily transactions, will be, must be, governed and controlled by the national banks who hold their stock and elect two-thirds of their directors. It is bank ownership and control with Government supervision and regulation just as in case of national banks.

The banks and bankers who own and control the reserve banks may make them instruments for the public good. Whether they will or not remains to be seen. Experience teaches us that they will whenever it is to their own interests as well as the interests of the public, but not otherwise. The powerful banking interests have been the friends, financial agents, and supporters of the great trusts. They will continue to be so under the reserve-banking law with the added power the new banks give them. The law affords no protection against this use of their power. It is suggested that the establishment of the regional banks will, or I had better say may, serve to break up the enormous reserves held in the great banks in New York and Chicago and distribute them to different parts of the country. Let us hope that at least this expectation will be realized to some extent. But at best it can only be to a very limited extent when the enormous financial and business transactions of the country are considered. The overpowering influence of the great financial institutions of New York will undoubtedly continue to control and dominate the situation in the future as they have in the past unless prevented by other laws, notwithstanding this new banking law. This command of the situation might be overcome, at least in part, by laws severing the connection of banking institutions and the trusts and utility corporations. But this bill not only does not do anything of this kind, but leaves the banks at full liberty to promote and support these offending aggregations of wealth and strengthens their power in this respect by turning over to them the reserve banks.

Mr. President, there is another phase of this question that has received but little attention, and that is the enormous cost to the public of establishing and maintaining the reserve banks. According to my observation since I have been a Member of the Senate the matter of cost, when the people must foot the bills, does not, as a rule, receive very serious consideration. The bill provides for at least 8 reserve banks, with the privilege on the part of the reserve board to increase the number to 12. No doubt the number will be increased to the limit. It is ever so when additional Government agencies are provided for. Let us, for the purpose in hand, take the minimum and not the maximum number. But there is something more coming. The bill provides:

Each Federal reserve bank shall establish branch banks within the Federal reserve district in which it is located and may do so in the district of any Federal reserve bank which may have been suspended. Such branches shall be operated by a board of directors under rules and regulations approved by the Federal Reserve Board. Directors of branch banks shall possess the same qualifications as directors of the Federal reserve banks. Four of said directors shall be selected by the reserve bank and three by the Federal Reserve Board, and they shall hold office during the pleasure, respectively, of the parent bank and the Federal Reserve Board. The reserve bank shall designate one of the directors as manager.

Under this section the reserve banks are compelled to establish branch banks within their respective districts, and the number that may be set up is not limited. Each of these must have seven directors, and four, or a majority of them, are selected by the banks, thus giving them the control of the branches. Now, suppose we consider, just a little, the cost of it all. Whatever the cost is, it must be borne by the people, who are forbidden to exercise any control of the banks or their branches. It is a new burden placed upon the business of the country. To begin with, we have the salaries of the members of the reserve board. Five of the members receive $12,000 a year and traveling expenses. There is added to the salary of the Comptroller of the Currency, as extra compensation for his work on the board, $7,000. So we have an expense, for the salaries of the members of the reserve board alone, of $67,000 a year. This does not include the traveling expenses, rents, office force, fees for attorneys that the board is authorized to employ, and a multitude of other expenses. Congress knows only too well how they grow and multiply. It is fair to say that the expense of this board alone will amount to $100,000 a year. This is a very moderate estimate. Then we have at least eight banks and the same number of branch banks. The former may be increased by four and the latter without limit. The banks must have a board of nine and the branches seven directors, with a president for each, with cashiers, clerks, bookkeepers, and the many other officers and employees necessary to man a bank, all of whom must be paid. Then banking houses must be provided and furnished, and all other expenses of maintaining and carrying on the numerous banks and branches must be met. To add to the unnecessary and already enormous expenses, an advisory council of 1 from each reserve district, 8 or 12, as the case may be—probably 12—is provided for, "who shall receive such compensation and allowances as may be fixed by his board of directors, subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there for an observation? Does not the Senator realize that all the expense of the reserve banks will have to be paid out of the profits of the reserve banks; that those profits will accrue from the reserves of the national banks and the capital which they put into the reserve banks; and that, consequently, so far as that feature of the question is concerned, it is no expense whatever to the Government?

Mr. WORKS. I was just coming to that.

How much this may be we do not know, but bankers come high, and we may be sure the amount paid for advice from gentlemen distinguished for their ability to give it will not be small. It will be seen readily that all this runs up into the millions every year. It will be said that the expenses will be paid out of the earnings of the banks. But, sir, from whom are these earnings derived, and who receives the profits? The earnings come from and are a burden on the business of the country, and are ultimately charged up to and paid by the ultimate consumers and contribute to the high cost of living. Besides the expenses, they are taxed with the profits, which go to the banks, up to 6 per cent. If anything more is made, then and then only does the Government derive any benefit from it. If the banks make more than 6 per cent profit, then the burden is excessive and should not be allowed. The incidental benefit to the Government of the excessive profits can not meet the heavy expenses borne by the country, and if it does it amounts to a direct tax on the people and is unjust and inexcusable. The matter of profits is thus provided for in the act:

After all necessary expenses of a Federal reserve bank have been paid or provided for the stockholders shall be entitled to receive an annual dividend of 6 per cent on the paid-in capital stock, which dividend shall be cumulative. After the aforesaid dividend claims

have been fully met, all of the net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax, except that one-half of such net earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 40 per cent of the paid-in capital stock of such bank.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does not the Senator recognize that whatever charge there may be it will not be upon the individual borrower? No individual can go to a Federal reserve bank and borrow a dollar. The new system has been created for the purpose of relieving runs upon the banks; it is the banks that will have to pay; and, consequently, the burden will be no greater than the demand which will be made by the banks.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is altogether mistaken. You must trace these expenses back to the people who support the banks by the payment of interest and otherwise. The loans that are secured from the national banks and other banks are carried on the books of the reserve banks, and therefore the people support them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but these banks——

Mr. WORKS. Well, Mr. President, I shall have to decline to be interrupted further. I am perfectly willing to answer any questions, but I do not want to indulge in a discussion of the matter at this point.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, it is claimed for the act that it will provide a sufficient reserve fund from which to draw in case of need and thereby prevent money panics. Under the present law every national bank is required to maintain in its vaults a reserve that has been regarded as sufficient to meet such emergencies. It has not been the fault of the law that depositors and others have not been protected in this way. It has been largely, if not entirely, the fault of the banks and bankers.

It has been the policy of the banks whenever a money stringency occurred, or was even threatened, to add to it by withholding further loans, drawing in those already made, and hoarding their money by the millions when business and personal demands of the people, whose money they held in their vaults and who were entitled to receive it, needed to have it. Their methods in this respect were most arbitrary and unjust. It was cowardly. They were afraid, and their fears added to the scare and precipitated the panic that they should, and generally could, have avoided. Now, it is proposed to take the money of these same banks, not other or additional money, and put it into other banks and expect thereby to change the timid natures of the bankers and avoid panics. And to make that result perfectly sure we put the new banks and reserves in the hands of these same bankers to operate and control. They will doubtless control these banks just about as they have the others, making a sure profit for themselves and rendering the banks useless as public agencies when they are most needed. The money paid for the stock of the new banks, it must be understood, is paid out of the money of the old banks. It is simply a transfer of the money from one set of banks to the other. It is quite true that if a single bank should get into financial difficulties it could unload its securities onto the reserve banks under this law, thus securing the cash it needs without drawing in its loans. But this aid is now almost uniformly extended to such banks by other banks in the vicinity for their own protection. This is a condition easily met without the aid of this law. When the panic is general and banks all over the country are threatened the reserve banks will be just as helpless as the others. About the only good this law will do in this particular will be to stiffen up the backbones of the bankers, give them courage, and thereby avoid the panics that their own fears bring on. But when the test comes and the law and the reserve banks fail of their object this effect will be gone.

The provision for issuing reserve notes, for which securities must be furnished by the reserve banks, is an aid to be extended by the Government, and will, in case of necessity, be helpful. But this elaborate and expensive banking system was wholly unnecessary for that purpose. The National Treasury has for years extended aid by way of advancing money in case of stringency and threatened panic. All that was necessary was amendments to the then law authorizing the Treasury Department to extend such aid. In fact, this whole matter of giving needed relief in case of panic should have been vested in the Government through its lawfully constituted departments. If a bank should have been necessary as a means to this end, it could have been provided for and made a branch of the Treasury Department. Thus we could have accomplished everything that can be accomplished under this law with one-hundredth part of the expense and with far greater safety. But that would not have furnished salaries to hundreds of bankers and others or 6 per cent interest to the banks, that the people must pay in the end, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, this law is not in the interest of the public, but of the bankers. They get most all of the salaries and the profits. The people get nothing but the hope that it may prevent a panic maybe once in 10 years. For this they pay millions of dollars every year. If the President and Congress had possessed the courage to do what the majority wanted to do and knew ought to be done, namely, establish one strong central bank, the stock to be subscribed by the people instead of the banks, that could meet impartially any financial trouble that might arise anywhere all over the country, the administration would have done at least one thing in the public interest. But our Democratic friends lacked the courage of their convictions. They surrendered to the banks, and the people must suffer the consequences.

RAID ON CIVIL SERVICE.

One of the worst features of the two important laws I have been considering—the tariff, including the income-tax law, and the banking and currency act—is their deliberate attempt to limit and eventually overthrow the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations. In the income-tax law it is provided in terms that appointments of the force of agents, deputy collectors, inspectors, and other employees shall be made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, thus throwing this army of employees open to the spoils system. The Republican Members of Congress earnestly protested against this breaking down of the classified service. Several amendments were offered by Republican Senators to bring these appointments under the classified service, but they were all voted down by Democratic votes. There was no reason for taking these employees out of the civil service except to give the jobs to Democrats for political purposes. There are something like 300 of these employees thus placed under the spoils system, instead of subjecting them to competitive examinations and appointing them on their merits by the Civil Service Commission. The same controversy arose over the banking and currency bill. The Republicans in the Senate again contended that the large number of subordinate employees made necessary by the act should be selected from the classified list under the civil-service laws. This was voted down. But our Democratic friends were beginning to be a little timid of public sentiment. The income-tax law in this particular had been strongly and very generally condemned as a raid on the civil service. So they compromised. They wanted the jobs. They wanted them awfully bad. There were so many of their constituents clamoring for jobs that they needed some places to put them. They lacked the courage to take the employees to be appointed out of the civil service, so they provided:

All such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, and other employes shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883 (vol. 22, U. S. Stat. L., p. 403), and amendments thereto, or any rule or regulation made in pursuance thereof.

The act referred to in this clause is the act establishing the civil service. Therefore the civil-service law, rules, and regulations are expressly set aside by the act and the employees, that will run up into the hundreds, opened to the spoils system. But in order to save their faces and avoid public censure the Democrats, pressed by the protests of Republican Members, inserted the clause:

*Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the President from placing said employees in the classified service.

This was an unworthy shifting of the responsibility to the President. After declaring, in express terms, that the appointments should not be subject to the civil-service law they said that notwithstanding Congress had provided it should not be done the President might place them in the classified service. The country, and especially the great mass of the people who detest the spoils system and believe in the civil service, will await with interest the action or nonaction of the President under this proviso.

The urgent deficiency bill furnishes another case of the same kind. When the bill was on its passage the following rider was offered by a Democratic Member of the House and passed both Houses and became a part of the law:

All Executive orders heretofore made placing the positions of deputy marshals and deputy internal-revenue collectors in the classified service, and all regulations made thereunder, are hereby revoked, and hereafter appointments to said positions shall be made in the same manner as obtained prior to the making of such Executive orders.

The author of the amendment made the following frank statement of the reason for offering it:

I know that there is no office, in my judgment, under Democratic administration that could not be better filled by a Democrat than by a Republican. If you can call that the spoils system, you are welcome to so denominate it.

The amendment was subsequently enlarged so as to allow collectors and marshals to discharge all subordinate employees in addition to deputies, and to appoint their successors without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations.

The National Civil Service Reform League telegraphed the President, protesting against this further invasion of the civil service, as follows:

On behalf of the National Civil Service Reform League I earnestly urge that you veto urgent deficiency appropriation bill, because of provision exempting from civil-service law subordinates of collectors of internal revenue and marshals. Provision affects not only deputies, but all subordinates of collectors and marshals, and is a vicious attack on merit system through rider legislation.

In reply the President said:

I am convinced, after a careful examination of the facts, that the offices of deputy collector and deputy marshal were never intended to be included under the ordinary provisions of the civil-service law.

In commenting on this case the North American Review said:

Why did President Wilson permit this backward step to be taken? That is the question. By a nod of his head he could have beaten it in the House of Representatives, where a change of only three votes would have prevented its passage. But no intimation was forthcoming, and the obnoxious "rider" was made a law of the land by the signature at the bottom of "Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States," to which should have been added, for the making of a complete record, "Former vice president of the National Civil Service Reform League."

But, Mr. President, the evident intent of the Democratic Party to break down and destroy the civil service has been manifested in other ways than by direct legislative enactment. There are thousands of assistant postmasters in the country now under the classified service. The Democratic House deliberately attempted to remove all these from that service and make the offices the prey of the hungry office seekers. And I have no doubt that this would have been done but for the fact that the wave of indignation and protest all over the country was such that no political party could ignore it, and the President and Postmaster General were forced by public sentiment to call off this further raid on the civil service. And, as I shall show further along, the President's word is law to this Democratic Congress.

It is singular that this should have occurred under the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, former vice president of the National Civil Service Reform League, and now claiming to be the head and leader of the Democratic Party. The platform of that party declares:

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rightly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party.

That was worthy of a great reform party, and it sounds well. But it was no better than this declaration in a letter from the President to the National Civil Service Reform League as late as October 22, 1913:

My warm advocacy and support both of the principle and of the bona fide practice of civil-service reform is known to the whole country, and there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance.

Again the President said, in speaking of the civil-service act:

The President may accept its directions or not, as he pleases. The only force that can hold him to the observance of its principles is the force of public opinion.

Public opinion was not strong enough to "hold him to the observance of its principles" when the question was squarely presented to him by the income-tax act, the banking and currency act, and the urgent deficiency act. They were all most flagrant violations of the principles of the civil service. Protests were urged, amongst others, by the National Civil Service League against this breach of the law. He approved them, notwithstanding his declaration that "there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance." I do not know that he connived at this invasion of the civil-service law, in advance, but he did approve it by signing all of the bills with these objectionable provisions in them—provisions that would have been omitted, as in case of assistant postmasters, if he had said the word.

There is another thing that shows with equal clearness that the spoils system has crept in with the approval and by the act of the President himself. There has been much criticism and unfavorable comment in respect of the appointment of Democrats to diplomatic and consular posts. They constitute the most flagrant abuses of the merit system of appointment. To the higher places most of the favored ones were probably appointed because of their large contributions to the Democratic campaign fund or their political activity, others on the ground of personal friendship. I think it can fairly be said that none of them were appointed on merit alone. That is not to say that they are not good men; but they were in most, if not all, cases inexperienced, and for that reason would have been unfit under any fair rule of appointment on merit.

The able editor of the North American Review, himself a Democrat, has this to say on this subject, under the heading "Political debauchery in Latin America":

We come now to the branch of the Diplomatic Service whose reformation upon a higher plane, initiated by Secretary Hay and scrupulously safeguarded by Secretary ROOT and Secretary KNOX, with the full approval of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, reflects the highest credit upon the Republican Party—and, alas, the scene changes. We refer, of course, to the Latin-American missions, obviously the most delicate and difficult of all in the present state of our relationship to the smaller Republics of the Western Hemisphere. It was to the changes in these posts that President Eliot took exception in his report to the Civil Service Reform League.

He then proceeds to compare the men appointed with those displaced by them, showing the superior qualifications of the old officers as compared with the new, and concludes:

The average experience of the former ministers to these South and Central American Republics was 15¼ years, and their average age at the time of their expulsion was 47. All spoke the language of the countries to which they were accredited. The average age of the new ministers is 54½, five being past 60; no one of them, we believe, understands Spanish; and none, of course, has had diplomatic experience. In other words, 12 trained and capable representatives, several of whom entered the service under competitive examinations and all of whom had long since forsaken partisanship, are superseded by mere party hacks whose ages clearly disqualify them for continuance in office for sufficient time to equip themselves for proper performance of their duties. A clearer case of partisan political debauchery can not be imagined.

This is a fair statement of the case. It is none too strong. It presents a sad case of the spoils system in its worst form. The victors are given the spoils. No more aggravated case of the iniquitous spoils system of rewarding politicians for political work done could be conceived. If Andrew Jackson has been permitted to look down on the performance he must have smiled his approval. Unless he has reformed in the beyond, he must have been delighted at the spectacle.

PATRONAGE.

Akin to the question of the civil service is that of patronage. The law providing for the examination of applicants for positions under the Government and appointments on their merits was intended as far as possible to put an end to the disgraceful and demoralizing spoils system under which places were given out by successful politicians as rewards for party or personal political services. The wisdom of such a law was never more fully exemplified than by the scramble for office and place under the present administration and the manner in which the places have been filled. There never was a more partisan administration of the Government than the present one. I have already pointed out its unfortunate lowering of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. It has been even more deadly in its effects upon the service generally. I can not, I need not, go into details of the demands for places under the Government and the methods resorted to to obtain them. Every Member of this body has been witness to it, especially the Democratic Members who have suffered most from it, and who, I am sure, deplore it as much as I do, although because of the system of appointments that prevails they have been forced to become parties to it.

Mr. President, I have offered a remedy for much of the evil flowing from this disgraceful and degrading condition. I have offered a bill providing for a commission to sift out the applicants for appointments and recommend to the President the best man for appointment in each case, and forbidding Members of Congress to recommend or aid in securing the appointment of anyone to office, and also forbidding anyone to apply to them for aid or recommendation. The bill is so manifestly in the interest of the President, of Members of Congress, and of the public service that I had hoped the Democratic majority would take it up and pass it. But, like hundreds of other meritorious bills, it slumbers in committee without action upon it one way or the other. The necessity of some such law was borne in upon me just lately by one typical case. Under the income-tax law, which, as I have pointed out, provides for appointments in internal-revenue offices, under the spoils system perpetuated in the income-tax law, there were a number to be appointed under one of the collectors of internal revenue in California. The appointments could not be made by the collector, who was responsible for the conduct of the office. They must be made by the commissioner at Washington, who, of course, knew nothing of the merits or competency of the applicants for the places. The collector happened to be an old-time friend of mine, and he wrote me that he had recommended certain people for appointment to places under him and asked me to try to have the commissioner appoint them, as he had selected them for their competency and efficiency. I wrote to the commissioner, saying, in substance, that I knew the collector well and that he could be trusted to select the right kind of people to serve under him, and that he would be responsible for the conduct of the

office, that he must handle millions of dollars, and had given a large bond, and therefore his recommendations might well be followed. This polite communication did not meet with the courtesy of a reply. Much to my astonishment, I learned a few days later that the Democratic Members of the House from California had claimed these appointments as part of their patronage and had named the people they wanted the commissioner to appoint, all different from those recommended by the collector. I took up the matter with one of the Members of Congress and protested earnestly against this manner of imposing employees on a public official as rewards for political work. He finally said he would give up one of his places to the collector, thus allowing him one employee of his own selection. There were 15 or 16 to be appointed. I again wrote the commissioner, protesting against this mode of farming out places in the public service. This letter was not quite as polite as the first one, because I was indignant, but it met with a like fate. It was not answered. What has been done about the appointments I have not been informed.

I hope, Mr. President, that this is an extreme case and that there is none other so bad. But this one shows quite conclusively the evil effects of placing these appointments, hundreds of them, under the dishonored spoils system instead of the civil service. It is a serious reflection on this administration that opportunity for such methods should have been authorized by law.

THE SECRET CAUCUS.

Mr. President, I come now to a brief consideration of the secret caucus as a means of promoting or enforcing legislation. It is a fit companion to the spoils system of appointments. It does not pass laws on their merits. It forces them through almost always against the judgment and conscience of a majority of the legislative body, because if the majority favors any given measure no caucus rule is necessary. It is not new, but it is none the less a great evil. In this administration it has assumed its worst form. It has been resorted to perhaps more frequently, under more objectionable circumstances and in less excusable cases, than ever before. There is some excuse for caucus rule in case of purely political questions or in the election of officers of a legislative body, but there is none whatever when legislation involving vital principles or any other nonpolitical question is concerned. In such cases it is vicious and inexcusable. This has been the most prominent and most unfortunate feature of legislation under this administration. Neither the tariff bill nor the banking and currency bill would have been passed in the form in which they were enacted but for the coercive use and effect of the secret Democratic caucus. We would not have had on the free list many of the articles placed there by this act, and the reductions in other cases would have been kept within reasonable limits and not made destructive of our home industries as they are now. Neither would Congress have bowed the knee and surrendered to the moneyed interests of the country the ownership and control of the reserve banks with the enormous power that goes with them.

There is another feature of the secret caucus, as used in this administration, that intensifies and multiplies its evil effects. They have not been the free and voluntary actions of even a majority of the Democrats of either House of Congress. The power of the executive department has forced caucus action with the very purpose of coercing Members of Congress to do the will of the President in the passage of laws. So we have two illegitimate forces at work to circumvent the majority in Congress and compel the enactment of important legislation against their will. It is not a pleasant thing to think about. Such methods have no legitimate place in the making of laws in a free Republic. The independence of every American citizen should rise up against it.

EXECUTIVE DOMINATION OF CONGRESS.

Mr. President, I come now to comment on what I consider one of the most important of the questions that are confronting Congress to-day, if not the most important of them all, and that is the evident purpose of the Executive to dominate and control the legislative branch of the Government. I have had occasion to speak of it before and since this administration came into power. It was bad enough under previous administrations, but in this one it has increased a hundredfold over anything that has been known in the past. This dominating influence has become so insistent and continuous, and has been submitted to so slavishly by the majority of Congress, that the independence and usefulness of the legislative branch of the Government are both threatened. It has been so asserted and exercised and obediently submitted to that we have come perilously near to a dictatorship. The President has not contented himself by advising what measures should be considered by Congress and vetoing them if they do not meet his approval, as the Constitution authorizes him to do. He has demanded that certain legislation shall be enacted, has insisted upon Congress remaining in session until the laws he insists upon are enacted, and the secret caucus is made the instrument with which to enforce his will. As a consequence we have laws on the statute books that are in effect, and in reality, Executive orders and not legislative acts. They are legislation of and enacted by the executive department and not by Congress. It is a condition that should attract the serious attention of the whole country. We have three distinct departments of government. They were intended by the framers of the Constitution to be independent of each other. It has, up to a very late period, been regarded as absolutely necessary to the liberty of the people and the public welfare that this independence should be maintained. A few days ago we listened to the reading in this Chamber of Washington's Farewell Address. In the course of that address he says:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against the invasions of the others has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates; but let there be no change by usurpation, for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

This solemn declaration of so evident a truth that seems to have been forgotten by some should be taken to heart now as never before in the history of our country.

The Supreme Court of the United States is even more emphatic in declaring the separation of the departments of Government and their independence. In the case of Kilbourn v. Thompson (103 U. S., 168, 190) this is said on the subject:

> It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law that all the powers intrusted to government, whether State or National, are divided into the three grand departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons intrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other. To these general propositions there are in the Constitution of the United States some important exceptions. One of these is that the President is so far made a part of the legislative power that his assent is required to the enactment of all statutes and resolutions of Congress.
>
> This, however, is so only to a limited extent, for a bill may become a law, notwithstanding the refusal of the President to approve it, by a vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress.
>
> So also, the Senate is made a partaker in the functions of appointing officers and making treaties, which are supposed to be properly executive, by requiring its consent to the appointment of such officers and the ratification of treaties. The Senate also exercises the judicial power of trying impeachments and the House of preferring articles of impeachment.
>
> In the main, however, that instrument, the model on which are constructed the fundamental laws of the States, has blocked out with singular precision and in bold lines in its three primary articles the allotment of power to the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of the Government. It also remains true, as a general rule, that the powers confided by the Constitution to one of these departments can not be exercised by another.
>
> It may be said that these are truisms which need no repetition here to give them force. But while the experience of almost a century has in general shown a wise and commendable forbearance in each of these branches from encroachments upon the others, it is not to be denied that such attempts have been made, and it is believed not always without success. The increase in the number of States, in their population and wealth and in the amount of power, if not in its nature to be exercised by the Federal Government, presents powerful and growing temptations to those to whom that exercise is intrusted to overstep the just boundaries of their own department, and enter upon the domain of one of the others, or to assume powers not intrusted to either of them.

But more conclusive still to the Democratic Party and its leader should be these declarations contained in its national platform:

> We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Our platform is one of principles, which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the

cooperation of all citizens, regardless of party, who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

It would seem that nothing more need be said on the subject. But, sir, there is a feeling, not without foundation, that there should be a closer relation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in the making of the laws. To this end it has from time to time been suggested that members of the President's Cabinet should be authorized by law to sit in Congress, to take part in the discussion of public questions, and be subject to inquiry on any subject that may arise. This would enable the executive department to present the views of that department to Congress, in an orderly way, in dealing with public questions, and at the same time put it in the power of Congress to test the knowledge of the representatives of the Executive and the wisdom or accuracy of their views. I am not going to discuss that question. I am not prepared to say that it might not be a good thing if authorized by law. But such necessity for participation in the framing of the laws by the executive department, if it exists, can be no justification or excuse for interference with legislation by that department without authority of law. Neither can good intentions affect the question. If such efforts to control legislation are wrong, unauthorized by law, and dangerous, as I maintain they are, the sentiment that prompts them can not affect the question further than to mitigate or aggravate the offense in the individual case.

INDIFFERENCE AND INEFFICIENCY.

Mr. President, one of the most striking features of the work of this body at this time is the apparent apathy and lack of interest in the work before it. This is not confined to the Democratic side of the Chamber. It extends to and affects the whole Senate in the performance of its duties. But it is more pronounced and more general on the other side of the Chamber. Seats in the Chamber are vacant for days, sometimes for weeks, at a time. Senators will not listen to discussions of questions of the greatest importance and most vital to the interests of the country. The Senate seems to have lost snap and vigor and industry. Committees are poorly attended. Quorums are obtained in case of the most important committees with the greatest difficulty, and a prompt meeting of a committee at the time it is called to meet is practically unknown. Some committees having important business before them do not meet at all. The Committee on the District of Columbia, one of the large and very important committees of the Senate, having to do with the vast and important interests of the District, is one of these. There have been over a hundred bills referred to that committee this Congress, some of them very important ones, and only four of them have been reported out. The committee has had but one meeting during this session of Congress. These conditions did not exist under the last Republican administration. Committees met with regularity, and usually in the more important committees a quorum was present. One of the peculiar phases of the present situation is that while the Democrats are in the majority and have larger representation on the committees there are almost invariably more Republicans than Democrats present at committee meetings. It is evident that our friends on the other side of the Chamber do not like committee work.

Now, Mr. President, what is the cause of this condition of stagnation, lack of interest, and consequent inefficiency in the work of the Senate? It was claimed here on the floor only a short time ago, I believe by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], that it was because our system of procedure by committees is a failure. But, sir, I do not believe that is the cause of the inefficiency that exists. It is the result rather than the cause. Work through committees fails only because that work is not well done. No better means of facilitating the work of Congress has been suggested and probably none will be found.

No, Mr. President, that is not the cause nor reason for the extreme conditions that exist at the present time. In my judgment, the reasons are not far to seek, and they are ample. The Senate is indifferent to its work. It has lost interest in it and does not show the vigor and energy of former times, mainly because it is no longer an independent body. Its bills are prepared for it by another department of the Government and are forced through by Executive order and, if need be, by the secret caucus. It is a blight upon the Senate and its work. Men of spirit and independence of character will not work energetically or with enthusiasm if compelled to work under a master. Slavish obedience to the commands of the head of the executive department will sooner or later destroy the independence and usefulness of Congress. It has come perilously near it already. This unwarranted interference of the executive department with the functions of Congress has extended to the committees of both Houses. Committees receive bills prepared by that department. They visit the White House to confer with the President about measures of legislation and are directed by him. Democratic Members hold secret caucuses to the exclusion of Republican Members and formulate and agree upon bills to be passed. Republican members of committees under such circumstances have no voice in the formulation of legislation or the reporting out of bills, and might just as well absent themselves from committee when bills are being considered in that way.

Mr. President, the passing of bills by Executive order and caucus rule affects this side of the Chamber as well as the other, but not to the same extent. The knowledge that the passage of a bill has been agreed upon with the President and decreed by a secret caucus destroys any interest that may be taken in future proceedings upon it on both sides of the Chamber. Any discussion that may be had upon it is wholly perfunctory. On the Republican side anything that is said is known to be useless, except as a protest, and on the Democratic side no discussion at all is necessary. It has been had in the secret caucus. What can be expected of Congress under such circumstances? Why should interest be taken in its proceedings, even by its own Members? If this manner of dealing with legislation continues for long, the country will lose all respect for Congress, and it will richly deserve public condemnation.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. President, one of the most important questions before Congress and the country at this time is that of woman suffrage. It is a live political issue. It is evident to everybody who understands the situation that this administration is opposed to granting suffrage to the women. But it lacks the courage to come out openly and oppose it. Efforts have been made to secure from the President some expression of his views on this important subject. A short time ago a delegation of women called upon the President to secure, if possible, his aid in their effort to so amend the Constitution as to give to their sex the right to vote. He answered their appeal by saying:

> I want you, ladies, if possible, if I can make it clear to you, to realize just what my present position is. Whenever I walk abroad I realize that I am not a free man; that I am under arrest. I am so carefully and admirably guarded that I have not even the privilege of walking the streets. That is, as it were, typical of my present transference from being an individual with his mind on any and every subject to being an official of a great Government, and incidentally, or so it falls out under our system of government, the spokesman of a party.
>
> I set myself this very strict rule when I was governor of New Jersey and have followed it as President—that I am not at liberty to urge upon Congress in messages policies which have not had the organic consideration of those for whom I am spokesman.
>
> In other words, I have not yet presented any legislature my private views on the subject, and I never shall, because I conceive that to be part of the whole process of government, that I shall be spokesman for somebody, not myself.
>
> I am an individual; when I am spokesman of an organic body I am a representative. For that reason, you see, I am by my own principles shut out, in the language of the street, from "starting anything." I have to confine myself to those things which have been embodied as promises to the people at an election. That is the strict rule I set for myself.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> When my private opinion is asked by those who are cooperating with me I am glad to give it, but I am not at liberty until I speak for somebody besides myself to urge legislation upon Congress.

This was a most remarkable statement to make. He purposely evaded any expression of views or opinion on the subject. But this was not nearly so remarkable as his reason for not doing so. Woodrow Wilson is an American citizen, and as such has a perfect right to express his views on any public question. There is no reason why he should not. He could with perfect propriety have done so in this instance. He could with equal propriety have said that they were his own private views, and should not be regarded as an official declaration. Unfortunately the President regards himself not only as an American citizen and President of the United States but as the leader and spokesman of the Democratic Party. The two latter are entirely inconsistent with each other. No man can be such a President as this Nation is entitled to have and be at the same time the spokesman or leader of any political party. The sooner the country realizes that fact and insists that when a citizen is elevated to the exalted position of Chief Magistrate he shall from that time on be the President of the whole people and not a mere politician, the leader of and trying to do the will of a political party. One of the leading journals of the country, commenting on this subject, very justly says:

> It is one of the evils of personal, public, and vigorous participation of the President in the deliberations of Congress as party leader that he at once falls from the lofty position of President of the Nation to the place of a mere party leader, and thereby invites, is sure to receive, and in this case richly deserves the personal attacks to which it is not well for any of us that a President of the United States should be exposed. It tends to Mexicanization.

The President might very well have said that he did not desire to express any opinion on the subject for himself or anyone else, or that he regarded the question of suffrage as one to be settled by the States, but it was exceedingly unfortunate that he should have sheltered himself behind the fact that the Democratic Party had not declared itself on the subject, and for that reason decline to speak on that account, for that was no reason at all. The President himself has since shown that his reason for not speaking was without force, as I shall show a little further along, by taking a position on proposed legislation in direct opposition to the platform declaration of the party of which he claims to be the leader.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. President, this administration has declared itself as against free tolls through the Panama Canal for American coastwise ships. The President has again taken the field and is demanding that an act be passed repealing the clause contained in the former act granting our ships free passage through the canal. This is in direct opposition to the plank of the platform of the Democratic Party on the subject, which declares:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

This declaration was made when the present law exempting our ships from the payment of tolls was under consideration by Congress and with full and accurate knowledge of all objections that had been made to it, including the claim that it was in violation of the treaty with Great Britain. That provision in the canal bill was bitterly opposed and the question was extensively discussed and the free-tolls clause carried by a large majority. It was after the issue on the question was fully made up and with the known attitude of Democrats on the question that the Democratic Party declared itself on the subject. The fight against free tolls was made, principally, by the transcontinental railway companies and the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and in their interest. There is no doubt that the same interests are at work now to repeal the act. They maintained a powerful lobby here in Washington when the bill was under consideration before. They will, no doubt, be represented here again when the bill to repeal that clause comes on for hearing. The people who believe in the granting of free tolls will want some good reason for this change of front on the part of the Democratic Party under the leadership of the President. If it is done to satisfy the demands of Great Britain, they will not be satisfied with this submission of legislation about our domestic affairs to the dictation of a foreign country. However, if the President is satisfied, for good and valid reasons, that this free-toll clause should be repealed, his advice that it should be done, in spite of the declaration of his party to the contrary, does him credit. In that case he is for once acting as President of the United States and not as the leader of his party. But if he shall attempt to force his views on Congress in this case, as he has in others, his course can not be justified. He may properly advise, but he has no right or authority to command or coerce action by Congress or any Member of it.

EXTRAVAGANCE IN APPROPRIATIONS.

The tendency toward paternalism and extravagance in the appropriation of public moneys is a marked characteristic feature of this administration. The example has been set by previous administrations, but this one has been going beyond them all. It is a tendency that should excite concern. As the Democratic Party has materially reduced the revenues of the Government by an unjust tariff law and imposed a direct tax on the people to make up the deficiency caused by low tariff duties, it might reasonably be expected to reduce the appropriations and expenditures. But this has not happened, and there is no evidence of an intention to reform conditions in this particular. The expenditures of the Government are enormous. The appropriations for carrying on the departments of the Government are necessary and should be ample for that purpose. These are being very considerably increased year by year. But it is the special appropriations that should be carefully looked after and over, or unnecessary expenditures guarded against. I can not take up the time of the Senate in any effort to determine whether the regular appropriations are unduly high or not. It would take up too much time even if I felt competent to deal with this broad subject, which I do not. But I am going to attract the attention of the Senate to some of what I call paternalistic and other special appropriations that deserve consideration. We establish the Agricultural Department. Of that I am not going to complain. The department has done much good. Some of the expenditures of it, notably for the distribution of seeds, are next to useless and wholly indefensible. This costs the Government over $300,000 a year. A reform administration would have done itself credit by abolishing this system. The Agricultural Department costs about $20,000,000 a year. In addition to this, we have expended $77,000,000 for agricultural and mechanical colleges in the States, something that should be done by the States themselves and not by the National Government. At this session we have passed an act appropriating $20,000,000 for the next seven years for demonstration work on the farms in connection with the colleges and $4,800,000 each year thereafter for the same purpose. A bill has passed the House appropriating $25,000,000 a year for the improvement of roads within the States, a burden that should not be imposed on the National Government. We have a bill pending to appropriate $50,000,000 a year for river and harbor improvements. We have passed a bill for the physical valuation of railroads. This will cost at least $12,000,000, according to estimates. We have passed this session a bill appropriating $700,000 for the cure of hogs of cholera, and horses of other diseases. We are spending $20,000,000 a year for the preservation of the public health. For the reclamation of public lands $101,000,000 have been appropriated, of which $81,000,000 have already been expended. We have pending also a bill to appropriate $1,000,000 for the survey of roads within the States, another of $500,000 for the improvement of rural sanitation. We have passed a bill through both Houses of Congress appropriating $35,000,000 to build a railroad in Alaska. The Postmaster General has proposed the purchase of telephone and telegraph lines that would cost hundreds of millions. The new regional bank system will burden the people with millions more every year. The Post Office appropriation has been increased by about $25,000,000; the District appropriation bill as it came from the House by $81,741.49. The appropriations for fortification has been raised in the Senate $1,720,000. We have created the office of vice admiral of the Navy, and provided for the appointment of five such officers at a salary of $12,000 a year when at sea and $8,000 when on land. The larger appropriation bills have not yet passed the House. How much they will be increased, if at all, can only be predicted in the light of what has gone before. And so we go on spending more and more of the public money almost without limit or thought of the ultimate consequences. It is evidently one of the chief objects of the Democratic Party to legislate in this easy and convenient way in the interest of the farmers with the hope of restoring to the party the confidence lost by the passage of the tariff law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator for just a moment? I assume the Senator is criticizing the administration for some of these large appropriations. I should like to ask him if he himself has been opposed to the appropriation of moneys for the improvement of rivers and harbors and, say, for the construction of a railroad in Alaska? Does the Senator approve those expenditures or not?

Mr. WORKS. Some of them I do. I am not criticizing the President in respect to that. I am calling attention to the tendency of the Senate or of Congress itself. It does not matter to me whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

OUR RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

Mr. President, to speak of our relations with Mexico and the dealings of this administration with that distracted and unhappy country is an unpleasant task. It is a dark page in our history. Unless the American people shall have lost all virility, courage, and patriotism, it will be read, in the years to come, with sorrow and shame. For three long years American citizens have been murdered, their wives and daughters outraged, their homes pillaged, and their property destroyed, and this administration has done nothing more than enter occasional mild protests and submissive appeals, and to whom? To Huerta, whose government we had refused to recognize and who, according to our view, had no power or authority to act. To Villa, not recognized as a belligerent; not even a soldier, but a brigand and murderer of innocent people. To Carranza, a weakling dominated by Villa and equally without authority. What had we a right to expect from protests and appeals made to such as these?

Now, sir, how did we come to this unfortunate and degrading situation that reflects upon the integrity and courage of our country and the manhood of our people? Diaz, the man of iron will, who ruled over the Republic of Mexico by force and violence, was in his old age dethroned, deprived of his power, and by his own voluntary act banished from his country. Madero, who succeeded to the presidency by revolution and bloodshed, was a failure. He could not govern the Mexican people in peace. He was weak and unreliable. He failed to keep his promises to the people by which he came into power. He, too, was dethroned by a counter-revolution. Having been deprived of power by violence and sent to prison, he was finally assassinated, doubtless by Huerta, who succeeded

him, or with his knowledge and connivance. Our Government refused to recognize Huerta as President or the Government he had formed, because of the means by which he came into power. This left us with no one to negotiate or deal with, no one upon whom we could call for the protection of our citizens or their property or for redress where their rights were violated. Our ambassador to that country was withdrawn and finally removed from office, apparently without cause. So we could only act through subordinate officers or employees with people whom we had denounced as usurpers and wholly without authority. Then commenced a series of conduct of a kind wholly unknown to diplomacy and so absurd as to make us ridiculous at home and abroad. The President sent to Mexico a private citizen, not an officer, without authority of any kind, not as the representative of the Government, but the private representative of the President himself. Then commenced a series of negotiations, if they may be dignified by that name, that surpasses everything that has ever been known in history. Its utter futility was recognized by almost everybody from the beginning. It excited ridicule and derision and made us, as a Government, ridiculous. The President sent to Huerta certain propositions as a basis of settlement of the troubles in Mexico. They were as follows:

1. An immediate cessation of fighting throughout Mexico; a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed.
2. Security given for an early and free election in which all agree to take part.
3. The consent of Gen. Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President of the Republic at this election.
4. The agreement of all parties to abide by the results of the election and cooperate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new administration.

Now, why should these propositions be made to Huerta? According to the position we had taken, he was only a private citizen of a foreign country, without any official standing or authority. The so-called constitutionalist leaders were the same. They did not pretend to have authority to bind anybody. They were, as everybody should have known, unable even to control their own followers. So the President laid down certain propositions and made certain demands on people having no power or authority to carry them out. The first was a demand for a cessation of fighting throughout Mexico and a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed. Did the President really think a few private citizens in Mexico could declare an armistice or stop the fighting that was going on all over Mexico? There were roving bands of so-called "soldiers," but really brigands and murderers, who were slaying people and destroying property without hindrance. They were subject to no authority of government or head of an army. No one, neither Huerta nor Carranza, had any control over them and could no more stop their fighting than could the President of the United States by his manifesto. Besides, there was no reason to suppose that there was the slightest disposition on the part of either of the contending forces to cease their warlike operations; and if any such armistice had been entered into, everybody having any knowledge of conditions in Mexico at that time must have known that it would not be scrupulously observed or observed at all. So this demand was impossible of performance, and if performed as to the call to cease fighting, it could not and would not have been observed. Therefore that demand had better never have been made. The next, that a free election be held in which all will agree to take part, was even more clearly impossible. I do not know who was meant by "all" in this proposal, but I suppose it meant all the people of Mexico. If it did, the President was calling for such an election as never was held in Mexico and probably never will be, and one that would be disastrous to the Republic, if all the people were allowed to vote. It would have been much worse than no election at all. The ignorance of the masses of the people in Mexico precludes the possibility of having a free election with desirable results. It would probably bring about the election of a bull fighter for President, and other public officials of a like kind, to plunder and devastate the country. It is inconceivable that anyone at all informed of conditions in that country could believe that any such thing were either possible or desirable.

The next demand, namely, that Huerta should bind himself not to be a candidate for President of his own country, was nothing less than preposterous. What right had the President of the United States to insist that a citizen of a foreign country should not be a candidate at a "free election in which all will agree to take part" or to say that the people of that Republic should not at such an election as he demanded and approved elect whom they pleased as their chief magistrate? Of course no self-respecting or independent man would submit to such a demand. To clinch this election without regard to its results, however disastrous they might be, it was further demanded that all parties, by which I suppose all the people of Mexico was meant, should abide by the result of the election and cooperate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new administration chosen by this election. It must have been a public-spirited people that would allow the head of a foreign nation to dictate how they should hold an election, whom they should not elect, and that they should not contest the election of anyone chosen at the election they were commanded to hold. Every one of these propositions, except that Huerta should not be a candidate, was impossible of execution, and to make such demands was highly unreasonable and presumptious.

Naturally Huerta refused to consider these proposals. What else could have been expected? His refusal put our Government in a most unfortunate position. It could not enforce its demands. It might go to war, but the refusal to comply with the demands could furnish no justification for declaring war, because we had no right to make them. So we had to submit tamely to the position of Huerta, bear the derision and sneers of the Mexican people and the indulgent smiles of all the nations of the world. And, sir, whatever may be said of Huerta in other respects—and I have no disposition to defend him—he did bear himself with courage, wisdom, and moderation in this whole matter. We were in the wrong. Our course was indefensible. He was wise enough to take advantage of us and put us to open shame. This episode was ineffectual to put an end to the conditions in Mexico or even to ameliorate the sufferings of the people. Civil war continued, murders increased, even greater destruction of property ensued. At last a prominent British subject was brutally murdered by Villa or by his orders. Public indignation ran high. The people were aroused, but the State Department maintained its usual degree of composure. I do not know why the murder of a citizen of Great Britain should have created more feeling than the assassination of hundreds of our own people, except that we have assumed to be the protector of the citizens and subjects of all other nations and insisted that such nations should leave this duty and responsibility to us. It therefore involves the question of our good faith toward other nations when we allow their people to be slaughtered in Mexico.

This case was one to put our good faith and our courage to the test. The poor widow asked for the body of her dead husband, buried on Mexican soil. What did our Government do to secure this right? It humbly petitioned Villa, his murderer, to allow his remains to be removed. The State Department spent days in trying to find out whether this man was shot by Villa or put to death by order of a drumhead court-martial, called not by a soldier, not by a belligerent, but by a brigand and professional murderer. What possible difference could it make whether he lost his life one way or the other? For this the sorrowing widow was left waiting for her dead. What should the Government have done in this case? Just what it should have done for one of its own citizens—sent our soldiers into Mexico and brought out the body. What right has Villa to say whether the body of the victim of his wrath and cruelty should be removed or not? What has become of our courage and manhood that we could leave it to him to settle such a question?

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the question of future dealings with Mexico. I am speaking of what has been done in the past and its consequences, not what should be done in the future. But I am convinced that that is a matter that we shall be forced to deal with in some decisive way, and that very soon. Congress is not without fault in allowing things to go on as they have without protest or action of any kind. If this feeble method of dealing with the Mexican situation has resulted in the unnecessary loss of American lives, Congress may well be regarded as accessory to the act.

Through all this troublous time I have never doubted the good faith or sincerity of purpose of either the President or the Secretary of State. I am sure their ultimate object has been to save this country from intervention in the affairs of Mexico. With that object I am in full sympathy and accord so long as it can be done with honor and consistently with the duty we owe to our citizens in that country and the obligations we are under to protect the subjects of other nations resident there. But I have not been in the least in sympathy with the methods resorted to to accomplish that object nor the failure on the part of the Government to protect our own people there.

We may be forced yet to intervene in some form in Mexico. If we do it should not be for the aggrandizement of our country, the acquisition of territory, or any other advantage to us, but in the interest of the Mexican people and others resident there, the restoration of peace and order, and the establishment of a stable government for our sister Republic.

During the delivery of Mr. WORKS's speech,

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have reached a point where I am about to take up another question. I see the time has arrived for taking up the unfinished business. I will suspend here and give notice that I will complete what I have to say immediately after the close of the morning business to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

[Mr. SMITH of Maryland reported from the Committee on Appropriations the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of committees."]

Mr. WORKS. In view of the fact that a part of what I am about to say discusses to some extent the matter presented by the unfinished business, I will ask the consent of the Senate to conclude what I have to say. It will not take very long.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say the Senator does not have to ask consent. The Senator can just proceed to complete his address. He has a perfect right to discuss the unfinished business.

Mr. WORKS. Then I will take advantage of my right.

After the conclusion of Mr. WORKS's speech,

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I submit the report, which I send to the desk, on the credentials of Senator elect WEST from Georgia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Chair what is before the Senate? I understood that the unfinished business was before the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, for the consideration of the report which I have submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Indiana is a question of the highest privilege, the Chair rules.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know what the report was that the Senator from Indiana had presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the credentials of WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, claiming a seat in the Senate from the State of Georgia, respectfully report that such credentials are proper in form, and that the said WEST is entitled to be admitted to a seat as a Senator from said State.

JOHN W. KERN, *Chairman.*

The undersigned members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections authorize the chairman to make a favorable report on the credentials of WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

JAMES K. VARDAMAN.
W. O. BRADLEY.
WILLIAM S. KENYON.
T. J. WALSH.
W. P. DILLINGHAM.
GEORGE SUTHERLAND.
LUKE LEA.
WILLIAM HUGHES.
WILLIAM H. THOMPSON.
L. Y. SHERMAN.
ATLEE POMERENE.

Mr. KERN. I move that the report of the committee be adopted, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the newly designated Senator from Georgia is in the Chamber, and I ask that the oath of office may now be administered to him by the President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator appointed from the State of Georgia will please present himself at the Secretary's desk to take the oath of office.

Mr. WEST was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] may speak in answer to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that he ask unanimous consent, with the understanding that the unfinished business shall be again taken up at any time this afternoon that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] may desire.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, to be taken up immediately after the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]? The Chair hears none; and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside. The Senator from North Carolina.

"ONE YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC RULE."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, for something over two hours the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has proceeded in an attack upon the present administration and its policies, with practically no interruptions. On account of my physical condition to-day and because I have promised the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], in charge of the unfinished business, that I would interfere as little as possible with the consideration of that measure, I should prefer, unless it be to correct some misstatement of fact that I may fall into, that I should not be interrupted, as it will require considerable time to present to the Senate the answer which I shall make to the speech of the Senator from California and also some substantive matter that I desire to present to the Senate and to the country. Interruption would not only divert me from the line of my argument, but would extend this discussion far beyond the time I have permission, through the courtesy of the Senator from Arizona, to displace the unfinished business.

Mr. President, I was greatly surprised at the character of the speech of the Senator from California. I was aware of the fact that in the late presidential campaign that Senator had cast his vote for Mr. Wilson for President. I knew that he had always since he has been a Member of this body held himself out as a Progressive and as a tariff reformer. Having understood the Senator from California as strongly favoring tariff reductions, I had supposed that he had supported Mr. Wilson largely because of his position upon the tariff, largely because he did not sympathize with the position of the Republican candidate upon that subject or those of the Progressive candidate.

The Senator from California now tells us that the reduction of tariff duties and the free listing of foreign importations do not tend to reduce prices and are not in the interest of the consumer of products. He tells us that the effect of the somewhat radical reductions made in the present tariff law has not been to bring about a reduction in prices, but, on the contrary, that it has tended to increase prices. In the light of these facts I can not understand the Senator from California's former attitude in favor of reducing tariff duties. If the Senator knows now that a reduction of tariff duties—a reduction so great as was made in the present law—will not affect prices and will not benefit the consumers of this country, he must have known that fact when he was advocating tariff reduction; and so I am at a loss to understand, in the light of his speech to-day, what he meant when he was such an ardent champion of a reduction of tariff duties in the interest of the consumer.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I must express, because I feel it, my very great astonishment at the columbiad which the Senator from California, in view of the fact that he supported him, has leveled at the President of the United States, that great man who now occupies the Executive office, equal in intellectual endowment and admittedly, I am sure I may safely say, equal in his grasp of great public questions, equal in equipment for the duties of his great office, equal in moral force, and equal in patriotic purposes and aspirations and fidelity to the public weal to any man who has ever occupied the office of Chief Magistrate of this country. I say I have been surprised at the Senator's assault upon the President in view of the fact that the Senator gave him his ardent support, as I understand; but I have been still more surprised, if possible, that this man, this great and distinguished Senator of a great State, speaking in this august presence and to the country, in the face and in the light of his past record on the subject of tariff reduction in the interest of the people, in the light of his denunciation of the protective and prohibitive duties of the old Republican tariff—I am amazed to find him in so short a period of time, by implication at least, aligning himself upon this question with the reactionary element of his party.

The Senator seeks to belittle the achievements of the present administration—both that of administration and that of legislation. The Senator declares that during the incumbency of Mr. Wilson there have been passed and approved by him 63 acts—I think that was the number he gave—and all of these, he declares, with the exception of the appropriation bills, the currency bill, and the tariff bill, are of comparative unimportance; and as to the tariff and the currency measures he de-

clares those at best harmful and vicious in their effect upon the welfare of the country.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any considerable number of people in this country, without regard to party, who agree with the Senator from California in this indictment of the first year of Democratic administration. If there is one thing that, to my mind, the sentiment of the country has crystallized upon, it is in the conclusion that during no year of our history and under no administration has so much that makes for the peace, the happiness, the welfare, the greatness, and the glory of our common country and people been accomplished as during the last year, under Democratic administration. That feeling is shared not only by Democrats, but by Republicans who have open minds and appreciate great public service and great national accomplishment. The administration and the Congress may safely submit the indictment of the Senator from California to the calm, deliberate judgment of the American people, who, in my opinion, have already passed upon that subject and have declared the present occupant of the White House to be one of the most remarkable men this country has ever produced and that his achievements during his first year of service are unsurpassed in the annals of our history.

The Senator from California is so eager to find fault with the present administration that he devotes large space in his prepared speech to the charge that the time of the people was wasted, frittered away, during the extra session of Congress, and that the Democratic Party should be held responsible for that. I admit, Mr. President, that we did not pass during that session many measures of any great importance outside of appropriation bills and the currency and the tariff measures. That session was called for the express purpose of dealing with two great vital questions, whose far-reaching consequences affected the highest interest of every American citizen. It was called in response to a public demand, which could not be gainsaid or resisted, because the evils which had grown up with respect to those great subjects under the dominant party during its control of more than a third of a century were of such pressing importance and demanded such urgent remedy it was felt there should be no delay in dealing with them in a broadly remedial way. That was the inspiration and purpose of the special session. When that special session met, it was the distinctive purpose, by the consensus of opinion and agreement, I might say, of both sides of this Chamber, that nothing should be taken up of general importance except those two measures.

The Senator complains of the long hearings and consideration given to both of these measures by the Congress. Mr. President, I want to say in reply to that criticism—I have not heard it made before—that in the beginning of the consideration of these two measures, especially of the tariff, the other side of the Chamber demanded, from day to day, that before action was taken by the committee there should be the most thorough and exhaustive investigation; that the men who were best able to speak with reference to the tariff and the men who were best able to speak with reference to the financial situation should be invited to come here, should even be brought here, and permitted to appear before these two great committees and take such time as they saw fit in the discussion of these questions. The greater part of the time consumed in the consideration of those measures by the committee was devoted to an earnest and patriotic effort on the part of the committee to obtain light in order that they might frame measures which would meet the needs and demands of the country and afford relief against the admitted evils of the old system. It ill becomes those who then insisted upon that course now to make it a cause of complaint against the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, the Senator from California enumerated the different legislative enactments of the present administration; I believe he did not read them, but asked that they be published as a part of his remarks. I do not know what that summary contains, but I want to put alongside of that summary and alongside of the comments that are made, as I assume, in that summary as to the importance or the wisdom of those enactments, a statement, not prepared by myself—I have not taken the trouble to do that—but, fortunately, I have been able to get this morning a summary, with appropriate comments, explanatory of the effect, significance, and importance of each of the larger measures of the last year, prepared by that great Washington correspondent of the New York World, Col. Charles S. Albert. I do not think I will take the time now either to read the statement or to ask that the Secretary read it, but I will ask that it be incorporated in my remarks. I hope when the people of this country come to read the speech of the Senator from California, if they should do me the honor to read also my feeble impromptu remarks in reply to some of his statements and representations, that they will read in parallel columns the Senator's enumerations and his comments and the enumerations and comments of this great correspondent of a great paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THORNTON in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT WILSON HAS ACHIEVED IN FIRST YEAR—NO SUCH RECORD MADE BY ANY PREDECESSOR.

WASHINGTON, *February 28.*

For the first time in 50 years the hand of Wall Street has been removed from the Government of the United States.

This desirable result is regarded by President Wilson as the paramount achievement of his administration. He considers the elimination of Wall Street as a dominating factor in many governmental functions the best gift of triumphant Democracy to the American people. The removal of this blighting influence will prove beneficial, if not permanent.

Aside from this accomplished blessing, the President views the creation of a new banking and currency system as the most notable event of his incumbency. He believes this great reform takes precedence over downward revision of the tariff, with the partial destruction of special privilege and the transfer of taxation from poverty to wealth.

One year of Woodrow Wilson's service as President of the United States and leader of the Democratic Party has become history. One-fourth of his elective period has expired. In taking stock no Chief Executive has ever found such a remarkable record of performance to his credit. With persistence and wisdom he has steadfastly urged redemption of all pledges carried in the Baltimore platform. He has been supported by both branches of Congress to a more marked degree than any predecessor in office.

GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS.

Among the great achievements which President Wilson has guided to consummation are:

A banking and currency law which has removed the hand of Wall Street and established a democracy of credit.

A tariff act comprising reduction in duties on imported necessities and calculated to lower the cost of living. No favoritism has been shown protected interests, but the people were substituted as beneficiaries. In framing this legislation the supervision of Wall Street and special interests was rejected.

The lobby, representing all those who profited from legislation, through publicity on the part of Mr. Wilson, was removed as a powerful instrumentality in the shaping of statutes. As a result of exposures made by the President, this obnoxious feature of congressional intimidation was removed.

Two important amendments to the Constitution—the first adopted in 43 years—were made effective. One provides for the direct election of Senators by the people. The other authorizes the imposition of a tax on incomes, thus transferring the burden of maintaining the Government from the poor to the wealthy.

Proposals were made to all civilized nations for the arrangement of treaties whereby actual hostilities would be deferred during a year of reflection. Thirty Governments signified their acceptance of this principle.

RETURN TO POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

A return to popular government was encouraged when the President appeared in person and addressed the two branches of Congress on legislative propositions. He thus sought to terminate domination through private arrangements and secret conferences by the aid of public opinion.

The amendment of laws whereby arbitration of disputes between capital and labor was made more successful.

The constitution of peace presented by the President has gone far in the direction of breaking up interlocking directorates, which formed the backbone of trusts and monopolies.

The helping hand of the Government was extended to the farmers when $50,000,000 were distributed to assist in moving crops.

The divorcement of the Government from the New York financial concerns that proposed cooperation with foreign Governments in furnishing funds for China.

The employment of peaceable methods by which the Telephone Trust was dissolved without litigation or expense.

The policy of diplomatic postponement under which the unsettled relations between the United States and Mexico have been handled.

The placing of the Postal System on a self-sustaining basis for the first time in governmental history

The Parcel Post System has been developed and extended to a remarkable degree of efficiency and benefit.

MAJORITY RULE IN CONGRESS.

Parliamentary rules in the Senate and House were amended, removing the heritage received from Aldrich and Cannon, leaving the majority to control.

The pure-food act was extended to include inspection of all meats, thus affording adequate protection to American consumers.

A bureau of markets was established in the Department of Agriculture, providing a scientific method by which farm products may be transported and distributed.

The Armor Plate Trust was compelled to submit competitive bids in connection with the construction of American battleships. The Government was saved more than $2,000,000.

The special delivery system was extended to the parcel post.

The home life of the farmer was given consideration by the Department of Agriculture. Encouragement in the utilization of labor-saving devices was contained in 55,000 letters sent out.

The full protection of the law has been given Indian children.

A new public-land policy was inaugurated. It combines conservation and the proper use of the national domain.

The enactment of an agricultural extension law, which is expected to double the production of American farms.

The institution in the Navy of academic, vocational, and technical instruction.

The two great transportation monopolies of the East and West were forced to dissolve. The Pennsylvania Railroad relinquished its holdings in the Baltimore & Ohio. The Southern and Union Pacific merger was canceled.

The extinction of many great combinations in restraint of trade by agreement.

The ratification of eight general arbitration treaties, which will enable the President to adjust numerous foreign disputes and complications that now prove irritating. Among the treaties approved were those between the United States and Great Britain and with Japan.

The establishment of an eight-hour day for women and girls in the District of Columbia.

TO REDEEM PLATFORM PROMISES.

Marvelous as has been the record of performance, it represents less than 50 per cent of President Wilson's plans for redeeming platform promises and perpetuating prosperity for the people. In addition to the achievements indicated, he has planned and started on the road to legislative completion more beneficial propositions than any predecessor. Many of these will soon be on the statute books. All the remaining features of his program will be enacted into law before another anniversary of presidential incumbency is reached.

The list of important matters under way includes:

The negotiation and ratification of a treaty with Colombia by which payment shall be made for the loss of Panama and the Canal Zone. This is considered on a parity with the great achievements of the past year. It is intended to remove the stain upon national honor caused by the violent seizure of Panama and restore friendly relations with a sister Republic.

The repeal of the tolls-exemption clause in the Adamson Act, under which American coastwise vessels are given free use of the Panama Canal. This is expected to remove causes for irritation between this Government and those of Great Britain and other maritime powers. It will demonstrate that the United States is willing to respect all treaty obligations.

The ratification by the Senate of 16 additional general arbitration treaties.

The continued arrangement of peace treaties until all civilized nations have been brought into a "breathing" agreement with this country.

Continued efforts for the restoration of peace in Mexico without intervention or the employment of force.

Perfection of a treaty with Nicaragua under which this Government will acquire the right to construct a canal over the Nicaraguan route and secure sites for a naval base and fortifications to protect the Panama waterway.

Legislation under which the Federal Government and the various States will unite in the construction of good roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, much of the speech of the Senator from California covers things that have been thoroughly thrashed out upon the floor of the Senate during the long months of debate upon the questions to which they refer. In my judgment, it is not necessary that they should be discussed again in the Senate. I was somewhat surprised that the Senator from California, in his eagerness to put the present administration, whose head he voted for, in the wrong, should have raked and scraped everything that could be tortured into a subject of criticism, should have revamped all of the adverse arguments that were made during the months of consideration of these measures, and should turn them against him and his administration. They do not need to be discussed now, for, as I have already said, most of the subjects upon which he has spoken have already been discussed. They will be discussed again, in the coming election, before the great body of the American people; and I have not a doubt as to what will be the verdict.

In the discussion of the subjects the Senator has covered, I shall limit myself to those things which affect legislation already passed and which pertain to the effect of that legislation upon the welfare of the country. I shall not follow him in the domain of speculation. I shall not seek to vie with him in denunciation. Nor shall I discuss anything unless it pertains to some legislation, or the effect of some legislation or some act of this administration, which is already accomplished and gone into effect.

Mr. President, I assert and shall maintain that what the Democratic Party has done in the way of legislation and administration has, in the main, been well done; that it was in the interest of the people; and that they are daily reaping the benefits; and that as time goes by they will realize them in increasing measure.

The Senator from California was pleased to denounce the caucus as inimical to popular government, and especially to denounce the caucuses held by the Democratic Party over the tariff and over the currency bills as defeating the will of the people with regard to legislation on these subjects. That charge has been repeatedly made and answered before. In reply to these insinuations and charges we have always said, as we say now, that we were charged as a party with the duty of fulfilling our pledges under our system of party government and party responsibility; and that we were responsible for legislation to carry out these pledges of our party and meet the demands of the people upon these vital questions. We adopted the caucus or the conference as a method of accomplishing our purposes, and we submit the result of our action in this behalf to the people of the country with confidence in the verdict.

It is supposed, however, that caucuses are unpopular, and so our action is and has been virulently attacked and animadverted upon. Mr. President, there was a time when the caucus almost always tended to defeat the will of the people, and whatever defeats the will of the people is going to be unpopular with the people; but that was before representative government was restored in this country.

That was when government in this country was government by Wall Street and by special interest. That was when the people had practically no voice in the making of the laws and in the conduct of their business at Washington and in many of the State legislatures. That was during the dominion in this country of the trust and the monopoly and the special interest.

Thank God, that day has passed. The greatest achievement of Woodrow Wilson rests in the fact, recognized by the people, that he has restored representative government in this country; that he has taken the Government out of the hands of these special interests and lodged it once more in the hands of the people, and that the people rule not only at the ballot box but in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me. There will be ample time for the Senator to reply to me when I have finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the caucus, acting upon the tariff, brought about this result: It brought about harmony among the Democrats in this body. It brought the Democrats of this body together upon the basis of compromise. It secured a Democratic bill that carried out the pledges of the party to the people, that carried out the will of the people upon this great question; and we were enabled to pass, for the benefit of the people, a Democratic tariff instead of a mongrel Democratic and Republican tariff.

You tell me, when a caucus accomplishes this great result, when a caucus carries out the will of the people, that it will be unpopular with the people. Let us try that. I say to our opponents, you can, if you put that question to the test at the next election. I do not fear the verdict.

The Senator attacks the civil-service record of the present administration in most violent and uncompromising terms. He can see nothing but a purpose on the part of the administration to overturn all the legislation, all of the administration, with reference to the civil service and go back to the spoils system.

Mr. President, it is well known in this country that during the long years of Republican incumbency, by Executive order or by device and manipulation, in many lines of Government employment and service, nearly the whole body of Democrats were displaced, and Republicans, protected by the civil service, took their positions. It has been stated upon the floor of the Senate that in some of the great departments of the Government in this city only a handful of Democrats were holding office when Mr. Wilson came in.

How did that happen? How did that come about? If Democrats have been permitted, under the civil-service law, to stand these civil-service examinations, does anybody believe that Democrats, as a rule, have been so dull, so lacking in aptitude for the duties of those offices that they were unable to pass the examination, and were excluded because they could not qualify themselves?

I think the consensus of opinion in this country is that a Democrat is just about as capable of standing these examinations and filling these offices as a Republican; and yet that was the result. When we came in, in some way, by some process of legerdemain, the Democrats were practically out of civil-service positions in many lines of governmental employment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would rather not yield.

Mr. REED. I remember the Senator's suggestion now, and while what I wanted to say was apropos of what he has been stating, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would rather not yield. I wish to get through as soon as possible.

More than that, it is a matter of record and of common knowledge in this country that just before the retirement of the late President Taft, within less than a month of the election, I believe, when everybody in this country knew that Mr. Taft would not be reelected, and when the sentiment of the country had crystalized in the confident belief that Mr. Wilson would be elected, President Taft made an order covering something like 40,000 fourth-class postmasters, nine-tenths of whom were Republicans, under the civil service, without requiring them to stand any merit test and with full knowledge that they were Republicans.

Mr. President, if there be a position in the public service where the civil service should not apply, it is to the office of the fourth-class postmaster. Any man who has lived in the country

districts of this Nation, among the farmers, near the crossroads and the little villages where these fourth-class postmasters are, any man who has any knowledge of the duties of the fourth-class postmasters knows that what is required in the discharge of those duties is not book learning. The blanketing under the civil service of these 40,000 men, who were Republicans, just before the election by President Taft to keep Democrats out is to be left unrebuked by the Senator from California; while President Wilson, because he has consented to taking out of the civil service some five or six hundred employees, who ought to be under the civil service no more than fourth-class postmasters ought to be, is to be condemned as a spoilsman!

I have some familiarity with the duties of most of the officials taken out of the civil service by the amendments referred to by the Senator from California. For deputy marshals, for deputy collectors, and such officers, men who capture criminals and break up illicit distilleries, intelligence is needed, judgment is needed, discretion is requisite, courage is needed, but not book learning. It is not essential.

Taft is acquitted when he blankets under the civil service 40,000 postmasters who ought not to be under the civil service because of the character of their duties and necessary qualifications; and Wilson is denounced because he has taken from under the civil service five or six hundred people who ought not to be under the civil service, because the civil-service examinations afford no test of their practical efficiency.

Very much to my amazement, the Senator finds great fault with the income tax. He says we have reduced the tariff, decreased the revenues of the Government, and because of that fact we are compelled to resort to this unpopular and odious method of direct taxation. The words "unpopular" and "odious" are mine; but the Senator animadverts on the undesirability of direct taxation. Even in the case of big incomes, as against swollen fortunes, he queries whether it is wise and good policy and right; but as against any others, as to any other incomes, upon anybody except the big and rich, he says that it is a violation of all our traditional policy of opposition to direct taxation.

The Republican tariff system, unaided by the income tax, placed about as high a tax upon the poor man, his wife, his children, and his little cottage as it placed upon the rich man, with his thousands and his hundreds of thousands, and his palatial home. That condition of things, perpetuated by the Republican Party for 40 years, resulted in collecting practically all taxes for the support of the Government from consumption; it levied a tax against the individual and his needs and his necessities, while the rich, who paid but little tax, received, in the protection of their swollen fortunes and their broad possessions, the benefit of possibly more than half of all the money extracted from the people by this process of unjust taxation.

Finally that condition of things, that situation, palled upon the American people, and the public conscience, aroused beyond the point of further endurance of this wrong and this iniquity, passed an income-tax bill. The Supreme Court by a single vote declared it unconstitutional. The agitation became so fierce and so insistent and so irresistible from one end of the country to the other on the part of the masses, practically of both parties, that the States of this Union amended the Constitution, and Congress, in conformity with the will of the people, passed the present act.

Mr. President, if that constitutional amendment was not intended to place a part of the burden of government upon the men of ample fortunes and of great wealth and simultaneously, pro tanto, to take it off the shoulders of the poor and the needy, what was it passed for? What was the purpose of it? Why should the Democratic Party be challenged when putting into operation that amendment as doing a wrong to the American people?

So far from convincing the American people that we were wrong the Senator from California will find that there is no act of this administration that will be more approved than the part of the tariff bill which levies, justly and equitably, a tax upon incomes. We did not include the poor; we did not include anybody whose income was less than $3,000, because it was that class that most largely pays the consumption taxes that we wanted to supplement.

In imposing this income tax we expected that it would make up any deficit that might arise from the customs duties imposed in the bill. You can not relieve the people of the burdens of tariff taxation without reducing tariff duties. We expected that there would be a falling off of revenues on account of the reductions that we made in the interest of the people. We intended to relieve the people of these taxes by putting the rates down, so that there might be importations, so that importations should be possible. We abhorred the Republican thought and idea that rates should be allowed to be so high as to exclude all possibility of importations. We deliberately put some things on the free list to relieve the masses and help the manufacturer to reduce his cost of production in the interest of lower prices. We deliberately reduced duties on others to relieve the masses. In order to do that we had to put them down to a point where importations were possible, and we did it.

Mr. President, if there is any part of the speech of the Senator from California in his discussion of policies and legislation that has amazed me more than another it is his remarks with reference to the banking and currency bill. He charges that the present banking bill is a bill in the interest of the bankers and not in the interest of the people, and from that he would have it inferred that the great controlling financial forces represented in the big banks of the financial centers wanted this legislation, and the bill was framed as a surrender to their demands and their wishes, and that it was satisfactory to them.

Mr. President, the present banking and currency bill is satisfactory to the country bankers. By "the country bankers" I mean all the bankers outside of the reserve cities. It is popular with them, because they have felt the throttling grip of Wall Street. They have been made its slaves and its tools. They have been forced time and again to do things that their conscience and their judgment told them were not only against the interest of the community in which they transacted business, but against the best interests of the country; but they were helpless. They accept this bill as an emancipation from those shackles and from that slavery. They are for it, and uproariously for it, as the great Secretary of the Treasury said when he returned from that wonderful tour, circling the country, which brought him in contact and conference with all the bankers in every section of the country. They were in favor of it. They recognized that it was a great thing for them to be free. It was a great thing to the people of this country and every community of this country to have some place where in stress and need they could take their securities and get money, and there was no reason why they should not have it. It was a great relief from the old system where their masters in a few centers said "yes" or "no" to their pleading, to their cries for help to relieve distress in their communities; and whenever it suited their policy to make money high or to make money cheap, made it so.

But, Mr. President, the opposition came from the men who under the old system absolutely dominated and controlled the finances of this country, and through the finances of the country controlled its business interests for weal or woe. They to a man stood solidly against it. Why should they not have done so? The power that they wielded under the old system was a power that no emperor, king, or potentate in this world ever wielded, the power to decide the welfare and the happiness and the prosperity of the Nation as their selfish interests might dictate, the power by the manipulation of finances to garner even from the poor and the needy as well as the rich and the well to do the coin of the realm. It was not so much the love of money with them as it was the power that the possession and control of money gave them. When they lost that power their loss was equal to that of any monarch who has been forced by circumstances to lay down his scepter and dominion and control.

Yes, Mr. President, the people are amply protected. The Senator from California is mistaken, for they are amply protected. The reserve board is given effective control. It appoints three of the directors and has the power of removal at will of three others. While these three are elected by the bankers, they must be representatives of some one of the great industries of the country, and they can not be stockholders or directors in the banks. These six directors can be controlled or removed. That is ample governmental control.

What grows out of that control, of as great importance as the power to appoint three of these directors, is the power to remove three of them, for in that way practically control is obtained of a majority of the board. Under that law this board, representing the sovereignty of the Government, representing the interests of the great American people, have the right to dictate to the regional banks, every one of them, Morgan's and Rockefeller's included, what interest they shall charge the people of this country.

Do you say that it is no protection to the people of this country to have that power vested in the Government and taken out of the hands of these pirates who have exploited and preyed upon the right to fix the interest charge, to say whether money shall be high or whether it shall be low, to fix that charge according to the necessities and conditions of the different sections or regions?

The Senator from California says people have no interest or control in these banks.

Oh, yes, the people have an interest in these banks. Because the national banks and the State banks are the only stockholders under the system does not imply that the people have no interest in them. Who are the directors of the regional banks? The six who are not appointed by the United States. By whom are they appointed? They are appointed by the member banks of that region. Who owns the stock and elects the directors of those member banks? Who controls the directorate, controls the stock, dominates the policy of these member banks? Why, of course, the thousands upon thousands and tens of thousands of stockholders in those banks, located in every little hamlet and town and city throughout the length and breadth of this great country. If the people who elect the directors are the stockholders of the member banks, then the people have a voice, and not an indirect voice either, but in its influence and in its effect they have a direct voice in the selection of the six directors.

Under the present system, under the new law, every regional bank in this country will be controlled by all the banks of that region, and all the banks of all the regions will be controlled by all the banks in the system. So we have a financial system in which all the banks in all the country which have seen fit to go into the system, and practically all the national banks have gone into it, will control the financial policy of the regional banks. Under the old system the financial policy of all the banks throughout all the country was controlled by a few great banks in the great reserve cities like St. Louis, Chicago, San Francisco, New York, and Boston. That is the difference.

Mr. President, the Senator from California discusses the tariff. The Senator finds great fault with it, upon the ground that it is not a protective tariff. He says it was openly avowed upon the floor of the Senate and House at the time of its consideration that it ignored the protective principle, and for that reason he finds fault with it. It is not, of course, a protective measure. It was not intended to be a protective measure. It was intended to be a revenue measure. The duties were intended to be based upon the principle of fair and reasonable competition as the most just and equitable basis and the one which promised the most revenue to the Government. Let us dismiss the idea that it was intended to be anything that it is not.

But the Senator gravely says this measure has turned over our domestic markets to the foreigner; not that it is going to do it or that in the course of time it will work out that result, but, as I understood the Senator from California, he claims that after four months' operation under the tariff law its effect has been to turn over the industries of this country to the foreigner.

Mr. President, I am utterly amazed at that statement of the Senator in the face of well-known facts. In the face of the common knowledge of all the people of this country, I am amazed the Senator should stand here and say that that has been the effect of the tariff law.

I suppose the Senator was led into this exaggeration of statement and, probably, led into overlooking the patent facts of the situation, by his indignation because the law does not grant to certain products of his State—lemons and raisins, for illustration—a continued prohibitive duty. What the Senator would like to have, what the Senator indicates as his judgment as to what he ought to have, is a tariff rate for lemons and raisins which would force every man, woman, and child throughout this broad country who want lemons or raisins, without reference to how far he lives from the groves and the orchards and the vineyards, to buy only from California. The Senator complains because the Democratic Party refuses to stand for that; because the Democratic Party refuses to say, for the sake of making the lemon industry of California a monopoly, we will require the people of the Atlantic seaboard, 3,000 miles away, to pay the high freight transportation from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast upon lemons, when they might get them elsewhere at more reasonable rates. What is the use of passing a tariff law to relieve people if you are going to get your duties so high that there can be no competition in a product 3,000 miles from where it is raised in this country? It is transportation protection added to production protection.

There have been increased importations of these articles I have no doubt. I am glad to hear that there have been. The old duties were prohibitive. The people upon the Atlantic coast are entitled to import them. There is nothing in justice or common sense that requires that they should be forced to buy from California and pay 3,000 miles' freight charges upon products if they can get them cheaper elsewhere.

The Senator from California says that we have opened the door to the importations of meat and cattle, and that they have been coming here in much larger quantities than heretofore. Undoubtedly that is true. It was our purpose to make that possible in order to control the high cost of living in this country, in the hope that we might break the monopoly in this country. If that monopoly is extended so as to include Canada and Argentina and Australia, so that our tariff can not accomplish any good because of the monopoly extending over the foreign field of supply, as well as the domestic field of supply, then the judicial arm of the Government, the mandates of the courts, together with such additional legislation as the Democratic Party proposes as a part of its great program of reform and relief to the people, will, I hope, relieve that situation.

Mr. President, the Senator says we have also had an increase in our importations of wheat. Yes, a little; almost too little to mention. As far as cattle are concerned, there is not much difference in the cost of raising cattle here and in Canada. So far as wheat is concerned, there is not much difference in raising wheat here and in Canada. We all heard time and again when we were discussing the tariff here the evidence which showed that Canadian wages and American wages are pretty much the same. There has been some importation of wheat. There has been some of cattle. There has been some importation of other things. But, Mr. President, when the Senator goes to calculating the per cent of the increase of these imports I call his attention to the fact that by reason of the prohibitive duties upon wheat and upon cattle there was relatively no importation of those products and others that he mentions into this country before the present tariff law was passed. If there has been any importations worthy of mention of either one since the tariff law was passed, of course starting with practically nothing it does not take much to make a big per cent of increase.

I made some little calculation, rough, probably not altogether correct, with reference to the amount of meat that has been imported into this country for three months—October, November, December, 1913—after the tariff act went into effect. I have found that taking the figures given by the bureau in regard to the increase in importations during these three months of the tariff law there have been imported of meat into this country just about 1½ pounds apiece for every man, woman, and child, or about half a pound of meat per month apiece.

The amount of wheat imported has been so negligible that it need not be mentioned. We heard the outcry of the Senator with reference to the importation of lemons and raisins. The amount of importations has been relatively negligible.

Yet, Mr. President, in face of the fact that there has been practically only half a pound of meat per month per capita imported under this tariff law, in spite of the fact that the amount of importation of wheat has been negligible, in spite of the fact that the amount of importation of products that he enumerates as those of his State have been insignificant compared with the general output of those products in this country, the Senator gravely tells us that the effect of the tariff law has been to seriously injure the cattle-raising industry, the lemon industry, the wheat industry, and so forth. Yet in the very next breath after he has made that statement, after he has charged that the effect of the tariff measure has been to seriously injure these industries in three months through the invasion of our markets by foreign goods, he states that there has been no fall in the price of these commodities; that, on the other hand, during the very period when this foreign invasion was imminently destroying the domestic industry prices were increasing in this country.

Mr. President, as long as prices increase, or as long as prices are maintained, that is conclusive evidence, accepted by every school of economy in the world and by every man of common sense in the world, that there is not any influence at work undermining, disturbing, not to say destroying the industries concerned.

Oh, our friends have failed to look at the record facts. What are the record facts of importations into this country? Taking everything during the last six months of 1912, when the Payne-Aldrich Act was in full force and effect in this country, as compared with the six months closing January 1, 1914, when the present Democratic tariff law was in effect during four months, the records of the Department of Commerce show that during that period of time, so far from a foreign invasion of our markets, so far from importations such as we had expected to come in the course of time, the importations have been slow in coming. National business especially has always slowly adjusted itself to changed conditions. During that period in 1913, when the Democratic tariff law was in effect for four months, the imports into this country were, in round figures, $20,000,000

less than they were during the corresponding six months of 1912. But during those six months, showing our ability to compete not only upon our own soil but throughout the world under the present tariff law, our exportations have increased about $19,000,000; and during the last six months of the year 1913, when this Democratic tariff law had been in operation for three months, there was an increase in our foreign trade balance of $38,000,000 over the trade balance for the like period of the previous year.

Mr. President, those are the facts. Our imports up to this very hour have not been as great as they were during the seven months of 1912, including January of 1913. During this very time, during the three months when the tariff law has been in operation—this law that it was said would paralyze industries, this law that it was said would result in the invasion of our market by the foreigner, this law that it was said would so completely destroy the competing powers of our home industries that they would not be able to hold or maintain the trade we now have in foreign countries—during the last six months of 1913, Mr. President, four months of this time under this Democratic tariff, our exports have exceeded our imports something over $400,000,000. To the foreigner—this man whom we so much fear here at home, this man whom we can not compete with—we are to-day selling, under this tariff, in four months, over $400,000,000 more goods than we are buying from him.

Mr. President, the Senator talks about increases in prices. There have been increases in some prices, I expect. There have been decreases in some prices, too. The truth about the business, Mr. President, as everybody knows, is that up to the present time the importations have not been sufficiently large to materially affect the price of products. These importations will grow; they will increase; certainly until there is a reduction in prices just exactly as we predicted. We did not predict an immediate tumble in prices. We said it would be slow, it would be gradual, almost imperceptible at first, but that it would come. You can not reduce prices through the tariff until there are sufficient importations to potentially affect the supply of the country. Take any of the products that the Senator from California has been talking about, the price of which he says has not been decreased. Although there have been increased importations, you will find that the importations have been so negligible that no man of common sense will expect them to very materially affect the prices.

The Senator has indicated that the price of meat has been increasing in this country. I think his statement was entirely misleading. He said that there had been so much increase, first, from 1900, and, finally, he said there had been an increase in the price from the beginning of 1913 up to the present time. Mr. President, you can see the fallacy of that statement. There may have been no increase at all during the last three months, when the new tariff law was in operation. There may have been a reduction during the last three months, when the new tariff law was in operation, but the increase from the beginning of January, 1913, under the operation of the old system, up to the time the new tariff law went into effect might account for an increase for the entire period, notwithstanding a reduction during the last three months.

I know that there is not that clamor to-day about the high price of meat that there was; I know that there is not that clamor in this country about the high price of eggs that there was; and yet the Senator from California would have us believe that eggs have not fallen in value, even out there in his own community, in his own State, to which, it is said, that China is exporting eggs—eggs unfit for human food, laid by the hens, as it is said in the letter which the Senator read, or produced, to use a politer expression, under conditions in China which render them unfit for use; and yet the Senator would gravely have the country believe that these spoiled, these insanitary, these unfit eggs from China are finding such a ready market on the Pacific coast that they are actually destroying the market for the fine, white, high-quality eggs of the California hen.

The Senator's contention goes a little further than that. We have not only, he says, destroyed the American market, turned it over to the foreigner, but he said, if I caught his words correctly, and I think I did, this measure that we have passed, this great wickedness that we have done in reducing tariff duties below the protective level, ostensibly and professedly in the interest of the people, has cheapened and degraded American labor.

Mr. President, I know of no influence, save one, working in this country which has degraded American labor. I am sure the tariff is not doing it. I will tell you the only thing of foreign origin or production that is cheapening and degrading American labor. It is the importation of ignorant foreign labor induced by the men who have been clamoring for protection to their factories and to their mills, and clamoring for it on the ground that they wanted this protection in order to enable them to maintain the high American standard of wages. It is these ignorant foreigners, imported here to supply the demand of these protected industries, employed by factories deliberately, because as they do not maintain the American standard of living, they can be secured at a less wage. That is doing more than everything else in this country to cheapen and degrade American labor and add to the list of the unemployed. It is the one influence that has stood in the way of the labor organizations of this country, of the labor unions, in their efforts to improve their wages and their condition. Whatever the wage earners have got in the way of better wages in this country they have not got through these protected manufacturers, these beneficiaries of the tariff, who have sought to lower their standard of wages by importing cheap and ignorant labor. They have got it through their organizations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me. I am trying very hard to get through. I shall be glad for the Senator, when I get through, to say what he should like to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator made the request or I should have refrained from interrupting him. There were one or two points which the Senator recently made that I should like to get a little light on.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from California says—and that has been repeated here before—that the tariff law has resulted in putting thousands of laborers out of employment; and yet I have not found a man, when the matter was discussed in the House—and this phase of the matter was debated there, and it has been debated in the press—I have not found a man who was ready to say that there has been a reduction of the wages of labor in any part of this country, in any industry in this country, during the last three months. Of course there may have been isolated cases where wages in that period of time have been decreased, as there have been like cases of increase; but, taking the level, it seems to be conceded by everybody, as I have abundant testimony here, which I shall ask to incorporate in the RECORD, from representatives of various interests throughout the country, that there has been no reduction of wages in the industries of this country since the passage of the tariff law. In another body one of the leading opponents of the tariff law admitted the fact that there had been no reduction in wages in the factories, and I have here, and will put them in the RECORD, statements from others in a position to know, to the effect that there has been no reduction in wages. I take it that it is an admitted fact, therefore, that there has been no reduction of wages in any one of the industries of this country.

I want to put this proposition, Mr. President: When there is a steady maintenance of the rate of wages—according to all theories of economics—is not that a conclusive proof that there are not two men seeking one job; that there is work for every man who wants work? You will not make the American people believe that an unusual number of men are unemployed in this country because of the reduction of tariff duties unless you can convince them that the rate of wages has fallen, because they know that the minute the supply of labor exceeds the demand there will be a reduction in wages in response to the universal law of supply and demand.

Of course, Mr. President, there have been a large number of unemployed in the great cities during the wintertime. There always are a great many more unemployed during the wintertime than at other seasons of the year; but in every season of the year in the big cities of this country, and in the big cities of every other country, there are under all conditions and any conditions a large number of unemployed people—people who do not want to work, who are unemployed, but who, though unemployed, do not come to the surface until the hard stress and necessities of winter, the pinch of cold and hunger, force them to apply for charity.

In my own State, Mr. President, I know there is a great lack of labor. I am satisfied in the industries and upon the farms of my own State that to-morrow 30,000 able-bodied men could secure employment at good wages.

Mr. President, I want to put into the RECORD a clipping, which I think is from the Washington Post, or it may be from the Star, of November 28. The name of the paper is not on the clipping I have. It is as follows:

SEE NO LABOR CRISIS—CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT CALLS CONDITIONS NORMAL.

NEW YORK, *February 27, 1914.*

The country is not facing an unusual crisis in its numbers of unemployed. This was the consensus of opinion expressed at the national conference on unemployment, which began a two days' session in New York to-day.

Many women, representing different States and foreign countries, attended the session.

Mayor Mitchel, who opened the conference, declared that this year presented almost unprecedented conditions. Three hundred thousand, he said, might be an exaggerated estimate of the number of unemployed in New York, but the number was at least the largest that had ever flooded the city.

PRESENT CONDITIONS NOT ABNORMAL.

Charles B. Henderson, secretary of the Chicago commission of the unemployed, took issue with Mayor Mitchel. "Present conditions," he said, "are not abnormal. Most agencies report that the number of the unemployed is not larger than usual. The tragedy of the present conditions consists in the fact that they are not abnormal, but are steadily recurring, inevitable results of industrial mismanagement throughout the country."

Mr. Henderson said the two years' work of his commission proved that most of the work in alleviating conditions of unemployment has been done by private bureaus with great economic waste and in some places with grave abuses.

HITS AT FREE PUBLIC BUREAUS.

"Present free public bureaus," he continued, "are almost without exception inefficient. The fact is, it is impossible to furnish men with jobs when no jobs are to be had. The solution lies in reforming industrial methods, so that full staffs of employees may be retained even in slack seasons."

"There is no problem of unemployment in my State," said W. C. Cheney, delegate from Connecticut. "In fact it is the other way around. Not long ago manufacturers were actually unable to procure the labor they needed."

Mr. President, in addition to that I wish to put into the RECORD the statement of several officers of charitable bureaus, who make it a business to look after and to care for the unemployed in the cities in which they live, and cooperatively throughout the country, to the effect that the number of unemployed people at this time is not abnormal; also, a statement of Mr. Gompers, made in a recent address, with reference to the condition of the unemployed in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The statements referred to are as follows:

[From New York Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 17, 1914.]

STATEMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF EMPLOYMENT BUREAU AS TO NUMBER OF PEOPLE OUT OF EMPLOYMENT.

J. J. Fitzgerald, head of the employment department of Gimbel Bros., said:

"Several days ago we placed a big display advertisement in the four leading New York newspapers asking for applications for positions of milliners, copyists, milliner helpers, and apprentices. We offered the highest salaries obtainable by this class of help in New York City. We expected hundreds of applications, but received only seven. The advertisement was taken out of the classified columns and placed in other parts of these four papers, in the belief that we would have better results, but they failed to bring a single answer.

"Picture fitters usually are to be had in any number. We advertised for them, and received seven applications. Two years ago, when business was unusually prosperous, according to all reports, we frequently had 8 and 10 applications from chauffeurs. If we told them that we could not take them on, they frequently asked to be employed as helpers until there was an opening. Now we have few applications, and I haven't heard a chauffeur ask for a helper's job for many months.

MORE HELP NEEDED.

"I was looking over our employment sheets and wondering where I was to obtain more help when the head of the mail-order department telephoned to me and said that he would need several men. Every department store in the city is confronted with the same situation with which we are faced, and I can not remember any period when there was a less number of applicants for work than at present.

"Just previous to the holidays we had hundreds of applications for work, and if there was any business depression it was to be felt then, to judge from the number of unemployed. If we had advertised at that time for sewing-machine salesmen, we would have received scores of applications, many of the persons making an effort to 'bluff' their way through. A few days ago we advertised for this same kind of help and received two applications."

ONE CLASS ALWAYS "OUT OF WORK."

James T. Hunt, business manager of the Bowery Mission and head of the Mission Employment Bureau, said:

"We are having a great number of applicants for work, but not a sufficient number to lead us to think that there are 350,000 men out of work in New York City alone, as has been said. Several months ago we had hundreds of applications from men who had been laid off by railroads, street car lines, telephone and telegraph companies, but they soon began to grow scarce, and I understand that most of them have again been placed at work at their trades.

"It would make no difference what state of prosperity we had, there would always be a certain element looking for work and making a howl about hard times. It is easy to discriminate between this class and that composed of able-bodied, willing, and intelligent workmen who may be thrown out of employment. We will always have both classes to deal with, irrespective of how good business conditions may be.

"During the seven years that our employment bureau has been in existence we have placed 22,000 men. At present we are receiving just as many calls for men as we received during the time when we were supposed to be enjoying an unusual run of prosperity. Manufacturing plants that were partly closed down two months ago are again working with full forces, and in many instances I have heard of extra men being placed at work to take care of increasing business."

GAIN IN TYPEWRITER BUSINESS.

Alfred Augustus Fraser, general manager of the New York office of the Remington Typewriter Co., at No. 327 Broadway, said that his company's business has shown a decided improvement in the last two months.

"Business is better with us in all parts of the country," said Mr. Fraser, "but in New York the improvement is more marked than elsewhere. Our sales in December greatly exceeded those for December, 1912, and since January 1 we are far ahead of our business for the corresponding period in 1913. Orders and contracts now in hand assure us a profitable year. We feel certain that business in general must be good and getting better, because there is no surer barometer to the condition of trade than the typewriting industry. Our employment agency also reflects the healthful tone of business. There is an increased demand to-day for stenographers, and we find that salaries are running higher than they have been for many a day. Employers are ready to pay more now for stenographers and bookkeepers than they were willing to pay at any time last year. Good operators are in demand daily, and where last year they had trouble in obtaining permanent places at relatively low wages they are finding them now at salaries that give no concern about making ends meet."

STATEMENT OF MRS. HARRIMAN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER ON UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, TO THE EFFECT THAT CONDITIONS ARE ABOUT THE SAME IN LABOR MARKET NOW AS THEY ARE AT THIS SEASON EACH YEAR.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, resident commissioner of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, to-day gave out the following statement supplementing yesterday's announcement of an investigation by the commission into unemployment:

"Anyone who fails to realize that conditions are about the same in the labor market now as they are at this season each year is either ignorant of conditions or insincere.

"The unskilled laborers, who are the chief sufferers from these annual periods of unemployment, are for the most part migratory, and belong to the class known as floating labor. This makes the problem an interstate one, which can only be adequately studied by a Federal body."

[Editorial from the New York Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 17.]

UNEMPLOYED IN NEW YORK—AN "ARMY" THAT HAS DISAPPEARED.

President Wilson is fully justified in questioning "statistics" that assume to show the presence of 350,000, or anything like that number, of unemployed in this city. The Herald certainly challenges their accuracy, and examples of Sunday and of yesterday furnish ample warrant for the challenge.

Confronted by the herculean task of clearing the city's streets of the heavy accumulation of snow, Commissioner Featherstone and the contractors working under him sent out urgent calls for men. The response was prompt on the part of those who wanted work. Every man who applied was employed, and still the need for men remained.

Were there 350,000 applicants? Were there one-half, one-tenth that number? Mr. A. F. Gunther, superintendent of the bureau of snow removal, said he had about 13,000 men working yesterday. "We could use many more if they would apply," Mr. Gunther added. Either the "vast army of the unemployed" upon which the croakers have been harping has never existed or it vanished at the first suggestion of work.

STATEMENT GIVEN THE NEW YORK HERALD BY MR. GOMPERS FEBRUARY 26, 1914.

Unfortunately there is considerable unemployment among the working people of our country—and in so far as when any one man is unemployed through no fault of his own, to him it appears that all our social fabric is a failure—but that reports of the tremendous number of unemployed are much exaggerated I have not the slightest doubt. We are in the midst of winter and are now passing through the transitory stage of reconstructive tariff and banking legislation, and my experience warrants me in saying that the number of unemployed at present is comparatively less than during similar seasons of the year when tariff legislation had previously just been enacted. I am also decidedly of the opinion that the period of unemployment will be much shorter than during former similar periods and transitory conditions. The adjustment of industry to the new conditions is of vital consideration.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS.

There are three facts which answer completely the charge that conditions are panicky and that there is no work for the man who wants to work.

First is the fact, admitted by the leader of the House in the discussion in that body on last Friday, not denied by anybody, that there is plenty of money to be had for investment at low rates of interest.

Second, while there has been a slight drop in prices of commodities, prices, as a rule, have been maintained.

Third, wages have been maintained.

These conditions are absolutely the reverse of conditions that exist in times of panic or business stagnation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the purpose of the whole argument of the Senator from California was to show that under the present Democratic tariff law there has been stagnation; that there has been depression; that there has been lack of prosperity. It is the usual, ordinary calamity howl. I want to answer that, not by argument, but by presenting a symposium of testimony coming from the press, coming from the heads and representatives of nearly all the great industries of the country from one end of the land to the other, in refutation of the charge that the conditions which exist to-day under the present tariff law are not conditions of prosperity. Before I do that, however, Mr. President, I want to offer and ask to have printed an article from a paper published in the State of Ohio, called the Medina County Gazette. It is not only an answer to the calamity howl that we have heard so much of, but it shows how industriously and systematically, and with a common purpose, these calamity howlers, these prophets of woe and of evil, have been proceeding in order to disseminate a spirit of pessimism throughout the country, to the detriment of the Democratic Party, of course, but more important, and more significant in its criminal purpose and effect, to the detriment of the business interests of the country. The article to which I have referred shows how the Republican State executive committee of the great State of Ohio had this calamity-howl argument boiler plated and sent out, presumably to every Republican paper in that State, as is charged in this article, with the request that it be published, in order that the wave of

pessimism might be started on its career of devastation and ruin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[Extract from speech by Representative ANSBERRY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

CALAMITY-CRY POLITICS SHOWN BY PLATE MATTER SENT BY OHIO REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Some time in January of this year the Republican organization in the State of Ohio sent out boiler-plate matter to the little weekly and daily Republican papers throughout the State of Ohio on this same question, containing a calamity howl. Among other papers they sent this boiler-plate matter to the Medina County Gazette, which is supposed to be a stalwart Republican paper; but the Gazette did not look at the world through the colored spectacles of the gentleman who has charge of that organization, and here is what that Republican paper said with reference to the attitude of these men:

"DASTARDLY POLITICS.

"There has been nothing more reprehensible in American politics than the present studied effort on the part of the standpat forces in control of the Republican Party to aid and abet an era of hard times in this country. It was openly proclaimed at the recent meeting of the Republican national committee at Washington that hard times, want, and poverty were to be the life-savers of that party. To-day from every standpat source is coming a calamity howl coldly calculated to shake business confidence and bring on industrial paralysis.

"As we write there lies on our desk a copy of the Republican News Letter, dated at Columbus, January 3, 1914. Editors are invited to use the contents of this letter in whole or in part. And what is this Republican News Letter that all the editors of Ohio are 'invited' to use and bring before their readers? It is a pure calamity howl calculated to bring on a business panic, if possible—and it is nothing else. Its one big, flaring headline reads: 'Industrial depression.' Then follow three columns of 'calamity' talk, prophesying hard times and business disaster.

"At a recent meeting of the Republican national committee at Washington, Senator REED SMOOT, national committeeman from Utah, was cheered again and again when he airily made the following declaration for a turkey-buzzard policy for his party: 'The silent wheels of the factories, the smokeless stacks of our mills, and the suffering of our people under a Democratic administration will speak louder than any national declaration of principles that we can make. All we have to do to bring victory to our banners will be to point to the closed mill doors and say: "Wilson—that's all."'

"No declaration of principles needed, says SMOOT; just wait for calamity and suffering.

"From every other standpat Republican source is coming the same sort of business poison—the studied attempt to bring suffering and want to millions of American citizens to further the political ends of the Penroses and Smoots and Barneses and Daugherties now in control of the Republican Party.

"The attempt to inject this poison into the business arteries of this country is made, too, when reliable financial authorities like Bradstreet's and Dun's and Henry Clews's tell us that the business outlook for 1914 is brightening daily and that there is no business depression nor panic ahead.

* * * * * * *

"The despicable political panic effort has already failed. The country is aroused against it, and the boomerang is already recoiling upon its projectors.

"The political party that seeks a new lease of life at the hands of American voters by encouraging panic and hard times badly miscalculates, for it can reap from such foul sowing only the contempt and distrust of all right-thinking people."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the sentiment of this country with reference to the business outlook of the future is one of optimism. That optimism is justified by conditions; the people know it, and they are not going to be influenced by the cry of calamity. I do not envy, in the conditions that exist in this country to-day, the man who for political or for any other reasons under the sun seeks without justification to undermine that spirit of optimism which is such a power of hope and helpfulness to business and to prosperity in this country, especially at this time.

Now, Mr. President, I ask to put in the RECORD, without reading, various and sundry interviews which have appeared in the New York Herald, I think on the 17th, 20th, 21st, and the 22d days of the past month, the New York Journal of Commerce, and the St. Louis Republic with representatives of great institutions from various sections of the country, who testify to the same common end, that conditions of prosperity either actually exist or are indicated as about to arrive and restore normal conditions where there has been any disturbance in business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The interviews referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Herald, February 17, 1914.]

CHICAGO.

Charles A. Stevens, president of Charles A. Stevens & Bros., dealers in women's wear: "The prospects of spring trade are better than they have been for several years."

Modie J. Spiegil, treasurer of May, Stern Bros.: "The merchants and jobbers are making more and larger orders than they have in a long time. From the reports I have received from all parts of the country, I take it that these improved conditions are universal."

E. D. Hurlbert, president of Merchants Loan & Trust Co.: "All indications are that the improvement is sound and permanent."

SAGINAW, MICH.

"Industrially, Saginaw has never been in better condition than to-day, and the business prospects never looked brighter. Bankers, manufacturers, and merchants are all enthusiastic." W. S. Lenters, Republican postmaster, said: "The future never looked brighter for Saginaw than it does at the present time."

Charles W. McClure, Republican, president of one of the largest silo-manufacturing concerns in the United States, said: "Our business is 10 times as great as at any time in the history of our company, and prospects never looked brighter for all five of our plants."

W. R. Burt, one of Michigan's wealthiest citizens, is very enthusiastic over the business outlook. He said: "This prosperous condition not only prevails in Saginaw, but statements from towns throughout the St. Croix district show business throughout the section to be excellent, with the best possible prospects for the future."

WICHITA, KANS.

That prosperity has settled on Wichita is evinced by the amount of building that is being contracted for at present. Prospects for the largest crops in the history of the State were never better.

B. F. McLean, president of the Fourth National Bank and a prominent Republican: "Everyone is feeling fine over the outlook."

Judge E. B. Jurlit, vice president of the Farmers & Bankers' Life Insurance Co., a prominent Republican, said: "Every condition points to better times. The farmers all have money."

WHAT THE FOLKS BACK HOME SAY.

DANVILLE, ILL.

Danville, home of Joseph G. Cannon, is in a rich agricultural region. The failure of some crops and curtailment of others, owing to the long drought last summer and the unseasonable weather of fall and this winter, have been felt by business men of this city and the eighteenth congressional district in general; but most of them declare that, notwithstanding these handicaps, their business for the last year has been equal to, and in many instances greater, than any year since 1907.

There have been no business failures here; every business room is occupied, and merchants generally unite in predicting unprecedented prosperity for the next year, barring another crop failure. Real estate values are gradually increasing after several years of depression, and arrangements are being made for unusual building operations with the opening of spring.

Augustus L. Webster, Republican, president of the Webster Grocery Co., is an optimist on the future business outlook of this city and vicinity.

"Early in 1913 the prevailing conditions caused me to believe that business conditions would not improve during the last year, but my opinion was not verified," he said to-day. "The year 1913 was productive of bigger business than any year since I came to Danville, almost half a century ago. I believe every wholesale concern in Danville also enjoyed the same measure of prosperity.

"Comparing conditions existing at the present time with the conditions a year ago, I firmly believe that 1914 will be a greater season for the wholesale business in Danville than the eminently successful year of 1913. This is saying a great deal, but existing commercial and industrial conditions in Danville is the reason for my belief."

Charles L. English, Republican, president of the First National Bank, was more outspoken concerning his opinion of "Uncle Joe's" calamity talk.

"This is largely an agricultural country," said Mr. English, "and, of course, the failure of the oats crop, partial failure of the corn and other crops, was a severe blow from the principal money-producing source. Labor is now pretty generally employed, and there is a fair degree of prosperity in every branch of business. Money may be a little tight for the next six months, but I regard prospects for the coming year as being very bright."

M. S. Plant, Republican, a leading clothing merchant, said: "I regard the business outlook for the coming year as exceptionally good, barring another crop failure."

J. S. Emery, head of a large dry-goods firm; H. C. Adams, president of a building association; and Joseph Schingel, jr., a prominent contractor, expressed practically the same views as the above. One of them stated that the general feeling of optimism for the future and congratulation over past and present conditions in the face of adverse circumstances ought to be sufficient answer to "Uncle Joe."

SEATTLE, WASH.

"Business conditions in the Pacific Northwest," said C. B. Yandell, secretary of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, "are 20 per cent better to-day than they were during the corresponding period a year ago. Bank clearings, customs receipts, building permits, and railroad business prove my statement. Prospects of the early recognition in the House of Alaskan needs, the opening of the Panama Canal, the recent abundant rains are sure to bring on a feeling that the entire Pacific coast country, particularly Seattle and the Northwest, is entering into an era of prosperity not known here in five years.

CONCORD, N. H.

Secretary James O. Lyford, of the Concord Board of Trade, who was naval officer of the port of Boston from 1898 to 1913, and who now is mentioned as a Republican candidate for the United States Senate in succession to Senator Gallinger, said to-night that there was no business depression in this city or vicinity and no indication that anything of the sort was impending.

"With one exception," he said, "every Concord industry is employing as many men to-day, at as high wages and for as many hours in the week, as was the case a year or two years ago. The one exception is the shops of the Boston & Maine Railroad, where the force employed has been diminished one-fourth owing to the opening of the road's new shops at Billerica, Mass.

"Both our wholesale and retail business houses report trade and collections up to the average for this season of the year."

LYNN, MASS.

After a period of depression, during which hundreds of employees were laid off, the big plant of the General Electric Co. here is getting busy again, and, according to Walter C. Fisher, its general manager, the outlook is bright. Many of the employees who were laid off have returned to work, and within a short time it is expected that every department of the plant will be in operation again. This is the between-seasons period for the shoe factories, but most of them here are busier than they have been for several months, and most of the manufacturers are confident that business will improve steadily from now on. The percentage of persons out of work in Lynn is very small compared with other years.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED MEN RESUME WORK AT GARY STEEL MILLS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

More than 1,600 men have been put back to work recently and the plant is operating about 80 per cent of capacity.

Declaring he is glad to find a factor like the Herald substantiating the position of optimism regarding business conditions he assumed more than a year ago, Henry R. Towne, president of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. and formerly president of the Merchants' Association, said yesterday that he believes business everywhere is safe, sound, and promising.

"Speaking of my own business," Mr. Towne said, "and the insight that gives to allied businesses, and my contact with business men from every part of the country, I hold, and I have steadily held for a year, the conviction that business everywhere is in a sound, safe, and promising condition."

That business conditions in this country are improving as a result of public confidence following the enactment of currency legislation was the statement made to the Herald yesterday by L. H. Shearman, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co., exporters, of No. 7 Hanover Square. Mr. Shearman said:

"It will be admitted by all business men that conditions are improving and that things will be better within a short time. The public fear that President Wilson's currency and tariff legislation might cause serious trouble if not precipitate a money panic, as was predicted by many, proved to be unfounded and a healthy reaction is now taking place. From now on I look for a steady advance in the volume of business in this country."

OPINION OF C. A. SCHIEREN, JR.

Charles A. Schieren, jr., of the Charles A. Schieren Co., No. 34 Ferry Street, and first vice president of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, said that after a careful study of business conditions prevailing in this country the promises for great industrial activity in the coming spring are excellent. Mr. Schieren said:

"There was a decrease in the volume of business by our company in January of only 7 per cent, as compared with the figures for the same month last year. But that loss promises to be made up by a corresponding increase in the business for the current month. These facts coupled with reliable information supplied to me by correspondents in the Middle West assure me that a steady, healthful revival of business is in progress.

"Every business man felt the effect of the calamity cries which arose when the tariff and currency legislation was being discussed. The pessimists seemingly convinced the people of the country that if either of President Wilson's measures was passed a death blow to business would be dealt. But happily this prediction was not verified, the fact being that public confidence, upon which the prosperity of the Nation actually depends, has been restored."

COTTON MILLS INCREASE OUTPUT.

Edward K. Cone, president of the New York Cotton Exchange, said that there is a strong revival of business in the industries associated with cotton. The cotton mills not only have not closed, as was predicted by pessimists, but have steadily increased their output. The consumption of cotton at the mills during January established a new high record. "All the statistics and estimates of the cotton trade," said Mr. Cone, "bear out the Herald's contention that at the base of commercial conditions all is well."

NO HALT IN GROCERY TRADE.

Few men have a better opportunity of obtaining information regarding the general aspect of trade and business than M. E. Roche, manager of the Butler grocery stores throughout the city. Daily he meets salesmen from all parts of the country and confers with the managers of the many stores over which he has supervision. He has to make estimates and purchase accordingly. When business conditions are on the wane he is among the first to realize the fact. When they are otherwise his source of information never fails him. This is what he thinks of the outlook:

"I think the prospect never was better. Business to-day is in a splendid condition. We know by the purchases that are made daily. When there is uncertainty and lack of confidence there is a decrease in the sale of luxuries. At present there is no such thing. As far as the public is concerned, the alarmist reports of a few months ago fell on deaf ears.

"Our business year ended on November 1 last. It was a very successful one. Since then, in view of the various reports which have been circulated concerning the general business situation, I have maintained a close surveillance upon our own affairs. The result is that I am able to report that for the period between November 1 and to-day I find that we are ahead of the corresponding period of last year.

"I do not regard the situation simply from my own standpoint. In the course of my daily routine I meet and converse with men who are active in other lines. Many of these are salesmen, who come here with goods to sell and whose opportunities for gleaning authentic information are remarkably good.

"When sales are slow for them it indicates that business is slow generally. If the merchant is slow to purchase, his sales are not up to the average, and if the public is hesitant, then everything becomes more or less stagnant. But that is not the case now. Everyone seems to be ready to purchase in good quantity."

TEXTILE TRADES PROSPER.

Thomas Smidt, a member of the dry goods firm of Vietor & Achelis, was another who sounded a note of optimism concerning the situation of trade.

"Our own business is in splendid condition," he said, "and the textile trade in general throughout the country is flourishing. That I know. Merchants are beginning to realize that no ill effects have been felt from the change in the tariff, and that none may be expected. This, of course, lends stimulus to trade.

"The prospects for the near future are just as bright as those of a year ago, and as far as we are concerned all departments are just as busy as they ever were. We observe also that trade all around us is in healthy condition, and we place no credence whatever in what some persons have been declaring about hard times. We have plenty of confidence. The Herald's attitude in the matter is praiseworthy indeed."

Samuel S. Campbell, vice president and director of the Fourth National Bank and director in several other concerns, stated that he observed distinct signs of improvement in the business situation generally.

"We observe a much better outlook," he remarked.

COASTWISE SHIPPING ACTIVE.

Anton A. Raven, president of the American Bureau of Shipping, said: "The surest barometer of business conditions I know of is the coastwise shipping trade. There is no better argument that I can advance to show that business generally throughout the country is prospering than to point to the increasing amount of business being handled by our coastwise vessels.

"There has been no appreciable change either for good or worse in the foreign shipping, although an increase was expected in the imports when the new tariff schedule went into effect. Our exports still lead the imports by a healthy margin, and from all indications it would be safe to say that they will show a greater gain at the end of the fiscal year than ever before in history. The shipping interests which confine their operations solely to the coastwise trade have nothing but encouraging news to give out on conditions to-day and the outlook for the future.

"With the situation cleared up in Mexico I believe there will be a great step forward in conditions in this country."

George Doubleday, president of the Ingersoll-Rand Co., said: "Business everywhere is improving, and I hear few complaints. The Ingersoll-Rand Co. is working full time again, and many of the big industrial plants are employing extra help. I hear nothing but encouraging reports. It seems to me that this talk of a business depression is absurd."

ENGINEERING CONCERN BUSY.

S. L. Selden, of the J. G. White Corporation, of No. 43 Exchange Place, one of the foremost engineering and construction concerns of the country, said that in his opinion the country would this year enjoy one of the most prosperous years commercially and industrially known in decades. Mr. Selden said:

"There is not the shadow of a doubt in my mind but we are entering upon a highly prosperous year. This conviction is based upon a careful study of the situation and comparison with the statistical data of previous years. Last autumn we wondered if we would find work enough to keep our forces employed during the winter. That question was answered when we received so many commissions that we must work hard to keep up with them.

"If business conditions had not improved, our corporation would have been among the first to suffer. It is because of this that I say with confidence that this will be a banner year in this country. There never was anything fundamentally wrong with industrial conditions in this country, but the depression noticeable last year was almost wholly due to the groundless fear that radical changes in our financial and tariff systems would bring hard times. This fear was aggravated by senseless predictions of disappointed politicians, but in the face of it all confidence is returning, and with it the inevitable revival of business along all lines."

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 22, 1914.]

GOOD TRADE REPORTS IN WEST AND SOUTH—MERCHANTS, BUYERS, AND TRAVELERS ALL SEE EVIDENCES OF PROSPERITY THROUGHOUT COUNTRY.

Buyers from all sections of the country, traveling salesmen, and manufacturers who were in New York yesterday were practically unanimous in the opinion that the United States is on the threshold of one of the greatest eras of prosperity in its history.

The general business conditions of the country were reflected by the fact that in most cases the buyers are increasing their orders for stocks of goods, according to the buyers and merchants whom I interviewed yesterday.

One of the large buyers who makes frequent trips to New York is George B. Monning, of the Monning Dry Goods Co., Fort Worth, Tex., who is staying at the Albert Hotel, University Place and Eleventh Street.

"The business prospects in Texas," said Mr. Monning, "are much better than at any time in the last six years. This is a conservative opinion based on a thorough knowledge of business conditions throughout the entire State."

GOOD REPORTS FROM GEORGIA.

One of the largest manufacturers of Georgia is L. M. Lynch, who is at the Albert Hotel. Mr. Lynch's concern, the Muscogee Manufacturing Co., of Columbus, Ga., which is in the cotton-goods manufacturing business, has a New York office at No. 47 Leonard Street.

"I have traveled all through the South and the Middle West recently," said Mr. Lynch yesterday, "and I know from personal experience and observation that the country is just as prosperous as the Herald's interviews and editorials have stated."

Walter Lassiter, who is a traveling salesman for Eugene Teschner & Co., dealers in flowers and feathers, at No. 719 Broadway, said that he had just returned from a trip through the Carolinas, Maryland, and Virginia, and found a wonderful condition of prosperity throughout those sections.

"In my own State of North Carolina," he said, "everything is moving in a satisfactory manner. Merchants, farmers, bankers, and, in fact, everybody is prosperous, with the outlook bright for more prosperity during the coming year. Sales are good and everybody is happy."

LABOR.

In discussing the matter every man interviewed said that, so far as he knew, the price of labor had not been reduced. They used this argument to refute the contention that there are unusually large numbers of unemployed men throughout the country.

"If the supply of labor is greater than the demand," they said, "and this situation exists for a great length of time, the price will fall because of the competition. We have noticed no such condition in our section."

SOUTH ENJOYING BOOM TIMES.

"The South is not entering upon but it is enjoying the greatest era of prosperity in its history. The Civil War no longer is a date for commercial comparison. From the Shenandoah to the Gulf and from the Carolinas to Texas the reign of Midas is more nearly absolute than at any other time since the war or than it ever was in the days of slavery."

Thus spoke James L. Tapp, president, general manager, and buyer of the James L. Tapp Co., of Columbia, S. C., which for 30 years has conducted the largest wholesale and retail department store in the State. Mr. Tapp has been here a week on one of his periodical buying trips, of which he usually makes 8 or 10 a year. But he said yesterday that he found it necessary to make several times the ordinary amount of February purchases of stock and that in consequence his present stay would be prolonged nearly a month. Mr. Tapp is a director in the Palmetto National Bank, of Columbia, and is largely interested in other enterprises of that city.

"I have been in business in Columbia 28 years," said Mr. Tapp, "and I never before saw trade so good as it is to-day. Our store did the

largest and most profitable business in its history last year, and the volume of business so far this year is far ahead of 1913.

SEE GREATEST YEAR IN DECADE.

J. J. Selman, representing William Morris & Co., of No. 140 West Twenty-second Street, manufacturers of silk petticoats, and Lichtenstein, Reichlin & Co., of Philadelphia, manufacturers of silk dresses and waists, has just returned from a trip through the South and West. Mr. Selman said yesterday:

"I went as far South as Texas, and everywhere I found business good and the outlook even better. All through the South and West manufacturers and dealers are stocking up as if they expected 1914 to be the greatest business year in a decade. The South is too busy to pay any attention to the political pessimist."

Albert F. Rockwell, president of the New Departure Manufacturing Co., of Bristol, Conn., which employs 1,500 operatives and is running on full time, said, "That we regard business as good and expect it to be better is proved by the fact that we have just completed a large extension to our plant and are about to enlarge further by adding another building for our coaster-brake department."

C. E. Burch, of No. 45 West Thirty-fourth Street, New York buyer for Burch Bros. & Co., owners of dry goods stores in Waterloo, Marshalltown, and Mason City, Iowa, and Aberdeen, S. Dak.: "We have the largest dry goods stores in Iowa, and we can see nothing but prosperity ahead."

A. W. Burch, of Waterloo, Iowa, manager of Burch Bros. & Co.'s Waterloo store: "The West is in very good condition, and it is going from good to better. All the 100 factories in Waterloo have their entire output sold for the coming year. Prosperity prevails throughout Iowa."

1914 "YEAR OF PLENTY."

J. C. Ratcliff, buyer for the Battery Dry Goods Co., of Gaffney City, S. C.: "Business is very good with us and with merchants and manufacturers of South Carolina and the South generally. In fact, we are too busy to think of any possible interruption of prosperity, and there are no indications, so far as I can see, that 1914 will not be a year of plenty and happiness."

THE MEN WHO KNOW BEST.

In interviews with well-known manufacturers occupying a half page of yesterday's issue sentiments such as these were uttered:

R. L. Prather, Boston: "We feel absolutely optimistic, and our sales are excellent."

F. R. Maxwell, Boston: "The fundamental business conditions are all right; the situation only needs an optimistic spirit to make business boom."

H. T. Colwell, Newburgh, N. Y.: "The business outlook for the coming year never was better."

C. B. Hamilton, Grand Rapids, Mich.: "There is every prospect that 1914 will finish strong."

W. Laughlin, Chicago, Ill.: "The country is bound to be more prosperous."

O. B. Carson, Southbridge, Mass.: "The outlook is excellent."

F. I. Towle, St. Johnsbury, Vt.: "The southwestern territory is in particularly good condition."

A. B. Whitlock, Wheeling, W. Va.: "Our sales are ahead of 1913."

A. B. Pfeiffer, Chicago, Ill.: "Prospects for a big business year."

Frank G. Drew, New Haven, Conn.: "The outlook is very encouraging."

Davis H. Reddie, Springfield, Mass.: "Prosperity is in store for us."

Edward Freshl, Milwaukee, Wis.: "Nineteen hundred and fourteen will be a splendid year for business."

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 20, 1914.]

"The year 1914 should be the greatest in the history of our State." This is the statement of Robert Newton Lynch, the president and manager of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco. Mr. Lynch added: "As far as we have learned from our business contact with other States throughout the country, there is a general rise in confidence all around and a thoroughly optimistic look."

Concerning employment conditions in the West Mr. Lynch declared that, while labor demands were being met, the supply does not exceed the demand, save in seasonal employments.

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 22, 1914.]

TRADE CONDITIONS.

INDICATIONS FOR GOOD SPRING TRADE.

A. V. Hamburg, president of the Newark Board of Trade, said: "Business is pretty good and orders are coming in well, with indications that the spring trade we are preparing for will materialize."

Attention was called yesterday by an important business man to an anomalous condition faced by the Daily Iron Trade, a Cleveland publication, which about a month ago undertook to collect proof that there was wide depression in the iron, steel, and metal trades of the United States. He exhibited a copy of the publication to show that its own news articles contradicted that assumption. On January 16 last the front page of the Daily Iron Trade, which is an organ for the industry, contained an article under this heading: "Steel trade backs up idle workmen statements."

On page 3 of the same issue appear articles under the following heads: "Structurals in better demand," "See big rail tonnage," "Sheets appear of firmer tone," "Puddling mills to resume work," "Buffalo sold much," "Wire goods in better demand," "Larger bar tonnage."

TEXTILES.

Herman W. Block, of the S. S. Stein Co., said: "Letters we are receiving from retailers and from our agents everywhere speak hopefully of the future. Orders which we are receiving are unusually large for this time of the year."

TYPEWRITING BUSINESS.

The typewriter industry never was more prosperous or more promising than it is now, according to Harry Bates, of the Underwood Typewriter Co., in its head offices in the Underwood Building in Vesey Street.

"Instead of feeling any depressed business condition," he said, "we have been enjoying a continuous boom. Our business is better now than ever before, and contracts in hand indicate unmistakably that it is going to be better still.

"No one thought of crying hard times a year ago, yet business conditions everywhere, as indicated by our business, are better than they were a year ago.

WOMEN'S COSTUMES.

I. Lahm, of Lahm & Deutz, women's costume designers, at Nos. 33 and 39 West Thirty-fourth Street, said he expected the biggest season the firm ever has known.

"Already our sales for this year have exceeded by 10 per cent double the sales of this time last year," he said. "Our collections, which until recently were rather slow, are fine now, and our losses for the last several months have reached a minimum. I regard the promises of this business year as nothing short of phenomenal. Merchants who have come here to place their spring orders are actually sending in hurried reorders, saying that business in its present state promises so well that they do not want to be caught shorthanded. We find right now that our only trouble is the inability to fill orders, not to sell goods."

TRADE IN JEWELRY SPECIALTIES.

Charles Lippman, of the Lippman, Spier & Hahn Co., designers and wholesalers of jewelers' novelties, at No. 1261 Broadway, with branches all over the country and in Europe and South America, said: "Our business, I find, is an excellent index of general conditions. We sell largely to the big department stores, and they buy little of our goods when times are dull, because their customers do not buy many trinkets when they have little money. This year our sales have been heavy, and the quality of the goods has been excellent."

Matthias Stratton, of Alling & Co., manufacturing jewelers, said: "Storms have caused a cessation of orders in our line from the central western section of the country, but otherwise the trade is keeping up. Collections have improved since the first of the year, and jewelry manufacturers generally are working on full time making spring goods, the outlook being good for a brisk demand."

AUTOMOBILES.

From the automobile industry comes the particularly optimistic statement of Harry S. Houpt, president of the automobile company of that name, which deals principally in Lozier cars, at No. 1751 Broadway.

"This is the eleventh year I have been in the automobile business," said Mr. Houpt, "and in January and February of this year I have been more successful than in any other two months since I began. Since the first of the year I have outsold the previous best two months by 14 automobiles."

Arthur B. Underwood, president and manager Riley-Klotz Co., makers of automobile accessories, said: "We are not as busy as we could be, but orders are coming in steadily, and we are hoping that the indications for a brisk trade revival this spring will materialize. There is nothing to croak about, and if the promised forward movement arrives on time we'll all be too busy to even shout for joy."

SANGUINE IN CLOTHING TRADE.

An indication of business conditions from the viewpoint of New York business men was shown in a statement by Maurice Brill, of Brill Bros., dealers in men's wearing apparel. "Everyone in our line of business is sanguine," said Mr. Brill. "Manufacturers and importers are going ahead as fast as ever."

SHOES AND LEATHER.

Johnson & Murphy, shoe manufacturers, reported a full force, working full time. The season is regarded as a good one, with bright prospects for spring trade.

Weingarten Bros.' corset manufactory is running full time, with a force of about 1,500 workers. Sales for January exceeded those for the same month last year and big orders are coming in.

Whitehead & Hoag, manufacturers of badges, buttons, and novelties, have between 750 and 800 hands working full time, a larger force than was employed a year ago.

Peter Loehnberg, Atlantic Leather Co., said: "The leather trade has picked up considerably during the last few weeks. Orders are coming in and there are indications that within the next 60 days the leather-making industry will be humming along at a great rate."

BRIDGEPORT FACTORIES WORKING TO CAPACITY.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Threatened disturbances in business having been found mythical, factories here are working at capacity and some of them overtime to meet demands of their trade. Among others, the Union Metallic Cartridge Co. is working overtime.

D. W. Wheeler, secretary of the Acme Shear Co., said: "The business outlook is very good. We can see good business ahead."

S. T. Davis, jr., president Locomobile Co. of America, said: "As far as our own business is concerned, we know that the tendency is toward improvement. The general sentiment throughout the country is optimistic."

F. J. Kingsbury, president Bridgeport Brass Co., said: "Business is better with us now than at the close of last year. The outlook is for a steadier business than last year."

C. E. Woods, manager of the American Graphophone Co., said: "Up to January 1 we never had such big business, and business at the present is about 20 per cent ahead of last year. There has been no diminution in the export trade."

Charles V. Barrington, secretary Crane Valve Co., said: "We are running full time in our plants here. Everything is picking up and conditions look good for the future. We are shipping to all parts of the United States."

Dever H. Warner, president Warner Bros. Co., manufacturers of corsets, employing 5,000 persons, said: "We look for normal conditions of business during the year and think that the work being done is bound to be a benefit to the country. We believe that the tariff will adjust itself and that from every viewpoint business is bound to be good. Our export business is increasing."

F. E. Baskets, superintendent of the Fletcher Engineering Co., said: "The business outlook in this country is good. We expect a big year not only from the building operations which have already begun, but from contracts upon which we are asked to bid."

Charles Hutchinson, treasurer Barnum & Bailey Circus, said: "We are expecting one of the biggest years in the circus business which we ever have known. The seating capacity of our big tent has been increased several thousand."

Thomas J. Seward, superintendent Electric Cable Co., said: "With a quiet beginning, we look forward to a good business. Our factory is working full time, with new business in sight for March and April. This is an extremely good outlook for what is usually a bad season."

Lynn W. Wilson said: "Business should be better than normal during the year. Many concerns here are putting on help, and some few are working overtime. At this season of the year outdoor workers are usually without employment. When outdoor occupations are resumed in the spring it will be discovered that the scale of employment is greater than it was a year earlier."

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 21, 1914.]

MANUFACTURERS REPRESENTING $500,000,000, IN PROSPERITY CONFERENCES HERE, SEE GREAT BUSINESS YEAR AHEAD.

Sounding a note of present and forthcoming prosperity and of confidence in the stability of the fundamental business principles of this country, more than 50 prominent manufacturers, representing $500,000,000 of invested capital, met yesterday at the Waldorf-Astoria to consider cooperation for immediate expenditures that would develop trade and bring added volumes of business in the revival that they predict is near at hand.

C. L. Forgey, representing Berry Bros., varnish manufacturers: "This year looks fine for us. We have received orders for fine baking japans for use by concerns in Milan, Italy, and Turin. Business is fine and the prospects are bright. Our Detroit, Walkerville, and San Francisco factories are running all the time and one branch of the Detroit plant is running day and night."

R. L. Prather, advertising manager of the Thomas G. Plant Co., Boston: "We manufacture fine shoes for women. Naturally we come into contact with the best stores, not only in America but abroad. We feel exceptionally optimistic, and our sales are most excellent. We have every confidence that the market is going to be just as good, if not better, as the year advances."

GOOD OUTLOOK FOR SHOE TRADE.

F. R. Maxwell, vice president of the Thomas G. Plant Co., Boston, shoe manufacturers: "The fundamental business conditions are all right."

H. T. Coldwell, assistant general manager and secretary of the Coldwell Lawn Mower Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: "There is every reason to say that the business outlook for the coming year never was better. It is so with us. Conditions are good for prosperity, and we are going to have a corking year."

FINE PROSPECTS FOR FURNITURE.

C. B. Hamilton, of the Berkey & Gay Furniture Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.: "There is every prospect that 1914, while it has started slow, will finish strong. Retail stocks are low and every condition points to a successful year."

W. Laughlin, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "With a greater consumption of 'the ham what am,' the country is bound to be more prosperous."

O. B. Carson, advertising manager of the American Optical Co., Southbridge, Mass.: "The outlook for the current year is excellent. Present business is most encouraging. It started slow for the year, but bids fair to end with record business. We have felt no hard times since President Wilson went into office, and we are expecting a general improvement all around."

Frank I. Towle, of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn., and St. Johnsbury, Vt.: "From reports given to us by our salesmen throughout the section west of Chicago we find the southwestern territory in particularly good business and financial condition."

A. B. Whitlock, New York representative of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "Our sales are ahead of the same period in 1913. The prospect is good for the rest of the year."

ARMOUR & CO. SATISFIED.

A. F. Pfeiffer, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "Prospects and conditions are encouraging for a big business year."

Frank G. Drew, sales manager of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co., New Haven: "Business at present is normal with us. The outlook for 1914 is very encouraging."

David H. Reddie, of Smith & Wesson, Springfield, Mass.: "With conditions fairly normal, we believe that prosperity is in store for us."

John H. Eggens, of the L. E. Waterman Co.: "Business is good and improving, as unsettled conditions are being cleared up."

E. P. Seymour, of the L. E. Waterman Co.: "When uncertain matters of legislation are settled, business will resume activities to proportions heretofore unknown in this country."

H. E. Cragin, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "Conditions are promising."

Edward Freshl, president of the Holeproof Hosiery Co., Milwaukee, Wis.: "Indications are that 1914 will be a splendid year for business."

George W. Dickerman, vice president of the Remington Typewriter Co.: "There seems to be a better feeling generally to-day, with sounder business conditions."

Walter H. McClure, of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "Conditions are normal; orders are plentiful and prospects are good."

George S. Quay, of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "The business outlook for 1914 is very bright."

John Rickaby, of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn.: "The business outlook is, in our opinion, favorable for healthy progress in all legitimate lines."

John J. Gardiner, sales manager of the Hull Bros.' Umbrella Co., of Toledo, Ohio: "We have every reason to believe this will be our banner year."

Eben C. Speiden, of the International Acheson Graphite Co., Niagara Falls: "Prospects and conditions are encouraging. The Rice Leaders of the World Association represents the most powerful force for the promotion of clean and honest business that ever existed in this or any other country."

Charles M. Steele, vice president and general manager of the Carl M. Green Advertising Agency, Detroit, representing Berry Bros. (Inc.) and the Anderson Electric Car Co.: "Automobile and other business in Detroit show marked improvement. The outlook for the year is very bright."

FACTORIES RUNNING OVERTIME.

Francis D. Bowman, advertising manager of the Carborundum Co., of Niagara Falls: "We sell grinding wheels and other abrasive products to the factories of the world. When factories are running our products move. At present our plant is running overtime to meet demands. The manufacture of grinding wheels and grinding products is a splendid trade barometer."

George U. Crocker, president of the Simplex Electric Heating Co., of Cambridge, Mass. "A period of readjustment to new business ideals is closing and a period of advance under new conditions is in sight."

H. H. Whiting, Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., of Minneapolis, Minn.: "The business outlook is very encouraging at the present time."

P. C. Ludlam, general sales manager of the Coldwell Lawn Mower Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: "Business prospects are excellent and the Rice Leaders of the World Association will materially improve the already prosperous business conditions."

Philip F. Hall, National Veneer Products Co., of Mishawaka, Ind.: "Business is 35 per cent ahead of last year, and it looks as if we will hold it for a year."

BUSINESS IN GLASSWARE GOOD.

J. C. Brady, vice president of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, Va.: "Judging solely from our own business, general conditions and prospects are good."

E. C. Waldvogel, assistant general manager of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.: "Business for 1914 will be up to the normal, with more to come."

Lothar W. Faber, of the Eberhard-Faber Pencil Co.: "Present business conditions are normal. The future prospects are favorable, unless interfered with through legislative action."

A. G. Baker, vice president of the Niagara Silk Mills, of North Tonawanda, N. Y.: "Conditions are promising for a good year, and there is every indication of a returning confidence and prosperity."

W. C. Anderson, president of the Anderson Electric Car Co.: "The future depends upon the action of legislation on railroads and corporations. Give prosperity a chance and we will have it."

At the banquet last night at the Waldorf, Job E. Hedges presided, and speeches were made by Isaac F. Marcosson and William B. Howland.

VOTE OF THANKS TO THE HERALD.

Felicitous speeches were made also by C. B. Hamilton, of the Berkey & Gay Furniture Co., of Grand Rapids; H. Seymour, of the L. E. Waterman Co.; E. Eaton, of the Eaton, Crane & Pike Co.; F. R. Maxwell, vice president of the Thomas G. Plant Co.; and Mr. Rice, all of whom had a tone of hopefulness and praised the purposes of the association.

Mr. Hedges brought up the matter of the Herald's attention to prosperous companies, and said that, as this newspaper had exerted itself toward expressing the optimistic side of the situation, he thought it was in keeping with the purposes of the association to extend a vote of thanks. David H. Reddie, of the Smith & Wesson Co., put the question in the form of a motion, and Edward Freshl, president of the Holeproof Hosiery Co., seconded it. Mr. Hedges then put the subject to a vote, and it was passed unanimously.

Nathan Straus, of New York: "We are entering what will be the greatest era of prosperity the country has known. The grip of Wall Street on the United States has been shaken off by the new currency law. It means that all parts of the country may act on their own initiative without being compelled to consult Wall Street."

B. J. Greenhut, of the Greenhut-Siegel Cooper Co., said there is not the slightest indication of slackening in the speed of business in his house, and in coming in contact with others in the same and associated lines he has learned, he said, that the same feeling of confidence is firmly established throughout the country. There are as many employees at work in the various great business houses throughout the city as there were a year ago, and as far as the Greenhut-Siegel Cooper Co. is concerned, said Mr. Greenhut, business is very healthy indeed and everyone is busy.

GLASS.

Commending the Herald's reports on the business situation, Representative EDWIN S. UNDERHILL, of New York, in an interview to-day called attention to the boom conditions in the glass industry. He said:

"It may be of interest to the Herald to know that the Corning (N. Y.) Glass Works is at present enjoying a period of the greatest activity since its establishment 40 years ago. It is the largest glass factory in the United States, employing upward of 1,500 persons. It never employed so many men before and its pay roll was never so large.

"Corning's leading paper states that the pay roll last week was nearly 30 per cent higher than the corresponding period a year ago, and that one of the blowers received $45 for his week's work on the piecework basis, on which the factory operates."

[From New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 3, 1914.]

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CREDIT MEN ON BUSINESS OUTLOOK.

That business men are more cheerful regarding the outlook is asserted in the February circular letter issued yesterday by the National Association of Credit Men. It says:

"The first month of the new year has clearly given a new note to business. Uncertainty as to what was going to happen next has been giving way during the month to definiteness. Instead of pursuing a policy of self-protection, as business men have thought necessary for several years, they may look forward, in lines where stocks have not been carried over on account of unseasonable weather, with genuine confidence, working aggressively and expansively for business.

"There is a world-wide ease in the money market, a condition almost novel, so long is it since we have been free from financial stress and strain in one or more of the world's centers.

"This note of cheer does not mean that we need be less vigilant in keeping receivables well under control, for no matter how favorable business prospects may be, anything but a close-collection policy is bad business.

"It is obvious, from reports reaching the National office, that during the last two months of 1913 slowness in the settlement of merchandise accounts was general. There are two distinctive reasons for this condition: First, unseasonable weather operating against sales of winter stocks; and, second, timidity on the part of the interior banks pending banking and currency legislation."

[From the St. Louis Republic, Feb. 12.]

GENERAL BUSINESS.

The marked changes in financial conditions in New York to-day are harbingers of a period of great prosperity, according to Ben Altheimer, president of the Altheimer & Rawlings Investment Co., who has just returned from the East.

"There is money everywhere for investment. Interest and discount rates have been lowered. Commercial paper in large amounts is being bought up rapidly by the banks, and new issues of securities are absorbed as quickly as they are offered.

"Banking houses that had prepared February bond circulars to mail to their clients were compelled to withhold them, as the securities were disposed of without the necessity of circularizing.

"Whether this is a natural reaction from the lethargy of business that existed a few months ago, or whether it is caused by the demand resulting from prosperity, I can not say. It is certain, however, that confidence has been restored here and abroad, and Wall Street has proved again that it is not only cold and practical, but also sensitive and sentimental—a contradiction, but a fact.

"There has been no real scarcity of money during the past few months. It was only temporarily out of sight. London and the Continent are again buying our securities, whereas in October and November indifference to American issues was the rule.

"The passage of the currency bill, which will give us a fixed status in banking and currency affairs, has much to do with this change of conditions, no doubt. It has given a stimulus and confidence where doubt and hesitancy existed."

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask permission also, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, upon his return from the trip around the country in connection with the organization of the regional banks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY M'ADOO UPON HIS RETURN FROM A TRIP AROUND THE COUNTRY AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF REGIONAL BANKS.

The committee was presented everywhere with overwhelming evidence of the enormous economic strength of the country and of the rapid progress of every section. The fact that the Nation's banking resources as a whole make enormous advances every 12 or 15 years, approximately doubling in each such period, was made evident. Facts and figures submitted to the committee in every part of the country show amazing growth and strength, and disclosed a condition of financial, industrial, commercial, and agricultural soundness and prosperity that leaves no doubt as to the future.

Mr. SIMMONS. Also an interview of Gov. Craig, of North Carolina, published in the Washington Post, February 23, 1914:

North Carolina was never so prosperous, nor her people so happy, as at present. We have plenty of money, and everyone except a few of our Republican friends is pulling for Wilson. The Democrats have made a great success. They have passed more constructive legislation in the 10 months that Wilson has been in the White House than all the Congresses since the war.

If some of the unemployed men of whom I have read will come to North Carolina, we can give them plenty of work. I believe we could employ 20,000 able-bodied men at once if we could get them.

I wish also, Mr. President, to put in the RECORD certain extracts from the report of the special board of examiners sent during the last month or six weeks by the Secretary of Commerce into the State of Washington to examine into certain charges preferred by a Representative from that State in another body to the effect that about 190 of the mills of that State were under suspension. The report shows that there were no more mills under suspension in December last year than usual under like weather conditions. It also shows that the price of wages has not materially changed since 1908, and that the number of unemployed in the State was no greater in the shingle industry in December, 1913, than at numerous times under similar conditions under the operation of the protective tariff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The closing of the shingle mills in the State of Washington is not an unusual occurrence.

The labor cost of producing shingles in the United States and British Columbia does not differ greatly, if at all.

The cost of timber is probably somewhat greater in the United States than in British Columbia.

American manufacturers are not abandoning their mills nor are they moving to British Columbia. On the other hand, new mills are being built and old ones enlarged in this country.

There has been no reduction of wages in the shingle mills, and in only a very few instances have there been wage reductions in the lumber mills.

There are not more idle men in the State of Washington at this time due to the closing down of shingle mills than there have been at numerous times under a protective tariff.

The list of 194 mills reported closed on December 1, 1913, was not an unusually long one. At some time during every year, practically ever since the development of the shingle industry in the State of Washington, almost all of the interior mills and some of those at tidewater are closed about 60 days. Every man who is now or has been connected with the shingle industry declares that during the winter months a large number of interior mills are forced to close on account of weather conditions. The records of the various shingle associations and the files of the lumber trade journals bear abundant testimony to the fact that in practically no year since the development of the industry have the mills generally been operated more than 10 months.

It is particularly significant that, in order to obtain a list of 194 mills closed, it was necessary to include therein those mills that are always forced to close on account of weather conditions, those that were compelled to close because they had no timber, those that were burned, and those that were bankrupt or in financial distress.

A considerable number of the mills reported closed on December 1 were operating on January 1, 1914, and a still larger number have resumed operations since that time.

In regard to wages, the facts are that there has been no material changes in the rates of wages paid in the shingle industry since 1908.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want also, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD various and sundry statements from magazines and newspapers, such as the Wall Street Journal, the New York Journal of Commerce, the Iron Age, the Square Deal, and a number of other papers and periodicals, which I will not now enumerate, showing the prosperous condition in the steel and iron industry in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 3, 1914.]

CONDITIONS IN STEEL INDUSTRY IMPROVED.

GARY SOON TO RUN ON FULL TIME.

CHICAGO, *January 31.*

Conditions in the steel industry at Gary, Ind., improved in the last week, and word was given out by the general managers of the different plants to-day that the mills would be operating to full capacity by the end of February.

The Gary plant of the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. is now operating at full capacity after a shutdown during December. The American Bridge Co. is operating at three-fourths capacity and is turning out a large order for the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1914.]

STEEL MILLS FAST GETTING UP TO THEIR FULL CAPACITY.

SHARON.

Blast furnace No. 3 of the Carnegie Steel Co., at Farrell, will start up Wednesday. This means an additional battery of coke ovens will be fired immediately. After Wednesday the Farrell works will be running at the same capacity as before the depression. The tin-plate mill is running at full capacity, for the first time in months. Nearly 8,000 men will be employed at the Farrell mills this week.

Production at the Ohio works of the Carnegie Steel Co. will be increased this week when the billet, sheet-bar, and slab mills will be operated to capacity. One of the Bessemer furnaces that went out of blast some time ago for relining has gone to commission. Two other Bessemer stacks are still being overhauled while out of blast. Prospects are much better now at the Youngstown Carnegie mills.

The Republic Iron & Steel Co. will continue to operate in full, excepting the 20-inch bar mill at the Brown-Bonnell works. During the past week all of the mills were operated to nearly full capacity. At the sheet and tube mills the same department will be in commission this week as were operated last week.

CHICAGO.

The American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., at Gary Ind., is operating to full capacity, and American Bridge Co. at 75 per cent of capacity.

The Illinois Steel Co.'s plant is expected, within a few days, to operate at full capacity, employing 8,570 men, including 1,000 reemployed since last autumn.

PIG-IRON OUTPUT HEAVIER.

Increased buying is reported from different centers of the steel trade. Freer purchases of pig iron are commented on by trade periodicals, and an increase of production in the present month is expected. The Iron Age says: "Iron and steel markets have gained ground in the past week. January buying was so large and the behavior of prices so satisfactory that with the opening of February producers in several finished lines have announced advances of $1 a ton."

The Iron Trade Review says: "The effect of the increased bookings of iron and steel products in January clearly is being shown in the movement of the market toward higher price levels. The Steel Corporation this week has raised its operations to 75 per cent of steel capacity, and some predictions now are being heard that the steel industry of the whole country will be close to this rate before the end of February. Larger buyers continue to come into the pig-iron market more freely, and the better volume is hardening prices."

[From the Square Deal, February, 1914.]

CONDITIONS IN WEST VIRGINIA IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

WHEELING.

This city and State have shared in the betterment of business, which began with the new year. There has been a marked improvement in every line of industry which was involved in the depression prevailing during the closing weeks of 1913. State Labor Commissioner I. V. Barton's investigations lead him to report a reduction in the ranks of idle workers and fewer inquiries for employment at the bureau conducted by him.

Within a week normal conditions will prevail in the iron and steel mills, and the starting of 5 of the 10 mills of the Wheeling Co.'s new plant at Tiltonsville, Ohio, will result in a smaller number of idle men in the steel mills of the district than at any time within a year. The big Carnegie plant at Bellaire is going full blast. The Laughlin in Martins Ferry and the Whitaker in Wheeling, both under the same independent management, are running to capacity. The entire steel department of the Riverside plant at Benwood will be going on the 12th for the first time in many weeks, and Furnace B, which has been undergoing repairs for a long time, will be ready for operation within a few days. At the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co.'s operations in Benwood conditions are normal. The La Belle tin mill, which worked three days a week during December, is now going four and five days a week, with a promise of full operation soon.

In railroad circles conditions as to employment are decidedly brighter. At the Benwood yards of the Baltimore & Ohio most of the men who were laid off during December are back at their jobs.

Coal-mining operations throughout the State were not much affected by the depression late in 1913, and it is the confident prediction of several prominent operators that all records for coal output in West Virginia will be broken in 1914.

In the glass and pottery industries conditions are not the brightest, but manufacturers are optimistic. The plants at Newell, W. Va., are running, and the biggest independent glass factory in the world, at Moundsville, W. Va., is going to full capacity. The Owens machine plants at Fairmont and Clarksburg are turning out all the bottles the machines will make. The Central factory in Wheeling, Senator Scott's plant, is enjoying a prosperous run. The glass factories are still experiencing difficulty in securing boys.

The enamel plants in Moundsville and Bellaire are doing fairly well. The latter will be in part removed to other locations, but the departments retained by Bellaire are going full tilt.

PITTSBURGH.

Following four months of depression and gloom, the industries of the Pittsburgh district are brightening up again as 1914 grows older. The steel business is the barometer of conditions here. The estimated production in the district for the first two weeks of the year is 100,000 tons per week. For the three months previous the production had

dwindled to between 60,000 and 65,000 tons per week, making the increase for the first two weeks of the year more than 33 per cent.

Plants in the Pittsburgh district that have not turned a wheel for weeks are resuming operations, bringing back employment to thousands of men. During the dull period mills of the United States Steel Corporation in Sharon, Farrell, New Castle, Homestead, Pittsburgh proper, and other places in this district were forced to close down. These are all opening up and the majority are running full time now.

That the steel manufacturers are not alarmed is proven by the improvements they are making to their plants. Eight companies in the Pittsburgh district are constructing additional open-hearth furnaces that will give them an additional total annual capacity of 2,113,000 tons.

[Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, Feb. 2, 1914.]

MERCHANT IRON SALES IN JANUARY, 900,000 TONS—EQUAL TO TOTAL ORDERS IN JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH, 1913—HEAVIEST MONTH'S BUSINESS SINCE APRIL, 1912—LESS ACTIVITY LAST WEEK—SMALL ADVANCE IN PRICES ACCOMPANIDED THE LARGER TRANSACTIONS—STEEL-MAKING IRON DULL.

Merchant furnaces booked orders for 900,000 tons of pig iron in the various distributing districts during the month of January. This is the largest tonnage booked during a single month since April, 1912, and equals the total orders placed during the first quarter of 1913. In January last year total contracts were 400,000 tons, and the heaviest buying last year was in July, when total orders were 565,000 tons.

IMPORTS, THREE MONTHS, IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. SIMMONS. That the iron and steel industry is not suffering from an invasion from other markets as a result of the lower tariff duties is shown by the fact that during the last three months of the past year, after the tariff bill went into effect, importations of this product fell off 332,000 tons.

*Total iron and steel imported and exported during the months of October, November, and December, 1912 and 1913.*

| | Imports. | | Exports. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1912 | 1913 | 1912 | 1913 |
| | *Dollars.* | *Dollars.* | *Dollars.* | *Dollars.* |
| October | 2,773,916 | 2,574,978 | 25,271,559 | 25,189,745 |
| November | 2,793,448 | 2,495,093 | 26,406,425 | 20,142,141 |
| December | 2,649,485 | 2,814,774 | 23,750,864 | 22,616,701 |

The imports for the three months in 1912 were $8,216,849, and imports for the three months in 1913 were $7,884,845, a falling off under the new tariff of $332,004.

Mr. President, I have covered all the ground that I laid out to cover. There are other phases of the speech of the Senator from California which I should like to have taken up, but I knew I would not have time to discuss all of the subjects that he entered upon. Yet I desired to put in the RECORD some substantive matter upon the general conditions of the country, labor conditions, and business conditions, which I thought ought to be given to the people.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THOMAS. I was not aware that the Senator from Utah had the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator, if he so desires.

Mr. THOMAS. No; my purpose, Mr. President, was to ask for a unanimous-consent order with reference to the unfinished business, but I will do so later.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THORNTON. With the permission of the Senator from Utah, I should like to ask if he proposes at this time to discuss Senate joint resolution No. 1?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will state that joint resolution No. 1 is not before the Senate at this time; it has been temporarily laid aside——

Mr. THORNTON. I beg pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. With the understanding, however, that if any Senator desired to speak upon it, he could proceed this afternoon.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I had expected briefly to speak to the Senate on the joint resolution. I did not know that it had been temporarily laid aside. I only reached here at 3 o'clock, and I understood the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] was replying to some remarks made this morning by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am not going to occupy very much time, and the Senator can follow, if he shall so desire. I am sure he will have plenty of time to do so this afternoon.

Mr. THORNTON. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should not take a moment of the time of the Senate this afternoon to answer the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] if he had not referred to the value of importations of foreign goods and to the volume of our exportations for the last three months.

The Senator is mistaken as to both. I am not going to fill the RECORD, as the Senator has done, with newspaper clippings with a view of proving the country was never so prosperous. The Senator and everyone else know that is not the case. I could fill thousands of pages of the RECORD with newspaper clippings apparently proving that the industries of this country are in the throes of distress from one end of the land to the other. I do not believe it any more than I believe that there is no suffering among the laboring men for want of employment. The Senator, in having printed in the RECORD as he has newspaper clippings from papers which perhaps he did not know existed, written from a biased point of view, will never convince the American people of the accuracy of the statement made, particularly not in that way, nor will he convince the hundreds of thousands of American wage earners at present out of employment.

I wish the industries and institutions of the United States were as prosperous as the Senator from North Carolina claims them to be. I wish every mill, every factory, and every industrial plant in all the land were so busy with orders they could not possibly fill them, as was the case before the passage of the present tariff act.

Mr. President, there is no need of our deceiving ourselves. There is no need of taking partisan newspaper reports as testimony. We have, in the Treasury Department, accounts kept of the value of every dollar of goods imported into this country and every dollar of custom duties collected. Every Senator has that information or can secure it any day of the week or month. I am going to confine what I have to say to the absolute figures given by the department. I shall state in dollars and cents the exact amounts, and I shall leave the people to decide whether the results of the present tariff act have been to the advantage of the people as a whole or whether it has not.

Mr. President, take the month of November, 1913, as compared with the month of November, 1912. The importations for November, 1912, were $153,094,898. The importations for November, 1913, were $148,216,536.

For December, 1912, the importations were $154,095,444. For December, 1913, they were $184,587,571.

In January of 1913 the importations were $163,063,438. In January of 1914 they were $154,469,263.

That is to say, Mr. President, during those three months under the Payne-Aldrich tariff act the importations were $470,253,780; under the present law for the corresponding months they were $487,273,370, or a difference of importations during the three months of $17,019,590. The imports in those three months of 1912–13 were less than for the corresponding months of 1913–14 by $17,019,590.

That is only one side of the picture. What is the other? Let us see what the Government collected in revenue from goods imported during those months.

In November, 1912, there was collected customs revenues of $25,666,353. In November, 1913, there was collected $21,173,623. In December, 1912, there was collected $24,248,161. In December, 1913, there was collected $21,510,140. In January, 1913, there was collected $29,334,124. In January, 1914, there was collected $23,528,080.

Taking the total for the three months there was collected in customs revenues during that part of the years 1912-13 $79,248,638, and during the same three months of the years 1913-14 but $66,211,828, or a loss in revenue in those three months of $13,036,810, with an increase of importations of $17,019,590.

In other words, Mr. President, the American workman was prevented from the making of $17,000,000 worth of goods, and the Treasury of the United States lost $13,036,810.

I must admit there has been an increase of revenue from one source since the inauguration of the Democratic administration, for I find that the ordinary internal-revenue receipts from October 2, 1913, to February 18, 1914, were $78,447,507.93, and from October 2, 1912, to February 18, 1913, were but $75,780,164.84, showing an increase of revenue derived from the sale and consumption of beer, whisky, tobacco, and so forth, of $2,667,343.09, and at a time when other industries of the country were suffering from Democratic legislation, notwithstanding the claim made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that conditions never were so prosperous and newspaper clippings submitted by him as proof positive of the same.

Mr. President, taking the month of December and taking the following items—manufactures of aluminum, parts of automobiles, clocks and parts of clocks, watches and parts of watches, cotton goods, knit goods, burlaps, fruits and nuts, glass and glassware, cutlery, tin plate, gloves, linoleum and oil-

cloths, paper and manufactures of paper, pencils and pencil leads, manufactures of silk, wool and manufactures of wool, and wood pulp—what do we find? Of those items alone during the month of December, 1912, there were imported into this country $18,600,970. During the month of December, 1913, there were imported into this country of those items $28,912,679, an increase in importations of those items alone of $10,251,709 and an increase on all goods imported during December of $30,492,127, and with that increase of importations there was a loss of $2,738,021 to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, an increase of $30,000,000 of goods imported from foreign countries in one month means that many less goods made in the United States. Who has been benefited by this? Certainly not the vast number of unemployed workingmen in this country. It would have taken thousands of them to have produced this $30,000,000 worth of goods. This is lost to the American workmen, and the foreign laborers have received the money that was necessary to produce that amount of goods.

I should not find so much fault with that if the consumer in this country had been benefited to the extent of the cost of producing the $30,000,000, but the fact is that the ultimate consumer has not been benefited one iota by the increase in the importations of this class of goods.

I have not been able to obtain the value of the importations for February, 1914, in order that I might compare them with February, 1913, as the Treasury Department has not yet gotten them out for February, 1914. I wish, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we do have the receipts of customs for February, 1914, and can compare them with the year 1913. For the year 1913 the receipts were $27,605,115.83, and for February, 1914, they were but $17,609,603.70, or a loss to the Treasury of the United States for that one month of nearly $10,000,000.

As I said before, if the ultimate consumer received the benefit of this difference there would be some reason for approval; but, Mr. President, the amount of reduction in duties that has been made in the present tariff law is not passed on to the ultimate consumer. The importer takes a part of it; the foreign manufacturer has taken a part of it; the distributor of goods in this country has taken a part of it; and I doubt whether a Senator here can point to an item which the ultimate consumer purchases for less money on account of the reduction in rates of duties. The middlemen buy for less, I admit, in many cases.

I did intend to take up the question of the amount of importations in certain lines of goods for the month of February and show that up to this time the foreign manufacturers had not adjusted their business so as to take care of their own trade and also extend it to the American market. I wish to say, however, that I do not believe the increase of importations has fairly begun, nor do I believe it will do so until, perhaps, after the election this fall. If the country votes to approve the tariff bill, I have not the least doubt but that the foreign manufacturers will immediately prepare to enter this market; and they can do it. There is no question in my mind about that, nor is there any question in the mind of the manufacturers of foreign countries but that they can do it.

I met here not long ago one of the largest manufacturers in England. He was in my office, and I asked him if he was prepared to make goods for the American market. He said: "Only by increasing the hours of labor; but after the fall election, if the present tariff act is approved by the American people, I expect to increase my plant, and I expect to make a fight for the American market." There is no question in my mind but that that will be done, not only by him but by thousands of others.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Utah, I will say inasmuch as he knew I expected to address the Senate this afternoon that, so far as I am concerned, he is entirely at liberty to proceed as long as he wishes.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am passing over a great deal of what I intended to say this afternoon. I promise the Senator that I will be through in a very few minutes.

Mr. THORNTON. I request the Senator not to hurry on my account.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] referred to the importation of cattle and horses and products of the farm, and said that when the bill was passed he really thought there would be an increase. He also said that the importations into this country of products of the farm were negligible and that they amounted to practically nothing. Mr. President, I have here the total importations of such products for four months under the tariff act of 1913 and 1914, and I want to say that the value of those products imported under the present law was $38,066,107, while the value of those same items for the same four months of a year ago, imported under the Payne-Aldrich bill, amounted to but $10,883,810.

I picked up the other evening the handbook of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and I went through their estimates of importations. The committee based their rates upon the importations that they estimated would come into this country. I was very much surprised to see that their forecast for the year on cattle was $5,570,000, although we have already imported for the first four months under the law $10,110,948. Their forecast for the year on horses was $612,500. We have already imported $933,634. Their forecast for eggs was $210,000. We have already imported $612,700 in four months.

Mr. President, I could go on along the list and tell the Senate of each item, showing that the forecasts and estimates upon which the present rates were based are absolutely worthless.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GORE. My recollection is that when these estimates were submitted to the House there was a duty on cattle in the House bill which was removed in the Senate. I may not be correct as to that, but that is my recollection; and I have the same recollection as to eggs.

Mr. SMOOT. The rates on eggs and cattle, I think, were left the same. There was a change made in the rate on horses. Oats were made free in the House.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken as to cattle. My recollection is that the House put meats on the free list, but retained a duty on cattle, and I think the same was true of eggs. It is easily verified.

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, can be very easily verified. It makes no special difference, however, because if I had the time I could go through the whole list, and cattle would be only one item showing the same relative increase. As far as that is concerned, on nearly everything that is produced on the farm the increase of importations has been away beyond any estimate made in the House and away beyond the dreams of any speaker in the Senate. No one on the other side supposed the importations could amount to any such figures as they have actually proved to be.

Mr. President, it is so late that I feel that I do not want to discuss the questions to-night that I intended to. Some suitable occasion may arise, however, within the next day or two. I shall therefore avail myself of the first opportunity to answer a number of statements that were made to-day by the Senator from North Carolina. I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] desires to make a motion at this time, and I am perfectly willing to defer my remarks to a later date.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for the moment to the Senator from Indiana.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, of course, I shall have no objection to the adjournment, but I desire to give notice that immediately following the routine morning business on Monday next I shall address the Senate on Senate resolution 164, which makes a request for information with reference to Mexican affairs, and that I shall also ask to have read at that time Senate resolution 139, on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

The motion was agreed to.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is evident that we shall not be able to get a vote to-day upon Senate joint resolution No. 1, and the further fact that some Senators who desire to be present when the vote is taken will not be here at an earlier time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote upon the joint resolution and all amendments at an hour not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant. I presume a roll call will be necessary for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Dillingham | Myers | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bankhead | Fall | Norris | Smith, Mich. |
| Bradley | Gallinger | O'Gorman | Smoot |
| Brady | Gore | Oliver | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Hitchcock | Overman | Swanson |
| Bristow | Hughes | Owen | Thomas |
| Bryan | James | Pomerene | Tillman |
| Burton | Jones | Reed | Townsend |
| Catron | Kenyon | Robinson | Vardaman |
| Chamberlain | Kern | Root | Walsh |
| Chilton | Lane | Shafroth | Warren |
| Clapp | Lodge | Sheppard | Williams |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martin, Va. | Sherman | Works |
| Cummins | Martine, N. J. | Shively | |

Mr. REED. I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr STONE] on account of sickness. I make this announcement generally for the day and during his absence. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]——

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Out of order I ask to be permitted to introduce a joint resolution which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution creating a joint committee of Congress, and authorizing said committee to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, the property known as Monticello, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me to make a request?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I wish to make a point of order. I should like to know if it would not be necessary to call the roll again if the proposition to submit a unanimous consent is made and then business is done in the meantime?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to rule that the roll call must proceed again.

Mr. THOMAS. I can not yield if that is the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to ask to have some printing done. Do I understand the Chair to rule that I can not make a request to print a document without a call for a quorum beforehand?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair has ruled that when a roll call is had for the purpose of presenting a unanimous-consent agreement, if business intervenes the roll call must be had again before the unanimous-consent agreement can be presented.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry, then, Mr. President. May I ask what business has intervened since the roll was called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has introduced a joint resolution by the consent of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. REED. I presume there is no way to rectify the matter now unless I can withdraw the joint resolution. I do not want to put the Senate to the inconvenience of another roll call.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not wish to yield if by doing so I shall put the Senate to the inconvenience of another roll call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not yield unless it be for some inquiry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply wanted to inquire of the Senator if he would not ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] be allowed to withdraw the bill which he introduced and that the unanimous-consent agreement asked by the Senator from Colorado be stated to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. I ask that unanimous consent be given the Senator from Missouri to withdraw the joint resolution I just offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Will that avoid the difficulty which has been suggested?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will so rule.

Mr. REED. Very well; I concur in the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The joint resolution is withdrawn. The Senator from Colorado will state his proposed agreement.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that at the hour of 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that debate as to all amendments thereafter offered be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator speaking thereon.

I will state to the Senate that I fixed the hour of 2 o'clock on the 10th instant for the purpose of accommodating Senators who can not be here at an earlier time and who desire particularly to be here and to participate in the voting.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is, the debate is limited to 15-minute speeches on the amendments or on the joint resolution?

Mr. THOMAS. On amendments which are offered after the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. On the joint resolution itself?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to have the consent agreement stated by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that at the hour of 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments then pending, and that debate as to all amendments thereafter offered be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator speaking thereon.

Mr. LANE. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the hour be 4 o'clock. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] gave notice that he is going to occupy a portion of the time on Monday.

Mr. THOMAS. I am willing to make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. LANE. I believe in free speech and lots of it. We have heard a good deal and I should like to hear more.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well; I will make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator if this proposed unanimous-consent agreement would not permit unlimited debate after the hour named, provided it was on an amendment that had been offered prior to that hour?

Mr. THOMAS. It would practically amount to that, if amendments were offered.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator wants to reach that, it seems to me he ought to meet that contingency.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to meet the wishes of all with reference to the form of the agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator if there would be any objection to striking out the word "thereafter"? I think that would cover it then.

Mr. THOMAS. If that were done, then there certainly would be unlimited debate afterwards, because there is a pending amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand as to a pending amendment or any other amendment that might be offered between now and 2 o'clock on Tuesday there could be unlimited debate. So if anyone wanted to prolong the debate to an unlimited extent, the agreement really means nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. There would be unlimted debate in the sense that addresses might be made limited each to 15 minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I do not understand the agreement in that way.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly; it reads that way.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I did not get it right when it was read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood it exactly as the Senator from Nebraska understands it. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that if the limitation upon debate on any amendment offered after 2 o'clock is 15 minutes—and that is all the unanimous-consent agreement says about it—it will be perfectly proper for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] or any other Senator to take the floor upon the amendment pending offered by the Senator from Mississippi and speak the entire time up to the time we would be compelled to vote, and that would cut off debate upon everything else.

Mr. THOMAS. That is not the design of the agreement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no doubt that is not the design, but I think that would be the effect.

Mr. THOMAS. The limit I suggest is 15 minutes for each Senator upon a subsequent amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the trouble is the amendment I am talking about—that proposed by the Senator from Mississippi—is not a subsequent amendment; it is an amendment pending now.

Mr. THOMAS. So it can be discussed up to the hour of voting.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly; that is what I am complaining of.

Mr. NORRIS. Why could not only that amendment but any other be discussed after the joint resolution is passed? All a Senator would have to do in order to talk longer than the time

mentioned would be to simply say "I am talking on this amendment which has been offered."

Mr. THOMAS. It is quite evident, to my mind, that the hour fixed in the agreement will be reached before we agree upon it. Therefore I am perfectly willing to accept any suggestion that may be desired for the purpose of reaching an agreement.

Mr. JAMES. Why does not the Senator from Colorado suggest an hour when we shall commence to vote upon the pending joint resolution and all amendments without debate?

Mr. LODGE. Without debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Because there is objection to it.

Mr. JAMES. I have not heard that suggested.

Mr. THOMAS. There might be no objection made, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] suggested differently, and I accepted his suggestion and I thought it would be satisfactory.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator if there would be any objection to his including in the request, before or after the words "to be offered thereafter," the words "upon the bill and pending amendments or amendments to be offered."

Mr. THOMAS. No; not on my part.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think that would confine the debate to 15 minutes to each Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. My impression is that the anticipated trouble will not arise. However, I am willing that that shall be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock p. m. Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that the debate upon the resolution itself, on amendments that may be then pending, and on amendments that may be offered shall thereafter be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. That is satisfactory to me if it is to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Colorado how we can proceed to vote if the right to debate is open?

Mr. THOMAS. This is precisely the rule which the Senate made by unanimous consent in the Alaska Railway case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we got into an awful trouble.

Mr. JAMES. That was because the Alaska consent agreement provided that we should vote on the calendar day, as I understand it. There is no provision here for a calendar day. That was the trouble in the Alaskan case. The two agreements are not at all similar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the unanimous-consent agreement is adopted the Chair asks the Senator proposing it to construe what it means. If the Senate is going to vote at 4 o'clock on the joint resolution and the amendments, the Chair is impressed with the idea that it means to vote at 4 o'clock and the subsequent discussion would be after the voting. I have heard that in the Senate, but it can not accomplish any purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it seems to me it ought to be that after 4 o'clock debate be limited to 15 minutes on the joint resolution and any amendment that is pending or which may be offered. Then we will reach an end.

Mr. THOMAS. My personal preference would be to arbitrarily fix 4 o'clock as the time to vote on the measure and all amendments. The Senator from Kansas, however, suggests the necessity or expediency of considering amendments which may then be offered. If the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa is agreeable to the Senator from Kansas it is to me.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection to an agreement that will limit debate to any hour, I care not how soon it may be, and that as soon as that debate is over that we vote. But an agreement which says that at 4 o'clock we shall proceed to vote, accompanied with an arrangement for debating after that time, it seems to me, is very inconsistent; that it is impossible to be either applied or understood.

Mr. THOMAS. I have cited the only precedent for it that I am aware of.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement be restated to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will restate it.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that at the hour of 4 o'clock upon Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that debate thereafter, as to all amendments——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We can not debate after we commence to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the query the Chair was propounding.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The consent must be stated in writing, of course. It is not half understood, nor is it even formulated.

Mr. THOMAS. My own suggestion would be to have the agreement end where the Secretary stopped reading.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is not this what the Senator from Colorado seeks to accomplish, that after 4 o'clock on Tuesday the debate shall be limited to 15 minutes for each Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. That is not all I want to accomplish, but I assume that is all I can accomplish.

Mr. CUMMINS. If debate is open for 15 minutes to each Senator——

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to say that that is all I assume I will be able to accomplish, in view of the suggestions made to me as to what the agreement shall contain.

Mr. JAMES. That is some relief.

Mr. CUMMINS. What further would the Senator from Colorado like to accomplish?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I venture to make a very modest suggestion. It is that in place of agreeing to commence to vote at 4 o'clock the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution and amendments and then limit the debate.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the suggestion I have just made to the Senator from Colorado. It is what he evidently intends.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether that fixes the hour of 4 o'clock for voting?

Mr. GALLINGER. That can follow. We proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution at a certain hour—at 2 o'clock—and then, at 4 o'clock, debate can be limited on the bill and amendments. I apprehend there will be very few amendments offered.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not see, Mr. President, with all deference to the superior experience of the Senator from New Hampshire, that that changes the matter very much.

Mr. GALLINGER. The only difficulty is, Mr. President, as I think the Senator will appreciate, that the proposition of the Senator is that we shall proceed to vote at a certain hour and then that debate shall follow.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. THOMAS. With pleasure.

Mr. ROOT. I suggest that, starting with the original proposition, it be put in this form: That after 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, debate on joint resolution No. 1 be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day the Senate shall proceed to vote upon the resolution and all amendments thereto without further debate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should object to that. I object to any agreement to vote at a specific hour without further debate, because, under such an arrangement, amendments may be offered which can not even be explained. An amendment such as has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] may be put in here at any time. I shall object to any request for unanimous consent unless there be allowed 15 minutes debate by each Senator on the joint resolution and all amendments that may be offered to it.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, I think I will withdraw my request.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I would suggest, to avoid the difficulty suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], that the Senator from New York amend his request for unanimous consent by providing that no amendment shall be offered after 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would object to that.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the Senator from Colorado has withdrawn his request and objected to another request, I should like to submit a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not objected to any request. The Senator from Kansas having objected, I perceive the folly of attempting to agree to anything. Therefore I withdraw my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator from Kansas to say that he would make no objection if 15-minute speeches were allowed on each amendment. I ask unanimous consent that after 2 o'clock on Tuesday next debate on Senate joint resolution No. 1 shall be limited to speeches of not exceeding 15 minutes, so that no Senator would be allowed to speak more than 15 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. On the joint resolution.

Mr. GRONNA. I should object to that, unless the Senator includes 15-minute speeches on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objectoin to putting that in. I will modify the request to make it 15 minutes on any amendment or

on the joint resolution itself, and that the vote shall be taken when there is no Senator who desires to speak and when there are no further amendments to be offered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state his question of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the submission of another proposition for unanimous consent by the Senator from Nebraska require another roll call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks not. The same question is still before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not see any advantage to be gained by putting the discussion off until Tuesday when we could go right along on Monday. Therefore I object to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have tried to amend the form which I suggested. It seemed to be satisfactory except in one respect, and I have amended it to meet the objection, so as to read: "That after 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, debate on Senate joint resolution No. 1 be limited to 15 minutes for each Senator, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day the Senate vote upon the joint resolution and all amendments thereto without further debate, except under the 15-minute rule upon amendments thereafter offered."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall object to that. I suggest that we get the Secretary to draw a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe he could draw one which would be satisfactory to the Senate.

I have not had an opportunity to speak on the pending joint resolution, and I want at least 15 minutes. I suggest that unanimous consent be asked to take the joint resolution up for consideration at not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday, and that no Senator shall speak more than once and not to exceed 15 minutes upon the joint resolution itself or any amendment after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LANE. I object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. The only purpose of a unanimous-consent order is to get a vote and dispose of a pending measure. None of these requests do that, and therefore the unanimous consent, if granted, would be worthless.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, Mr. President, I do not agree with that. Unanimous-consent agreements are entered into for the purpose of hastening action in this body.

Mr. LODGE. This will not hasten it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think this will hasten it very materially, because if we begin the discussion at 2 o'clock on Tuesday and every Senator thereafter is limited to 15 minutes, he will only make a 15-minute talk upon something in which he is particularly interested. There probably would be no amendments offered after that time, or, if any should be offered, they would be few, and there would not be very much time consumed in their discussion. It seems to me that something will be accomplished by this suggestion for unanimous consent.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that that is true, but it seems like those who have spoken the most and who are most favorable to this joint resolution are the least anxious to have a vote on it.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, as no agreement has been reached, and as there does not seem to be the prospect of any, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold that suggestion until the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator who has objected is placed before the Senate. We have gotten down now to where there is a request for unanimous consent made by the Senator who objected to all the other requests for unanimous consent, and perhaps we can agree with him on a time for a vote.

Mr. KERN. I withhold my motion for the present.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the Secretary read the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from North Dakota a unanimous-consent agreement to propose?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of joint resolution No. 1 not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday next, and that after 2 o'clock on that day no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than 15 minutes upon the joint resolution itself nor upon any amendment that is pending or that may be offered to it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will cheerfully agree to any request for unanimous consent that will bring the Senate to a vote at any specified time, but, personally, I do not care to agree to any request that seems to me to be meaningless. Under the rules of the Senate this joint resolution comes up at 2 o'clock on Monday, and we do not need a unanimous-consent agreement to bring it up at 2 o'clock. The suggestions made propose a limitation of the time of debate, and the only valuable thing in a unanimous-consent agreement is to fix a time when we shall vote and dispose of a pending measure. None of the proposed unanimous-consent agreements do that; and so I object.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts answer a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., March 6, 1914.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

I hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Respectfully,

HENRY F. ASHURST,
*United States Senator.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Arizona is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington D. C., March 6, 1914.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

I herewith tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Coast Defenses.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MARTINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from New Jersey is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE CHAMBER, *February 6, 1914.*

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Respectfully, yours,

BLAIR LEE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Maryland is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER.
*Washington.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

I desire to hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM J. STONE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Missouri is accepted.

On motion of Mr. KERN it was

*Ordered*, That HENRY F. ASHURST, a Senator from Arizona, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator STONE, of Missouri;

That JAMES E. MARTINE, a Senator from New Jersey, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Industrial Expositions to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator ASHURST, of Arizona;

That BLAIR LEE, a Senator from Maryland, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Coast Defenses to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator MARTINE, of New Jersey; and

That WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, a Senator from Georgia, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator LEE, of Maryland.

## PURCHASE OF MONTICELLO.

Mr. REED. Out of order I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) creating a joint committee of Congress and authorizing said committee to acquire by purchase or condemnation the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson, and the family graveyard in which his remains were interred, with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary in order to carry out the various public objects

and purposes in said resolution set forth, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va., was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) creating a joint committee of Congress, and authorizing said committee to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson and the family graveyard in which his remains were interred, with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary in order to carry out the various public objects and purposes in said resolution set forth, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va.

Whereas the Senate and House of Delegates of the State of Virginia have passed the following resolutions:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to acquire Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson.

"Whereas Monticello, the home of the immortal Thomas Jefferson, is now private property, and the public has no right of access thereto; and

"Whereas the buildings were placed, the grounds laid out, and the work of construction carried on under the presiding genius of that great statesman, thus in itself forming a fitting memorial to his greatness; and

"Whereas in the shadows of its walls lie the earthly remains of him who was the author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute for religious freedom in Virginia, and father of the University of Virginia; and

"Whereas by the side of the great leader rest the remains of three other great Virginians—Dabney Carr, the member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, whose resolutions established the Committees of Correspondence between the sister colonies; William Cary Nichols, governor of Virginia and friend of Thomas Jefferson; and Thomas Mann Randolph, governor of Virginia and son-in-law of Thomas Jefferson; and

"Whereas his wife, his children, and his grandchildren to the fifth generation rest by his side on the lonely mountain which he loved so well; and none but his descendants have the legal right to enter the shrine, where all lovers of popular government would gladly repair to pay a tribute of love and devotion and to seek from the works which he wrought the inspiration of his wonderful life; and

"Whereas his services as governor of Virginia, as minister to France, Secretary of State, and President of the United States, together with his political genius shown in the foundation of our Government and shaping her destiny, has made him the patron saint of all parties and his home the mecca of all lovers of liberty in thought and action: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring)*—

"1. That the General Assembly of Virginia does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States, now in session in the city of Washington, to acquire Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, to be held in trust for all the people of the Nation.

"2. That the general assembly does hereby request the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Virginia to use all legitimate means to accomplish this end.

"3. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and to each of the Representatives from Virginia in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

"Agreed to by house of delegates, February 11, 1914.

"JOHN W. WILLIAMS,
*"Clerk House of Delegates.*

"Agreed to by the senate, February 16, 1914.

"O. V. HANGER,
*"Clerk of the Senate."*

And

Whereas hundreds of thousands of patriotic American citizens have petitioned Congress to the same effect: Now, therefore, for the reasons aforesaid, and for the reasons hereinafter set forth, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby created a joint committee of Congress, to consist of six members, three of whom shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The six persons so named shall constitute a joint committee of Congress, and shall be known as the Monticello purchase or condemnation committee.

SEC. 2. That the members of said committee shall continue to hold the positions aforesaid until the objects and purposes of this resolution have been accomplished, or until their successor or successors are appointed and qualified: *Provided*, That the term of any member shall cease at the termination of his term of office as a Member of Congress, at which time a successor may be appointed by the President of the Senate or Speaker of the House of Representatives, as provided in section 1 hereof. Any member of said committee may be removed by a vote of the branch of Congress of which he is a Member. They shall serve without salary or other compensation, but in lieu of subsistence while absent from the city of Washington or their usual places of abode and engaged in the business of the committee they shall be paid $5 per day and their ordinary traveling expenses.

SEC. 3. That the committee shall at once proceed to negotiate with the owner or owners of the property hereinafter described for the purchase of the same for and on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. If said committee shall receive from the owner or owners of said properties within 30 days after this act shall become a law a proposition in writing to sell said properties to the United States Government at a price which to said committee seems just and reasonable, and said price is further approved by the President of the United States, as in his opinion just and reasonable, then said committee is authorized to purchase said properties and to draw a warrant against the Treasurer of the United States in favor of said owner or owners for the said purchase price; and it is hereby made the duty of the Treasurer to pay the same: *Provided*, That in no event shall the price paid exceed the unexpended portion of the amount hereinafter appropriated.

SEC. 4. That if the owner or owners of said properties shall not within the period of 30 days aforesaid propose to sell said property upon terms deemed by said committee and the President to be just and reasonable, as aforesaid, or shall fail to convey the same with title satisfactory to the committee, then said committee is authorized to notify the Attorney General of the United States of such refusal or failure, and thereupon it shall become the duty of the Attorney General to bring and prosecute in the name of the United States of America proceedings to condemn and take such property, or such part thereof as may be designated by the committee, for the following public uses, namely: To create a public park for the convenience and use of the people of the United States; to preserve the historic mansion house which was erected by and occupied as the home of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia; to afford a suitable site on which shall be hereafter erected a monument to his memory, which shall bear appropriate tablets and inscriptions reciting and permanently preserving a concise record of the services rendered by him to the American people and the cause of human liberty; to protect and adorn the grave in which reposes his immortal dust. Said mansion house shall be preserved, and, together with such other buildings as may hereafter be erected upon said grounds, shall be used as a repository in which shall be kept original manuscripts and writings of Thomas Jefferson, especially those connected with his public acts and the public history of the times in which he lived, with such other valuable public and historic documents as the committee shall deem proper. There shall also be collected and conserved in said mansion house and buildings the relics associated with his private life and public services. Said grounds, buildings, writings, and properties shall be acquired for the purposes aforesaid, and shall be kept and maintained for the public benefit, and to enhance the respect and love of the citizens of the United States for their common country, and in order that the truth of history may be preserved for the benefit of the present and future generations.

SEC. 5. That said committee shall be permanent in its character, and shall have the care and custody of said properties, and shall conserve and preserve the same, and shall perform such other duties as may from time to time be designated by Congress.

SEC. 6. That the properties so to be purchased or taken shall embrace the home and family graveyard of Thomas Jefferson, in Albemarle County, Va., together with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary to the carrying out of the objects and purposes aforesaid.

SEC. 7. That if at any time during the pendency of such condemnation proceedings the committee shall be able to purchase at private sale, it may do so upon the terms and conditions aforesaid.

SEC. 8. That there is hereby appropriated for the purposes of paying the expenses of said committee and the purchase price, and the expenses incurred in acquiring said properties, either at private sale or by condemnation, the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any moneys in the hands of the Treasurer not otherwise appropriated.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1914.*

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas W. Griffith, Nineteenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Col. Lea Febiger, Sixth Infantry, retired from active service March 2, 1914.

Maj. Almon L. Parmerter, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. Thomas W. Griffith, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Samuel E. Smiley, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. Jacob F. Kreps, Infantry, unassigned, retired from active service March 2, 1914.

Capt. William H. Simons, Sixth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1914, vice Maj. Almon L. Parmerter, unassigned, promoted.

Capt. John F. Madden, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1914, vice Maj. Samuel E. Smiley, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1914, vice Capt. William H. Simons, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Hatie, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1914, vice First Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

*To be first lieutenants with rank from March 3, 1914.*

Morris Fishbein, of Illinois.
Benjamin Hobson Frayser, of Virginia.
Edward Sutton Gooch, of Oklahoma.
William Henry Huntington, of the District of Columbia.
Hugh Farber McGaughey, of Minnesota.
Ashley Baker Morrill, of Illinois.
Charles Benjamin Palmer, of Arizona.

Leo Francis Schiff, of New York.
Charles Mason Smith, of Virginia.
Herbert Edward Wheeler, of Washington.
Reinhard Ernst Wobus, of Missouri.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Col. John A. Lejeune to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Maj. Wendell C. Neville to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Capt. Harry Lee to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Boatswain Niels A. Johnsen to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1914.

Boatswain Isidor Nordstrom to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1914.

Albert L. Bass, a citizen of Kentucky, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 27th day of February, 1914.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Lewis J. Lawson to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ala., in place of Lewis J. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1913.

ARIZONA.

Bertha M. Rees to be postmaster at Wickenburg, Ariz., in place of John Witherlay, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

C. H. Francis to be postmaster at Loomis, Cal., in place of Frederick W. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. R. Gore to be postmaster at Fairoaks, Cal., in place of Leonard M. Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

R. C. Hannan to be postmaster at Corning, Cal., in place of M. H. Chittenden. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Virgil W. Norton to be postmaster at Sutter Creek, Cal., in place of Frank J. Payne. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. A. Rice to be postmaster at Saratoga, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

Hiram A. Rudd to be postmaster at Walnut Creek, Cal. Office became presidential July 1, 1913.

David C. Simpson to be postmaster at Courtland, Cal., in place of Charles E. Bauer, resigned.

Will Smith to be postmaster at Soldiers' Home, Cal., in place of Duncan A. Gray, removed.

Edwin L. Story to be postmaster at Anderson, Cal., in place of W. S. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Frank C. Thompson to be postmaster at Garden Grove, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. N. Tibessart to be postmaster at Orland, Cal., in place of Clyde L. De Armond. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

J. W. Townes to be postmaster at Pinole, Cal., in place of Edward M. Downer, resigned.

M. S. Trigueiro to be postmaster at San Miguel, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

J. D. Wagnon to be postmaster at Sonoma, Cal., in place of John M. Cheney. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

COLORADO.

L. D. Conant to be postmaster at Monte Vista, Colo., in place of George B. Boutwell. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

FLORIDA.

F. M. Brown to be postmaster at Miami, Fla., in place of Morgan E. Jones, removed.

Robert O. Cresap to be postmaster at Lakeland, Fla., in place of Joseph L. Skipper, resigned.

William D. Sanford to be postmaster at Cocoanut Grove, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

HAWAII.

M. K. Keohokalole to be postmaster at Paia, Hawaii, in place of David C. Lindsay, removed.

IDAHO.

J. J. Caldwell to be postmaster at Meridian, Idaho, in place of Samuel M. C. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

W. A. Criswell to be postmaster at Mackay, Idaho, in place of George L. Morgan, resigned.

W. B. Stone to be postmaster at Driggs, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

ILLINOIS.

William Baskerville to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of Hugh Bennett, resigned.

M. L. Briscoe to be postmaster at Westfield, Ill., in place of John Biggs. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Gustav L. Burmeister to be postmaster at Elmhurst, Ill., in place of Otto W. Balgemann. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

M. B. Dolan to be postmaster at Durand, Ill., in place of Lillian J. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

James N. Hall to be postmaster at Delavan, Ill., in place of William F. Hodson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

E. P. Hectorne to be postmaster at Avon, Ill., in place of Arthur Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Fred H. Henckler to be postmaster at Columbia, Ill., in place of Joseph M. Arnin. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Arthur F. Hiland to be postmaster at De Kalb, Ill., in place of Martin A. L. Olsen. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1914.

George Hoffman to be postmaster at Crete, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Joseph Kramer to be postmaster at West Chicago, Ill., in place of John H. Creager. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Thomas Mercer to be postmaster at Sandwich, Ill., in place of Edward F. Ledoyt. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Joseph A. Roesler to be postmaster at Ashton, Ill., in place of Harlow E. Chadwick. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

David Schein to be postmaster at Waterloo, Ill., in place of Henry Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

John L. Schmidt to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill., in place of William G. Bale. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1914.

Henry Stahlie to be postmaster at Plano, Ill., in place of George S. Faxon. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Louis A. Stoll to be postmaster at Aurora, Ill., in place of Louis A. Constantine. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charles E. Wescott to be postmaster at Sheffield, Ill., in place of Charles A. Simington. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

William Vollbracht to be postmaster at Camp Point, Ill., in place of Maggie Kay. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Bert C. White to be postmaster at Downers Grove, Ill., in place of Elbert C. Stanley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Charles M. Wright to be postmaster at Gilman, Ill., in place of Michael O'Neill, resigned.

INDIANA.

William H. Beaty to be postmaster at Worthington, Ind., in place of George D. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Curtis Butler to be postmaster at Oakland City, Ind., in place of James H. Cockrum. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

R. Philip Carpenter to be postmaster at Noblesville, Ind., in place of John Owen. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

John J. Cleary to be postmaster at Terre Haute, Ind., in place of Thatcher A. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Joseph P. Cummins to be postmaster at Middletown, Ind., in place of Joseph A. Young. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Frank W. Dalton to be postmaster at Plainfield, Ind., in place of Taylor Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

George E. Erdmann to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of Bert Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Franklin M. Field to be postmaster at Spencer, Ind., in place of Lyman D. Heavenridge. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

Allen P. Green to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ind., in place of Elisha Sexton. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Benjamin F. Hoopingarner to be postmaster at Syracuse, Ind., in place of Joseph H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

William A. King to be postmaster at Danville, Ind., in place of Charles P. Hornaday. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

John B. Lawler to be postmaster at Madison, Ind., in place of Marcus R. Sulzer. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Dennis O'Riley to be postmaster at Remington, Ind., in place of William E. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

John R. Paine to be postmaster at Clinton, Ind., in place of John O. Stark. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

Frank J. Retterath to be postmaster at Goodland, Ind., in place of Alvin J. Kitt. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Charles H. Salm to be postmaster at Rockport, Ind., in place of Frank B. Garlinghouse. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Allen Swope to be postmaster at Seymour, Ind., in place of Edward A. Remy. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

IOWA.

Clarence E. Brooks, to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Iowa, in place of Elmer E. Rayburn. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Albert H. Brous to be postmaster at Prairie City, Iowa, in place of Thomas W. Nickson. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Elizabeth Crowe to be postmaster at Clermont, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

L. A. Dugan to be postmaster at Kingsley, Iowa, in place of John M. Wormley, removed.

Lee S. Edwards to be postmaster at Dunlap, Iowa, in place of B. J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

L. H. Flood to be postmaster at Carson, Iowa, in place of James T. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

Isaac Fouch to be postmaster at Monroe, Iowa, in place of Henry A. Perrin. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

John McC. Gass to be postmaster at Albia, Iowa, in place of George L. Robb. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

George H. Helscher to be postmaster at Keota, Iowa, in place of Lauren E. Hulse. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

William H. Keough to be postmaster at Lehigh, Iowa, in place of Hal C. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1913.

Martin C. Nelson to be postmaster at Spirit Lake, Iowa, in place of George W. Stapleton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Elmer A. McIlree to be postmaster at West Union, Iowa, in place of Charles F. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Thomas A. Massie to be postmaster at Logan, Iowa, in place of James H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Frank Thompson to be postmaster at Cambridge, Iowa, in place of James A. McKee, resigned.

KANSAS.

Adelaide Brandenburg to be postmaster at Frankfort, Kans., in place of John M. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1914.

J. P. Fern to be postmaster at Scammon, Kans., in place of Thomas B. Evans, deceased.

E. S. Irwin to be postmaster at Liberal, Kans., in place of John N. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

Hugh N. Jones to be postmaster at Lebo, Kans., in place of James E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

R. C. Logan to be postmaster at Smith Center, Kans., in place of D. B. Dyer, resigned.

James E. Miller to be postmaster at Walnut, Kans., in place of William H. May. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

John L. Paden to be postmaster at Fowler, Kans., in place of I. J. Stanton, resigned.

J. H. Plummer to be postmaster at Westmoreland, Kans., in place of Lair D. Hart. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Harry Spurrier to be postmaster at Kiowa, Kans., in place of Harry E. Glenn. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Richard E. Thoes to be postmaster at Alma, Kans., in place of Clinton O. Kinne. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Bowles Unsell to be postmaster at Caldwell, Kans., in place of John W. Nyce. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

KENTUCKY.

Francis E. Bradley to be postmaster at Scottsville, Ky., in place of M. B. Dixon, removed.

Mary McR. Bruce to be postmaster at Stanford, Ky., in place of James C. Florence. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

R. A. Field to be postmaster at Catlettsburg, Ky., in place of William C. Harper. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Harry H. Grobmyer to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ky., in place of Harry N. Stringfellow. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

E. W. Hackney to be postmaster at London, Ky., in place of A. R. Dyche, removed.

R. K. McCarney to be postmaster at Paris, Ky., in place of N. A. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

John O'Reilly to be postmaster at Hardinsburg, Ky., in place of W. Sherman Ball, removed.

Spalding Trafton to be postmaster at Henderson, Ky., in place of William H. Overby. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

LOUISIANA.

Lillian D. Richardson to be postmaster at Independence, La., in place of Lillian D. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

MAINE.

Edgar M. Frisbee to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of Frank T. Clarkson, deceased.

Patrick F. Welch to be postmaster at Calais, Me., in place of George Downes. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James M. Hurley to be postmaster at Marlboro, Mass., in place of John S. Fay, deceased.

J. J. Harrington to be postmaster at Chester, Mass., in place of James W. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1913.

James Kinsley to be postmaster at West Acton, Mass., in place of Charles H. Mead. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

MICHIGAN.

M. R. Bradley to be postmaster at Hermansville, Mich., in place of Edwin P. Radford, resigned.

Edgar E. Bedell to be postmaster at Bellaire, Mich., in place of Samuel Adams. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

George L. Belcher to be postmaster at Leslie, Mich., in place of George W. Dennis. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Samuel D. Bonner to be postmaster at Newaygo, Mich., in place of Louis Larson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Ernest J. Dubé to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of Richard B. Lang. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Thomas G. Finucan to be postmaster at Charlevoix, Mich., in place of Arthur L. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Andrew B. Goodwin, to be postmaster at Carson City, Mich., in place of Charles R. Culver. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1914.

Michael Hoban to be postmaster at St. Ignace, Mich., in place of Frederick Kruger. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

James L. Klett to be postmaster at Whitehall, Mich., in place of Edward D. Skeels. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Charles F. Parker to be postmaster at Middleville, Mich., in place of Richard M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Jacob C. Rough to be postmaster at Buchanan, Mich., in place of Albert A. Worthington. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

John E. Shekell to be postmaster at Jackson, Mich., in place of Josiah C. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Christopher Lowney to be postmaster at Laurium, Mich., in place of Vincent Vairo. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

MINNESOTA.

Edward A. Buckley to be postmaster at East Grand Forks, Minn., in place of Ole A. Thoreson. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

George G. Stone to be postmaster at Pipestone, Minn., in place of J. H. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1914.

MISSOURI.

William Arterburn to be postmaster at Carrollton, Mo., in place of Lewis A. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires March 10, 1914.

Adolph B. Bertram to be postmaster at Rockport, Mo., in place of William R. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Hugh J. Bowen to be postmaster at South St. Joseph, Mo., in place of Abel F. Daily, deceased.

B. C. Drummond to be postmaster at Lexington, Mo., in place of John K. Taubman, resigned.

Edgar J. Geisinger to be postmaster at Unionville, Mo., in place of Clarence Conger. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Benjamin F. Hackney to be postmaster at Carthage, Mo., in place of Robert T. Stickney. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

William H. Hambaugh to be postmaster at Craig, Mo., in place of F. K. Allen, resigned.

W. A. Kirkpatrick to be postmaster at Joplin, Mo., in place of Luther McGehee. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Alfred T. Lacey to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Mo., in place of Ezekiel A. Sample. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

Dudley A. Reid to be postmaster at Gilman City, Mo., in place of Ivan S. Goodwin, resigned.

James E. Sater to be postmaster at Monett, Mo., in place of Samuel A. Chappell. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

John K. Scott to be postmaster at Golden City, Mo., in place of Mordecai Bell. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

James Todd to be postmaster at Maryville, Mo., in place of Scribner R. Beach. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charles L. Wilson to be postmaster at Sarcoxie, Mo., in place of J. T. Burden. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

MONTANA.

Thomas Gibb to be postmaster at Miles City, Mont., in place of John S. Towers. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Joseph E. Pickens to be postmaster at Huntley, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. H. Rutter to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

MISSISSIPPI.

Newton D. Goodwin to be postmaster at Gulfport, Miss., in place of Thomas W. Wadlow, deceased.

Mrs. Lallie H. Humphreys to be postmaster at Greenwood, Miss., in place of W. C. Peel. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

NEBRASKA.

Andrew J. Caldwell to be postmaster at Walthill, Nebr., in place of Cecil R. Boughn, resigned.

Fred H. Davis to be postmaster at Madison, Nebr., in place of Jehiel H. Secor. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Gustav A. Koza to be postmaster at Clarkson, Nebr., in place of Joseph Krahulik. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

W. C. Treadway to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Nebr., in place of Dennis Tracy. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

NEVADA.

R. W. Gale to be postmaster at Gardnersville, Nev., in place of H. A. N. Todd, declined.

John P. Reynolds to be postmaster at Sparks, Nev., in place of Charles A. Beemer. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Fred L. White to be postmaster at Reno, Nev., in place of Dwight A. Dawson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

Benjamin Rosenthal to be postmaster at Goldfield, Nev., in place of Edward R. Collins, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edrick S. Avery to be postmaster at Franklin, N. H., in place of Ellsworth F. Pike. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

George B. Cavis to be postmaster at Bristol, N. H., in place of Fred H. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

John L. Fulton to be postmaster at West Lebanon, N. H., in place of Horace French. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Benjamin C. Garland to be postmaster at Whitefield, N. H., in place of George L. Crockett. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

Arthur D. Sloan to be postmaster at Enfield, N. H., in place of Frank B. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

NEW JERSEY.

George H. Abel to be postmaster at Haddon Heights, N. J., in place of George E. Schenck, resigned.

Henry Bell to be postmaster at Ramsey, N. J., in place of William H. Pulis. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

Leo M. Danerhirsh to be postmaster at Woodbine, N. J., in place of Jacob Feldman. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

William H. Elcks to be postmaster at Leonia, N. J., in place of Philip P. Cluss, removed.

George N. Harris to be postmaster at Newton, N. J., in place of James E. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Cyrus B. Honce to be postmaster at Belmar, N. J., in place of William M. Bergen. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1913.

E. Furman Hooper to be postmaster at Trenton, N. J., in place of Alexander C. Yard. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Peter Latourette to be postmaster at White House Station, N. J., in place of William C. Swackhamer. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Benjamin F. Smith to be postmaster at Ocean City, N. J., in place of Edward M. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

Edward C. Wheaton to be postmaster at Cape May Courthouse, N. J., in place of Horace E. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

NEW MEXICO.

Ervin E. Brunk to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

John M. Clark to be postmaster at Dawson, N. Mex., in place of George L. Bradford, resigned.

Henry C. Rochl to be postmaster at Albuquerque, N. Mex., in place of Robert W. Hopkins, resigned.

Leopoldo Sanchez to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, N. Mex., in place of Bonifacio Lucero, removed.

NEW YORK.

Henry S. Sutherland to be postmaster at White Plains, N. Y., in place of James K. Cowan, resigned.

Charles M. Estell to be postmaster at Friendship, N. Y., in place of Frank R. Utter, removed.

Sumner I. Houghwout to be postmaster at Falconer, N. Y., in place of Emil A. Peterson, resigned.

William E. Kelly to be postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y., in place of Edmund W. Voorhies, resigned.

Claud M. Armitage to be postmaster at Candor, N. Y., in place of James H. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

William A. Cochran to be postmaster at Southold, N. Y., in place of Moses T. Horton. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Thomas Conners to be postmaster at Camillus, N. Y., in place of Owen E. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

George D. Cunningham to be postmaster at Schaghticoke, N. Y., in place of Fred M. Askins. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

Joseph E. Downs to be postmaster at Islip, N. Y., in place of Edgar S. Cloch. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

Herbert W. Rackett to be postmaster at Greenport, N. Y., in place of Joseph Ogie. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

H. S. Ransom to be postmaster at Ransomville, N. Y., in place of George F. Monahan. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Robert E. L. Reynolds to be postmaster at Amsterdam, N. Y., in place of Thomas Liddle. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1913.

Verne Seeber to be postmaster at South Dayton, N. Y., in place of Nathan L. Rowe. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Lee Van Vredenburgh to be postmaster at Rhinebeck, N. Y., in place of Charles E. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

John E. Walker to be postmaster at Philmont, N. Y., in place of Dean Best. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Samuel N. Wheeler to be postmaster at Hancock, N. Y., in place of George Realy. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Lula F. Bland to be postmaster at Pittsboro, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William C. Blanton to be postmaster at Forest City, N. C., in place of M. M. McCurry. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Samuel Y. Bryson to be postmaster at Hendersonville, N. C., in place of Brownlow Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Luther B. Carr to be postmaster at Wallace, N. C., in place of Robert B. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

John K. Cline to be postmaster at Lincolnton, N. C., in place of D. L. Yount. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Hamilton Erwin to be postmaster at Morganton, N. C., in place of Charles F. McKesson. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Owen Gudger to be postmaster at Asheville, N. C., in place of Wallace W. Rollins. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Vernon G. Pleasants to be postmaster at Rowland, N. C., in place of Hayes S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

W. D. Templeton to be postmaster at Mooresville, N. C., in place of Alonzo C. Kerby. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

E. S. Yarbrough to be postmaster at Duke, N. C., in place of Felix M. Kay. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John H. Bloom to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of Richard Dacley. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

Joseph G. Senger to be postmaster at Harvey, N. Dak., in place of Chester A. Revell. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Robert E. Wessel to be postmaster at Oakes, N. Dak., in place of William H. Bush. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

OHIO.

Richard D. Brown to be postmaster at Pataskala, Ohio, in place of Clarence C. Fravel. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

John T. Flynn to be postmaster at Bellaire, Ohio, in place of Orlando P. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Charles L. Hunter to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ohio, in place of John A. Anderson, resigned.

Orrin E. Jones to be postmaster at West Salem, Ohio, in place of W. W. Garver. Incumbent's commission expires March 15, 1914.

Joseph L. Riesser to be postmaster at Ripley, Ohio, in place of Sarah E. Maddox. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

Philip Wetzel to be postmaster at Perrysburg, Ohio, in place of Fred Yeager. Incumbent's commission expires March 15, 1914.

OKLAHOMA.

M. E. Dillake to be postmaster at Quinton, Okla., in place of Maud C. White, resigned.

Laura Houston to be postmaster at Woodward, Okla., in place of Sherman M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

James W. Smith to be postmaster at Grandfield, Okla., in place of Andrew D. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expires March 10, 1914.

W. J. Strange to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of J. R. Sequichie, resigned.

OREGON.

Paul C. Belt to be postmaster at Willamina, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

M. M. Fitch to be postmaster at Sherwood, Oreg., in place of Lawrence S. McConnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

C. W. Holloman to be postmaster at Haines, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Victor P. Moses to be postmaster at Corvallis, Oreg., in place of Burtis W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

Archie Parker to be postmaster at Monmouth, Oreg., in place of O. A. Wolverton. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

Russell H. Sullens to be postmaster at Prairie City, Oreg., in place of D. B. Davidson, resigned.

J. H. Young to be postmaster at Hermiston, Oreg., in place of John H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

PENNSYLVANIA.

David Burke to be postmaster at Bangor, Pa., in place of R. F. Schaeffer, resigned.

Thomas N. Burke to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, Pa., in place of Thomas R. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1914.

John A. Coonahan to be postmaster at Ogontz, Pa., in place of William H. Michener. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

Charles S. Duncan to be postmaster at Gettysburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Beales. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Simon P. Geisel to be postmaster at Hooversville, Pa., in place of Fred G. Fryburg. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

John K. Gorman to be postmaster at Coalport, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Alonzo W. Jones to be postmaster at Mount Union, Pa., in place of I. Newton Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

W. R. Speer to be postmaster at Everett, Pa., in place of John C. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1914.

Annie H. Washburn to be postmaster at Wyncote, Pa., in place of Annie H. Washburn. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

PORTO RICO.

Fernando Callejo to be postmaster at Manati, P. R., in place of Fernando Callejo. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Manuel S. Pacheco to be postmaster at Fajardo, P. R., in place of Manuel S. Pacheco. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

RHODE ISLAND.

Alonzo A. Greenman to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Daniel G. Coggeshall to be postmaster at Bristol, R. I., in place of Edward J. Prest. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

N. C. Andrews to be postmaster at Irene, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William S. Small to be postmaster at Gettysburg, S. Dak., in place of William Toomey, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

M. B. Capps to be postmaster at Livingston, Tenn., in place of Timothy F. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1914.

I. S. Davidson to be postmaster at Petersburg, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

W. H. Howard to be postmaster at Milan, Tenn., in place of A. D. Holt. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

TEXAS.

Clinton Bybee to be postmaster at Willis, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Thomas W. Cain to be postmaster at Bastrop, Tex., in place place of George Realy. Incumbent's commission expires March ary 18, 1914.

F. W. Easterwood to be postmaster at Hearne, Tex., in place of C. J. Hostrasser. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

F. P. Henry to be postmaster at Floydada, Tex., in place of Jesse D. Starks. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Archie N. Justiss to be postmaster at Corsicana, Tex., in place of H. E. Kinsloe. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

Frank Leverton to be postmaster at Grapeland, Tex., in place of Benjamin F. Hill, resigned.

Maxey McCrary to be postmaster at Calvert, Tex., in place of James A. Gammill. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

A. L. Melton to be postmaster at Leonard, Tex., in place of Robert C. May, resigned.

Fred R. Ridley to be postmaster at Campbell, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. J. Sutton to be postmaster at Stockdale, Tex., in place of Mary A. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

Arthur T. Terrell to be postmaster at Eagle Pass, Tex., in place of George W. Rohleder, declined.

J. D. Williams to be postmaster at Sinton, Tex., in place of Waldo E. Haisley. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joe Wren to be postmaster at Normangee, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

UTAH.

Noble Warrum to be postmaster at Salt Lake City, Utah, in place of Arthur L. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

VERMONT.

Henry D. Allen to be postmaster at Wilmington, Vt., in place of Orrin H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

Cornelius Buckley to be postmaster at Barton, Vt., in place of C. B. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

WASHINGTON.

George H. Bevan to be postmaster at Kettle Falls, Wash., in place of R. A. McKellar. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Andrew Hunter to be postmaster at Issaquah, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

F. H. McCroskey to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of W. A. Buckley. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Charles A. Ramm to be postmaster at Davenport, Wash., in place of Jacob F. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

T. T. Richardson to be postmaster at Northport, Wash., in place of William F. Case. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

R. A. Turner to be postmaster at Ellensburg, Wash., in place of Oliver Hinman. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

F. L. Whitney to be postmaster at Ferndale, Wash., in place of Minor McLain, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Benjamin L. Brown to be postmaster at Kingwood, W. Va., in place of H. S. Whetsell, removed.

W. W. Johnson to be postmaster at Glenville, W. Va., in place of John S. Brannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

William G. Keyes to be postmaster at Philippi, W. Va., in place of William A. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

William L. Reinhart to be postmaster at Shepherdstown, W. Va., in place of Harry E. Munday. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1914.

Burton B. Rohrbough to be postmaster at Belington, W. Va., in place of J. W. Criss. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

WISCONSIN.

J. D. O'Brien to be postmaster at Randolph, Wis., in place of Hugh H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Jeremiah J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Janesville, Wis., in place of Charles L. Valentine. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Samuel P. Godfrey to be postmaster at Waupaca, Wis., in place of A. M. Penny, resigned.

Edward Schroeder to be postmaster at Granton, Wis., in place of John M. Tompkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

James C. Thomas to be postmaster at Poynette, Wis., in place of P. W. Mackenzie. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

WYOMING.

James B. Delaney to be postmaster at Saratoga, Wyo., in place of Joseph Munz, resigned.

A. N. Hasenkamp to be postmaster at Laramie, Wyo., in place of Elmer T. Beltz. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1914.*

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Lewis J. Lawson, Greensboro.

CONNECTICUT.

Hugh W. Cronin, Torrington.

IOWA.

Robert C. Plummer, Forest City.

NEW YORK.

William E. Kelley, Brooklyn.

OHIO.

John M. Francis, Cadiz.

UTAH.

William W. Le Cheminant, Garfield.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Maurice E. Wentzell, Harpers Ferry.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### FRIDAY, *March 6, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the wisdom which gave us the adage, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry," which is not only good philosophy, good sense, but good religion. May we trust in Thee and keep a clear head; trust in Thee and keep a clean heart; trust in Thee and be diligent; trust in Thee and do our duty; trust in Thee and be coworkers together with Thee in the establishment of Thy kingdom upon the earth under the spiritual leadership of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. POU and Mr. LEVER rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized, and my motion is pending. But if he is recognized, I make the point of order that his motion is not in order, and upon that I ask to be heard for a very few minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that if the House desires to go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, this is a day which belongs to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. POU. Upon that point I would like to be heard, also. I respectfully differ with the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that by way of suggestion.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not claims day or war-claims day.

Mr. POU. I wish to address myself briefly, Mr. Speaker, to this question. Of course I know what the custom of the House

has been with respect to this day. In the first place, I submit that this Friday is not the day for the consideration of bills reported by the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman make that out?

Mr. POU. I was about to state. For this reason: On the third Friday in the last month the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar, giving preference to bills from the Committee on Claims. After the third Friday came the fourth Friday, which, of course, belongs to pensions. Then came the fifth Friday, and under this rule that belonged to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. There were only four Fridays in February.

Mr. POU. The Speaker is right, there was not a fifth Friday in the last month; but I know that this is true: There has been a Friday since the Committee on Claims was given consideration by the House, to which the Committee on War Claims was entitled, because I talked with the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], and he said that he expected to get a part of the day. That being the case, this is the alternative Friday which would belong to the Committee on Claims, provided the House agreed to this motion.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Claims had the last Friday.

Mr. POU. No; the last Friday, barring the second and fourth, belonged to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The last Friday that we considered claims the Committee on Claims had it.

Mr. POU. That is true; but there has been since then a Friday which properly belonged, under the rules, to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman if in such a case as occurred then and the House took Friday away from the Claims Committee, if that is not practically no Friday at all?

Mr. POU. No; I think not. I think this rule contemplates that one Friday shall belong to the Committee on Claims and the next to the Committee on War Claims. I do not think the rule means that if the Claims Committee gets in on a certain day that then the Claims Committee must be shut out until the Committee on War Claims has an opportunity to have its bills considered. It is my duty to be here to do all I can to secure consideration of bills from the committee of which I am chairman. It is the duty of the chairman of the Committee on War Claims to be present on the Friday to which his committee is entitled and have his bills considered. This, I understand, he attempted.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on War Claims was here and doing all he could to get in, except that he did not make the motion on the floor. He came to the Chair and asked about it, and the Chair told him he was going to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider appropriation bills, and would not recognize him, but the Chair would recognize him to-day if he was here, unless the House went into Committee of the Whole House on appropriation bills.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, in any event, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is not in order. If this rule means anything, it means that Friday of each week, barring the second and fourth, shall be set apart for consideration of certain business. It seems to me that in view of the plain reading of this rule the Speaker should hold that the preferential motion should come from the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims. The rule says:

> On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar—

And so forth.

The rule says plainly that on a certain day the House shall give preference to certain business. This rule does not mean that the Committee on War Claims or the Committee on Claims or the Committee on Pensions can be shut out at will by the chairman of some great committee. If the rule meant that, the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Pensions had better go in advance and appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairmen of the other great committees and ask them whether it is their sweet will that we shall have an opportunity to get in on these particular days. I say that if the rule means anything at all, it means that on these particular days the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Claims, and the Committee on Pensions shall have the preferential right to make the motion to go into Committee of the Whole. The Committee on Claims has 35 bills on this calendar. We have probably 15 other bills ready to be placed on the calendar. What is to become of them? I think I know, if this sort of procedure is maintained. We will have a rule brought in probably giving some night to the consideration of these bills. Then what is going to happen? Whatever we can get through by unanimous consent will go through, and bills to which any Member objects will not go through, and we will be subject to the will of anyone who wants to make the point of no quorum.

I believe that the membership of this House wants these committees to have consideration for bills reported by them on the days set apart by this rule, and I do not believe that under a proper construction of the rule the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is in order. On every day set apart, under the rule, for consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Claims I am going to be here and do what I can under the rules to secure consideration of these measures. The membership of this House that voted for this rule, the committee that framed the rule, did not intend that a set of men should be working diligently day after day to put bills on the calendar and then see the result of all their labor nullified at the sweet will of some gentleman who happens to be at the head of one of these great appropriation committees. If this rule has been so construed in the past, I maintain that the time has come to change it, and there is no better time to do that than right here and now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, clause 6 of Rule XXIV, to which the gentleman refers, provides:

> On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar in the following order:

The gentleman insists that this shuts out the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but clause 9 of Rule XVI provides:

> At any time after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue or general appropriation bills.

So that both motions are in order. The fact that the Private Calendar is in order on Friday does not shut out the other rule. The other motion is also in order. The rules have been frequently construed, and this memorandum follows the Private Calendar rule:

> This rule does not interfere with the highly privileged motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider revenue or appropriation bills, which may be made immediately after the reading of the Journal on Fridays as on others days, and at any time of the day has precedence of the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the Private Calendar.

I think that disposes of the gentleman's contention as to his point of order that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is not in order.

If we should go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, the gentleman from North Carolina insists that the claims bills would have precedence. The last day that was devoted to the Private Calendar outside of pensions was devoted to claims. The rule provides that except on the second and fourth Fridays the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees; and the gentleman from North Carolina claims that this means alternating Fridays, although that is not the language of the rule. This rule has been frequently construed, and the memorandum or note made by the parliamentarian under the rule provides:

> When the House, by special order, devotes Friday entirely to business other than private business the special rules governing the use of the day are thereby suspended.

The alternating is between the committees and not between the Fridays. As a matter of fact, at this session of Congress war claims has had no day whatever. We considered the war-claims bill on claims day, because while the Claims Committee took precedence on that day it had no bills on the calendar. That was the first Friday of this session of Congress, December 5. The House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, and the Claims Committee came first. It took precedence, but having no bills on the calendar we proceeded with the consideration of the omnibus war claims bill, but that day, theoretically, was devoted to the Committee on Claims which had precedence. Subsequently we have taken up again the Claims Calendar, considering by general consent, I take it, that the war claims having actually called up a bill on a day devoted to the Claims Committee it should be so treated. But the Committee on Claims in any event under no construction

of the rule would be entitled to this day as against the War Claims Committee.

Mr. LEVER rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear further argument on these points of order. The Chair is prepared to rule. There is not a more vigilant Member of the House than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. [Applause.] He attends to his business, and he is always on hand when the time is propitious, and sometimes when it is not propitious, to get up his bills. But this is the parliamentary situaton: In the first place, some of these rules need recasting to make them harmonious with each other. For instance, one rule provides that a report from the Committee on Rules is always in order, while the rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] quoted, section 9 of Rule XVI, provides that at any time after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue or general appropriation bills. At first blush it would seem that those rules were in direct conflict with each other, and in one sense they are.

Suppose the chairman of the Committee on Rules were here demanding recognition to bring in a rule and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] were insisting on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to discuss the Agricultural appropriation bill, what would happen? All of these rules must be considered together, to make, if possible, a consistent whole, and they must be considered in the light of common sense. In addition to that, the Speaker is under moral obligation to construe them so as to expedite the business of the House. There are 14 general appropriation bills. The Government can not exist unless the Committees on Appropriations in Congress, under its leaders, perform their functions, and it is the business of the Speaker to expedite the passage of these bills where he can under the rules so that we may be able to get away from here before the frost comes.

Originally private claims did not have any more standing than any other bills, but had to come up under the usual procedure. Finally, the House determined to set aside certain Fridays in order that preference might be given to consideration of claims bills over the ordinary run of business; but that was not to give consideration of those matters preference over a motion of an Appropriation Committee that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering an appropriation bill, which is of the highest importance.

It has been ruled on—and the Chair wants to settle this thing for all time to come if he can—by three different Speakers; that is, by two Speakers and one Speaker pro tempore—Speaker Reed, Speaker Henderson, and the Hon. John Dalzell, Speaker pro tempore. Now, here is Mr. Speaker Reed's ruling (Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3082):

> The motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider general appropriation bills has precedence on a Friday of a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar. On Friday, February 4, 1898, Mr. James A. Hemenway, of Indiana, from the Committee on Appropriations, moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a general appropriation bill. Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of Texas, made the point that the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider business on the Private Calendar was of higher privilege than the motion made by Mr. Hemenway. The Speaker said that it had been the invariable construction of the rule that public business had the right of way.

Now, that is the crux of the whole thing. Continuing, Speaker Reed said:

> If the House did not desire to consider appropriation bills, it could vote down the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, and then the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar would be next in order.

The other two decisions are to the same effect.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a general appropriation bill.

Now, the House has its remedy. It can do as it pleases. I will give an illustration. A couple of years ago the gentleman from New York, Mr. Sulzer, reported the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and about five minutes after that Capt. Lamb, of Virginia, reported the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the gentleman from New York was very solicitous to get in first, and he came in the Speaker's room and asked me to recognize him. I said to him, "They will not consider your bill; they will consider the Agricultural bill." He wanted to be recognized anyhow. I said, "They will vote you down 10 to 1." So he was sitting where Judge HOUSTON is, on a front seat, and made his motion and I recognized him. Capt. Lamb was back where the gentleman from South Carolina sits, motioning with his fingers, trying to make the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the Agricultural bill. I said we could not have two motions of that sort pending at once. He asked me what would be done if the motion of the gentleman from New York was voted down? I said I would recognize him to make his motion. They voted the gentleman from New York down, about 10 to 1, because there were at least 10 men in the House interested in the Agricultural bill to 1 interested in the Diplomatic and Consular bill. [Laughter.] So the House can always do as it pleases. Now, on the other point, about which one of these two committees on claims is entitled to this day, if the gentleman from South Carolina was not interfering, it would be the War Claims Committee. It is not Fridays, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested, that alternate, but the committees. The last time either one of these committees had a Friday it was the Committee on Claims, the committee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]; and, as I stated in an interlocutory way a little while ago, the chairman of the Committee on War Claims [Mr. GREGG] was here and was very anxious to get in, and asked me if I would recognize him, and I told him I would recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. So next Friday, if the House sustains the Speaker in this matter, the Committee on War Claims will have the right of way unless a privileged matter is called up.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POU. Unless this rule is changed, why, the Committee on Pensions could be displaced if any chairman of one of the great appropriating committees made a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House, just as the Committee on War Claims and the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Just exactly; no earthly difference between them.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will indulge me for a moment, I desire to say I have no wish to displace the Private Calendar to-day, except for the reason that all of us agree that we must pass these appropriation bills if we are to get away from this Congress at all, and hence my motion this morning.

Mr. POU. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he does not think it is an important matter to look after the pensions of the old soldiers, and does he not think claims are entitled to some consideration from the House also? Is not that public business also?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. If that condition arises and the House wants to consider pensions next Friday, or claims, it can say so.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to consume just a moment in my own time.

The coincidences of life are always interesting. Gentlemen of the committee will remember that on the morning of March 3 in opening my remarks I made this statement:

> Mr. Chairman, at breakfast this morning I happened to overhear a remark made by one of those two-by-four know-it-alls which set me thinking. It was this: "No class of people in this country except the farmer and the criminal can get any money from the Federal Government for any purpose." Continuing, he said, "Do you know that there are appropriated $50,000,000 a year for the farmers of this country?"

I was very much interested and amused this morning to receive a letter, which I desire to read to the committee, without including the name of the writer. It is as follows:

COSMOS CLUB,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. A. F. LEVER, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: On Tuesday morning, March 3, 1914, I had the (unconscious) privilege of breakfasting with you, neither of us at the time being aware of the fact.

Later in the same day upon casually straying into the House of Representatives I was somewhat astonished to hear resounding through the room your words, repeating some of mine, uttered, however, thoughtlessly:

"At breakfast this morning I happened to overhear a remark made by one of those two-by-four know-it-alls which set me thinking. It was

this: 'No class of people can get any money from the Government except the farmer and the criminal.' Continuing, he said: 'Do you know that there are appropriated every year for the farmers of this country,'" etc.

I commend, sir, to your attention the coincidence which allowed you to hear these words of mine, which, however "grossly ignorant," nevertheless "set you thinking," and my subsequent hearing of your own words of corrective statistics on the floor of the House.

I sincerely thank you for your remarks on my personal appearance, which is of small importance, but they did not coincide with the descriptive adjectives in your opening remarks. May I say that you estimated me wrongly; I am 2½ by 5¾, not 2 by 4.

In some seriousness, my remark I believe reflects, at any rate, the well-founded opinion of millions of my class, that much of the money appropriated by the Congress is wasted. The appropriations are increasing, and so is the adverse opinion. We know little of the details of the disbursements, because few Congressmen make speeches as clearly explanatory as your own, but we do know of the useless, free-seed "graft," the abuse of the franking privilege, and many other similar extravagances, and unfortunately these cause more adverse comment than is offset by the real use of certain departments, as that of agriculture.

I ask your pardon for addressing you thus, but believe that you may find the recital of our little coincidence amusing, which it certainly was to me.

I commend to you again, in real earnest, the desirability of catering somewhat to us "two-by-fours," for we are legion in number, and really show signs of restlessness when we see you chaps in Congress spending our money too freely.

Very sincerely, yours, ———— ————.

MARCH 5, 1914.

He signs his name, and them adds this postscript:

I will be at the Shoreham until Saturday night, and if you desire to challenge me to a "dewell," or would honor me by lunching with me, I should be gratified. I assure you that you would be taking no more chance than I.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONNOLLY].

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill accentuates the friendly interest of this Democratic House and its earnest disposition to cooperate with that great producing class represented by the farmer. [Applause.]

The years roll on and with them rolls up in impressive and gigantic volume the population of the United States. The ratio of increase in our consuming population has not been paralleled by our producing population. With the travel of time the volume of our manufactures grows in leaps and bounds, advancing as a most impressive chapter in the history of our exports. With this growth of industry comes an increase in population that bears down heavily upon the resources of our farmers. It is not a great strain upon the imagination to picture the coming conflict of a great consuming demand for food supply on the one hand and the struggling array of food producers upon the other. Therefore with a capacity for consumption on the one hand levying toll upon the agricultural resources of our country, which in some items show an actual decrease in production, it is but natural and obvious that this Democratic House should address itself most seriously to the problem of farm production.

In the time allotted to me I will touch but briefly upon a few of the methods by which we are lending our help and inclining our cooperation to the interests of the agricultural classes.

FARM DEMONSTRATION WORK.

In the matter of farm demonstration work the Department of Agriculture has in a limited way sent out experts frequently in cooperation with the counties interested to devise plans and in a multiplicity of methods to demonstrate to the actual tiller of the soil.

The results in this limited way have been of such a satisfactory and encouraging nature that the Agricultural Committee recently reported out what is known as the Lever extension bill (H. R. 7951) with absolute unanimity.

For a great many years the Government has appropriated funds for investigation, laboratories, experiments, and various kinds of research, with the result that from these different channels there has accumulated a great reservoir of most valuable knowledge, data, and results. The acquisition of these results was a great asset to the Nation, but the problem developed as to a method of tapping this reservoir of knowledge gleaned, passing it through channels that would finally place it on the land of the producer, the actual tiller of the soil. The statutes under which the Government has in the past developed this knowledge was the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887, the second Morrill Act of 1890, the Adams Act of 1906, and the Nelson amendment of 1907.

As a justification for the appropriation of Government funds along agricultural lines, you can look to the experience of Europe. Let us contemplate, for instance, the history of Denmark in its application of the results of research and experiment to the problems confronting the actual laborer in the field, and this retrospection is of peculiar advantage in the light of the tendency in some of our great wheat-growing States that some years ago were producing 30 bushels to the acre and now have declined to about 13 bushels to the acre. Many years ago Denmark was at a very low ebb industrially, in its finances, in its commerce, and in its agriculture. The Danish people became thoroughly aroused and they studied their own conditions most seriously and came to a realization that the foundation of its fabric of prosperity was the soil, and so the nation began upon the fields and initiated agricultural schools and laid out agricultural extension work, but this did not suffice, and so the Government sent out throughout the land skilled experts and enlightened evangels of the soil to lead the farmer from the wilderness. These experts lived with the laborer, studied the localities, conditions, the soil, and every agricultural problem, and in a concrete way met these problems by conclusive demonstrations. At the time the percentage of the urban population greatly overshadowed the rural population, but the result of this labor at the basis of national prosperity was a great boom in agriculture, and rising up and concomitant with it went finance, industry, and commerce. As an instance of success of the Danes, compare the average yield of wheat per acre in Denmark of 40 bushels, with soil centuries older than that of the United States and perhaps not so good originally, with the average yield of wheat in the United States of 14 bushels per acre. And contrast, also, the results in the ancient soil of Germany, with its average yield of 28 bushels to the acre; in England, with 32 bushels to the acre; in Belgium, 34 bushels to the acre.

I understand that at one time in Denmark the rural population amounted to only 15 per cent of the total, whereas to-day it is almost 90 per cent. To-day in America the call is to the country, and the Democratic Party harkens to the call. We wish to place before the country the benefits of science and research.

THE BOYS' AND GIRLS' CORN, POTATO, GARDEN, AND CANNING DEMONSTRATION CLUBS.

At this point let us establish a bench mark indicating the difference between ordinary husbandry and the application of science and demonstrated methods of successful farming by introducing the results of the boys' and girls' corn, potato, garden, and canning clubs. In the culture of corn we find that a 10-year average in the United States would show a rate of 25 bushels per acre, and yet last year one of the winners in the Alabama Boys' Corn Club showed a record of 232 bushels to the acre, and as an Iowan I was proud to note that the winner of the Boys' Corn Club of the Northern and Central States was Arthur Runfit, of Reinbeck, Iowa, showing a yield of 138 bushels per acre, with a resultant profit of $133.43, and in the recent visitation of the winners of these different clubs my gratification was further stimulated by the record in the cultivation of tomatoes by Miss Friddall, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, my own district. Among the club she was first in the amount of profit and second in the volume of production, showing on the profit side over $100 per acre, and a yield of 3,403 pounds. [Applause.]

Through research, laboratory, and experiments we have acquired knowledge of incalculable value to the farmer. For instance, in the matter of soil fertility the analysis, the physical and chemical survey of soils have developed typical instances of areas that seemed almost worthless, so thorough was the depletion, and it was found that one element lacking was that of phosphorus or nitrogen, and this almost barren soil was redeemed and brought back to the proud yield of 50 bushels to the acre at a cost of about $1.50 for the requisite phosphorus or nitrogen, as the case happened to be. Then, again, there were the so-called clover sick and sour lands, forming a discouraging prospect to the owner of the soil, but analysis and survey passed over the land and scattered a mixture of ground limestone or marl, and lo! as if by magic wand, the soil produced once more. Besides, in the field of experimentation we are impressed with the beneficent results in the pure-seed grains of barley, corn, and oats and in the valuable data acquired from the study of pests, of rust, and smut.

THE LEVER BILL.

And now to meet the problem of bringing to the farmer the knowledge and accumulated results of our colleges, laboratories, experiment stations, under a Federal supervision, comes the Lever extension bill, by which this Congress provides for cooperative agriculture.

The Lever extension bill affords work through field demonstrations, laboratories, publications, and otherwise, according to a plan recently agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and those land-grant colleges receiving the benefit of the first Morrill Act. The provisions of the bill will tend to eliminate the publication of effort and will secure a better coordination of effort between the Federal Department of Agriculture and the State

agencies. It is the Lever bill that brings the demonstrated methods of successful farming, the management of the farm, home economics, through the medium of the traveling expert giving his ocular demonstrations, down to the last man, the laborer in the field, the actual tiller of the soil.

Besides the regular appropriation of $10,000 to each State assenting, there are additional appropriations for each year, until at the tenth year and thereafter the total appropriation would be $3,480,000 annually. Under the table prepared by the committee it would appear that the allotment for Iowa would be $93,900.

Provision is also properly made that no payment out of the additional appropriation be made unless an equal sum has been provided by the State, county, or local authority for the maintenance of the work provided in the bill.

LEGISLATION LOOKING TO THE ERADICATION OF HOG CHOLERA.

Another piece of legislation in the interests of the farmer that attracted my attention and support is the bill passed by this Democratic House looking to the investigation and the ultimate eradication of that disease so dreaded by the Iowa farmer—the hog cholera. As in many other States, Iowa has yielded heavy tribute to this menace of the stock breeder, and it is not only proper but vitally essential that this Government should assist the swine breeder to shake off the shackles of this disease. [Applause.] It is more than a serious condition to the average breeder; it is an economic tragedy. When he contemplates the loss of his herd fattened by the production of his cornfield he becomes disheartened and is inclined to turn toward other fields of endeavor, and coupled with this tendency is the great problem of feeding our people, who depend more upon pork than on any other meat for their daily food. Thus the ravage becomes double-edged in its destructive influences.

I have a letter from Prof. Kennedy, of the Iowa State College, who writes in behalf of the Iowa swine breeders for legislation looking to the amelioration of these conditions among the breeders. He states that if there was some provision last year for the testing of the commercial serum and virus it would have saved the Iowa farmer ten to fifteen million dollars in losses from hog cholera. It would have standardized the serum, and with the proper serum good results would have been general, and with good results it would have stimulated the use of this preventive and revivify the interest in hog breeding. According to a recent report of the agricultural extension department of Iowa State College, the Iowa farmer, in the year 1913, lost more than $33,000,000 from hog cholera. The reports, which were gathered from 1,125 different men, covering every community in every county in the State, showed that cholera destroyed 2,827,907 swine, or 34.3 per cent of all the hogs in Iowa. In addition to this tremendous loss, the data shows that nearly 2,500,000 young hogs, ranging from 50 to 150 pounds in live weight, were marketed ahead of time—a heavy sacrifice because of the cholera scare. As a matter of fact, cholera manifested itself in every county in the State last year. In some counties, however, the loss was less than 5 per cent, but in most of the counties the loss ranged from 60,000 head to well over 100,000 head, the heaviest loss being sustained by Sioux County in the destruction of 103,765 head. It is interesting in this connection to note the results of the application of serum and virus, it being evident that where good serum was properly used good results went hand in hand. The director of the State serum laboratory has developed data indicating that when healthy hogs were treated the loss after the treatment was less than 2¼ per cent. Where sick herds were treated the loss jumped up to 16 and 17 per cent. In cases where there was an application of good virus but poor serum cholera was given a foothold, and the consensus of opinion of those who have studied the effect of the last year's fight in Iowa against hog cholera is that there should be a thorough testing of serum either by Federal or State government before it can be sold, and also there should be competent men to administer the virus and renew the activity and watchfulness in the development of better sanitary regulations. Personally, I am intensely interested in this campaign against hog cholera, as I am keenly sympathetic with my brother and neighbor, the hog breeder, and I am thoroughly aroused to the human and economic aspects that are accentuated by this unfortunate combination of increased demand by the great consuming masses on the one hand and decreased production of swine breeders on the other.

GOOD-ROADS LEGISLATION FOR THE RURAL COMMUNITIES.

In another department this Government stretches forth a sympathetic and helping hand to the farmer, from the Bureau of Public Roads, and in the latest enactment of this Democratic House, the Shackleford good-roads bill. For some time the Bureau of Good Roads in the Department of Agriculture has been cooperating with the different counties throughout the country in road construction. They sent out experienced road builders to counsel and advise with the local authorities. The counties can avail themselves of the service of these experts in the planning of the road as well as the expert's supervision in the matter of engineering and in the matter of proper materials to be employed.

It was a source of great gratification to me to be of assistance in procuring for Dubuque County, the only county in my district to make application before the fund available was exhausted, to secure an appropriation of $30,000 from the Government to accompany an appropriation of $60,000 on behalf of the county to construct a sample road as an object lesson along a strip of postal and rural free delivery. There happened to be a very keen desire upon the part of the citizens of Dubuque County to initiate through this road construction a general movement for road improvement throughout the entire county. The Bureau of Good Roads has built sample strips of the different types of road construction in various parts of the country and have kept most valuable data upon same that is available for the examination and investigation of the different portions of the country which are already engaged or are about to take up this most important problem of the transportation of farm products to the market.

The Shackleford good-roads bill carries the spirit of friendship and interest to the farmer as it is calculated to stimulate and help the road movement in the rural communities.

And so in many ways this Democratic House manifests its interest in the farmer and its desire to encourage him and to cooperate in the much-desired pilgrimage back to the farm. It extends the hand of fellowship and friendship in the application of the latest scientific results for the use of the farmer, and it raises the voice of encouragement and cheer and stands shoulder to shoulder with him in the great redemption of our lands by scientific study and intensive treatment of his acres.

THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF.

There are, of course, divers views in regard to the effect of the tariff upon the prices of farm products, and I wish to state that I would not consciously participate in any legislation that would produce gross injustice upon the farmer, as some of the Republican Members of this House claim has been placed upon the farmer through the Underwood tariff bill. As to the Republican tariff, the farmer must appreciate that, under the blind of so-called protection upon some of the commodities produced on the farm, he was obliged to purchase the materials needed upon the farm in a market sheltered by a prohibitive tariff wall, and yet in these periods of so-called protection on his own products he has seen prices fluctuate from high to low. He has realized that in many of his products he was on an export basis, and that the price of his products was governed and controlled by a great many conditions. As to any possible effect of the tariff upon the products of the Iowa farmer, and in connection with the claims of some Republican Members of this House, it is always well to revert to the recorded views of the present senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], in which he states:

I know that my friend from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] does not agree with me in respect to these things, but I do not believe that we in Iowa receive any direct benefit for the 400,000,000 bushels of corn that we raise every year; I do not believe that we receive any direct benefit from the duty on 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 hogs that we market every year; I do not believe that of the $700,000,000 of agricultural products that we pour every year into the channels of trade, protection advances the price of a tithe of them. * * * We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with a product that will surpass in value $700,000,000, and it is idle for even any enthusiast to assert that the price of these products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

At this time I will not go into a prolonged discussion of the tariff and the Iowa farmer, but in closing I wish to insert the following article from an issue of an Iowa paper, the Carroll Times, under date of February 26, 1914:

IOWA FARMERS AND THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF—MARKET QUOTATIONS SHOW PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS GREATER THAN UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE.

The Iowa farmer enjoys better prices for his corn, cattle, wheat, hogs, and eggs under the Democratic tariff that recently went into effect than he enjoyed under the Payne-Aldrich tariff which preceded it.

This is the answer which the daily market quotations for the month of February make to the lying statements of Republican newspapers that "Democratic free trade" is bringing ruin to the farmers by reason of the competition of Canada and the Argentine Republic.

The daily quotations on corn for February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff average 13 cents a bushel higher than the quotations for the corresponding month in 1913 under the Republican protective tariff.

The daily quotations on wheat average about 3 cents per bushel higher in February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff than they averaged in the same month of 1913 under the Republican tariff law.

The daily quotations on hogs for February, 1914, average 45 cents per hundredweight higher than those of the corresponding month in the preceding year.

The daily quotations on cattle average 18 cents higher per hundredweight in February, 1914, over the prices quoted on the corresponding dates of 1913.

The daily quotations on eggs for February, 1914, average about 9 cents a dozen higher than the quotations for the corresponding dates in 1913.

This advance in prices means millions of dollars of added value to the products of Iowa farms and the revenues of Iowa farmers. Take the one little item of eggs alone: The annual production of eggs in Iowa is estimated by the State department of agriculture at 97,549,731 dozens. An increase of 9 cents per dozen means that this annual production will sell for $8,000,000 more money. The advance of 13 cents in the price of corn means an increase many times greater than that from the advance in eggs.

HERE ARE THE PROOFS.

From the files of the Daily Trade Bulletin, in the office of J. R. Whitney & Co., the Times has taken the quotations of prices for the above-named commodities on the Chicago Board of Trade, for the dates specified. To save time and space, the quotations only for the last market day of each week have been taken, but the quotations for the other days of the week would afford the same contrast.

February, 1913, came in on Saturday. The dates for which quotations are given are, therefore, February 1, 8, 15, and 21. There was no session of the board of trade on Saturday, February 22, a public holiday. The Saturdays of 1914 most nearly corresponding to these were January 31, February 7, 14, and 21. These are the dates for which the following quotations were reported in the Daily Trade Bulletin, and we invite doubters to consult the files themselves for verification or refutation of the figures given by us. The corn prices quoted are the cash prices for No. 3, mixed on track, Chicago, which is selected as a standard grade. Any other grade might be chosen, but the lesson taught by the quotations would be the same. The prices given on wheat are for No. 2 spring. The prices quoted on hogs are the lowest and highest, including both light and heavy grades, but excluding "pigs." The quotations on cattle are for "steers, medium to choice."

CORN—NO. 3 MIXED, ON TRACK CHICAGO.

| | Low. | High. |
|---|---|---|
| 1913. | | |
| Feb. 1 | 48 | 50 |
| Feb. 8 | 49½ | 50½ |
| Feb. 15 | 47½ | 49½ |
| Feb. 21 | 47½ | 49 |
| 1914. | | |
| Jan. 31 | 60½ | 63 |
| Feb. 7 | 60 | 64 |
| Feb. 14 | 59½ | 63 |
| Feb. 21 | 59½ | 64 |

WHEAT—NO. 2 SPRING.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1913. | | |
| Feb. 1 | 88 | 90 |
| Feb. 8 | 88 | 90½ |
| Feb. 15 | 87 | 89 |
| Feb. 21 | 87 | 89½ |
| 1914. | | |
| Jan. 31 | 88½ | 90 |
| Feb. 7 | 89½ | 91½ |
| Feb. 14 | 91 | 92 |
| Feb. 21 | 93 | 95 |

LIVE HOGS—LIGHT AND HEAVY.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1913. | | |
| Feb. 1 | 7.30 | 7.70 |
| Feb. 8 | 7.85 | 8.10 |
| Feb. 15 | 8.00 | 8.35 |
| Feb. 21 | 8.15 | 8.40 |
| 1914. | | |
| Jan. 31 | 8.25 | 8.50 |
| Feb. 7 | 8.45 | 8.72½ |
| Feb. 14 | 8.25 | 8.60 |
| Feb. 21 | 8.40 | 8.75 |

CATTLE—STEERS, MEDIUM TO CHOICE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1913. | | |
| Feb. 1 | 7.50 | 8.25 |
| Feb. 8 | 7.60 | 8.25 |
| Feb. 15 | 7.90 | 8.50 |
| Feb. 21 | 7.90 | 8.50 |
| 1914. | | |
| Jan. 31 | 7.85 | 8.85 |
| Feb. 7 | 7.85 | 8.65 |
| Feb. 14 | 7.75 | 8.65 |
| Feb. 21 | 7.85 | 8.60 |

The Chicago prices for eggs in February, 1913, ranged from 15 to 24 cents. The prices for February, 1914, have thus far ranged from 24½ to 27 cents. The average of prices for the past month has been nearly 9 cents higher than for the corresponding period in 1913.

The Times makes no claim that these higher prices are the result of the Democratic tariff revision. We believe now, as we believed through all the years when the robber tariff prevailed, that the prices of things that the American farmer had to sell were determined by the world market, and would neither be increased or diminished by protective duties. The market quotations prove that this belief was correct. They also prove the Republican claim that the prosperity of the farmer was due to the tariff to be utterly false and without foundation. They prove that the calamity bowling of the Carroll Herald and papers of its sort has no warrant in fact. They prove that the statements that such papers have made as to the disastrous effect of the new tariff law are utterly and maliciously false.

Never again should the Iowa farmer permit himself to be misled by the false and delusive claim that he is a beneficiary of the protective policy and that the removal of the duties on such things as he produces would diminish the returns from his farm. He should know from this time forth that the pretense of protection to the farmer is only designed to secure his support to a policy that raises the price of every manufactured article that he buys, while it can not enhance the price of the things he has to sell.

MANUFACTURED GOODS COMING DOWN.

While the farmer is selling his own produce at as high or higher prices than he received under the old Republican tariff, the prices of manufactured goods have begun to fall under the influence of world competition. Sugar is a notable example of this. The wholesale price of sugar one day last week was $4.65 per hundredweight. Last year it was as high as $6.30, and there have been times, when the demand was exceptionally great, as during the fruit season, when it was close to $8 per hundred. In the great eastern cities the prices of dry goods and clothing have already dropped materially, and the purchasers of such goods are realizing the benefit that tariff reduction brings to them.

These are sad facts for the calamity howler to contemplate, but they are nevertheless the facts.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRIEST].

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Chairman, when the statistics of the United States census of 1870 were prepared and published, they proclaimed Lancaster County, Pa., to be the greatest of all agricultural counties. The aggregate value of farm products of that county exceeded its closest competitor, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., by $2,000,000. Ten years later the census returns showed a like result; the nearest competitor to Lancaster County then being Monroe County, N. Y., which lagged $3,000,000 behind. In the census of 1890 the leading agricultural counties were Lancaster County, Pa., and St. Lawrence County, N. Y., and the latter was within $1,000,000 of winning. The returns of the census of 1900 classified Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory, as a single county, and although its area was eight times that of Lancaster County, yet the latter won out, but by a narrow margin. In the last census, that of 1910, the name of Lancaster County again led all the rest in the race for agricultural supremacy, winning against Los Angeles County, Cal., with an aggregate value of $20,767,145 of farm products. For the information of the House and the country I shall include in these remarks statistics furnished me by the Census Bureau for the 12 counties in the United States which rank highest in the last census in the total value of farm products:

*The banner agricultural counties of the Nation, census of 1910.*

| | Total land area. | All land in farms. | Value of farm property. | Value of crops. | Value of live-stock products. | Value of animals sold or slaughtered. | | Aggregate value of farm products. | Rank. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Sold. | Slaughtered. | | |
| Lancaster County, Pa | 602,240 | 550,499 | $84,426,907 | $13,059,588 | $4,037,286 | $2,790,333 | $879,939 | $20,767,146 | 1 |
| Los Angeles County, Cal | 2,602,880 | 757,985 | 199,998,200 | 14,720,884 | 2,492,378 | 710,569 | 63,561 | 17,987,392 | 3 |
| McLean County, Ill | 762,240 | 733,161 | 147,846,611 | 12,811,506 | 1,094,130 | 4,144,602 | 318,180 | 18,368,418 | 2 |
| Champaign County, Ill | 667,520 | 608,428 | 123,312,914 | 9,991,658 | 858,080 | 1,573,316 | 250,486 | 12,673,540 | 7 |
| Livingston County, Ill | 667,520 | 646,551 | 121,558,684 | 11,377,297 | 925,671 | 1,298,383 | 224,813 | 13,826,164 | 6 |
| La Salle County, Ill | 733,440 | 662,755 | 114,911,820 | 10,222,235 | 1,897,834 | 1,991,409 | 206,633 | 14,318,111 | 5 |
| Fresno County, Cal | 3,808,000 | 1,106,616 | 92,583,058 | 7,991,187 | 1,412,843 | 1,324,168 | 89,080 | 10,817,278 | 11 |
| Cook County, Ill | 597,120 | 387,603 | 91,648,602 | 8,941,336 | 2,276,918 | 585,345 | 247,927 | 12,051,526 | 8 |
| Vermilion County, Ill | 580,440 | 534,385 | 87,002,954 | 7,416,946 | 836,471 | 1,806,048 | 246,468 | 10,305,933 | 12 |
| Sangamon County, Ill | 560,640 | 520,909 | 85,743,114 | 7,458,942 | 805,532 | 2,979,044 | 268,326 | 11,511,844 | 10 |
| Whitman County, Wash | 1,349,120 | 1,187,966 | 67,357,022 | 12,540,694 | 671,386 | 1,154,180 | 235,337 | 14,601,597 | 4 |
| Aroostook County, Me | 4,129,920 | 864,430 | 44,220,004 | 10,150,955 | 738,950 | 581,726 | 255,879 | 11,727,510 | 9 |

This matchless marvel of farm productivity, the county of Lancaster, Mr. Chairman, constitutes the congressional district which I endeavor to represent in this body.

Scanning carefully, as the Representative of this exceptionally productive farm county, the appropriation bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture for the fiscal year 1915, I find in it many meritorious features which entitle the chairman of the committee and its entire membership to commendation and congratulation. An examination of the printed reports of the hearings held by the Agricultural Committee furnishes additional and gratifying evidence of the earnest desire in Congress to serve well those of our countrymen who are devoting themselves to agricultural pursuits.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES IN LANCASTER COUNTY, PA.

In Lancaster County, Pa., the Agricultural Department is engaged in tobacco-growing experiments, is making a soil survey, and is conducting farm-demonstration work. The appropriations carried by this bill for the continuance of these services represent an investment of money which returns to the Government and the people a handsome profit. All three projects are highly valuable. It is evident that the wide range of possibilities for financial results to the farmers is greatest from the farm-demonstration work. It means a study of farm conditions, a determination of the profitableness of farm enterprises, surveys which have to deal with the different types of farms, a study of the soil, the relation between crops, the maintenance of soil fertility, and the demonstration of agricultural experiments with the object of increasing crop production.

There is a wide public interest in what the Agricultural Department actually does for the American farmers, and the general public wants to know of the scope of this work, its possibilities, and the activities of the experts and agricultural scientists in their cooperation with the practical farmers. The successful and ambitious farmer wants all the information obtainable concerning crop production. He welcomes suggestions that will increase the productivity of his land and the fertility of the soil. The demand is strong for knowledge of the science of farming, and public sentiment approves of appropriations which will enlarge the value of the Agricultural Department to the individual farmer. No just complaint can be made for the expenditure of money to demonstrate how the production of corn, wheat, and other cereals can be increased per acre. No protest will be offered by the people for funds appropriated to conduct tobacco-growing experiments in order that the farmer can get the best results from a profitable crop. Good farmers know the value of proper rotation of crop growing, and every dollar spent by the Government in efforts to prove the best order of crop rotation is sure to bring more dollars to the people and advance the public good. The farmers can not be expected to spend their own money to carry on these experiments. That is as much or more the duty of the State and Nation as it was to dig the great Panama Canal or to build railroads in Alaska at the cost of untold millions of dollars.

What the practical farmer wants and is entitled to is practical consideration by his Government. The demonstration work done right on the farm by men trained not only in agricultural science but in practical farming is a sound method of proving what the Federal and State agricultural departments can do to benefit the farmer. A year ago I secured the cooperation of the agricultural authorities, business men, and practical farmers in the establishment of a farm bureau in Lancaster County, Pa., and during the first year the results of the cooperative work of the farm agent and the local farmers shows encouraging results and satisfactory returns to the people for the money and effort expended. Congress has been appropriating less than $1,000,000 yearly for scientific research and demonstration work of this character over the entire United States, but the States and the people themselves have contributed generously in order that the work of the department may be given extended practical value.

FARM DEMONSTRATION AND FARM SURVEYS.

There is special interest in that item of the bill which appropriates $400,000 for farm management and farm demonstration work. It relates directly to the welfare of the individual farmer. No more practical service can be rendered than demonstrations on the farms. The Government annually expends thousands of dollars for research work and the collection of information affecting agricultural subjects, but there has been an absence of means whereby the results might be personally explained and demonstrated upon the local farms for the benefit of the agriculturists themselves.

Recently I suggested to the Agricultural Department that Lancaster County would appreciate the honor—and the entire country would be benefited thereby—should the department determine upon this great agricultural county as a study for farm welfare. Information worth millions of dollars could be secured by the Agricultural Department if a farm survey were made to determine the money-making factors of the capable and industrious farmers residing in the county to which I have referred. Of course this suggestion was not offered without regard for the benefits which it is hoped the local farmers would also derive, because the investigation is expected to locate the things which are grown, with little or no profit, and to indicate the work which would be worth while in the production of crops of profit; in other words, "a study of the profits of the individual farmer to determine the factors that control his income."

It is important that the farmer shall have financial resources to enable him to conduct his business. Likewise is it essential that the individual farmer shall determine the factors that control his income. To make farming a success certain economic problems must be solved. The farming of diversified crops makes the farm a combination of enterprises involving the use of capital and labor, and it is fair to expect that the farmer shall derive both an income on his investment and remunerative wages for his labor.

Although many farmers do not keep statistical records concerning their crops, expenditures, and so forth, it is a fact that most farmers know more about their business than some people in big cities give them credit for knowing. But the farmers do not have the facilities or organization with which to make a community study to determine the types of agriculture suited to their particular region. Here is where a farm-management survey to determine the profitable and unprofitable farm factors can help the individual farmer.

FARM SURVEYS AND FARM PROFITS.

In the interest of my constituents, both producers and consumers, and for the reasons stated, I have made inquiry concerning the results of a farm-management survey of three areas in the best agricultural counties in the corn belt of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, where about 700 farms were surveyed. The facts reported by the Agricultural Department are somewhat surprising. About 57 per cent of the farms studied were operated by owners and 43 per cent by tenants. Most of the farmers were not reasonably compensated for their efforts, as the figures show that many farmers received little or no wages for their labor. With the permission of the House, it is desired to include several small statements taken from Agricultural Department Bulletin 41, of January 14, 1914, giving the results of this farm survey:

FARM PROFITS.

INCOMES RECEIVED BY FARM OWNERS.

*Average area, capital, receipts, expenses, and profits on 273 farms operated by owners in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa.*

| Item. | Indiana. | Illinois. | Iowa. | Grand total or general average. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of farms | 123 | 73 | 77 | 273 |
| Average area.....acres.. | 105 | 253 | 176 | 176 |
| Average capital | $17,535 | $51,091 | $23,193 | $30,686 |
| Average receipts | 1,873 | 5,042 | 2,308 | 3,059 |
| Average expenses [1] | 689 | 1,866 | 858 | 1,139 |
| Average farm income | 1,187 | 3,176 | 1,450 | 1,935 |
| Average interest at 5 per cent | 877 | 2,554 | 1,159 | 1,530 |
| Average owner's labor income | 310 | 622 | 291 | 405 |

[1] The value of unpaid family labor, except the operator's, has been added in with the other farm expenses. It is equivalent to the amount that would have been paid to hired help had not the family done the work. The average amount per farm was $86 in Indiana, $127 in Illinois, and $101 in Iowa.

INCOMES RECEIVED BY FARM TENANTS.

*Average capital, receipts, expenses, and profits of tenants on 247 farms operated by tenants in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa.*

| Item. | Indiana (83 farms). | Illinois (71 farms). | Iowa (93 farms). | Average (247 farms). |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Average area.....acres.. | 128 | 202 | 167 | 173 |
| Average capital | $1,758 | $2,867 | $2,067 | $2,431 |
| Average receipts | 1,335 | 2,257 | 1,695 | 1,777 |
| Average expenses | 492 | 975 | 759 | 769 |
| Average farm income | 843 | 1,282 | 936 | 1,008 |
| Average interest, at 5 per cent | 88 | 145 | 134 | 122 |
| Average tenant's labor income | 755 | 1,139 | 802 | 879 |

These official figures show that the average net income on the capital invested was 3.5 per cent, all items of expense, including taxes, repairs, seeds, and insurance, being deducted before

figuring the net income. In discussion of the farm income the department says:

The farm income, which represents the income earned by the combined forces of labor and capital, is the amount available to the farmer for his living and savings, provided he had no interest to pay on any mortgage or other debt.

Deducting 5 per cent interest on the average capital leaves an average labor income of $408 for the 273 farm owners. This income, in addition to the food products furnished by the farm, represents the farmer's salary as manager of the business. It is evident that these men are receiving only a moderate sum for their year's work. If they sold their farms at inventory value and invested the money in good securities at 5 per cent the interest alone on a capital of $30,600 would return them $1,530. In addition to this, they would have the amount they were able to earn at other work.

Mr. Chairman, this is convincing evidence that farmers are not making large profits. The report further says:

The assertion that farmers are making large profits is erroneous. They are living on the earnings of their investment and not on the real profits of the farm. A farmer having an investment of $20,000, with no mortgage, may receive a minus labor income, yet have nearly $1,000 as interest on which to live. It is assumed in this discussion that capital should return 5 per cent before allowing the farmer anything for his labor.

Farming is a business and a profession. By studying a sufficient number of farms in a community it can be learned how the more successful farms differ from the less successful. As the business and the professional man makes a study of the best business and scientific methods, so the Congress should provide the Agricultural Department with an appropriation sufficiently large to insure a farm survey which would collect facts upon which the individual farmer can determine the farm enterprises and type of farming which will pay the cost of production, produce an income on the investment, and return wages as a reward for labor.

MARKET STANDARDS FOR VARIOUS FARM PRODUCTS.

The Agricultural Department is doing good work in endeavoring to develop a system of standards for various farm products, and the appropriations for this work and for investigations of the best methods of marketing and distributing farm products are items which merit the approval of Members from both the city and rural districts. The department experts are trying to solve problems which relate to the prosperity of the farmer and the cost of living of the consumer. By the adoption of a system of standards for apples, wheat, corn, and other grains; for eggs, potatoes, and so forth, the seller and buyer can better deal directly, and the parcel post will then become of greater value to the people.

Grades for wheat, apples, oranges, and so forth, have been standardized, and the Agricultural Department reports that by the adoption of standards for eggs it will be possible to sell eggs directly to consumers, with a saving of from 4 to 6 cents per dozen less than it now costs to get the same class of eggs into the city markets. As the egg and poultry business of this country is valued at $750,000,000 to the consumer, of which amount $500,000,000 is accredited to the egg business, it can be readily calculated that the Agricultural Department is endeavoring to render the individual farmers and the ultimate consumers a highly valuable service.

PROTEST AGAINST NONAGRICULTURAL DUTIES.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the greatest of all callings—the tilling of the soil—I suggest that there should be limitations to that tendency in Congress to fasten upon the Agricultural Department responsibilities which are not "agricultural." This bill appropriates $18,947,000, a small proportion of the more than a billion dollars which will be appropriated in this session of Congress, and yet only about two-fifths of the amount carried by this bill is to be appropriated directly for agricultural benefits, such as farm experiments, demonstration work on the farms, scientific research, and so forth. The balance appropriated, about $12,000,000, is authorized for purposes that may be termed supervisory work, police duty, or regulatory service, in which the Government is properly engaged but which are not strictly agricultural. These nonagricultural tasks assigned to the Agricultural Department deal with meteorological and climatological problems by the Weather Bureau, the administration of the national forests by the Bureau of Forestry, the enforcement of food and drug laws, game and bird laws, and other laudable purposes not in themselves agricultural.

It is right that we should recognize the present duty to provide and conserve for the welfare of posterity. Pure-food laws are essential to the health and protection of honest producers and all consumers. The Weather Bureau renders the public valuable service for the money expended. These are conceded to be commendable, but they are not directly agricultural, only serving individual farmers as they serve the public generally, and they illustrate my point that since the establishment of the Agricultural Department in 1889, there has been a growing tendency to develop other than agricultural matters under this department.

Quite recently Congress passed a banking and currency law. An attempt was made to have the Secretary of Agriculture designated as a member of the Federal Reserve Board, and the law actually made the Secretary a member of a committee to organize and install the new money system, and he will be engaged in other than agricultural duties for many weeks. That it was a mistake to assign to this task a Cabinet officer having charge of a great scientific department is manifest. If the officials of the Agricultural Department are permitted to concentrate their efforts and energy on work purely agricultural, it will suffice to keep them busy, and the service rendered can be made to return greater profit to the Nation. I protest most earnestly against further legislation which will impose upon officials of the Agricultural Department nonagricultural duties.

REGULATION OF PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS UNDESIRABLE.

It will be a great mistake if the regulatory powers of the Agricultural Department are increased at the expense of the agricultural service which the department can render the people. Legislative bodies have in recent years enacted all kinds of regulative laws, and much of that legislation has tended to increase the cost of living. Some enthusiasts have even suggested the fixing the prices of farm products. Rome tried that policy 1,600 years ago and failed. The old Romans decreed that wheat was to be sold at 33.6 cents per bushel; rye at 45 cents; pork at 7.3 cents; beef at 4.9 cents; eggs at 5.1 cents; butter at 9.8 cents per pound, and so forth. Any plan to govern the people by a commission which fixes prices may be described as reductio ad absurdam. If the people are burdened with restrictive measures, fair competition among individuals will be impossible.

WHAT THE TARIFF POLICY MEANS TO AMERICAN FARMERS.

For political purposes it was charged that the tariff on agricultural products was responsible for the high cost of living. Those who so contended proclaimed a policy of low tariff and free trade for farm products and pictured the American farmers as barons of finance. Soon after the party now in power gained control of Congress it undertook a revision of the agricultural schedules of the tariff law, and revised the rates so thoroughly as to take the duty totally off many farm products. Thus the 6,361,502 American farmers were placed in open competition with the farmers of foreign countries, regardless of whether the labor, climatic, and other conditions enabled the foreigner to produce crops more cheaply than such crops can be produced in American soil by American labor.

So far as the farmers are concerned they now have free trade in many farm products, and foreign importers are preparing to develop their trade so as to take advantage of the opportunity in this rich American market. Wheat prices have for years been on practically an international or world-wide basis, and the enactment of the Wilson-Underwood tariff law has probably marked the passing of corn and oats in the United States from a domestic to an international basis, which means a lower average price for American farmers. With this readjustment of the tariff the farmers are brought face to face with new and more difficult conditions.

CORN AND OATS.

Prices on corn in the United States have been well above the 10-year average, but with corn deprived of a protective duty of 15 cents a bushel, already 10,000,000 bushels of Argentine corn have been shipped to this country, and Argentina is preparing to place on the market its entire surplus from the new crop of 250,000,000 bushels. Some of this foreign corn has already been contracted for and is being offered at prices 8 and 10 cents a bushel under American prices. The home market has also been opened for 30,000,000 bushels of Canadian oats. Wheat and other cereals likewise have been subjected to foreign competition with similar articles produced on cheaper lands and with cheaper labor. As a result the prices of wheat, corn, and oats have depreciated, but the advantage to the consumer is not apparent.

BUTTER AND EGGS.

An influx of foreign butter from all parts of the world, due to the reduction of the tariff from 5 to 2½ cents a pound, caused a decline in the wholesale price of butter. The importers are shipping butter from Argentina, Denmark, Australia, and Siberia, and it is admitted that the price of American butter will be kept in the future at a lower average level than heretofore. The consumer can benefit only slightly in proportion to the foreign importers, and the farmers and dairymen are the sufferers as the direct result of the tariff reduction. Consignments of eggs are being received from Russia, Denmark, Germany, France, China, and other countries, and it is said they are being landed at an average price of 17 cents a dozen.

FREE TRADE AND THE PRICE OF BEEF.

Many theories have been advanced as causes for the great increase in the price of beef and other meats. One fact, however, seems to be established, namely, that the number of all food animals has been decreased 7,000,000 in four years, while there has been no check in the consumption of meat. The claim was made that the new tariff law would reduce the cost of living. The party now in power totally removed the duty on cattle and meats, but it seems that the big packers have been the beneficiaries from this free trade. For October, November, and December, 1913, the imports of dressed beef were 32,017,647 pounds, which came mainly from Argentina, Uruguay, and Australia, where it costs much less to round up and prepare cattle for the market than it does in the United States. In order to overcome this it is asked, Why do not the eastern farmers raise cattle and supply the demand? The eastern farmer, like any other business man, counts the cost of production. It does not pay eastern and northern farmers to raise steers on high-priced land, when they sell a veal calf for $15 to $20.

It would not pay the farmer to keep and feed the stock two or three years. What the eastern farmers want is feeders or stockers, and with a scarcity of reasonably priced American feeders our people had need for thin and hardy Canadian cattle which, after four to seven months fattening, developed into marketable beef. The Canadian reciprocity act proposed this benefit for the American farmers, but did not contemplate opening the home market for free trade in beef, so that the world would enter into competition with our farmers. To deprive the farmers of every semblance of protection was wrong. Cattle can not be fattened to compete with the price of foreign beef shipped to this country in refrigerator ships.

President McClain, of the Lancaster (Pa.) Live Stock Exchange, is authority for the statement that during 1913 over 4,600 cars of cattle, representing about 150,000 head, valued at $8,000,000, arrived at Lancaster, which handles more cattle for feeding purposes than any other market in the East. These cattle were purchased mainly by farmers to be fattened for the market; 1,417 cars came from Virginia and 1,131 cars came from Buffalo, the latter being largely Canadian cattle. But notwithstanding the removal of the tariff from cattle the Canadian steers were not sold at bargain prices, and owing to the high price of cattle feed in this country to-day, Mr. McClain says that although the prices of beef are high "it will take an even higher price than the price now prevailing to make cattle feeding pay this winter in eastern Pennsylvania." With free trade in beef, as well as cattle, the American farmer is confronted with a serious question which time alone and a statesmanship in sympathy with the tillers of the soil can solve.

CAUSES OF SO-CALLED HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Much injustice has been done the American farmer during the recent discussions relating to the high cost of living. It has been represented that the farmers have been making excessive profits, but the figures of farm earnings which I have quoted contradict the charge. In fact, the profit to the farmers for the growth of various products is notably small when compared with the cost of production and the sale price when handled by intermediaries.

Just take one illustration. The Santa Fe railroad has been gathering facts concerning the cost of distributing farm products, and President Ripley, of that railroad, is quoted as saying:

When, for instance, the housewife buys a package of oatmeal for 25 cents, she is getting 3 cents worth of oatmeal, the rest being fancy packages, advertising, the middleman's profit, and the cost of delivering at the door.

Mr. Ripley reminds us that—

In the old days she used to go to the store with a basket, and the grocer would take her oatmeal out of the barrel.

Here is an apt illustration of one factor that has made living costly.

Another factor is explained by the census statistics, which show that between the years 1900 and 1910 the urban population of the United States increased 34.8 per cent while the rural population increased only 11.2 per cent. In other words, the consuming population increased over three times as much as the producing population, necessarily increasing the cost of, demand for, and the prices of farm products.

Few farmers have amassed wealth from the profits derived from farming; and where success has been attained it is due to skill, hard work, good management, economical living, and persistent endeavor. In order that men may be induced to engage in agriculture, either as owner or tenant, that the back-to-the-farm movement shall become as popular as it is desirable, it must be demonstrated that the farm is profitable for investment and remunerative for personal service. This is the essential step to increase agricultural production in the United States. If the farmer's investment yields less than 5 per cent, and if one farmer out of every three on the surveyed farms cited above paid for the privilege of working his farm—that is, after deducting 5 per cent interest on his investment, he failed to make a plus labor income—then there is every reason why a helping hand should be extended by this Government, if by so doing the science of agriculture shall be better understood and rendered more profitable.

The Father of His Country was not only first in war and in peace, but was the foremost farmer of his time. He favored agricultural schools for the study of the best ideas and the most approved practical methods of farming. He believed farming to be the greatest of all occupations. In his day, and now, and even more so in the future, great responsibility for the welfare and prosperity of agriculture rests upon the Government. To it the farmer is entitled to look for encouragement and protection. In return the perpetuity of the greatest government of the people which history records will rest upon the sure foundation of farm prosperity.

"'Go, till the ground,' said God to man,
'Subdue the earth, it shall be thine';
How grand, how glorious was the plan!
How wise the law divine.
And none of Adam's race can draw
A title, save beneath this law,
To hold the world in trust;
Earth is the Lord's, and He hath sworn
That ere old Time has reach'd his bourne,
It shall reward the just!"

[Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

[Mr. MONDELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES].

[Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILMORE].

Mr. GILMORE. Mr. Chairman, I listened with keen interest to the able and clear manner in which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who is in charge of the Agricultural appropriation bill, presented and outlined the great works being carried out for the benefit and comfort of the people of our great country by our Department of Agriculture. It should appeal to every Member of this House, regardless of the section of the country he may represent.

In his opening remarks he clearly presented the fact that really only a moderate sum of money is asked in this bill to carry out and maintain and perfect the great work that is being done at the present time and contemplated for the near future in aiding our farmers to more successfully carry on their methods of conducting their farms in order that the maximum of production may be secured and an honest living profit made more certain to the farmer in return for his noble labor. To me it appears that there is no labor more worthy of encouragement and reward than the labor of the farmer. Certainly there is no more necessary labor than his and no other that means so much to the welfare and the happiness of the people of the country. From his fields and his barns and his pens and his trees and his vines comes the very life of our Nation in the shape of our food supplies.

As a Nation we have grown up to immense proportions in all lines. We have spread out most wonderfully in manufacturing and industrial and commercial directions, and have devoted our utmost energies to make them bigger and grander and greater, until we have become almost marvelous in the eyes of the other nations of the world. Our great and steady growth in population has rapidly pushed us far to the front and the top of great nations in these lines. But during all this time we as a people have paid but scanty attention until very recent years to the one greatest of all industries; that is, our farming. We sailed along our sea of prosperity, seldom stopping to think that with all our growth and grandeur we would some day be called to halt and give serious reckoning to the great problem of how we were going to care for the immense body of people that were coming up year by year and adding to our population. We felt in the past that we were secure on this point. Did we not have the great plains of the North, the West, and the South, that seemed almost limitless in their broad expanse, to forever supply our needs? Did we not have the mountain ranges of the great Rocky Mountains and their branches, extending for thousands of miles across our country and furnishing appar-

ently limitless feeding ground for our cattle and sheep, and why should we worry about our food supply? Were we not alone supplying our own wants but likewise supplying the wants to a great extent of the great nations of western and southern Europe? How little we thought only a few years back that we would at this time be facing a situation in which we find ourselves to-day, not a simple one easily solved, but a serious problem that will take the united brain of science and wise legislation to solve in the future. Our farmer was simply looked upon as something we knew was necessary. In the past he was looked upon as an honest, slow, and easy-going person who cast his lot out in the wide expanse to grow and live and prosper if he could, and if not he simply passed out and on to something else. Our hustle and bustle of get-rich-quick men had no time to pay attention to him and no thought of why he did not succeed. He was left to work out his own salvation as best he could, while other walks of life were hammering and crying at the doors of legislative halls here and there for assistance to cure their troubles and their ills. The farmer simply plodded on, asking little.

We glory with pride and spend hundreds of millions of public moneys on our ships of war and our Army. We glory again in our great achievements of building and improving our rivers and harbors for commerce. We are getting ready to spend hundreds of millions out of our Treasury on our roadways throughout the Nation. States and great cities expend immense, almost untold, millions of public money on improvements of all kinds. Plans calling for millions are being discussed and advocated in all parts of our country. Public and private commissions and boards of all kinds who are organized and working to better and make more efficient our industrial methods, that the most economical and greatest amount of product is gained and brought out in all lines of business endeavors; and to all these works and many other similar ones that could be mentioned I say amen to them. It is good work, it is grand work, and I am heartily in accord with it all; but what is the use of it all if in its wake we do not have a happy, healthy, and contented people? We can not all be wealthy; in fact, most all of us must be contented to work and labor for our living by the sweat of our brow at labor wages; and as our outside comforts grow better and pleasanter, we desire our inside comforts to be likewise, and this brings us to those most necessary things that bring us comfort—our food and our clothing supplies. These all come from our farms, our ranges, our trees, and our vines; and if for any reason these food and clothing supplies become curtailed or reduced, the great multitude of our people, the workingman and the laborer whose time and toil must be given in our great factories, mills, and mines, are the ones to feel and suffer the hardship most. Now, what do we find the outlook in this direction? All our great fields and ranges that seemed limitless in the past are being narrowed down and absorbed for other purposes, and the remainder, although yet great in extent, are being heavily taxed to supply our increased home wants and the increased demands and needs of our European neighbors. In the past we received an abundant supply from them, and our industrial workers in all walks of life in our great cities and manufacturing centers were enabled to purchase a great variety of their products at a reasonable price; but of late years the abundant supply of former times has rapidly diminished and scarcity of many of the ordinary necessities of life exists to-day, and as a consequence higher prices are prevailing on all our necessities, bringing a heavy burden on the shoulders of the everyday man and uneasiness and discontent into his life. Where he had the choice of most anything for his table, he now finds himself deprived of many things he formerly enjoyed, and is restricted to the simplest of food supplies. This is the condition prevailing among the people in all our big cities and industrial centers. My district, being largely a manufacturing district, depends greatly on other sections of our country for its great farm products, there being no great, extensive wheat, oat, and corn farms and very little raising of beef cattle, sheep, and hogs to supply its home needs and wants in these lines, and it is only natural that anything that could be done to increase the food supply for my people would be of keen interest to me; and in this bill I find just such work called for and contemplated by our National Department of Agriculture.

Now, being faced with this condition, what are we going to do to try and relieve these conditions and make them normal for our people again? What can we do as legislators of the people to help out this condition as it is presented to us and exists to-day? We have already taken some progressive steps here like releasing all unjust taxation that came through high-tariff laws. We are passing through the process of regulating the money question of our country and putting it on a sound and fair basis that will be most beneficial to the farmer and all our people, and we have done and are contemplating to do shortly many other good and great things to help relieve the burdens that have crept onto our great masses of everyday men and women in the battle of life, and are about to pass this agricultural bill in this House as a step in the right direction that appeals to me to be one of the most necessary and beneficial measures for our future home comfort that will come before us during this session. Each year sees this department branching out in all directions, taking up new scientific experiments and making studies for the purpose of securing the most valuable information to be gotten together and distributed in the most free manner to instruct our farmers how to get the best results and greatest amount of crops from the tilling of the soil upon their farms and the care of their animals and their orchards. Every dollar in this bill is expended for the purpose of increasing the amount of our farm products, our range products, our vine and our orchard products, and at the same time have instructed the farmer how to care for and ship his products so that they are brought to our home and our table in a clean and health-giving manner. What money can we expend that is more beneficial to the life and happiness of our people than that which will help to bring to them plenty of food and clothing at a reasonable price? How long can we hesitate or refrain from taking up and advancing any work that can be done to bring about such a result? Rather can we not afford as a Nation to be liberal in providing the means that will be helpful to our farmers and bring their farms to the highest point of productiveness? Should there be any hesitation or criticism about the little we are doing in this bill when we consider the great benefit to come from it?

The gentleman from South Carolina in charge of this bill well stated how vital every item in it was to the farmer and that it should receive the sanction of every Member in this House. I agree with him; it is also most vital to the interests of every man, woman, and child of our many millions of people who are not farmers and depend on the farmer for their supplies. This is not alone a farmer's bill; it is a nation's people's bill. As a nation, this work means much for our future independency or dependency. It is our future, a nation's food supply; but, if some will have it a farmer's bill, let them have it so, and remember what your farmer and farm is is what your Nation is, and let us encourage and advance him, be he little or big. His past in our national life and growth has been great. We owe him much that we have neglected to give him in our thoughtless past. Let us commence now, and for the future turn our great energies and thoughts to him. I have only mentioned a few of the many important branches of service rendered under this department's care. I fully realize what great subjects are cared for all through this bill, and know that there are many other important matters represented in it that are likewise beneficial to the welfare and comfort of our people on which, if I had the time, I would like to speak of, but before closing I want to say this, that our Agricultural Department deserves great praise for the broad and liberal manner in which it does its work. It reaches out its helpful hand to the small farmer in my section with the same freedom and interest as it does to the great farmers of the North and West and South. Its aid is always freely given to the agricultural colleges of our States, our granges, and societies all over the land, to help and assist them in their good work among the farmers to better their farms and make the home life on the farm sweeter and happier, and when they do this they are engaged in a grand and noble work and deserve all the support we, as Representatives of the people in the Nation, can give them.

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KIRKPATRICK].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lincoln said that as between labor and capital the former was entitled to the higher consideration; thus in agriculture we find nothing but an obedience to the divine injunction, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." Therefore the bill now under consideration comes clearly within the highest type of labor demonstration.

To some the amount of this appropriation may seem large, improvident, or extravagant, but when we consider that of this aggregate amount of $25,000,000 there are to be divisions and subdivisions in its application, then it is fair to assume that the same is comparatively small and inadequate to meet just demands.

There are no artificial means by which we can produce bread. The indispensable article of bread and meat must in some way be wrung from the bowels of the earth, and when they are brought or produced they should be husbanded with care and safeguarded by intelligent action. There is still much room for

improvement in the intelligent and economic preparation of food, and to this the good housewives of this country are bending their energies as never before.

Whether in farm, in mine, or in workshop, I am for those who labor, and, first of all, it is the interests of the farmer that this bill seeks to promote and maintain. It is clearly evident that it is the intent of this committee to render assistance in the eradication of hog cholera. In my judgment no more laudable effort could be presented. It is appalling to know that last year the farmers of this country were subjected to a loss of $92,000,000. Now, this is alarming in the extreme and accounts largely for the high price of meat, and the more serious aspect is the apprehension that many thousands of animals may be slaughtered ignorant of the fact that they are inoculated with the dreaded prevalent disease, with no means or methods of knowing of the presence of poisonous germs at the time of slaughter.

We have too long looked upon the buzzard and the carrion crow as sacred scavengers. I would exterminate both, for these foul birds only serve to disseminate disease and death by their filthy, revolting mode of living.

No farmer should allow a diseased animal of any kind to remain in sight after death, and a diseased animal should at once be removed from the herd.

Though old, the adage is true that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure, and in this way let me urge cleanliness in the hogpen as well as elsewhere. The frequent change of bedding in the wintertime, salt, wood ashes, charcoal, small bits of bituminous coal, an acid swill of any kind; never allow the pen to be on or near a public highway; provide the growing pig with pasture grass of some kind and less dry feed. With an observance of all these warnings, let science assist in the prevention of the ravages of this dreaded disease, for in this way can the producer and the consumer be benefited and protected.

If this ravaging disease can be controlled, then the question of building the Alaskan railroad could easily be solved, and, better still, the conversion of the Father of Waters into an Isthmian Canal here at home, a thing devoutly wished for by a majority of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 30 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] 29 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

[Mr. AINEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to discuss at any length the message of the President delivered to the House and Senate yesterday in person, or the Panama Canal toll proposition, at this time. I hope I may have the opportunity to do that later.

But yesterday, in closing his address he stated, after asking Congress to repeal the law:

> I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

I will confess when I heard the message read I did not fully appreciate the importance or the significance of this remark of the President. But in a cablegram published in the Washington Post this morning there was considerable light thrown upon this delicate situation which is so bothering the President. The following is the article:

> THINK UNITED STATES FEARS JAPAN—MEXICAN SITUATION FORCING AMERICA FROM ISOLATION IS LONDON VIEW.
>
> LONDON, *March 5.*
>
> The policy of the United States toward Mexico occupied a leading place in the editorial columns of the English newspapers again to-day. The Evening Standard discovers "a marked change in the whole trend of American foreign policy. Instead of 'haughty isolation' based on the strict letter of the Monroe doctrine, the United States is now becoming anxious to stand well with the European powers. The Government at Washington is apprehensive lest if it became involved in intervention in Mexico, Japan might seize the occasion to carry her ambitious designs on the Philippines and Hawaii into effect, and believes that Europe, if so disposed, could lay an embargo on Japanese ambitions."

After reading that article I can appreciate the significance of the last remark of the President yesterday, indicating that he would not know how to deal with the delicate situation in relation to our foreign affairs unless, at the behest of Europe and in order to gain their friendship and protect us from desolation, following a war with Japan, we should yield on this question.

As for me, Mr. Chairman, I do not court, but I am not afraid of, a war with Japan or anybody else. [Applause.] And I would not yield what I believed to be right on the part of the Government of the United States through fear, whatever else I might do. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in addressing the committee at this time I am aware of the old adage that it is no use to lock the barn door after the horse is gone. But I want to put in the RECORD a few remarks embracing my views upon the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, expressly stating that they are my own views. I am not calling anyone to task for the part they have taken in the framing of the Post Office appropriation bill or in the conference report or in the adoption of the report, but I do not approve of some things contained in the report, and I can not remain idly by without submitting my protest and making it a matter of record.

I undertook to get an opportunity to speak yesterday morning while the conference report was up for consideration, but I could not do it on account of lack of time. There was pending before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of which I am a member, for quite a while different bills proposing to increase the salaries of rural-route carriers. I have no quarrel with or criticism of this class of Government employees whatever. They are a high class of men and do a splendid and noble service, but I was opposed to the bill to increase their salary while the same was pending before our committee, and I hope before I close to be able to put into the RECORD reasons justifying my opposition to this proposed increase.

For years rural-route carriers have beseeched Congress in season and out of season to increase their salaries, first, on the ground of the increased cost of living, which to a certain extent was a justifiable ground. Later they retreated from that position and took the position that their salaries should be increased solely because the salaries of the city letter carriers were higher than theirs. This may be true; I do not know, nor do I express any opinion upon it. I am disposed to believe that the salary of the city letter carrier is too high, and if it is too high two wrongs never make a right.

Later, however, the rural-route carriers have retreated from the last position and have taken refuge in an attempt to have their salaries increased on account of the increased weight of the parcel post. The proof before our committee was that the increased weight upon the rural-route carriers by reason of the parcel post was a negligible increase in weight, and if this be true there is no justifiable argument on this proposition that their salaries should be increased by reason of the parcel post.

I have heard various departments of the Government and various bureaus in the different departments of the Government criticized upon the floor of the House by Members time and time again because of their everlasting and incessant demands for more money. But here is a place, gentlemen, where no criticism whatever should fall upon the Post Office Department or any of its bureaus. The Postmaster General, a man of extended experience, a former Member of this House, always liberal in the increase of salaries, stated before our committee that he did not ask an increase of salary for any of his employees, that while none of them were overpaid they were all paid a sufficient salary. Notwithstanding the statement and desire of the Postmaster General not to have an increase of salaries of any of his employees, the conference report on the Post Office bill, adopted yesterday, shows that we have increased the salaries of employees to an amount of approximately $5,000,000 a year. So far as the Post Office Department is concerned, I hope that in the future no man will rise on the floor of this House and criticize it, when we have given it upward of $5,000,000 more than it asked.

The provision to which I refer got on the floor of the House when the appropriation bill was pending here, and was stricken out on a point of order. The friends of the increase sought the Senate, and it was inserted in that body and became a law in the agreeing to the conference report. No hearings were had before our committee whatever as to what the bill would cost the Government, and, so far as I know, no information was sought by our committee from the Post Office Department upon the bill proposing to increase the salaries of rural-route carriers. The conference report shows that this item alone will increase the appropriations of the Post Office bill $4,350,000 a year. In addition to this, the conference report agreed to another item in the nature of an increase of salaries, which will cost the Government I do not know how much.

I do not believe we can justify this wild extravagance with the people's money. While the political exigencies of our party may be great in the way of procuring nominations and reelec-

tions to Congress, yet I oppose this way of making appropriations. It is unfair to the taxpayers of this country, and I desire to protest against it in the most vigorous and positive language possible. If I were talking for home consumption, I would keep my mouth shut and say nothing about it, because I have a large number of rural-route carriers traveling all over my district six days in every week, and no doubt they will be electioneering against me. But I can not, in the discharge of my duty, remain idly by and see the people burdened to the extent of practically four and a half millions a year by a class of people that, in my judgment, are already receiving a sufficient salary. Two or three years ago we were denouncing the Republican Party on the floor of the House as plundering the Treasury of the United States, in their wild, extravagant appropriations, and we have denounced them time and time again in the most vehement language in our platforms, and I am wondering whether this denunciation upon the floor of the House of the Republican Party for their appropriations, and our denunciation of their course in our party's platform, were solely for the purpose of getting into power. If the denunciation was in good faith, we ought to live up to it, and live up to our platform promises and pledges.

It may not be amiss at this time to read into the RECORD some of our platform promises and denunciations of the Republican Party for their extravagance with the people's money. In 1908 our platform contained the following plank:

Economy in administration: The Republican Congress in the session just ended made appropriations amounting to $1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditure of the past fiscal year by $90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than $60,000,000 for the fiscal year just ended. We denounce the needless waste of the people's money which has resulted in the appalling increase as a shameful violation of all prudent considerations of government and as no less a crime against the millions of working men and women from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. It is not surprising that in the face of this shocking record the Republican platform contains no reference to economical administration or promise thereof in the future. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance and insist upon the strictest economy in every department compatible with prudent and efficient administration.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to conceive of an act being criminal unless we have criminals to commit the act. I do not believe when the platform of 1908 was written we were denouncing the Republican Party as being criminals, but I am disposed to believe that we were endeavoring to call the attention of the country to the fact that, through the profligacy, waste, and exorbitant appropriation of the people's money, the Republican Party was no longer fit to control this Nation and should be driven from power. The Baltimore platform uses language almost as stringent as the plank contained in the platform of 1908. The Baltimore platform says:

Economy in administration. Republican extravagance.—We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriation of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand the return to that simplicity and economy which befits Democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Does this conference report square with either the plank of 1908 or the plank of 1912? Let the English language speak for itself. I say not. If it be true that the salaries drain the substance of the people—and grant they do—then why are we adding, in the way of increased salaries, $5,000,000 per year to the burdens of the people? If these two items in the conference report square with the platform adopted at Baltimore, upon which we were elected, then I must confess I am unable to read and construe the English language plainly written.

The estimates of the Post Office Department for the year 1915 were $306,953,117. The amount carried in the House bill for the year 1915 was $305,401,767. The bill as it passed the Senate for the year 1915 carried $311,772,067, an increase over the estimates of the Post Office Department for the year 1915 of $4,818,950, this being an increase over the House bill of $4,758,200. The conference report therefore shows that we gave to the Post Office Department approximately $5,000,000 more per year than they asked for, nearly all for the increase of salaries to men who are already getting round, sound, sufficient salaries.

I said, and I repeat it, that I do not believe we can justify ourselves before the country upon this proposition at all. There are 2,300 rural-route carriers in my State. If everyone of them should resign, in less than 48 hours there would be five, yes, ten times that number of men ready, willing, and anxious to accept these jobs upon the salaries as they originally were, to wit, $1,100 per year, and this increases the salary to $1,200 per year.

I was recently told by a Member upon the floor of the House that last summer there was an examination in his district to fill a vacancy in the position of rural-route carrier, and that 57 men took the examination and 24 of them made the eligible grade. I was told by another Member on the floor of the House that an examination was held in his district last summer to fill a vacancy in the position of rural-route carrier, and that 117 men took the examination. This shows that these jobs do not go begging at the salary formerly paid; yet there are countless thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, of men in the United States who stand ready, willing, and anxious to take these jobs to-day at a salary of $1,100 per year on a standard route of 24 miles per day.

Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong in my position, I may be mistaken, and I may be regarded as a man without charity and unwilling to aid his fellow men. But this is not so; it is untrue. Who is going to talk for the farmers of the country, for the laboring men of the country, upon whose backs this $5,000,000 per year must be laid? Because this money must be raised, and can only be raised by taxation. This is the class of men I am talking for.

I recently heard Judge SABATH, of Illinois, make a very significant remark upon the floor of the House when the Post Office appropriation bill was going through. We were discussing the item of pay to contract stations in the cities, and, as I recall, the judge was trying to get the salary of these men increased, and he remarked that this class of men were unorganized, and that that was the reason they could not get an increase of salary.

To me his remark was significant. Can it be that solely because rural-route carriers are organized they are able to swoop down upon Congress and force an increase of their salary? Can it be that it takes organization, concerted action, to force these increases through, whether needed or not?

I would rather talk for and defend the great unorganized mass of people—the countless millions of men and women on the farms, in the factories, the foundries, and machine shops—against these wild, extravagant appropriations. We shall see in the next session of Congress, when the parcel post is worked out to the 100-pound limit, this same class of men coming back here and asking for another increase of their salaries; and, if Judge SABATH's ideas are sound, they will be able, through organization and fear, to force it through again.

Where it can be shown to me that an increase in salary is justifiable, I care not on what ground, I am willing to vote the increase; but I have given this question thorough study, and, as a result of my investigations, I unhesitatingly state that this increase in salary is unjustifiable, can not be defended; and, in my judgment, when the people of the Nation wake up to the situation they will hold us responsible for it. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARRISON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4167. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 2725. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School, on Sallisaw Creek, Okla.;

S. 1618. An act granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; and

S. 2226. An act for the relief of Joel J. Parker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Alabama devoted most of his time in an extended speech to endeavor to show that farmers do not believe in protection and that farmers' protection did not protect. The remainder of his time was devoted to me personally. That, of course, was complimentary, because to bask in his smile were a gleam of heaven, to feel his frown were indeed "sweet sorrow." Who would not be delighted with his caress? Nearly all would be grateful for his stroke. Standing before a score of enraptured colleagues, a sartorial cynosure, a prince of pulchritude, with a voice rich, unctuous, and mellifluous, he gave a feast to the eye, a banquet to the ear, and allowed the auditor's mind absolute rest. [Laughter and applause.]

Tariff and farming. On the first his speech showed no sordid effect of study. There was a supreme disregard for unaccommodating facts, wholly unhampered by any of the considerations which so often furnish let or hindrance to the flow of language. On farming he showed himself equally well informed. This being an agricultural bill, my discussion was confined almost wholly to the tariff as it related to farm products. He saw fit not to be so limited. But with a voice as of one who wept he complained of the Republicans having taxed window glass, infant swaddling clothes, and tombstones. While doing so he charged me with being a young Member. This I admit, but I hope that I shall never become a Member so old that a great tariff bill may be passed by my party of whose terms I shall be, as the gentleman from Alabama is, entirely and woefully ignorant. [Applause.]

Under the Underwood bill, for which he voted, there was placed a tax on window glass of 28 per cent, while he was voting for free northern meats and 29 per cent on southern mica. On swaddling clothes—I am not sure whether he meant swaddling clothes for infants or for those Congressmen who have never doffed theirs, though having served five or six terms. [Laughter.] If he referred to the infant born in comparative poverty, its swaddling clothes are found to be taxed under his vote. Its swaddling clothes are made up of Carolina cotton, which was by his vote taxed at 30 per cent, while he was voting for free corn of the Northwest and 18 per cent protection on the rice of the South. If the child were born in the winter, and its swaddling clothes were flannel, we would find those garments taxed 35 per cent, for which he voted, and at the same time voted for free wheat of the North under condition, but retained a duty of from 60 to 160 per cent on the tobacco of the South. If the child had been born with a silver spoon in its mouth and in harmony therewith entitled to silken swaddling, we would find that this product of the New Jersey mills was protected by a duty of 45 per cent under his vote, and at the same time Virginia peanuts retained upon the protected list at 10 to 18 per cent and the poultry of the Northwest placed upon the free list. And finally he complains of tombstones. I find that there is a duty in the Underwood bill, for which he voted, on granite and marble from 6 to 45 per cent, while by the same vote he placed a protective duty of 15 per cent on the hair of the Angora goat of the South and placed northern wool on the free list. [Applause.]

And that reminds me that he saw fit to characterize my defense of the farmers' interests of the Northwest as the work of the sacrifical goat. Had he been awake during the tariff debate and had a lucid interval he would have recalled the discussions of that time which show that the goat under these piping Democratic times has ceased to be a term of reproach and has been exalted to the real brute aristocracy by the Democratic Party, because while they reduced the duty on the mule—hybrid emblem of his party—there was retained a protective duty of 15 per cent on goat hair, which, as Representative GARNER was reported as saying, "by the holy horns of the sacred goat, there it shall remain." [Applause.]

It is related that in the caucus debate when the goat-hair protection was being discussed, numerous Ohio Democratic Members said that it would be a reversal of the Scripture, which, in the inspired gospel of Matthew, places on the great day the sheep upon the right and the goats upon the left, giving eternal protection to the former and sending the goats to everlasting free trade or the well-known equivalent thereof. [Laughter.] Some one said, "That will be easy; we can reverse the Scriptures, we can repeal in part the Ten Commandments, we can repudiate the Baltimore platform." But the real trouble is, How can HEFLIN, when he wakes up to make a tariff speech, accommodate his stories to the situation? They are "like the laws of the Medes and Persians, they change not," and, like the poor, always with us. In looking up his record, the investigator does not seek to find how he voted—yea or nay—on any great question; he simply ascertains which of his four stories or which of his five jokes he told on that particular occasion. [Applause.]

If I am selected for some slight reproach for daring to defend the interests of my people, I find myself in good company. The Republican convention declared in favor of protecting products of the farm as are other products protected. In almost similar terms the Progressive Party so declared. The National Grange and the Farmers' Congress make substantially similar declarations. The Democratic Party in its platform did not dare declare nor did any Democratic orator of the Northwest in 1912 declare in favor of free farm products when speaking in any country district. Moreover, the farmers of the South are in favor of protecting farm products, as witnessed by the tenacity with which they insisted on protected peanuts, Angora goat hair, tobacco, and rice. When the gentleman from Alabama says that the farmers of the Northwest know that protection is not to their interests, he would unwittingly give what he regards as a compliment to them which he denies to the farmers of his own section, because the latter have not shown their opposition to protection on the farm products.

The gentleman evidently considers that his work in this direction has been like the work of the searchlight upon a great ocean liner, which can illuminate from neighboring wave to the far-off horizon, but can not throw a gleam on to its own deck. [Applause.]

Moreover, the Ways and Means Committee of this House believes that free farm products will cheapen them, as will be seen from the expressed purpose of their bill and the table presented on page 3 of the tariff-bill report. Moreover, that the free listing of meats and cereals would reduce the selling price in the United States millions of dollars is the judgment of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House in support of the free-list bill of that time, the estimate of saving to the producer and consequent loss to the seller being, by that committee, measured by one-half the tariff rate which was proposed to be removed. Moreover, in the vote in 1912 in that part of the United States where men vote their convictions and not their prejudices 3 votes out of every 5 were cast favorable to protection for farm products.

It will be some source of relief from the charge made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for the farmers of the Northwest to know politically who their genial self-appointed guardian from Alabama is. He represents a dainty little district beyond the swamp and back of the log which has polled, on an average, since he came to Congress 10,000 votes, about one-fifth the vote of a congressional district in the Northwest. [Applause.]

But apart from all these considerations it is always a delight to hear this philosopher of felicity and fallacy, who, if I would properly characterize him, would say "he is the personification of the voice of Alabama." Interpreted, means vocalization without attending or connected mentality. [Laughter.] He always delights, but never instructs; seldom right, usually wrong, I pay him my compliments. Viva La Heflin Tom. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this great Agriculture Committee it has been my pleasure to sit in almost constant session for more than a month taking testimony, sifting facts and adjusting items, and finally voting with the other members of the committee to report this Agriculture appropriation bill to this House for passage. We listened with earnest ears to the statements of every person and expert who appeared before the committee, from the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States down. On some items we had witnesses from as far away as Montana; we insisted on first-hand information from men actually on the ground, and we got it. It was our aim to economize wherever possible without hampering efficient service, and this bill we present states our conclusions. Without going into detail, I will say that in some items we were obliged to cut the sum estimated by the various departments, while in other items, such as the appropriation to fight disease in animals, the committee increased the estimates. This bill will, of course, pass the House and the Senate without material amendment; the very maintenance of this great branch of the Government is based on its passage. The bill provides the money to furnish weather forecasts, so essential not only to the agricultural sections of the country but to all business, shipping, planting, harvesting, safety at sea, and all matters of life. It provides for the proper supervision of serums and toxins used so successfully in the treatment of diseases among animals when properly handled and when properly made. It provides for the quarantine and inspection work of the Government, and the construction of dipping vats, the breeding of live stock, chickens, and chicken feeding. We are actually trying to discover some feed that will make hens lay in the wintertime. We provide for further investigation of the diseases of grain, fruit, plants, and

vegetables. We want to stop the rust in wheat and the smut in corn; yes, and we have a very important item in the bill that goes after the chinch bug, and we propose to get him. You Members from the cities may not know what a chinch bug is, but I do. He kills millions of acres of wheat and corn every year, and, in my opinion, is the farmer's worst enemy, except drought.

The head of the department has testified that he has found a killer that will work, and your committee is presenting to you a means whereby we can put this chinch bug killer—it is a parasite—at large all over the country. We want to stop the blight in fruit trees and destroy the web worm; to endeavor to stop potato "rot" and to assist in furnishing seed grain that will grow; to encourage the movement of "back to the farm" and increased yields; the knowledge gained from actual tests and demonstrations on Government farms to the country, and show, for instance, that there is at least one kind of alfalfa that grows 3 feet high and produces four crops a year and another similar appearing kind that grows only a foot high and furnishes but two cuttings a year—and the big one produces the most seed, too—there are eight principal varieties; to protect the forests from timber thieves and forest fires; for the survey and platting of Government lands to be opened for settlement; to investigate and perfect a sucessful method of freezing, drying, storing, and transporting eggs and poultry, fish, meat, and other foodstuffs; to enforce the pure food and drugs act; to procure soil surveys that will demonstrate what cereal will best grow on different land; to investigate bee culture and attack insects that damage and destroy the garden; to print valuable information on all these lines and get it to the people most interested; to continue the experiments of the department to determine the best fat-building food for live stock and the most nutritious for human beings; to ascertain the feasibility of irrigation in districts not now considered possible and to look after drainage and prevent overflow; for inquiries regarding systems of road management and for expert demonstration and construction when required—the item will be handy when the $25,000,000 expenditure is made for State aid to highways recently passed by the House, and of which my good State of Kansas will receive about $773,750—to establish an office of markets; for the demonstration of live-stock production in connection with the $500,000 appropriation we made two weeks ago to stamp out hog cholera in this country, the scourge of the farmer and stockman and the ruination of many an honest and hardworking citizen of the Republic. And last, gentlemen, we have provided a small sum to do what we may to prevent the complete extinction of that noble old American patriarch, that pioneer of the plains, the forerunner of civilization, found now only in parks and Federal reserves, whose bones have whitened the prairies and whose hide has decorated the homes of kings and paupers—the buffalo.

These, gentlemen, are a few of the important items provided for in this bill which you will soon be called upon to pass into law. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 19 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ].

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural appropriation bill, now under consideration, is a bill that interests me more than any one of the other appropriation bills, because agriculture has been my life work from boyhood until the day I came to Congress. I am still a farmer, and no one knows better than I the benefits derived by the farmers through the Agricultural Department. I want to say right here that every dollar we appropriate for the purpose of promoting agriculture is money well invested, because the country at large will be benefited through the superior knowledge farmers receive by reading the Agricultural Department literature, which in most cases has a free distribution.

Mr. Chairman, no objection to the provisions of this bill rises in my mind. I look at it simply from the standpoint of a moderately successful farmer, not an experimental farmer, who recreates on the land in the summer and piles up his wealth in the cities in the winter, or the farmer who cultivates some fad or fancy on the farm through the hands of hired employees and who pockets his losses without a regret, so long as his theories or ideas are carried out. No; it is from the view of an old-fashioned, horny-handed, early-to-bed and early-to-rise farmer that I look upon this bill and admire it. To me it is a revelation to think of the millions of dollars herein appropriated for agriculture and its many branches. It means much to the farmers of this country if they will pause and think and learn of the advantages, scientific and otherwise, which will be laid before them through the provisions of this act. No doubt the Government is doing a mighty work for agriculture, and no question but that it is being more and more appreciated by the farmers throughout the country. What astronomy has done for the navigator the Government is endeavoring to do for the farmer, and this measure is the annual portion of the foundation of that great structure which is being erected for the welfare of the men who till the land and protect and conserve the forests.

Still, is there not something more and beyond all this? Can we not secure results more rapidly than we are doing by getting closer and nearer to that great class of the farming element which reads only when work is done, and whose hours of daily labor are not controlled or regulated by any organization or State or governmental enactment?

With thousands of immigrants daily pouring in upon us from foreign shores; with farms abandoned yearly; with our population in the cities increasing by leaps and bounds; with production lessening daily, where is relief? It must be in the land, and I am one who believes that in time the pendulum will swing back to the point where farming will become a profession; when the broad acres of this country will bloom with bumper crops; when science and industry and love of nature will join hands and produce hundreds where only bushels grew before.

To bring this about, in my mind at least, there are two things necessary: First, to so educate the young, to so instill in their minds the love of the soil, the home, and the occupation that the bustle, the glare, and the excitement of the cities will not attract them, inducing them to leave the old folks on the farm, either to rent or abandon it when age shall have rendered them too feeble to care for it. Second, our education of the young—at least in the rural communities—must be conducted along different lines. Please do not understand me as opposed to education. Far from it. Yet I believe the sons and the daughters of the farmers of the present generation have been too highly educated in certain branches. It is the sort of education which drives from these pupils the love of plants and fruits and flowers; of growing and unfolding and ripening crops; of lowing kine and the scent of new-mown hay. It leads them along the pathways of higher ambitions, of (to them) loftier ideals and aspirations, to which many aspire and few attain. It beckons them to fields of luxury and ease and opulence, only in the end to vanish and leave them hopelessly shattered and deserted.

Let us, for a moment, look at conditions in this country, especially with regard to the urban and rural population. In 1800, 97 per cent of our population was rural and 3 per cent urban. In 1900 only 59½ per cent was found in the rural communities. In 1910 this was reduced to about 54 per cent, and to-day it is estimated to be not quite 50 per cent, or, for the first time in our history, the urban population is greater than the rural. No wonder the cost of living has increased. No wonder our Treasury reaped great balances from import trade. Little wonder that the people of this country applauded a tariff bill which by its provisions will increase those imports at lower prices to the consumer.

Foreign nations long ago recognized this danger of the absorption of the rural population by the cities and towns. The smaller the countries the more imminent was the danger. Denmark, for instance, only in area about as large as the State of Illinois, was among the first to see the importance of counteracting this condition. Her wise men were wise indeed. Their remedy was education; not the education of which I spoke a moment ago; not the university in the populous centers; not the school of arts and languages. Better than this, they established schools among the people; they carried education of the proper sort to the homes of agriculturists. There are schools for the young, for the youths, for the men and women—"grown-up" schools they call them. From the moment the youth of 5 enters these schools until he has completed a course at his agricultural college there is instilled in his mind love of country, love of home, and love of the soil. He is instructed in farming and how to make it pay. He is taught how to establish a home on the farm and how to live contentedly in it. He is grounded in the belief that the farmer, the producer, the furnisher, is the most useful, the most independent, and the most desirable citizen. And all this labor and expenditure has paid. In 1840 of the total population of Denmark, 85 per cent was rural; in 1890 that population had fallen to 21 per cent; in 1901 it rose to 28 per cent; and in 1906 it had grown to the unbelievable degree of 90 per cent. This wonderful result is a glowing tribute to Denmark's system of education in the rural communities. Her present contentment, prosperity, and happiness are due to nothing else.

So to one whose education has been neglected, who has never been won by the lure of the cities, but who still believes that in the farm is hidden the jewel of harmless prosperity and real content, it seemed permissible at this time that he might intrude his views upon this House, and venture the hope that at some no distant day, in a measure such as we are now considering, provision might be made for the education of the young of our rural communities along the lines which will instill into their minds the fact that agriculture is a worthy occupation; that will teach them that the farm, large or small, is a little kingdom, a monarchy all their own, where no whim of fortune, no depression of business, nothing but a nation-wide disaster, can upset their thrones or bring want to their doors.

The farmer can use all the honorable means that any business man invokes. He can do more. He can watch every dollar of his profit grow and can rest easily and comfortably in the thought that its growth is not taking away from another that which he has thus earned.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have but one speech on this side. I shall be glad if the gentleman from Iowa will use some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 13 minutes left.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Then I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that my speech on yesterday has greatly disturbed the high-tariff champion of Nebraska. I felt it my duty to give the gentleman a word of warning before it was everlastingly too late—to tell him of the dangers that lurk along the highway of Republican protection, and to warn him of the political pitfalls and quagmires that await his footsteps if he continues to advocate the repudiated high-tariff doctrine of the old stand-pat Republican Party. It was my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to prevent, if I could, the repetition of the thoughtless and inexcusable blunder of the gentleman—that of standing here in this enlightened age trying to convince the farmers of the country that it is to their interest to have added to the price of their necessities the additional burden of a tariff tax. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that I have warned and pleaded in vain with the gentleman from Nebraska. Some people stumble over a situation and never see it. They have eyes to see and see not, ears to hear and hear not, minds to understand and understand not. Let me paraphrase the Scripture, and say the wise man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself, but the foolish pass on and are punished.

The American farmer can no longer be deceived and imposed upon by the agents and advocates of high protection. He has suffered long at the hands of the Republican Party. If he had in his pocket now the money that your party has wrung from him through unjust and burdensome tariff taxes, he could enjoy more of the comforts and conveniences of life. Be it said to the everlasting credit of the farmer that he has at last repudiated the system that gave him 10 cents in a tariff tax on what he had to sell and took from him 90 cents on what he had to buy.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Nebraska had been any kind of a philosopher the old standpatters over there could never have imposed on him as they did when they induced him to appear and seriously contend that a tariff tax benefits the farmer. They never could have persuaded him to mount that old tricky protection steed and proclaim that a tariff tax helps the farmer. If he had been even a feeble philosopher, he would have observed that many gentlemen on that side were thrown by that old protection steed in the last campaign, and he would have profited by their example.

But, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I am reminded of the story of old Uncle Rufus. Uncle Rufus said, "The trouble with the rising generation is they don't know how to ride a mule nohow. The way to ride a mule is to draw the reins close up on his neck, mount him, slip your feet under his forelegs, and stay wid him. Now I want all you little niggers to gather around here and watch Uncle Rufus ride dis mule. Now, you see I am gwyne to draw de reins close up on his neck, and den I am gwyne to mount him and slip my feet under his forelegs and stay wid him." One little nigger who had observed some of the antics of the mule said, "Yas, sir; maybe." [Laughter.] When Uncle Rufus mounted the mule he went up in the air in the shape of an interrogation point, darted to the right, wiggled like an eel, and threw Uncle Rufus 3 rods away in the plowed ground. [Laughter.] Uncle Rufus got up very much humiliated but still retaining his wit. As he brushed the dust from his clothes he said, "Dat's de way to do it. Whenever you see they are gwyne to throw you, git off uv 'em." [Laughter and applause.] I recommend the story of old Uncle Rufus to the gentleman from Nebraska and advise him to "git off uv 'em." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman's speech pleading for the old tariff-tax system that oppressed the farmer and nearly everybody else, I read in this House yesterday what Senator CUMMINS, a Republican Senator from the Western State of Iowa, said about the tariff and the claim that it benefits the farmer. The Senator from Iowa contended in that speech that the farmer was not benefited one cent by the protective tariff.

Now, I want to read to the gentleman what the master of the Washington State Grange, Mr. C. B. Kegley, said upon the subject. He said:

> The businesslike course open is for the farmer to fight the system—not to continue it, but to smash it.

I place these two western witnesses against the rehashed and warmed-over protection argument of the gentleman from Nebraska. For a long time you deceived the farmer, and when he achieved prosperity, not by reason of but in spite of the tariff-tax system of your party, you told him that the tariff had brought him those blessings and benefits. He has at last realized that you were robbing him for the benefit of those who were creating monopolies and trusts. But I want to say to the gentleman that the farmer refuses longer to kiss the hand that smites him. [Applause.]

Senator CUMMINS expresses the view of the farmer when he says protection does not benefit him one cent, and the master of the State Grange of Washington expresses their determination when he says, "Let us no longer dally with it, but let us smash it." The farmer lived under the system of high protection for 16 years, but, with all its boasted blessings and benefits, no farmer in the length and breadth of the country has accumulated a fortune and retired to count his accumulations and clip his coupons. But trust magnates and tariff barons have flourished and multiplied under that system. Take Carnegie, for instance, who wrung tribute money from every farmer in the country on every implement in which there was steel. In three years, under the Dingley tariff law, his fortune increased from $10,000,000 to $360,000,000.

The gentleman from Nebraska can not deceive the farmer into believing that this Democratic Congress has injured him. This Democratic Congress and the House preceding it have enacted laws for the benefit of the farmer that a Republican Congress failed and refused to enact for 16 long years. Epidemics of hog cholera have seriously injured the farmer in many sections, but it remained for a Democratic Congress to make the first appropriation to check that disease. It remained for a Democratic Congress to establish in the Department of Agriculture the Office of Markets. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman from Nebraska that it remained for a Democratic House at this session of Congress to pass an appropriation of $25,000,000 to build roads leading to the homes and farms of the farmer. The Democratic Party has done more for the farmer in 12 months than the Republican Party did in 16 years. The present Agriculture appropriation bill is teeming with provisions that look to the benefit of the farmer. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, all time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, $12,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $6,000; Solicitor, $5,000; chief clerk, $3,000, and $500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, $2,500; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, $2,250; 1 appointment clerk, $2,000; 1 chief, supply division, $2,000; 1 inspector, $2,750; 1 law clerk, $3,000; 2 law clerks, at $2,500 each; 7 law clerks, at $2,250 each; 1 law clerk, $2,200; 8 law clerks, at $2,000 each; 4 law clerks, at $1,800 each; 3 law clerks, at $1,600 each; 1 expert on exhibits, $3,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, $1,600; 4 clerks, class 4; 8 clerks, class 3; 11 clerks, class 2; 21 clerks, class 1; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, $2,000; 9 clerks, at $1,000 each; 8 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk, $840; 15 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 11 assistant messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 1 chief engineer, $2,000; 1 assistant chief engineer, $1,400; 1 assistant engineer, $1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at $1,000 each; 8 firemen, at $720 each; 8 elevator conductors, at $720 each; 1 construction inspector, $1,400; 1 cabinetshop foreman, $1,200; 4 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,200 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,100 each; 8 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $1,020 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at $900 each; 1 electrician, $1,100; 1 electrical wireman, $1,000; one electrical wireman, $900; 2 electrician's helpers, at $720 each; 2 painters, at $1,000 each; 2 painters, at $900 each; 5 plumbers or steam fitters, at $1,020 each; 1 plumber's helper, $840; 2 plumber's helpers, at $720 each; 1 blacksmith, $900; 1 lieutenant of the watch, $1,000; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at $960 each; 38 watchmen, at $720 each; 5 mechanics, at $1,200 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $960 each; 1 janitor, $900; 21 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 19 laborers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $540; 2 charwomen, at $480 each; 15 charwomen, at $240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, $14,000.

Total for office of the Secretary, $329,830.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to direct the point of order

particularly to the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. On February 9, 1889, the Department of Agriculture was created, and fixed the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture at the same as the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which was at that time $4,500.

Mr. Chairman, since that time there has been an appropriation in violation of that statute, increasing the salary to $5,000. I therefore make the point of order against the same, carried in the bill, $6,000, for the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I offer an amendment. On line 1, page 2, after the dollar mark, insert the figure "5" in lieu of the figure "6."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 1, by inserting the figure "5" instead of the figure "6" after the dollar mark, so that it will read "$5,000."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is not well taken. The last appropriation act, the current law, contained that provision, which was inserted in the Senate and is in the law at this time. I call particular attention to this language:

And hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

I submit that this is permanent law and controls the salaries in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order, and I desire to be heard on it. Mr. Chairman, the statute to which I referred creating the Department of Agriculture fixes the salaries of only a very few of the employees, among which was the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. If the last act appropriating for the Department of Agriculture is to be construed as fixing permanently the salaries of all of the officers whose compensation is carried in this bill, it is very unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that these two lines and a half should be tacked on to an appropriation bill for the purpose of dealing with these great problems of fixing salaries for the employees of a great department.

If there is one thing needed in this Congress, it is a committee in each one of the great departments of this Government for the purpose of classifying the employees in the departments and classifying and grading the salaries therein. I can not think, Mr. Chairman, that it was intended by the Agricultural Committees in both branches of Congress to undertake to fix these salaries in this bill as permanent salaries hereafter. If that was the intention, Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate for Congress. In the hands of a small number of people, a conference committee dealing with the grave problems like this, where Congress has not had the opportunity to hear, discuss, and determine the wisdom of such change—I say if such legislation is to be taken as permanent legislation fixing the salaries of the employees of the Agricultural Department it certainly is unfortunate for this Congress and for the people of the United States.

It is not known to the people how easy it is to make legislation by a conference committee. Their report comes into the House, with no right on the part of any Member to object or offer amendments, and no right to be heard, and I say, Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the gentlemen who constituted that committee intended to fix the salaries of the various employees of the Agricultural Department. If that was true, then how unfortunate it is that at the very next session of Congress an effort should be made to raise the highest salaried office save one carried by the bill. If that be true, that these two lines and a half were intended to fix permanently the salaries, then it applies to the Secretary of Agriculture the same as it does to the Assistant Secretary. His salary, like the Assistant's, was fixed by an act many years ago by permanent law, and has been increased thereafter by a like permanent law, by a bill brought into this House for the purpose of discussing it regularly, so that every Member of the House might be heard upon it. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I can not think that it was the intention of the conference committee to permanently fix the salaries. If that were true, it was an evasion of the rights of Members of Congress, who have made points of order against unreasonable increases in salaries. I say again, Mr. Chairman, if this committee proceeds in that way hereafter it will not meet with the approval of the people of the country, because some man on the floor of this House will expose it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, last year the Agricultural appropriation bill, now in force for the current fiscal year, carried the item, "Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, $5,000." In the bill presented this year it is proposed to increase the salary to $6,000. That has gone out on a point of order. The gentleman now in charge of the bill offers an amendment to restore the appropriation to what the existing salary is, at $5,000. My colleague [Mr. FOWLER] has made a point of order to that on the ground that the law providing for the Assistant Secretary provided for a smaller salary. In the first place, I very much regret that anyone should invoke the technical rule of the House as to the salary carried in the bill. This office is held by Dr. Galloway, for many years the head of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the Department of Agriculture, who was promoted by the President, without any regard whatever to politics, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This was not a political appointment. Dr. Galloway stands at the very head, in my opinion, of agricultural study and development in this country. In the office of Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry he rendered as much service to the country, to the farmer, and to all of the people of the country as any one man has ever rendered in the same length of time. I think his salary ought to be increased to $6,000. I think he ought to receive as high a salary as the Chief of the Weather Bureau—a division under him—receives, and I hope that when this bill passes the House and goes to the Senate the Senate will amend it in this respect and make it $6,000; and, if it does, it is very certain that no one person can prevent it going into the law at $6,000.

On the point of order the current law provides that—

Hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

The amendment now offered proposes to fix the salary of this officer at the rate which was specified in the current law, wherein this item of legislation appears, and we have considered for years that inserting the word "hereafter" in the bill makes it permanent law. So that the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture is now $5,000 a year.

Mr. LEVER. And the gentleman from Illinois knows, Mr. Chairman, that the Comptroller of the Currency has held time and time again that the use of the word "hereafter" makes permanent law.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and that has always been held by the Chair. My colleague criticizes the conference committee because this item appears in the current law. It never lies in the mouth of a man who seeks himself to invoke a technical rule to complain about technicalities in other people. I do not know how anyone has the license to criticize Congress for having inserted this item in the agricultural appropriation law of last year; but certainly, when one Member here tries to invoke the rule himself and all the other Members of Congress are opposed to him, as is the case in this particular proposition, he can not criticize because a committee of conference did something by inserting a particular word in a bill. I do not believe there is a single Member of the House, with the exception of my colleague, who would reduce Dr. Galloway's salary from $5,000 to $4,500, and I doubt if there is another Member of the House who would not favor the increase from $5,000 to $6,000. My district is not an agricultural district. I come from the city that helps to pay the taxes for the maintenance of this department, and I am glad to represent a people who are proud to have a chance to contribute money for the payment of a salary to a man like Dr. Galloway, and I am surprised that any gentleman on the floor of the House representing an agricultural district should seek to strike down the Agricultural Department. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the point of order is not well taken, and therefore overrules the point of order. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order against the salary of $5,000 for the Solicitor, and I desire to be heard upon that.

Mr. MANN. That is the same situation exactly.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. The salary is $5,000 in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask the gentleman a question. It is conceded that $5,000, the amount stated in this bill, is the amount carried in the current law?

Mr. LEVER. That is the fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to determine was as to who had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Illinois to make a point of order against that particular part of the paragraph?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; and I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, up to 1905 the agricultural appropriation bill carried a provision for a law clerk at the sum of $2,500. During the consideration of the bill for that session of Congress it was contended that there was no use for a law clerk, but there was use for a solicitor, and the argument was then made that in order to dignify the position there ought to be some dignified word invented and applied so that the Nation at large might know how important that office was. So "law clerk" was omitted entirely as a useless adjunct, and in lieu thereof "solicitor" was created, at a salary of $2,500, but at the next session of Congress "law clerk" was revived, at a salary of $2,000. The solicitor's salary has repeatedly been increased annually from $2,500 in 1905–6 to $3,000 in 1906–7, to $3,500 in 1907–8, to $4,000 in 1908–9, to $4,500 in 1909–10, and to $5,000 in 1911–12. Not only that, but from that time we began to see an extravagance in the "law clerk" after his new advent in 1906 until, instead of having an increased salary of one man—the "solicitor"—we have seen the "law clerks" grow in number until to-day there are 26 altogether with this same solicitor, carrying the enormous salaries of $58,950 instead of the sum of $2,500, less than 10 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair just to make a suggestion or an interruption? That perhaps will go to the argument of the merits of the proposition; but what the Chair wants to hear, if the gentleman desires to discuss it, is the question of the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I presume that if the Chair is going to hold the act of 1913 as permanent law it applies to this solicitor the same as it does to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Chair has already held that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will say again in his opinion we have got to assume at least that Congress intended what it said when it included in the current bill this language:

> Hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

Now, as was correctly stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it has been repeatedly, and as far as the Chair knows always, held that the word "hereafter" makes permanent law. That being true and it being a fact that the amount specified in the present bill as the salary of the solicitor is the same as in the current law, it naturally follows that the Chair will be compelled to overrule the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "One accountant and bookkeeper, $2,000," in lines 12 and 13, page 2. It is not an office which was carried by the bill in which it is claimed the permanent law was passed.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will return me my copy of the old act, I will be obliged to him.

Mr. MANN. That is a new office.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say that it is not in fact a new position, but it is a transfer, as I recall the fact, from the Division of Accounts—the same man, with the same amount of salary, and the office the same.

Mr. MANN. Suppose it is a new office; what is the difference?

Mr. LEVER. It is not subject to a point of order even if it were a new provision.

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. LEVER. It is a transfer, as I have said, from the Division of Accounts. Members will remember that under an act of Congress a few years ago the Division of Accounts in the Department of Agriculture was directed to be reorganized, with the purpose of decentralizing its work and compelling each head of a bureau to be responsible for his own accounts; and this is in line with that, and it is only a transfer, and of course it would not be subject to a point of order even if it were absolutely a new place, because the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to employ persons to carry out the purposes of the creation of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, if this law which my colleague from Illinois has been stoutly invoking and which the chairman of this committee is invoking is worth anything, it is worth nothing more nor less than this, to establish the character of offices in the Agricultural Department and to fix the salaries thereof. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that if the act of 1913 is worth anything, it means that Congress intended to fix the character of the offices in the Agricultural Department and to fix the salaries in those offices. If that be true, and if the contention of the gentlemen who have just been arguing this question is to be taken as the basis on which to found a ruling of the Chair, then this is a creation of a new office entirely, which is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. While I call the attention of the gentleman, and also the attention of the Chair, to section 523 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows:

> The Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk, with a salary of $2,000 a year—
>
> And so forth—
>
> and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in the natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

And the Chair has held a hundred times that under that language we had a right to create a new place in this bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture unfortunately mistakes the power granted in that law. It is when an emergency arises that additional labor may be employed, and not for the purpose of dealing with permanent offices that have been created by law.

Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly held that where the statute fixes a number of offices and the salaries thereof, a new and distinct office can not be tacked on as a rider to an appropriation bill. And that is just what this means in the light of the act of 1913. Here was an act undertaking to fix the salaries and the number of offices in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. It fixes the salaries and not the number of offices.

Mr. FOWLER. And if it is to take any precedence whatever, it is to do away with all other laws on this subject. And if that be true, Mr. Chairman, as I verily believe in the light of the investigation of that act, then this is a new office entirely, which can not be created as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Now, if the officers are classified and graded as they ought to be, this condition would not arise. I am surprised to find the officers of this great department in an uncertain and loose condition. No greater opportunity for political graft ever presented itself to a legislative body. Were the various positions in this department graded and classified as grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and so forth, carrying servants in each grade, it has been held, Mr. Chairman, that the number of servants in one or more of the grades may be increased, but where no such grades exist and a new position is proposed in an appropriation bill, as is the case here, it has been uniformly stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Are you aware of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture did go through the entire department, regrade all his officers and make certain changes and transfers, and that all through this bill there are statements of that fact?

Mr. FOWLER. I am aware of the fact that he did not do it.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Why, he did. He changed all these offices. He went through all the departments and graded some of the offices, and changed some of them and put them in other locations.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman that that duty devolves upon Congress, and not upon the heads of bureaus. I want to say to him that there lies one of the great evils in government, namely, for Congress to be governed and controlled by the heads of the bureaus and departments. Shall we give up this Congress to the whims and caprices of chiefs in the departments, or shall we stand up here like men, like students and statesmen, legislating for the good of this country?

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman whether he has read——

Mr. FOWLER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Have you read the estimates of the Secretary of Agriculture in the report which he sent to this House?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority under the law to report estimates to Congress. That duty devolves upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and you had better inform yourself on that question.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Have you read his estimates? Are you acquainted with them?

Mr. FOWLER. I have read them.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you know that in his estimates he made certain recommendations, and do you know that he did make certain transfers and changes and grades in his offices?

Mr. FOWLER. I repeat that he had no right to make a recommendation of estimates to this Congress.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you not know that he has done it, as a matter of fact, whether he had a right to do so or not? Do you not know that he did the very thing you wanted him to do?

Mr. FOWLER. I would pay no attention to any recommendation made without authority.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Well, do you not know that it has been done, as a matter of fact, namely, the very thing you want done, the grading of these offices?

Mr. FOWLER. I know the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted estimates, and I have examined all of them, if that will satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that these estimates were submitted, that these offices were transferred, and regraded, and reclassified, for the purpose of making the department more efficient? Are you acquainted with that fact?

Mr. FOWLER. I have answered the gentleman. There has been no such classification as provided for by law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this is a new office, created solely by an appropriation bill in the form of a rider. Now, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the chairman of this committee is a good man, and I know his heart is bent on good. I am sorry I can not say as much regarding some of the rest of my friends. [Laughter.] My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman who has just taken his seat, made a great laudation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. I have nothing to say against him. He made the same laudation of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, who was compelled to surrender his position by an order of the Executive of the United States. Was my colleague [Mr. MANN] mistaken when he used the following language concerning Mr. Moore's management of the Weather Bureau, found on page 1815, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, second session Sixtieth Congress?—

I think, from my own knowledge of the situation, that this service is the most economically administered service, with the work that has been done, in the governmental service anywhere; that the chief of that service is more careful about the expenditure of money; that he gets the best results from the expenditure of money, and gives way a fewer number of times to extravagances than any other chief in the service. * * * It seems to me it would be worth a good many thousands of dollars if Congress would advertise that where a bureau chief insists not only upon economy in the service under him, but himself exercises economy in making his appointments and does not ask for excessive appropriations, that in such a case we will slightly increase his salary. I think that under the circumstances the chief of this service is worth the money for the work that he has done.

Mr. Chairman, this matter interests me only as a Member of Congress and as a citizen, but I insist that before new positions are created they shall go through the regular channels and be presented by a bill to be considered by this House and by the Senate. No other honorable way can be pursued.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the point of order ought to be sustained in this case.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is necessary to argue that point of order further. I want to say, however, once and for all, that as a member of the conference committee which permitted this language, against which my friend from Illinois directs his attack, to go into the law, I have no apologies whatever for it. I can demonstrate to this committee very easily that the employees of the Department of Agriculture are probably the lowest-paid employees in the Government service. The Committee on Agriculture believes that the employees of the Department of Agriculture, who are devoting their lives and their time and their energy and their minds to the development of better agricultural methods and the bringing together of scientific information that will be of value to this great country, are entitled to as good salaries as are paid to other officers and employees of this Government.

I want to call these facts to the attention of my good friend from Illinois—and he is my good friend and I am going to make him keep on being. The Bureau of Standards pays higher salaries than does the Department of Agriculture. The Director of the Bureau of Standards receives $6,000—the amount that the committee thought that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture should be entitled to. The Director of the Geological Survey receives $6,000. I wonder if anybody believes that the duties of the Director of the Geological Survey are comparable to the duties and the importance of the position of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman; yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not cut down, then, the salaries of the Bureau of Standards, instead of trying to increase these?

Mr. LEVER. May I ask the gentleman why he himself does not do that? He is the "watchdog of the Treasury," not the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. But the gentleman from South Carolina is the chairman of this great committee.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois, of course, knows, I hope, that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction whatever over the Bureau of Standards. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I thought so. The Director of the Reclamation Service draws a salary of $7,500. One of his consulting engineers also receives $7,500. One engineer is paid $6,500. Another is paid $6,000. In the Bureau of Mines—a new bureau—the director has a salary of $6,000. I understand that the Assistant Postmasters General, four of them, receive salaries of $6,000 each; and with all due deference to them—because I think they are all faithful men—I do not hesitate to say that I do not believe that there is in the Government service to-day a man who is more efficient, more capable, and more energetic than Dr. Beverly T. Galloway. [Applause.] I have no apology, either for myself or for my committee, for trying to put the salaries of the great Department of Agriculture, the farmers' department, upon an equality with the salaries of lesser departments and of less important bureaus in this Government. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order, the Chair has already held that the language in the current law fixes the salaries of that bill. I want to direct the attention of the Chair to section 523 of the Revised Statutes, which he has already read and to which I have already directed his attention, and call his attention to the fact that precedent after precedent can be found in the debates on this very bill, holding that we do have the right to create positions in the nature of employees in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman says that the act of 1913——

Mr. LEVER. The act of 1913-14, covering the fiscal year 1914——

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; fixes the salaries. Is it possible——

Mr. LEVER. I do not say it. The Chair has said it.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it possible to fix salaries without fixing positions for the salaries?

Mr. LEVER. Surely. This paragraph in the act for 1914 provides—

And hereafter every officer and employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein—

Not hereafter—

shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

It does not preclude us from exercising the right to add, under the rules of this House and in accordance with the fundamental law, other employees whose salaries may be fixed from time to time as Congress sees fit to fix them.

Mr. FOWLER. But it does provide only for those who were in the last bill.

Mr. LEVER. It provides for the salaries for those who were carried in the last bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Only.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. That does not preclude the adding of others if Congress wants to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] want to be heard?

Mr. MANN. Yes. I wish to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

This is a very important proposition. It involves all of the bill; not merely the item that the gentleman makes the point of order on, but the rest of the bill, too.

The departments of the Government have certain authority granted to them for the appointment of employees of the departments. The employees of a department are never named in the law creating the department. We provide for the chief of a bureau, or an accountant, possibly, and a chief clerk, or something of that sort, and other employees, to be provided for by Congress in different language in different laws. Of course it is manifestly impossible in creating a department or a bureau to indicate the number of clerks that shall be employed in that department or bureau, because necessarily, with the passage of time and the growth of the Government, the work done by any bureau increases if it is doing active work, and if it is not it is likely to decrease, so that it is impossible in any organic act to name the employees and fix their salaries.

Now, it has been held consistently for many years that, as to the salary of an employee, the current law fixes it. That is impossible in a new law. That was a purely arbitrary ruling in the first instance. Of course in this particular case that question is not involved, because we have here a specific law, enacted last year, making the salaries of the current law the

legal salaries. That is the item that has already been referred to.

It has also been consistently held that the insertion of a provision for an office in one appropriation law is no authority for inserting it in the next appropriation law. In other words, the consistent ruling is that while you may create an office in an appropriation bill, that is considered created only for the fiscal year and has no existence beyond that unless it is carried in another appropriation law; that is, it is not permanent law. So that when we come to a question like this we have to determine whether you have authority to insert an item for an office under the authority which the department has to make use of its employees or to employ clerks or other employees.

Now, there is no distinction between the item here that my colleague makes the point of order on and almost every other item in this paragraph and almost every other item in the bill that refers to an employee. There is no provision of law, outside of the appropriation act, for more clerks. There is no provision of law for messengers. There is no provision of law for one assistant chief engineer or for one assistant engineer or for two assistant engineers or for eight firemen and things of that sort.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment—except that they are carried in the current appropriation law, which is not sufficient, unless we say that the organic act providing for the department authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to employ these employees when provided for by Congress; and it has always been ruled that as to the ordinary employees of a department the organic act is a sufficient authority to authorize the appropriation for those ordinary employees in the appropriation bill. That does not refer to some fanciful office. Here is the item: One accountant and bookkeeper. The Chair knows and will take official notice of the fact that no department of the Government can operate without an accountant and bookkeeper. It is just as much necessary as it is to have an engineer to take care of the furnaces and to turn on the steam heat. You might provide a Department of Agriculture that would only be in operation during the summer time; that would not require heat; but the Chair knows that you can not operate the Department of Agriculture without an engineer to handle what is necessary for heat and power, and the Chair knows that you can not operate the Department of Agriculture without a bookkeeper; and the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in the organic act to employ other persons or other employees is sufficiently broad to authorize Congress to make an appropriation for this person, who is an ordinary employee of such department. Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FOWLER. The positions to which you have referred, such as the law clerk, telephone operators, and messengers, have been created heretofore, have they not?

Mr. MANN. They have not been created, except in the sense that they are carried in the appropriation act, which, so far as those offices are concerned, is good only for the current fiscal year. That is not permanent legislation at all.

Mr. FOWLER. The last appropriation act has always been regarded as the law for a position, has it not?

Mr. MANN. It has never been regarded as the law as to the creating of positions. It has always been regarded as the law as to the fixing of a salary of a position which is provided for.

Mr. FOWLER. But this is an effort to create an entirely new office which has not heretofore been carried by an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference at all.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Is it not a fact that the duties of the Department of Agriculture have been added to from time to time by the food and drug act and other acts?

Mr. MANN. That is undoubtedly the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Does not that increase the need for a law clerk?

Mr. MANN. That does not affect the point of order. That affects the desirability of having the offices. Let me remind the Chair that some years ago—I think possibly before the present incumbent of the chair was a Member of the House; I know before my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] was a Member of the House—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and my colleague then from Illinois, Mr. Prince, started to tear to pieces one of the appropriation bills of the House.

We were considering the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. These two gentlemen made points of order upon every item in the bill as far as it was ever read, and the gentleman who was then occupying the chair held that unless an office was particularly provided for by law, practically by name, the item was subject to a point of order; and as far as the legislative bill was read, after my two distinguished friends were through with it, it looked like a skeleton. There was nothing left in it. That was the ruling of the Chair; but that ruling never was followed after that time. It became perfectly apparent that if the House was to sustain—which it did not on that occasion—the position that in order to have a place in an appropriation bill fixed by name you had to have a law specifically authorizing that place, you could not ever pass any appropriation bill through the House, and we would absolutely turn the functions of this House over to the Senate, where such rules did not prevail. Since that ruling every Chairman has overruled the decision made at that time, and has held that the natural and ordinary offices in a department are authorized to be carried in an appropriation act by the provision in the organic act authorizing the heads of the departments to employ other necessary employees.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to another illustration. The gentleman will recall that several years ago I myself attacked the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint the so-called Remsen Board, and made the point of order on the floor of the House, which was debated here for several hours, as I recall it; but the Chair then held, although I was taking a position opposite to that which I take now, that under the words "as Congress may from time to time provide employ other persons," under the words "other persons" he had the right to appoint that Remsen Board.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair will permit one other suggestion, I have made this same argument every year at the beginning of the consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill, certainly for more than 10 years, and every year, up to the present time, the Chair has sustained my contention that those items in the bill were in order, and that no one could object to them by making a point of order that an ordinary position could not be newly created in the bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that since my short service in this House, where a new position different to any other position in an appropriation bill has been offered to be created, when a point of order has been interposed against it that point of order has been sustained; but the rule that my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] refers to is this, that where there has been a classification and the bill has carried a certain officer—for instance, as the law clerk—it has been held that it is proper to appoint two law clerks, but where an entirely different office has been created, invariably the Chair has held that it was not proper. I have made these points of order myself and the Chair has sustained them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair recognizes the rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] seeks to invoke as a salutary one, but the Chair is of the opinion that he misapplies it. In the creation of these great executive departments it would be utterly impossible, and it is physically impossible for the organic act to anticipate the name of every subordinate position, unimportant in one way but important in another way, that will be found necessary to carry on the work of that department. If we create the department, we must provide the machinery; and it seems to the present occupant of the chair that it would be utterly impossible to anticipate all of these necessary positions. The Chair thinks that Congress in the past has recognized that fact more than once, and has given to the heads of these different departments certain discretion——

Mr. FOWLER. Will the Chair submit to one question?

The CHAIRMAN. In a moment. Section 169 of the Revised Statutes authorizes the executive departments to employ clerks, and so forth, as Congress may appropriate from year to year. This has been held to be authority for making an appropriation to pay the salaries of such clerks, and so forth. That question came up on December 6, 1912, and it seems to be almost on all fours with this question here. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] was in the chair, and in passing upon this question he construed the authority under section 169 to employ clerks to carry on the work of these different departments. It was his conclusion, which conforms entirely to the conclusion of the present occupant of the chair, that the point of order was not well taken. Therefore the Chair feels constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, suppose the salary of this clerk was fixed at $100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could move to amend and have it cut down.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be subject to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not; if the House wanted to vote $100,000 for a bookkeeper, it could do it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I interpose a point of order against the new position, "one cabinet shop foreman, $1,200." I do not care to argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled for the same reason.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I interpose a point of order against the language "one chief clerk at $3,000, and $500 additional as custodian of buildings." The statute creating the office fixes the salary at $2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman designate the line and page.

Mr. FOWLER. That is on lines 1 and 2, page 2.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that that is in the current law with the same salary and is no change whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the point of order against the paragraph will still be pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agriculture appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

## ALASKAN RAILWAY.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Alaskan railway bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to omit the reading of the report and read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 341).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said House amendment insert the following:

"That the President of the United States is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to adopt and use a name by which to designate the railroad or railroads and properties to be located, owned, acquired, or operated under the authority of this act; to employ such officers, agents, or agencies, in his discretion, as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this act; to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies, to perform any or all of the duties imposed upon him by the terms of this act; to detail and require any officer or officers in the Engineer Corps in the Army or Navy to perform service under this act; to fix the compensation of all officers, agents or employees appointed or designated by him; to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska and with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and the settlement of the public lands therein and so as to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, transportation of troops, arms, munitions of war, the mails, and for other governmental and public uses, and for the transportation of passengers and property; to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate, with the necessary branch lines, feeders, sidings, switches, and spurs; to purchase or otherwise acquire all real and personal property necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; to exercise the power of eminent domain in acquiring property for such use, which use is hereby declared to be a public use, by condemnation in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force there; to acquire rights of way, terminal grounds, and all other rights; to purchase or otherwise acquire all necessary equipment for the construction and operation of such railroad or railroads; to build or otherwise acquire docks, wharves, terminal facilities, and all structures needed for the equipment and operation of such railroad or railroads; to fix, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property, which rates shall be equal and uniform, but no free transportation or passes shall be permitted except that the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to the lines constructed under this act; to receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property, and to perform generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad; to make and establish rules and regulations for the control and operation of said railroad or railroads; in his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress: *Provided*, That if said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority herein given, then and in that event they shall be operated under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws; to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire upon such terms as he may deem proper any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him: *Provided*, That the price to be paid in case of purchase shall in no case exceed the actual physical value of the railroad; to make contracts or agreements with any railroad or steamship company or vessel owner for joint transportation of passengers or property over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel, and to make such other contracts as may be necessary to carry out any of the purposes of this act; to utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama, and the Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this act.

"The authority herein granted shall include the power to construct, maintain, and operate telegraph and telephone lines so far as they may be necessary or convenient in the construction and operation of the railroad or railroads as herein authorized, and they shall perform generally all the usual duties of telegraph and telephone lines for hire.

"That it is the intent and purpose of Congress through this act to authorize and empower the President of the United States, and he is hereby fully authorized and empowered, through such officers, agents, or agencies as he may appoint or employ, to do all necessary acts and things in addition to those specially authorized in this act to enable him to accomplish the purposes and objects of this act.

"The President is hereby authorized to withdraw, locate, and dispose of, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, such area or areas of the public domain along the line or lines of such proposed railroad or railroads for town-site purposes as he may from time to time designate.

"Terminal and station grounds and rights of way through the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska are hereby granted for the construction of railroads, telegraph, and telephone lines authorized by this act, and in all patents for lands hereafter taken up, entered, or located in the Territory of Alaska there shall be expressed that there is reserved to the United States a right of way for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines to the extent of 100 feet on either side of the center line of any such road, and 25 feet on either side of the center line of any such telegraph or telephone lines, and the President may, in such manner as he deems advisable, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable.

"SEC. 2. That the cost of the work authorized by this act shall not exceed $35,000,000, and in executing the authority granted

by this act the President shall not expend nor obligate the United States to expend more than the said sum; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000 to be used for carrying out the provisions of this act, to continue available until expended.

"SEC. 3. That all moneys derived from the lease, sale, or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites, in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained, or the timber thereon, and the earnings of said railroad or railroads, together with the earnings of the telegraph and telephone lines constructed under this act, above maintenance charges and operating expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscelleanous receipts are paid, and a separate account thereof shall be kept and annually reported to Congress.

"SEC. 4. That the officers, agents, or agencies placed in charge of the work by the President shall make to the President annually, and at such other periods as may be required by the President or by either House of Congress, full and complete reports of all their acts and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the operation of said work or works and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith. The annual reports herein provided for shall be by the President transmitted to Congress."

And the House agree to the same.

W. C. HOUSTON,
FRANK E. GUERNSEY,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

KEY PITTMAN,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
W. L. JONES,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report, namely:

The provision as agreed to retains all of the important provisions of the House amendment. The only substantial changes are the striking out of the provision with reference to the application of the interstate-commerce law. The committee of conference has left the operation of the road, as long as the President retains the operation of it in his hands, unhampered, giving him absolute authority in reference to it, but have provided that if the road should be leased, then it shall become subject to the operations and provisions of the interstate-commerce laws.

And rights of way have been granted through public lands, and a provision made for the express reservation of such rights of way in patents which may be issued for these lands, and full power has been given to the President to make whatever reservations he may deem necessary for terminal station grounds.

The verbiage has been reformed and changed in different places by the elimination of unnecessary repetition, and the transposition and rearrangement of sentences, clauses, and words which do not make any material alteration in the provisions of the bill, as follows:

(References are to "amendment" as passed by the House.)

In line 7, section 1, after the word "act," the words "such officers, agents, or agencies to be appointed or designated by him or under his direction" are omitted.

In lines 12 and 13 of section 1 the words "or any official in the civil list of the United States" are stricken out.

In line 3, on page 2, of section 1, after the word "exceed," add the words "in the aggregate."

In lines 7 and 8, page 2, the words "yielding coal sufficient in quality and quantity for naval use" are omitted.

In line 12, page 2, after the word "Navy," there is inserted the words "the transportation."

On page 2, all of line 25, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and part of line 5, on page 3, to and including the word "thereto," are stricken out.

In line 7, page 3, beginning with the word "for," down to the word "property," in line 8, is stricken out.

In lines 12, 13, and 14, page 3, the words "subject to the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as hereinafter provided," are stricken out.

In line 12, page 3, after the word "property," there is added the following: "which rates shall be equal and uniform, but no free transportation or passes shall be permitted, except that the provisions of the interstate-commerce law relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to the lines constructed under this act."

In lines 16 and 17, on page 3, the words "not in violation of law" are stricken out.

In line 1, page 4, after the word "Congress," there is inserted the following clause: "*Provided*, That if said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority herein given, then and in that event they shall be operated under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate-commerce law."

In line 2, page 4, after the word "acquire," there is added the words "upon such terms as he may deem proper."

In line 4, page 4, after the word "him," the words "in the first instance, upon such terms as he may deem proper" are stricken out.

In line 10, page 4, after the word "property," there is inserted the following words: "Over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel owner."

After the word "act," in line 11, page 4, the remainder of the paragraph is stricken out and instead of it there is inserted a clause from the Senate bill, as follows: "To utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama; and the said Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this act."

In lines 17 and 18, on page 4, the language is changed so as to read: "The authority herein granted shall include the power to construct, maintain, and operate telegraph and telephone lines," etc. This is a mere change in phraseology without altering the meaning.

In line 22, page 4, after the word "hire," strike out all of the remainder of the paragraph.

In line 12, page 5, the word "lawful" is stricken out and the word "necessary" inserted.

In line 13, page 5, the word "necessary" was stricken out because it was inserted above.

In lines 14 and 15, page 5, the words "*Provided*, That" are stricken out and the word "The" is begun with a capital and made the beginning of a sentence.

In line 19, page 5, after the word "designate," there is inserted the following: "Terminal and station grounds and rights of way through the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska are hereby granted for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines authorized by this act, and in all patents for lands hereafter taken up, entered, or located in the Territory of Alaska there shall be expressed that there is reserved to the United States a right of way for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the center line of any such road and 25 feet on each side of the center line of any such telegraph or telephone line, and the President may, in such manner as he deems advisable, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable."

On page 5 all of section 2 is stricken out.

On page 6 section 3 is numbered section 2.

In line 5, page 6, after the figures "$35,000,000," the word "that" is stricken out and the word "and" inserted instead.

On page 6 section 4 is numbered section 3.

In line 15, page 6, the word "net" is striken out, and after the word "railroads" there is added the following: "Together with the earnings of the telephone and telegraph lines constructed under this act."

Section 5 on page 6 is numbered section 4.

W. C. HOUSTON,
FRANK E. GUERNSEY,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, as set out in this statement the provisions of the House bill in the main are retained. There

are very few changes that have any important effect on the bill. The amount is retained the same as provided in the House bill of $35,000,000. Also the amount appropriated is retained at the sum of $1,000,000, as provided in the House bill. There was a change made in the House bill by striking out the clause that provided for the interstate-commerce laws to apply to this road. We changed that so as to make them apply only in case the road was leased. In case the road is leased or operated by private companies it will be operated under the terms of the interstate-commerce law, but if run by the President we thought it best not to have any limitation or anything to hamper his free hand and the exercise of his discretion.

The right of way has been granted through public lands in such terms as were not provided in the House bill, and it is provided that express reservations may be made by the President in order to secure rights of way without any hindrance or anything to interfere with the right of way over the public domain. It was also provided that patents issued on public land hereafter should contain a clause stipulating that the right was reserved to the Government to retain right of way, so as to prevent any delay or hindrance in acquiring rights of way.

There was another change in regard to the transportation of parties on free passes. That has been forbidden by a clause inserted here, which was taken from the Senate bill, providing that free transportation or free passes should be given only to the extent provided in the interstate-commerce law for employees and their families.

There are a number of other changes in phraseology, some transposition of words and sentences, which I do not think make any material difference.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I notice on page 2 of the bill that emerged from conference you have retained the provision which places a limitation on the right to purchase other railroad stock at its actual physical value.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I believe that is a provision that went out in the House committee.

Mr. HOUSTON. It was in the bill as it passed the House. The language in the present bill is identical with the language as it passed the House.

Mr. FERRIS. It was my impression that it was eliminated in committee

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; and was inserted on the floor of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. There is another question I want to ask the gentleman about, and the gentleman will understand it is not a criticism, but I find it was in the House bill, and that is the language in the bill which authorizes the use of the Panama Canal appurtenances, but reciting that it shall not in any sense be charged up to the Alaskan account with reference to the cost of the railroad.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. It seems to me that that was unwise. What were the conditions that led the conferees to agree to that?

Mr. HOUSTON. Upon that point, I will state that it was thought wise to provide that any machinery, or tools, or implements of any kind that might not be needed in the completion of the Panama Canal, that could be utilized in building this road, it would be a proper thing to let the Government take charge of such machinery and tools and use them in carrying on this work here.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, that is not the part, as the gentleman understands, that I object to.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am coming to that. It is provided here that the Isthmian Canal Commission shall receive credit for the amount that these tools and machinery are valued at, but that it shall not be charged against the fund appropriated for the construction of the railroad.

This is Government property. It is Government machinery, but the Government has no longer any use for it at the Panama Canal, because the provision in the bill is that it shall be turned over when the same is not needed there. It is nothing but right and proper that the Government, which is undertaking to enter another great enterprise, should have the benefit of this machinery. This belongs to the Government. Let the Government get the benefit of it in building this railroad, and, incidentally, let Alaska get the benefit of the free use of this property which the Government has already on hand.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but the anomalous position is this, that the property we are to transmit to Alaska, whether it be much or little, is charged against the Panama project, but when we take it up to Alaska and install it there we do not charge it against that project. In other words, it seems to me that the thing that we use in Alaska being transported from the Panama Canal ought to figure in the project, so that in the last analysis we might be able to tell what our total expenditure has been, and, in turn, how far we have been reimbursed. This bill is based on the theory that the Alaskan resources will reimburse us. That being true, I wondered what the plan was to eliminate this one feature.

Mr. HOUSTON. This bill provides we shall take this machinery at a certain valuation, and the Panama Canal Commission gets credit for that valuation. The only question is whether or not you will make the Government pay for its own property, which it is going to use in the construction of the Alaskan railroad. There is a desire on the part of the friends of this measure to make a success of it and do it as cheaply as possible, and we think it but a small favor to ask of the Government that it shall take this property it already has, and has no further use for, and let us have it; and if we want to know what it is worth, this act provides it is to be given credit for it, and you can add that to the cost of the road.

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly; but instead of doing that the bill specifically precludes it from being done.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think not.

Mr. FERRIS. No; the language specifically says that.

Mr. HOUSTON. It provides that we shall have the free use of these tools.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right. It is a gift to the Alaskan project to that extent.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. On that same point I had intended to address the House when the bill was under consideration, but I thought it safer to leave it open. I do not understand, and I would like to ask the gentleman if he made any inquiry, how it is possible for the Isthmian Canal Commission to take credit for a percentage of the original cost of any machinery. I would like to ask if the gentleman made any inquiry as to the modus operandi. Does it mean that they give themselves credit when they talk about it, or that they put it on the books of the Treasury?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think it is more a matter of bookkeeping than anything else. It shows what it is probably worth when they get through with it.

Mr. MANN. I know of no way in bookkeeping of entering an item on one side of the ledger without having a corresponding item on the other side of the ledger, if you are going to balance your books.

Mr. HOUSTON. It provides this: That the Government takes that machinery at whatever it is worth for the needs of the Canal Commission and gives the commission credit for it. Then we provide that it may be used in the construction of this railroad.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the proposition. What I asked was whether any inquiry was made as to how it could be done, because it is perfectly patent that you can not take credit on the books unless there is a corresponding charge made on the books.

Mr. LENROOT. Would not the charge be made to the Government?

Mr. MANN. The charge can not be made to the Government; certainly not.

Mr. LENROOT. On the books?

Mr. MANN. The books must balance. There is no appropriation from the Government to do this.

Mr. MANAHAN. It is all the Government's.

Mr. MANN. Whether it is all the Government's or not, you can not enter an item on one side of the ledger with no item on the other side of the ledger. The machinery has been paid for and the item is closed, so far as that is concerned. The books have been balanced, as far as this machinery is concerned. If you enter an item on the ledger or on the books of the Government—and I do not know whether that is the intention or not—you must have a corresponding item somewhere. It is not against the Government. In other words, you bring the Government into debt to these people, and that can not be done.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the bookkeeping proposition would be to credit the Canal Commission with this machinery received and charge the Government with what it took back from the canal.

Mr. MANN. And then have a claim against the Government for all time standing on the books of the Government.

Mr. HARDY. The Government would simply be charged just as if it had purchased a horse, and the horse might die later.

Mr. MANN. But the Government is never charged with the buying of a horse and you can not do it without an appropriation. You can not get that sort of item on the books.

Mr. HARDY. Suppose you have an appropriation or an authorization when you pay for a thing; you have to balance that somewhere.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but this is no authorization.

Mr. HARDY. This will equivalently authorize the Government to buy this property from the Canal Commission.

Mr. MANN. It will not do any harm. It will give the governor of the Canal Zone, when he makes his annual report, authority to say that they have turned this machinery over to the Alaska railroad and that he claims credit for a certain amount of reduction in expenses. It will not change any item on the books, because it can not under the terms of the law.

Mr. HARDY. Let me ask the gentleman how he would square his books if we passed a law now taking back from the Panama Canal account the machinery they had there; just charging it back to the Government and allowing them credit for it, to say nothing about Alaska?

Mr. MANN. They could not square the accounts on the books in that way.

Mr. HARDY. Then it ought not to be squared now.

Mr. MANN. It should be squared now. We take it back from the Panama Canal Commission. The gentleman talks about the Government owning machinery; the Government owns the machinery now.

Mr. HARDY. Suppose for the sake, however, of wanting to see what the Panama Canal has cost when they get through with their work we have certain remnants of property for which we have no further use and they turn them back to the Government.

Mr. MANN. Turn them back to the Government! They are owned by the Government now; they can not turn them back.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman wants to do something to show the Panama Canal left that property; that is all.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is done by writing an essay, it can not be done by keeping books.

Mr. HARDY. I think this is an essay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the gentleman's exposition, I believe he inadvertently omitted to call the attention of the House to a very material change. As I understand, one of the main purposes of this legislation was to provide a railroad to reach the coal fields which would yield coal of such a quality as could be used in the Navy. Now I find in the bill reported by the conferees all reference omitted of that special clause in the House bill which says the purpose is to construct a railroad to reach coal fields yielding coal sufficient in quality and quantity for naval use. That is stricken out entirely and in lieu thereof I find this phraseology:

To construct a road connecting with a coal field or coal fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral and other resources of Alaska.

Now, I wish to ask the gentleman why the supporters of this project abandoned the contention that this railroad is to be built to furnish a supply of coal suitable for the Navy, and under the bill as now presented to the House there is no such restriction whatsoever in the construction of the road?

Mr. HOUSTON. In answer to that question I would say that the reason we struck out the words "sufficient in quantity and quality for naval use" was because, after consideration, we concluded they were improper terms to qualify and describe just the character of the coal to be established or describe the purpose for which the road was to be built. There is no very definite meaning in those terms; you can not tell what quantity or how much would be sufficient; you can not beforehand judge accurately as to a sufficient quantity or exactly just what the grade might be; but the provision which is inserted there provides it is for the purpose of shipping coal for the use of the Navy, and there is no need of a limitation such as these words contain.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon; there is no qualification in the bill which is now reported that the coal shall be of a quality for use of the Navy——

Mr. HOUSTON. Where is it?

Mr. STAFFORD. First page, about six lines from the bottom.

And with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and——

Mr. HOUSTON. And it says also to provide for the transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, troops, arms, munitions of war, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. It says to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, but I understood the bill as it originally passed the House to provide the road could not be built unless there was coal of such a quality that it could be utilized for the Navy, but now the road will be built or is authorized to be built regardless of whether there is coal there of a quality that can be utilized for naval purposes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, if the gentleman will just think about this he is sure to realize when you provide to build a road to a point to ship coal sufficient in quantity or quality for naval use that that is an indefinite thing, that perhaps the engineer and the Government officials, having that impression in mind, might possibly make a mistake and take it to some field which might not be of the very highest order desired. It is a vague qualification, it is a vague limitation, and it is not necessary, especially in view of the fact we provide just afterwards it shall be for the purpose of shipping coal for the Army and Navy. Now, I think the gentleman voted for the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I did. I will say to the gentleman I voted for it because it was to provide coal for naval purposes and for that especially. If I had understood there was no coal up there that would be suitable for naval purposes, I could not justify my vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. We thoroughly believe that it will provide for the transportation of coal of a very high quality and for naval use. We believe all that. Yet we do not think it proper to make that a qualification as to the location of a road and make it depend upon that.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a question. If there was a coal field containing coal not suitable for the Navy but for commercial purposes within 20 miles of the main line of the railroad, do you not think the President ought to have authority to build a branch to that coal field?

Mr. STAFFORD. He would have authority under the House bill to build such feeders. Under that bill he would not have authority to construct this railroad unless there was coal there suitable for naval purposes, but under the bill now presented to the House he has authority to build this railroad whether there is coal there for naval purposes or not.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. I understood the gentleman to say that he voted for this bill when it passed the House?

Mr. STAFFORD. The RECORD so shows; and not only does the RECORD show it, but I stated on the floor of the House that I was going to vote for it, and stated the reasons why I voted for it.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to remind the gentleman that the coal in Alaska has not changed from that day to this, and if it was good for naval use then it is now.

Mr. STAFFORD. From the exposition held on the floor of the House I was in doubt, from statements made, whether they did have coal there fit for naval use. However, I resolved my doubts in favor of the proponents of the measure. I did not know but that you had a notion now that it was about passed to withdraw the mask from the bill and admit that it is a bill purposely for the exploitation of the "frozen north."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as the Alaskan railroad bill comes back in its final form to the House it contains a provision that no free transportation—that is, passes—shall be permitted upon the roads. I think that provision, if it does nothing else except to emphasize that policy, is in point, for there is evidence in the country that the antifree-pass policy is breaking down.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has made several investigations as to the violation of the provision in the interstate-commerce law against the use of free passes, and indictments have followed in Colorado. They have also investigated in Montana and have found violations there. While the Interstate Commerce Commission was investigating in Montana it had occasion to look into the books in the general offices of two railroad companies in Chicago, and it found there some very curious documents, documents which purport to be letters signed by one "John T. Denvir," chairman of a joint committee, known as the "legislative public-utilities commission" of the State

of Illinois. It seems that among the documents unearthed in the general offices of those two transcontinental roads is a letter signed, or purported to be signed, by John T. Denvir, requesting an annual pass over the Burlington lines on account of the legislative public-utilities commission. I am now quoting from the Interstate Commerce Commission report:

A reply having been mailed to John T. Denvir at what is understood to be his regular address, stating that the Burlington issues no free transportation, State or interstate, the following communication bearing the same signature in the same handwriting was later received by the general counsel of the company on what appears to be the official letterhead of the commission.

I recommend this letter to the attention of the House. It is purported to be from John T. Denvir, and is as follows:

I regret exceedingly to acknowledge receipt of your letter in which you refuse me annual transportation over your lines in Illinois. As chairman of the public-utilities commission you can look for legislation that will work hardship to your company, and I wish to assure you that when our commission get through with you that you will find your road in the hands of a receiver, for you certainly are violating the laws of the State in a great many respects, and we know it, but have gone along and been friendly to you; but inasmuch as you are inclined to be so diplomatic in your statement that you would not "like to violate the custom you have indulged in." I feel inclined to think that a little resolution with respect to a committee for a thorough investigation of your gross negligence with regard to your methods of procedure will be well to adopt at the next meeting of the senate.

Hoping that you can see fit to favor our commission's request, I am, as ever,

Faithfully, yours, JOHN T. DENVIR.

The commission continues:

When these and other letters in the same file of correspondence were called to Mr. Denvir's attention he denied that the signatures were his or that the letters were written by his authority. When his attention was called to the fact that the above letter was in direct reply to a letter addressed to him by the general counsel of the Burlington, at his Chicago residence, and that he alone could have used the pass had one been issued, Mr. Denvir vaguely stated that some one had been playing a joke. Although the opportunity for a full explanation was afforded Mr. Denvir, it was not forthcoming, and we deem it our duty to make this record of the matter. It is well to add that our investigations of the records of other carriers at Chicago show that many requests have been made in the past for free transportation for the use of "John T. Denvir." The records of the Illinois Central show that a refusal to issue such a free pass was followed by the receipt of a letter to its vice president as follows—

And I commend this to the attention of this House. This is the letter—

Replying to your favor, which I am returning to you, will say that I insist you grant me transportation requested, and will not accept no as the answer. In the event you disregard my request you can rest assured that in the next general assembly, the forty-eighth, of which I will be a member, I will introduce a bill with regard to frontage on the lake front from Sixty-third Street to Randolph Street, which belongs to the State of Illinois, and which you realize was never purchased or leased.

Furthermore, if you object, you can refuse to honor my annual pass over your lines also. It is not my aim to be disagreeable in the matter, and I am therefore at a loss to understand how you can consistently refuse me.

Soliciting your reply, I beg to remain,

Yours, very truly, JOHN T. DENVIR.

The commission says:

The signature to this document apparently is in the same handwriting as the signature to the letter quoted above.

Now, the commission in its——

Mr. FERRIS. Do all the rest of the commission have the same amount of intelligence that this man seems to have?

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no evidence to that effect.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. MURDOCK. The date is not given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like one minute more.

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is fair to say and it is wise to say that the commission is on guard on this matter, and every time a violation occurs takes steps and notifies the proper officer to prosecute. And the commission, at the conclusion of the bulletin I am reading, issued February 4 last, speaking of the widespread practice of the use——

Mr. MANN. This was intrastate business.

Mr. MURDOCK. The law passed in 1906, a copy of which I have——

Mr. MANN. That does not affect these passes at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. It does affect passes given to interstate shippers.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. MADDEN. The matter that the gentleman refers to does not affect interstate commerce.

Mr. MURDOCK. It affects it if Mr. John T. Denvir was an interstate shipper. He was a Republican, I believe.

Mr. MANN. Oh, he was a Democrat.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was he a Democrat?

Mr. MANN. I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thought he was a Republican. But there is nothing here to show it.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply say to the gentleman from Kansas that the matter referred to, that he is reading to the House, had nothing to do with interstate transportation at all. It was purely an intrastate matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is nothing in this to show it. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] will yield to me a minute further, I want to put something into the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman said he would yield to me in a minute. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will yield one minute more to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. The commission says it is diligent and vigilant in this matter and it issues this general warning, and I think it is such a good thing that it should go into the RECORD:

On broad general grounds, however, all must condemn such practices, and the carriers that dissipate their revenues in that form and recoup the loss in their rates will find, sooner or later, that this commission will not lose sight of the practice when their rates are questioned in complaints pending before us.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think it any worse for a man to seek transportation by a free pass than for a President of the United States to accept a free railroad train, as a recent President did? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I do not know. Will the gentleman say he has never traveled on free transportation?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes. I have refused it repeatedly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the gentleman is one man out of ten thousand.

Mr. GARDNER. Understand me. I do not boast about it and I never said this before, but I never did travel on a free pass.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman means not since there is an express provision in the law forbidding the use of passes.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no. I ask the gentleman whether there is any difference between a man seeking transportation by a free pass and the President of the United States taking free trains, as the leader of the gentleman's party did? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; "the leader of the gentleman's party" did not.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would now be very well to declare war with Mexico inasmuch as we have the standpatters and Progressive Republicans at war over the statement of Mr. Denvir, a gentleman who is said to be a Democrat. [Laughter.] I think it is an opportune time now for war.

Now, I want to say, with reference to the adoption of this conference report, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asked a very pertinent question, although I do not think that it is material now because he is wedded to the bill, and he had an opportunity to investigate the facts as to what the quality and the quantity of the coal in Alaska is, so far as statistics went, before he cast his original vote.

So far as the conference report is concerned, I believe that as the literal construction of the bill goes the bill is as good a bill as you can get for those of you who want a bill enacted to construct a railroad in Alaska. But I have not seen anything to change my mind and to cause me to change my vote since the bill originally passed the House.

I am not going to take up the time of this House in asking for a roll call, and I am not going to take up the time of this House which is needed for other business that should be dispensed with and delay the House longer on this report, except to say that I feel as I did when the bill passed the House, that I am not in accord with the measure, not in regard to its form, but in regard to its principle and the theory underlying the project by which we are undertaking to construct a railroad in Alaska. Therefore I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and content myself with saying that I am opposed to the passage of the bill in its entirety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire only to say that I have doubted the propriety of the passage of this bill from the start. I doubt it now with the same earnestness as I did then.

But I want to say that we now have the cart not in front of the horse but behind it, from the fact that another body has just passed a bill to open the coal mines of Alaska, and whatever value the coal up there may have, you will soon have before you a bill opening the way for its disposal, and giving an opportunity to haul away from there whatever coal there may be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], under the mistaken impression that he was casting odium upon an Illinois Republican, reads some letters about him asking for passes, and said it was a violation of the law. The latter statement is incorrect. There is no law in Illinois—at least there was none when these letters were written, and I do not know whether there is now in Illinois or not, but I think not—forbidding the use of railway passes within the State. While I certainly do not admire the discretion of the person who wrote——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment. While I do not admire the discretion or the good sense or the sense of propriety of the person who wrote the letter practically demanding passes, or really demanding passes under threat of legislative action, still he was not in conflict with the law passed in 1906 forbidding the giving of passes. Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will change the form of my question, because the gentleman has gone on. Would it not be in violation of the law if he were an interstate shipper?

Mr. MANN. He would not be violating the law unless he was an interstate shipper; and he was not a shipper, by the way. He is not a shipper at all; he is a State senator, a member of the Senate of Illinois. He did not violate the national law any more than Mr. Roosevelt did when he took a special train, and he did not violate the law, nor did he at the time violate the common practice.

I am not sure that I agree with the idea that there shall be no passes granted on the Alaska railroad. I wish it were possible that a majority of this House could be compelled to go to Alaska and have an opportunity of riding free upon a railroad or anything else owned by the Government there.

It would certainly add very much to the value of the information possessed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I took the floor not for the purpose of making those remarks but for the purpose of congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] upon the conference report which he brings in and upon the success which he has achieved in this legislation. [Applause.] The Alaska bill was under general debate in this House longer than any other bill not a great revenue bill, or an appropriation bill, or something of that sort has been debated since I have been a Member of the House. It received very careful consideration under the five-minute rule for amendment. It was materially changed in the House by way of amendment in some respects. The Senate had devoted a considerable time to the discussion of the measure, but very little in the way of amendment was inserted there which remains in the bill. Most of the amendments that were inserted in the House remain in the bill under the conference report. I am very glad that we have decided to build a railroad and pay for it out of the Treasury without resorting to bonds, while we still keep a separate account of all sorts of receipts from public lands or leases in Alaska, including any profits—ahem—from the operation of the railroad. I do not believe there will be any direct financial profit for years to come, so far as the railroad is concerned, but I do believe that the construction of this railroad in Alaska, even if it shall be only a short line, will aid greatly in the development of Alaska. Suppose the President only builds, in the first instance, a road from the sea to the coal fields, and we open up the coal fields and find out how far that coal can be utilized and sold and burned on the Pacific side. We will have learned a great deal. Then, suppose we go ahead with a little further development, reaching here and there, and in the course of time—I apprehend not immediately—we construct $35,000,000 worth of railroad. Probably by that time we will have learned enough to know whether we ought to increase the length of the road because of the industries or the development in Alaska. In my opinion, we could not retain Alaska as a possession or Territory of the United States without doing something toward its development, and we have reached the time when we must proceed, and I think it is a good thing to proceed along these lines. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the adoption of this conference report, and I rise only to make one observation. We have reached the last stage of one of the most important bills that this Congress has considered. It is the first great, important bill that this House, as a House of Representatives, has been permitted to consider upon the floor, and it has been demonstrated that as to any bill which does not in itself involve party or partisanship matters it is not necessary to hold a Democratic caucus and put through the bill under caucus rule. Every Member of this House will admit that this is a better bill to-day because both sides of this aisle have been free to offer amendments, and amendments have been considered upon their merits. That action has improved the bill, and we have a better bill than we would have had if you had attempted to legislate upon it through your Democratic caucus. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Is not that same statement true of the immigration bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon agreeing to the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 13679, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 5, page 3, I discover that there are two new places, called "lieutenants of the watch." I desire to ask the chairman of the committee the necessity for creating those two places.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture has 25 or 30 buildings to care for, and a number of watchmen are employed to take care of those buildings. It was thought better to designate two of these men as lieutenants of the watch; in other words, as foremen. There is no change whatever in the salaries of these two men. There is just simply a change of title, in order to give them the positions of foremen of the other watchmen.

Mr. FOWLER. How many new positions have been created under this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. One clerk of class 1, two lieutenants of the watch at $960—the men we are talking about—four watchmen at $720, and two charwomen at $240.

Mr. MADDEN. And there are three assistant messengers, are there not?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that those are transfers from other departments.

Mr. BOOHER. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina if the duties of these lieutenants are the same?

Mr. LEVER. The duties are not exactly the same. Their duties will be to have supervision of certain messengers and watchmen under them. Their salaries are not increased at all. They are the same men who have been doing watchmen's service heretofore.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact that the duties of the lieutenants will be the same as those of the lieutenant who is getting $1,000?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, why not pay these two lieutenants $1,000 each, the same as you pay the other lieutenant, if they are performing the same duties?

Mr. LEVER. The committee followed the suggestion of the department, in order to do as the department wanted, and to keep up its line of promotion. If a vacancy occurs in the position of the $1,000 lieutenant, by death or otherwise, there will be a line of promotion for those of less salary.

Mr. BOOHER. And the one who is promoted will receive the $1,000 salary?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is it on a political subject?

Mr. WEBB. No; it is about a matter that arose here in the House last Saturday.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I do not usually notice newspaper reports of my conduct. However, I notice in this morning's Post these headlines:

May bar Army horses—WEBB would prohibit officers' mounts in shows—"Joker" slipped in the bill—North Carolina Member declares economy calls for cut in money allowed for exhibition—Chairman HAY, of the Military Committee, protests in vain—Prominent officer's view.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not true that this amendment was "slipped" in. It is not true that it is a "joker." I wish to read from the RECORD, page 4417, of last Saturday, when the amendment was agreed to:

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, on page 27, line 17, after the word "available," to add:

"*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended for defraying the expenses of officers, enlisted men, or horses in attending or taking part in horse shows."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. HAY. I have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amend, page 27, line 17, after the word 'available,' by adding:

"'*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended for defraying the expenses of officers, enlisted men, or horses attending or taking part in horse shows.'"

And yet the newspaper states that it was put in over the protest of Mr. HAY. Mr. KAHN, the gentleman from California, debated this amendment and mildly resisted it, but finally the Committee of the Whole adopted it. So there is no "joker" about it; nor was it "slipped" in; it was done on the floor of the House, as the RECORD clearly shows. That is all I care to say. I will talk about the merits of the amendment later, because the "prominent Army officer" says that the transportation of Army officers, their horses and enlisted men to care for them, is a mere trifle. I will show in the debate later on that it is not a mere trifle, but that it is a tremendous and an unwarranted expense to the country. I want to keep the newspapers straight and not allow them to misrepresent me or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For several years the Government has been paying large sums for transporting privately owned horses of officers to attend horse shows in the United States and even to Stockholm, Sweden. These horses are shipped in palace Arms cars, the mileage of the officers is paid at 7 cents per mile, their regular salary goes on, stallage for horses is paid, and the transportation of all enlisted men to take care of the horses is paid. There are four or five shows a year which officers and horses thus attend, from Denver, Colo., to New York City. I contend that there is no warrant of law for such expenditures, nor are such displays of official and equestrian vanity useful to the Army service. I estimate that we have been spending $50,000 to $75,000 yearly for such shows.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the statement the gentleman from North Carolina has made, as to the amendment which he offered to the Army appropriation bill not being a joker, is absolutely correct. There was no joker about it. It is only fair to the gentleman to make such a statement. The gentleman offered his amendment and it was agreed to by the House. I called attention to the amendment. Personally I did not think it advisable to adopt it. Personally I do not think it applies to the section to which the gentleman offered it, and that practically it is of no legislative value as it now stands in the bill; but there was nothing in the nature of a joker about it.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman from California so stated at the time, but he understood the amendment fully, as did the committee.

Mr. MANN. I want to say that I had nothing to do with the newspaper article. As a matter of fact this matter has been proposed several times, and I have been successful in keeping it out, but I was not present at the time this amendment was adopted.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman tried a year ago to prevent the knocking out of the polo shows, but he did not succeed. We knocked them out just as we are going to knock out horse shows.

Mr. MANN. He did succeed.

Mr. WEBB. It was done over the gentleman's protest.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rather think that if there is any joker about the matter the joke is on the gentleman from North Carolina. The amendment should have been offered to the item which covers transportation for the Army, but the gentleman offered it at a place where it will not apply and it will do no harm.

Mr. WEBB. It evidently hit somebody, and particularly this "prominent Army officer," because he thinks the horse shows are ended unless the Senate rescues them. The amendment provides that "hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation" shall be used for horse shows, and so forth, and I think that covers whatever appropriation there is in the Army bill, and I am satisfied with it. My object was, however, to show to the House and the newspaper writer that there was no "joker" about it and that it was not "slipped" in, and that the newspaper report is entirely erroneous.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] asked if I had ever accepted free transportation from a railroad company, to which I replied I never had; and I said that when passes were offered to me I sent them back. I made a mistake, because only one pass was ever offered to me, and I did send that back.

I have been in Congress since 1902. I heard a great deal about the passes that were thrust on us. I have had but one offered to me, and that was from the Canadian Pacific Railway, accompanied by Sir Thomas O'Shaunessy's card. I sent it back, and I never was offered any other. I never was offered any when I was in the State legislature. I never accepted any here; and now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he ever accepted free transportation from a railroad company since he has been a Member of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am going to answer the question. The gentleman has an unfortunate habit of speaking for himself and also trying to speak for me. I acknowledge the gentleman's monumental virtue. I have sat for years with admiration for its magnitude. I did not suspect the gentleman had ever accepted transportation when I asked him the question. I thought probably he could answer as he did, that he never had. Now, I will answer the gentleman that since I have been a Member of Congress I have traveled on railroad transportation——

Mr. GARDNER. Free passes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Free passes. I will say to the gentleman that long before I came to Congress I traveled on free railroad transportation. As a newspaper man, I traveled on free railroad transportation for years. They were sent to the office, I suppose, on application; I did not apply to the railroad; I applied to the newspaper office. After I was elected to Congress, I received passes galore. I do not know that I have received one signed by one whose name started with "Sir," but I did have transportation free to a considerable extent sent me.

Mr. GARDNER. They knew that you were in the habit of receiving them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I do not claim the gentleman's great virtue, but I do try to be frank with the gentleman and the House. Long before they passed a law here, which I hold in my hand, the law of 1906, I stopped using railroad transportation, because the light came to me that it was not right for Congressmen to use free transportation.

Mr. GARDNER. How about the owner of a newspaper?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, unlike the gentleman from Massachusetts, I was not born absolutely pure.

Mr. GARDNER. Did the gentleman carry railroad advertisements in his paper?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, heavens, I do not know. I was engaged in the editorial side of my newspaper, and I do not suppose they did; but if they did they were paid for.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman was in the habit of riding on free passes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly. When I came to Congress I traveled on passes, as most of the other Members did.

Mr. GARDNER. I am not a Progressive and I am not virtuous, but I never did.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, we all stand astonished at the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely pure and that he was born pure.

Mr. MANN. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that even the gentleman from Kansas was born pure.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not think I was.

Mr. MANN. Though certainly he has not been since.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, $6,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $3,000; 1 chief of division of stations and accounts, $2,750; 1 chief of printing division, $2,500; 3 chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; 8 clerk, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 23 clerks, class 2; 30 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at $1,000 each; 10 clerks, at $900 each; 1 telegraph operator, $1,200; 1 assistant foreman of division, $1,600; 1 chief compositor, $1,400; 1 lithographer, $1,500; 2 lithographers, at $1,200 each; 1 pressman, $1,200; 5 compositors, at $1,250 each; 14 printers, at $1,200 each; 11 printers, at $1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at $720 each; 1 chief instrument maker, $1,400; 3 instrument makers, at $1,200 each; 2 skilled mechanics, at $1,200 each; 7 skilled mechanics, at $1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, $840; 1 skilled mechanic, $720; 6 skilled artisans, at $840 each; 1 engineer, $1,300; 1 fireman and steam fitter, $840; 5 firemen, at $720 each; 1 captain of the watch, $1,000; 1 electrician, $1,200; 1 gardener, $1,000; 4 repairmen, at $840 each; 6 repairmen, at $720 each; 4 watchmen, at $720 each; 17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 31 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 88 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $450 each; 27 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $360; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $328,270.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. There are several new pieces of legislation in the paragraph and several increases of salary in violation of the statute; that is, the permanent law. I desire to direct my point of order against the increase in the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau. The statute fixes that salary at $4,500, which is in the same category of places that were spoken of in the act of 1913. I do not desire to discuss the question.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit me I will call attention to the fact that the salary here is exactly the same for the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order that there was an assistant chief of the bureau, which office was filled by Henry E. Williams, at a salary of $3,250, and that there has been an effort in the bill to transfer him to the Division of Forecasting. I think it is proper to call the attention of the House to this question now, in order to save time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make the point of order against that reduction, or does he intend to try to restore the language?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I am not complaining about the saving, because there is no saving. It is absolutely a changing of Henry E. Williams as Assistant Chief of the Weather Bureau into another division at a salary of $3,250; and, so far as the saving in the salary is concerned, there is no saving whatever. Henry E. Williams was with Mr. Moore, the former chief of the bureau. He was one of the fellows who was in Mr. Moore's Landmore apartment-house scheme, a list of whose officials I hereby insert:

COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION, RECORDER OF DEEDS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Landmore Apartment House Co., No. 6418, book 18, page 142. Received for record November 3, 1904.]

Object of incorporation: To acquire the property of the Landmore Apartment House Co. of Virginia, consisting of an apartment house in Washington, D. C., Twenty-fourth Street, between L and M Streets, NW., lot 10, in square 37, and to own, operate, manage, maintain, transfer, convey, sell, and mortgage the same.

Existence of corporation: Perpetual.

Capital stock: Fifty thousand dollars.

Shares: Five hundred, at a par value of $100 each.

Directors of corporation for first year: Willis L. Moore, Frederick V. Coville, Henry E. Williams, Theodore Harding, Edgar B. Calvert, Elizabeth V. Coville.

Incorporators, all of whom are residents of the District of Columbia: Willis L. Moore, Frederick V. Coville, Henry E. Williams, Edgar B. Calvert, Theodore Harding, Elizabeth V. Coville.

Acknowledgement: Before D. J. Carroll, a notary in and for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate what line that is?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois does not have anything before the House. He has not made a point of order, nor has he submitted an amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would point out the part of the paragraph to which he is directing his attention, the Chair will be obliged.

Mr. FOWLER. In line 16 there is an omission of the position of Assistant Chief of the Weather Bureau, which position was filled by Mr. Henry E. Williams. An effort has been made to transfer him to another department.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair would like to know is, Where does the gentleman from Illinois get the information that there is an attempt made to transfer him somewhere else?

Mr. FOWLER. I have looked into it, and know.

The CHAIRMAN. But it does not appear in this paragraph, does it?

Mr. FOWLER. The last bill carried a provision for an assistant to the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the gentleman may understand the position of the Chair, does the gentleman make his point of order against a proposition that some position is left out of the paragraph?

Mr. FOWLER. No. I am calling the attention of the House now to this effort to make a change, in order that a point of order may be properly maintained at the proper place, if it is in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that there is absolutely nothing in this proposition to which the point of order could lie, because the gentleman is discussing something that is not in the bill at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman for a short time.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 17 there is a new position attempted to be created—one Chief of Division of Stations and Accounts, $2,750. That is a new position entirely, not carried in the bill heretofore, as I recollect, and I have run the matter down and have marked it new. I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order against that position?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unnecessary to argue that point. The Chair has already taken its position upon it, and I have nothing further to say.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly held here that where there is an effort to create a new office entirely distinct from what the bill has ever carried heretofore, it is subject to a point of order, and that has been the unanimous ruling of the Chair heretofore. I have interposed these points of order myself, and the Chair has uniformly sustained the point of order. This is not a position similar to a position heretofore held in this bureau, but it is the creation of a new place for a new man, to add new burdens to the taxpayers of the land, and I am trying to save the people these burdens, and these positions ought not to be created so promiscuously without some kind of authority of law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I do not care to discuss the point of order, because, as I said a moment ago, the Chair has already ruled on the proposition, but for the information of the gentleman from Illinois I desire to say that the position against which he is complaining is not the creation of a new place at all, and if it were it would not affect the point of order. It is a transfer, under authority of Congress and under the direction of Congress, of a man from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements to the Weather Bureau, at the same salary that he held in the Division of Disbursements and Accounts, and that appropriation is accordingly there reduced, as is set out very fully in my report. This man is not a new man, he has been doing this work for many years, and he has been located in the Weather Bureau and heretofore has been attached officially to the Division of Accounts and Disbursements, but Congress, through an act in 1912, I think, required that each bureau should do its own accounting, and that the Division of Accounts and Disbursements should hold only a revisionary accounting. It is not a new place; it does not increase the appropriation; it is only a transfer directed to be done under the law; and even if it were a new place it would not be subject to a point of order. I ask the Chair for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard any further?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I submit this is a new place, a creation of a new office, and my point of order ought to be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. The Chair based his ruling a while ago on the proposition that there are certain details of organization in these different departments that must be left, necessarily, to the discretion of the heads of the departments in order that the work of the department may be carried on, but the Chair is somewhat reluctant to extend that ruling to posi-

tions other than subordinate detailed minor positions of the department. Now, the Chair desires to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill is this a new position which is being created?

Mr. LEVER. It is not a new position, but a transfer under the direction of law of a man who has heretofore been carried on the roll of the division of accounts and disbursements, but actually doing work in the Weather Bureau. I desire to call the attention of the Chair further to section 4 of the act creating the Weather Bureau, which provides:

That the Weather Bureau shall hereafter consist of one Chief of the Weather Bureau and such subordinate employees as Congress may annually provide for and as may be necessary to properly perform the duties involving on said bureau by law, and the Chief of the Weather Bureau shall receive, etc.

Clearly the statute that created the Weather Bureau gave Congress the right from time to time to afford it such employees as are necessary to carry out the work for which it is created. If the Chair desires to see this law, I will send it to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have you send it up.

Mr. FOWLER. But, Mr. Chairman, that statute does not give Congress the right to create new positions.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say the gentleman's contention has this very remarkable effect: If the contention of the gentleman from Illinois is correct that the section of the Revised Statute which the Chair has before him does not give authority to Congress to create sufficient positions to carry on the necessary work of the Weather Bureau, then every single, solitary item of this statutory roll is subject to the point of order, except the item for the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau. It is just exactly in line undoubtedly with the ruling of the Chair this morning and with the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not quite agree with the gentleman from South Carolina on that proposition, and yet in the main the Chair thinks there is not much difference between us. This position would come, the Chair thinks, in another category from the class of employees we were considering a few moments ago, and the Chair wants to ask the gentleman this question: The Chair understood the gentleman to say a while ago that this same work has been done in the bureau by the same person and at the same salary, but perhaps under a different title. Is that true that it is only a change of title?

Mr. LEVER. It is not even a change of title. This work has heretofore been done in the Division of Accounts and Disbursements, but under an act of Congress the Division of Accounts and Disbursements was decentralized; and this man who has been doing this work, with his office located in the Weather Bureau, has been transferred from the roll of the Division of Disbursements and Accounts to the roll of the Weather Bureau, doing precisely the same work.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is the point the Chair desired to have made clear. The Chair understood the gentleman at first to make that statement. If that be true, there is really no new position created; and, therefore, the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 24 there is a new office created—one pressman, at $1,200. I make the point of order against it as being new matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled for the same reason that the Chairman gave a moment ago.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, line 2, there is one chief instrument maker, at $1,400—a new position—and it is a chief position.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the Chair that this is only a change of title. It is "one chief instrument maker" in lieu of "one chief mechanic," at $1,400. The salary is exactly the same, the work is the same, and the man is the same. The only thing we did here was to try to set out more distinctly and accurately his line of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the chairman of this committee has relied upon the act of 1913—the two-line-and-a-half provision—for the salaries of this bureau. Now, he is bringing in at the very next session of Congress an increase to that force by creating new places and then contending that, because they may have been carried somewhere else, they are not new places. "Somewhere else" was a place where a man had no duty to perform and was compelled to get out. "Now" is a new place created in this bureau for the purpose of taking care of him. That is what this case is.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the gentleman is making a statement which, I trust, he ought to know does not state the facts, because I tried to state to the gentleman as plainly as I knew how to use the English language to convey my thoughts that this was the same man at the same salary and doing the same work, and that it was only a change of title. I hope the gentleman will not so far forget himself as to impugn my veracity as to a statement upon the facts in this bill. The "gentleman from South Carolina" is not given to doing that kind of work, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman from South Carolina has the respect of the "gentleman from Illinois."

Mr. LEVER. I believe that, and I am proud of it.

Mr. FOWLER. Repeatedly so. But I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I have gone into this bill with some degree of care, the same as he has.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman deny the truth of the statement I make that this is nothing but a change of title?

Mr. FOWLER. I say that this place was not provided for in the last bill.

Mr. LEVER. It is exactly the same place, except we call him by a different name. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

Mr. FOWLER. That is one of the ways the appropriation committees have had in the past to create new offices, and then reinstated the old fellow under the old title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has overruled the point of order on that proposition and it is not necessary to take up any more time on it.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, Mr. Chairman, in line 3, there is the item "3 instrument makers"—new material and new places, and at $1,200 each.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the same explanation, exactly, applies to that as applies to the item above. They are three instrument makers, at $1,200 each, in lieu of three skilled mechanics, at $1,200 each. In other words, the department desired to change the title of these men in order more clearly to express the character of work they are doing. They are the same men, doing the same character of work.

Mr. FOWLER. And then you will come along at the next session of Congress and ask that the three skilled mechanics be reinstated.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will trust me not to do that.

Mr. FOWLER. That was what was done with the law clerk and solicitor, and you made 21 law clerks instead of 1 law clerk two years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, line 9, is a new place; not exactly a new place, but an increase in the salary over the salary of last year of a gardener. The word "gardener" is a misnomer. He is nothing but a lawn mower, and if they would change the title to that of "lawn mower" and give him $1,200 a year I would be satisfied with it, and I hope the gentleman will see proper in the next bill to properly name this man.

Mr. LEVER. I am afraid the gentleman would make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] make a point of order against this item?

Mr. FOWLER. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not desire to make a point of order on that.

I desire also to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that he is not a gardener, but just a lawn mower?

Mr. LEVER. It is not a fact.

Mr. FOWLER. What garden work does he do?

Mr. LEVER. Here is what is disclosed in the hearings:

Mr. CALVERT. That gardener is a remarkable man. Without any assistant whatever, he takes care of all the ground and flower beds about the Weather Bureau premises. He does it in a manner that is highly creditable.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. How much ground have you?

Mr. FOWLER. It is about a quarter of an acre?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know. I have not stepped it off myself. I will read further:

Mr. CALVERT. I can not say. It is probably an acre or a little bit more; but it is so cut up that it involves a considerable amount of work.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have more than a block, haven't you?

Mr. CALVERT. We have only a little more than a fourth of a block. It is a very large block. It is the same block in which the Columbia Hospital is located.

Mr. SLOAN. How long has he been gardener?

Mr. CALVERT. I do not recall exactly, but I should say five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he had an increase of salary since he came into the service?

Prof. BOWIE. He had an increase of $10 a month last year.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, last year there was a general increase of salaries of gardeners in the department. That was made without any estimates being submitted, and about 15 or 20 gardeners had their salaries increased.

The CHAIRMAN. How does this salary compare with the other gardeners of the department?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It is less. Some of the gardeners receive salaries ranging from $1,200 to $1,400.

The CHAIRMAN. For the same kind of work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; the high-class men doing propagating work, of course, are paid the higher salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. The only thing I am complaining about——

Mr. LEVER. Now, that is all the information I have.

Mr. FOWLER. However, he is nothing but a lawn mower.

Mr. LEVER. Then the gentleman has more information than has the department official.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Weather Bureau: For carrying into effect in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, in the West Indies, and on adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, in Bermuda, and in Alaska, the provisions of an act approved October 1, 1890, so far as they relate to the weather service transferred thereby to the Department of Agriculture; for the employment of professors of meteorology, district forecasters, local forecasters, meteorologists, section directors, observers, assistant observers, operators, skilled mechanics, instrument makers, assistant foremen, proof readers, compositors, pressmen, lithographers, folders and feeders, repairmen, station agents, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, special observers, display men, and other necessary employees; for fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, ice, dry goods, twine, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, and washing towels; for advertising; for subsistence, care, and purchase of horses and vehicles, and repairs of harness, for official purposes only; for instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers and repairs thereto; for rent of offices; for repairs and improvements to existing buildings and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary outbuildings and sidewalks on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds; and the erection of temporary buildings for living quarters of observers; for official traveling expenses; for telephone rentals and for telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreements with the companies performing the service; for the maintenance and repair of Weather Bureau telegraph, telephone, and cable lines; and for every other expenditure required for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations and for the issuing of weather forecasts and warnings of storms, cold waves, frosts, and heavy snows, the gauging and measuring of the flow of rivers and the issuing of river forecasts and warnings; for observations and reports relating to crops and for other necessary observations and reports, including cooperation with other bureaus of the Government and societies and institutions of learning for the dissemination of meteorological information, as follows:

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will this bill be read by paragraphs or by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. It is read by paragraphs. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses in the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, $122,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, for the first time, as I recollect, in the history of the Weather Bureau, a new term has crept in, namely "seismology," and I desire to make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to say this: The Department of Agriculture for a number of years has been requesting the Committee on Agriculture to include that language in the bill. Up to 1913 the department, in fact, through its Weather Bureau, was doing seismological work, but the Comptroller of the Treasury held that there was no authority under the law for the Weather Bureau to do it. The committee, however, held that inasmuch as we have opened the Panama Canal, and inasmuch as we were continuing to build higher and higher structures, and in the West to erect drainage canals and irrigation canals, and with the evidence before us of the value of information as to just where the earth fissures were, probably this would be a rather good investment.

I want to call your attention to the statement of President John C. Banner, of Stanford University, made on December 13, 1913:

[From the Star, Washington, D. C., Sunday, December 14.]

EARTHQUAKE SHOCK CALIFORNIA PUZZLE—STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT DECLARES THERE IS "CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE"—GLARING NEED OF DATA IN PANAMA CANAL ZONE—THINKS WHOLE PROBLEM SHOULD BE PART OF DUTIES OF THE WEATHER BUREAU HERE.

SAN FRANCISCO, *December 13.*

There is an "earthquake problem" in this country, according to President John C. Branner, of Stanford University, and it can and ought to be coped with in the same way that a business problem or a pestilence would be met.

In a speech here to-day he spoke deprecatingly of the "conspiracy of silence," which he said had hindered a scientific and sane study of the "active faults" in the earth's crust in California which would make possible a campaign against a repetition of the disaster of 1906.

"We must study quakes, where they originate, how and why," he said. "Our study of the 1906 earthquake enabled us to map out the entire distance of the fault which caused the damage—the fracture of the earth's crust which slipped and caused the tremble.

WORKING TO LOCATE FAULTS.

"There are plenty of active faults in California, and we should be working now to locate them. When we know where they are we can keep our houses, bridges, dams, pipe lines, and other structures off them, or we can do our engineering so that when the next earth slip comes the effect will be negligible.

"If the wrigging line of the 1906 fault had been accurately known the Spring Valley Water Co would not have had its pipe line laid over it, the water would not have been shut off, and this city would not have been destroyed.

"In projecting the great Hetch Hetchy municipal water system to this city, Engineer Freeman asked my advice as consulting geologist. I pointed out that near Civington the line would have to cross an active fault, which sooner or later would shift and cause a break in the line. Freeman proposes to remedy this by constructing a valve above the fault and erecting a repair station near by

LOS ANGELES AFFECTED.

"In the enormously long and expensive pipe lines which Los Angeles has built from Owens Valley it has been impossible to avoid crossing an active fault, which in time will cause a break. The city of Los Angeles has sought to minimize the danger by constructing a huge reservoir and repair facilities near by.

"In the Panama Canal Zone there is a glaring example of the need of gathering earthquake data. At present it is evident that there is no intelligent study and the engineers are working in the dark.

"This whole problem should be under Government supervision. Economically, it should be a part of the duties of the Weather Bureau. In due time the comparison and tabulation of information on all quakes would give us a working knowledge of all menacing faults, and we could guard against their damaging effects."

I read the following memorandum:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WEATHER BUREAU, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF,
*Washington, D. C., December 16, 1913.*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY ON THE SUBJECT OF SEISMOLOGY AND THE WEATHER BUREAU.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I wish to ask your attention to the inclosed clipping from the Washington Sunday Star of December 14, wherein Dr. Branner, president of the Leland Stanford University, points out the great need of seismological work, especially in California and the Canal Zone, and incidentally states that, economically, this work should be a part of the duties of the Weather Bureau. I hope you will bring this matter to the attention of Mr. LEVER not only because the Weather Bureau estimates contain the authority to engage in seismological observations, but because I made it the subject of special remarks in connection with our estimates for taking up forecast work in the Caribbean Sea and the Canal Zone. Both aspects of the matter are touched upon by President Branner, who is one of the foremost students of the great problems of seismology confronting residents and engineers of California.

Very respectfully,

C. F. MARVIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

I want to call my friend's attention to the further fact that the United States is the only great Government on the face of this earth that is not doing seismological work. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The language is subject to a point of order. But the committee recognized that when it put it in the bill, but we thought that the matter was of such importance and that the cost of doing it is so little—$10,000 is the estimate—and it does not increase the sum heretofore carried in this bill for the purposes of the Weather Bureau. They are going to take it out of something else if we should allow it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the insertion of this word involve any increase in the amount of the appropriation in this item or in any other item?

Mr. LEVER. It involves no increase in the funds for the present fiscal year, but of the funds provided in this bill from eight to ten thousand dollars will be used in this work. In other words, let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota, all we need to do is to purchase a few of these instruments which record the movement of the earth. For instance, the other night in the great storm we had the seismological instrument that they have at the Georgetown University described distinctly the motion of the earth under the tremendous pressure above it. The Weather Bureau officials are capable of doing this work. All we need to do now is to provide them with a few instruments, and in the future only a small sum of money will be needed to keep up with that work.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand the department is now doing this work, but that the Comptroller of the Treasury has held that they had no authority to do it.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The comptroller said they had no authority. I concede the gentleman's point of order, if he makes it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know if there is any handle upon which to hang this appropriation in order to make it in order? I desire to ask if the other matters carried in the paragraph are authorized by existing law? If they are, then this whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, and the point of order being made to one item only, under the familiar rule this item would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I contend and absolutely believe that the other items are not subject to a point of order. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] will not make his point of order, because I know this will be very valuable work.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that seismology has any more connection with astronomy than the forest fires that originate in Canada; none whatever. If we embark on the study of seismology in the Agricultural Department, it undoubtedly will carry us adrift.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a minute?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; in a moment. The great pressure that will be brought to bear upon the committee and upon Congress was indicated by the distinguished chairman of this committee when he said that in the region of the Panama Canal there is an earthquake zone. That will be brought with the greatest force on earth before Congress for future appropriations, and I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that if we place in the scope of the authority of the Agricultural Department seismology it will cost the United States more than the digging of the Panama Canal. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, $1,189,000, including not to exceed $591,000 for salaries, $120,000 for special observations and reports, $275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and $30,000 for traveling expenses.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a change of existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that point of order is well taken. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to what the committee is undertaking to do in this rearrangement of the language of this bureau.

This language under general expenses under the Weather Bureau has been a matter of a good deal of attention on the part of the committee for several years. Heretofore the bureau has been doing its work upon a basis absolutely different from that of any other bureau of the Department of Agriculture. In the estimates the department submitted certain language, rearranging the old language of the bill, but conferring no new authority upon the bureau. The Committee on Agriculture was not entirely satisfied with the language submitted, and we had the department submit other language time and time again until we found such language as we thought would meet the situation.

Heretofore the Weather Bureau has been doing its work on the line of the material used rather than upon the basis of projects. In other words, if you were building a house, what you would be interested in would be the total cost of the house. Now, the Weather Bureau heretofore has been submitting its estimates not upon projects but upon how much the brick in the house will cost; how much the laths will cost; how much the cement will cost; how much the doors will cost; how much the labor will cost, and the like of that. I do not know that this arrangement is the very best we can get ultimately, but what we want to do is to put the Weather Bureau on a project basis, just as the other bureaus of the department now are.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that in last year's appropriation act you segregated much more specifically than you have in this bill as to the various provisions. One of those items, carrying an appropriation of $590,500, was for the employment of professors, meteorological inspectors, and the like. In the phraseology which is submitted by the committee in the present bill there is no language authorizing the employment specifically of professors for the purposes herein indicated. Does the gentleman think, or does the committee believe, that it is good legislation to combine under general authority and give the department wide discretion in the expenditure of the appropriation, or whether, as some other committees believe, it is better policy to segregate the items as far as possible?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that as a general proposition I believe the more we can segregate these items the better.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman point out wherein he would place any limitation whatsoever on the activities of the Weather Bureau in the employment of professors of these various kinds, if there is no limitation as to the amount that can be expended?

Mr. LEVER. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 6, line 19:

Including not to exceed $591,000 for salaries,

That is the limitation. As I said a moment ago, what we are trying to do is to get the Weather Bureau on a project basis, and hence we have divided it up in this way—so much in the city of Washington, so much outside of the city of Washington, so much for the maintenance of a printing office, and so much for the erection of buildings. But you will notice that in that second division we have put limitations and divided that up. While it carries a total of $1,189,000, not to exceed $591,000 is to be used for salaries, $120,000 for special observations and reports, $275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and $30,000 for traveling expenses. In other words, when it comes right down to bedrock, we have more nearly segregated the items here than in the old bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take the contrary position, because under the general phraseology "for necessary expenses," that might include employment of services that would not be considered strictly as salaries. I address the inquiry in all good faith to the chairman, whether he thinks that in the preparation of future bills the Weather Bureau will be held to as strict an account when you lump these items together, as in the former bills, when we had separate paragraphs in which they were limited specifically to the various kinds of work that they might do?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture is required to file a detailed statement with Congress as to the lines of expenditure, and the Committee on Agriculture never makes up one of these bills without looking very carefully into that.

Now, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to a specific case which illustrates how necessary it is that we get upon a project basis, and not upon a material basis, as it were. In other words, here is one man who is doing a number of lines of work, and yet he must keep a separate account of how many hours he puts upon climatology, how many hours upon meteorology, how much fuel is used while he is devoting his time to climatology, how much gas is used while he is devoting his time to sending out forecast warnings. It was the thought of the committee that if we could place this upon a project basis, in the future we would be able to keep such a hand upon it that we could actually effect a real economy in the work of the Weather Bureau, and that is the thought of the Department of Agriculture in its rearrangement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the gentleman's further attention to some other segregated items in last year's appropriation act:

For fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, and all other necessary supplies and miscellaneous expenses, $106,500.

That item is not segregated in any way in this general omnibus provision.

Mr. LEVER. For the very reason I suggest. Here is a man who is in charge of climatological work, in charge of meteorological work, in charge of the issuing of flood warnings, in charge of the issuing of forecasts. All these things are done by the same man.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would not the gentleman's reasoning apply to every other department?

Mr. LEVER. To some extent; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. He is in the same bureau?

Mr. LEVER. But this man, doing this work, is required to keep a separate account against every line of work he is doing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not under these segregated items for fuel and materials used.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Congress is surrendering supervision as to the amount that may be expended for these different items. I will take the following item in last year's appropriation act:

For instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers, and repairs thereto, $43,500.

Where is there any such segregated item in this general omnibus paragraph that the committee reports?

Mr. LEVER. That is carried for necessary expenses outside of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under "necessary expenses" you are leaving to the control of the department the expenditure of money and surrendering the control of Congress over limitations.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is not Congress entitled to know the expenditures of each station outside of Washington?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been the policy of Congress to segregate as far as practicable every item that it was possible to segregate. For years and years Members have been trying to have the appropriations in the Agricultural bill segregated. For years the bill came in without much segregation, but after a while Members made an attack on that plan and the committee in a subsequent Congress then revised and segregated it somewhat. Now, I am fearful that the committee is going back to that old way of surrendering the authority to the department. Politics has nothing to do with this question; but in past administrations abuses grew up in the Agricultural Department which had their seat in the fact that there was no limitation on the expenditures of the vast sums of money that were committed to the discretion of the various bureau heads. I believe in segregation. We all know that every person at the head of a bureau has a hobby, and how they always try to emphasize the importance of their special work by extending in all possible directions if there is no limitation on their power or on the separate amount that may be expended.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call my friend's attention to this fact: The Secretary of Agriculture appointed a committee from his department to go into the matter and reorganize the Weather Bureau, put it on a project basis in keeping with the line of work of the various other bureaus of the department. That committee, as I suggested a moment ago, submitted the language which the gentleman will see in the items. The committee did not believe that it carried out the purpose that the gentleman is now suggesting, the segregation of these items, to such an extent as would meet the will of Congress. Hence we sent back to them for additional segregation of these items. The result was that they brought to us this language which we offer, which I went over very carefully to see that there was no new authority slipped in, and which the committee likewise did, and we believe that we are beginning—we may not have accomplished it yet—but we believe we have set out to place the Weather Bureau on a project basis so that hereafter Congress will know exactly how the money is being spent.

There are 202 principal weather bureau stations. We would like to know how much money we are spending. There is not a line in the old bill that will designate that proposition or indicate how and where it is spent, but we can do it under this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman point out under this item as it is framed how much money will be spent for instruments, shelter, and apparatus?

Mr. LEVER. Of the $1,189,000 there is not to exceed $591,000 for salaries; that is to be expended outside the city of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there any provision that restricts the expenditure for instruments?

Mr. LEVER. The bill says not to exceed $120,000 for special observations and reports, $275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and $30,000 for traveling expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but where is there any limitation upon what should be expended for instruments? That was segregated in the last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. There is not anything as to instruments, but I call attention to this fact, that it would be impossible to segregate that amount without doing what we do not want to do—going back to the old line of appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. All the items covered in this paragraph have been provided for in previous bills under a different form of language?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. If my friend will look at the old language and read it with the new language he will find that there is not a word of new language in this bill that was not in the old bill, except the word "seismology," which my friend from Illinois, Mr. FOWLER, had excluded on a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. The thing that occurred to me was that it had been the policy of the House in the past, as far as possible, to itemize the different appropriations for the various activities of each department.

Mr. LEVER. And the committee is in line with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid the language used in this paragraph departs from that practice and goes back to a policy which was in existence before the beginning of the system which itemized the statements and expenses in the various bureaus of the different departments of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. The committee, on the contrary, believes that we are beginning—we may not have accomplished it fully in this bill, because it is the first time we have attempted it—but we believe that this is the beginning of such segregation as the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, there are $591,000 that may be used in this paragraph for salaries. My thought was, and is, that we ought to state the number of men to be employed, the salaries to be paid, and the duties to be performed. But under this method of appropriation we yield all of that to the judgment of the head of the department, and we leave it to him to say whether he shall employ 100 men at $200 a month each or whether he shall employ 200 men at $100 a month.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will understand that the scientific employees have always been carried in a lump sum, while the clerks, pure and simple, are carried on the statutory roll under act of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Are not clerks paid out of this item?

Mr. LEVER. These are all scientific men. I want to call attention to a statement I have in my hand showing that the committee is informed of the names of these men, the salaries that are paid to them, where they are located, and so forth, 55 pages of it.

Mr. MADDEN. The only thing that prompted me to raise the point of order was the doubt as to whether or not we were not departing from the custom that we have heretofore adhered to and yielding up all of our authority to the heads of the department.

Mr. LEVER. It was the earnest intention of the committee to work in the very direction which has been outlined by the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Minnesota. If we have not succeeded, we do believe that we have begun a start which will end in such a setting out of the items in our bill as will put Congress in full possession of the amount expended in the various lines of work.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I have no disposition to make the point of order if there is no reason why it should be made.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order, but his colleague [Mr. FOWLER] reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I feel quite sure that certain portions of the language in that paragraph ought to be stricken out. For instance, the word "seismology" ought to be stricken out, in harmony with the ruling of the Chair a short time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair presumes the chairman of the committee will concede that. The gentleman from Illinois raises the point that in this paragraph the word "seismology," in harmony with the ruling a while ago, ought to go out.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing that that should go out.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that would carry the entire paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois to make the point of order against the word "seismology," on page 6, line 18?

Mr. FOWLER. I have not done that yet.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "seismology" may be stricken out.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to yield the floor.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I thought the gentleman just wanted to get that word out.

Mr. FOWLER. No. Mr. Chairman, there are other features in this paragraph than that of seismology that are objectionable, and I desire to point some of them out. The distinguished chairman of this committee is always frank and generous. I know he never makes a mistake unless it is purely a mistake, and does not intentionally at any time, I believe, try to deceive this House. I could not pay a higher tribute to any other man in the House than he is deserving of, but as he has well said, he is not the Committee on Agriculture, but only a member of it and its chairman, and he stands like other chairmen of committees. He is dependent upon the information which he receives from the Secretary and chiefs of bureaus and those who may be connected with important parts of the work. Mr. Chairman, there is one feature of this paragraph that to my way of thinking is absolutely horrible, and that is the lump-sum appropriation of $591,000. This appropriation is made for an alibi. There is not a single man in this bill for which any of this money is to be appropriated. If he were charged with an offense and wanted to interpose a plea of alibi, he could successfully maintain his position and be acquitted. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice for a goodly number of years to appropriate lump sums. In 1900 the lump sum was something like $380,000, but since that time we have seen it almost double itself, and there ought to be a change made some time, so that

Congress would know for what purpose the appropriations are being made. There is a statute providing that this force of laborers, skilled laborers, or professional men, as the case may be, can not be paid above $3,500. There is a provision in this bill to extend that to $4,500.

Mr. LEVER. It is $4,000 at the present time, and the provision is to extend it to $4,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the chairman of the committee that the law now is $4,000, but I had understood it to be $3,500; I may be mistaken. There is a provision in this bill proposing to raise that limit to $4,500. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a list of 465 employees whose salaries are fixed solely by the chiefs, or by the Chief of the Weather Bureau, which I desire to extend in the RECORD.

*Weather Bureau employees on miscellaneous roll of "General expenses, Weather Bureau, station salaries."*

Professors of meteorology ($3,500): H. J. Cox, H. C. Frankenfield, A. J. Henry, A. G. McAdie, C. F. Marvin. Total (5), $17,500.

Professor of meteorological physics ($3,500): W. J. Humphreys. Total (1), $3,500.

Professors of meteorology ($3,000): C. Abbe, H. L. Heiskell (on furlough until further orders), J. Warren Smith (on furlough until further orders). Total (3), $9,000.

Professors of meteorology ($2,500): O. L. Fassig, H. H. Kimball, F. J. Walz, W. M. Wilson. Total (4), $10,000.

Junior professors of meteorology ($2,400): W. R. Blair, C. F. Talman. Total (2), $4,800.

District forecaster ($3,000): E. H. Bowie. Total (1), $3,000.

Inspectors ($3,000): N. B. Conger (on furlough until further orders), H. B. Hersey (on furlough until further orders). Total (2), $6,000.

Climatologist and chief of division ($2,500): P. C. Day. Total (1), $2,500.

District forecasters ($2,400): E. A. Beals, F. H. Brandenburg, I. M. Cline, D. Cuthbertson, M. W. Hayes, J. H. Scarr, J. W. Smith. Total (7), $16,860.

Local forecaster ($2,400): W. G. Burns. Total (1), $2,400.

Local forecasters ($2,000): W. H. Alexander, F. A. Carpenter, P. Connor, W. C. Devereaux, E. H. Emery, H. Pennywitt, G. T. Todd. Total (7), $14,000.

Section directors ($2,000): G. S. Bliss, B. Bunnemeyer, A. J. Mitchell, T. G. Purssell, C. F. Schneider, C. F. von Herrmann. Total (6), $12,000.

Local forecasters ($1,800): A. Ashenberger, L. H. Daingerfield, L. M. Fee, S. C. Emery, H. O. Geren, W. S. Palmer, C. D. Reed, J. M. Sherier, J. H. Spencer, C. M. Strong, L. M. Tarr, J. R. Weeks, L. A. Weish, G. H. Wilson. Total (14), $25,200.

Section directors ($1,800): H. F. Alciatore, V. H. Church, E. A. Evans, R. Nunn, G. A. Loveland, G. N. Salisbury, P. H. Smyth, W. B. Stockman, A. H. Thiessen, R. F. Young. Total (10), $18,000.

Local forecasters ($1,600): H. F. Alps, J. H. Armington, W. S. Belden, M. E. Blystone, H. B. Boyer, A. Brand, A. Buell, L. C. Cover, W. S. Currier, E. R. Demain, C. J. Doherty, L. J. Guthrie, J. K. Hooper, F. P. Jones, W. W. Neifert, E. S. Nichols, E. H. Nimmo, G. H. Noyes, J. N. Ryker, M. R. Sanford, J. H. Scott, C. Stewart, W. P. Stewart, R. H. Sullivan, C. D. C. Thompson, J. F. Voorhees, G. B. Wurtz. Total (16), $25,200.

Section directors ($1,600): W. E. Barron, L. A. Denson, S. W. Glenn, R. G. Grant, F. E. Hartwell, H. C. Howe, T. B. Jennings, R. E. Pollock (on furlough until further orders), G. Reeder, O. W. Roberts, J. F. Shuster, E. L. Wells. Total (12), $19,200.

Local forecasters ($1,400): O. O. Atte, A. H. Bell, W. E. Bonnett, T. I. Bridges, W. R. Cade, J. L. Cline, E. D. Coberly, F. H. Coleman, J. W. Cronk, W. L. Day, T. F. Drake, W. M. Dudley, E. D. Emigh, M. L. Fuller, R. W. Gray, R. M. Hardinge, J. S. Hazen, F. Jermin, B. C. Kadel, J. M. Kirk, D. S. Landis, G. S. Lindgren, R. T. Lindley, P. McDonough, G. W. McDowall, E. R. Miller, W. A. Mitchell, J. F. Newsom, L. M. Pindell, W. F. Reed, jr., H. W. Richardson, D. A. Seeley, W. A. Shaw, M. B. Summers, N. R. Taylor, E. C. Vose, B. L. Waldron, G. N. Wilson, C. S. Wood. Total (39), $62,400.

Local forecasters ($1,200): W. J. Bennett, A. G. Burns, E. C. Horton, L. G. Sutton, E. C. Thompson. Total (5), $6,000.

Section directors ($1,400): R. R. Briggs, H. S. Cole, C. E. Linney, C. J. Root. Total (4), $5,600.

Observers ($1,400): G. J. O'Connor. Total (1), $1,400.

Observers ($1,200): J. C. Alter, R. L. Anderson, J. D. Blagden, T. A. Blair, F. W. Brist, A. L. Brockway, W. S. Brotzman, J. W. Byram, C. C. Callin, H. G. Carter, H. T. Collman, M. Connell, F. W. Conrad, H. B. Cowdrick, J. Craig, A. W. Crosby, N. M. Cunningham, T. F. Davis, W. Davis, F. L. Disterdick, C. A. Donnel, R. A. Dyke, C. H. Eshleman, W. H. Fallon, G. W. Felger, C. E. Faulhaber, L. C. Fisher, J. Fitzgerald, S. D. Flora, W. D. Fuller, C. C. Garrett, F. Gillam, E. B. Gittings, jr., F. Z. Gosewisch, W. R. Gregg, G. K. Greening, jr., J. Grover, D. C. Grunow (on furlough for a longer period than three months), O. M. Hadley, E. H. Haines, W. B. Hare, G. Hass-Hagen, J. E. Hutchison, V. E. Jakl, H. A. Jones, L. A. Judkins, J. L. Kendall, H. E. Kichline, J. H. Kimball, G. W. Lady, N. D. Lane, W. T. Lathrop, G. E. Lawton, J. G. Linsley, L. Lodholz, D. P. McCallum, A. F. Magrum, H. A. Marks, G. W. Mindling, C. L. Mitchell, R. C. Mize, D. R. Morris, S. L. Mosby, D. C. Murphy, C. E. Norquest, H. R. Patrick, S. P. Peterson, J. C. Piercy, R. P. Powell, A. W. Pugh, W. J. Reed, W. W. Reed, C. H. Richardson, M. V. Robins, H. H. Roche, E. E. Row, G. V. Sager, J. W. Schaeffer, W. B. Schlomer, W. H. Scholl, B. J. Sherry, R. W. Smith, H. H. Spindler, M. Sprague, M. B. Stubbs, T. R. Taylor, W. W. Thomas, A. R. Thorson, H. Tullsen, J. L. Vanderpool, J. I. Wehmeyer, A. Wiesner, J. R. Williams, H. M. Wills. Total (94), $112,800.

Section director ($1,000): G. M. Chappel. Total (1), $1,000.

Observers ($1,000): W. Bailey, H. McP. Baldwin, W. Bell, T. J. Considine, H. B. Dick, R. L. Fisher, H. A. Frise, W. H. Green, G. E. Grimes, S. Hackett, H. P. Hardin, H. K. Holcomb, M. R. Hovde, J. J. Kelliher, C. W. Ling, E. W. McGann, W. U. Simons, R. M. Williamson, M. Wright. Total (19), $19,000.

Assistant observers ($1,000): H. J. Andree, E. C. Band, jr., J. Bily, jr., D. Blake, L. W. Blanchard, W. R. Bormann, E. T. Burns, L. W. Carroll, R. E. Clark, W. F. Clark, F. T. Cole, M. S. Collom, F. S. Cushing, A. J. Davis, R. H. Dean, C. Dill, L. Dorman, S. L. Dosher, M. W. Dow, J. A. Dusseault, M. C. Faulk, E. L. Felton, D. Fisher, J. S. Garrason, E. J. Glass, C. C. Grant, H. C. Gross, C. Hallenbeck, H. G. Harp, J. C. Hayden, C. E. Heckathorn, P. Hess, M. S. Howard, H. M. Howell, H. E. Hyre, J. H. Jaqua, H. N. Johnson, W. Johnstone, J. Jones, A. A. Justice, E. E. Lanning, E. G. Larson, B. R. Laskowski, O. T. Lay, H. Legler, O. L. Lewis, D. M. Lillie, J. E. Lockwood, H. W. McKenzie, F. E. McLeary, F. A. Math, H. H. Martin, W. D. Maxwell, K. Meeker, G. C. Merchant, H. C. Metcalf, E. M. Minehart, O. E. Merry, M. T. Nesmith, J. J. O'Donnell, E. J. Olsen, E. Peterman, G. W. Pitman, T. R. Reed, M. A. Rice, O. R. Rogers, J. E. Sanders, A. H. Scott, R. M. Shaver, A. W. Shilling, T. G. Shipman, J. B. Sloan, O. D. Stewart, A. R. Teeple, R. W. Thomas, W. H. Tracy, G. E. Turner, H. E. Vail, O. Whitman, B. B. Whittier, J. B. Wilson, C. A. Woodworth, W. L. Wyland, E. E. Yeager (on furlough for a longer period than 3 months). Total (84), $84,000.

Assistant observers ($900): F. H. Ackelow, F. H. Ahearn, C. G. Andrus, C. D. Asher, W. Atkins, R. A. Barrie, F. J. Bavendick, C. A. Bell, H. C. Berger, G. J. Brands, T. R. Brooks, E. A. Brown, L. M. Camnfield, A. A. Catterall, T. J. Chancellor, L. T. Chapel, E. G. Conner, M. E. Conway, S. R. Creider, L. L. Criswell, C. I. Dague, J. Daily, C. R. Davenport, W. P. Day, S. Deitch, R. M. Dole, G. W. Eddey, A. F. Farkhauser, W. F. Feldwisch, R. H. Finch, T. D. Firestone, J. C. Fisher, jr., E. H. Fletcher, G. D. Frost, T. Gibson, J. H. Gordon, C. E. Hadley, L. Hagen, W. C. Haines, C. C. Hamme, O. H. Hammonds, I. F. Hand, P. R. Hathaway, D. B. Hayes, H. M. Hickman, H. D. Helby, H. E. Hever, P. R. Hill, C. T. Hilmers, E. W. Holcombe, W. H. Hossler, H. B. Hovde, P. E. Johnson, E. H. Jones, T. J. Jordan, J. F. Jungermann, L. H. Junken, A. G. J. Kautz, H. B. Lake, A. S. Lane, C. S. Ling, F. Long, W. McDonald, P. G. McGinnis, M. M. Maguire, W. Mahaffy, M. F. Marsh, E. E. Meadley, F. I. Moses, R. L. Murdoch, L. A. Murphy, W. A. Oates, C. B. Odenweller, O. Parker, W. H. Parker, H. L. Pugh, J. W. Raplee, L. Raplee, T. E. Reed, W. G. Riley, K. C. Rupert, A. D. Sanial, W. J. Schnurbusch, S. S. Schworm, L. E. Scott, R. E. Seaton, J. C. Smith, J. H. Smith, G. M. Sullivan, W. J. Summerville, W. W. Talbott, V. B. Tallman, F. J. Thomas, E. H. Thompson, E. E. Unger, H. F. Wahlgren, J. F. Warren, R. C. West, G. C. Westervelt, A. E. White, C. E. Wilson, H. R. Wright, F. D. Young. Total (103), $92,700.

Local forecasters ($1,000): H. C. Bate, W. T. Blythe. Total (2), $2,000.

Local forecaster ($900): S. S. Bassler. Total (1), $900.

Assistant observer ($840): G. E. Matthew. Total (1), $840.

Observer ($600): E. S. Wiest. Total (1), $600.

Student assistants ($500): J. M. Hazen, W. M. Kenealy, P. H. Miner, J. Pennywitt, R. M. Rightsell. Total (5), $1,500.

Expert in vessel reporting ($840): L. Rogers. Total (1), $840.

Unskilled laborer ($360): Bryan Byrd. Total (1), $360.

Congress has never had anything to do with fixing these salaries at all, except as to the maximum amount that can be paid, and here are these men, some receiving $3,500 a year and some of them $200 a year. Who fixes the amount that shall be paid? The Chief of the Weather Bureau. It was through this system, Mr. Chairman, that the late unfortunate Chief of the Weather Bureau, Willis L. Moore, wrecked himself, because by virtue of the power in the lump-sum appropriation he organized a system of men within the Weather Bureau to fight his campaign to be appointed Secretary of Agriculture, and he fell. I do not think this Congress ought ever to place in the hands of any man such a great power which might be abused and bring scandal and disgrace upon any great bureau of the Government. There ought to be some kind of exactness and certainty which will limit those who have charge of work in the expenditure of money.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the gentleman has said, but I desire to ask him if he has ever introduced a bill proposing to repeal the law that fixes this lump-sum appropriation, and whether he has followed that bill to the proper committee and asked that committee to report it?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have not; but I have stood on the floor of this House, even when I was in my swaddling clothes as a Member, and I have interposed objections for the purpose of getting regularity, a system whereby political graft could not show its miserable visage anywhere. Mr. Chairman, not only do we have a vast sum of money, aggregating more than half a million dollars, at the disposal of one man for the purpose of employing professional help in the Weather Bureau, but we find that a portion of this money is being used for the purpose of educating other men's children. That may be right. I may not have enough knowledge of the situation to fathom the deep and wonderful recesses of education, but I do have some well-defined ideas about that. I believe that the best education that any man ever received is that which is prosecuted by his own will and his own determination and paid for from his own earnings. However, I am not against furnishing young men bountifully in procuring an education. Here is a young man over here at Pittsburgh, named Pennywith, who is being educated at Cornell University out of this lump sum, and here are four more——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is before the House?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. The gentleman can not stop a gentleman by a parliamentary inquiry. He must make some point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, the Chair thinks, without doubt.

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is not discussing the question under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order. The point of order is well taken, and the gentleman will please confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg the pardon of the Chair, because I thought I was giving reasons why I should impose this point of order which I think ought to be known to this House, but if the Chair rules it is not proper then I will conform to the ruling of the Chair most gracefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not want to indicate what line of argument the gentleman shall pursue, but only requests him to confine himself in his argument to the point of order since that question has been raised.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman make the point of order against the language——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, unless there can be some agreement somewhere about this lump sum which has been the cause of so much scandal in the Weather Bureau I will have to make the point of order against the whole paragraph. I do, Mr. Chairman, make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order is well taken and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 6, by inserting after line 14 the following:

"For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, evaporation, and aerology, $1,189,000, including not to exceed $591,000 for salaries, $120,000 for special observations and reports, $275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and $30,000 for traveling expenses."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I think the amendment is subject to a point of order because it carries with it, as I understand, some new material which has not heretofore been in the law. Is that true?

Mr. LEVER. That is not true if I know myself.

Mr. FOWLER. Has it carried "evaporation" heretofore?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I do not care for it at all.

Mr. LEVER. The bill last year provided for investigations in climatology and evaporation, including the erection of temporary buildings, and so forth. I will say to my friend that I looked the matter over as carefully as I looked over anything in my life, and this is nothing but a continuation of these very items in the present law, with the exception of the word "seismology."

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation for the purpose of obtaining some information. I should like to inquire whether under the phraseology, "for special observation and reports," included in the pending paragraph the Weather Bureau would be authorized to make seismological investigations and observations?

Mr. LEVER. No; the Comptroller of the Currency has held during the last year, 1913, that under this language, which is a repetition of the old language, the Weather Bureau would have no right to make seismological investigations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall anything in the language of last year's act which contained the phrase, "for special observations and reports." If there is no limitation on that phraseology, it is certainly vesting in the executive head of this bureau a very wide discretion. He could branch off and go into any line of activity he sees fit, providing it is observations.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to call my friend's attention to this, that in the old act there were a number of observations provided for in these words, "and other observations, warnings, and reports, and for the pay of special observers," and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that found?

Mr. LEVER. In the old language.

Mr. STAFFORD. What paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I do not have the old bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have last year's act before me, and I have glanced over it and I do not find the phraseology that the gentleman is now reading.

Mr. LEVER. It is on page 3, about the seventh paragraph from the top, where it says:

For observers, for rivers, rain, snow, ice, crops, evaporation, aerial, storm, hurricane, and other observations, warnings, and reports, and for pay of special observers and display men.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is a good enough lawyer to know——

Mr. LEVER. I will say the gentleman is not a lawyer.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). To know that the Comptroller of the Currency in construing that phraseology in last year's act would hold observations to be of such a kindred character to the generally stated purposes mentioned in the paragraph.

In the provision now before the House there is no limitation whatsoever. You provide for "special observations and reports, $120,000." I respectfully contend that if there be no limitation whatever the head of the Weather Bureau can branch out in all kinds of observations.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that I am not a lawyer, but I took a short course over here at Georgetown. However, I am lawyer enough to believe that no man construing this act would construe this language for special observations and reports to give him authority to go beyond the general scope provided for in the language creating the Weather Bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. But you are giving special authorizations for observations and providing $120,000 for that purpose without any limitation whatsoever. It only goes to emphasize that your so-called revised plan does not contain much segregation. In fact, it is going back to the old general omnibus authorization without any restrictions or qualifications.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. Is not that provision limited by the first appropriation that comes under the head of "General expenses, Weather Bureau," the first paragraph? It starts in "as follows," and then follows the appropriation. It provides for doing certain things that are enumerated, and then the appropriation follows. The appropriation is all limited to the scope of that work as enumerated.

Mr. LEVER. As fixed by the fundamental law regulating the bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not fixed by the fundamental law, but as fixed by the enumeration of those purposes indicated in the preceding paragraph. Of course, if it would bear that construction, I would have no objection to the phraseology. I have no objection, I will say to my friend across the aisle, to the Weather Bureau even making investigations in this seismology field.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will notice that, beginning with the paragraph beginning with "the Weather Bureau," it provides for carrying into effect, and so forth, and for doing certain things, the first paragraph carrying no appropriations, and ending up "as follows." Then comes the appropriation, all of which comes under the first paragraph, so far as the scope of authority is concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that explanation, Mr. Chairman, it being quite certain it would be limited to the purposes as carried in the preceding general statement, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph carries $275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning. The bill at the session of the Sixty-second Congress carried $306,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this affects the farmers of the country directly. Living far away from centers, in order that they may have a knowledge of the conditions of the weather, so that they may more scientifically govern themselves in the harvesting and management of their crops——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain that to the gentleman in a moment if he desires an explanation.

Mr. FOWLER. In a moment. I am exceedingly anxious, Mr. Chairman, that that work shall be carried on to the very fullest extent, because I do not think there is another department, if I should use that term here—I use it in a limited sense—in the entire Weather Bureau that brings to the country as great a service as the knowledge of the conditions of the weather when brought to the farms.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman's position, and if he will permit——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. In a moment, Mr. Chairman. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to extend this service further than it has already been extended. I know that an immense saving can be had to the farmer by virtue of supplying him with the necessary information regarding conditions of the weather. I think this appropriation ought to be increased. My section of the State is agricultural, and there we depend upon the warnings from Evansville and St. Louis, and if we can not get the proper appropriations for this purpose we are left to guess at the weather, as the old farmer used to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. LEVER. I wanted to make a statement, but I will make it in my own time.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have in mind that this appropriation ought to be increased to what it was a year ago, at

least, so that the farmers of the country can get the full benefit of the conditions of the weather. This bureau in that department was inaugurated many years ago by a very scientific man, who has spent many years in that bureau and given the best part of his life to it. It ought to be kept up. It ought to be extended, and we ought to have weekly and daily crop reports sent throughout the farming districts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by inserting certain information regarding the Weather Bureau, dealing with the question of a lump-sum appropriation and the uses made thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees, when necessary, $26,000.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, on page 7, insert the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved by the gentleman from South Carolina. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of that amendment is plain; but the fact is, for a good many years the disposition of the heads of departments has been in the direction of segregating the printing business of the Government. In the very recent past—in the last two to four years—the intention of the Congress has been in the other direction. We have a very elaborate Printing Office in Washington, maintained at enormous cost; we have all the facilities there necessary to do all the Government printing. We have the machinery; we have the material; we have light, heat, and organization, and it is under the immediate direction and supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. In just a moment, please. The purpose of that amendment is this: A new printing bill is about to come forth, and in that bill provision will be made for taking care of this printing for the department heads at the Government Printing Office, so far as possible.

The adoption of this amendment will give the Joint Committee on Printing, if the new bill becomes a law, the right to pass on questions of a bureau to print what it please for its department. The difficulty about that, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a separate printing office in each one of the departments, and, segregated as they are, they cost a good deal more money than if they were consolidated; and the reason for that is there is a waste of material, there is light and fuel and heat to be paid for, and many other items of expense in a great many printing offices that can be avoided if we had them all under one department.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman—and I hope the committee will see it in the same light—the amendment will in no way interfere with the good intentions of the bill, but I think the tendency is to turn back from the concentration policy and give the Weather Bureau a little more money than it has had in recent years. But I am not objecting to that. I think they give good reasons for it. But I do believe that the adoption of this amendment will enable us to provide in line with the present purpose of the Joint Committee on Printing, to curtail the printing expenses of the Government as much as possible, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Government Printing Office is to do the work that is done in the Weather Bureau? Have they the rapid rotary presses that are needed?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; they have all the necessary machinery to do this printing, and yet the Government Printing Office is not insisting on doing any printing—and neither will the new printing bill require the Government Printing Office to do any printing—that can be done more expeditiously and economically in any of the departments than it can be done under the supervision of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman understands this has reference to the printing of maps under the immediate supervision of the Weather Bureau, and that it can be done at less expense and better advantage in the bureau?

Mr. BARNHART. I know that is the contention of the bureau, Mr. Chairman, but I am not conceding that; neither am I prepared to dispute it. I have not the necessary information at hand to do that. But I do say that the adoption of the amendment will in no way interfere with the privilege of the bureau to do all the printing that is necessary for it to do, and yet it will reserve the right to the Joint Committee on Printing to decide between the Weather Bureau, and the Government Printing Office as to what printing can be done to best advantage by either.

Mr. HAUGEN. If it can be done just as well in the Government Printing Office, I think it should be done there. However, if it can be done better in the bureau, I would prefer that it should be done there. I think the amendment is so worded that it works no hardship on the bureau?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it does not work any hardship on the bureau.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The language of the amendment will not interfere with the necessary printing that is now being done or will be done hereafter in the bureau itself. It simply provides for such printing in the Government Printing Office as need not be done with special expedition?

Mr. BARNHART. That is all.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and accept the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], unless there is some objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the erection of a building at Neah Bay, Wash., to be constructed under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses connected with this work, $3,000

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves the right to object on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman whether it is customary for these new stations to be constructed out of general funds, at the discretion of the Chief of the Weather Bureau? Can the Secretary of Agriculture, without specifying the particular appropriation, build a station at a particular place?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Illinois that my recollection is that heretofore these appropriation bills from the Committee on Agriculture have carried authority for the construction of buildings of this kind. I recall that in the city of Columbia, in the district I have the honor to represent, the Weather Bureau did erect out of the general fund a building of this character. That was six or eight years ago.

But I see no objection to this. On the contrary, I think it would be well for the Department of Agriculture to let the House know, through the Committee on Agriculture, just when it does want to erect a building.

Mr. MANN. I take it, without knowing what district in Wisconsin this is——

Mr. STAFFORD. It is in the State of Washington, I can assure the gentleman, not in Wisconsin.

Mr. LEVER. It is really to rebuild the present station there. The recommendation before the committee is that the man who is in charge of the station at Neah Bay, Wash., is in charge of one of the termini of the cablegraph, and he has been living in a little shed there for a good many years, and his place has become absolutely uninhabitable, and they ask this to build decent quarters in which he can live.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to be erected. Is there not some appropriation from which they can erect it themselves, if they think proper? In other words, I do not think it is good policy for Congress to start in and indicate certain stations. I remember a few years ago the distinguished Committee on Agriculture either recommended particular stations or brought in an appropriation in which they indicated where the stations were to be erected, and at that time all the stations that were to be erected were to be erected in districts represented by the

distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture—which was very natural, because they knew better about the conditions in their own districts than they knew about the conditions in other districts. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Nobody on the committee represented that section, I will say to the gentleman, so that this is a patriotic investment to be made in the State of Washington.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the general principles.

Mr. LEVER. In the present law we carry general authority for the construction of buildings outside of the District of Columbia by the Weather Bureau, under the direction of the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

That is in the present law; but I take it in naming this station here the department desired to call attention to the fact that it was one of their special stations out in that wild, bleak country.

Mr. MANN. This is a station already located?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is a station already located, and this is really for the repair of a building.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand it correctly, there is a general fund out of which buildings can be erected at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I think there is no fund in this bill out of which he could do so; but, as I said to the gentleman from Illinois, I remember that about six or eight years ago the Secretary of Agriculture did erect, in my own district, in the city of Columbia, S. C., a building which cost $12,000; but I was not quite so well informed then as I am now, I hope, on the proposition. If the Secretary has any fund now out of which he can erect a building I do not know it. It has not been called to our attention.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I think the building to which the gentleman refers was erected out of a lump fund which was carried in the bill for that year, but there is no lump fund of that kind in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. I want to get exact information, if I can, from the committee, whether or not there is carried in this bill any appropriation out of which the Secretary of Agriculture can erect buildings in which the keepers of Weather Bureau stations throughout the country may live?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Texas very frankly that it is my belief that there is not a single dollar in this bill that can be used for that purpose, except as carried in this particular item to which we have called attention.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman realize the difficulty of a Member of Congress who has weather stations in his district, when a provision of this kind is carried in this bill, and in the future he may not be able, possibly, to get a similar appropriation for the housing of a man and his family in the district which he represents? Does not the gentleman realize that some good reason will have to be given for that?

Mr. LEVER. I will say, in answer to that, that the department is not going to locate observation stations in anyone's district unless it provides the funds with which to house the man who has charge of the station and his family, if he has one, and the instruments with which the observations are made.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman mean to say that in each one of these two hundred and odd stations that he speaks of there is a house provided by the Government to take care of the man in charge of the station——

Mr. LEVER. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. GARNER. Wait a moment. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is a house built?

Mr. LEVER. Either built or rented.

Mr. GARNER. There is a good deal of difference between a house built by the Government and one rented by the Government; and what I am trying to call the attention of the gentleman to is that by virtue of the carrying in this bill of the provision for this station, there will be a discrepancy between this station and others where they must rent houses, and there will be a continuous effort made by Members of Congress, doubtless, in response to requests from the men who are taking care of weather stations, to have the Government make a direct appropriation for the building of a house at each station to take care of the family of the weather observer.

Mr. LEVER. I think if my friend will take into consideration the fact that this is an existing station, and that it is far out on the coast of Washington, at an uninhabited place, he can very readily distinguish that case from the average Weather Bureau station.

Mr. GARNER. That makes a very different proposition, when the gentleman states that there is no house there to be rented for the occupancy of the gentleman in charge of that station.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the language of the hearing:

Mr. CALVERT. Neah Bay is the terminus of one of the Weather Bureau's telegraph lines, a point from which observations must be obtained. It is in a wild, uninhabited section of the country. For a number of years this operator has been occupying a building which was formerly a storehouse for an Indian post. It was repaired and put in some sort of order. It has got to a point now where it is unfit for human habitation, and we propose to put up a small habitable house to replace that structure. We must have a house there, because it is a telegraph terminal line and there are no houses in that section that can be rented.

Mr. GARNER. I am in perfect accord with the gentleman that he ought to carry this provision in this bill. What I am calling attention to is that if we once establish the policy of building a house at each one of these two hundred and odd stations throughout the United States, we must do it by wholesale, and not at retail, as indicated here. The explanation given by the gentleman that it is not possible to rent a building at this station, presents an entirely different case; but I believe that, as a general proposition, it is more economical for the Government to rent houses at the various stations throughout the United States rather than to build them. The Government is building $50,000 post offices where it can rent a building suitable for a post office for $10 a month. That is the reason I have undertaken to call this matter to the attention of the committee at this time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I wish to state that the Government owns but a few of the buildings; that the bureau has not constructed the buildings except where Congress authorized it. I wish also to state that a good deal of pressure has been brought to bear on the committee to authorize appropriations, but the committee has been going very slowly in that direction. I believe the last committee reported in favor of constructing four buildings, but it went out on a point of order.

Mr. GARNER. At this point it occurs to me, and I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking Member on the Republican side, would agree with me that if we undertook to establish the policy of building these houses to take care of the keepers of the weather stations they would need to go into this matter very thoroughly. If it is more economical, it ought to be done, but if it is not, I do not believe we ought to start by piecemeal, because of some pressure that is brought to bear on the committee to build some particular station.

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee has never authorized the building of any except where a very strong showing was made, and it has been left to the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This is an emergency; it is isolated, and there is nothing like it in any other section of the country.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman that this ought to be constructed, but in regard to leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, as mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa, it is like leaving the establishments of stations throughout the country to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The stations would be likely to be established where the strongest pressure is brought to bear. If a lump sum were appropriated for that purpose, the buildings would be built where the most pressure was brought to bear on the Secretary. I do not want to subject the Secretary of Agriculture to this tremendous pressure.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have no lump-sum appropriation in this bill for building these buildings.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas about bringing pressure to bear on the Secretary of Agriculture, in whom I have a great deal of confidence. Undoubtedly pressure is brought to bear on him, but it was discovered long ago that it was easier to work around and through the members of the committee than it was to work through the head of a department.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say that I have as high an admiration for both the outgoing and the present Secretary of Agriculture as any Member in this House.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. Apparently there would be no item in the bill out of which this building could be constructed except the $1,189,000 item for collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and so forth. I suppose that is intended to be used elsewhere. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I think it is fair, Mr. Chairman, to say that the Government erects no buildings except where there are certain local conditions that make it absolutely necessary.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Referring to the paragraph on page 6, I think the chairman stated that amount had been increased in order to provide for observations relating to seismology.

Mr. LEVER. No; my statement was that out of the total fund the Weather Bureau thought it could set aside a sufficient amount to begin the work, and that the cost of the seismological work would not be over $10,000. It would take them a year or more to organize the work.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In view of the fact that the committee has stricken out the word "seismology," would it not be well to provide for that amount of reduction?

Mr. LEVER. No; we do not think so, for the reason that this appropriation does not become available until July, and of course the department would have to reorganize the forces to handle the work.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell and dispose of in whole or in part, or lease in whole or in part, the tract of land consisting of 84.81 acres of land, more or less, known as Mount Weather, and located in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, in the State of Virginia, including all buildings thereon, and the sum accruing from such sale or lease, after deducting the cost of sale or lease, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. I would like to hear the chairman of the committee state the reason for this item in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in 1903, about 10 years ago, the then Chief of the Weather Bureau bought about 84 acres of land at a point called Mount Weather, out in Virginia, and erected what is known to us on the committee as the Mount Weather station. There was an investigation as to whether or not he had the authority to do that under the law, and my recollection, at least, is that it was held that he did have such authority. We have expended at Mount Weather the sum of $183,075.15. The work at Mount Weather is largely scientific, the exploration of the upper air by means of balloons and kites, to determine the solar radiation and what effect it has on atmospheric conditions, and the like of that.

Of course, that is purely a scientific proposition, with which I am not so familiar, and perhaps my explanation of it is not very lucid. It has been determined, under the reorganization of the Weather Bureau by its present chief, that this character of work can be done best in the West, in the pathway of the storms. They call attention to the fact that in sending their balloons up, sometimes as high as 20 miles, the drift of the wind frequently carries them out to the Atlantic Ocean and the records are lost, which results in a great deal of valuable information floating somewhere on the waves of the Atlantic Ocean.

They contend, also, that the atmospheric conditions at Mount Weather do not make for the best study of this problem.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Do they send balloons up, as the gentleman said, 20 miles?

Mr. LEVER. I am informed that that is the fact.

Mr. COOPER. More than 100,000 feet?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. They attach a little instrument to the balloon. Of course, the instrument is very sensitive, and it records the varying conditions of the upper air. Attached to the instrument is a notice that if anybody finds it, he will please return it to the Weather Bureau, and from this data they have been collecting there for 10 years they have been able to issue some remarkable scientific information. I presume it would not be fair to say that this half million dollars, in round numbers, had been wasted, because I do not believe that money expended along investigational lines is ever wasted. It may be we will never reach a conclusion from it, but the fact will remain that if we should happen to reach a conclusion that is of any value to civilization and humanity, it will be of so much value as will offset all that we have spent in a negative way in getting to the conclusion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any provision in this bill for a continuance of this work?

Mr. LEVER. There is no provision in this bill for a continuance of this work. As set out by the item, it is the purpose of the Department of Agriculture to establish in connection with the Signal Corps service at Omaha, Nebr., this same character of work, because Omaha happens to be in the path of the storms which sweep across from the west into the Central West and across the continent, and their plan is to have 15 or 20 outlying stations near Omaha for the purpose of developing not only what takes place within the center of the storm region, as the storm goes by, but what takes place on the outskirts of the storm also, and they inform us they need nothing at all in connection with this work except a few very cheap buildings that will house their instruments, balloons, and kites. Instead of having a great structure and four or five magnificent buildings, as they have at Mount Weather, we shall have only a few little sheds to house the instruments with which to do the work.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where is the authority for the construction of these buildings in Omaha and the vicinity?

Mr. LEVER. There is no authority, and I imagine the buildings will not cost $25 apiece.

Mr. ANDERSON. But they must have some authority to construct them, no matter what they cost.

Mr. LEVER. There is no definite authority in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they could take out $25 from this lump-sum appropriation, why could they not just as well take out $25,000?

Mr. LEVER. I may be entirely mistaken about that. The gentleman from Wisconsin, dealing as he does with a large appropriation bill, knows how hard it is to think of everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. But in the preparation of the Post Office appropriation bill we go to extremes in segregating the various items, because it was brought to the attention of the committee 10 years ago, when I first served on that committee, that appropriations under lump sums begot graft and peculation, and it was necessary to restrict the department officials as far as possible in the exercise of wide discretion in unlimited appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. On second thought I am sure that I am mistaken as to any fund here provided from which they can pay for the erection of any buildings, for here is a memorandum furnished me by the Chief of the Weather Bureau in which he says that it is not proposed to erect permanent buildings or establish any extensive plant, but to rent the necessary quarters and provide the simplest possible equipment that will make it possible to send up kites and balloons from this point at the central station. In other words, they are going to rent some buildings, and not build any.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I made the inquiry is because we have apparently blown in $400,000 in establishing a summer resort at Mount Weather, and there ought to be some limit upon the expenditure of a sum for the same purpose.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's inquiry was quite pertinent, and I am glad that he called my attention to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the gentleman has the floor I would like to direct one query to him. I take it from his exposition of this weather resort down here on the Potomac, or whatever it is, that the present Secretary of Agriculture or the present officials supervising the Weather Bureau deem it is no longer practicable or expedient to continue its operation.

Mr. LEVER. It is the intention of the service to use Mount Weather Station for a simple observatory station, keeping one man at a salary of about $1,000 annually.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is the confirmed opinion of the departmental officials and the conviction of the committee, as I take it, that there is no further use for this resort, then I ask the gentleman why has the gentleman provided in this paragraph an authorization to the department to lease it? Why not dispose of it outright; why should the department engage in a policy of leasing property for which it has no use and for which it will never have any use?

Mr. LEVER. The committee took that very proposition into consideration, and we felt that to direct the Secretary outright to sell this property would mean we would have to sacrifice it outright.

Mr. STAFFORD. In your phraseology the committee left it in the discretion of the Secretary to sell. There is no mandatory direction to sell at a sacrifice price, and it can not be construed he would be obliged to sell at a sacrifice.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman again I am not a lawyer, but the lawyers who are on the committee thought that a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without this proviso would mean that he would have to sell.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not direct him to sell. Your plain phraseology does not require that.

Mr. LEVER. We are trying to give the Secretary the power to try to get the most he can for the property.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; you are authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the leasing business, to continue holding this property for years under a lease system, if he so elects.

Mr. LEVER. If my friend will let me make a statement for about three minutes, I think I can clear it up in that length of time. We put this proviso in here for the purpose, as I said a moment ago, of giving the Secretary the right to sell or lease

at his discretion, but in the meantime we will spend $1,000 per annum at the station there. We are providing for only that much. There is a rumor going along, which seems to be pretty well confirmed, that a street railway is to be built from Bluemont, I believe it is, a terminus of a little railroad out of Washington, out to Mount Weather. If that is true, it may be a year or so before the railroad will be built; certainly that property will be much more valuable than it is now. This place is about 6 miles from a railroad, 1,800 feet up on a mountain. It is a beautiful spot which overlooks the Shenandoah Valley on one side and Loudoun on the other. Nobody will want this property, or at least want to give anything like its true value for it unless they have some means of communication. We think it would be better to give discretion for a year or two, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture upon this proposition. Referring to Mount Weather, he says:

> A committee of scientists from the bureau reported against the use of this property for aerial research in 1903, and within the past year other committees reported that solar radiation, upper-air research, and dynamic meteorology could better be carried on at other locations. For this reason the department has determined to discontinue the research work at this observatory and operate it simply for the taking of climatological records. This can be done by the man who will protect the property, at a total cost of about $1,000 a year. This will make available approximately $12,600, which can be expended to far greater advantage for scientific research.

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON. It struck me if this property, which has cost $480,000, will only bring about $13,000 rent a year, less than 3 per cent, we had better get rid of it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the Secretary of Agriculture now has no authority on earth to rent the property or to sell it. It is not rented at all, and probably will never be used for the purpose for which it was built; but it is our intention——

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Secretary apparently has no intention whatever of renting it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the Secretary, I take it, will follow the direction of Congress, and we are directing him here in this bill to rent or sell it, in his discretion.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman from South Carolina think of a proposition to permit an executive officer of the Government to sell 80 acres and more of Government land at any figure that may please him without first reporting the terms of sale to Congress? It may be worth $500,000. It is customary when public lands are to be sold to have them appraised and the executive officer instructed to sell, but not at a price less than the appraised value.

Mr. LEVER. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the language of this bill, would go through the ordinary procedure in the sale of public property. I take it he would have it advertised for sale and have it appraised, and the proceeds of it, as the gentleman will see, are to be turned into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous fund. If my friend will offer an amendment that a report shall be made to Congress, I will accept it.

Mr. GARNER. The point of order is still reserved against this paragraph.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit me to say one word?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think that Government real estate should be turned over to any executive officer to be disposed of in his discretion without any appraisal and without a minimum price fixed by law. We all know that the present Secretary of Agriculture is a man of the very highest integrity, but this is a government of laws and not of men; and in disposing of Government lands we ought always to remember that maxim. My judgment is that there ought to be a price fixed by this bill below which he can not sell, and that, in any event, such sale should be subject to confirmation by Congress before title can pass.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will prepare such an amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. GARNER. I had two objects in reserving a point of order against this proviso—first, to bring out the thought that has already been suggested, that this extravagant expenditure of money was made without the Committee on Agriculture apparently knowing anything about it. And I want to draw the committee's attention to the fact that this bill ought to be guarded in the future so that no Secretary of Agriculture or Chief of the Weather Bureau or any other chief can make an extravagant expenditure of money of this character without Congress knowing something about it. [Applause.] And in this connection I want to call the gentleman's attention to one remark he made a while ago, that possibly the Secretary of Agriculture now had authority under this bill to erect buildings in Omaha or somewhere else, although they might not cost more than $25. If there is such authority in here I hope the gentleman will point it out to the committee, in order that we may have an opportunity to discuss the matter and see if it should not be stricken out of this bill. Because if you can expend $25 for the purpose of erecting buildings at Omaha or any other place you can expend $25,000 or $250,000 if carried in this bill. Evidently these buildings were erected at these summer resorts without Congress knowing anything about it, or else it would not have been done, and I believe that this committee ought to so guard these appropriations that these palaces and these winter or summer resorts can not be built unless they first come and submit their estimates to the judgment of the Congress.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The buildings at this Mount Weather station were built out of a lump-sum appropriation. It was not carried in this bill, and probably never will be carried in the bill as long as the present chairman presides over this committee and as long as the membership is as it is now. But from year to year, where the stations were not designated specifically, like the one stated in this bill, a lump-sum appropriation was made, and it left it to the Chief of the Weather Bureau or the Secretary of Agriculture to locate those buildings and erect those buildings, one building at a time, in addition to the building at Mount Weather, until the present plant was erected.

Mr. GARNER. I understand this was a near public scandal. In fact, it is as much subject to criticism as any one act of its size that you can think of within the last 10 years.

Now, may I ask the chairman another question? If I understand the law applying to public lands, the lands used by the Agricultural Department, the War Department, or other departments of the Government, there is absolutely no necessity for this legislation. I understand the law to be that when any public property, occupied or used by any department of the Government, is no longer necessary for the use of the Government, a mere Executive order carries that property into the public domain and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell it under the general laws that now exist on the statute books. If I am in error on that I would like to know it, but if that is the rule there is no necessity for the proposition in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. As I have suggested so many times, I am not a lawyer; but this matter was urged on us by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I take it, of course, that the proposition had been submitted to the solicitor of the department, who is a very able lawyer, I understand. But even if the gentleman's contention is correct, it would do no harm to leave the provision in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Well, I think some harm could be done. Why is it necessary to have two departments of the Government authorized to sell the public domain?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. In just a moment. For instance, there are a number of military posts in this country that are being abandoned, and constantly Executive orders are being issued carrying them into military reserves.

Mr. MANN. There is a special law on that subject.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that there is a special law on that subject. But what I am trying to ascertain is whether there is a statute authorizing the President of the United States to issue an Executive order carrying into the public domain any public property that is no longer needed for the purposes for which it was formerly used?

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe, so far as my information goes, that the departments are without any authority to dispose of public land, unless there are special statutes authorizing it, as in the case of abandoned Army posts.

But, again, I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he suggests that if this is to go into the national domain, it might be sold for the small figure of $1.25 an acre, and I do not suppose the gentleman will favor such a reckless policy as that.

Mr. GARNER. No. I suppose the gentleman from Wisconsin will not undertake to try to create the impression that the present able Secretary of the Interior, under the rules governing the sale of the public domain, which permit him to sell it in as large or as small lots as he may desire, would sell it,

even if he desired to, at such a low figure as the gentleman names.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the general law he could do that.

Mr. GARNER. He would not have the right to enter upon that, but the Secretary would have the right to sell it in such quantities as he might see proper, and if he did that, he would do it at public auction.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman is in error as to the law.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the two propositions are entirely different. I do not take it that in the general sense of the use of the words "public domain" this property would be included, but I want to call my friend's attention to this fact: Assuming that there is such a law as that to which he refers, and the President does have authority by Executive order to sell this land, does not the gentleman think that it is a rather unwise policy and is it not a rather unwise thing to ask the President of the United States to issue an order about a proposition concerning which he can not know very much, and is it not far better that these people should act under the authority of law and by the direction of Congress?

Mr. GARNER. I will say to my friend from South Carolina that the President could secure just as much information upon this subject as the committee could regarding this property.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he thinks the President could order the Capitol Building sold?

Mr. GARNER. I hardly think so.

Mr. MANN. Why not, on the gentleman's statement?

Mr. GARNER. I say if it is no longer used he might.

Mr. MANN. Well, the President might determine that it was no longer used.

Mr. GARNER. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he thinks the President has the right to convey back into the public domain any property of the United States that is now used by some department of the country and is no longer necessary for such use?

Mr. MANN. Clearly he does not have that authority. As to military reserves, there is a special law providing that they shall be covered into the public domain and sold in a particular manner, as set forth in the law, and the difficulties surrounding such a transaction are so great that whenever we have one we pass a special law throwing it into the general method of entering the public domain.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that scientific investigation is profitable, even though the results may not be immediate. Gentlemen here without much knowledge of the subject have idly referred to this as "a summer resort" or "a winter resort." I was over in Atlantic City last Sunday, and read in the New York Sun, when it came in the morning, that it was going to be a fair day. I do not know where they got their information. This purported to be a weather report. I was out walking with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and we walked for 6 miles in a bitter, biting snowstorm. Probably that was not the fault of the Weather Bureau.

The truth is no one has yet learned and is able to tell the principles that guide the weather, and yet we know that nothing happens in nature except under law. The weather is guided by law. These people in the Weather Service some years ago attempted to obtain information of the upper currents of air, in the hope that in course of time they might learn more in regard to the principles which govern the movement of air upon the earth's surface. They have not learned a great deal, probably, in the way of principles, although they have learned a great deal in the way of facts. It was a surprise, undoubtedly, to nearly everyone in the House to hear the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] say that they have been sending up balloons for a distance of 20 miles. I say that if any Member of the House who is not acquainted with the facts had been asked if it were possible to send up a balloon 20 miles in the air he would have said it was not possible.

They have learned a great deal concerning air currents. They do not desire to abandon the work, but having experimented here, where they can compare one experiment with another, the department now wants to move the experiments off to some distant point, where comparisons will be of no value. I do not agree with that. It is the tendency of new officers to say that the work of their predecessors was valueless. Why, these men in the Weather Service may be gone to-morrow. They will, at any rate, soon be gone, and the next crop that comes in may think that these experiments ought to be carried on here, where they were before.

While it is immaterial to me whether they keep on with these experiments, I think they ought to keep the ground and the buildings—buildings which have cost a great sum of money and which can not be replaced without a great expense if they should ever be used. Of no value to sell, they can not be sold for any price to speak of. Having been constructed for this particular class of work in the main, they had better keep them, at least for a few years, before they dispose of them. And the chances are that the present officials in the Department of Agriculture in the course of a little longer time will themselves reach the conclusion that when they know so little about predicting the future of the weather, as they proved last Sunday, they will want to get additional information about the upper currents of the air in the hope that they may be able to make their predictions more accurate and for a longer time in the future.

I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I am trying to find the appropriation from which they have made the expenditure for the conduct of that work. Is it the gentleman's purpose to ask that we continue the work out there; and if so——

Mr. MANN. I think that has been paid out of the lump-sum appropriation, which is here $1,189,000.

Mr. LEVER. It has been costing $25,000 a year, approximately, to do that.

Mr. MANN. I should imagine that they will do what the Secretary has indicated was his intention, to maintain some one there to do ordinary work in the way of observation and take care of the property. There is no loss about it.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that is correct.

Mr. HAUGEN. The statement of the Secretary is that it will cost about $25,000 to maintain these buildings, and then the average cost of maintaining an ordinary office.

Mr. MANN. They say they want somebody to make observations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that the House met at 11 o'clock this morning, and we can not go very far with the Bureau of Animal Industry to-night.

Mr. GARNER. Let us read down through page 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for the Weather Bureau, $1,668,270.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In reply to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said with reference to the weather in Atlantic City on Sunday, I think he was misled by the weather forecasts published in the New York Sun. I believe the officials of the Weather Bureau claim that the bureau foretold the coming of this blizzard or storm, and thereby saved the shipping of the country something like $10,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Yes; they said that after the storm had passed by.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I do not wish the gentleman to claim that the New York Sun is more reliable than the officials of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. MANN. The Sun got its information from the Weather Bureau.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman undertake to tell the House that the Weather Bureau as now constituted is totally inefficient?

Mr. MANN. I do not.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman undertake to say it is any more inefficient than it was two years ago?

Mr. MANN. I do not.

Mr. GARNER. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. I undertake to say that no one has yet learned enough to forecast the weather accurately on every occasion.

Mr. GARNER. To that statement I think everyone agrees.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the Weather Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 editor and compiler, $2,250; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, $1,680; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,380 each; 3 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,300; 1 clerk, $1,260; 39 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,100; 1 clerk, $1,080; 50 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $960 each; 64 clerks, at $900 each; 1 architect, $2,000; 1 architect, $900; 1 illustrator, $1,400; 1 laboratory helper, $1,020; 2 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 1 laboratory helper, $600; 1 laboratory helper, $480; 1 instrument maker, $1,200; 1 carpenter, $1,100; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,000; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 33 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 3 skilled laborers, at $720 each; 9 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at $840 each; 10 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at $720 each; 2 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at $660 each; 11 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $600 each; 3 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $540 each; 32 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; 6

laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 watchman, $720; 1 charwoman, $600; 1 charwoman, $540; 11 charwomen, at $480 each; 4 charwomen, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $300; 2 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $347,030.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4167. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2725. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School on Sallisaw Creek, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1618. An act granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2226. An act for the relief of Joel J. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, for 10 days, on account of important business.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think that at this stage of the session it is necessary to have the House meet every morning at 11 o'clock and interfere with all the committee meetings of the House?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Agriculture has a number of very pressing matters that it desires to take up for consideration.

Mr. MANN. How will that committee be able to do it when the next committee that has charge of an appropriation bill will want us to meet at 11 o'clock in the morning, and the point of no quorum is raised, and the Committee on Agriculture are called over to the House in the midst of their committee meeting?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois has been here long enough to know how that can be done.

Mr. MANN. I know it can not. When the House meets at 11 o'clock there is not much chance for committees to work. A few committees like the Committee on Agriculture have the authority to sit during the sessions of the House, but a point of no quorum is often made, and if no one is here it ought to be made.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object? I would like very much to go along to-morrow because of the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MANN. To-morrow is Saturday; what time will the gentleman agree to adjourn if we come in at 11 o'clock?

Mr. LEVER. Not later than this time.

Mr. MANN. That is no concession.

Mr. LEVER. I will concede half an hour, then.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman say half past 4? I think we had better meet at the regular hour and thus give the committees a chance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file views against the bill with reference to exempting vessels in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file their views on the bill repealing free tolls of the Panama Canal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 7, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1922) to repeal that part of the act entitled, "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 343), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11246) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 344), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River, near Welden Springs Landing, Mo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 345), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14181) granting a pension to Jennie Adel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14088) granting a pension to Eliza F. Greenwood; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1032) granting a pension to Frank Sanford Stirling; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 14282) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, and the act of May 11, 1912, as amended by the act of March 4, 1913, to the officers and enlisted men who served in the Eighteenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14283) for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Lawrence, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 14284) amending paragraph 81 of the act creating a Public Utilities Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14285) providing for the improvement of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14286) to provide for the examination and survey of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14287) requiring double postage on certain mail matter forwarded on which sufficient postage is not prepaid; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14288) relating to contracts for the erection or alteration of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 434) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring the establishment and maintenance of vocational training schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the New York State Legislature, relative to immigration of insane aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14289) granting a pension to Mattie Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 14290) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14291) granting a pension to John Iverson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 14292) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Bucey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14293) granting an increase of pension to George Cleckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 14294) granting a pension to Mary A. Ruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14295) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14296) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 14297) granting pensions to Agnes Mann and Mary Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 14298) for the relief of Katie O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14299) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 14300) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 14301) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fishback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 14302) to reimburse Saunders Lewis, jr., for expenses of the office of clerk of the circuit court of appeals for the third circuit; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 14303) for the relief of the estate of John V. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 14304) granting an increase of pension to Melville Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14305) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14306) for the relief of C. W. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14307) granting a pension to Winnie May Barlow, Annie Alice Barlow, and Niles Brunette Barlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) granting a pension to Serena C. Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 14309) for the relief of Thomas J. Craycroft; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14310) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14311) granting a pension to Henrietta Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14312) granting an increase of pension to Joshua M. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14313) granting a pension to Edward L. Herriman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to R. Roy Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14315) granting an increase of pension to William H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14316) granting an increase of pension to William Muer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 14317) granting a pension to Catherine Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 14318) for the relief of Patrick J. Purcell; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petitions of various members of the Christian Endeavor of the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, and the United Brethren Sunday School, all of Decatur, Ind., and the Adams County (Ind.) Civic League and sundry citizens of the State, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Albert Sidney Johnston Chapter, Ohio Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to naming of forts along the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of various Methodist and Episcopal clergymen of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition signed by members of Local No. 911, Farmers' Union, of Sabetha, Kans., in favor of House bill 10076, to prevent stock-exchange gambling in farm products, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mrs. George E. Blakely and 14 other ladies, of Doylestown, Ohio, in favor of the Sheppard-Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Monrovia, Cal., protesting against the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Camden Mannerchor and sundry citizens of Camden, citizens of Swedesboro, Woodbury German Society, and sundry citizens of Woodbury, all of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Oxford, Wis., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of 383 members of the Baptist Sunday School of Phoenixville, Pa., and the Concord Quarterly Meeting of Friends, at Media, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the National Bank of Coatesville, Pa., and of the Farmers and Mechanics' Trust Co., of West Chester, Pa., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, relative to protection of white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Boston Stove and Rail Division of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 13305, referring to stipulated price of certain merchandise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of 100 citizens of Stockton, Cal., and of 20 citizens of Oakley, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 17 union-labor organizations of California, favoring the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of Unity Post, No. 171, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, opposing the proposed monthly payment of pensions by coupons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Cooks and Waiters' Union, No. 561, of Sacramento, Cal., opposing House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 watchman, $720; 1 charwoman, $600; 1 charwoman, $540; 11 charwomen, at $480 each; 4 charwomen, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $300; 2 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $347,030.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4167. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2725. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School on Sallisaw Creek, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1618. An act granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2226. An act for the relief of Joel J. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, for 10 days, on account of important business.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think that at this stage of the session it is necessary to have the House meet every morning at 11 o'clock and interfere with all the committee meetings of the House?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Agriculture has a number of very pressing matters that it desires to take up for consideration.

Mr. MANN. How will that committee be able to do it when the next committee that has charge of an appropriation bill will want us to meet at 11 o'clock in the morning, and the point of no quorum is raised, and the Committee on Agriculture are called over to the House in the midst of their committee meeting?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois has been here long enough to know how that can be done.

Mr. MANN. I know it can not. When the House meets at 11 o'clock there is not much chance for committees to work. A few committees like the Committee on Agriculture have the authority to sit during the sessions of the House, but a point of no quorum is often made, and if no one is here it ought to be made.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object? I would like very much to go along to-morrow because of the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MANN. To-morrow is Saturday; what time will the gentleman agree to adjourn if we come in at 11 o'clock?

Mr. LEVER. Not later than this time.

Mr. MANN. That is no concession.

Mr. LEVER. I will concede half an hour, then.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman say half past 4? I think we had better meet at the regular hour and thus give the committees a chance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file views against the bill with reference to exempting vessels in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file their views on the bill repealing free tolls of the Panama Canal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 7, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1922) to repeal that part of the act entitled, "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 343), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11246) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 344), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River, near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 345), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14181) granting a pension to Jennie Adel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14088) granting a pension to Eliza F. Greenwood; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1032) granting a pension to Frank Sanford Stirling; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 14282) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, and the act of May 11, 1912, as amended by the act of March 4, 1913, to the officers and enlisted men who served in the Eighteenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14283) for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Lawrence, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 14284) amending paragraph 81 of the act creating a Public Utilities Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14285) providing for the improvement of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14286) to provide for the examination and survey of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14287) requiring double postage on certain mail matter forwarded on which sufficient postage is not prepaid; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14288) relating to contracts for the erection or alteration of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 434) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring the establishment and maintenance of vocational training schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the New York State Legislature, relative to immigration of insane aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14289) granting a pension to Mattie Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 14290) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14291) granting a pension to John Iverson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 14292) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Bucey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14293) granting an increase of pension to George Cleckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 14294) granting a pension to Mary A. Ruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14295) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14296) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 14297) granting pensions to Agnes Mann and Mary Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 14298) for the relief of Katie O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14299) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 14300) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 14301) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fishback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 14302) to reimburse Saunders Lewis, jr., for expenses of the office of clerk of the circuit court of appeals for the third circuit; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 14303) for the relief of the estate of John V. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 14304) granting an increase of pension to Melville Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14305) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14306) for the relief of C. W. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14307) granting a pension to Winnie May Barlow, Annie Alice Barlow, and Niles Brunette Barlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) granting a pension to Serena C. Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 14309) for the relief of Thomas J. Craygroft; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14310) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14311) granting a pension to Henrietta Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14312) granting an increase of pension to Joshua M. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14313) granting a pension to Edward L. Herriman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to R. Roy Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14315) granting an increase of pension to William H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14316) granting an increase of pension to William Muer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 14317) granting a pension to Catherine Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 14318) for the relief of Patrick J. Purcell; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petitions of various members of the Christian Endeavor of the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, and the United Brethren Sunday School, all of Decatur, Ind., and the Adams County (Ind.) Civic League and sundry citizens of the State, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Albert Sidney Johnston Chapter, Ohio Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to naming of forts along the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of various Methodist and Episcopal clergymen of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition signed by members of Local No. 911, Farmers' Union, of Sabetha, Kans., in favor of House bill 10076, to prevent stock-exchange gambling in farm products, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mrs. George E. Blakely and 14 other ladies, of Doylestown, Ohio, in favor of the Sheppard-Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Monrovia, Cal., protesting against the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Camden Mannerchor and sundry citizens of Camden, citizens of Swedesboro, Woodbury German Society, and sundry citizens of Woodbury, all of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Oxford, Wis., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of 383 members of the Baptist Sunday School of Phoenixville, Pa., and the Concord Quarterly Meeting of Friends, at Media, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the National Bank of Coatesville, Pa., and of the Farmers and Mechanics' Trust Co., of West Chester, Pa., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, relative to protection of white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Boston Stove and Rail Division of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 13305, referring to stipulated price of certain merchandise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of 100 citizens of Stockton, Cal., and of 20 citizens of Oakley, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 17 union-labor organizations of California, favoring the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of Unity Post, No. 171, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, opposing the proposed monthly payment of pensions by coupons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Cooks and Waiters' Union, No. 561, of Sacramento, Cal., opposing House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Moving Picture Operators' Union of Sacramento, Cal., opposing House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, relative to protection for white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the Fred N. Rix Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of William E. Hearn and other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of sundry citizens of La Crosse County, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Pastors' Union and pastors and ministers of the Protestant churches of La Crosse, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Commodore Barry Branch, No. 331, Continental League of America, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York State, favoring remedial legislation in the form of pension bills now before Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Swedish Hundred Men's Society, of New York, favoring a bill for the erection of a memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Cook County, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Anthony Wayne Branch, American Continental League, against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the First United Presbyterian Church of Brockton, Mass., against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to changing compensatory time clause for Sunday work by postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of the Burnett immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., suggesting the last Monday in October be set apart as national Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petitions of 46 citizens of Madelia, Minn., protesting against national prohibition, and 88 citizens of Worthington, Minn., protesting against Columbus Day as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Affidavits to accompany House bill 10168, relative to a claim of Leon Greenbaum, of New York City; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against barring The Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Stanwood, Wash., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of various officers of the Bartenders' Local No. 454, of the third congressional district of the State of Washington, and of sundry citizens of the third congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of John A. Beekcoll, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Waiters' Union, Local No. 20, favoring the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against increasing the postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of various voters of the State of Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of E. Determann; Harry Loewenthal; A. C. Blinn; Samuel L. Orr; Edward Miller, jr.; William Hinspeter; Boswell Torian; J. L. Knauss; Harvey O. Herndon; and R. A. Brennan, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of citizens of St. Cloud, Elk River, and Akeley, all in the State of Minnesota, protesting against joint resolutions 168, 88, and 50 relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut (Inc.), protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3631, providing for the appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut (Inc.), protesting against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise commerce from tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, opposing any change in the Sunday closing law as regards post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the local branch of the Civil Service Employees of South Norwalk, Conn., favoring passage of the Hamill bill relative to pensions for civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill relative to pensions for civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn., urging legislation relative to cotton futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Manila Merchants' Association, of Manila, P. I., favoring the legislation for including the Philippines in the 2-cent postal convention between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various voters of the State of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of various voters of the first congressional district of Nebraska, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, favoring bureau for bill drafting and reference; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, favoring House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of J. F. Behrend, of San Francisco, Cal., and 31 other citizens and voters of the city of San Francisco, Cal., against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of E. Dillstrom, Peter Kiefer, and Louis H. Rovey, citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles Mannhardt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House bill 11898, known as the "Mothers' pension bill"; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring New York City for Army-Navy football game; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, of New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 13044, for pensions for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the General Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 21, United Spanish War Veterans, of Brooklyn, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for pensions for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Michael James Burke, member of the New York Mailers' Union, No. 6, favoring the Bartlett-Bacon bill to exempt labor unions from the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of the Kathryn Fellows Auxiliary, No. 28, Department of New York, Auxiliary to the United Spanish War Veterans; and the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring House bill 13044, relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of various voters of the thirty-sixth congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cayuga County, favoring prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petitions of the Champlain (Vt.) Aerie, No. 793, Fraternal Order of Eagles, and D. M. Jones, of Williamstown, Vt., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring the passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut, protesting against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal bill for free tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of House bill 3631, relative to appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 100 citizens of Kentucky, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the city council of Chicago, favoring passage of House bill 5139, providing for retirement with pension of civil-service employees after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the National Jewelers' Board of Trade, protesting against amending the Sherman Act and favoring amending the national stamping act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William A. Reichert, of Henderson, Ky., relative to increase in appropriation for reclaiming swamp lands, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions to be inserted in contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring investigation of Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of eight business firms of Rieidfield, Idaho, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Memorial of various voters of the fifth congressional district of Wisconsin and Coopers' Union No. 30, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of J. S. Wambach, W. H. Diemert, and other citizens of Moorehead, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Affidavits to accompany a bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to R. Roy Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Petitions of sundry Jewish citizens of the United States, relative to ritual murder in Kief, Russia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturers and Business Men's Association, favoring changes in the Federal reserve bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Tampa, Fla., favoring passage of House bill 8199, for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the American National Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring a rigid examination of the Postal Department of the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association and the New Bedford Ministerial Union, all of New Bedford, Mass., protesting against any change in law relative to Sunday work for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of Russell French, Herbert A. Terry, Jay Dudley, Charles Geis, A. I. Kappes, F. E. Durant, and 206 other citizens of Zanesville, Ohio, and of Maurice Hartman and 35 other citizens of Duncan Falls, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and churches of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of M. J. Pfeifer and other citizens of Wyandot and Morrow Counties, Ohio, against House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Berlin Grange, No. 629, of Delaware, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### SATURDAY, *March 7, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our heavenly Father, for the degree of civilization we have attained, especially for the ideal civilization for which we are continually striving; for whatever attainments we have reached as individuals, and for the ideal manhood which is just beyond for which we all long in our better moments; but, above all, for that spirit which is ever leading us toward the higher life in Christ Jesus, illustrated in the life and language of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### HYGIENE OF PAINTERS' TRADE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 389 (H. Rept. 347).

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to have printed 16,000 copies of House Document No. 1477, Sixty-second Congress, third session, entitled "Hygiene of the Painters' Trade."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, ETC.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present also the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 11 (H. Rept. 346).

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 357, volumes 1 and 2, Sixty-first Congress, and Senate Document No. 1063, Sixty-second Congress, being a compilation of the treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols, and agreements between the United States of America and other powers from 1776 to 1913; and that the superintendent of documents is hereby authorized to order reprinted such copies of the foregoing documents as may be required for sale by his office in accordance with law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice that this resolution provides for the printing of 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate. That is a document which is very frequently referred to. Of course this is to bring it down to date?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that while we are printing these 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate it would be entirely appropriate to print copies for the use of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Otherwise the House would purchase the copies from the Senate and the Senate would get theirs free.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, that is not an uncommon course of procedure.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It should be.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember ever when we have done it before, unless it was particularly a Senate document.

Mr. PAYNE. The first document, I understand, was only for the use of the Senate. I know that I had a great struggle to get hold of a copy.

Mr. MANN. We have printed at least two editions of conventions and treaties. Of course the purpose of reprinting the document at this time is to bring it down to date. A Member of the House consulting a volume of this kind ought to have it down to date. It is not quite so important for us, perhaps, as it is for the Senate, and yet the extra cost of printing while the plates are on the press will not be very great. Has the gentleman any objection to printing copies for the use of the House?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Printing took that into consideration, but inasmuch as there had been no demand, either formally or otherwise, for this document the Committee on Printing did not feel it was within its province to amend the resolution and probably print something for which there was no demand. The chairman of the committee is ready, however, to accept an amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I had demands for it. In fact I had to give away the copy that I had obtained for myself, because of insistent demands.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution, if the gentleman will yield the floor for that purpose——

Mr. BARNHART. I yield.

Mr. MANN. By inserting the words "and 1,500 copies for the use of the House."

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to accept that amendment. Does the gentleman think 1,500 copies are enough?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 3, after the word "thousand," insert: "And for the use of the House, 1,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, if it is not too late, I do not believe 1,500 copies will answer the demand that will be made. This is a very important book, and there is not a law library in any Member's district that will not ask for a copy of it. I think while we are printing them we may as well double the number, and I move to amend the amendment by striking out the words "one thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three thousand."

Mr. BARNHART. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the words "one thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three thousand."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2876. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2876. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. BOWDLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent. Within the past few days there has appeared in one of the leading journals of the country an excellent appraisal of the most illustrious living Democrat, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, by the most illustrious living Republican, Mr. Taft. I ask unanimous consent that this appraisal be printed in the RECORD. I do this with more than ordinary pleasure, because until very lately the distinguished Republican named was a resident of my own district.

Mr. MANN. That is not an illustrated article?

Mr. BOWDLE. No.

The SPEAKER. From what journal?

Mr. BOWDLE. The article appeared recently in one of the leading journals of the country, the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANN. I would not object; the President needs it pretty badly now. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARNHART. I am not going to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWDLE] asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by President Taft, published in the Philadelphia Evening Post, eulogizing President Wilson. Is there objection?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask unanimous consent to print an editorial by Mr. Hearst on the President. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to printing them all. We can not print all the editorials written about the President, both favorable and critical, in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. To what does the gentleman object, the Hearst editorial or both of them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will object to both, so as to show no partiality.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects to both.

### PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker asks unanimous consent to address the House for a few minutes, not perhaps to exceed 10. [Applause.]

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. As a basis for these remarks I will, without objection, direct the Clerk to read the article marked.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

"RING" RULES, HE SAYS—ZUEBLIN WANTS A COMMISSION TO GOVERN UNITED STATES—CALLS THE HOUSE UNWIELDY"—SOCIOLOGIST, LECTURING UNDER SUFFRAGE AUSPICES, INTIMATES PRESENT FORM OF GOVERNMENT OBSOLETE—GROWS SARCASTIC ABOUT SOUTHERN CHIVALRY—SPEAKS AT ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL'S.

Application of commission and manager forms of government to States and even of the Nation was advocated last night by Charles Zueblin, former professor of sociology at the University of Chicago. His address on "Man and Woman" was delivered before a gathering of 100 men and women at the residence of Dr. and Mrs. Alexander Graham Bell, under the auspices of the Congressional Union. In the audience were many women prominent in social circles.

"The House of Representatives," he said, "is too unwieldy to accomplish anything, and will never grow less so. The situation is such that any majority member must go to Representative UNDERWOOD or Speaker CLARK to find out what he himself thinks.

MUST SIMPLIFY, HE DECLARES.

"You who live under the shadow of this thing have got to know more about its workings," he continued. "All who believe in the right of either men or women to vote should recognize their obligation to look into it. The system must be simplified."

As an instance of control by the minority Dr. Zueblin cited the vote in the House on the report of the Mulhall investigation, asserting that the Speaker announced the number voting for a roll call was 23, whereas 50 men, he said, have signed a statement that they rose to their feet. "I am not blaming all this on the Speaker," said Mr. Zueblin. "He is only one of the ring up there.

"We should have a twentieth century Government, based on twentieth century conditions, not a fabric created by Alexander Hamilton."

RAPS SOUTHERN "CHIVALRY."

Chivalry, Mr. Zueblin described as "a circumlocution to gratify masculine egotism," whatever may be the ideas of large southern statesmen. "Women of the South," he declared, "have had a difficult time getting ordinary civic improvements from the men who prate to them of chivalry."

The SPEAKER. In what I shall say about this matter I propose to use parliamentary language. [Laughter.] Unparliamentary words never yet added force to any statement. I am now serving my twentieth year in the House, and never yet rose to a question of personal privilege and would not do so now if it were simply a personal question involved, but the words of Prof. Zueblin, of Winchester, Mass., as reported in the Washington Post, go far beyond that. I have been lied about so much that I have grown used to it. His words are not only a foul and malicious slander on me, but involve the integrity of the proceed-

lngs of the House—a much more important matter—as well as the courage, intelligence, patriotism, vigilance, and fidelity of at least 165 Members, for that many were here in the Hall by actual count. This is too serious a thing to permit to go unchallenged, for some people believe everything they see in the newspapers. What this man wanted his hearers to believe, though he did not say so in so many words, is this: That on the demand by Mr. MACDONALD, of Michigan, for the yeas and nays, on the motion of Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, to refer the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, 50 Members rose in the affirmative and that I reported only 23, and that 165 Members sat here dumb and made no protest against my action. It is absolutely unthinkable that any Speaker would do such a brazen, outrageous, and corrupt thing, and it is equally incredible if any Speaker should be so unworthy of his high responsibility as to do such a thing that 165 Members should be so forgetful of their duty to themselves, their constituents, their country, and the cause of representative government as to sit mute and motionless. All any Member had to do to expose such a performance on my part, if there had been any such performance, was either to raise the point of no quorum, which would have been well taken, because there were only 165 Members present, while it takes 218 to constitute a quorum, or any Member could have demanded tellers. Now, here is what happened on the point involved.

The committee, of which Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee was chairman, to investigate these Mulhall charges brought a report in and it was read. They made no recommendation. They did not think, under the resolution which authorized that inquiry, that they had authority to do it; neither do I. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] made a minority report, and wound up by offering two resolutions. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] moved to refer his resolutions to the Committee on the Judiciary, and after a good deal of wrangling about parliamentary points one way and the other the gentleman from Tennessee moved the previous question; and on a division there were 129 ayes and 36 noes. Nobody raised the point of no quorum. Any Member could have done so, and thereby forced a roll call. Nobody asked for tellers. Then the yeas and nays were demanded on the previous question. There were 22 ayes and 129 noes. On the previous vote it took 33 to order the yeas and nays. Nobody raised the point of no quorum on that; nobody asked for tellers. On the first vote the noes were 36, and on this other vote it had fallen off to 22. Everybody who has been here much knows that men frequently vote against a thing, but they are not willing to waste time to have the yeas and nays, and will not vote for the yeas and nays when opposition is hopeless. Now, they had two chances to test my count on that and two chances on the other. That is, when the motion to refer was voted on the ayes were 133 and the noes were 34. I had declared that vote before the gentleman from Michigan rose, but nevertheless and notwithstanding I recognized him, in spite of the fact that the point of order was made against it; and then he got 23 votes. There were two opportunities to demand the yeas and nays and two opportunities to demand tellers, and the truth is that if the Chair had not helped the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] out at least twice that day, and stretched the rules, because he was a congressional freshman and was not supposed to know much about them, he would not have gotten in at all on divisions.

Here is what happened:

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks for a division. Those in favor of referring these resolutions, and so forth, to the Committee on the Judiciary will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-three gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-four gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this question the ayes are 133 and the noes are 34.

He could have made a point of no quorum, if he had wanted to do so. I will quote further:

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.
SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late!
Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the gentleman demanded the yeas and nays in time.
THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] demands the yeas and nays.

So the Speaker ruled in his favor. Technically, the rule barred him out. Further:

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACDONALD] demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-three gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative—not a sufficient number—and the resolutions, and so forth, are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

It was too late on that vote. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moved to adjourn, which motion was agreed to. Now, there are a good many men who have been here a long time, and they could tell instantly whether 50 men were standing up or whether 23 were standing up. They would not have to count. They might not know there were exactly 50, but they would know that there were more than 23.

The custom of the Chair is, if there is a very large vote on each side, to count by fives, and in the shuffling around that takes place in the House, if there is anything like a full vote, it would not be anything strange if he was out of plumb 5 or 6, or even 10, votes. But when a few gentlemen stand up and try to get the yeas and nays, or do anything else which they have a right to do, the Chair counts with the greatest accuracy possible.

This man declares that he is in favor of a commission form of government. Evidently what he is trying to do, and men like him, is to bring into disrepute and disrespect every man of prominence under this system of Government, and to make the country believe that all of the officers of the Government and men in Congress are a lot of crooks. I thought it was my duty to bring this matter up in order to give him a contradiction, not so much because it affects me as that it brings the representative system of government into disrepute; and when you think of the number of people who swallow everything that they hear or read that is bad about a public man—it does not make any difference whether he is a Democrat or a Republican or a Progressive—it is a matter of grave concern whether we shall let such slanders go on uncontradicted.

I have been nominated twice unanimously for minority leader and twice unanimously, in a Democratic caucus, for Speaker, a record no other man living or dead ever had. I have been elected Speaker of this House twice by the unanimous vote of the Democrats and with the personal good will of every Republican and Progressive in the House. [Applause.] Facts of which I am naturally proud. I am willing to put those facts over against any mountebank slanderer roaming around over the land. [Applause.] He says there is some sort of a ring up here. I would like to see it. Now, if there was a wrong committed when the aforementioned proceeding was had, I will tell you some of the men it would take in. It would take in myself as Speaker; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the very able majority leader; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the distinguished Republican leader; and the enthusiastic leader of the Progressives, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], because he was here consenting.

If there is any ring up here, I do not know. This man says a Democrat can not vote unless he comes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or myself and asks how to vote. Each one of us has entered on his twentieth year here. It would be a strange and unfortunate thing if the Speaker of the House and the majority leader, after being here for going on 20 years, would not have some influence in the House. Why, once in a long while somebody will come along and say, "How ought I to vote on this question?" And sometimes I know and sometimes I do not. If I know, I tell him what I think; and if I do not know, I tell him that I do not know, for I have not studied it. I have not consulted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] about it, but I have no doubt he acts in the same way, and that the gentleman from Illinois acts in the same way, as well as the gentleman from Kansas. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], or any other of the old Members here, or even some of the new Members, may know more than some others. Sometimes the new ones do. Anyhow, they have the courage of inexperience. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the Speaker has said, and since I was the proponent of the resolution at that time, I think perhaps I ought to say that neither at the time nor after the vote was taken, or at any other time, have I ever said or believed that there was any question in the count on the demand for the roll call. I heard it questioned at that time, and stated my opinion, and have stated it since, to the effect that I had no doubt the count was correct. [Applause.] And I stated so at the very time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], when we discussed the matter after leaving the floor following the adjournment.

I think that is all I need to say in regard to my connection with this matter at present, but I would like to say that there are some criticisms of a general nature in regard to this whole transaction that I expect to take opportunity to make when the matter comes up properly in the House again, but nothing concerning anything in regard to the count or this action of the Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I remember the incident very well. It is not an uncommon habit for many Members of the House to count those who are standing upon a standing vote, especially when there is not a large number and the count is easily made. I counted those who rose in favor of asking for a roll call on that day, and I know a number of other gentlemen who counted, including some of the gentlemen who rose, who have told me that they made the count at the time, and that their count agreed with the count of the Speaker, as mine did. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Speaker, it would be an error which ought not to be permitted to go forth for the people to believe that the Speaker has the power to defraud the House by a wrong count. If there had been 50 gentlemen who rose at that time, it would have been an easy matter to have asked for tellers on that proposition, and thus take the count out of the hands of the Speaker and place it in the hands of two gentlemen representing each side of the proposition. We frequently resort to tellers, not because we doubt the count of the Speaker or of the Chair, but because we wish to have gentlemen pass between the tellers so everyone can see them, and give those who do not happen to be in the Hall when the first vote was taken on a division an opportunity of voting.

It is undoubtedly true that many persons throughout the country believe that at least in some of the State legislatures the speaker exercises the gavel to do what they call "gaveling things through" regardless of the vote. I have served in this House now for quite a number of years, and I never yet have seen any Speaker attempt to override the House by the exercise of autocratic power in refusing a fair count or a fair vote. In many places, especially in conventions outside or congresses outside of legislative bodies, people take advantage of certain situations to declare that the demand for a division or the demand for a roll call comes too late. That is seldom exercised in the House of Representatives. Here the Speaker attempts to preserve the rights of every Member to have an actual count of the real vote, and no Speaker would be permitted to remain as Speaker 48 hours who attempted to defraud the House of its right to a square vote upon a proposition. [Applause.]

I have had many political contests with the Speaker, many battles over political propositions, over economic suggestions, over bills pending before the House, but on this, his sixty-fourth birthday, I am proud—— [At this point there was, first, general applause, and then all the Members of the House rose and cheered.] I am proud to be able to say that no man has the right to question his honor, to doubt his integrity, or to disbelieve in his fairness as Speaker. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be heard for a couple of minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a minute or two.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the pleasures of my life to be able to admit in this public place that I have served in this House with its present Speaker almost 18 years, and during all that time, while he has been criticized on our side for his partisanship, no man has ever doubted his integrity and his fairness. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I recall the incident you refer to. It is in my mind clearly, because of some criticism that has been made publicly of the count of the vote made that day. I sat at this corner of the Chamber, along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and two or three others. Before the vote was announced you demanded that those who were in favor of the yeas and nays should rise and stand until they were counted. We counted together, and did not make the count as large as the Speaker made it.

It is not necessary for anyone to offer any evidence of any kind to sustain the honor and the integrity of this Speaker, but inasmuch as the incident is fresh in my mind, and because I desire to see justice done a good man, I presume to offer this testimony. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in testifying that I was here on the day referred to; that I counted the men who rose in response to the request of the Speaker; and that there were only 23 men who rose in their places.

No man in the history of my experience has proved himself more worthy of the confidence of the men associated with him than has the distinguished man who presides over this body. [Applause.] He is always clean and honest and fair; and no man living could induce him to do a wrong thing. [Applause.]

If this man Zueblin has the names of 27 men who rose in their places, in addition to the 23 who actually did rise, I would like to know who they are and where they are. I do not believe he has them; but if he has, he ought to publish them for the information of the House and of the country, because I do not believe that any man who did not rise in his place has the right to say he did. Every man ought to have the courage of his convictions, and I believe every man here has. Every man here should be willing to go on record, and I feel sure that the membership of the House never hesitated to do so when the public interest demands it. I am proud to be able to certify to the truth of every word spoken by the Speaker of the House, and I am glad to know that every man here, regardless of political affiliations, believes in his integrity and has confidence in him, as the people of the Nation have and ought to have. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not ask for two minutes, but I will use the two. I do not know Zueblin, but I was intensely interested in the scene about which this controversy has arisen. My recollection is—and I do not claim to be letter perfect upon it—that Mr. MACDONALD, from Michigan, had offered two privileged resolutions; that against those resolutions the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made the point of order; that Mr. MACDONALD talked for five minutes; that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] then began a discussion on the point of order, did not continue it very long, and then made a motion to refer those resolutions to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am frank to confess that I did not believe at the time that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] had the right to the floor to make that motion. I believed that after the point of order was disposed of the floor reverted to the gentleman from Michigan. However, whether that be true or not, the vote came upon the proposition to refer those resolutions. I was very anxious for a roll call, and so far as I know the parliamentary rules of the House—and I do not know them exceptionally well—I would have exhausted every measure on earth to get a roll call. When the Speaker put the proposition of those in favor and those against I watched. I did not count, but my impression was that there were 23, 25, 26, or maybe 28 men on their feet. The RECORD shows that the Speaker counted 23, and there is no question in my mind at all that that is the exact number who arose. [Applause.]

I do not agree with everything that has been said here this morning, and I hope my two minutes have not gone. I do not think the count always has been square in this House. I have watched a former Speaker of this House, as virtually 100 Members here this morning have watched him in the old days, and he used to count this House by blocks, with the gavel in his left hand, swinging it this way. It is an absolute impossibility for a man to count in that fashion. He may make a very close estimate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Was that the case except on a division? Was not the Speaker to whom the gentleman refers always as careful and particular in counting those rising to obtain the yeas and nays as any other Speaker?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I will say I did not distinguish as to that. That may be true, but the gentleman will remember the famous gesture of the former Speaker in counting by blocks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Anyone who ever occupied the chair knows that the occupant of the chair never makes an attempt to count on an ordinary division with the particularity that is necessary in counting on a demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suppose that is true; but now——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am making this statement so that no injustice will be done to any Speaker, so that no one will have the slightest suspicion as to the integrity of the proceedings in this House under any Speaker.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have undoubtedly seen miscounts, even at the time the gentleman refers to. When the present Speaker came to the chair I was anxious to see if he would continue that practice. As a matter of fact, he did not. He did not continue the old practice of counting by blocks, even on the minor matters, but he has been very careful——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me complete this statement and then I will. He has been very careful on every occasion to count each individual Member. I think that is the way it should be done, and I honor him for it, and I think he counted correctly when

he counted 23 on that day. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman ever recall an instance in his service in this House where there was an incorrect count for the purpose of affecting or that did affect the actual results? I think that is a matter of high importance to this House. I have served here 11 years and I have never seen such an instance.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I do not now recall a specific instance. I will say to the gentleman that I saw one thing much more serious than that. I saw the inclusion of a man's name in a roll call when he was not present either in the Chamber or in the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did the gentleman call attention to it?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], I think, did on the following morning.

Mr. SHERLEY. Was it corrected?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I think it was corrected. My recollection is that it was.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, then, what is the gentleman's point?

Mr. MURDOCK. While I can not give the gentleman specific instances of a miscount, the gentleman will not stand here and say to me that in former Congresses there was always a square count.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have never——

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman say that?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say this: I do not believe there has ever been a miscount that affected the result.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order. I do not believe any good can come by continuing this joint debate.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to answer the question the gentleman is asking. I have never seen a decision in regard to a count made either by a Speaker of the House or a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that I thought was erroneous in the sense of affecting in any degree the result. Everybody knows——

Mr. MURDOCK. If there was, the remedy was in the Member, who could always call for tellers.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, of course. But what is more important is that there should not go out as the result of the remark of the gentleman from Kansas the inference that there has been unfairness in counts here. [Applause.] I have too much respect for my place and for the dignity of the House of Representatives to sit silent and allow even an inference of that kind.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I know; but that does not alter the proposition that there have been miscounts.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman ought to qualify a statement of that kind——

Mr. MURDOCK. I will qualify it by saying that if there is a miscount the remedy lies with the Member to call for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is so obsessed with the idea of trying to throw odium upon former Speaker Cannon that he is never at himself when he is discussing any subject relating to the former Speaker. If my friend from Kansas ever gets to occupy the chair, which seems unlikely [laughter], he will discover what everybody knows who has ever occupied the chair, that it is easier and safer to count 250 members in blocks than it is to endeavor to count them individually. Almost every chairman, in counting a large number of men, will count very much after the fashion that former Speaker Cannon used, although he may not use the same gesture. There is always a remedy for a miscount, if any should occur. No one pretends that any Speaker can count 250 Members standing on the floor and tell accurately whether there is 248 or 252. There is a remedy under the rule for a miscount, and there never was a miscount while Mr. Cannon was Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House, of the older Members, knows that I have never agreed in a partisan, political way with the previous Speakers. No one here questions the integrity and fairness of the present Speaker. I have served under Speaker Reed, Speaker Henderson, and Speaker Cannon, and I do not hesitate to say that I have not the slightest doubt of the absolute integrity of all three of these men in reference to the counting of votes. [Applause.]

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee arose last night there was a point of order pending to the paragraph on page 8.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved May 29, 1884, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1891, providing for the safe transport and humane treatment of export cattle from the United States to foreign countries, and for other purposes; the act approved August 30, 1890, providing for the importation of animals into the United States, and for other purposes; and the provisions of the act of May 9, 1902, extending the inspection of meats to process butter, and providing for the inspection of factories, marking of packages, etc.; and the provisions of the act approved February 2, 1903, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases of live stock, and for other purposes; and also the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts, to permit and regulate the movement of cattle and other live stock therefrom, and for other purposes: *Provided*, That hereafter all the provisions of the said act approved March 3, 1905, shall apply to any railroad company or other common carrier whose road or line forms any part of a route over which cattle or other live stock are transported in the course of shipment from any quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from the quarantined portion of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, into any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia; and for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to prevent cruelty to animals while in transit by railroad or other means of transportation"; and for carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products manufactured in the United States, and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals; and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and disseminate information concerning live-stock, dairy, and other animal products; to prepare and disseminate reports on animal industry; to employ and pay from the appropriation herein made as many persons in the city of Washington or elsewhere as he may deem necessary; to purchase in the open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture, which are sold in the United States, for the detection, prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals, to test the same, and to disseminate the results of said tests in such manner as he may deem best; to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I notice in reading the bill that you are carrying in this provision much the same phraseology as was carried last year, and which in that act was made permanent law. I want to direct my query as to the reason for carrying it in this bill when in last year's bill a considerable portion was made permanent law.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is absolutely no change in the phraseology of this paragraph relating to the Bureau of Animal Industry, except what may be found on page 10, lines 9 to 15. This is the language of the act of Congress which we passed last year permitting the inspection of virus and serums and the like of that. It has been the custom in the general-expense items to call attention briefly to the statutes without setting them out in full.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year's appropriation act was made permanent law by providing that hereafter, and so forth, and you incorporate the same phraseology in the bill this year.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly, that has been done ever since I have been connected with the Agriculture Committee, simply to call attention to the acts which are to be enforced. There is absolutely no change in the phraseology.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is all permanent law, but the purpose is to direct attention as a basis for the following appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the language on the top of page 11, "to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals." To what extent does the department indulge in that line of work?

Mr. LEVER. Only once in my experience of 10 years on the committee has the department undertaken to destroy and pay for condemned animals, and then they did it under a

special appropriation made by Congress at the recommendation of the committee, because of the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease six or eight years ago. But I will say to the gentleman they would have the authority in an emergency that was great enough, in order to prevent the spread of any contagious or infectious animal disease, to purchase stock and condemn it and pay for it, if they had the appropriation.

Mr. COX. Of what benefit or use or value are these animals? Why pay for them if they are diseased or have been exposed to disease?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that this language he is referring to is under a permanent statute enacted in another Congress. I think the theory is that in case of an outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease, for instance, in cattle, which might spread very rapidly and involve the property in the different States, it would not be fair to expect the unfortunate owner to lose the whole value of the cattle in which the foot-and-mouth disease occurred. I think in those cases the State paid half and the Federal Government paid half on an assessed three-quarters value of the animal.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman believe that it is fair for the people of the United States to pay any part for any animal that is afflicted with this disease that is incurable?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly I do.

Mr. COX. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Take the outbreak of dourine in horses.

Mr. COX. What is a horse afflicted with that disease worth?

Mr. LEVER. A horse with that disease is worth nothing for general purposes except for a certain length of time. He is valuable for six or eight years, but ultimately he becomes a worthless animal. He might be the means of spreading the disease from his State into other States. It was not thought right to take that horse, which might be useful for six or eight years, away from the man who owned him in Iowa to protect the people of South Carolina against the infected animal, kill the animal, and make the owner bear the whole burden entirely.

Mr. COX. I think he should bear the burden. I think it is wrong to tax the people for animals that are suffering with an incurable disease. I can not agree with that kind of legislation. I know that it is a permanent statute and the gentleman and the committee are not to blame.

Mr. LEVER. I can say emphatically that the department since I have been connected with the committee has never exercised the right except when it has come to Congress for specific appropriation.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know how much the department has expended for this purpose?

Mr. LEVER. I think the appropriation for the foot-and-mouth disease is half a million dollars.

Mr. COX. Five hundred thousand dollars paid out for the destruction of animals admittedly suffering with an incurable disease.

Mr. LEVER. But it might have been the means of infecting every animal in the country.

Mr. COX. Is there not a criminal statute that makes the owners of those animals liable if they sell them?

Mr. LEVER. There is a quarantine law against that; yes.

Mr. COX. And they are criminally liable if they violate it?

Mr. LEVER. I think so.

Mr. COX. Why not prosecute the fellow who would undertake to violate the statute?

Mr. LEVER. It is not a question of criminal prosecution, it is a question of equity; that is to say, must the individual bear the entire burden incident to the enforcement of a Federal statute for the protection of the entire public? I think not.

Mr. COX. I think it is a question of obeying the law and not compelling people to buy peace at public expense. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the item is subject to a point of order, anyway.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. It seems to me that an appropriation of money to destroy diseased animals is improper, and any provision that would appropriate money for paying the value of diseased animals is subject to a point of order unless the animals are destroyed for the purpose of preventing the spread of disease with which human beings may be affected. Under the general law, or under the law under which appropriations for this kind of work are made, it is expressly provided that no payment shall be made for animals destroyed unless they are destroyed to prevent human beings being infected with the disease from which animals are suffering. In the last Congress, to be specific, gentlemen representing near-by districts in the State of Virginia came before the committee and told its members of serious diseases affecting the cattle of their districts, cattle which furnished the milk supply for the city of Washington, and they stated that it had been found necessary to destroy some of those animals and wished an appropriation made to reimburse the owners of the animals so destroyed. The committee refused to make that appropriation because the law does not permit it, the law permitting appropriations only to pay the value of animals destroyed to prevent the spread of disease among human beings. It would seem to me that this provision, which heretofore has escaped my attention, would accomplish just what the Representatives from the State of Virginia wished to accomplish when they asked us to incorporate in the bill a year ago a provision to pay for cows in their district because they were affected with tuberculosis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate to the committee in what part of the bill those words are to be found?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Page 11, line 2:

To purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman contends there is no authorization in existing law for that appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is my impression, and I made the point of order with the idea of directing the attention of the committee to those words, having in mind that if they are permitted to become law it will permit the use of money in an improper way—in a way not justified by law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Animal Industry was established not only for the purpose of studying the diseases of animals, but for the prevention of the spread of the diseases of animals. Section 2 of the act of May 29, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry, contains the following language:

That the Commissioner of Agriculture is authorized to appoint two competent agents, who shall be practical stock raisers and experienced business men, to examine and report upon the best methods of treating, transporting, and caring for animals, and the means to be adopted for the suppression and extirpation of contagious pleuropneumonia, and to provide against the spread of other dangerous, contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases.

That section sets out also the salaries of these agents of the department. I think under that language—"and the means to be adopted for the suppression and extirpation of contagious pleuropneumonia, and to provide against the spread of other dangerous, contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases"—the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to employ such means for the prevention of the spread of these diseases as he may see fit to do. The Chair will notice that that language is as broad as English can make it, and it is only a question of finding means to carry out the intent of the law.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, have we ever carried such a provision in the bill before as that beginning on line 2, page 11?

Mr. LEVER. The provision has been carried in the bill for a number of years.

Mr. BOOHER. Permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and destroy cattle?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. There is absolutely no change in this.

Mr. BOOHER. Do I understand that the gentleman is in favor of that provision?

Mr. LEVER. I am, undoubtedly, and for the reason I suggested to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX]. Take the gentleman's own farm, for instance. The foot-and-mouth disease breaks out on his farm, we will say. It is a very dangerous disease, and it rapidly kills his stock. His stock is worth nothing to him after they are dead, but here are his neighbors' stock, and the gentleman's stock is liable to contaminate their stock. Here is the neighboring State of Kansas and my State of South Carolina. It is not quite fair that the gentleman who has been so unfortunate as to have his cattle contract this dangerous disease, which threatens the entire cattle industry of the country and in which every man in the country is interested, should bear the entire burden of the act of the law, which compels him to kill this stock to keep the disease from spreading.

Mr. BOOHER. But the gentleman does not take this into consideration. We can only do this to prevent the spread of the disease from one State to another. Is not that right?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; it is.

Mr. LEVER. I presume as a general legal proposition that is true, but they always have a cooperative arrangement with the State.

Mr. BOOHER. That is the trouble with the whole matter. They always have an arrangement by which they do certain things, but unless the animal is to be transported from one State to another and is liable to communicate disease to the animals of another State the department can not act, and the gentleman's argument is destroyed.

Now, take glanders, for instance. You have a provision in this bill for the first time concerning glanders, a disease of horses. I do not think there is a State in the Union but what has a law against the disease of glanders in horses. Take my own State. If a neighbor of mine has a horse that is thought to have the glanders and we can not agree upon it, we call the State veterinarian to come there and examine the stock. He examines it, and if the veterinarian determines that the animals are diseased and that others are exposed to it, he calls it to the attention of the county court, and they appoint three men whose duty it is to go to the farm and examine the stock and to bring a report back to the court, with an appraisement of the value of the stock. The animals are destroyed, and the State pays for it, just exactly what the State ought to do in this case, instead of putting the burden upon the people of the whole country. To prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia in your State you put a burden upon all the people instead of putting it upon the people of the State, where it properly belongs.

Mr. LEVER. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. BOOHER. Take the question of dourine, which we had up here before. There is no doubt but what it is a bad disease, and there is no doubt but what it is a disease that ought to be controlled. What are the States where this disease prevails doing to control it? Anything? Not a thing.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly they are doing a great deal.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Suppose a State is unable to cope with this disease, which is communicable. Does not the gentleman think the Federal Government ought to do something in order to prevent the spread of that disease to the other States?

Mr. BOOHER. If the gentleman has a law giving the control and defining the power and right of the Federal Government, not putting into the hand of some inspector to go out and tell what shall be done, it would be all right; but you have no regulation touching this at all, and under this provision they go into the State and inspect animals that are never intended to be exported from one State to another, and if found to be diseased purchase and destroy them. They are doing a thing within the jurisdiction of the State, and if they are to be destroyed because they have the disease in the State it ought to be a State law and a State regulation, and not at the expense of the General Government. Now, take the question of dourine in horses. There is no doubt, as I said before, but what it is a very dangerous disease; but what is the appropriation of $100,000 made the other day for and what was the argument? Why, that you wanted to examine the blood of those animals to ascertain whether the animal was diseased or not. There is not a State in this Union but what has a State chemist, who could examine the blood just as well at home and determine that fact, and not send an expert down there who does not know any more than they do.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. I will.

Mr. NORTON. In making that statement in reference to these for which an appropriation of $100,000 was made a few days ago, the gentleman is very much mistaken. There is no chemist in any State to make that investigation to determine whether that disease exists in the blood of the horse or not.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to say I will have to differ with the gentleman. There are States that have got chemists who can do it. If you have chemists in your own State, I have no doubt it is true of the gentleman's State. If they can not, you have not got any chemist at all.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. BOOHER. Why not let the State determine it? Then, after they have determined that the disease exists and they can not control it, then let them call upon the General Government for an appropriation, and not leave it to a bureau, just as this intends to leave it. Then you will know exactly what you are going to do and what you are going to spend. I will tell you where this thing sprang from and where it is going to, and you can see no end to it. You began with an appropriation for eradicating the cattle ticks in Texas. There is where the whole thing started from, and it is going on——

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend this provision was in the bill long, long before we appropriated anything for the cattle tick.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no——

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BOOHER. Let us see what this item says:

To purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another.

Now, the chairman of the committee argues that the Agricultural Department has got the right to go into a State and examine the animals and if they find they are suffering from this disease, they have the right to destroy them and the Government pay for them whether they are intended to be exported out of the State or not.

Mr. LEVER. In cooperation with the State.

Mr. BOOHER. When did a State ever appropriate a single dollar to cooperate with the Government in this kind of work?

Mr. LEVER. I will state to the gentleman that the States of the South are appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars to cooperate in the eradication of the cattle tick. My own legislature, at the request of farmers from all over the State, appropriated $30,000 to do that work.

I went before the legislature of the State, the joint assembly, during the last month and made a speech, and they appropriated $30,000 for that work.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LEVER. Massachusetts has appropriated several hundred thousand dollars, as I understand it—and I have it here somewhere—to help the Federal Government in the eradication of the gypsy moth and the brown-tailed moth. The State of Pennsylvania has appropriated a large sum of money, or did, to help in the fight against the chestnut-bark disease. A number of the States are doing exactly the same thing. I doubt if there is a State in this Union that is not, through its many and various agents, endeavoring to cooperate with the United States Government to stamp out these insects that infest animals and plants.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman should state for the information of the committee that the purchase and destruction of diseased animals is confined to the District of Columbia, and the department does not go into the States. We had a proposition before us where it was proposed that the department should go outside of the District, and the committee turned down the appropriation. Whatever money is spent in this way is confined to the District of Columbia and does not go into the States. The gentleman seems to hold that it is proper for the State to pay for the diseased animals. I would like to submit to the gentleman if Congress does not occupy the same position to the people of the District as the government of a State does to the people of the State, and that it is the duty of the Congress to protect animals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; that is right; but why does the United States pay for the diseased animal in the States of Virginia, Maryland, or Pennsylvania, say, if there is no intention to convey that animal outside of the State and thereby spread the disease?

Mr. HAUGEN. The answer is this, that the department is not doing that except as to foot-and-mouth disease. The authority is there, but the appropriation is not in the bill.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact that that disease is peculiar to the Western States among sheep? Is there a State out there that could ship its sheep out to the markets without having them first treated for the disease, and the owner of the sheep pay for the treatment? And is it not a fact that when they go to the markets of the East, at Chicago, St. Joseph, Kansas City, or Omaha before these sheep are put upon the market to be sold to the farmers as feeders, and before they go through the stockyard, they have to go through another treatment, and does not the man who purchases the sheep pay for it?

Mr. HAUGEN. That has reference to the dipping of the stock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] reserved the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. I also did the same thing a while ago, and I have not given up the floor.

Mr. LEVER. I call attention to the fact that the gentlemen are not discussing the point of order, and I would like to have the Chair rule on that proposition, and then, if the gentleman desires, he can offer an amendment to strike that matter out and then discuss the question.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been reserved.

Mr. LEVER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. Do I understand the Chair to say it is possible for a member of the committee to reserve a point of order and then speak beyond five minutes?

Mr. GARNER. All the gentleman from South Carolina has to do is to call for the point of order, and then they have either to make the point of order or withdraw it.

Mr. LEVER. I have always understood the practice to be, even in discussing the point of order, that you are confined to the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may be in error, but he is of the opinion that when a point of order is reserved he has no right to rap a Member down at the end of five minutes. The trouble in this case is that we are proceeding under a reservation of a point of order, and the remedy that occurs to the Chair would be for the Member in charge of the bill to demand the regular order if he wanted to shut off debate. But inasmuch as the Chair is informed that the practice has been to enforce the five-minute rule under those conditions, the Chair will do it.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] give me just a minute, and I will be through?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, it seems to me everything could be accomplished in that paragraph by striking out all except the quarantine provision, and permitting the Government to quarantine against a shipment of this diseased stock from one State to another, and striking out everything about the purchasing of it. Just give them the power to quarantine, and then it belongs to the people of the State to protect themselves.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] is right in that Congress ought not to make an appropriation for the purchase and destruction of animals affected by disease. As far as we ought to go is to establish a quarantine, and then, for their own protection, the people of the State can make provision for destroying animals and paying the owners for them. But on the point of order, I wish to insist, Mr. Chairman, that there is no law that will permit this appropriation. This Government has never undertaken to pay owners for animals destroyed on account of disease, has never done it, and attempts have been made to incorporate into this bill appropriations to enable the Government to make such payments, and they have always been refused, because there is no law to permit them.

The gentleman speaks of the situation in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. To what particular language does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] direct his point of order?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Against the latter part of the paragraph, at the top of page 11, particularly to the word "purchase," which seems to me to be the objectionable word.

Mr. LEVER. Now, let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact, in order to get his views on that, that the language was carried in the present current law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It may have been carried in the last bill, but I do not know that the word "purchase" was used there.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But if it appears in the current law it does not become permanent law, and it is proper for us now to make a point of order against continuing those words. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is true, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] states, that the States of the Union, realizing that they must take care of this matter themselves and not depend upon the Federal Government, have enacted laws and have made appropriations which are used for the purpose of reimbursing the owners of animals killed on account of disease. Almost every State in the Union has such a law. They have not depended upon the United States. But if we were to make an appropriation providing money to reimburse the owners for animals killed on account of disease, how long would the States make these appropriations? How much State money would be used? There would soon be an entire dependence upon the Government of the United States and upon the money that it furnished.

Mr. HAUGEN. What would the gentleman suggest in order to protect the people of the District of Columbia against the milk or meat from cattle infected with tuberculosis?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a law now which permits of the destruction of animals affected with disease when there is danger that that disease may be communicated to human beings. That is as far as that law goes. If it is thought best to have a law providing for the destruction of animals infected with disease, and providing payment to the owners, let that law be enacted, so that there may be a basis for an appropriation to carry it on.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the gentleman will agree with me that unless the appropriation is made the law is of no value whatever?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a law—I can not direct the gentleman's attention to it now, because I have not the books—but there is a law relating to the District of Columbia which permits the destruction of animals affected with disease to prevent the spread of that disease among human beings; and it seems to me it provides for the payment of the value of those animals to the owners out of the appropriations by the Federal Government. But there is no law, even as it relates to the District of Columbia, that will permit an appropriation to be made to pay for animals that are killed for any other purpose than to protect human life, even in the District of Columbia, and there is no law which will permit an appropriation, or any law upon which an appropriation may hang, for paying private owners for animals destroyed elsewhere in the country. If it has been incorporated in the law heretofore, it has been because of an oversight.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is no law upon which to hang it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the language of the fundamental act creating the Bureau of Animal Industry, which I read to the Chair a moment ago, and to which I desire to call his attention again—the language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to adopt such means for the suppression and extirpation of contagious pleuropneumonia, and to provide against the spread of other dangerous contagion and infection and communicable diseases—I want to call the attention of the Chair to section 2 of an act of Congress approved February 2, 1903, where this language occurs:

> That the Secretary of Agriculture shall have authority to make such regulations and to take such measures as he may deem proper to prevent the introduction or dissemination of the contagion of any contagious, infectious, or communicable disease of animals from a foreign country to the United States, or from one State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia to another, and to seize, quarantine, and dispose of any hay, straw, forage, or similar material, or any meats, hides, or other animal products—

And so on.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman claim that that language is broad enough to permit the Secretary to purchase and pay for diseased cattle?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COX. In a State?

Mr. LEVER. Of course not. My contention and that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] was that the Secretary of Agriculture was not going into a State except at the request of the State and in cooperation with it, but his purpose in being there would be to prevent the spread of disease beyond the State line.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is discussing the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I am discussing the point of order. I do not want to argue the merits of the matter now.

Mr. COX. Suppose the Secretary of Agriculture does go into a State and he finds animals suffering from this disease. Under such circumstances does the gentleman contend, if this language were permitted to remain in the bill, that he could go into a State and pay for the killing of animals that are never intended to be exported or shipped outside of the State?

Mr. LEVER. The language would not call for that, of course. We have nothing to do with it except in interstate commerce.

Mr. COX. That is just what they have been doing—going into the States and killing animals diseased, or exposed to disease, and paying for them out of the appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the gentleman from Indiana catches my point of view at all. I will state it again. If there is an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Pennsylvania, for example, as there was some years ago, and the authorities of the State of Pennsylvania request the Federal Government to come in and help them, and Congress appropriated half a million dollars for that purpose—the idea of Congress was to prevent the spread of that disease, which had to be localized, or stateized as you might call it, and prevent it from spreading across the State line and getting into interstate commerce.

Mr. COX. But would you have the right to go in and quarantine them?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; you would have the right to go in and quarantine them. There would be no sense in acting after the danger had been incurred; and hence the Federal Government, in its wisdom, strikes while the iron is hot.

Mr. COX. That is all true; but, taking the case that the gentleman refers to in the State of Pennsylvania, when the Secre-

tary of Agriculture went in there to stop the spread of that disease, suppose the Secretary of Agriculture went into the State of Pennsylvania and condemned to death a large number of animals suffering from that disease. Is there any appropriation carried in this bill that would justify the Secretary of Agriculture in paying for the loss of those animals?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will read down the page upon which he finds this language, he will see just exactly how we have segregated those items. So that while there is authority here to do it, I do not believe that there is any money with which to do it; and what the Secretary would do, very probably, would be to come to Congress and ask for an emergency appropriation, if the emergency should arise.

Mr. COX. The gentleman thinks he would not undertake to use the appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. LEVER. He has never done it, as far as I know, in my 10 years' experience on the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman has read the law. I will ask if the construction put upon it has not always been that the department had no authority to pay money to the owners of animals destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. That has not been my interpretation of it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Further, have not the gentlemen connected with the Department of Agriculture appearing before the committee told us that they had been forbidden to use the money to pay for animals destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Michigan that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] and myself called up Dr. Melvin, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, with reference to horse dourine, and inquired whether or not he would have the right under the general law to condemn horses in North Dakota and pay for those condemned. The gentleman [Mr. HELGESEN] will recall that he said he did have the right under the general law to do that, and that it had been so held. Is that correct?

Mr. HELGESEN. That is correct.

Mr. LEVER. That is correct. Now, I want to call attention to some other language as bearing out the general thought that this language is broad enough to give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to choose his own machinery by which to accomplish the purpose of Congress to prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases in animals.

Section 2 of the act of 1884 reads:

That the Commissioner of Agriculture shall report annually to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a list of the names of all persons employed, an itemized statement of all expenditures under this act, and full particulars of the means adopted and carried into effect for the suppression of contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases among domestic animals.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting under the broad provisions of the law, has issued a regulation to this effect—regulation 8 of the Secretary of Agriculture, covering the Bureau of Animal Industry, which contains this provision:

When, in order to prevent the spread of a disease, it becomes necessary to slaughter any diseased or exposed live stock and the purchase of such live stock by the United States is authorized by law, and an appropriation is available therefor, the value of the live stock shall be ascertained and compensation made therefor, either by agreement with the owner or by appraisement in the manner provided by the laws of the State or Territory wherein the owner of the live stock has his legal residence.

Mr. BOOHER. Who pays for the stock—the State or the United States Government?

Mr. LEVER. The United States Government.

Mr. BOOHER. That is the order of your Secretary, and that is exactly why you have got this provision in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that under the existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to go into any State in the Union and pay for horses or cattle that may be destroyed on account of disease?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. Out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. LEVER. I do; to prevent the spread of disease; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I always assumed that was a State function and that the State always, as a matter of course, paid all such bills.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's assumption is incorrect. I will repeat that, as far as my memory goes, the practice has not been to do so, except when direction was had through Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not agree at all that under the law read by the gentleman a moment ago the Secretary of Agriculture has the right or the power to go into any State in the Union and pay for the destruction of horses or cattle that may be diseased; but, on the contrary, it becomes his duty to notify the State of the difficulty and to call the attention of the State officers to the necessity for destroying the cattle that may be diseased, and to require them to pay for any losses that may be sustained as the result of that disease.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Has the Secretary of Agriculture ever exercised this authority and taken money out of the Federal Treasury to pay for animals slaughtered that were afflicted with disease?

Mr. LEVER. I have said repeatedly that within my memory he has not, but I do not question his right to do so under the law, if he has the money.

Mr. COX. He has not, except where he has a specific appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. No; that is true.

Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that this identical language is carried in the act of 1914. It is carried in the act of 1913. It is carried in the act of 1912. I have those three acts before me, and the question has never been raised before. I do not think it is a proposition that is going to give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to do something that he ought not to do, and my contention is that the language creating the Bureau of Agriculture, which the Chair is now reading, is so broad as to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to employ such means as he thinks wise to prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases among animals. Language can not be made any more broad than that is. He is absolutely limited only by the amount of appropriations he has available. If he wants to quarantine, he can do so. If he wants to pen animals and keep them shut up, he can do so. He is given the broad authority to employ such means as he sees fit to employ to do the work which Congress has imposed upon him.

Mr. JACOWAY. I should like to ask the gentleman further if the testimony before the committee does not disclose the fact that this disease is becoming so prevalent there that the State itself is helpless to prevent it?

Mr. LEVER. That was the case with dourine.

Mr. JACOWAY. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. Is it a fact that that is an emergency provision, giving the Secretary of Agriculture the right to take charge and exercise authority where the State, in his judgment, can not handle it?

Mr. LEVER. My idea is that the language here is the department's interpretation of the fundamental laws governing the bureau in this regard, and they put the language in here for the purpose of calling the attention of Congress to their interpretation of their powers under the law.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. This language in the first paragraph relating to the general expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry is supposed to be a compilation of the statutory authority conferred upon this bureau, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. That is true, and is also true of all the general-expense items in the bill.

Mr. MANN. In that respect this bill is unusual and different from any other appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but not unusual from other bills from this committee.

Mr. MANN. It is unusual and different from other appropriation bills. You carry what you suppose to be the statutory authority of the different bureaus.

Mr. LEVER. In the general-expense items.

Mr. MANN. There is no appropriation here, but you set out the statutory authority and then you make the appropriation by items.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. There is no appropriation in this paragraph——

Mr. LEVER. None whatever.

Mr. MANN. But you keep it in the paragraph, because it has been in the bill in the past, and some year you might want to make an appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. There might be an emergency, and we would have authority to do it. I will ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that Congress has intended to give the Secretary of Agriculture full power to prevent the spread of disease among animals. The same language is in the current law that is carried in this bill without any change whatever so far as the language of the part against which the gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will indulge me, the two preceding appropriation bills carried the same language exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will direct the attention of the committee to current law in the same paragraph to which the

language objected to here is carried—"that hereafter all provisions of said act approved March 3, 1905," and so forth; and then without any break includes the language against which the point of order is made in this case.

Mr. MANN. I think the Chair is in error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not completed his sentence. The Chair is in doubt whether it is intended to apply to that part to which the gentleman has leveled his point of order.

Mr. MANN. The hereafter provision refers only to the railroad provision, and it does not cover anything beyond.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that the gentleman from Illinois is correct, and was proceeding to say that the Chair is in doubt whether that does apply to the whole paragraph. The Chair is of the opinion that it is the plain intention of Congress to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to take such measures and means as he may find necessary to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia or tuberculosis among animals from one State to another. The means to be used by him to successfully carry out that work must of necessity be left largely to his discretion. It having been carried in the present law and in the law the year before and the year preceding that, the Chair is inclined to and does overrule the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 2, after the word "to," strike out all down to and including the word "or" in line 3.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, it does appear to me that the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment ought to go out of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's amendment is plainly not just what he wants. He would leave in the words "to quarantine the same."

Mr. BOOHER. We will have to put in some other language if this amendment is adopted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, take the regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture, which have been in force for a long time, in which he proposes to do exactly what the chairman of the committee in his opening argument said they would do—go into the State and kill diseased animals whether intended for exportation or not and pay for them. They are only waiting for an opportunity to go into some State where there is a disease and stamp it out, killing the animals and not charge it up to the State, but make the people of the whole country pay for it.

This is the regulation:

8. When, in order to prevent the spread of a disease—

He does not say from one State to another. He does not put that in. He contracts the law always when they come to the question of spending money—

When, in order to prevent the spread of a disease, it becomes necessary to slaughter any diseased or exposed live stock by the United States as authorized by law, and an appropriation is available therefor, the value of the live stock shall be ascertained and compensation made thereof either by agreement with the owner or by appraisement in the manner provided by the law of the State or Territory wherein the owner of the live stock has his legal residence.

Here you have him authorized to purchase, and that is the part that I want to strike out. Now, it does not provide that the State shall pay for it, it does not say who shall pay for it. The Government is condemning it and the Government is destroying it under the laws of the State. The Government will be the paymaster.

Mr. COX. The way the regulation reads it plainly provides that the Government shall pay for it when there is an appropriation.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; when an appropriation has been authorized. And it is so easy to get an appropriation, if some one or somebody who is a farmer among Congressmen or a Congressman among farmers gets up and tells them that it is for the interest of the farmer. Nobody raises his voice against it, because it is for the farmer. Gentlemen, we are undervaluing the intelligence of the farmers of this country. The farmers of the country know as much about this proceeding as we do.

They know as much about their rights and to what they are entitled as we do, and we are constantly making appropriations here for one thing and another, and presume upon the ignorance of the farmer to indorse it, because we say it is in the interest of the farmer. I want to call the attention of the committee for just a moment to something that took place the other day in the State of Nebraska. It is interesting to show the difference between the idea of the farmers of one section of the country and another. In the State of Nebraska the State agricultural department had a regulation which prevented the farmers of that State from treating their own hogs. The farmers could not use the serum for the prevention of hog cholera unless they employed a veterinary surgeon. For several years the farmers of that State worked with that State board of agriculture to get them to change that regulation. The board refused to do it, but finally the State grange as an organization took it up, and here was the result of it. It is interesting, and I commend this to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and to all members of that committee. I think we ought to know something about it. It shows that the farmers of one State in the Union, at least, are in favor of taking care of themselves if you will give them an opportunity of doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to read this article taken from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

NEBRASKA FARMERS CAN NOW INJECT HOG SERUM.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *February 1.*

The right of farmers to administer hog-cholera serum to their own hogs and not call in veterinarians for every administration thereof was fought over and settled favorably to the farmers at a meeting of the State live stock sanitary board held here recently.

The question was fought over at a preliminary meeting at which there were present J. H. Bulla, South Omaha member of the live-stock board; F. G. Odell and T. F. Sturgess, of Omaha; O. E. Davis and L. S. Herron, of this city; Charles Graff, of West Point; J. A. Ollis, of Ord; and other officers of live-stock associations. The meeting, together with a lengthy session held during the forenoon, was called upon invitation of Gov. Morehead and the sanitary board members in the hope that the matter could be settled in full justice to the farmers of the State and in a way that will afford stockmen full protection.

Millions of dollars' worth of Nebraska live stock are affected by the action taken by the board. Rules were promulgated which it has been impossible to pass through even legislatures of agricultural make-up because of disagreement over details. In less than 24 hours' labor the "peace conference," so called because it meant a fusing of live-stock and farming industries, the veterinarian association and the State board members accomplished a task that puts Nebraska far in the lead of other States in restricting shipments of stock into the State and in the care of animals subjected to plagues and scourges of various kinds of diseases. Following were the rules adopted:

Farmers will be permitted to apply their own or neighbors' hog-cholera serum.

Five qualified veterinarians to be employed by the board and available for use in any part of the State when emergencies arise.

No inspectors of interstate stock shipments will be employed who are not qualified to practice veterinary medicine in the State.

Live stock shipments from other States shall be received only under strict regulation and full information regarding origin and destination and health must be given.

Stock sent in for grazing or slaughter purposes shall be accompanied by affidavits giving full information of the animals in the shipment.

Producers of veterinary biological products must possess licenses in accordance with Federal provisions or a permit from the State board.

All hogs vaccinated by the "simultaneous" treatment shall be confined on premises at least 30 days.

All sales of hog-cholera, blackleg, and other disease or scourge preventives and veterinary bacteriological products shall be reported to the State veterinarian within 48 hours after sale.

All bulls for public service shall be submitted to the tuberculin test annually.

The gathering, easily the most important that has taken place in the State outside of the legislature in several decades is also significant in that it forecasts the delegation of more power to department, the conservation of power in a few boards, and the accomplishment of needed reforms through other than the tedious legislative procedure.

Suggestion that outside forces be called in and that rules satisfactory to the interests most vitally affected came first from Gov. Morehead. The executive was an interested listener at the sessions of the board and was called upon to address the variegated, but finally harmonious, meeting after the rules had been agreed upon.

I desire now to call attention to another little paragraph from a paper in my own district, which shows that if the farmers could get the serum to use for the prevention of hog cholera they do not want any Federal inspector or Federal officer running all over the country lecturing to them and telling them how to do it. All they want is to have the serum prepared and be enabled to buy it at what it costs. They will administer it to their own stock. Here is what one farmer in my district did, and what he did dozens of others in the same neighborhood have been doing. This is taken from the Holt County Sentinel, a newspaper published in Holt County, Mo.:

[Bigelow correspondent in Jeffersonian, December 4.]

Last week J. E. Slater vaccinated 305 hogs on his farm west of town, at a cost of $225. They weighed 30 to 490 pounds. Mr. Slater believes in keeping his stock in good shape and not run any chances of cholera. There are one or two cases of hog cholera near here, it is said.

That simply shows that if you will give the farmer an opportunity he will take care of his own stock, and do it better and on less money to himself and the people of the country than the Federal inspectors and Federal officers will do and have been doing all over this country.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Missouri will write to the gentleman about whom he has just read a statement in the newspaper and get him to say that he did not have the use of a veterinary inspector when he did that, I will buy him the best 50-cent cigar in the city of Washington.

Mr. BOOHER. That is from the Government or a veterinary surgeon that he hired himself?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, he probably hired him himself, but I venture that he was a trained veterinarian.

Mr. BOOHER. If he hired him himself, it is not the Government inspector. What I am complaining about is the Government inspector running all over this country and spending money to advise the farmers when the farmer knows more in a minute than one of your experts does in a year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if he is acquainted with the cattle fever in Texas? Does he not know that our cattlemen spend a million dollars a year for the purchase of material of different kinds preparing vats and dips for the purpose of eradicating the cattle tick?

Mr. BOOHER. Well, it ought to be eradicated, but here is the proposition: If you have discovered the remedy, after the Government has furnished the people with the remedy which will kill the ticks on the cattle, what is to prevent the gentleman's own people, without the interference of an inspector or some expert from the Federal Government, taking care of the cattle themselves? Do they not know how to do it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Every ranchman has his vat prepared and his dip prepared and he takes care of his own cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Texas, does he know that this bill carries an appropriation of $400,000 for that very thing? It does. I believe that the Government ought to study these questions thoroughly and if possible find a remedy, and then let the people do the rest.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is for the purpose of dipping cattle that leave infected parts of the country and are liable to go to uninfected parts of the country, so as to prevent the carrying of disease from one part to another.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman from Texas is taking all of my time. My point is that the Government ought to study these diseases carefully and thoroughly; and, if it finds a remedy, it ought to provide that remedy for the people for what it costs the Government to provide it. After it has provided the people with the remedy, then the people themselves ought to use it and not call on the Government to show them how to do it. Why, I heard people on the floor the other day object to a bill brought in to provide for teaching people of this country how to read. They did not want that kind of a law; but here you are spending money to teach people how to kill cattle ticks in Texas and in other parts of the country. It is more important to teach them to do that than to teach them to read, I suppose.

Mr. HELGESEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows that there are dangerous diseases among the cattle and horses of the country and no farmer can determine whether his stock has those diseases or not?

Mr. BOOHER. I know that.

Mr. HELGESEN. And the gentleman does not want the Government inspector to go and find out whether they have disease or not?

Mr. BOOHER. No, sir; the State inspector should do that, because I think the gentleman knows that almost every State in the Union has a veterinary bureau.

Mr. HELGESEN. If I understand aright, the gentleman said he is not opposed to this if it applied only to those animals which went in interstate commerce. Is that right?

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; the gentleman misunderstood me. When we were arguing the interstate-commerce proposition I was replying to the chairman of the committee. He took the position that you could go into the State and kill them whether they are to be transported or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee to argue the merits of this amendment, except to say this, that the Federal Government, through its Congress, has from time to time authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce quarantine laws for the purpose of preventing the spread of contagious and infectious animal diseases. The quarantine laws against the cattle tick, it is estimated, is costing the South from $40,000,000 to $60,000,000 a year. I have no doubt that the quarantine against the spread of horse dourine will cost the people of the State of North Dakota alone a million of dollars, and I put the proposition squarely before this committee, that if Congress, in its wisdom, prevents the free shipment of our stock, whether diseased or not, is it not the duty of Congress to help bear some of the burdens of the enforcement of such quarantine law? Now, that is all there is to this proposition, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is a change of existing law and in keeping with the ruling of the Chair a moment ago.

Mr. BOOHER. Not a change of permanent law. There is no law upon the subject.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair has held the other way.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not think the Chair held that it had the force and effect of law. I had not heard of such a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is very plain the amendment is not subject to a point of order. The gentleman ought not to make the point of order. This is to strike out something that is authorized by law, but we are not obliged to keep it in.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me that by striking out a provision of law you are certainly changing the law.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. This is an appropriation bill. The law remains as it was before, but this is an appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. But, if we strike out this matter here, it seems to me we are bound to affect the permanent law wherever it might be.

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. LEVER. You are certainly interfering with the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Well, we do not make an appropriation to carry into effect the permanent law when you leave it out.

Mr. LEVER. My contention is——

Mr. MANN (continuing). Where the permanent law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals, or quarantine the same, we can say that we will authorize him, so far as the appropriation is concerned, to purchase, or we can say we authorize him to destroy or sell, or we will authorize him to quarantine so far as the appropriation is concerned. We do not affect the permanent law in this.

Mr. LEVER. My contention is this: The Chair has held that the language in this bill is in order because it is a part of permanent law. Now, if we adopt this amendment suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, we have to that extent limited the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture as given to him by existing law, and that being the case, it seems to me there is no doubt that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph commences, "For carrying out the provisions of the act approved May 29, 1884," and so forth, "for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 29, 1906," and so forth, "and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and disseminate information," and so forth; "to purchase in the open market samples of all tuberculin," and so forth; "to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals," and so forth, "as follows." This is contained in an appropriation bill. This is not law, but it is part of an appropriation act, and I do not understand the Chair to hold that placed in the current bill it made current law, but the Chair held that under the act of Congress this provision in this bill is authorized by law, and the Chair referred to the fact that being in the current law, and it had been in the previous act, that does not make it in order here. We are not required in an appropriation bill to include all that is authorized by law; that is our province to determine whether we will or not.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: The Secretary of Agriculture now under the law, as I understand it, has the authority to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals or to quarantine them?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Now, then, by act of Congress in this bill we say we do not want to put it in.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. LEVER. What does it mean, then?

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority now to purchase and destroy, and so forth, exposed animals, if he has an appropriation. He has the authority, but he can not do it unless he has an appropriation. Now, you are making the appropriation here, and you can decline to include those words. As a matter of fact, they do not mean anything in this bill, anyhow.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is very true.

Mr. MANN. There is no actual appropriation. But we can leave that out. We are not required to appropriate for a thing where we have authorized the department to do something. We may authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to construct a building. You might bring in an act here that provided to carry out the purposes of constructing buildings in a dozen towns, where he has authority, and we can strike any of them out if we want to do so. We are not required to appropriate.

Mr. LEVER. Let me take the gentleman's illustration and see what effect that would have on the Secretary of the Treasury in erecting this building. Suppose that there is a provision in an act of Congress that a building should be 10 stories high, and we did not provide any appropriation for it at all, and then the next year we did provide an appropriation for a building, limiting it to 9 stories?

Mr. MANN. That would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. That would be subject to a point of order, undoubtedly, but it seems to me to be absolutely on all fours with this. Here the Secretary of Agriculture has authority under the law to purchase and destroy diseased animals. The Secretary of Agriculture, it seems to me, if this amendment prevails, would take that to be a direction from Congress that hereafter he should not do that.

Mr. MANN. Take the case that the gentleman puts, and suppose that the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to construct a building 10 stories high. Now, by law, all that we do is to make an appropriation for that building. The law fixes the height of it. We do not describe it in making the appropriation; but suppose we did describe it in the appropriation bill, and say, "for a building 10 stories high." That conforms with the law, and hence the appropriation is in order. If some gentleman would move to insert "9" in place of "10," that would be contrary to the rules of the House, because that would change the building, but if some one would move to strike out "10 stories" that would be in order, although it would not change in the slightest degree the building to be constructed, because the appropriation is for a building; but we can refuse to make the appropriation at all, even though it has been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. In overruling the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] a few moments ago, to certain language in the bill, the Chair thinks the effect of that was simply to hold that the committee would have the right to place that language in the bill or retain it in the bill if they desired to do so. But, of course, that is a question for the committee. The Chair does not think the amendment is contrary to the existing law; therefore the Chair does not think the amendment is subject to a point of order. The point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk report the amendment again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 2, after the word "to," in line 2, strike out all down to and including the word "or" in line 3.

Mr. LEVER. So that it will read——

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the paragraph as it will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, as follows:

Mr. BOOHER. Of course, if that amendment is adopted, there will have to be some change made in there.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest to the gentleman that he put his amendment as he wants it, because the amendment as reported does not connect up at all.

Mr. BOOHER. It connects entirely; but, if that is in, there will have to be some change made.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Inasmuch as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] has not his amendment in shape, perhaps mine will reach it.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. LEVER. Offer the amendment.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to strike out the words "purchase and," so it will read:

To destroy diseased or exposed animals or quarantine the same.

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 2, strike out the words "purchase and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and the alteration of buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the tuberculin and mallein testing of animals, $625,520, of which sum not more than $3,000 may be used for the construction of a superintendent's house on the ground of the United States animal quarantine station for the port of Boston, at Littleton, Mass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the opinion of the chairman of the committee relative to the paragraph that has just been read. It provides for inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, and so forth. Now, that paragraph, unlike the paragraph which has just been passed, contains no reference to the purchase and destruction of diseased animals. Does the gentleman understand that under the appropriation carried in this paragraph it would be possible for the Secretary to purchase or pay for animals destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. I do not. My opinion is that the language of the paragraph which the gentleman has read specifies the only lines of work that the Secretary of Agriculture can undertake with the appropriation which is carried.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, then, to what specific appropriation does the language which has been discussed at some length to purchase and destroy, and so forth, apply?

Mr. LEVER. It does not apply to any appropriation whatever. It is set out in the general expense items of the bureau only in order to call the attention of Congress to the statute under which the Department of Agriculture, or that bureau of the Department of Agriculture, is acting.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman understand that the Secretary has general authority to pay for animals that are killed?

Mr. LEVER. That is true if he has the money with which to do it. But the gentleman will see that the general-expense language in the bill is followed by specific language carrying the appropriations and showing exactly the lines of work that can be done under the general-expense language.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is of opinion, then, that while the "general-expense language," as he calls it, recognizes the authority of the Secretary, as a matter of fact these specific appropriations themselves could not be used for the payment of animals destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. That is absolutely true. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the new language on page 10 of the bill, with reference to "the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products, manufactured in the United States, and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals." This is a way of calling to the attention of the House the fact that there is a permanent law authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to do this work. But the gentleman will see that in the itemized language carrying the appropriation we carry no appropriation for that virus work, for the reason that we carry that in a separate bill which was passed the other day—the hog-cholera bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. Another question: We passed a bill the other day which is now a law, I believe?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. A law authorizing the expenditure of a large sum for the eradication of hog cholera and dourine in horses?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. As I recollect it, there was no specific language in the bill authorizing the use of that appropriation for the payment for animals that might be killed?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman understand that any part of the appropriation could be used for that purpose?

Mr. LEVER. That is a close question. The Secretary of Agriculture might hold that under the general law he had the right to use a portion of that money for the purpose of paying for exposed animals. I am sure that he would not do it, and I am not sure in my own mind that he could do it, because, as I have said a number of times, I am not a lawyer and these legal points "ball" me up, but my opinion is that he does not have the authority to use the funds in the way suggested.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman think he would be authorized, under the language which we refused to strike out, to do the very thing that the gentleman from Wyoming asked about? Could he not take the money and pay it?

Mr. LEVER. He certainly could not take any money in this bill, and I do not believe he would have the right, without the specific authority of Congress, to use any of the fund that we appropriated some days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. It would be quite clear, I think from the language of the bill that we passed the other day, that unless it was used in some demonstration and experiment work, no hogs could be paid for. In other words, as I understand the gentleman's question, the question is whether or not the department could go out and pay for the loss of hogs of some individual that had occurred because of hog cholera.

Mr. MONDELL. Hogs and horses; and my recollection is that the chairman of the committee a moment ago stated that he and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] called up some official of the department, the Secretary or some other official, and asked if the department had general authority to pay for animals killed for the purpose of preventing the spread of disease, and he stated that they had. If he has such general authority, query, Can they exercise it without specific authorization in the item carrying the appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a question of money rather than of authorization?

Mr. MONDELL. I would not say, answering the question of the gentleman from Minnesota, that it is a question of money, because if they had only a hundred dollars and wanted to use it and had the right to use it in payment for an animal, of course they would have a hundred dollars for use for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. But they could not use it unless it had been appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. This is what I am trying to get clear in my mind.

Mr. LEVER. Let me answer the gentleman and call his attention to this fact: That while the Secretary of Agriculture has general authority to purchase exposed animals, that authority is contingent upon his having the money with which to purchase these animals.

Now, here we have a large sum of money—$625,520—but that fund is to be used for inspection and quarantine work, including "all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of 28-hour law," and so on. There we specify the uses to which the fund may be applied, and the Secretary of Agriculture would not go beyond what he had specific direction for.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the authority to quarantine carry with it the right to destroy animals, if necessary, in order to maintain the quarantine?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wyoming yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is it not the purpose here to provide an appropriation for the purpose indicated on page 11, beginning with line 7? Do we not make the foundation for the future so that if in the future an item were offered in the appropriation bill a point of order could not be raised against it?

Mr. LEVER. That is it.

Mr. GARNER. So that Congress in the future may make an appropriation for this identical work if it wants to; and, not carrying any appropriation at this time, it is easier to get it through than it would be if you carried a large appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will yield to me, it seems to me there will be no question but that. Referring to the question of hog cholera, the authority would be in the department to pay for and kill the hogs, because of the fact that, in order to establish a quarantine station for effective operations, it might be necessary to obtain an area upon which they could experiment by eliminating danger from the surrounding territory. I think there would be no question but what they would have that authority.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to this fact: I want to get this bill through as speedily as possible, but this language has been in the bill since I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, without the changing of a word, the dotting of an "i," or the crossing of a "t." It is identically this language. It is perfectly proper for the gentleman to inquire about it, but I am satisfied that there is no "negro in the woodpile" in this language.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not had any thought that there is any African concealed here that ought to be dug out. I am simply trying to get a clear notion of what the situation is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to give the gentleman my view. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $400,000, of which sum $50,000 may be used for live-stock demonstration work, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of cattle for breeding purposes: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 11, in line 24, by striking out the word "cattle" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "animals."

Mr. LEVER. If my friend will permit me, I have no objection to that amendment. It will save time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved a point of order on this paragraph. My purpose was to inquire of the chairman of the committee the object of this $50,000 for live-stock demonstration work. That is something new in this appropriation bill, but perhaps the department has been doing similar work heretofore.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied the language is not subject to a point of order, but I will tell my friend the character of the work we desire to undertake. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that we have a great area in the South infested with the cattle tick. For several years we have been spending about $375,000 a year for the purpose of eradicating the cattle tick, which is an insect that causes Texas fever and great loss among cattle. We have freed about 218,000 square miles from this pest, and the thought of the Secretary of Agriculture, in which I agree most heartily, is that we ought to begin to teach the people in those free areas how to grow good beef cattle and good stock.

Mr. STAFFORD. How is it proposed to engage in that character of work?

Mr. LEVER. I will tell my friend how it is working out practically, and I will illustrate by my own State, because I

happen to know more about that. The department has sent a man to South Carolina who is cooperating with the authorities of our agricultural college at Clemson. This man goes from courthouse town to courthouse town. He calls a meeting. The farmers come in, sometimes 100, sometimes 500. He gives them a lecture on the value of live-stock growing as an adjunct to farming and as a profitable undertaking. Then he organizes a live-stock association in that county. Frequently he will have from 50 to 75 progressive, up-to-date farmers who will join that association. Then from time to time, probably every two weeks, he will go back to the courthouse, call his associates together, and teach those people the best breeds of cattle and how to grow cattle properly. I recall reading in my home paper this morning of a recent meeting in the city of Greenville, where they have organized such an association.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand the gentleman, this is only for the expenses of this demonstrator who goes around to country towns, elucidating information particularly connected with live-stock work?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. In other words, it is nothing more nor less than an attempt of the Department of Agriculture to get its accumulated information out of Washington to the people who need it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to state that the department has been successful in eradicating the cattle tick from a large territory?

Mr. LEVER. From 218,000 square miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then what is the necessity of increasing this appropriation which is here $400,000, which last year was $325,000?

Mr. LEVER. We still have about 725,000 square miles to free from the cattle tick.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in the section which we are now considering, that of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the committee has increased the amounts sometimes twofold, but the instances are rare where the amounts have not been increased. What is the occasion for some of these inordinate increases of hundreds of thousands of dollars in this special industry?

Mr. LEVER. In making up this bill, whenever the committee were dealing with a bureau which was devoting its efforts to increasing the food supply or the clothing supply of the people of the United States, it was the general policy of the committee to act liberally with regard to that bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the committee acted liberally last year.

Mr. LEVER. I was not the chairman of the committee last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. But a very potential member.

Mr. LEVER. I call the attention of my friend to the fact that in my opening address on this bill I called attention to the vanishing meat supply of this country and the vanishing bread supply of this country. These facts impressed the chairman of the committee, as they impressed every member of the committee, with the necessity of dealing most liberally with the great constructive bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, such as this Bureau of Animal Industry and the Bureau of Plant Industry, also. We said that we could not afford to be parsimonious or small minded in the matter of furnishing means for this great constructive work of helping to supply the people of this country with food and clothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am speaking on my reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make this statement——

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Chair changed his opinion that he recently expressed concerning that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the practice has uniformly been to proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was quite advised of that when the Chair made his former statement. I am glad he has changed his ruling to conform to the uniform practice.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that the time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask the gentleman whether in these amounts that the committee has recommended the amounts of the estimates have been allowed almost uniformly?

Mr. LEVER. In some instances that is true and in some instances it is not true.

Mr. STAFFORD. In those instances in which it is not true, are there cases where the committee has gone beyond the estimates?

Mr. LEVER. That is true in some instances and in some instances not.

Mr. STAFFORD. What are those instances, if the gentleman can inform the committee?

Mr. LEVER. There is no item for this bureau, as I recall, where the estimates have been exceeded or where they have been very much reduced, except in the item for Army horse breeding.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the gentleman's explanatory statement he did not single out those items in which the Committee had gone beyond the estimates of the department.

Mr. LEVER. I think if the gentleman will look at the report that the chairman of the committee filed with this bill he will find every single item explained rather fully.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have glanced at it, but I do not see that you single out an item where you have exceeded the estimates.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that we have, but I can put my finger on each item of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was very much interested in the statement the gentleman made with reference to the use that the $50,000 was to be put to, and I think it can be utilized to very great advantage.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think there is a more important item in the bill than that.

Mr. GARNER. I heartily agree with the gentleman. What I wanted to call attention to is that you confine the expenditure of the $50,000 to a small area in the United States—about 170,000 square miles. Now, if this money can be so efficiently utilized for the purpose of teaching the people how to produce cattle more economically and thereafter have a greater supply of meat, why not extend the area? If this can be used to such an advantage, why not increase the area and, if necessary, increase the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that the thought of the committee was that this being the first time that we have attempted this line of work, we felt that we ought to go slowly on it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to offer any opposition to the provisions in this bill, because I took some part in preparing it, but I want to express myself in relation to this particular measure as I expressed myself in the committee. I am not opposed to the use of the money for this particular purpose, but I am opposed to the appropriation being made in this way. There is an appropriation for farm-demonstration work, carrying $378,000, ostensibly for work in the destruction of the boll weevil, but it is purely farm-demonstration work.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is not discussing the item to which he is objecting; this is the cattle tick.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I know. There is also an appropriation of $400,000 for farm-demonstration work and farm-management work. It seems to me the two items ought to be combined. These appropriations for farm-management and farm-demonstration work ought to be put in one appropriation.

Then, in order to get more money, an appropriation is asked to assist farmers in another particular section of the country to engage in other lines of agriculture, which is also farm-management and farm-demonstration work. There ought not to be separate appropriations for this work; the appropriation ought to be large enough, and there ought to be only one appropriation.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman does not object to the amount, but only as to the division made in the expenditure.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that I have taken that position all the time. Here is $50,000 for farm-demonstration work in an area free of the cattle tick, $400,000 in the States of the North, $378,000 for farm-demonstration work in the boll-weevil section, and $10,000 carried in the bill for farm-demonstration work in the cane area, put in at the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK]; also $50,000 dollars for farm-demonstration work in the Louisiana cane area—all farm-demonstration work. Why not make it $700,000 or $800,000, or whatever is necessary for farm-demonstration work, and be done with it, and let the country know how big the appropriation is and the kind of work being done.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman would be willing to put it all under one head and make one appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I would; and give the department authority to use that money where it could be best used.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The money is well expended, the gentleman thinks?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do think it is well expended, but I do not think one appropriation ought to be made for farm management and its use limited to an area described as the cattle-tick

area, another appropriation limited in its use to the boll-weevil area, and another appropriation to be used for the same purpose in the Louisiana cane area. Let there be one appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I take it that these items have to be expended by experts. In the gentleman's opinion, would it be more desirable to have the experts in charge of the live-stock demonstration in the Bureau of Animal Industry and not in the Bureau of Plant Industry, where the demonstration work will be carried on?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In answer to the gentleman, my idea is that this work can be done by any well-informed man going into a community and suggesting better methods of agriculture, in stock raising, and in other lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I ask for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. BOOHER. Ten minutes is not time enough, Mr. Chairman, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, my objection is that, under this method of making appropriations, one man goes into the tick area to teach farmers a better way of raising hogs and cattle. Another man, under another appropriation, administered by the Bureau of Plant Industry, covers exactly the same territory and undertakes to teach the farmers to raise in a better way some of the crops they are engaged in raising. Another man will come along from another department, under another appropriation, the same kind of a man in the same territory, meeting the same people, and suggest some better method of agriculture in some other line. One man could do the entire work, and it could be better done under the administration of one department than several.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest that often two men are sent from the same bureau in the same field to do practically the same thing.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, all of these respective agents are qualified to do all of the work, and they are merely duplicating the work of some other agent?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think they are qualified; they ought to be. It is not difficult work. It does not, as I think the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] implies, take an expert.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I have a brother who is pretty well known among agriculturists with reference to raising crops, and I have frequently heard him say that he did not know enough about fattening cattle to undertake it under any circumstances.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman say, then, that it was incumbent upon the Federal Government to hire a man to go on his brother's farm to show him how to feed cattle, another to show him how to feed hogs, another man to show him how to cultivate and harvest oats, and still another to teach him in regard to wheat? That is what this policy of separate appropriations leads to.

Mr. MANN. They have not anybody in the Government employ who can show my brother anything about raising oats and crops of that kind.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has been a member of the Agricultural Committee for a long time, under Republican and Democratic administrations. I desire to ask the gentleman if this bill is not the first bill that has ever come from this committee since he has been a member of it which provides for such a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture as will take care of the very thing about which he is complaining?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that I will say that this bill more than any that has come from the committee is separating these different lines of work and providing for the employment of a number of men to do the same kind of work where one man might do it all.

Mr. LEVER. The item in the bill to which I was calling attention is that item which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit his estimates upon a plan of reorganization that must be worked out, and does not the gentleman also know that the Secretary of Agriculture has in mind the very thought that all of the demonstration, extension, and teaching work shall be done through one agency; that all of the research work of the department shall be done through one agency; that all of the quarantine work of the department shall be done through one agency; while the Weather Bureau, because it is of the type it is, of course would have to be separate and distinct, as would also the Forestry Bureau? I think the gentleman ought to say that Secretary Houston, Assistant Secretary Galloway, and practically every man from the Department of Agriculture who discussed the subject, discussed it along the line of running the department in the future, if this language stays in the bill, as I hope it will, with the end in view of coordinating all of the work of the department so that we will get rid of the lost motion that the gentleman complains of now.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am justified in talking much longer upon this, as I approve the general purpose of the department in these particular matters. I simply object to the manner in which the money is appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. We are not appropriating too much money for the benefit of farm work in this country, but we are appropriating too much money to be expended in certain localities for certain specific purposes. I think the appropriation for farm demonstration work ought to be liberal, and it ought to be expended in an intelligent manner in every section of the country for the benefit of all the farmers. I know something about this cattle proposition. The chairman says that the beef, the food cattle of the country, are constantly decreasing, and that they want to teach the farmer in certain sections of the country that it would pay him better to raise a high-grade animal than it would to raise a scrub. There is not a farmer in the United States, there is not a farmer anywhere, who has brains enough to be a farmer, who does not know that without the Government expert telling him. When my friend talked the other day about the decrease of beef cattle in this country he should have told us that the beef product had increased as the number of cattle had decreased, and he would then have stated the entire facts, because two beef animals sent to the market to-day will make from three to five beef animals sent to the market 20 years ago. We have no more of these great range cattle that went to the markets as they used to go. They are not being raised. The farmers and the stock raisers all over this country are improving their stock, and they do not need an expert to tell them that it pays. It is proposed to spend $50,000 to go amongst the farmers who took the first prizes at the great National Stock Show in Chicago—the farmers in Mississippi—and tell those people that it will pay them to raise good cattle. If I represented Mississippi, I would resent that.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to see one gentleman from Mississippi do it.

Mr. BOOHER. No; they probably would not have the nerve, but they would fight something else.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Oh, the gentleman from Missouri would never question the nerve of a Mississippian. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. No; I would not on certain subjects. The testimony taken by the Committee on Agriculture is very interesting.

Mr. LEVER. It is a very interesting committee.

Mr. BOOHER. It is an interesting and able committee, but they put more in here than they ought to put in if they expect the people to swallow this appropriation for teaching the farmer how to raise good cattle. Of course, there is a dispute between Arkansas and Mississippi as to whether the particular prize animal was bred in Mississippi or Arkansas. There is no dispute that it was born in Mississippi and taken from there to Chicago and that it took the first prize in the National Stock Show as the best Hereford bull in the United States. It is now proposed to go down there and spend $50,000 to teach that kind of farmer that it is a good thing to raise good cattle. For years and years the breeders up in Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa have been raising blooded cattle, and the cattlemen of the South have been coming up there and shipping that blooded stock down by the carload and the trainload, and they did not have to have a Government expert tell them that it was to their advantage to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman says this animal took the prize as being the finest in the United States. It was the finest in the world, as the world was admitted to that contest.

Mr. BOOHER. Will my friend tell me whether the animal was from Mississippi or Arkansas?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It was from Mississippi. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. The Arkansas gentlemen will not admit it. Now, I say that that ought not to be in this bill. I say that it ought to be stricken out and be left to general farming work. Let us make this appropriation $2,000,000 for farm demonstration work, if necessary. Let us make it, and if the Agricutlural Department thinks it ought to be spent down there eradicating the Texas tick, let them do so, instead of making a specific appropriation not exceeding $625,000 for that purpose and say to the farmers all over the rest of the country, "You may hustle if you want to get a single dollar out of the appropriations for farm demonstration work."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object, but I want to say, certainly to gentlemen on this side of the House, that we must get along with this bill. The statement of the gentleman from Missouri is very interesting, but I want to ask my friend that we move along here a little to-day.

Mr. BOOHER. Well, I will not take any more time from the gentleman. Now I want to get back to the prize animal. Here is the evidence; this is what Dr. Rommel said; he is an expert of the Agricultural Department:

Mr. ROMMEL. It was raised in Arkansas. The herd came from Mississippi.

Mr. HAWLEY. Bred in Arkansas?

Mr. JACOWAY. It was raised at Booneville.

I presume that meant Booneville, Mo., in my friend's district.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I object. There is only one Booneville, and that is in my district, where the animal was raised.

Mr. BOOHER. Here is what Dr. Melvin said:

And a few years ago they would not have thought it possible.

That is, a few years ago they would not have thought of raising such an animal. Now, that is a reflection upon the intelligent farmer everywhere. It is a reflection upon him to say that a few years ago it was up to him to improve his stock and now appropriate money to tell him he was right about it.

If you will give the farmer credit of having as much sense as people have who are engaged in other business, that he has as much sense and knows as much about agriculture as we do, although we are farmers, if you will just give him credit and then send some experts out through the country to tell him how much better he can apply his knowledge than by making this kind of an appropriation, you will do our farmers a great amount of good. Now, that is what we ought to do with the money. I say, we are not appropriating too much for the farmer; but let us see what the Agricultural Department is doing. It issues bulletin after bulletin telling the farmers what to do. Is that the reason why you did not want the farmers to learn how to read, so they would read these farm bulletins? They tell the farmer how to apply all these things, and let us appropriate money enough to put the farmers' bulletins in the hands of every farmer in this country, so that those engaged in a particular kind of industry will read them, which he can and will be glad to do.

Now, in regard to the cattle-tick business. What has the Government done for the people down there? Why, they have issued bulletins telling these farmers about this process of dipping in the vats, and they have gone so far as to give a sectional diagram of the vat and giving the complete vat. They have got a vat with an animal swimming through it and a gentleman, well dressed, sitting on the fence with his back to the audience; and I presume he is there as an expert, watching the poor steer go through the vat. That is the way you are spending your money. Now, if the farmer is furnished with the means, after he knows how to do these things that are furnished, I tell you the farmer will do all he can, and he does not need a man to stand up and tell him he can drive an animal through a vat of this dipping medicine in some way or another way. He has got sense enough to do the thing himself.

Let me tell you what some of these experts did at the stockyards in St. Joseph, Mo. Under the law they had to dip sheep down there. Every sheep that had been shipped in from the West that the farmer wanted to take out to feed had to be dipped. One farmer in my county bought 600 head of sheep, and all of them had to be dipped at his expense at the rate of 3 cents a head. The Government expert stood there and superintended the dipping of those sheep, and 300 of the 600 died, mostly before he got them home. Why? It was because of the expert. The dip had to be warmed to a certain temperature, and the expert stood at the foot of the vat and made his tests instead of at the head, where he ought to have been and where the hot liquid was coming in all the time, and as a result the sheep were scalded and died from the effects of it. That is your expert!

Another gentleman, in the district of my friend from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], bought sheep at the same time and at the same place, and they were dipped by the same expert, and that farmer lost nearly all of his sheep. There is no pay for that. The Government denies all liability.

Mr. MADDEN. It is rather a bad case of expert.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I will say to the gentleman that in 1877, in Colorado, they were dipping sheep, and the sheepmen, by using a thermometer, knew how hot the liquid was, and they had no trouble.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, when I was a boy 10 years old I helped my father dip sheep, and we did not have an expert to help us, either. Farmers all over the East did that, and I presume they are doing it now. My contention here is to strike out all these appropriations for special work. Let us make a lump-sum appropriation for the benefit of farm work, and leave it with the Secretary of Agriculture to determine in what sections of the country he will spend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my friend from Missouri, and I have listened to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. My friend from Missouri says that we should put all of these appropriations into one great lump fund.

Mr. BOOHER. I say for farm work.

Mr. LEVER. For farm work, and that amounts to three or four million dollars, all told. My friend from Wisconsin says to segregate them. And we are between the devil and the deep blue sea, and gentlemen can take their choice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I never made any such claim as to segregation where it permitted of such duplication of work as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan, but I did insist on some segregation where you would have control over the department against spending money wastefully, especially as to items connected with the Weather Bureau.

Mr. LEVER. Ever since I have been a Member of this House I have heard this argument about the segregation of the items. The Congress requested this segregation several years ago, so that every Member might know just how every dollar is being spent and for what purpose, and the committee has been trying to follow as nearly as it could the direction and the will of Congress in that respect.

I want to say another thing, and I think the time has come when I should say it. If gentlemen do not believe that the work of the Department of Agriculture is a wise expenditure of Federal money, the people's money, they ought to have the courage to announce their amendments to this bill and strike out these items. I am willing to submit every proposition in this bill to the judgment of the House of Representatives. I am willing to stand here and defend every item of this bill as being a wise investment upon the part of the Federal Government, and if gentlemen do not believe that to be the case, if they believe that it is a wasteful expenditure of the people's money, it is their duty, representing honestly and courageously the people of their districts, to take the floor here and offer amendments by which these appropriations shall be cut down or stricken from the bill entirely. It is one thing, my friends, to complain; it is one thing to criticize; it is one thing to destroy—it takes one kind of mind to do that, but it takes an entirely different kind of mind to create or construct something. [Applause.]

The Committee on Agriculture stands here as a constructive, creative committee. We have no apologies to make for any of the items in this bill. I would be willing to submit them to a popular vote in the United States, and I venture the assertion that of all the appropriation bills passed by this Congress the Agricultural appropriation bill would prove itself the most popular by a vote of 50 to 1 of the people of the United States.

I am getting a little bit tired of complaint and criticism. I have seen appropriation bills carrying $94,000,000 for the Army, $140,000,000 for the Navy, $180,000,000 for pensions, $9,000,000 for this little District of Columbia, and $11,000,000 for the In-

dians of this country, and I have not seen these gentlemen who are complaining now standing on the floor of this House fighting those appropriations. But every time the Agricultural appropriation bill comes on the floor, a bill that is seeking to do something for agriculture, the greatest industry of the American people, gentlemen find fault, criticize, talk, and complain. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] has made some criticism of the $400,000 item carried in this bill for the eradication of the southern cattle tick. It has not been many years, Mr. Chairman, since the Government began in this great work, but they have made the discovery that there is a remedy by which the southern cattle tick that infests all of the Southern States can be absolutely destroyed. That remedy is now being used throughout the infested districts. It is a difficult matter to get these discoveries to the individual farmer, and it is still a more difficult matter when the discovery, as made in this instance, carries with it, in order to have it avail anything, a large expense account to make it available.

In my State, a great cattle-producing State, according to the last census we had more than 7,000,000 head of cattle below the quarantine line. The Government has seen fit to throw a dead line above us and say to our people that they can not ship one hoof of those cattle beyond that dead line unless they have freed them from this tick pest. That same dead line is thrown above every Southern State. The Government has done it. Now, what effect does it have? It holds from the commerce of the world more than 7,000,000 cattle in my State. It holds from the commerce of the world from 700,000 to 1,200,000 in each of the other Southern States of this Union. Since the Government throws this dead line about us, is it not a part of the business of this Government to help carry out and disseminate this information among the meat-growing people of the country to the end that this pest may be completely eradicated?

Now, in the State of Texas the great ranch owners provide their own dipping vats, at an expense of from $500 to $800 a vat, and they are freeing these ranches very speedily of the cattle tick. But going into the eastern portion of the State, where the cattle are grown by the individual farmer, the man on the 100 acres or 50 acres of land, and in the other Southern States, where the conditions are the same as they are in the eastern part of my State, how are they going to get the information?

The States have begun to act. Practically every Southern State has made an appropriation in aid of the extermination of the cattle tick, and why delay this matter? Why not increase the appropriation here, as the States have increased it, and sweep the cattle tick away by one fell swoop, in order that we may increase the meat supply of this country? The people of Illinois, the people of Indiana, the people of Ohio, the people of the corn belt of the country need the southern cattle in order to use the supplies that they raise on their farms to the best advantage; and the meat-eating people, who need meat, are compelled to pay an increased price by reason of shortage in cattle grown for market, and this Government could not engage in a better work than this identical work, and the successful culmination of the Government's endeavors along this line will directly benefit practically every citizen of this Republic. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PAIGE] may address the House for five minutes on another subject. It is agreeable to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PAIGE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, during my short stay in this House I have listened frequently to expressions of opinion in favor of and against the present tariff bill. I would like to leave that discussion for a moment, and refer to a matter which, in my judgment, is one of the greatest concern to the business of this country, and to a far greater extent than the people generally realize.

There is one great question which must be solved, and solved speedily, and as that question is solved, right or wrong, depends the weal or woe of our people for years to come.

I refer to the railroad problem. The railroads of this country, assuming all of the criticism of their financial management that has been made to be true, are nevertheless confronted by a condition and not a theory at the present time, and should receive consideration at the hands of Congress and the American people.

In the month of November last the gross earnings of the leading railroads of this country showed a decrease in earnings over the figures of November, 1912, of $9,000,000, while their operating expenses showed an increase of $6,000,000 over the corresponding month of the previous year. Thus the net earnings of these roads are decreased by $15,000,000 for one month alone. Now, what does this mean? It means simply this: That if the railroads of the country are compelled, as they are and have been, to pay increased wages, increased cost of supplies, increased interest charges, on account of their credit being injured by the onslaughts made by State and National legislatures upon them, it will be but a short time before the railroads of the country will all be in bankruptcy if they are not allowed a reasonable increase of rates to cover the increased expenditures forced upon them.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order. The case he refers to is now being tried by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and it is not proper to discuss it here.

Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. I meant to discuss it as it applies to agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has unanimous consent to discuss it.

Mr. GORDON. Is it proper, Mr. Chairman, to discuss a case that is on trial in the Interstate Commerce Commission? The question is whether this 5 per cent increase ought to be granted or not, and it seems to me that ought to be left with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the House granted the gentleman consent to speak on any subject he wanted to speak on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is in order and will proceed.

Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. The railroads are compelled to accede to the demands of the public to furnish better rolling stock, more frequent train service, to abolish grade crossings, and hundreds of other things to satisfy the demands of the public, and yet when they come forward, as they have for the past 10 months, asking for a small increase in rates, they are turned down by the State or the Nation, and in the meantime their credit is injured to the extent that they are not able, if they thought it the part of wisdom, to accede to the demands of the public.

Take it in my own State. The New Haven Railroad has been made a football for the politicians for the last half a dozen years. No corporation, whether it be a railroad or a manufacturing concern, could avoid bankruptcy that has the onslaughts made upon it that have been made upon this road.

But a great many people have an idea that the depreciation of railroad stocks and railroad securities affects the Morgans and the Rockefellers and the other great captains of finance, and they stand by indifferent as to results. There never was a greater mistake. There is not a savings bank, a life insurance company, or a trust estate that has not thousands or millions of dollars invested in railroad securities.

The credit of the railroads has been injured to such an extent that they are obliged, if they borrow money, to pay exorbitant rates for the same, and what is the result?

The millions of securities held by these institutions and these trustees are depreciated in value just the difference between the high rates of interest they are compelled to pay to-day and the amount of interest-bearing bonds issued when sanity prevailed in regard to railroad properties and the onslaughts upon the railroads had not begun.

I want to quote a statement made by the Hon. Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, one of the leading business men of my State, a Democrat of prominence, and one who has been the nominee of that party for governor of Massachusetts, who said:

> The railroads of Massachusetts have stood the friends of the people from the time the first spike was driven in the building of the first railroad in the United States to the present day. I warn the working men and the working women of the State of Massachusetts that their homes and their firesides are in danger; that their means of livelihood are threatened by the folly and the stupidity and corrupt use of political power by their representatives in high places.
>
> To reasonable control and regulation of railroads there can be no objection. But legislation which has no excuse for being except prejudice and political exigencies, should find no place on the statute books of this Commonwealth. But if such things are to be and are to go on unrebuked by the people themselves, then the ax has been laid at the root of the tree of our industrial prosperity and we may well pray, God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I commend these words to the attention of the legislators on the floor of this House, and say here and now that the time has come to cry a halt against the sandbagging of the railroads of the country, whether it emanates from the corner grocery, the editorial rooms of the great newspapers of the country, or in the State legislatures, or the Halls of Congress.

We have recently passed a bill in this House appropriating $35,000,000 toward building a railroad in Alaska. I actually believe that there would accrue far greater benefits to the people of this country to appropriate that amount of money to save the railroads that we now have; to save the great business interests that are dependent upon the prosperity of the railroads; and to conserve the interests of the laboring men employed by the railroads, whose interests run far up into the millions.

I have been surprised, when the friends of the present tariff bill have been endeavoring to answer the charges of diminished business in the steel trade of the country, the shutting down of mills, the throwing out of employment of workmen, and the like, that some one has not arisen on the other side of the House and made a statement that the railways consume, directly and indirectly, between 40 and 50 per cent of all the iron and steel products of the country, and the present condition of the railroad business and the restriction in the consumption of iron and steel by the railroad companies vitally affects this industry.

But I understand very well that it is so popular to antagonize and to be opposed to anything favoring the railroads of the country that no one has had the courage to stand up and make this statement, for fear they would be charged with being owned by the railroads.

Whenever the purchases by the railroads decline, prosperity is not only threatened but will soon become an acknowledged fact.

I have not the time to go into the details of the present condition of the railroads of the country, but I desire to insert in my remarks an address delivered by Mr. Howard Elliott, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York, on December 11, 1913.

I speak on this subject at the present time not because it is the popular side of the matter, but because my State and New England are threatened, in my judgment, with great business disaster, that will in turn affect the country as a whole.

We may possibly survive a tariff that discriminates against New England manufacturers and New England agriculturists; our manufacturers may possibly survive the inequality of hours of labor and of child labor in the South. But we can not stand having our transportation facilities crippled, as they bid fair to be at the present time, and I believe we have reached the danger point where some one should speak out.

It is easier to avoid the danger line than it is to face the crisis, but if the men who fought at Gettysburg had avoided the danger line the history of the country would have to be rewritten.

For one I believe the antagonism to railroads has gone beyond all reason, and I believe the time has come when men who have the interests of the country at heart should take their stand and cry a halt against the policy that has not only crippled but bids fair to destroy one of the greatest industries of the country.

The railroads of the country constitute its greatest industry next to that of agriculture, and while we are giving deserved attention to the needs of agriculture, in order that the agriculturists may prosper, we utterly ignore the present railway conditions of the country.

If we really wish to enhance the interests of the agriculturists, we must not ignore the present needs of the railways of the country. Unless we either by our acts or, at least, by expression of opinion lend our assistance in straightening out the great railroad problem of the Nation we are singularly remiss in our duty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PAIGE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I insert the following as a part of my remarks:

THE RAILWAYS AND THE GOVERNMENT.

[Address by Howard Elliott, chairman of the New England Lines, delivered at the fifth annual dinner of the Railway Business Association, the National Association of Manufacturers of Railway Materials, Equipment, and Supplies, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, December 11, 1913.]

This is a gathering of representative men who contribute much to the industrial activity and prosperity of the Nation. The opportunity of speaking to you was accepted with hesitation, and only because it gives me a chance to meet many old friends and make, I hope, some new ones, and also because gatherings like this help us to appreciate our mutual interests. It is well to talk over those problems which the remarkable social and industrial evolution of the Nation has placed upon the business men, who are anxious that this country shall progress, and who believe that the social and intellectual advancement of the people depend upon reasonable success in all forms of industry—a class of men also who are as high minded and patriotic and as great believers in the United States and its future as any class of men in the country.

INDUSTRIAL INTERDEPENDENCE.

The rapid increase in the country's population, accompanied, as it has been, by a racial mingling unprecedented in history, has produced new economic conditions and has brought to the fore new problems and new theories of the relation of the Government and the citizen in his business. The application of the principle of increasing Government supervision of business emphasized more than ever before the interdependence of all industry.

The industries which you and I represent are very closely related. Lack of sustenance and stagnation in one affects the others. If the railways of this country are to be maintained and operated as they should be, increasing their facilities to meet the increased demand of the growing business of the Nation, then they must be supplied with materials, and this benefits the many industries which you represent. These purchases of the railway stimulate the activities of the whole country. [Applause.] On the other hand, any curtailment in the purchasing power of the railway will have a withering effect on many industries and retard the prosperity of some which have been leading factors in the commercial growth and expansion of the Nation.

RAILWAY GROWTH.

The growth of the railways in the United States is without a parallel in any other nation. In their present form these railways have been constructed practically within the last 50 years. The total operating revenues of railways earning $1,000,000 or more for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, were $3,057,089,811, of which $2,134,563,789 came from transportation of freight and $678,440,089 from carrying passengers. In the same year these railways paid out for expenses $2,118,529,173, of which $407,156,008 was for maintenance of way and structures, $501,663,582 for maintenance of equipment, $1,074,914,428 for the actual expenses of transportation, and $134,795,155 for administration and traffic expenses. The net operating revenues of the railways of the country in the last fiscal year amounted to $938,560,638, out of which was paid in taxes $123,682,118.

The railways east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers in the same year did a business of $1,386,073,429, of which $992,403,390 was from freight and $293,234,927 from passengers carried. For the three items which make up between 90 and 95 per cent of the expense of operation, maintenance of equipment, maintenance of roadbed, bridges, etc., and transportation, these roads spent, in 1913, $246,727,105 for maintenance of equipment, $180,273,335 for maintenance of tracks, bridges, etc., and $502,734,000 for transportation.

THE RAILWAY PAY ROLL.

Everyone admits now that the transportation question in this country is a very vital one, and these few figures are given to emphasize its importance. And the importance to the general welfare is not alone in the service rendered by transporting man and his property but also because the railway is a great paymaster. The railway pay roll is one of the greatest pay rolls in the country, more than 1,700,000 employees receiving in wages and salaries last year nearly $1,250,000,000. Adding the families of those employees, there are nearly 7,000,000 people, about 7½ per cent of the total population, supported by this pay roll. Think of what this means to the communities in which these railway employees live, to the tradesmen to whom their earnings go for food and clothing! Think of the effect upon the business interests of this country generally of the distribution of this sum of money, passing through the hands of this multitude of purchasers into the channels of trade! It would be difficult to find a person in this country who is not, in one way or another, benefited by this employment of labor. The railway employee is an important factor in his community, and there is no better proof of the theory that the prosperity of a railroad and the section it covers are interdependent than that furnished by the part the railway employees' purchases play in helping business.

Out of $2,750,667,435 which the railways earned in 1910, $1,143,725,306, or 41.58 per cent, was distributed in wages and salaries; in 1911, out of $2,789,761,669, $1,208,466,470, or 43.32 per cent; and in 1912, out of $2,826,917,967, $1,243,113,172, or 43.97 per cent. And each year this wage distribution has been taking a larger proportion of the railway dollar. Between 1910 and 1911 there was an increase of 5.66 per cent in the pay roll and only 1.42 per cent in the operating revenues. Between 1911 and 1912 the increase in the pay roll was 2.87 per cent and in operating revenues 1.33 per cent. There are no very complete statistics of the amount of material purchased by the railways, but it is very large—many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Obviously, as an abstract proposition, because of its effect on general business activities and upon the welfare and happiness of so many people, everybody must want this great pay roll maintained and want the railways to go on spending money. Curtailment of the railway purchasing power, or a diminution of its pay roll, would be felt in millions of homes. A continued improvement of the railway will stimulate trade, give a general steadiness to business, and minimize depression. The money the railways would spend in expanding their facilities as they should be expanded, to keep pace with the growth of business in the country, would percolate into every conceivable artery of trade. Can it be doubted that this would impart that wholesome stimulus to business that is so anxiously awaited at the present time?

To a large extent the railway is simply a collecting and distributing agency of the sums, small in units but large in the aggregate, that the public pays for the service it performs. The railway owner retains for himself what, compared with many forms of other business, is a relatively small return on the value of the railway plant. If there is to be a halt in railway activity, if the railways of the country are to be forced, by the conditions imposed upon them, to abandon all new construction and restrict their outlay to the absolute necessities of maintenance and operation, what will be the result? Will there not follow a corresponding contraction, especially in those industries, many of them very large, which the railroad helps to support, and be imparted by them, in turn, through still other trade channels until an adverse influence is felt throughout the entire business life of the country? For example, the railways purchase a very large proportion of all the iron and steel made in this country. Thus their prosperity is very closely interwoven with the prosperity of the great metal industry of the country, and upon this industry enforced economies and the suspension of construction by the railways will have a most serious effect.

RAILWAY EARNINGS.

There is indisputable evidence that that expansion of our railways which has contributed so much to the country's prosperity has, by

reason of the conditions now imposed upon them, reached a point of practical suspension. There is hardly any new construction being undertaken, and improvements are being postponed wherever practicable, because of lack of funds. This is due, in part, to the great increase in the cost of labor and materials, in part to the elaborate and luxurious facilities which the people demand, and in part to the rise in the rates of interest, all of which is reflected in the loss in net earnings shown by recent statements of the railways; and this despite an increase in gross earnings maintained until very recently, though there are signs to-day of a falling off even in gross. In the case of the eastern roads, the gross earnings increased $187,000,000 from 1910 to 1913, while operating expenses and taxes increased $201,000,000, the increase in tax payments alone amounting, in those three years, to $11,590,000. There was an actual decrease in the net operating income of these roads of $16,311,000. In 1913 these railways earned in gross $1,424,000,000. Their net operating income was $336,754,000, and after payment of interest on funded debt and other obligatory charges there was left $206,600,000. The dividends paid out of this amounted to $130,000,000, which was 5.10 per cent on the capital stock outstanding. This was $19,000,000 less than the dividends paid in 1912 and $7,000,000 less than the dividends paid in 1910.

In the Central Freight Association territory a group of 28 roads, having 23,167 miles of road, or 51.5 per cent of the entire mileage in the territory—roads like the Big Four, Vandalia, Wabash, Chicago & Alton, and Illinois Central—in the year ending June 30, 1913, earned $63,000,000 more than in the panic year of 1908, but their operating expenses and taxes were $62,000,000 more, and after paying expenses and taxes their net operating revenues were only $811,000 more than in 1908, and their net corporate income was actually $8,000,000 less, although in these five years $180,000,000 of new capital had been invested in these properties.

The reduction in net is shown very strikingly in the statements of the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, and the New Haven for the first four months of the present fiscal year. In this period the New York Central lines showed an increase in gross earnings of $4,339,442, as compared with the same period of 1912, but as a result of increased expenses there was a decrease in the net earnings of $7,614,542. The Pennsylvania, for the same period, showed an increase in gross earnings of $5,100,192, but a decrease in net earnings of $4,367,795, while the New Haven, including all transportation lines in which it is interested, showed a decrease of $790,379.12 in gross and $4,020,311.51 in net operating revenue and of $4,934,725.01 in net corporate income, after allowing for all fixed charges of every kind.

THE RAILWAY PROBLEM.

I think that all candid and thoughtful persons will admit that the situation as reflected here is a serious one, not only as affecting the railways themselves but the entire business of this country. Indeed, with railway credit impaired, it would seem difficult for the railways to extricate themselves from the present situation unless a change occurs in public sentiment and in the treatment they receive from the people, as expressed through their various governmental agencies. Undoubtedly various causes have contributed to bring this situation about. Some of these have been economic and some social, and the railway has suffered from both, perhaps, more than any other industry in that the price of its service is no longer within its own control, and the same may be said of its great pay roll.

Is it not incumbent upon all thoughtful men who wish to see this country continue to prosper to stop and ask themselves what can be done in this emergency? Is this trouble a socialistic one, due to new currents of thought and feeling in the minds of a majority of our citizens fostered possibly by ideas of government brought here by many of our new citizens from the Old World, who influence many others with whom they come in contact? And if the trouble is socialistic, does it not behoove every citizen who does not believe in this kind of doctrine applied to business to speak out?

PRESENT TENDENCIES.

Many of us have hazy ideas about socialism, but the principle underlying the proposed socialistic state, as expressed by many socialists, is that from everyone shall be expected according to his ability, and that to everyone shall be given in accordance with his needs. The socialistic ideal thus expressed is that every man shall do his utmost, but that he is not to be paid in proportion to the amount of work that he does or in proportion to its value, but, on the contrary, he is to be paid in accordance with his needs. The tendency of the people of the United States, however, seems to be not to extend to the railways even that treatment which is expressed by this socialistic ideal. [Applause.] Under that ideal the railways would be expected to do all that they can, and would be allowed to receive all that they need, but is it not true to-day that the railways are expected to do more than they can and at the same time are not permitted to receive what they need?

THE HUMAN FACTOR.

For example, first and foremost, the railways are expected to run their trains without causing injuries or deaths that would be avoidable by all ordinary human precaution. Yet distinction is seldom made between the need for care and caution on the part of the public and the need for care and caution on the part of those intrusted with railway operation. [Applause.] A very large number of the injuries and half the deaths charged against the railways are of trespassers on railway property. If people will not keep off railway property the law should compel them to do so. [Applause.] Yet, although the railway companies have time and again urged legislatures to pass laws against trespassing, only two or three State legislatures have responded. In other words, more is expected of the railways in diminishing the number of casualties and fatalities than they can do, and there is not given them that protection which they need and which the people need. [Applause.] Wrecks and accidents are sometimes due to the delinquency of those charged with the management and operation of a railway, and it is only right that the managing officers of a railway should be held directly to account for defects in administration and carelessness in directing operation. But there is another side, and if the officers are to be held responsible for the administration and discipline the employees of a railway should be held responsible for submission to proper discipline and should not consider their allegiance to their brotherhoods above their allegiance to the company which employs them [great applause] or their duty to the public who supply the money for their wages. The Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed out that one of the most disturbing causes of accidents is the carelessness of the railway employees. Under these conditions, quite generally acquiesced in by the public and the press, the people make it difficult for the railway managers to preserve the discipline that the hazardous business of train operation demands and are asking almost more than the railways can do. [Applause.] If the railways are quasi public servants, their employees are also quasi public servants, and the people should hold the man as well as the master to his responsibility. [Applause.] By not demanding this responsibility, the people are not according to the railways that which they need and that which the people need.

IMPROVEMENTS.

While the railways should be held directly to account for maintaining roadbed, track, and other facilities in proper condition, the fact should not be lost sight of that safety in operation, as the people look upon it to-day, means equipment of steel or steel underframe in the passenger service, and other heavy expenditures in consequence. To demand that such improvements be made within any short period of time, in advance of the ability of the railways to pay for them, is to demand of the railways more than they can accomplish. And to hold them down and so to impair their credit that they can not obtain funds for such improvements is certainly not to accord to them that which they need. [Applause.] Again, in insisting that they serve the end of efficiency from the standpoint of economical operation and at the same time meet the requirements for fast and frequent service the people demand of the railways more than they can do. If they desire such service without allowing the railways the compensation that justifies it, they are not according the railways what they need.

In this respect the railways of Europe are treated better than ours, because there the justice of charging a higher rate for a fast freight service has been recognized. In Europe, as in this country, there are generally three kinds of service—express freight on passenger trains, expedited or fast freight, and ordinary or low-speed freight. But while in this country no distinction is made between the fast and slow freight in the matter of compensation, in Europe a higher rate is permitted in the case of "accelerated freight." Such a charge, if permitted here, would increase earnings and help the railroads to make improvements now badly needed and yet would not impose an undue burden upon the public. [Applause.]

COMPETITION VERSUS COMBINATION.

There is another respect in which the people of this country are dealing at cross purposes with the railways, and this is a question of transcendent importance, not only in the field of transportation but throughout industry and commerce. This is a question of competition versus combination. The New Haven road is a consolidation of 189 companies; the Boston & Maine and Maine Central of 200 companies. Before the consolidation of these lines, when it was desired to move a carload of freight from one end of New England to another, separate arrangements had to be made and varying instructions issued for each railway and endless bargaining and higgling over rates and schedules, as well as the expense of many separate organizations. In this combination of separate railways in one organic whole there is the possibility of efficiency under proper management, both from the standpoint of economical operation of the railways and from the public's standpoint of improved service. Because of practices incident to the great construction period of American development, and not confined to railways, the people created the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has pretty effectually not only restrained competition but stifled it, so far as rates are concerned. As the commission has the power to prevent the railroads from charging unreasonable rates and to prevent unjust discrimination, it is a grave question whether it is not an economical error to object to combinations of railways which, under suitable management, can be made to serve the ends of efficiency by more economical operation and better service. [Applause.] Here, again, we find an inconsistency on the part of the people, who insist that the railways shall practice the greatest economy and efficiency in operation, but who, at the same time, object to principles that will further such economy. If the railways are not supported by the people, they can not render service to the people. The very expression "The railroads and the people" indicates a distinction, a separation of interests, that the prosperity or the adversity of the railways is a matter of indifference to the people, and vice versa. Such a feeling occasionally finds expression in such an utterance as was made recently in the New Orleans Picayune, which editorially called upon the voters to oppose any candidate who was not "fully competent and willing to place the people's interests above those of the railroads and transportation lines under all circumstances," when, as a matter of fact, their interests are identical. One reason, I believe, for this attitude is that our people do not realize that railroading is business just as much as rail making or producing paint is business and that railways are as much a part of everyday life as any other business.

MULTIPLICITY OF LAWS.

There are State legislatures which pass laws concerning the railways within their State, and the laws of one State sometimes conflict with those of another and sometimes with those of the National Government. The effect of this multiform and heterogeneous regulation is to compel the railroads to serve 49 masters, although the impossibility of serving even two masters has been crystallized in a proverb. [Applause.] The effect of this multiplicity of laws also has been to undermine the confidence of investors, whose money is needed for the extension and the improvement of the railroads. It has been estimated that nearly $1,000,000,000 will be required within the next year to improve the railways so that they may meet the demands of growing business and safer and more luxurious service. How can this money be raised? How can this condition be remedied? Must it not come from cooperation of the people with the railways and from the conviction in the public mind that railways are rendering to the people not only an essential but a vital service?

GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY.

If the people, by reason of new tendencies of thought, are exacting more of the railways and allowing them less in return for service rendered, are the people following the same rule with respect to the great machine of government which they themselves have created and in whose management they have a potent voice? There has been criticism of lack of efficiency in railway administration, and some of it is just, because railway officers and men are human and imperfect, but as a class they are doing better year by year. As a class they are high-minded, patriotic gentlemen, dealing with a problem that at times is very discouraging. They believe in frank and honorable business methods. They are doing the very best they can, and they should receive help and commendation from the public instead of hindrance and hostile criticism. [Great applause.] Does the Government set any better example to the business men or to the youth of this country of the necessity of hard, efficient, and high-minded work? [Applause.] In 1896 there were in the executive civil service, excluding employees

in the Congress, the judiciary, and enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy, 178,717 persons, and in 1910, 355,635, an increase of 100 per cent in 14 years. While the population of the country has increased, it has not increased 100 per cent; and is the Government doing the careful, efficient work the taxpayer has a right to demand? [Great applause.] If the Government, with all its power, has been unable to resist the demands for greater elaborateness and more employees, can it be expected that the railways can escape these same forces? [Applause and cries of "No!" "No!"] Again, does the Government exemplify in its own dealings with others the principles of justice and business morality which the people, through this same agency, exact from those subservient to it?

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT.

There has been a gradual and desirable change in the standards of business in the past 20 years, and particularly in the past 10. Practices that a few years ago were considered proper in financial, commercial, manufacturing, and transportation business are contrary to the ideas of the public to-day.

In this business uplift I think the great railway systems of the country, taken as a whole, are in the front rank in trying to do their work on a high plane and in trying to observe the complicated laws of the land. [Applause.] And the larger and more complicated the business the more rigid is the carrying out of the maxim that "honesty is the best policy." [Applause.]

Some people are still ready to ask for the rebate, the pass, and the special privilege. Because of some glaring failures here and there the press and the public sometimes are too prone to condemn all. But every man in modern industrial business life knows how insistent the majority of men charged with the responsibility of management is for honesty, good morals, industry, and avoidance of sharp practice, and of trying to get something for nothing. [Applause.]

The moral effect of this policy on the young man in business must be good, because whether he likes it or not he must behave or be thrown into the discard. What kind of an example does the United States Government set before the youth of the land in its treatment of the great transportation lines? The Government should surely be as scrupulously honest and high-minded in dealing with the railways as it expects the railways to be in dealing with the people; but is it? [Applause.]

RAILWAY MAIL PAY.

Look at the mail and parcel-post situation for a moment. The Government pays the railways for transporting the mail on the basis of weights obtained in the autumn of 1912 for four years, beginning July 1, 1913, although there is always some increase in weight each year. In January, 1913, the parcel post began with a weight limit of 11 pounds, then increased it to 20, and it is now, in some cases, to be 50 pounds. The parcel post takes business away from the express business of the railway and reduces earnings in that way, but the Government pays nothing for the extra weight carried, as the test weighing was before the parcel post began. So for four years the railways must carry the increasing weight of the ordinary mail and the rapidly growing parcel-post freight for nothing, unless the Government takes steps to pay for service already performed and to be performed, which, so far, it seems disinclined to do. [Applause.]

On the New Haven Road, which right now needs all the help it can get [laughter and applause], a careful computation made by chartered accountants showed that the company was performing service costing $743,000 a year more than it received, and what is true of the New Haven is true of many other roads. Yet there is little criticism of the action of the Government, although it is taking large sums of money away from the railroads. [Applause.] Do you remember all the outcry there was, and justly so, when it was found some years ago that an importer in Brooklyn was defrauding the Government through false weights? [Laughter and applause.]

The New York Times, in an editorial in October, 1913, said:

"Every receiver of a postal parcel carried at the cost of the railways whose services are not paid for is a receiver of stolen goods." [Laughter and applause.]

The Chicago Inter-Ocean, in commenting on this, said:

"Any man who, merely because he has the power, compels another to give him unpaid service is a robber. [Great applause.] He has taken from the other his time, his strength, or his property in some form without making due compensation. If 10 men thus combine to rob 8, the immorality remains. Because several millions have combined, 'through Government,' thus to rob their fellow citizens who happen to own railroads, the wrong of it is not made right."

SERVICE WITHOUT PAY.

This is strong language, but is it not true?

Here are the railways, struggling to make both ends meet, and the Government takes service from them worth, exclusive of the parcel post, at least $15,000,000 per year, and no pay. What kind of an example is this for the great United States Government to set to the younger men of the country? [Laughter and applause.]

The whole theory of modern railway regulation is to secure honesty of operation and fairness of treatment on the part of the railway toward all classes of the public. Does it not therefore behoove the Government, in all of its relations with the transportation companies, to treat them with most scrupulous regard to the dictates of honesty and fairness? Treatment by the Government, however, of the question of compensating the railways for carrying the people's mails suggests a lack of full appreciation of this converse proposition by some of our highest governmental authorities. While not a single definite and practical step has been taken with a view of compensating the railways for carrying the additional weight of the mail for the period of the first six months of the parcel post, the Postmaster General was empowered, after July 1, to add not exceeding 5 per cent to the pay of the railways. But on August 15 the Postmaster General increased the weight limit from 11 to 20 pounds, and the Interstate Commerce Commission only last week gave its approval to his recommendation of a further increase to 50 pounds. No arrangements were made, however, and no arrangements have as yet been made, to compensate the roads for this additional weight. Is it any wonder that the parcel post under such conditions has been eminently successful? [Laughter and applause.] And is it any wonder that some advocates of Government ownership have seized upon its success as an argument for other theories, particularly with respect to its efficiency and economy? [Laughter and applause.]

The Supreme Court has ruled that the railways are not compelled to carry the mails, but that if they do carry them it must be under the rules laid down by the Postmaster General. Any thinking man will realize that they could not seriously consider refusing to carry the mails. If the law compelled them to carry the mails under rates fixed by Congress which were not compensatory, they would have some standing before the courts, but under the law as it stands they must make now a contract with the Post Office Department upon terms dictated by that department, and can only appeal to public opinion for a redress.

THE RAILWAY FACTOR.

The more men of fair and unbiased mind study the economic situation in this country, affected as it undoubtedly is by some of these experiments of government, the more are they impressed with the importance of the railway situation as a factor. Sir George Paish, eminent in the field of finance and economics, commenting on the country's condition after a long trip of observation, said recently:

"In considering the economic outlook of the United States in the immediate future, it is evident that the factor of most immediate importance is the application of the railways of the Eastern States to the Interstate Commerce Commission for an advance in rates. The difficulty experienced by the railways in raising capital has already caused many of them to reduce their new capital expenditures, and this reduction, in a large measure, accounts for the reaction in the iron and equipment trades that is now observable. If the difficulties of raising new capital become still greater, then it is obvious that the railway companies would practically stop improvement works and a serious setback in trade would result. If, however, the railways succeed in funding the large amount of notes which fall due in the current year, and in raising the new capital they require to expend on works of improvement and on new equipment, then the reaction in trade, due to international conditions and other influences, would, in my judgment, be comparatively small. Thus the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in altering or disallowing the railways of the East to advance their rates by 5 per cent will have important economic consequences."

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENT NECESSARY.

With all our troubles, however, I still feel that we will come out all right, but—and this is a great big but—care must be taken in working out these problems, and the public must be told the truth or harm will be done that will take years to cure and the best results will be delayed. It is foolish in this country to admit that all railway improvement must be given up. These things must go on; public opinion will not tolerate a deterioration of the railways. It will insist upon their being able to furnish the service required by growing business, and by the very logic of the situation the public will provide the means for them so to do. But it is most important not to delay too long.

HOPEFUL SIGNS.

There are some rifts in the clouds. Signs indeed are multiplying of a readjustment of ideas in the public mind, which ought to find a reflection in the attitude of governmental agencies. The miasma which has arisen from the misrepresentation of the past is disappearing and the public mind is clearing in consequence. That a constructive rather than a destructive sentiment is growing is apparent. This drift in public sentiment is clearly beginning to make itself felt, as shown in some recent expressions of a friendly nature coming from those in Government offices. Such, for example, was the statement made only a short time before his death by Interstate Commerce Commissioner Marble: "We are seeking to bring about a condition that will be fair and equitable and that will make the railroads successful under present ownership." [Applause.] In the newspapers this drift is finding expression in a rebuke of continued criticism and intemperate denunciation of former practices, and a general realization that such a course can only produce widespread business atrophy.

CURING THE PATIENT.

National need of terminal and other railway facilities having been thoroughly impressed upon the public mind, shippers and editors generally convinced that larger net railway returns should be permitted, what are the reasons and perplexities which prevent the people from giving effect to a policy that will cure the trouble, making it unanimous? Even if there is only a vigorous minority opposed to such policy, candid consideration of their objections is due them.

It is claimed that the management of some roads has not been honest—that insiders have profited when they should not. The morals of all kinds of business have improved year by year, and things have been done in railway and other business in the development of the country that were probably not right then, and that certainly are frowned upon now by law and public opinion. Such things ought never to have been done. Owners of railways should root out dishonesty if it exists, and if they will not, public authority will do it. But is there anything in the situation that warrants calling a halt on the development of the continent? [Applause.] Every time a clergyman, a doctor, a senator, or a cashier is punished, are we forthwith to abolish all clergymen, all doctors, all senators, and all cashiers, while we unfrock that particular clergyman, convict that particular doctor, expel that particular senator, or jail that particular cashier?

RAILWAY SECURITIES.

Others say that some railways are overcapitalized. Whether they are or not—and certainly American roads have led the world in refraining from it—no more capitalization ought to be created than is necessary in order to serve the public. If too much was issued by some roads in the past, this is to be regretted, but no workable method has been suggested by which securities issued legally and bought in good faith can be taken from their owners without failures and receiverships that harm many more people than the owners of the securities. [Applause.] As for the future, every railway of importance runs through one or more States which regulate security issues. And apart from that, those responsible for railway management realize, as they never did before, the absolute necessity of sound business principles in issuing securities, law or no law. The present problem is not to restrict the issues of securities but to find people willing to buy them. [Laughter and applause.]

Another says that if securities were sold over the counter the bankers' commission would be saved. Perhaps, some day, if confidence can be restored, part of such commissions might be saved; but a railroad must have financial experts, as well as engineering experts, and pay a fair price for services rendered. If the commissions can be saved, they ought to be. But not even city, State, and Federal Governments, whose credit is based on the taxing power, have been able at all times to float even moderately large popular loans without the aid of bankers. [Applause.]

Others object because they say the new revenue would go to increased dividends. So some of it would and must. The dividend which a stockholder receives is not all that he would like or that his managers want to pay, but is an amount needed to induce him and others to buy more stock or bonds when an enlarged plant is necessary in order to meet the desires and absolute necessities of the public.

EFFECT OF ECONOMIES.

It is said that the increased income needed could be had by economies. It is true that economies have been introduced, and there is room for more of them. Railroad managers, as a whole, are pushing hard every day to improve men, methods, and facilities. Many economies, however can only be adopted by throwing away old appliances and buying new ones, which is the case in mills and factories as well as in railroads. And if the railroads have no money with which to get the new tools, they must do the best they can with the old ones. No effort in this direction should be neglected, and no other industry is, or in the nature of thing can be, so thoroughly organized nation wide as the railways to cooperate in studying, experimenting, and standardizing their progress. But, in view of the wonderful savings already accomplished, both major and minor, in the past few years, and in spite of the larger percentages of gross earnings absorbed by expenses and taxes, it is doubtful if the people should depend on such measures to offset the apparently irresistible rise in wages and in the price of materials, the higher cost of capital, and the demands for more elaborate facilities and luxurious service.

Are any of these obstacles sufficiently important to delay such revision of rate schedules as will meet this anomalous situation of increasing gross earnings, but declining net earnings, and still more rapidly declining net corporate income after payment of fixed charges?

The railway managers of the country want to know where to improve. They welcome just criticism based on a real knowledge of all the actual facts. It is their purpose to profit by it. To serve the public adequately, on the other hand, is also their purpose, and it is their duty to seek diligently from the appropriate authorities the sanction and help necessary if the railway is to do what the people want and must have if the country is to grow. So it would seem as if it was to the interest of the people to be patient with a railway which has practically no control over the price of what it has to sell—transportation—and very little control over the price of labor needed to produce that transportation.

New England is a great educational and financial force. She has sent her sons all over the country to help do the work needed. In the last edition of "Who's Who in America" 20 per cent of the names are those of men born in New England. Anything that affects adversely the credit and social welfare of New England will in turn affect the whole country. Her welfare and the welfare of her railways are important to the entire country. These six New England States have one-fourteenth of the national population and have one-twelfth of the national wealth. They consume one-eighth of the materials of manufacture and they have one-sixth of the bank deposits. For the New England lines that I represent I ask the patient good will of her people and of the Nation while her peculiar and difficult transportation problems are being solved. [Great applause.]

I do not think I ever sat in a board that felt so badly as the New Haven board did yesterday when the figures forced them to make the decision that took away a dividend, coming at Christmas time, from thousands and thousands of people. [Applause.] But they had the courage to take that position because they felt in the long run it would be better for the property, better for New England, and better for the stockholders themselves. [A voice: "Good!" "Good!"]

The business men of the country who benefit from the accumulated savings of New England, from her large purchases from other parts of the country, from her great and continuous contributions to the national welfare in sending out trained men and women, should at this time of storm and stress help the situation in every reasonable way. It is to your interest to do it, and as patriotic citizens, interested in the welfare of the whole country, I ask you most earnestly to help. [Great outburst of applause and prolonged cheering, Mr. Elliott rising and bowing.]

Mr. BORLAND and Mr. TOWNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], if he is present, whether he withdrew his point of order against that language?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I was recognized by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman, but not to take the time of a gentleman who did not have any time.

Mr. TOWNER. I understand he did have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not have any time.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask for time in my own right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman then should move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TOWNER. If the point of order was not made, I desire to make it; and I make it against this language of the bill as new legislation. I want to call the attention of the Chair to this——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will not the gentleman withhold his point of order until the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture returns?

Mr. MANN. It is too late now to make the point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. I thought it was pending.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] has not withdrawn his point of order, it does not need to be made again.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the point of order was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], and has not been withdrawn. The gentleman is not on the floor now, and I ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] not to make his point of order until the gentleman returns.

Mr. TOWNER. I offer this amendment, then, Mr. Chairman. We ought to know whether the point of order is withdrawn or not.

Mr. MADDEN. The point of order is not withdrawn.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, are, as it seems to me, something of a reflection on those who have differed from him as to how the bill should be made up.

I venture to say, however, that he intended no reflection on me, because I have been a member of that committee with him during the last six or seven years, and it has been my pleasure to cooperate with him. I am proud of my connection with him, and I congratulate him on the character of the work he has done and on what he has accomplished. He not only has the full confidence of his fellow members on the committee, but he has gained and richly deserves the confidence of the entire House. [Applause.]

But in some respects I differ from him as to the make-up of the appropriation bill, and I have expressed the same difference of opinion to-day. We have been speaking of the great work of farm demonstration and of farm management. Many of the Members of the House know that I have heartily approved of that work, although I have questioned the form of the appropriations providing for it. I found when I came to the House and learned better than I knew before the character of the work the great Department of Agriculture was doing, and learned better than I knew before the results of its investigations and experiments—I have felt that if results could be taken to the country in such form that they could be readily understood and applied by those who ought to know them and ought to have opportunity to apply them immense benefit would result. And I learned that insufficient appropriations were made for the purpose of carrying on what we may call this practical work of taking to the farmers in a practical way the results of investigations and experiments. And I have said before and I feel now that in the Department of Agriculture, as in the colleges throughout the country, the results of investigations and experiments load down the shelves.

The books are full of the results of experiments and investigations, which, however, are practically worthless unless they can be taken out to the farmers of the country in such a way that they can be understood and used in a practical way.

I say I have criticized the form of the appropriation because there is one providing for the taking of the results of these investigations to the farmers, providing for the employment of men to go into the southern section of the country, infested with the cotton-boll weevil, to teach the farmers there better methods of agriculture. That money, however, has been appropriated by Congress, it seems to me, under a misapprehension.

The words of the law are that the Department of Agriculture is to use the money in learning the best methods of combating the boll weevil, when the fact is that they have not been combating the boll weevil at all. They have been sending men into the southern country to teach farmers to raise corn and cattle and potatoes, without any reference to the weevil, and that money has been spent in many instances hundreds of miles away from the section of country infested with the boll weevil.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I did not hear the opening remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, but I understand he took some exceptions to my remarks, made a little while ago. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not include him at all in those remarks, because the gentleman from Michigan has been a very warm advocate of all the projects carried in this bill, and his only complaint while he has been on the committee has been that they have not been properly lumped. I want to say that we have not had a more efficient and more faithful member of the committee than the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I thank the chairman for what he says of my work on the committee and of my attitude toward projects provided for in this bill, but his former statement was general and seemed to apply to all who differ from him or who oppose the bill in its present form. I therefore felt justified in explaining my position.

I approve the work the Department of Agriculture is doing under appropriations made for farm demonstration, farm management, and farm practice, but appropriations are not carried in proper form in this bill, nor have they been properly carried in former bills. I have spoken of the appropriation now reaching $378,000 for "study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil," which appropriation, I believe, is made by Congress with the idea that the money is used for the purpose of attacking directly the ravages of the weevil, whereas the money, as I have said, is used in

regular farm-demonstration work to pay salaries and expenses of men who undertake to teach farmers in the cotton-growing section new and improved methods of agriculture. Much of the money is spent in sections of the country not yet reached by the boll weevil.

Another paragraph of the bill carries an appropriation of $400,000 for improving "methods of farm management and farm practice and for farm-demonstration work." This appropriation is for exactly the same kind of work as is carried on under the boll-weevil appropriation, except that it is generally carried on in the North, whereas the boll-weevil appropriation must be spent in the South. These appropriations are to be used by the Bureau of Plant Industry.

This bill, on page 11, carries an appropriation of $50,000 to be "used for live-stock demonstration work in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry in areas freed of cattle ticks." This appropriation, providing for work which is farm-demonstration work pure and simple, is to be used by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

On page 19 we find an appropriation of $10,000 for "investigations in connection with the production of sirup and sugar cane and the utilization of cane by-products," which appropriation is to be used by the Bureau of Plant Industry. On page 17 there is an appropriation of $38,000 for "investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for improvement of cotton by cultural methods, breeding, and selection." Both cotton and corn are mentioned in this clause, but the words "other crops introduced from tropical regions" evidently make it necessary for the Bureau of Plant Industry to use the money in the States of the South.

On page 67 the bill carries an appropriation of $50,000 for "the development of live-stock production in cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States." This is farm-demonstration work, and the appropriation ought to be included with those made elsewhere in the bill for this kind of work; and, besides, I believe these appropriations ought to be made without any restriction as to the section of the country in which the money is to be used.

After speaking of the different sections of the bill carrying separate appropriations for one and the same kind of work, I repeat my criticism and enlarge on my reason for insisting that only one appropriation ought to be made, and that all money appropriated for this farm-management work ought to be used by one bureau of the department. Perhaps the excuse for making several appropriations is that larger amounts and a larger amount in the aggregate may be appropriated. My insistence is that only one appropriation—although it may reach the large sum of $926,000, as it does—ought to be made, and that Congress and the country ought to know the amount of money used in this kind of work. Only one appropriation ought to be made, and it ought to be administered by one bureau, because under the present way of doing business it is absolutely certain that there will be duplication. Different kinds of work are provided for, but all are along the same general line of farm-demonstration work, and in one community one man ought to be employed to do all the different kinds of work. If this plan is not pursued, the result will be that one man will be sent into a community to advise and assist farmers in the production of one kind of live stock, another will be sent to give help in producing another kind of stock, another will work in the community with a view of assisting farmers in improvement of sugar cane and the use of cane by-products, another will work in the same community for the purpose of assisting farmers to improve their methods of producing other crops; and the upshot of the whole proposition will be that four or five—perhaps more—men, some from one bureau and some from another, some paid out of one appropriation and some out of another, will be sent into one community, each to do some work in the line of farm management or farm demonstration, whereas one man who understands his business could perform all these duties himself.

I am not finding fault with the amount of the appropriations nor with the character of the work the officers and employees of the department are doing. I believe the farm-management and farm-demonstration work is absolutely necessary, and I agree with what former Secretary Wilson said, to the effect that this line of work is one of the most important lines of work in which the department is engaged. I find fault with the form in which appropriations are made. They ought to be made so that Congress and the country may understand the amount appropriated and so there may be no duplication of work or waste of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, of course I have no objection to the members of the committee throwing bouquets at one another, but if exceptions are to be inferred from the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina, it seems to me fair that he should state the gentlemen to whom he did refer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are still under the discussion of this item relating to the extermination of the southern cattle tick, and more especially the $50,000 appropriation for farm demonstration work. I want to say that the work of the extermination of the southern cattle tick has been remarkably successful. It has shown substantial results. The report of the committee here shows that approximately 25,000 square miles are annually cleared of the cattle tick and added to the free zone, and that, in all, about 215,000 square miles have been cleared of the cattle tick and added to the free zone.

Mr. MADDEN. And there are 725,000 square miles left in it.

Mr. BORLAND. A very large percentage of the cattle we are getting to-day comes from the Southern States, and much of it south of what we call the quarantine line. When these cattle have been sent to northern markets for butchering, they have been compelled to submit to charges and delays and exactions caused by the existence of the cattle tick in their region. They are required to be put in a special quarantine yard at Kansas City, or St. Louis, or Chicago, or St. Joseph, so that they will not mingle with other cattle and communicate the disease. The expense and delay of handling them is considerable, both to the transportation company and to the owner of the cattle, and incidentally to the man who buys them for butchering or export. As fast as any portion of the country can be cleared of the cattle tick it brings in a large section suitable for the raising of beef where there are no quarantine regulations, and where the cattle may be sent to a northern market or an export market directly without the restrictions to which I have referred.

Now, we know that the supply of cattle in this country has gone down in the last five or six years from about 52,000,000 head to less than 35,000,000 head. For a while that enormous shrinkage was made up by heavy importations from Mexico. Those importations, of course, came from a tick-infested region, according to our classification; but they came into a tick-infested region, so that there was not very much distinction. But the cattle have ceased to come from Mexico to a great extent. I understand that there is not only an export tax on cattle now in Mexico under present conditions, but that the supply of cattle there has been greatly depleted by the disturbed condition of the country. There is only one way in which we can increase the supply of beef in this country for the American consumer, and that is, as speedily as possible to clear the Southern States of the tick-infested area. Then, with the cultivation of corn that they are engaging in down there, which is being encouraged by their boys' corn clubs, and that sort of thing, with the cultivation of winter feed, they will be able to feed cattle on the farm, as our Missouri, Iowa, and Kansas farmers do. They can take a bunch of feeders, fatten them, and send them to a northern market. Now, if they can go into Missouri, Iowa, and Kansas and buy bunches of feeders and take them down there where they have this equable climate, and fatten them and bring them back, that is going to increase the beef supply of this country. An increased beef supply is going to redound to the benefit of the wage earners of the city and the producers of the country and every section of our population. There is not an item of this bill that reaches more people directly than this item to increase and make available a larger area for the raising of beef cattle in this country. [Applause.] The place where we must look for the increase of that area is in the Southern States, where in the past we have had a large area that was quarantined because of the cattle tick. If we are driving this tick line back at the rate of 25,000 square miles a year, we ought to continue to drive it back until it is driven clear over the Mexican border and there is not a foot of American soil anywhere that can not be used for beef cattle, so that the feeders and the fat cattle can be shipped from that section to any market in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there were not large numbers of cattle being shipped from Mexico?

Mr. BORLAND. I said there had been a decrease in the number, and I think that is true. Eighteen months ago there was a very large number of cattle came in from Mexico.

Mr. SLOAN. How long ago?

Mr. BORLAND. Eighteen months ago a large number of cattle came across the border. My understanding is that decrease comes from two causes: First, the imposition of a heavy export tax by the Mexican authorities; and, second, a decrease in the Mexican supply of cattle.

Mr. SLOAN. My information is that there has been a marvelous increase in the last four months, and that something over a quarter of a million cattle have been imported.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will recognize that that is not a normal or healthy increase. That must be due to some temporary cause and that drovers are selling their herds, because surely they have not raised the cattle to ship.

Mr. SLOAN. I understand that they are actually coming to this country and paying the export duty.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not a permanent condition of export from Mexico to this country, but indicates that the temporary condition which existed about 18 months ago has broken out again. It means a clearing off of the Mexican pastures if it means anything.

Mr. SLOAN. It means that cattle are being imported under the Underwood tariff law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, the time has gone by when cattle can be herded on the range in this country. I think they are still herded on the range in Mexico. When I was a boy and worked at the Kansas City stockyards they were herded on the range in this country, and the long-horned animals commenced to come in in September by the trainload, with a drover on top of the cars. But that time has gone by, and the source of the beef supply in this country is the little farmer, who goes to the local market and buys a bunch of feeders, or buys out his neighbor's yearlings, takes them over where he has a supply of corn and a little pasture, or where he can buy a little corn, and he takes those cattle, sometimes borrowing the money to buy the feed, and in 90 or 120 days he puts so many pounds of beef onto those cattle and then sends them to market.

Now, that is our beef supply. It is bound to be our beef supply. As we extend the area in the South it is going to benefit the southern farmer if he can know that he can buy a bunch of feeding cattle and use his grass in the winter, with the help of extra feed. I believe in this $50,000 appropriation for farm demonstration work. There is no use in publishing research work printed in books, contained in magazines by the ton, that does not reach the farmer. But if you can have farm demonstration work right before him, you will have results in relation to beef cattle. If every farmer, in proportion to his water and grass, would keep a bunch of cattle, you would find that the number of cattle would come up again from the thirty-five million mark up past fifty million, and you would be more independent in the beef supply.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Iowa has made a point of order to the paragraph.

Mr. TOWNER. There was a point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri, and it is still pending. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if he withdraws his point of order?

Mr. BOOHER. I will withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this part of the paragraph beginning in line 21, page 11, "of which sum $50,000 may be used for live-stock demonstration work in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of cattle for breeding purposes."

I make the point of order on two grounds. First, that it is new legislation, that there is no authorization and never has been in law for this form of appropriation.

I desire further, Mr. Chairman, to make a point of order against it for the reason that it is not germane to this section and has no relation to it whatever. It will be noticed that there was first an appropriation of $400,000 for the reduction of the southern cattle tick. Then follows an appropriation of $50,000 which has no connection with the eradication of the cattle tick, and, as the gentleman stated, was to be used for an entirely different purpose—for the purpose of showing down there in the cattle-tick areas how they might raise a better kind and class of cattle.

That has nothing to do with the cattle tick except that you limit it to the area where the cattle tick can be found. It seems to me clearly it is not germane to this appropriation. Everybody ought to understand that this is a part of the general demonstration work and ought to be included in the appropriation for that work. It has no relation to the eradication of the cattle tick and is new legislation here. If it could be considered a part of the eradication of the cattle-tick section, it is entirely new legislation to say that within the area where they may have had cattle tick there shall be special work of farm demonstration to instruct people there that they can raise a better class of cattle. I submit that on both grounds this clause in this place ought to be taken out.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the language of the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture is sufficient authority to provide for this work. I read to the Chair:

> There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that language is broad enough, and it has been held to be broad enough to permit any proposition coming upon this bill where the relationship to agriculture can be shown. Of course, the Chair will recognize the importance, from the standpoint of agriculture, of demonstration work in teaching the people of these free areas the better practice and methods of live-stock growing. In addition, I think it is only a limitation on the appropriation bill, and for that reason would be in order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] makes two points of order, one of which is that the provision is not germane. Of course that point of order is not good. The bill itself determines what is germane in the bill. The question of germaneness can only arise where an amendment is offered. You determine whether it is germane to the provisions in the bill. The bill that is introduced does not have to be germane in its different parts to each other, unless it is a matter of privilege, and then you can take out the part that is not privileged. So that point of order is not good.

The gentleman makes a point of order that this is for something not authorized by law. It is for live-stock demonstration work, authorizing the use of $50,000 of an appropriation of $400,000 for live-stock demonstration work. The Chair will notice on page 19 in this bill that there are two items: "To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice and for farm-demonstration work, $400,000"; "for farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, $378,240." If these items are in order, then this item is in order. If this item is not in order, then these items on page 19 ought to go out.

Mr. LEVER. And does the gentleman agree with me that this item here is in order under the organic act establishing the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MANN. I do think that they are all in order. What is the situation? Here is a proposition to use $50,000 for live-stock demonstration work in areas free of ticks. The question is whether that is the acquirement and diffusion of knowledge relating to agriculture in its broadest sense. What are the facts which the chairman will take notice of in reference to agriculture in this country? Here is a proposition to diffuse knowledge by demonstrating in reference to the raising of cattle in the South. Only a few years ago cattle were cheap; they were plentiful because we had great areas in the West useless, at that time, for any other purpose than for grazing cattle on the public domain without charge.

We had great herds of cattle in the West and in Texas, many of which were sent afterwards to the feeders for fattening on corn. We had great supplies of cattle in this new area, but the new area has been largely taken up by farmers. We have no longer the great, numerous herds of cattle over the entire western range that we had a few years ago. Farmers in the North, largely in the corn country, do not encourage to a great extent the raising of cattle, because a man who can raise corn on land worth $250 an acre usually can not afford to raise food cattle upon it; and the bulk of those farmers do not raise cattle at all except a few dairy cows. They buy some cattle from the West for feeding purposes and feed the corn, but no longer can we supply the meat markets of the country with cattle raised in the West on the ranges or cattle raised in the northern corn belt. Where have we to go for cattle? We have got to go largely for our future supply of cattle to the South, where the climate is equable, where it is cheaper to raise cattle than it is in the North, both by reason of the lack of the rigorous winters and by reason of the fact that the land is not worth so much per acre. But what is the trouble about raising cattle in the South? The Texas fever, we used to call it. I do not know what they call it now.

Mr. LEVER. The same thing.

Mr. MANN. It comes from the tick. They can not afford to raise cattle in the South to a large degree because of the tick. I can remember when a very prominent old agriculturist and farmer of my State, old Sam Allerton, who died a few days ago, owning great areas of land, a large cattle owner, laughed at the idea that the Texas fever was passed on by the tick. But we

have learned better than we knew then. We know now that this fever is communicated by the tick. We have learned that if we can wipe out the tick we can preserve the cattle from the fever. We have learned that we can absolutely wipe out the tick from areas of land and extend the area. What is the proposition? To go to these farmers who live in this area where the tick no longer lives and show to them that with the tick gone—and they knew very little about the tick while it was there—they can raise cattle for the market to provide meat for the country. I do not believe there is a more important thing for our country. I am willing to give $50,000 or more in order that we may raise by our own farmers the meat that we consume rather than be compelled to import it from Argentine or Australia. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

Mr. TOWNER rose.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling. We have made only two pages of this bill to-day.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a few words more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I only desire to say this in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] with regard to the question of germaneness: Here is a provision made for the eradication of the southern cattle tick, and then follows a provision by which $50,000 of the $400,000 that is to be provided for the eradication of the cattle tick is to be used by the terms of this clause not for the eradication of the cattle tick but for the purpose of teaching the people down there how to raise live stock. It occurs to me that there is a diametrical difference between them. They are in no way related. While it is true, doubtless, that there is legislation that will authorize the $400,000 to be used for the eradication of the cattle tick, to which I do not object, and while it is perfectly proper to allow money to be expended for demonstration work, to which I do not object, yet it seems to me it is not good legislation and that it can not be proper legislation to say that you shall appropriate $400,000 for the eradication of the cattle tick, and then say that $50,000 of that appropriation shall not be used for that purpose, but shall be used for the purpose of teaching people how to raise live stock.

Mr. LEVER. Has not the gentleman simply said, when we get down to common sense, that we shall use $350,000 for cattle tick and $50,000 for this other work?

Mr. TOWNER. If the chairman will pardon me, that is what I think the bill should say, but does not.

Mr. LEVER. We have said it in our own way in the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. In your own way—yes; that is probably true. I insist on the point of order, although I have some doubt about it on one ground that has not been argued by the gentleman, and that is that possibly it may be a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. It is not a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to say in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], in reference to the importation of cattle, that during the months of October, November, December, 1913, and January, 1914, the importation from Mexico was 271,387 head, which was twice as many cattle as were imported in a similar period one year before from all sources. And that during four months first specified there were imported from all sources, including Mexico, 431,911 cattle, or three times what were imported in the similar period the year before from all sources. I state this simply to make the record clear on the proposition submitted. I desire to say that my views on the matter of protecting cattle by every means, including this appropriation, are well known, and coming from a part of the country which has produced most of the cattle heretofore that have been fitted and have gone to market, I look forward to the day when a majority of our cattle will be produced in the southern part of this country. I think the increased production of cattle will be a source of wealth to all of the people of the South. I think the more we encourage it in this way and by other legislation, the more the people of the South will be benefited. I believe those who have recently been so free with their votes and influence to discourage cattle raising in the South by throwing it into open competition with all the other nations of the earth, will, inside of five years, be as ready to protect, foster, and encourage cattle raising in the South by protecting it from competition with other nations as I am at the present time.

Mr. MANN. We will do that long inside of 10 years from this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I understood there was a point of order pending.

Mr. LEVER. The point of order has been overruled.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, I do that for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if he will not consent to a transfer of this item, providing for an appropriation of $50,000, to the appropriation to be made to the Bureau of Plant Industry for farm-demonstration work in the South, increasing that appropriation so as to include the $50,000. Does not the gentleman admit that the employment of this money by the Bureau of Animal Industry and the employment of the other money by the Bureau of Plant Industry will result in a duplication; that it is actually the same kind of work? When this appropriation was suggested, the chairman will remember that the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry intended to carry on some demonstrations of stock raising, and the note accompanying this paragraph in the Book of Estimates suggested the purchase of pure-bred animals for that purpose. The committee did not think it wise to appropriate money for the purchase of animals, so this clause has been amended to provide "that no part of the money shall be used for the purchase of animals." Now, it seems to me this amendment makes this strictly farm-demonstration work, and the appropriation ought to be used under the direction of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan, there are two objections to the transfer of this item at this time. There may be something in the gentleman's contention as to the proposition that all farm demonstration work ought to be carried under one item, and, as I have already suggested, I am confident that upon the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, which is to occur soon if the recommendation of the committee is adopted, this is contemplated. The two objections which I have in mind on this proposition of the gentleman from Michigan are, first, that the committee has not had an opportunity to consider the proposition of this transfer; in fact, if there was any consideration given to it at all—and the committee did consider it somewhat—it refused to make the change. In the next place, there is no reason for carrying this item in separate sections of the bill. Gentlemen can quite well understand how an expert in plant growing, for instance, would not necessarily be an expert on the proposition of the breeding of animals or animal husbandry, and it is very well to keep these items separate in the bill, in my judgment, until there is a reorganization of the department and the slacks of the department taken up and the complete work of the department put upon such a new plan as that we can put all kinds of work of the same character under one head and all of another character under another head, and so on down the line, but I would not like to do it in this bill at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. When this paragraph was first read I reserved a point of order on it, and just about that time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offered an amendment striking out the word "cattle," in line 24, page 11, and inserting the word "animal." The chairman of the committee expressed no objection to the amendment, but I believe the amendment was not in order until the point of order was withdrawn. The amendment could not have been in order until the point of order was either withdrawn or passed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdrew his point of order, and the amendment was then adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not recall the amendment having been adopted after I withdrew the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his motion to strike out, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, $256,490.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. This item in this bill is increased, I understand, $70,000 over the bill of last year. May I ask the chairman what that increase covers?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman had done me the honor to read my report, he would have found the exact information that he desires. The increase of the provision is for the purpose of enabling the dairy division to extend its work. First they

need some little additional funds for the renovated butter factory work; then they need some little additional funds for the matter of teaching our folks how to produce a better dairy product—demonstration work; then we need some funds to cooperate with health officials and the like in respect to dairy supplies to cities. I can give the gentleman, if he will permit me, the exact information, if he desires:

The general work of the division, including clerks, etc., is what we call administration, and for this year we have $11,855. Our work this year has been extensive for the amount of our funds. Next year we are asking for $6,500 more for this general work, to meet all sorts of unexpected and unforeseen demands of a general character, which are largely of an educational nature, and also to take care of the growth of our work.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not care about that.

Mr. LEVER. The next item is "dairy farming," and there they ask for an increase of $20,500. The next item under dairy farming is $9,000 to provide dairy specialists to aid county agents.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is not reading from his report?

Mr. LEVER. No; perhaps I did not make my report as full as I should on this point. The next is dairy manufacturing investigation, for which they are asking an increase of $7,190. The next is market-milk investigation, and so on down the line.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is not reading from the report, is he?

Mr. LEVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am reading from the hearings, and the gentleman's criticism of the report in that respect is probably correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not making any criticism of the report. I merely wanted to get a little information.

Mr. LEVER. Now, then, for market-milk investigation; there had been at this time $7,500. They are asking for an increase of $8,500, which will give them about three additional men for this work, and I think that is very worthy work, because it does not entail any great responsibility upon the department. In other words, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota, as I said this morning in a general statement, this very division of the Department of Agriculture is one of the constructive divisions of the department, and the committee felt we ought to be liberal with those divisions and bureaus of the Government which were seeking to provide more food and more clothing for the country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to the gentleman's reflections, that I have not only read his report but I have also read the hearings which he has just put in the RECORD. My complaint is not that the committee has allowed a large amount, but if I have heard any complaint at all upon this item and some others, it is that the committee has not allowed enough.

Mr. LEVER. We have allowed the estimates in this item.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, I want to know from the chairman how much of this money was to be spent in the vicinity of Washington or in Washington? To make clear exactly what I want, I desire to call the chairman's attention to the language of the paragraph. It says:

Cooperative investigation of the dairy industry in the various States.

I have been trying for nearly a year to persuade the Bureau of Animal Industry to cooperate with a State creamery located in the district which I have the honor to represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. The creamery was established under a law passed by the State legislature in 1911. It is maintained by an appropriation from the State. As I have said, I have been trying to get the Bureau of Animal Industry to cooperate with the State creamery in making some experiments, but I have been met with the proposition that the bureau would be very glad to cooperate with the dairy industry of Minnesota, and particularly with this creamery, provided I would move the creamery and the dairy industry down here to Washington.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota that my information is that the bulk of this appropriation is used in the field.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to call the chairman's attention to the Book of Estimates, which shows, under the item of "Dairy industry," that the amount spent in Washington is $60,730, for salaries alone, and outside of Washington $65,416.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that this item not only covers the work in the field, but also the scientific investigational and research work. That is work in connection with cream, milk, and cheese, and other scientific investigations which are necessarily carried on in laboratories here at Washington, but the bulk of this appropriation is to be expended in the field. And as to the gentleman's proposition, which he suggested a moment ago, that they regretted very much they could not do so unless they had a little increase of fund or move down here to Washington, I think that complaint could be made by a great many Members of Congress.

I think it is rather human nature that the scientists in all of these departments—not only in the Agricultural Department, but in all of them—live within their own little sphere and imagine that is the world, and they are frequently reaching out and wanting more money for their special lines of work and trying to find means to get it. That has been the experience of every man on the Committee on Agriculture. My mail is filled with letters every day asking for increase in this item or that item. I would not say they were inspired by department officials, but I think it is safe to assume that these subchiefs and chiefs of divisions would not be averse to the proposition of having just as much money as they could get from Congress for these matters. It is natural, and I do not criticize it, but our discretion must control.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that; but my complaint is this: That the amount of money which is spent in investigational work in the city of Washington and in the vicinity of Washington is disproportionate to the amount of money spent in the field. Now, in the particular case to which I have reference, the State creamery is operated under State patronage. The State offers to turn it over to the Bureau of Animal Industry, let them run it to suit themselves—remodel it, if necessary—and afford them opportunity to make demonstrations where the dairy interests are. They want to make the demonstrations down here in Washington, where there is no dairy industry and can not be any.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact, that $66,747 of the salaries of this appropriation in the current law last year was expended outside of the city of Washington. I will say to the gentleman this, that the committee in allowing these figures had in mind the fact that we understood the bulk of this increase would be used in the field rather than in Washington, and if you will notice the hearings, Mr. Rawl, the chief of the Dairy Division, sets out in great detail just how this increase is to be used, and very little, in fact, practically none, is to be used in the city of Washington.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman makes the statement, as I understand him, that it was the committee's intention to provide that the bulk of this increase should be used in the field in cooperation with the States?

Mr. LEVER. I do; exactly.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. LEVER. I have not the floor, but I will yield anyhow.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Is there any way by which Congress can be informed as to the amount of money appropriated in this bill to the Agricultural Department, outside of the question of forestry and real agricultural work—between $9,000,000 and $10,000,000, I understand——

Mr. LEVER. A little over $9,000,000.

Mr. GARNER. A little over $9,000,000. About how much of that money is spent in the District of Columbia and how much in the field?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have not those figures at hand, but we have them in our committee room. They are available. The department publishes a statement showing the expenditures in the Agricultural Department, which I hold in my hand. Take the Bureau of Animal Industry, for instance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Take, for example, the scientific investigations of the diseases of animals: Statutory salaries, $24,834; under the lump-sum appropriation, $18,927; or $43,761. The one is the lump fund out of the city of Washington, the other being in the city of Washington; a total of $88,000. Then, for traveling and field expenses, and so on, we have it particularly itemized, but it is hard to carry all the figures in one's mind.

Mr. GARNER. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina, if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will indulge me a moment, that the only criticism I have ever heard made of the Department of Agriculture and its work by practical farmers and cattlemen and others interested in it has been that,

in their judgment, a larger percentage of the money appropriated was used in the District of Columbia than ought to be used; that the gentlemen connected with the department were anxious to stay around here in Washington and its vicinity, and that work that ought to be done in the field is in many cases undertaken to be done here. If that is a just criticism, the Committee on Agriculture ought at least to call the attention of the department to this matter and insist that the work should be done in the most economical way, regardless of the wishes and convenience of their employees.

Let me say one word further. I have much confidence in the heads of this department, especially in the Secretary of Agriculture and in the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who has been connected with that department for many years; but it is necessarily impossible for those gentlemen to understand and to go into the details of these matters to the extent that the chiefs of bureaus do, and they must be guided to a large extent by their chiefs, and the chiefs, in turn, are influenced more or less by the employees in that department, and they want to suit their own convenience as far as possible in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. If my friend from Minnesota will let me reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I desire to call his attention to the fact that it is only very recently that the plan has been adopted of getting out to the people the scientific and useful information that we have been getting here in the Department of Agriculture since its creation in 1887. I think the time is coming when a very small part of the appropriations carried in this bill will be used in the city of Washington.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman believes that is to be for the betterment of the service?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly; but I do not want to be put in the attitude of overlooking the importance of the investigational and research work of the Department of Agriculture, because, first of all, we must get the information before we can disseminate it, and I feel there is danger of our going too far with our demonstration idea, because it is necessarily more popular, and making it out of balance with regard to the investigational and research work in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I just wanted to read a paragraph of the Secretary's report, which very fully answer's his question. The Secretary says:

> The present appropriations for work of a regulatory nature or only indirectly affecting agriculture constitute about three-fifths of the total funds of the department, or approximately $15,000,000, leaving two-fifths, or $9,000,000, available for scientific research, experiments, and demonstration work directly affecting the farmer. While it would be difficult to segregate the funds which are used for purely demonstration work, because of its close relation in many instances to investigational work, it is safe to say that more than $1,000,000 is devoted to such work.

Thus the Secretary indicates that the amount of money expended in the demonstration work is very small indeed in comparison with the total appropriations made for the department.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman ought to say this, however: That that does not carry with it the idea that $15,000,000 of this appropriation is expended in and around Washington here.

Mr. ANDERSON. But about eight millions are expended around here.

Mr. LEVER. The fact is that five millions go to the Forest Service, and the bulk of it is expended in the field and not in the city of Washington.

Mr. GARNER. But what the gentleman did intend to say was that out of this $9,000,000 that goes to the execution of this work only one-ninth is expended in the field and the rest is spent in the District of Columbia; so that my complaint is that of this nine millions that we appropriate for the benefit of the farmer and for the benefit of the cattle raiser about eight millions is consumed in the District of Columbia, whereas only $1,000,000 of it is used for the direct benefit of the people for whom it is appropriated.

Mr. LEVER. I do not understand, from the reading of the Secretary's report, that he made any such statement as that, because I could recall, offhand, appropriations of more than a million dollars that are expended in the field. For example, over $400,000 is expended in the field for the extermination of the cattle tick and $289,000 for sheep scabies, and I can think of several others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other necessary expenses, $182,840: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $30,000 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated $24,500 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding, including the feeding and breeding of ostriches and investigations and experiments in the study of the ostrich industry: *And provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated $5,000 may be used for the importation of Corriedale sheep from New Zealand for breeding purposes.

Mr. COX and Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. COX. Well, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the last proviso. We might just as well settle it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] makes a point of order on the last proviso.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman make the point of order on the paragraph?

Mr. COX. No; I make it on the last proviso.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. COX. I will reserve it a reasonable length of time, but later on I will make it.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if the gentleman wants to make it, he can make it now. I would like, however, to say a few words.

Mr. COX. I will reserve it, so that the gentleman may make a statement; but after that I shall make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I have no desire to say anything about it. If the gentleman desires to make the point of order, all right.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on that for a moment. This estimate was not submitted by the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] came before the Committee on Agriculture in the regular way and called our attention to the high mutton character of this breed of sheep, known as Corriedale sheep or New Zealand sheep. We felt that if we could import to this country a breed of sheep which would improve the breed that we now have, it would certainly be a wise investment of money, and while the committee had no statement from the Department of Agriculture, we took the initiative ourselves of putting this into the bill, because we thought it a wise thing to do. I think I can say that the Committee on Agriculture is trying as hard as any committee in this House to serve the people, and if it is necessary for us to import into this country different breeds of sheep, cattle, or horses to improve our breeds of sheep, cattle, and horses we ought to authorize the importation.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is there any specific provision in this bill that directly affects the wool or mutton growing industry of this country?

Mr. LEVER. There is not.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. You have provided for the cattle industry, have you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. And for the horse-breeding industry?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. And the poultry industry?

Mr. LEVER. Of course, the gentleman understands that we appropriate $289.000 for the eradication of sheep scab?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. But you are doing nothing for the information of the people as to sheep breeding in this country?

Mr. LEVER. Of course the department has the general authority and funds for that work. What it is doing I do not know.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Could the department take $5.000 out of any fund and invest it in this particular breed of sheep for the purpose of importing them?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. They could not do it under any other appropriation in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. No; they would not have the right to import them unless specifically authorized to do so.

Mr. COX. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. COX. On what ground does the gentleman base his argument that the Government should do this at public expense,

instead of letting private individuals do it? If they want to go abroad and import these sheep, let them do it.

Mr. LEVER. I will answer the gentleman's question in this way: What reason on earth is there that the Federal Government should appropriate $500,000 for the eradication of hog cholera? What reason on earth is there that the Government should appropriate $400,000 for the eradication of the cattle tick? What reason on earth can there be that the department should expend in this very bill here $182,000 for carrying on animal-husbandry work, or $30,000 for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes, and so on?

Mr. COX. I am dead against that. Does the gentleman propound that question to me?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. I am in absolute sympathy with the position taken on the floor of the House this evening by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER]. I do not believe that the Government of the United States has any right on earth or any moral duty to tax the whole people of this country to manufacture hog-cholera serum and turn that serum over to the farmers of this country. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] on that; and in response to the query put to me by the gentleman from South Carolina, I wish to say that when the Government has discovered the means of solving these problems, that is as far as the Government's functions ought to go. If the Government has discovered a remedy for hog cholera, I believe it to be the duty and function of the Government to turn that remedy over to the States and let them handle it. So far as cattle ticks are concerned, I have no objection to appropriating all the money that is necessary to enable the Government to discover a remedy; and after it has done that I deny the right of Congress to appropriate a single dollar for the purpose of aiding the States along that line. The gentleman has asked me, Why appropriate $30,000 for the breeding of horses? I do not agree with that at all. I think it is absolutely erroneous.

Mr. LEVER. Then the gentleman is opposed to this bill?

Mr. COX. Oh, no; I am not opposed to this bill.

Mr. LEVER. I thought the gentleman must be, because the bill contains these items.

Mr. COX. I am opposed to these items which the gentleman has mentioned in his question.

Mr. LEVER. Is the gentleman opposed to the work of the Dairy Division?

Mr. COX. They are doing lots of work that does not do any good, in my judgment.

Mr. LEVER. Is the gentleman opposed to it? Will he vote against it?

Mr. COX. No; I will not vote against it, just as I have voted many times for appropriations that I, in my individual opinion, do not believe are necessary at all.

Now, why spend $5,000 here to import a certain breed of sheep, when men all over this country in the sheep business are willing to spend this money out of their own pockets? Let them do it. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard.

Mr. COX. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman reserved the point of order and then proceeded to talk about general matters for five minutes.

Mr. COX. I told the gentleman distinctly that I would reserve the point of order and then make it after the gentleman had made his statement. That was what I said.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Has the point of order been decided?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. It is an amazing thing to me, Mr. Chairman, that gentleman will sit here and pass over without a word of objection paragraphs carrying $50,000, $100,000, $200,000, $300,000, or $400,000, and then an item of $5,000 so arouses their ire and indignation that it must go out on a point of order. This bill carries $400,000 for wiping out the cattle tick, $50,000 for teaching the man whose cattle you have cured of tick how to raise cattle free of tick. It carries hundreds of thousands of dollars for farm-demonstration work in the South, but not a penny for the great sheep industry of the country; millions for cattle, but nothing for sheep. This item, Mr. Chairman, provides for the importation of Corriedale sheep.

CORRIDALE SHEEP.

The Corriedale is a new breed of sheep which has been developed in New Zealand and, to some extent, in Australia. The breed has been produced by crossing high-grade Merino ewes with Lincoln rams. One of the best-known Corriedale flocks, the Teviotdale, of Canterbury, New Zealand, was established about 35 years ago. This and other flocks, like the White Rock flock of the same locality and some flocks in Australia, have been carefully bred for many years with a view of retaining the best characteristics of the Merino and at the same time adding to the size of the animal and the length and weight of the fleece. The Corriedale is, in other words, a fixed type, having the characteristics of the best examples of what has been known in the sheep and wool business for years as the half-breed.

Crosses of the Merino and the heavier and longer wool sheep like the Lincoln, the Leicester, the Shropshire, and the Cotswold, have been common for many years. In fact, comparatively few growers of Merino sheep have confined themselves to the pure Merino blood, but have endeavored, by crossing and recrossing, to produce a type of sheep which, while retaining the Merino characteristics, would yield a somewhat heavier fleece and a larger body of greater value for mutton purposes. The Corriedale seems to be the only breed, however, in which the best characteristics of the Merino has become fixed in a new type or breed of increased size of body and weight of fleece. This result has been obtained by careful selection and judicious inbreeding until it is claimed that a fixed type and breed has been obtained.

The best type of half-breed has long been recognized as having advantages over the pure Merino as a combined mutton and wool sheep, and crossing has been common except in those localities and regions where the preference of owners or special conditions have warranted the maintenance of the pure Merino blood. This crossing has been most general in those regions, at home and abroad, where the wool and sheep industry has been carried on on a large scale.

The placing of wool and mutton on the free list under the present tariff law, thus placing our sheep growers and wool producers in competition with those of all the world, has accentuated the importance, if not the necessity, of securing a larger sheep and a heavier fleece if the wool and sheep industry, particularly in the range States, is to sustain itself under the new conditions. The problem of meeting this competition, particularly in the range States, is not a simple one, for where sheep are ranged in large flocks in a region of sparce vegetation, of rough and mountainous pasture, with considerable extremes of temperature, it is essential that the predominant characteristics of the merino be retained.

These characteristics include a marked gregarious habit, rendering it possible to handle them in large flocks; a disposition to hustle and secure feed where the grasses are sparse and short; a nimbleness in getting over rough country; and a hardiness of constitution enabling the animal to withstand extremes of temperature and the inroads of diseases to which sheep are liable. Not only would the sheep business, as now carried on in the Mountain States, be impossible with the substitution of the heavy, nongregarious, clumsy, and tender sheep of the long and coarse wool mutton breeds, but the country would suffer an irreparable loss if deprived of its splendid annual crop of fine and medium wool.

It is claimed for the Corriedales that, on the same pasture, the lambs at marketing age and the sheep when full grown are considerably heavier than the average merino and that they produce a fleece of appreciably greater length and weight and of considerably less shrinkage than the pure-blood merino. The wool is claimed to run from fifties to sixties. It is hoped that the importation of enough of these sheep to form the nucleus for a breeding herd will not only give the American woolgrower an opportunity to secure the benefits of this fixed cross, but that it will also encourage the development here of other crosses into fixed breeds that may prove quite as satisfactory or even better adapted to our conditions than the Corriedales.

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will, if I have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS. The gentleman stated that $400,000 was appropriated to eradicate the cattle tick and that nothing had been appropriated to help the sheepmen. I want to ask the gentleman if he had overlooked the fact that the bill carries $289,000 to help eradicate sheep scabies?

Mr. MONDELL. The bill does carry an item for a great number of purposes, of which that is one. It does not contain any item under which, after you have helped eradicate the scabies, you propose to show the sheepmen how to grow sheep.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have grave doubt whether the language in the bill is subject to a point of order. We make a general appropriation on line 20, page 12, of $182,400, and then we proceed to limit the manner in which that fund shall be used. I am strongly of the opinion that this could be held to be in order as a limitation upon the appropriation bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of this committee bases his objection to the point of order on the language carried in this paragraph I think the reading of the paragraph completely answers his argument. There is no statutory law, or at least none has been brought forward by the chairman, that would justify any such appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call attention to this further fact. On page 12 of the bill we provide all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry, namely, for experiments in animal feeding and breeding. It seems to me that Congress has the right to indicate the method by which we shall make these experiments in animal feeding and breeding. Now we provide that $5,000 may be used for the importation of these Corriedale sheep for breeding purposes. I do not think the language is subject to a point of order at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that this can not fairly be regarded as a limitation on an appropriation bill. If that were true, the Chair can conceive where you can start in on the first paragraph of the bill appropriating eighteen or nineteen million dollars and make everything in order by provisos.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chairman will permit me, this language is either a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture or else it is a limitation upon this appropriation bill. Now, the Chair will see that we do not direct him; we say he may use the sum of $5,000, if in his wisdom he deems it advisable, for the purpose of carrying out one of the provisions of the bill, namely, the experiment and investigation into the matter of animal breeding.

The CHAIRMAN. It gives him authority to enter a new field which has not been authorized by law heretofore, and the Chair thinks the point of order ought to be sustained. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I had a point of order reserved on the paragraph. I withdraw the point of order and move to strike out the last word. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] had been honestly desirous of calling attention to language in this paragraph that was really objectionable, he ought to have directed attention to this proviso on page 12:

That of the sum thus appropriated $30,000 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that that has been carried heretofore time and again.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not say that it was subject to a point of order, but I say that if the gentleman desires to practice real economy, if he desires to object to an item which is really objectionable, it is his duty to direct the attention of the committee to this item and to move to strike it out. I understand that under this item the department has some 40 stallions. These stallions breed some 35 mares each. About 35 per cent are foaled, making abou. 14 colts to each stallion. It costs $1,250 a year to maintain each one of these stallions, making each one of these colts cost approximately $100 apiece to breed. In addition, I understand as a compensation the War Department is permitted to buy these colts at $150 each, provided the farmer is willing to sell, when they are 3 years old, or, in case they do not buy them, the owner of the colt pays the department a breeding fee of $15. It strikes me that that is very poor economy indeed.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I would like to ask the gentleman if these breeding operations are carried on in his part of the country to any extent?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are not.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I want to say in this connection that the farmers in my State have been very anxious to avail themselves of some of these privileges, but so far it has been impossible for them to secure any results.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can understand why farmers would be desirous of availing themselves of this opportunity, because they would be getting their mares bred at $15, where it costs the Government $100 to breed them.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 20, strike out "$182,840" and insert "$202,840." Line 21, strike out "$30,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the total item under this head by $20,000, and increases by a corresponding sum the appropriation for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes. I want to say at the outset that I have not been very enthusiastic about this military horse-breeding business. I have been rather inclined to the opinion that the farmers of the country, with proper encouragement other than direct aid of this sort, would produce plenty of horses for military purposes, but we have started on this work. We have spent a considerable sum of money in connection with it. We now own a considerable number of stallions, and if we are going to carry on this horse-breeding business for military purposes we ought to begin to breed some horses in the country where a good military horse can be grown, and that is in the range country of the West. This work is now being carried on only in Vermont, New Hampshire, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and mostly in Virginia and Vermont. For a number of years past our western people have been making inquiries with regard to this appropriation, and they have not understood why it was that in our country, where the horse business—the raising of horses—is one of the important industries of the country, we have not had the benefit of this particular class of Government service. For many years a very large portion of the cavalry horses of the country came from the range territory, so called, where horses are grown in large bands, where horses of good lung power, courage, and great endurance are grown; but in encouraging the development of the Army horse by breeding, so far we have confined the work entirely to the eastern section of the country, and to a very limited area there. I have offered this amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation in the hope that if the appropriation is increased a portion of this increase will be used in the plains country, in the intermountain country, where the horse industry is a very important one, and where we can produce, we believe, the best military horse grown anywhere.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming and to make this statement. I think it is the almost unanimous opinion of the members of the Committee o Agriculture that we ought not to go into the general business of experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes. Personally I do not believe we have any more right to send stallions around through the country than we have to send he goats or chicken roosters for breeding experiments. But the committee was confronted with this proposition: Congress at its last session provided an appropriation of $50,000 for the purchase of these stallions for breeding for military purposes. The committee thought that we ought to wait sufficiently long to see what the results were before stopping that work entirely. We have put into the bill $30,000 for maintenance purposes. My good friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], who is the business man of the committee, figured that under governmental management of stallions it would cost about $800 to $1,000 per annum for that purpose, and hence the committee allowed this appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the estimate furnished by the department is $1,250 for each stallion, or $50,000 for 40 stallions.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do is to provide only a fund sufficient to maintain the stallions. We already have 40 and by doing that we will indirectly compel the Department of Agriculture not to buy any more for this purpose until further authorized by Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. If it is a good thing to carry on this class of work in Virginia and in Vermont, why is it not a good thing to carry it on in Texas and in Montana and in the Dakotas and in Wyoming?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that it is not a good thing to do anywhere in Texas, Montana, or any other State.

Mr. LEVER. That is the opinion of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, as I understand it, options that are not a good thing anywhere are carried in the bill, providing they are for a certain section of the country, and any little item representing another section of the country, whether good or bad, goes out?

Mr. HAUGEN. The whole practice ought to be discontinued.

Mr. MONDELL. In that I agree that——

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not believe anybody will contend it is a good policy of the Government to spend $100 for a simple option to buy a scrub colt at $150, providing subsequently they will sell the colt at the age of 3. That is the option the Government has.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This discussion, it seems to me, has revealed the fact that this bill is carrying a provision which is largely of no benefit whatever to a section of the country which is very much interested in the development of the horse industry.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if my friend will allow me just a moment I think I can satisfy him, as we would like to get along with the bill. We have in Vermont a horse-breeding station that has been carried in the bill for 10 or 15 years, and we have in Colorado a breeding station of carriage horses, and this item was put in the bill last year——

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, if my friend will permit, I want to say this: We have in Colorado a large homestead population, made up of very zealous, industrious, and energetic farmers, who have gone out there with little capital, and they are trying to establish homes. They are located in a section of the country where they are dependent in some measure upon the development of the live-stock industry. When I was in Colorado last fall I met a delegation of some 40 or 50 of those men, some of whom came over 40 miles to see me to urge a change in the policy of the department which would make the provision we are now considering available for them. Now, the facts are that at the agricultural college at Fort Collins we do have a type of carriage horse, which is of little benefit to the farmer.

If the farmer can get a Morgan-Percheron or some form of draft animal that will be available for the farm, that purpose will be met, but when he has to accept driving horses when he needs draft horses, the animal is of no benefit to him, and this military proposition, we have been informed, is simply available in certain sections of the country. They will gladly respond and cooperate with the department if some opportunity were given them to avail themselves of the law.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will understand it would be impossible in this bill to say how many horses should go to Colorado, how many to South Carolina, and how many to Vermont, and, after all, it is a proposition for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the committee accept an amendment that $10,000 of this amount shall be expended west of the Missouri River?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the committee could not do that. I ask the Clerk to read——

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes with reference to what appears to be a fraudulent use of my name, and I have no doubt the same fraud is being perpetrated in other gentlemen's districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we can not agree we may run until we finish this bureau? It has only one more page, and I would like to get through and finish this bureau.

Mr. MANN. As long as it is Saturday night, and we have had a very hard week——

Mr. LEVER. Yes; and I have had a very hard day, and we have taken up a lot of time; but I do not think there is any disposition to cut off the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I would like to get through with half the bill, but I do not see any prospects.

Mr. LEVER. I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a letter from the principal of a high school in Haverhill, Mass., in my district, and reads as follows:

THE HIGH SCHOOL,
*Haverhill, Mass., March 5, 1914.*

Capt. AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: It may be of interest to you to learn that a gentleman who gives the name of G. A. Macdonald is canvassing Haverhill on what I believe to be a false representation in connection with a set of books called "Messages of Presidents." He endeavors to persuade his prospective customers that his firm has been delegated by Congress to distribute volumes which he calls "Government documents" and tries to leave the impression that he is in some way connected with the Government itself. In talking to me he did not use your name, but I understand that with others he has referred to "our Congressman" and given the impression that you and other Members are in some way connected with the distribution of these volumes. The price which he asks is $59.50 for 11 volumes, and the whole scheme is palpably a fraud. I am wondering if possibly the Government will not want to investigate this matter a little, and am inclosing the card which Mr. Macdonald left with me yesterday. I hope that I am not intruding unduly on your time and attention in writing you on this matter.

* * * * * * *

Thanking you for your attention, I am,
Very truly, yours.

WALTER D. HEAD, *Principal.*

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have called the attention of Members to this letter because I believe that many will find on investigation that the same thing is going on in their own districts.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I have evidence in my district to the same effect, that it has been canvassed in that way, perhaps not using the name of the Congressman, but conveying the impression these are official publications.

Mr. CRAMTON. I found a somewhat similar condition existing in my district last October at Mount Clemens.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, you will observe that the name of the publication which is being sold is "Messages of the Presidents." These volumes have been sold before in much the same way. It is an old story. It is 15 years since the Government originally printed the compilation. Each Member of Congress at that time was entitled to distribute a few copies, I have been told. Subsequently Congress gave the plates to a certain gentleman who had done work in preparing the compilation. Whoever is publishing it now is undoubtedly using the old Government plates. The canvassers are trying exactly the same scheme which they tried 15 years ago. They pretend that the Government has some connection with the matter. That is untrue. Unless you are on the lookout you gentlemen will find when you get home that your names are being used for purposes of which you do not dream.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. The impression has been created that these plates are now the private property of an individual whom it is not necessary to name, and that it is through an arrangement with him that these plates are being used. Is that correct?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know about that. Of course, I know the name of the party to whom the gentleman alludes, but I do not know whether the statement that he is still the owner of the plates is correct or incorrect. Now, the card sent me in Mr. Head's letter reads "G. A. Macdonald, Washington, D. C." That is the name and address which the canvasser gives. There is no such name in the Washington Directory which I hold in my hand. There is a "G. A. McDonald," but he is a plumber, not a book agent.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L., p. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the sum of $300,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of the meat-inspection law may be extended to the inspection of reindeer.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso. I would like to have some statement as to the purpose of the committee in recommending that the meat-inspection law be extended to the inspection of reindeer.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read, for the information of the gentleman from Wisconsin, a memorandum from Dr. Melvin to Dr. Galloway on this proposition, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
*Washington, D. C., February 27, 1914.*

Referring to your memorandum of yesterday, requesting certain information for the House Committee on Agriculture, I am inclosing memorandum from Mr. Bell in reply to the first inquiry and another prepared by Dr. Mohler in reply to the second; regarding the third, the present value of reindeer exported from Alaska is comparatively small. During the year 1912 it consisted of 127 carcasses, valued at $25 each. The total number of reindeer in Alaska is about 47,000. In a letter dated June 25, 1912, the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior states that the reindeer owned by the Eskimo have increased sufficiently to warrant the slaughter and sale each year of a limited number of the males. It is desired to dispose of part of the meat through the port of Seattle, and inspection is desired as a guaranty of the wholesomeness of the meat. Reports from Alaska indicate that the reindeer suffer from parasitic diseases and foot rot. The cost would probably not exceed one veterinary inspector's salary and expenses, about $2,000 per annum. His services could probably be utilized to advantage between slaughter seasons in making various investigations of livestock in Alaska.

A. D. MELVIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, it is intended to send an inspector up to Alaska to investigate the condition of the reindeer herd there?

Mr. LEVER. Between seasons, and when reindeer meat is being exported, in order to see that diseased reindeer meat is not put on board ship.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is an innovation to have reindeer meat exported into this country, as I understand from the reading of the letter?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,245,026.

[Mr. WINGO addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 4, page 14, the following proviso: "*Provided*, That of the sums appropriated for the Bureau of Animal Industry, not more than $5,000 will be expended for the importation of animals for breeding purposes."

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is subject to a point of order. It is simply a limitation on the appropriation. I trust the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, it was the same thing exactly that the Chair sustained a point of order against a few minutes ago.

Mr. MONDELL. No; it is in quite different form.

Mr. BOOHER. The "form" may be different, but the "substance" is the same.

Mr. MONDELL. I presume the gentleman from Missouri has no objection to making an importation not exceeding $5,000 in any event?

Mr. BOOHER. No.

Mr. LEVER. It does not increase the amount carried in the bill. I am perfectly willing to see it go in. In fact, I would like to see it go in. It was originally a committee recommendation. The amendment offered by the gentleman now would not increase the total at all as fixed by the bill. If it were adopted, the bill as passed would be $5,000 less than as reported to the House.

Mr. BOOHER. I am opposed to this way of doing business for the Government. I do not believe the Government ought to be in the horse-breeding business or in the sheep-breeding business. I am not positive—in fact, I do not know—whether it is subject to a point of order or not, but I will let the Chair pass on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. BOOHER. No; I did not withdraw it. I said that I could not tell whether it was subject to a point of order or not, but I would let the Chair pass upon it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the language in which the gentleman has drawn his amendment is clearly a limitation on the appropriation bill, and I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the Chair in discussing the point of order, but I think the amendment is clearly not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair confesses that he has some little doubt about that coming within the rule indicated by the gentleman from Wyoming; but the Chair feels inclined, inasmuch as the chairman of the committee seems to agree with him, to give him the benefit of the doubt, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, that completes the Bureau of Animal Industry. My friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has an amendment which he wishes to offer. I ask that the next line of the bill be read.

Mr. FOWLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MANN. Let the Clerk read line 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. FOWLER. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has an amendment to this item. I suggest to him that he offer it and let it be pending, and if it is subject to a point of order I shall reserve the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph before we pass it; but I had conferred with the chairman of the committee and he informed me that he was going to move that the committee rise.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. We can not dispose of the amendment now, to-night. I desire to confer further with the chairman and other members of the committee in order that we may expedite business, and I think it will be economy of time that that should be done. For that reason I prefer to wait until the next legislative day when this bill comes up to offer the amendment, so that we may have it understood as to whether it is advisable to offer it or not. I may not want to offer it after I have talked with the committee.

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, and in view of the fact that this is Saturday and it is getting late, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BOOHER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVENPORT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a bill for the relief of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to cover the value of beer stamps stolen June 7, 1899, while in transit (H. Doc. No. 814), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GORDON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8479) to repeal section 3 of article 110 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, enacted July 27, 1892; reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 349), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13921) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 350), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13985) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 351), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6260) for the relief of Hyacinthe Villeneuve, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 348), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13648) granting a pension to Mariah E. Orange; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13267) granting a pension to Charles Malicy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11371) granting a pension to Lauchling McDonald; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13782) granting an increase of pension to James P. Barton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14122) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Tanquary; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10892) granting a pension to Alice Clapper; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14214) for the relief of Joseph Glessner; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 14319) to create the grades of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14320) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the administration of justice in the Navy," to amend section 1624 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 14321) providing for the improvement of the French Broad River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14322) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 14323) for the relief of settlers on the shores of Mud Lake, Marshall County, Minn.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 14324) granting pensions to certain widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14325) for the relief of the Iowa Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14326) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station at Booneville, Ky.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 14327) prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor on premises owned by the United States in the District of Columbia, and forbidding the granting of licenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 14328) to prohibit the transmission through the mails of false statements in writing for the procuring of the credit thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 14329) providing for an appropriation for the making of surveys, plans, and reports in connection with the building of a system of highways in the Nez Perce Indian Reservation in Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14330) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 14331) to amend section 19 of an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio relative to proper Federal and State action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARD: Memorial from the Legislature of Ohio relative to proper Federal and State action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14332) granting a pension to Sadie E. Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 14333) granting a pension to Patrick Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14334) for the relief of Franz Mennerich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 14335) for the relief of George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 14336) for the relief of Charles J. Allen, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 14337) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 14338) granting pensions to E. H. Butram, M. T. Harris, D. M. Price, R. F. Mitchell, William B. Warren, A. L. Martin, John Mitchell, and A. M. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14339) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Whitson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 14340) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14341) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John C. Berry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14342) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John R. Butler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 14343) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Albert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: A bill (H. R. 14344) to correct the military record of John Oursler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 14345) granting an increase of pension to William Geen; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINDEL: A bill (H. R. 14346) granting an increase of pension to John Kremmer; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14347) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Olney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14348) for the relief of Edward Booth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14349) for the relief of Robert F. Risley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14350) for the relief of Leander Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14351) for the relief of the city of Denver; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14352) for the relief of the heirs at law of Charles H. Anderson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14353) granting a pension to Rhoda Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14354) granting a pension to Mrs. A. J. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14355) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Cashion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14356) granting an increase of pension to H. P. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14357) granting an increase of pension to William Macaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14358) granting an increase of pension to George Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14359) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kasiah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14360) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14361) granting an honorable discharge to Lucius Osterhout; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14362) for the relief of Benjamin F. Albright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14363) for the relief of John B. Vallra, alias James Breme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14364) for the relief of Christopher M. Ladd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14365) granting a pension to Sarah E. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14366) for the relief of heirs of Wesley W. Wallace, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 14367) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth V. Place; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14368) to waive the age of Rush M. Hoag, yeoman, first class, United States Navy, in the examination for assistant paymaster, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14369) granting an increase of pension to Sigmund Bauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14370) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose E. Beardsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14371) for the relief of the legal representatives of George Washington Tabb, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14372) for the relief of the heirs of Phlegmon W. Willis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 14373) granting an increase of pension to D. S. Orton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 14374) granting a pension to David W. Duncan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14375) granting a pension to Mrs. L. L. Gardner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINDEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) conveying the thanks of Congress to John J. Moran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Elmer E. Elwood and 245 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Harry Koetling and 246 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Mansfield (Ohio) Liedertafel, protesting against nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petitions of sundry citizens of Marshall County, Ind., favoring submission to the States for approval or rejection of national prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of York, Pa., protesting against House bill 12292, the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Hanover, Pa., protesting against Columbus day as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Petitions of J. F. Wahl and 1,982 other citizens of Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of A. Helberg and 1,793 other citizens of the State of Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petitions of sundry members of the Flatbush Presbyterian Church, favoring amendment to Constitution abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: Petition of bankers of Waterloo and Manchester, Iowa, favoring amendment to income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COVINGTON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Perryville, Md., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and of John Bates Clark, of New York City, favoring repeal of clause for free tolls in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of August Zolls and George Scheer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Frisco Lodge, No. 432, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Frisco Lodge, No. 432, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, favoring passage of bill relative to pay for overtime and longevity service of employees on Panama Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Richard J. Harden Camp, No. 2, Department of the District of Columbia, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 12612, granting pension to Benjamin L. Tubman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: Sundry petitions signed by various citizens of Hoboken, Guttenberg, West New York, Union Hill, West Hoboken, Weehawken, and Jersey City, all in Hudson County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of the Bartenders' International League of America, Local No. 298, of Wallace, Idaho, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Idaho Mining Association, relative to cutting of timber on mineral lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of the John Boyle O'Reilly Club, Springfield, Mass., against repeal of free-tolls provision of Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Endeavor Society, First Friends Church, and Fishermen Bible Class, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Clan-na-Gael, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of the clause for free tolls in the Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Paul Huebner and Simon Loeb, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Cigarmakers' Union No. 351, of Hamkato, Minn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of De Soto, Mo., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petitions of various voters of the first congressional district; J. B. Caldwell, of Burlington; Local 667, of Renton, and sundry citizens of King County, all in the State of Washington, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of the Bartenders' Union, of Aberdeen, Wash., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the San Diego (Cal.) Chapter, No. 2, Sons of the American Revolution, against changing the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the San Diego (Cal.) Chapter, No. 2, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring appropriation to enable the War Department to continue copying military records of Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KINDEL: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 14351) for the relief of the city of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of H. Schmicke Co., Seiffert Electric Co., Single Center Buggy Co., Caden Stone Co., Schelosky Table

Co., Evansville Packing Co., Indiana Builders' Supply Co., R. H. Pennington Co., Helfrich Lumber & Manufacturing Co., and Globe Paper Co., all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Bridgeport, Conn., and New Britain (Conn.) Branch, American Continental League, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Railway Business Men's Association of New York, favoring establishment of special facilities for legislative reference and bill drafting; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal law providing for the free passage of our coastwise tonnage through the canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., against House bill 11809, relative to granting further right of way to the Illinois Central Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAPES: Petitions of the employees of the Pere Marquette Railroad, favoring Government ownership of Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of various bankers of South Dakota, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas Elson Post, No. 54, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of South Dakota, favoring monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas Elson Post, No. 54, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of South Dakota; of the Woman's Relief Corps No. 42; and of sundry citizens of Northville, S. Dak., against changing the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, relative to House bill 12928, to amend the postal and civil service laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Memphis (Tenn.) Cotton Exchange, relative to the New York Cotton Exchange contract; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Local Union No. 193, of Pawtucket, R. I., and of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. D. R. Phinister, of Providence, R. I., favoring Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Captain Allyn K. Capron Camp, No. 1, Department of Rhode Island, United Spanish War Veterans, and E. R. Barker, of Providence, R. I., favoring House bill 13044, relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of various officers of the thirty-sixth congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various voters of Wayne and Cayuga Counties, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of Branch 34 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, relative to certain relief of substitute letter carriers in the Boston district; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from Dr. Rebecca S. White and others, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters from Joseph Ediner, of Placerville, Cal., and Charles Hope, of Truckee, Cal., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petitions of F. W. Foley and other citizens of New Haven County, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of a bill granting an increase of pension to David S. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of a bill granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Memorial of the Loveland (Colo.) Ministerial Association, protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of various voters of Carson County, Colo., favoring passage of the old-age pension bill (H. R. 12108); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petitions of E. G. Melander, Joe O. Campbell, Gus Finstad, F. L. Ries, and others, of Moorhead, Minn., and T. H. Patterson and others, of Pelican Rapids, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Scandinavian Christian Church, of Deer Creek, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Guardians of Liberty, Court No. 11, Detroit, Minn., against Columbus Day bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the General Contractors' Association of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various voters of the tenth congressional district of California, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Second Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles, 75 citizens of Altadena, and 17 citizens of Artesia, all in the State of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the American Federation of Labor, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland (by request): Petition of the Epworth League of Roland Park (Md.) Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of sundry citizens of Alabama, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various bankers of Alabama, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade, of Provincetown, Mass., protesting against the Linthicum antifish bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Colonel William L. Curry Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring date of inauguration day be changed to April 30; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Clan-na Gael, of Philadelphia, protesting against repeal of clause for free tolls in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petitions of Irish Bros., Greenwich Coal Mining Co., and Portage Coal Mining Co., all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against passage of Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First and the United States National Banks of Johnstown, Pa., and the First National Bank of Spangler, Pa., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, favoring passage of House bill 12740, relative to standardizing wages of all machinists employed by the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, protesting against passage of Senate bill 3895, relating to incorporation of stock exchanges, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 11321, the design registration bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Exchange of Johnstown, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 5139 for pensions and retirement for aged employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Jewelers' Association, favoring passage of the Owen-Goeke bill against stamping time guaranties on gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Concord Quarterly Meeting Society of Friends, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various camps of Spanish-American War Veterans, favoring passage of widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of the Pennsylvania Child Association and the Federation of Pennsylvania Women, favoring passage of child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of clause for free tolls in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petitions of the employees of the Pere Marquette Railway, favoring investigation of the Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, *March 9, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the King of Truth. We thank Thee for the truth, not only as it pertains to our physical life but for that which comprehends all our spiritual relationships and all the functions of our spiritual nature. We thank Thee for the truth that pushes back the curtains of the eternal order and gives to us visions of the far-reaching vista of God's government, God's changeless laws, and God's attitude toward men. We thank Thee for truth tellers, prophets, foretellers of the things that are and are to be, and that Thou hast witnessed Thyself among men.

We pray Thee to make us passionate followers after truth that we may hold to the King of Truth, and that Thou wilt reveal to us clearly what is right and wrong, what is truth and error, what is light and darkness, that we may be found ready to follow with a passionate desire the truth to its end, and that we may see established the kingdom of truth in all the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

### RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. PITTMAN. On behalf of the conferees on the part of the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate bill 48, I submit a conference report and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The report entire, which was in part read, is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said House amendment insert the following:

"That the President of the United States is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to adopt and use a name by which to designate the railroad or railroads and properties to be located, owned, acquired, or operated under the authority of this act; to employ such officers, agents, or agencies, in his discretion, as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this act; to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any or all of the duties imposed upon him by the terms of this act; to detail and require any officer or officers in the Engineer Corps in the Army or Navy to perform service under this act; to fix the compensation of all officers, agents, or employees appointed or designated by him; to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska and with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and the settlement of the public lands therein and so as to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, transportation of troops, arms, munitions of war, the mails, and for other governmental and public uses, and for the transportation of passengers and property; to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate, with the necessary branch lines, feeders, sidings, switches, and spurs; to purchase or otherwise acquire all real and personal property necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; to exercise the power of eminent domain in acquiring property for such use, which use is hereby declared to be a public use, by condemnation in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force there; to acquire rights of way, terminal grounds, and all other rights; to purchase or otherwise acquire all necessary equipment for the construction and operation of such railroad or railroads; to build or otherwise acquire docks, wharves, terminal facilities, and all structures needed for the equipment and operation of such railroad or railroads; to fix, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property, which rates shall be equal and uniform, but no free transportation or passes shall be permitted except that the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to the lines constructed under this act; to receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property, and to perform generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad; to make and establish rules and regulations for the control and operation of said railroad or railroads; in his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress: *Provided*, That if said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority herein given, then and in that event they shall be operated under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws; to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire upon such terms as he may deem proper any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him: *Provided*, That the price to be paid in case of purchase shall in no case exceed the actual physical value of the railroad; to make contracts or agreements with any railroad or steamship company or vessel owner for joint transportation of passengers or property over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel, and to make such other contracts as may be necessary to carry out any of the purposes of this act; to utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama, and the Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this act.

"The authority herein granted shall include the power to construct, maintain, and operate telegraph and telephone lines so far as they may be necessary or convenient in the construction and operation of the railroad or railroads as herein authorized, and they shall perform generally all the usual duties of telegraph and telephone lines for hire.

"That it is the intent and purpose of Congress through this act to authorize and empower the President of the United States, and he is hereby fully authorized and empowered, through such officers, agents, or agencies as he may appoint or employ, to do all necessary acts and things in addition to those specially authorized in this act to enable him to accomplish the purposes and objects of this act.

"The President is hereby authorized to withdraw, locate, and dispose of, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, such area or areas of the public domain along the line or lines of such proposed railroad or railroads for town-site purposes as he may from time to time designate.

"Terminal and station grounds and rights of way through the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska are hereby granted for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines authorized by this act, and in all patents for lands hereafter taken up, entered, or located in the Territory of Alaska there shall be expressed that there is reserved to the United States a right of way for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines to the extent of 100 feet on either side of the center line of any such road, and 25 feet on either side of the center line of any such telegraph or telephone lines, and the President may, in such manner as he deems advisable, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for

furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable.

"SEC. 2. That the cost of the work authorized by this act shall not exceed $35,000,000, and in executing the authority granted by this act the President shall not expend nor obligate the United States to expend more than the said sum; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000 to be used for carrying out the provisions of this act, to continue available until expended.

"SEC. 3. That all moneys derived from the lease, sale, or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained, or the timber thereon, and the earnings of said railroad or railroads, together with the earnings of the telegraph and telephone lines constructed under this act, above maintenance charges and operating expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscellaneous receipts are paid, and a separate account thereof shall be kept and annually reported to Congress.

"SEC. 4. That the officers, agents, or agencies placed in charge of the work by the President shall make to the President annually, and at such other periods as may be required by the President or by either House of Congress, full and complete reports of all their acts and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the operation of said work or works and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith. The annual reports herein provided for shall be by the President transmitted to Congress."

And the House agree to the same.

KEY PITTMAN,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
W. L. JONES,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*
W. C. HOUSTON,
FRANK E. GUERNSEY,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the bill embodied in the report be read?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Has the report been printed?

Mr. JONES. It appeared in the RECORD a few days ago, when it was presented in the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. On what day does it appear?

Mr. PITTMAN. In the proceedings of Thursday last, I believe.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not ask that the report be read, but I would like the Senator from Nevada to explain to the Senate what the amendment proposed really means. I particularly want to know whether his interpretation of the amendment means that the President is given power to begin the construction of the lines of railway that he may build at the northern terminus or termini of one or both the railroads now there, and to defer the acquisition of the existing railroads, if they are to be acquired at all, until after the parts of the road that he may build in the interior are completed. I have read hastily the proposal, and I confess great difficulty in understanding exactly what power is given to the President in this respect.

Mr. PITTMAN. In answer to the Senator from Iowa I will say that the bill, as the conferees on behalf of the Senate construe it, compels the President to build one continuous line from ports on the seacoast to river transportation in the interior, but it does not compel him to start that work at any particular point.

Mr. CUMMINS. If there is no particular urgency for the consideration of the report this morning, I would be very glad if the Senator from Nevada would allow it to be passed over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And have it printed.

Mr. CUMMINS. And have the report printed and put on our desks, although I understand the report has been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is printed at page 4626 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will state to the Senator that it has been printed as a document in addition to being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not had an opportunity to see the document. It is a matter of very great importance, and I ask that the report be laid over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. PITTMAN. On the statement of the Senator from Iowa I consent, on behalf of the conferees on the part of the Senate, to postponing the report until to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report goes over until to-morrow morning.

### LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 443).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to $119,847.64 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department, the appropriations and balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 441).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to $28,123.12, which have been presented to the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 442).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney General, submitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredation cases, amounting to $8,274, which require an appropriation for their payment, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 1933) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 357, Sixty-first Congress, and Senate Document No. 1063, Sixty-second Congress, being a compilation of treaties, conventions, etc., between the United States and other powers, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 13545) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a certificate from the governor of Ohio, transmitting a copy of a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to Federal action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Young People's Society of the Congregation B'nai Abraham, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Evansville, Greencastle, and Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Betsy Ross Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Robert Morris Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Commodore Barry Branch, American Continental League, of Jersey City, N. J.; of New Britain Branch, American Continental League, of New Britain, Conn.; of John Adams Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League of America, of New Bedford, Mass.; of Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Youngstown, Ohio; of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Lynn, Mass.; of Thomas Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of Peoria, Ill.; of the Clan-na-Gael, of

Philadelphia, Pa.; and of the John Boyle O'Reilly Club, of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the repeal of that part of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mott, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Solen and Odense, in the State of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of General Putnam Council, No. 125, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Pittsburgh; of Washington Camp, No. 157, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Williamsport; of Washington Camp, No. 366, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia; of Allegheny Council, No. 10, Daughters of America, of Pittsburgh; and of North Star Council, No. 67, Order United American Mechanics, of Quarryville; all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of the Federation of Liquor Dealers' Association of Sunbury and of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Wilkes-Barre, Verona, Warriors Run, Rochester, Brownsville, and Bellevue, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Crafton, of the Allison Park Board of Public Service, of the York County No-License League, and of sundry citizens of Philadelphia and Van Order, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Liberty Bell Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of the Clan-na-Gael of Philadelphia; of John Paul Jones Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of Betsy Ross Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of Robert Morris Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; and of John Adams Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of Prairie Center Local Union No. 640, of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit gambling on exchanges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of members of the bars of Lincoln County, Saline County, Buxton County, Lane County, Scott County, and Russell County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the district of Kansas at Salina, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Caro, Prescott, Bay City, and Linden, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Frederick Menzer, of Turner, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chelsea, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Carsonville, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee presented a petition of Antioch Council, No. 258, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Antioch, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Nashville, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented memorials of sundry citizens of Baltimore County; of the Catholic Workingmen's Union of the State of Maryland; of Society of Jaroslavz Dube, No. 45, of Baltimore; of Sharpshooters Council, Svornost, of Baltimore; of the Lodge Blanik, Bohemian Beneficial Association, of Baltimore; of the Bohemian Gymnastic Association, of Baltimore; of the Germania Quartet Club, of Baltimore; of the Bavarian Sick Beneficial Society, of Baltimore; of the Ladies' Society of Zion Congregation, of Baltimore; of the Brewmasters' Association, of Baltimore; of the East Baltimore Butchers' Mutual Aid Association; and of the Unkel Braesig Association, of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Anthony, Rice County, and Paola, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Garden City, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Clay Center, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Northfield, N. H., and a memorial of Local Union No. 633, Bartenders' League, of Nashua, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., remonstrating against an increase of postage on magazines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of the congregations of the Lutheran Church at Rush Point, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Redwood Falls, and the Clinton Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of St. Paul, and of the Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Minneapolis, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 365, Bartenders' Union, of Moorhead; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 351, of Mankato; and of sundry citizens of Moorhead, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented a memorial of Lincoln Branch, American Continental League, of Niles, Ohio, and a memorial of Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Youngstown, Ohio, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lisbon; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Doylestown; of the Men's Adult Bible Class of the Presbyterian Church of Plain City; of sundry citizens of Franklin County; and of the board of the Walnut Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Chillicothe, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation

of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Straitville; of Toledo Sektion, No. 1, Bayerischer National Verband, of Toledo; and of the Toledo Central Labor Union, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Albert Zettler, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to make legal uniform price maintenance under certain restrictions, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to abate the ravages of hog cholera, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WARREN submitted a memorial of sundry citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., and a memorial of Local Union No. 837, Bartenders' Union, of Kemmerer, Wyo., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1914.

Resolutions relative to the retirement of civil-service employees of the United States Post Office Department.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill for the retirement of all civil-service employees of the United States Post Office Department, known as the Hamill bill, House of Representatives, No. 5139; and

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts is in hearty accord with the principle of pensioning these faithful public servants: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully recommends to Congress the speedy passage of the said bill, and requests the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts to take such steps as may be proper to procure its passage; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Postmaster General, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts, and to the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 11, 1914.
In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 24, 1914.
A true copy.
Attest:

FRANK J. DONAHUE,
*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of Local Lodge, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Connersville, Ind., and a memorial of the Alliance of German Societies of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ladoga, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Ministerial Association of Hartford City, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of section 6 of the bill to amend the postal and civil-service laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented memorials of Machinists' Local Union, No. 191, of Grand Rapids; of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 67, of Grand Haven; of the Arbeiter Society of Saginaw; of the Lansing Trades and Labor Council; and of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids and Detroit, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the faculty of Adrian College, Adrian, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of J. M. Pond Post, No. 460, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Saugatuck, and a memorial of J. B. McPherson Post, No. 183, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Holly, Mich., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of Champlain Aerie, No. 793, Federation of Eagles, of Burlington, Vt., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS presented a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from sundry citizens of Columbus, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of West Peru, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lisbon Falls, Me., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Maine, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions for civil-service employees of the Post Office Department, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Board of Trade of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a legislative reference bureau in the Library of Congress, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of H. M. Warren Post, No. 12, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, of Wakefield, Mass., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Lynn; of Paul Revere Branch, American Continental League, of Leominster; and of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Capt. John M. Pettingell Camp, No. 52, United Spanish War Veterans, of Amesbury, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., and a petition of sundry citizens of Whitman, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts and of the John Boyle O'Reilly Club, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of Bartenders' Local Union No. 81, of Holyoke; of International Coopers' Local Union No. 89, of Boston; of Bartenders' Local Union No. 90, of Lawrence; of Local Union No. 499, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Brockton; and of sundry citizens of Boston, Springfield, and Milford, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present 233 individual memorials from citizens of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY presented petitions of Grant Council, No. 52, of Williamstown; of Local Council No. 75, Daughters of America, of Hinton; of Baxter Council, No. 194, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Louisville; and of Vale Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Vale, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Local Branch No. 4, Catholic Mutual Benefit Association, of Covington; of Kenton Lodge, No. 151, of Covington; of the Covington Turngemeinde; of the Pike Street Mutual Aid Association, of Covington; of Old Kentucky Lodge, No. 214, Switchmen's Union, of Ludlow; and of the Anker Mutual Aid Society, of Newport, all in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of the Federation of Labor, of Danbury; of International Molders' Union, No. 298, of Waterbury; of Horse Shoers' Union, No. 14, of Hartford; and of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Hartford, Norwich, Norwalk, and New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Connecticut State Business Men's Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the appointment by the President of clerks to United States courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Willimantic, the First Baptist Church of Willimantic, and the Congregational Church of Ellington, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Connecticut State Business Men's Association, and a memorial of Local Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the provision in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island; of the Italian Republican Club, of Torrington; of Ben Miller Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Danbury; of Gen. Joseph Walker Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Stratford; and of the United Hebrews' Societies of Stamford, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Mad River Grange, No. 71, Patrons of Husbandry, of Waterbury, Conn., and a petition of Excelsior Pomona Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the establishment of a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch Civil Service Employees' Association, of South Norwalk, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a memorial of New Britain Branch, American Continental League, of New Britain, Conn., and a memorial of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Connecticut State Branch of Post Office Clerks at their annual meeting at Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees and remonstrating against any change in the Sunday closing law affecting post-office clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of sundry citizens of Moorhead, St. Paul, and Minneapolis; of Local Union No. 598, Bartenders' Union, of East Grand Forks; and of Local Union No. 813, Bartenders' Union, of St. Cloud, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of Excelsior Pomona Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, and of Mad River Grange, No. 71, Patrons of Husbandry, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a memorial of the Connecticut State Branch, Post Office Clerks' Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling employees in the Postal Service to work on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of New Britain Branch, American Continental League, of New Britain, Conn., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of William H. Hamilton Camp, No. 20, United Spanish War Veterans, of Danielson, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Wadhams Camp, No. 49, Sons of Veterans, of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of General Joseph Walker Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Stratford, Conn., and a petition of Washington Camp, No. 8, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Stratford, and New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast, favoring free tolls for vessels engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hollister, Cal., and a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Arroyo Grande, Cal., favoring the suspension of the naval programs of the great powers, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Wheaton Camp, No. 8, Spanish War Veterans, of San Jose, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Monrovia, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of the Moving Picture Operators' Union of Sacramento; of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 469, of Bakersfield; of Bartenders' Local Union, No. 406, of Eureka; of Cooks and Waiters' Alliance, No. 31, of Oakland; and of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Sacramento Valley Improvement Association, of Sacramento, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented memorials of sundry citizens of Union County, Trenton, and Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture,

sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Young People's Society of the Congregation of B'nai Abraham, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Essex County, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. POMERENE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*State of Ohio, ss:*

I, James M. COX, governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the following is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in the office of and in the official custody of the secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio on the 27th day of January, A. D. 1914.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the great seal of the State of Ohio at Columbus, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1914.

[SEAL.] JAMES M. COX, *Governor.*

**Senate joint resolution 3.**

**Joint resolution relative to proper Federal and State action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera.**

Whereas it is estimated that on account of the ravages of cholera among hogs, the total annual diminution of the wealth of the United States is in excess of $50,000,000; and

Whereas it is further estimated that by reason of this disease there is a yearly waste of not less than 10 pounds of pork for every man, woman, and child in the Nation, a waste which, if it could be prevented, would aid materially in reducing the high cost of living; and

Whereas its ravages have become a menace to the national health and welfare, as well as being one of the most discouraging handicaps under which the American farmers labor: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly of Ohio*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, petitioned to enact the proper sanitary legislation to prohibit the interstate spread of this disease and to make such an appropriation of funds for its suppression as is commensurate with the magnitude of the damage and destruction inflicted by it upon the business and farming interests.

*Be it further resolved*, That the governor of this State be, and he is hereby, requested and directed to take all proper and necessary steps to secure conjoint action and cooperation on the part of all the State executives and legislatures to insure the complete eradication of this disease, which threatens to destroy and ruin the hog industry of the entire country; and

*Be it further resolved*, That the governor be, and he is hereby, directed to forward duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, together with each Member of the Senate and Member of Congress for Ohio, with the request that the same be laid before the Senate and House for prompt consideration.

C. L. SWAIN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
W. A. GREENLUND,
*President of the Senate.*

Adopted January 27, 1914.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*State of Ohio, ss:*

I, Chas. H. Graves, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio on the 27th day of January, A. D. 1914.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal at Columbus, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1914.

[SEAL.] CHAS. H. GRAVES,
*Secretary of State.*

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] introduced and caused to have read a telegram from Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont relating to the pending unfinished business of the Senate. For that reason only I ask unanimous consent to have a letter, dated March 7, from Dr. Anna Howard Shaw read into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION,
*505 Fifth Avenue, New York, March 7, 1914.*

Senator CHARLES THOMAS,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I have been reading of the various bills which have been introduced into Congress, of the debates on the floor of the Senate, and of the different groups of women who have made appeals for recognition before the judiciary and on the floor of the Senate.

As I wrote you some time since, the National Congressional Union in Washington, under the direction of Miss Paul, does not in any way represent the National Suffrage Association. There is no relation whatever between the two groups. The Congressional Union is largely made up of local people, with a few others scattered throughout the country, while the national association is an organized group of suffragists throughout the United States, which is represented by Mrs. Medill McCormick, Mrs. Antoinette Funk, Mrs. Helen Gardner, and Mrs. Booth in Washington. These ladies have been regularly appointed by the national association as their representatives, and no other group of women and no other woman from any part of the country is authorized by the national association to introduce any measure or to speak upon any measure in the name of the national association.

While I fully recognize that individual women and local societies have an equal right with all others to be heard, I also feel it my duty to state that none of these represent the organized suffragists of the country. So that whenever any individual or any representative of the Congressional Union in Washington makes any appeal to the Senate, or to yourself as chairman of the Senate committee, it is not to be understood as an appeal from the organized suffragists of the Nation. Nor when any threat is made of an attack upon the Democratic Party is it to be considered as coming from the organized suffragists of the Nation.

The National Suffrage Association and all of its auxiliaries, which are located in 42 of the States of the Union, are unalterably opposed to partisan action or to the attacks on any man or any group of men because they are allied with any particular political party.

With sincere regards.

Very truly, yours,

ANNA HOWARD SHAW.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the RECORD of March 6 I am reported as saying that Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, as I understood it, is a member of the National Board of Woman Suffrage. I stated that, as I understood it, she is not a member of the board. I should like to have that correction made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will be corrected.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7967) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a postal savings system, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 320) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13091) to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, which was agreed to.

## ADDRESSES BEFORE THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 440).

Mr. FLETCHER. At the fifth annual convention of the Southern Commercial Congress held in Mobile, Ala., October 27–29, 1913, a number of very learned, instructive, and important addresses were delivered by the President of the United States, representatives of Latin-America, and the Pan American Union, including a letter from the Secretary of State, all as shown by the letter of transmittal. These I presented to the Committee on Printing for consideration, and that committee authorized a report favoring their publication as a Senate document. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report and that it be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

The report was agreed to.

## PAINT CREEK DISTRICT, W. VA.

Mr. SWANSON. Under authority of Senate resolution No. 37, passed by the Senate May 27, 1913, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to appoint a committee to make an investigation of conditions existing in the Paint Creek district, W. Va., I submit a report (No. 321) together with the individual views of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

## SOUTHERN CLAIMS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to make a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary and to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 751) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 319) thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read for information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the bill is one in which our old

friend, the late Senator Johnston, of Alabama, was very much interested. It has been passed by the Senate three times.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to it at all.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "repeal," in line 5, at the end of the bill, insert "so far as it affects payments for services in the Army of the United States prior to April 13, 1861."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4714) to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 4715) for the relief of heirs or estate of David Jameson, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4716) granting an increase of pension to George Eichhorn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4717) granting an increase of pension to Catharine J. Goodknight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4718) granting an increase of pension to Wilkison B. Ross (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4719) granting a pension to Thomas Jefferson Rothgeb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4720) granting a pension to Mary E. (Ross) Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 4721) for the relief of persons suffering damages by the construction of the canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the Calaveras River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 4722) to create a bureau for the deaf and dumb in the Department of Labor, and prescribing the duties thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 4723) granting an increase of pension to Jennie J. Sheehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 4724) granting an increase of pension to John Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4725) providing for the establishment of a lobster-rearing station at some suitable point on the Atlantic coast; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 4726) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brawn;

A bill (S. 4727) granting a pension to Rosilla Dwelley (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4728) granting an increase of pension to John H. Gordon (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4729) granting an increase of pension to George W. Eaton (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4730) granting an increase of pension to Hannora Harrigan (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Brundage (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 4732) granting a pension to George M. Mitchell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4733) for the relief of the Chettimanchi Band or Tribe of Indians of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 4734) authorizing the Northern Arapahoe Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., borne on the annual and session rolls on the 15th day of October, 1913, who are receiving an annual compensation of $2,500 or less, as reimbursement for mileage expenses, a sum equal to one-twelfth of the annual compensation then paid them by law, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the ordnance service of the United States Army from $250,000 to $300,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,394,480 to reimburse the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., for extra cost in excess of contract obligations in the construction of the lock gates of the Panama Canal, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) submitted an amendment providing that the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $10,000 for the completion of the post-office building at Hanover, Pa., be made available for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the present site, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $17,655 for the rent of rooms for the United States courts and judicial officers and for the provision of necessary furniture and other equipment of courtrooms for New York City, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NORRIS submitted an amendment authorizing the Washington Gas Light Co. to purchase, at a price to be ascertained and fixed by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, as much of the 2,470 outstanding shares of the capital stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that on and after the 1st day of July, 1914, the Washington Gas Light Co. shall not charge or collect for gas furnished a consumer in any part of the District of Columbia a rate in excess of 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, matters connected with the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad and the Boston & Maine Railroad have been made the subject of interesting discussions in the Senate. I have in my hand an article and an editorial from the morning Herald of this city, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading, as it will save time.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY MEAGER PROFITS REALIZED BY J. P. MORGAN & CO. IN N. Y., N. H. & H. TRANSACTIONS—AT REQUEST OF CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT FIRM FURNISHES EVERY DETAIL, SHOWING THAT IN 20 YEARS NEARLY ONE-THIRD OF A BILLION DOLLARS' WORTH OF SECURITIES WERE HANDLED, THE NET PROFIT BEING $350,000—NOT INTERESTED IN OTHER PROPERTIES; YEARLY AVERAGE REFUTES MUCKRAKERS.

[House of Morgan's 20 years of financing with the New Haven road: Securities handled, $333,000,000; profit to Morgan & Co., $350,000; average yearly profit, $17,500.]

NEW YORK, *March 8.*

In correspondence made public to-day there are disclosed the details of the financial relations of J. P. Morgan & Co. to the New Haven road and its allied corporations.

It is shown that in relations extending for 20 years and covering transactions that aggregate $333,000,000 J. P. Morgan & Co. took a net profit of $350,000, an average of $17,500 a year for the past 20 years. It is further shown that neither the banking firm nor any of its partners was interested in any of the several properties acquired by the New Haven system.

Acting in response to questions submitted by directors of the road and others, Howard Elliott, chairman of the board of directors of the New Haven, wrote to Morgan & Co. on February 21 asking for the details of all financial transactions with the road and its allied companies, and as well that he be informed as to the interest of the firm or any of its partners in the properties bought by the company and the profits made by the banking firm.

RECITES LONG SERIES OF TRANSACTIONS.

The reply of Morgan & Co. bears the date of March 4 and, like the letter that brought it forth, is a striking document. It frankly recites

with detail and particularity a long series of transactions of large responsibility and the purchase or issuance of securities totaling one-third of a billion dollars in value, and in every instance discloses the profit or loss of the firm.

The popular impression, even in friendly quarters, has been that the banking firm took large profits from its transactions in the New Haven securities, and many fanciful tales as to the amount have been in circulation for weeks past.

No formal statement accompanied the publication of the two letters and the exhibits attached to the Morgan document. "The letters adequately explain themselves," said a representative of J. P. Morgan & Co., "and for that reason we have prepared no explanatory or other formal statement to accompany them. Our letter to Howard Elliott shows that in 20 years J. P. Morgan & Co. took part in the sale of $333,000,000 of securities of the New Haven companies and made a profit of $350,000 on the transactions."

NEITHER FIRM NOR PARTNERS INTERESTED.

It also shows that neither the firm nor its partners were interested in the properties acquired by the New Haven.

The correspondence, preceded by a brief explanatory statement from J. P. Morgan & Co., is as follows:

BOSTON, *February 21, 1914.*

Messrs. J. P. MORGAN & Co.,
*23 Wall Street, New York City.*

GENTLEMEN: I have been asked questions by our directors and by others about the transactions between your firm and this company, both before and since the fiscal agency contract, which was in effect from December 19, 1910, to December 4, 1913, and which was terminated by notice from your firm.

An examination of the books of the New Haven Co. will, of course, show these transactions, but as there are a number of subordinate companies and intercompany entries it would be a convenience to me, and would save some time, if I could obtain from you a complete statement of all transactions of the New Haven road and its allied companies, involving the placing of its securities or the purchase of securities for it, in which your firm or its predecessors, Messrs. Drexel, Morgan & Co., have taken part since January 1, 1894.

In addition to furnishing this information, it would assist me greatly, although I have no technical right to the information, if you would be willing to furnish me a statement showing the profits realized by your firm from the sale of securities purchased from the New Haven Co. or from any of its subordinate companies.

ASKS DATA OF MORGAN.

I should also be glad to have a statement from you as to whether your firm or any of its members ever had any interest in any properties acquired by the New Haven Co., such as the Westchester, the steam railways, the trolley lines, or the steamship companies.

I am also asked certain questions about the Millbrook Co., and I should be glad if you would inform me about the following:

1. The total amount of advances made by your firm to Mr. Oakleigh Thorne or to the Millbrook Co.

2. Whether your firm had any transactions with the Millbrook Co. other than for the account and by the order of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

3. Whether there was any profit or commission to your firm, or any member of it, in these transactions, and if so, the extent of such profit or commission.

4. Whether your firm, or any member of it, had any interest in any of the securities purchased by the Millbrook Co.

If you are willing to give me the information suggested in this letter, it will assist me greatly in answering numerous inquiries that are made, and I shall be under obligations, particularly if you can send the information in the near future.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) HOWARD ELLIOTT,
*Chairman.*

MORGAN & CO.'S REPLY.

NEW YORK, *March 4, 1914.*

HOWARD ELLIOTT, Esq.,
*Chairman, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.,*
*South Station, Boston, Mass.*

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of your letter of February 21, asking for certain information covering our relations with the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. and its allied companies. In compliance with your request, and in the comparatively brief time available, we have had thorough examination made of all our books, the results of which we present herewith in the form of various statements, embracing all our transactions with the New Haven road and its subsidiaries during the past 20 years.

PROFIT WAS $350,000.

Our relations with the New Haven have been of the following character: From 1894 to 1910 the New Haven generally disposed of its securities by selling them outright—sometimes to us, sometimes to other houses. The securities thus purchased were afterwards sold by the purchasers for their own account, they taking the risk of profit or loss thereon. From December 19, 1910, until December 4, 1913, we acted, under contract, as the fiscal agent of the companies. In the course of these 20 years, from 1894 to 1914, we took part in the handling of New Haven and subsidiary company securities of the par value of $333,000,000, from which our firm realized a total net profit of approximately $350,000, all of the foregoing being set forth below in detail. All our calculations have included any participations by our Philadelphia, London, or Paris houses. The transactions are grouped under two headings, viz:

Schedule I. All securities purchased by us, either alone or in participation with others.

*Summary of Schedule I.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total security purchases in which we participated | $131,724,000.00 |
| Amount of our participation in such purchases | 78,165,667.00 |
| Losses realized by us on certain of such purchases | 738,524.56 |
| Total profits accrued to us from all the remainder of such purchases | 555,164.42 |
| Net loss to our firm from the total of such purchases | 183,360.14 |

*Schedule II.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Section A: Transactions in which, prior to the fiscal agency contract, we acted as agent for the company, the total of securities involved in such transactions being a par value of | 58,851,803.00 |
| On these transactions total commissions paid by the company were | 158,561.13 |
| Being an average commission of less than three-tenths of 1 per cent. | |
| Of this commission the amount retained by us was | 148,645.25 |
| The balance being paid to others interested with us in the transactions. | |
| Section B: All transactions under fiscal agency contract (entered on Dec. 19, 1910, and terminated on Dec. 4, 1913) for all companies (including Boston & Maine), showing a total of | 142,507,000.00 |
| Of securities sold for account of the companies. | |
| Upon which they paid total commissions of | 837,605.00 |
| Or approximately five-eighths of 1 per cent for selling. | |
| Of this commission the amount retained by us was | 384,960.01 |
| The balance being paid to others interested with us in the transactions. | |

*Summary of Schedules I and II.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Schedule I: Amount of companies' outright sale of securities | 131,724,000.00 |
| Schedule II: Amount of companies' securities handled on commission | 201,358,803.00 |
| In all | 333,082,803.00 |
| Total amount of commissions paid by companies | 996,166.13 |
| Being a little less than one-half of 1 per cent. | |
| Total amount of such commissions retained by us | 533,625.20 |
| Net losses realized by us in the outright purchases (see Schedule I) | 183,360.14 |
| Difference, representing total profit to us | 350,265.12 |

DEAD FINANCIER'S INHERITANCE.

This total profit of $350,265.12 (being at the average rate of $17,500 per year) is, as aforesaid, the net result to our firms of all of our transactions with the New Haven and its allied companies during the 20-year period just ended. We have not received from the New Haven, or from the companies affiliated with it, any compensation or profit in any form, or on any other account, than those herewith described.

Answering your specific inquiry, we beg to state that none of our firms, nor any member of them, ever had any interest in any properties such as the Westchester, the steam railways, the trolley lines, or the steamship companies acquired by the New Haven Co. or any of its subsidiary companies. This broad statement has only one exception, the details of which are as follows:

Mr. J. P. Morgan, sr., inherited 1,222 shares of stock of the South Bay Wharf & Terminal Co. (being somewhat less than one-tenth of the whole) from his father in 1890. Seventeen years later, in January, 1907, he was asked to exchange this stock for 814 shares of New Haven stock and complied with the request. You may be interested in reading copy herewith of a letter under date of January 27, 1906, addressed to him by Mr. J. C. Cobb, explaining the method proposed for arriving, through outside appraisal, at a fair price to the New Haven in the matter. From this you will note that not only was Mr. Morgan's interest small, but that the transaction was carried through without participation by him.

Millbrook Co.: We are glad to make specific replies to your questions in regard to this company.

ROAD WAS "RESPONSIBLE."

(1) We hand you herewith statements of accounts from our books showing that from October, 1906, to September, 1907, we advanced Mr. Oakleigh Thorne, and afterwards the Millbrook Co., various sums aggregating $11,155,000. All these advances were made by order and for account of the New Haven Railroad Co. We inclose copy of an official letter to us from the New Haven Co., dated April 2, 1907, and received about that date, in which reference is made to an agreement dated December 4, 1906, between the New Haven Co. and the Millbrook Co., and to our advances on account of that contract. This letter confirms our understanding that all such transactions have been and are "for the account and benefit of the New Haven road," and furthermore that "that road is and will be responsible therefor." We hand to you also a list of the securities against which advances were made, such securities having been finally turned over to the Millbrook Co. under instructions of the New Haven Co.

(2) None of our firms, nor any member of them, had any transactions with the Millbrook Co. other than those for the account and by the order of the New Haven Co., as set forth in the statements of accounts furnished you herewith.

(3) In none of these transactions was there any profit or commission to our firms or to any member of them. The New Haven Co. opened with us an account which was designated as its "Account No. 2." In this account the company deposited from time to time (over $8,000,000 of the total prior to February, 1907) moneys to reimburse us for our advances for its account to the Millbrook Co. We inclose statement of that account, showing that any interest paid by Mr. Thorne was credited to the New Haven Co.'s "Account No. 2," and that we received no interest upon advances made.

$1,415,000 IN 11 YEARS.

(4) The securities thus purchased by the Millbrook Co. represented the ownership of those enterprises which afterwards became what is known as the New York, Westchester & Boston Railroad Co. None of our firms, nor any member of them, had any interest in the Millbrook Co., or in any of the securities or property purchased by the Millbrook Co., or received any advantage from such purchases. Nor had we any interest of any kind in any of the enterprises or properties which in any way became a part of the New York, Westchester & Boston.

DEPOSITS.

From the year 1903, when the first deposit account was opened with us, the companies have had with us total balances averaging for the 11 years about $1,415,000 (subject to draft) on which we have interest at 2 per cent.

We believe the foregoing covers all the points as to which you ask us. Should any point not be clear to you, or should you desire more detailed information on any point, we shall be very glad to give you explanation or further information you desire.

Yours, very truly,

J. P. MORGAN & Co.

WILL "SINK OR SWIM."

The letter from John C. Cobb to the elder Morgan, referred to in the firm's letter to Chairman Elliott, follows:

BOSTON, *January 27, 1906.*

MY DEAR MR. MORGAN: As representing your interest in the South Bay Wharf & Terminal Co., I would report that the present status of affairs is about as follows:

The question of adjustment of differences with the New Haven road has had further consideration, and our board of directors has appointed a committee consisting of Minot, Crocker, and Codman with full powers to adjust the matter as they may think best and to make a sale of the whole or any portion of the company's property. I have also stated to them that I control a majority of the stock of the company which I would sell at any price they might fix, other stockholders to have the opportunity to sell at the same price. These men were chosen as being men of unquestioned fairness, with large experience in real estate and railroad matters, and I would add each of them having a far larger interest in the New Haven road than they have in the South Bay Wharf & Terminal Co. They have recently made a careful and detailed estimate of the value of the company's property, which I figure would mean a value of about $170 a share for the stock.

Of the 12,387 shares of the company, about 7,500 shares, including yours, are directly in my control. Henry F. Dimock owns 1,282 shares which he says he prefers to hold, but will presumably do what the rest of us do. Minot, Crocker, and Codman, together hold about 1,000 shares and will presumably neither buy nor sell at the present time. As to the balance of the stock I have no definite knowledge beyond a general idea that 1,000 or 2,000 shares, possibly, might be purchased at or about par.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN C. COBB.

J. PIERPONT MORGAN, Esq.,
*Wall Street, New York.*

January 30, 1906, Mr. J. P. M. replied:

"I have received your letter of 27th and place my interest in the case in your hands. I am quite ready to sink or swim with you in the matter."

All above for Mr. Joyce's information. This had better be placed with the papers Mr. Joyce holds.

C. W. K.

—

LIGHT ON THE NEW HAVEN.

[Washington Herald editorial, Mar. 9, 1914.]

There is published to-day a chapter of modern financial history striking in its relation to the political thought and theme of the hour. J. P. Morgan & Co. have opened their books to disclose for public information the facts of their connection with the financing of the New Haven road.

The details are to be found on other pages of this newspaper in an extended dispatch from New York, and everyone should read them with care and thought; but we want to talk about them a little editorially, for the subject is high in the public mind and, incidentally, one which, in general and in variety, has been referred to in this particular column.

It appears that Howard Elliott, who is making encouraging progress toward the rehabilitation of the New Haven property, prompted by some of his directors and possibly inspired by a desire to satisfy himself, addressed an engagingly frank and pointed letter to J. P Morgan & Co. asking them for the facts of their former financial relations with his railroad and as to whether or not the house and its partners had interest, and if so, what, in the subsidiary properties acquired by the railway system.

The answer, equally frank and engaging, is going to be a distinct surprise to a large number of perfectly worthy persons, as well as to a considerable number who do not abide within that enviable class.

The response of the banking house, made as clear as simple English and plain figures can transmit meaning, shows that in financial operations aggregating just one-third of a billion dollars and extending over a period of 20 years its net profits were $350,265.12, and that the firm and its partners did not have interest in any properties bought by the railroad company.

We say this showing is going to be a surprise to the worthy and the unworthy because, between honest misconception and evil inspiration, there has been created the wide popular impression that Morgan & Co. had profited to the extent of many millions of dollars by methods that honest men abhor to the misfortune and partial wrecking of the New Haven system. It has been charged that Morgan & Co. led the railroad company on to destruction through the issue of securities for all manner of unwise and improper purposes, solely with the object of reaping dishonest profit through the sale of the securities which had to be issued. Discussion and agitation of the status of the New Haven property very properly claimed the attention of Congress and more than one Member of that body darkly hinted that the fiscal agents had robbed the railway system.

The inception and acceptance of such popular impressions, however unjust in their conclusions and harmful in their effects, are not to be wondered at. Truth is, the popular mind has long been in receptive frame along this line. Popular faith has been impaired, and on its more pessimistic side it has not only been prepared for the worst; it has hoped for the worst. Much of the political leadership of the time, many of our would-be molders of public opinion have deemed it wise or profitable to trade in broken faith and the discontent which it engenders, and do all they could to pass along and "bear in" these sensational and harmful tales. Nor have the stories lost anything in the telling, as is the way with the spoken word.

The lesson of the incident is a very simple one, but surely one not to be forgotten and overlooked in the higher politics of the time. It is that there are two sides to every tale, and that you'd better hear the other half before you adopt the story as your own.

For our own part, we are not surprised by the story told in this correspondence, unless it be at the smallness of the fee taken by J. P. Morgan & Co. They could have taken many times the toll that they did take and still have been within the decent bounds of legitimate business.

All through the months that the affairs of the New Haven have been under discussion we have doubted that this old and substantial firm of bankers had departed from the paths of honest dealing and fair play in its relations with the New Haven property. It has probably erred in judgment as to matters of policy, but its hands are clean and its integrity intact.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1933. An act to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise, wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurrent or other resolutions are in order. If there be none, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) yesterday submitted by Mr. CUMMINS was read, as follows:

*Resolved* That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that by unanimous consent the resolution just read will be continued from day to day without prejudice. It accordingly will now go over without prejudice.

TOLL-EXEMPTION PROVISION OF PANAMA CANAL ACT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 289), submitted by Mr. POINDEXTER on the 6th instant, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States,* That the President be respectfully requested to inform the Senate, in so far as not incompatible with the public interest, what "other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence" are referred to in the President's message of March 5, 1914; and to so inform the Senate what connection such matters have with the proposed repeal of the toll-exemption provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate Senate resolution 164, requesting the President to transmit information relative to measures taken to protect citizens of the United States in Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 5, the two Houses of this Congress met in joint session in the Hall of the House of Representatives—met in joint assembly to hear from the lips of the President of the United States a message in which, among other things, he said:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Congress, I have come to you upon an errand which can be very briefly performed, but I beg that you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. No communication I have addressed to the Congress carried with it graver or more far-reaching implications as to the interest of the country, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged in a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

Continuing, the President made this plea:

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

Mr. President, I shall grant to the President that ungrudging measure of support which he has so solemnly requested. In yielding that support with my vote I shall give it because of convictions long since formed and often announced.

I shall not be guided in giving that support because of any knowledge I may possess of the pressing need of a repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama bill as an act in support of the foreign policy of this administration.

The President speaks of the personal responsibility with which he is charged under the Constitution, and refers, I presume, to his constitutional duty to direct and, in collaboration or cooperation with the Senate of the United States, to shape the foreign policy of this country.

By his plea he admits the constitutional duty of the Congress of the United States in the matter of the construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and yet he imparts to this Congress none of the reasons upon which he bases his plea for our support, and leaves the Congress and the country in entire ignorance of those affairs of foreign policy, gravely important as they must be, to which he refers.

Does not the President, so sincerely impressed with his personal responsibility, overlook the equally grave personal and collective responsibility under the Constitution of the Members of this coordinate branch of our Government? Is there not also resting upon the President a constitutional obligation to

keep the Congress informed as to affairs in which it has a constitutional right to act with him and an equally grave constitutional responsibility?

We learn from the public press, Mr. President, that possibly Great Britain is yet insisting upon her construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; but while fully informed by Mr. Taft of that country's protest against proposed action upon canal tolls by this body, we have heard not one word from an authoritative source as to any further or other protest from her since we acted upon the subject.

We learn through the press that another country has protested against certain laws of a sovereign State of this Union, upon the ground that such State laws are in conflict with certain treaties or a treaty ratified by this body in the performance of its constitutional duty. Yet although a short time since requested by the President to join him in adopting an important arbitration treaty with that country, not one message, not one intimation have we received from the President concerning such reported protests.

On April 20, 1913, this Senate sent to the President a formally worded request for information as to the number of Americans killed in Mexico and the number driven out of that country; what steps had been taken by the President under his constitutional duty to see that solemn treaty stipulations for the protection of American citizens was enforced; and what measures were being pursued to obtain satisfaction for damages inflicted upon Americans in unhappy Mexico.

In the month of July following, no acknowledgment having been theretofore made even of the receipt of our respectful request, an answer was sent in informing us that the President did not deem it compatible with the public interest to furnish such information.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln, in the terrible days of our civil conflict, when the dark clouds of war hung low over this Capital City, thought it not incompatible with the public interests to fully inform the Senate of the United States concerning communications between this Government and that of France relating to matters of immense import touching the relative strength of the respective armies engaged in that strife, the conditions existing in the North and in the South, the offer of France to mediate, and so forth, as will be seen by reference to Executive Documents Nos. 37 and 38, Thirty-seventh Congress, third session.

Grover Cleveland thought it not incompatible with the public interests to fully inform the Senate as to the amount of damage claimed by our citizens in Cuba against Spain; as to the number of our citizens arrested in Cuba from February 24, 1895, to January 25, 1897; to forward to this body all papers and correspondence concerning the arrest, death, and so forth, of various Americans, and so forth, as will be seen by reference to special messages of January 22 and 25, February 1, 11, and 23, and March 2, 1897.

McKinley and other Presidents have thought it not incompatible with the public interest to furnish this body with similar information, realizing that in great national crises this is one branch of the department of government which must finally act.

Writers upon the subject of government and its different departments in this country have expressed appreciation of the difficulties under which Congress at times labors in the discharge of its constitutional responsibilities, and, passing such authorities as Brice and others, I will only quote from one, to-day recognized as the most authoritative upon this subject:

> But it is not always easy to get legislative questions fully and correctly answered, for the officers of the Government are in no way responsible to either House for their official conduct. They belong to an entirely separate and independent branch of the Government. Only such high crimes and misdemeanors as lay them open to impeachment expose them to the power of the Houses. The committees are therefore frequently prevented from doing their work of inquiry well, and the Senate has to act in the dark.

I have read, Mr. President, from page 530, The State, by Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. President, I fully appreciate and approve the invaluable service done the country and the assistance rendered this department of the Government by the press, from the great metropolitan dailies to the country weeklies, in giving out information concerning events in Mexico during the last three years and in calling attention from day to day to the deplorable state of affairs in that country and to the horrible outrages and atrocities perpetrated there upon defenseless men, women, and children, citizens of Mexico, and others, citizens of this great Nation and of other countries of the world. Personally I have been probably in closer touch with Mexico and have possibly had more ready access to accurate information than any other Senator, and I am oppressed with a sense of my personal responsibility, imposed upon me under the circumstances as I view them, by my sense of duty as a Member of this, one of the constitutional branches of this Government.

I shall ask indulgence, therefore, Mr. President, while I give to my colleagues some information in my possession. I shall refer, first, briefly to the outrages upon American citizens in the Republic of Mexico other than those resulting in death to the persons attacked. I shall go back into the history of the revolution in Mexico from the time of its inception or shortly thereafter. I shall only call attention to the fact that a committee of this body made a report containing 961 pages, over 500 of which contain instance after instance of attacks upon American citizens, of assaults upon innocent women and children—American citizens—in the Republic of Mexico, and I defy, Mr. President, the production of one scintilla of proof that anything whatsoever has been done by this Government or by any of its officials, further than in certain specific instances where matters were called to the attention of the State Department directly by Senators or others having some influence, to show one single instance in which anything more than merely a formal protest has been made, any single instance in which reparation has been sought or obtained.

Mr. President, among the witnesses whose testimony you will find included in this Senate report, I want to call the attention of Senators to the testimony of Stephenson, of Warren, of McKinney, of Fink, of Houghton, of Cobler, of Look, of Atwood, of Booker, and of Sutton. Among the hundreds, Mr. President, I mention these names because in every instance these men, not representing great corporations but representing their own private interests, speak to you through their sworn testimony of outrages committed upon American citizens in Mexico which have gone absolutely unrebuked. Everyone of these witnesses to whom I have referred is well known in his own State; each one of them has resided in Mexico for years; each one of them is familiar with the conditions in Mexico; and I have referred specifically to their evidence because they are among the men who came to Washington to plead with the Department of State in behalf of their fellow Americans in Mexico, but who were turned away from the department.

I am going to read, Mr. President, one affidavit from one of the 600 railroad men who were driven out of Mexico, a member of the Order of Railway Conductors. The affidavit is as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF J. S. M'CRANIE AND J. D. KENNEDY.

EL PASO, TEX., *August 3, 1912.*

On May 11, 1911, we were conductor and engineer on passenger train No. 236 between San Luis and Anguas, and were caught by a bunch of Maderistas at Pena Blanco, and were forced to back up to Salinas. Before backing up to Salinas the Maderistas robbed all the passengers, abusing them and poking them with rifles, making them halloo "Viva Madero." I, the conductor, was robbed and called all the vile names in the Spanish language, and also spit on. After backing up to Salinas the soldiers all went over to the town of Salinas and got drunk, sent over a bunch of from three to five men about every 15 or 20 minutes, who would call us out, punch us in the ribs with rifles, hit us with machetes, makes us halloo "Viva Madero," and then take us between horses and run us for about 100 yards. Treated the passengers in the same way. They also shot the train all to pieces. There was about 14 American men on this train. We got loose on the morning of May 13 about 9.30 a. m.

On May 12 Conductor Kane was running train between Silao and Guanajuato with Engineer McFarland. A rail was taken out by a bunch of rebels; the rebels held this train up, robbed passengers and all people on it. After Conductor Kane had given them everything he had and the brakeman was begging for his life—as Conductor Kane could not speak Spanish—they shot Conductor Kane in the mouth and then shot the brakeman through the arm for begging Kane's life; also beat the engineer with machetes. This I did not see, but did see and help take Conductor Kane to the hospital on his arrival and ours. Also was told by people coming in that there was a lady on the train that they laid in the middle of the aisle and beat her on her feet with machetes trying to make her give up some diamonds and jewelry that they supposed she had. This was April 11, 1912.

Also, Supt. Hamilton, superintendent of the Guggenheim mines at Sandhill, was beat up by a bunch of rebels in May, 1911, until he couldn't sleep on his back for a week; abusing Mrs. Krutchniett, also Mr. Krutchniett and the rest of the Americans that were at the camp. This information I got from Mr. Hamilton before his back was well from the bruises.

J. S. MCCRANIE, *Conductor.*
J. D. KENNEDY, *Engineer.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 3d day of August, A. D. 1912.

[SEAL.] H. E. CHAINIE,
*Notary Public in and for El Paso County, Tex., United States of America.*

Mr. President, I have here an extract from the report of W. W. Suit, the chief of the Order of Railroad Conductors in the Republic of Mexico prior to the time when all the American conductors and engineers, 600 or more in number, were driven out of that country. In this report, made through his official organ to his organization, he says:

> The United States of America, by the Monroe doctrine, assisted by sending an American Army to the Rio Grande in 1865, handed Mexico her liberty on a silver platter and has protected her ever since. Our reward is now being received in the form of about nine-tenths of our citizens fleeing from the country under humiliating circumstances to save their lives, while others are being shot down like mad dogs by a

lot of savages whose brains are pickled in alcohol and their nerves wrecked by immoral living, and who, convinced that they can not compete with honest business men in respectable pursuits of life, have turned loose to lay waste the country in their own natural way. Every American who has been in touch with the situation, and every citizen of other civilized countries, sees the necessity of adding the "big stick" to the Monroe doctrine, and the only question is, "When will it be done?"

I have here a letter from one of the conductors himself, Mr. T. J. O'Fallon:

I speak from experience. Four years as a conductor in Mexico gives me some knowledge of the country and the people I have seen in Guadalajara. The howling mob go through the streets crying death to the Americans, and our women and children scared very near to death. We had to stay in our rooms armed to protect ourselves for 24 hours before we could go out on the streets and view the wreckage of windows and doors of American-run business houses.

It was no use to apply to our Government. It was a dead one, as far as we Americans in Mexico were concerned. On account of the humiliating conditions that were being forced upon us, 600 conductors and engineers left the national lines of Mexico on 17th day of April, 1912; most of us came north of the Rio Grande. One of the first acts of myself and other ex-railroad men was to put our applications in at San Antonio to the Government for train service in Mexico. In case of intervention I hope in that case to run the first train into Mexico. It is time for our Representatives in Washington to show the firm hand. We expected this from our new administration, for we had nothing to expect from the old. You understand the conditions and what is needed in dealing with Mexico.

You surely have the hearty support of all the ex-Mexico railroad men and thousands of others.

This was in Guadalajara, said by the Mexicans to be the Athens of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. President, I shall comment briefly upon some of the most outrageous cases which have occurred in Mexico as affecting American citizens, which cases I have personally investigated. I have not had the advantage of private access to the papers in the State Department, as have some of the Senators, doubtless, in this body. I hope, if they have had such access, they will give to the Senate of the United States, as supplementary at least to that which I am undertaking to give, the information they have obtained from the files of our State Department.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FALL. For a question.

Mr. SHIVELY. Do I misunderstand the Senator? Does he say that he has sought access to the papers in the State Department in a given case and has been denied access to them?

Mr. FALL. No; the Senator did not say anything of the sort, and I am very much surprised that the Senator from Indiana should have so construed the statement that was made.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator seemed to distinguish himself from other Senators, who, he says, have had access.

Mr. FALL. The Senate as a collective body asked for the information, and it was refused. If, under the President's constitutional duty to inform the Senate and the Congress as to the state of the Union, and to inform them upon matters upon which they must act in cooperation with the President, this body solemnly requests information, and it is refused to the body, I do not see how access to it would be given to a single Senator.

Mr. President, the cases to which I shall call attention, which I have investigated, and as to the facts of which I have been satisfied, I will comment upon as I proceed. In the case of any others, where I have not thoroughly satisfied myself as to the facts, I shall simply read the names as having established the fact of the occurrence.

Probably the State Department might be able to look through its files, if it were to consider it compatible with the public interests, and answer as to what has been done, if anything, to investigate the death of Mrs. Anderson, which occurred in Chihuahua on June 22, 1911, not under this administration. This is no partisan question, and I think I will be acquitted of any attempt to take any possible political or partisan advantage in what I shall say as to the last administration and this administration; but I should like to know whether there has been any attempt whatsoever made to investigate the case to which I have just referred.

Here was a poor woman, with her little girl, 13 years of age, and her little boy, 7 years of age, in their house, proceeding about their business, when soldiers of Madero's army entered the house and demanded that the woman should proceed to cook for them. She did so, and while she was placing the food on the stove she was shot. When she fell to the ground she was compelled to rise from the ground and continue her services for their benefit, bleeding as she was, bleeding to death; and while she was continuing to cook, her little daughter, 13 years of age, was outraged in her presence. A neighbor boy hearing the shot and running to their assistance, was shot in the door of the house and killed. The American colonists, at that time not quite so much intimidated as they have been since, secured the arrest of the men charged with this crime and their production before the judge having jurisdiction of the case. They admitted their guilt and made their depositions acknowledging every fact. They were punished by six months in jail and then turned loose upon the same community.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, did the woman die?

Mr. FALL. She died.

Mr. REED. The Senator had not stated that fact.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the next case which was brought to my attention was that of Mabel Richardson, a little girl about 12 years of age, who was assaulted in a town 17 miles from where this first outrage occurred. Not only have her assailants never been punished, but not one word have I ever been able to find, not one line, where this Government has even protested concerning it.

These cases were all brought to the attention of the Government, and the cases to which I have referred were brought to the attention of the public in a speech made by myself in the Senate on July 22, 1912. I can not say that this specific case was otherwise brought to the attention of the Government.

James W. Harvey was killed in the State of Chihuahua in May, 1912, and mutilated with a spade. Nothing was done; no protest of any kind or character was made to anyone in so far as I have been able to discover.

William Adams was killed while his wife's dead body lay in an adjoining room. She had died from natural causes, and he had sent for her daughter and his, to come across from my State of New Mexico to attend the funeral. One of the officials of the Mexican Government, with whom this Government was dealing, despite the protests of this daughter and when her arms were thrown around her father for the purpose of protesting him, shot him through the head. I should like to ask if the records show that any protest was made or that any effort has been made to punish the perpetrator of this outrage?

You have heard something in the press of the case of Thomas A. J. Fountain an American citizen who was killed at Parai. I have all the official correspondence, including the deposition of Fountain, taken before his death by court-martial, and including the record from the State Department of the protest they made. They were notified by the consular agent at Parai through the consul, Marion Letcher, the present consul at Chihuahua, that Fountain was going to be killed for nothing except that he had been fighting in the forces opposed to those which had captured him. This Government was notified, and notified the man responsible, Mr. Jose Ynez Salazar, that he must not kill this American citizen.

We were more fortunate in this case than in the cases of Groce and Cannon, which brought down upon Zelaya, in Nicaragua, the wrath of this great Government, which resulted in this Government dismissing from this city the accredited minister of Nicaragua and taking active part, by armed intervention, in the affairs of Nicaragua and ejecting from the Republic Zelaya, the regularly elected President of that Republic. We were not so fortunate in those cases as we were in the Fountain case, where the flag of the Union was thrown around him as his shield and protection; but they tore aside the flag and killed the man. This Government protested to Madero, and served notice on Salazar and the other revolutionists in the field that the American people would hold the Mexican nation and the Mexican people responsible for such outrages, which must not be repeated. Has anyone heard anything further concerning the death of Fountain? Has any further protest been made, or any attempt to hold responsible the perpetrator of this offense?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Where is Salazar, who shot Fountain in that country, at the present time?

Mr. FALL. He is eating three square meals a day on this side of the river at Fort Bliss, near El Paso, Tex., protected by American soldiers. Meals are being furnished and paid for by the taxpayers of this Government for something over 4,000 of the Mexicans who came across the river at Ojinaga and other places at a cost to this Government, I have seen it stated, of $2,000 a day.

Joshua Stevens was killed near Colonia Pachecho, Mexico, on August 25, 1912. His two little daughters were attacked by Mexicans; and upon the father going to their assistance with a shotgun, and undertaking to drag the daughters away without using the gun, he was disemboweled by a machete in the hands of one of the men. They continued their attacks upon him, while the little girls defended him with sticks which they picked up from the ground and finally drove off the Mexicans, one of

them using the shotgun. Not a word of protest have I ever heard of coming from this Government, and I can say that this matter has been presented to the State Department.

Johnny Brooks was killed at Colonia, Chuichuipa, in May, I think, 1913. It was in 1913, I know. This man happened to be a Texan; and when he was attacked by five Mexicans, including one lieutenant, in a little closed room, with their guns down on him, he killed the lieutenant in command as he himself fell, riddled with bullets. Not a word has ever been heard in the way of demanding any reparation for the death of this man, who was then, and who had been, to my knowledge, living in Mexico for 10 years. He went there originally in my employ. He had been as gallant an officer as ever served in the noted Texas Rangers. His life was taken by these bandits without any earthly cause or provocation.

On July 26, 1913, in a little town a short distance up from Tampico, Mathew Gourd, from the State of Iowa, and his daughter and niece, living upon their little piece of land, were attacked by Mexicans. Gourd himself was tied to a tree and his daughter and his niece outraged in his presence. The Government of the United States sent word to the American consul at Tampico that they would have a Red Cross ship, which they were borrowing, sent down to Tampico in a short time, and requested that he might notify Americans that all who desired to go aboard would be allowed to do so and leave Mexico. Has the Government made any attempt to punish the perpetrators further than to notify some one who at one time happened to be occupying some position in Mexico that they would be held responsible for such outrages? Nothing, Mr. President, in so far as I have been able to learn.

Rogers Palmer, an English citizen, was killed with American citizens in Durango June 18, 1913, because he refused to open his safe and to turn over its contents to the bandits. At the same time Carlos Von Brandis and L. W. Elder, Americans, were wounded. One of them had his leg torn off, because they stood at the door of the McDonald Institute, in which the American women had taken refuge, and attempted to defend those women from the attack of Villa's bandits.

Has anything been done, Mr. President, in the attempt, I will not state to avenge, but to obtain reparation of any kind or character whatsoever for this outrage?

At the same time H. W. Stepp, an American, was shot because of his refusal to pay 500 pesos ransom.

A. W. Laurilaut, an English subject, was stripped, beaten, shot, and left for dead about the same time.

Mr. President, I will refer a little later to the other outrages which took place at this time and which have been communicated to this Government not only through consular reports, but by statements of eyewitnesses and presented to the President of the United States personally.

Edmund Hayes, an American employee of the Madera Co., and at the same time Robert Thomas, also an American citizen and an employee of that company, were killed by Santa Caravo, a captain in the federal army, at that time in full control of the State of Chihuahua. This matter was called to the attention of the State Department, and the Secretary of State telegraphed, making demands immediately for the arrest and punishment of the officer responsible for the killing of Hayes and Thomas. The killing was never denied. Santa Caravo belonged to Mercado's army, returned to Chihuahua, and remained there openly in charge of his men, and no attempt was made to arrest him, and nothing was done until two months later. It did happen, Mr. President, that I had been watching Mr. Caravo through my own men in Mexico and on the border, and, as I could show by the correspondence if I had time to go into it, I called the attention of the Secretary of State and of the President of the United States directly to the fact that Santa Caravo was walking the streets of Juarez, five minutes' ride from El Paso, Tex. Very promptly Mr. Bryan telegraphed to the Government in Mexico, and also to the consul at Juarez, Mr. T. B. Edwards, to demand the arrest and punishment, and that there might be an American representative at the trial which should be brought off promptly.

I should like to ask as to what the records of the State Department will show. He was arrested. What became of him? Where is he? Was he punished? Was anything whatsoever done by this Government to back up its threats to demand and to enforce the punishment of this man whom hundreds of citizens know was the murderer of one of our best American pioneers in Mexico? They had him. They caught him. Now, what did they do with him?

B. Stowe, shot by the rebels in 1912; a man living on his little ranch; a prosperous cattleman of a thousand head of good graded cattle. He was driven out; and he is now working in New Mexico for $40 a month. Every dollar of his savings and the accumulation of years is gone. The American consul and American Army and American soldiers under an American general were within 75 miles of him. Has there been any protest or any attempt to collect damages or to obtain reparation?

Benjamin Griffin, a ranchman, was murdered July 5, 1913, near Chuichupa, in the State of Chihuahua. Has there been anything further than a telegram sent by the State Department that it was expected that the perpetrators of outrages of this kind would be prosecuted? Has there been any attempt to obtain reparation or to hold anyone whatever responsible for the murder of this American citizen?

John H. Williams, mining engineer, was killed by a stray bullet at Nacozari March 8, 1913, when the rebels attacked that place.

Boris Garow, consulting engineer, was killed when an attack was made on Nueva Buena Vista, February 21, 1913.

U. G. Wolf, mining engineer, was murdered July 16, 1913, by outlaws in northern Sonora.

Mrs. E. W. Holmes was killed by a shell during the bombardment of Mexico City February, 1913. Of course that was one of the cases which was practically unavoidable, because the two contending forces were battling for supremacy in the City of Mexico.

Frank Ward, shot in the back by bandits near Yago, Tepic Territory, April 9, 1913. I endeavored to obtain information, not by asking it of the State Department, but from other sources, as I have been compelled to attempt to obtain information in other cases. For a long while it was impossible for me to get the facts of the occurrence resulting in Ward's killing, because when American women are attacked and outraged they themselves and their friends attempt to keep their names out of the press and avoid in every way possible publicity in matters of that kind. But I can say to you now, Mr. President, that an affidavit is on file in the American Embassy in the City of Mexico from Mrs. Ward herself stating that when her husband was shot, writhing in his wounds on the floor, she was outraged by Mexican bandits, who then killed him. The affidavit is on file. Has any attempt been made to secure the punishment of those guilty of this crime?

John S. H. Howard, United States customs inspector, was assassinated near Eagle Pass, Tex., February 1, 1913. In that case the State of Texas found one of the assassins and dealt with him as Texas is prepared to deal, I am glad to say, with other assassins.

Pablo Soto, a merchant of Naco, Ariz., was killed during a conflict between rebels and federals March 24, 1913. Two years before the United States Army had been drawn up at this identical place. They had communicated the instructions of this Government to both factions on the Mexican side that they must not precipitate a combat or a conflict within such distance of our lines as that the result of the firing of bullets might endanger the lives of our citizens. In spite of that warning, in the presence of the man who conveyed it, eight American citizens were shot down in the streets.

Again the same thing occurred in the presence of our troops two years thereafter. Has anything been done? Nothing, in so far as I have heard.

While I am upon this subject, Mr. President, I want to say that two months after the killing of these American citizens on the American side peacefully pursuing their daily occupation, these same forces—or at least the same forces from one of these conflicting factions—surrounded the city of Juarez, opposite El Paso, and they had a similar warning conveyed to them by the officer in charge of the United States troops. The United States troops patroled the city, the streets, the water front, and the boundary line. Telegrams were sent backward and forward, one of the officers, at least, demanding that he be allowed to go across into Mexico for the purpose of preventing the threatened danger to Americans on this side. In a city of 50,000 people. But they were not allowed to enforce their warning and 18 American citizens, including women, were shot down in the streets of El Paso.

Mr. President, when their friends asked of the Government of the United States that it might investigate the killing of American citizens on American soil and obtain for their families some little measure of relief in the payment of damages to those who needed it for their daily subsistence, this great Nation in writing refused to consider their cases and relegated them to the Mexican courts in the Republic of Mexico.

Finally this matter was brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and myself, and when the Congress of the United States finally understood the matter they took it out of the hands of the State Department, which had proven itself incapable and unworthy in dealing with affairs of this kind, and placed it in

the hands of the War Department, who found damages to American citizens in El Paso for killing and wounding Americans, to the amount of $71,000, which should be paid by this Government, which might thereafter undertake to enforce its claims upon the Government of Mexico.

The Senate, Mr. President, I am proud to say, made an appropriation a year ago for the payment of these claims. Now the people are back here begging again at the hands of this Government that some little measure of justice to the children and widows of American citizens shot down on American soil may be provided as for two or three years they have been compelled to depend upon their own efforts; and to-day they see within a mile of their town 4,000 of the people who shot them down entertained as guests at the expense of the American Government.

L. Bushnell, mounted policeman, killed in Naco, Ariz., March 24, 1913, by a stray bullet fired by rebels.

Frank Howard, killed by bandits in Coalcoman, State of Micheacam, in March, 1913.

Herbert L. Russell, manager of American Vice Consul McCaughan's ranch near the city of Durango, murdered by rebels September 29, 1912. Consul Theodore C. Hamm cabled a report to the Department of State.

Has anything been done by the Department of State? I presume that Mr. Hamm possibly sent his telegram at Government rates. That is one advantage in being a consul.

Robert Williams, policeman, of Phoenix, Ariz., killed by Mexican bandits who crossed the line to attend a celebration of Mexican independence day in Phoenix on September 16, 1912.

Scott Price, bystander, killed when bandits were firing on Williams, Ariz., another American town.

N. Matheson, an aged and crippled Mormon, killed while fleeing from Colonia Morelos, Sonoro, on September 16, 1912, when bandits were looting the town.

Mr. McKinzie, an American resident, executed near Agua Prieta in September, 1912, because the rebels suspected he had given information to federal troops.

W. H. Waite, manager of the Esmeraldes plantation at Ochotal, Vera Cruz, killed in April, 1912, when he refused to pay money demanded by bandits. He was beheaded.

H. L. Strauss, formerly a correspondent for the New York Herald, killed with 34 other noncombatants when Zapatists held up a train August 11, 1912, near Cuantla, Morelos.

Thomas C. Kane, conductor on a Guanajuato railroad, shot through head when bandits wrecked a train at Silao and killed many passengers on April 10, 1912.

Pehr Olsson Seffer, formerly a professor in the University of California, killed by rebels on April 29, 1911, together with three of his servants, near Cuernavaca.

R. H. Ferguson, of San Francisco, a member of Troop F, Third United States Cavalry, killed by bullet fired over the border.

Two unidentified men, killed May 9, 1911, in El Paso, by stray bullets fired by federals and rebels.

Those were among the 15 whom I have mentioned—

Dr. R. C. Clarke, Taylorsville, Ill., shot dead in Mexico City, May 27, 1911, by a partisan of Gen. Diaz.

John R. Lockhart, Scotts City, Mo., mining engineer, killed by bandits in Durango in November, 1911.

R. N. Meredith, Troy, Ohio, struck by bullet in the Porter Hotel during the bombardment in Mexico City in February.

Mrs. Percy Griffith, legs shot off during bombardment in Mexico City.

A. E. Thomas, murdered by bandits while protecting wife and seven children near Nogales, Sonora, March 10, 1912.

Robert Huntington, railroad switchman, shot without cause near Agua Prieta, April 13, 1911.

J. C. Edwards, native of Virginia, shot to death while accidentally within rebel lines near Agua Prieta, April 13, 1911.

Stepson of J. M. Foster, of Newark, N. J., killed at Alamo, southern part of California, in June, 1911, because he had professionally treated a wounded insurgent a few days before.

John Hertling, Douglas, Ariz., a German-American citizen, hanged near Nogales by rebels under Orozco in July, 1912.

Guido Schubert, Douglas, Ariz., a friend of Hertling, hanged at the same time.

Investigated by Consul Sempich; responsibility fixed. Has anything been done? Consul Sempich, of Nogales, made a special request that he be allowed to investigate this case, and such request was granted, as I understand.

John Camp, killed near the United States immigration station in El Paso, Tex., May 9, 1911, when the rebels attacked Juarez.

Antonio Garcia, killed in El Paso, May 9, 1911, by stray rebel bullet.

Clarence H. Cooper, throat cut with a knife and robbed at Pearson—he was acting superintendent there—August 4, 1913.

Graham Taylor, at Aguas Calientes—English—robbed, stripped; an unknown American killed on same road two days before (August, 1913).

I mentioned this case because Taylor's wife was an American, and she was left in that country without a dollar with which to make her way to the United States. Finally the British consul furnished funds.

Thomas (or Theron) Kelly, American, extra passenger conductor, said to have been the son of Rev. Bernard Kelly, of Emporia, Kans., who was chaplain of the United States Congress at one time, so my informant says. That I can not vouch for. He was cremated in the Cumbre Tunnel a short time since.

H. F. Mauders, superintendent of the express service on the Mexico Northwestern; was a native of Woodland, Cal., where he has a father living. He died alongside Mr. Kelly.

Lee Williams, assistant to the commissary manager at Madero, son of E. H. Williams, of Philadelphia, died in the tunnel. John E. Webster, the conductor—Mr. Webster, Mr. President, was the oldest conductor on the road running from El Paso to Chihuahua and from Chihuahua out into the western part of the country—known and loved by every American and, as we thought, by every Mexican in the entire country; speaking Spanish almost like a native; having the universal respect and affection of everyone who knew him; poor Webster went to his death in the tunnel. E. J. McCutcheon, engineer, resident of El Paso, Tex.; M. J. Gilmartin, superintendent of the Northwestern Railway system, the great Pearson Syndicate in Mexico, and numbers of others. No one knows just how many American citizens were cremated at Cumbre; but among others were Mrs. Lee Carruth and five children, of Union Star, Mo., en route to join Mr. Carruth, a stationary engineer, the husband and father, at Madera.

Alfred Olcott, now of Los Angeles, was very recently shot in the foot in the State of Sonora while he and his American partner were defending that partner's wife and daughter from outrage by Mexicans. Both of them were shot. Olcott finally made his escape across the line by the assistance of Americans, and is now safe in Los Angeles.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has concluded the list of those who were the victims of the tunnel disaster. I should like to ask him if it is not generally admitted that that was the work of Castillo?

Mr. FALL. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, that was the work of Castillo, who is now sojourning, along with Mr. Salazar, at Fort Bliss, Tex., as a guest of the United States Government.

Mr. LODGE. He has not been tried?

Mr. FALL. He has not been tried.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has several times referred, with disapproval evidently, to the fact that the refugees from the Battle of Ojinaga, across the line, have been entertained as "the guests of the United States." I should like to inquire of the Senator what policy should have been pursued by the Government with reference to those 4,000 refugees?

Mr. FALL. That, Mr. President, of course, is a question which would admit of debate and difference of opinion. I must say we were placed in a very difficult position; there is no question about that, because I myself, with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] at one time transmitted to the department the protest of citizens down there against allowing similar cases to be transferred back to Mexico. I joined in that protest presented by the Senator. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator——

Mr. FALL. I think I will cover in my suggestions——

Mr. THOMAS. But in view of the fact that he so markedly and evidently disapproved of the course taken by the Government, it seemed to me quite pertinent to ascertain, if possible, just what his view was of what the Government policy should have been with reference to those refugees.

Mr. FALL. I will state to the Senator, if he will just allow me to answer the question he has asked me——

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought the Senator had answered it, or I would not have interrupted him.

Mr. FALL. I shall undertake to tell the Senator, and I was proceeding to answer the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not believe this country has any constitutional authority to intern a foreign army. However, that is a matter of policy, which I know is one that is very difficult to decide. It may be that in interning this so-called army—for half of them were women and children who came across the

line, and 90 children have been born in the barracks where they are said to be interned—it may be that by interning them this Government pursued the most humane and the best policy. That part of it I am not criticizing.

Mr. President, I maintain that under international law—which I shall undertake to quote a little later—this Government should have recognized, as de facto and responsible, some man in Mexico, and when the bandit Castillo, who was not interned under the same law applicable to these other people, and when the bandit Salazar, who was not caught with arms when he crossed over into Texas, and was arrested under a warrant from my State for a violation of the laws of the United States—when these men were seized as they were, instead of being placed as our guests with these interned soldiers there should have been some responsibility placed upon Villa and Carranza in their relation to this country, and they should have been informed that this Government expected to turn Castillo over to the authority in Mexico which they recognized as de facto and responsible; that they expected to hold them responsible and to see that these men were dealt with according to civilized law and custom.

As to the Army, that is a very different proposition; as I say, that is a very hard question to answer. As a lawyer I do not believe that there is any power in this Government to hold those men at Fort Bliss that came across here with arms, and yet I think it is, as a matter of policy, possibly the best that could have been done; and, as I said, when citizens protested against the turning back of those who came across from Ojinaga to Nogales, I joined in presenting the protest of American citizens to the department.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has referred to Salazar and Castillo——

Mr. FALL. I intend to refer to them a little bit later.

Mr. REED. But the Senator has referred to them as "guests of the United States." As a matter of fact are they not under arrest?

Mr. FALL. Oh, yes; they are under arrest.

Mr. REED. They are under arrest? Then, instead of being "guests of the United States," they are prisoners of the United States.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri, I will explain exactly the particulars. Jose Ynez Salazar was caught in the State of Texas by a United States marshal, with a warrant from the court of the district of New Mexico, for a violation of the neutrality laws. He was not under arms, but he was caught on a train, taken off the train, conducted to the nearest United States commissioner, and gave a bond, which was approved and accepted, for $5,000. He was then, through some process unknown, conveyed to Fort Bliss by the military authorities. The matter has been presented within the last day or two, I will say to the Senator, to the State Department and to the Secretary of War in this city; and the attorney for Mr. Huerta, representing Mr. Salazar, is now in the gallery and hearing my voice.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, the only question I wanted to ask the Senator—I wanted simply to get the facts—was whether these men are guests, being entertained at the expense of the Government or whether they are prisoners of the United States?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. REED. And that is a very important distinction, in my mind. Of course, the Senator will answer it in his own way.

Mr. FALL. I have sought to make a distinction. The Senator from Missouri has a very much broaedr vocabulary and a more voluminous vocabulary than have I. I am a plain man, and——

Mr. REED. Oh, but, Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico knows the difference between a prisoner, who is being fed, because he is a prisoner, and a guest, who is being entertained because he is to be honored.

Mr. FALL. I know the difference.

Mr. REED. The Senator is giving us information that we are all greatly interested in and the American people also are undoubtedly greatly interested in, and I wanted a more accurate statement. I am challenging nothing the Senator says, but I should like to have him tell us in this plain, blunt English that he speaks of, whether these men are prisoners or guests?

Mr. FALL. The choice of my language may not suit the Senator, Mr. President, because I am speaking to the Senate of the United States, and I am not pleading technicalities to a criminal indictment in the courts of the State of Missouri or of some other State. However, I will repeat that Salazar was arrested on a criminal warrant charging him with the violation of the neutrality laws. This warrant was issued out of the United States court for the district of New Mexico, and he was conveyed before the nearest authority and gave a bond. He was not one of the soldiers who came across with arms and interned under the general policy—I can not, as I say, agree as to the law affecting that policy, but I am not criticizing it—applying to the other officers and soldiers who came across at Ojinaga. He did not come across at Ojinaga; he was not arrested there, but he was arrested by a United States marshal. In some way unknown, without a word to show for it, he came into the custody of the American military authorities, and I think I can go so far as to say that the Secretary of War has telegraphed to the commanding general at El Paso to know how he holds Salazar there. His bond has been approved; he is subject to release, and, as I have said, he was not interned as an officer or a soldier coming across to this side with arms in his hands. I did not intend to convey the idea that he was an invited guest, but he is a guest of this Government without any authority, so far as I know.

Mr. REED. But he is actually under restraint, if I understand the Senator, by the soldiers of the United States?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, my information is that Mr. Salazar asked Gen. Scott to put him in a cell, because he was afraid some of the people on the outside would assassinate him for some of the offenses of which he was charged in Mexico.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I am not trying to be hypercritical at all, or to cavil about language; but there is a very important distinction between a man who is free to come and go, to escape from this country and to escape from the punishment of the law—there is a very important distinction between that man's situation and the man who is actually being held under arrest, because in the former case he could get away, while in the latter case he is being detained in a position where at the proper time, whenever it may arrive, he may be tried and punished. As I understand now, the Senator says this man is actually under arrest.

Mr. FALL. No; I do not so understand. I have endeavored to explain to the Senator——

Mr. REED. He is under detention, whether it is legal or illegal, by the soldiers of the United States.

Mr. FALL. I have tried criminal cases in my life, and if this were a criminal case before a judge, I possibly could undertake to differentiate as to the meaning of words, and so forth; but, Mr. President, I must ask the Senator to allow me to proceed. I have made myself as plain as I possibly could, and I think he has understood me. I desire to proceed with this statement.

Mr. President, I have referred to the cases of death at Agua Prieta and at El Paso, for which we are now asked to make appropriations.

The Government of the United States, or this administration, through the State Department, have, I believe, been attempting to secure the body of Gustav Bauch, an American, who has disappeared, and who it is reported has been killed by Mr. Villa in Juarez, Mexico. Apparently they have been unable to discover anything as to the death of this man—this American—born in Louisiana.

About the same time two or three deaths occurred, and practically the same statement has been made as to each of them. As to Gustav Bauch, at El Paso, Mr. Villa is reported to have said that he turned him loose, but that he was dead; "doubtless killed by his enemies before he could get back to this side." The other, Clemente Vergara, an American citizen, born in the county of Webb, in the State of Texas, and a resident in this country all of his life, was called to the other side of the river and killed. It has been claimed as a defense to the efforts of this Government and those of the State of Texas to secure his body and secure the punishment of his murderers that Mr. Vergara was not an American citizen. That has been disproven absolutely by the records, I can say, so far as my information from the governor of Texas goes. It was then claimed that he was not killed at all, but that he was allowed to escape, and is now a member of Villa's insurrecto band. My information, not only from the press but direct from the governor of Texas himself, is that Vergara's body is now on this side of the river, on American soil, and that the examination of the body shows for itself how Mr. Vergara came to his death; that it is the body of Vergara, the American citizen; and that Vergara is not a fugitive or in the insurrecto or any other army.

The case of Benton, Mr. President, we must consider apparently from a different aspect. Benton was an English subject. We really began to hear some discussion of Mexican matters and of outrages upon persons in Mexico when it became apparent that William Benton had disappeared. Then investigations were made; then information was sought; and I understand from the press that negotiations are still pending concerning

the Benton case. Is it possible that the Benton case attracted some attention because of the English policy as laid down long ago by Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons June 25, 1850? He then said that—

> We shall be told, perhaps, as we have already been told, that if the people of the country are liable to have stones placed upon their breasts and police officers to dance upon them, if they are liable to have their heads tied to their knees and to be left for hours in that state, or to be swung like a pendulum and to be bastinadoed as they swing, foreigners have no right to be better treated than the natives and have no business to complain if the same things are practiced upon them. We may be told this, but that is not my opinion, nor do I believe it is the opinion of any reasonable man.

Great Britain has never acquiesced in that opinion, Mr. President. It may be possible—I can not say positively, because I am laboring in the dark—that the fact that Great Britain does not and never has acquiesced in opinions such as cited by Lord Palmerston may be one reason why the President of the United States in his message delivered to the two Houses of Congress a few days ago pointed out the importance of foreign matters now pending, and besought the assistance of Congress in the repeal of a law which had been adopted by an overwhelming vote that he might in some way by some means be able to satisfy Great Britain. It is merely a supposition, Mr. President, upon my part.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Senator from New Mexico will recall the witness Rossman, a distinguished citizen of New Hampshire, who appeared before our committee and testified that it was the judgment of all his associates in Mexico that if he desired to return to Mexico for the purpose of looking after his business interests there, he ought to permit the impression to prevail that he is a German subject rather than an American citizen if he would receive good treatment.

Mr. FALL. I recall that. Further, I can testify to the fact, after 31 years' experience in Mexico, that prior to the year 1890 I have myself known Americans in Mexico to claim to be subjects of Great Britain. I have in mind one instance which occurred in 1883, when I first went to Mexico, where an American boy and a Canadian boy were in jail in the city of Zacatecas, where I was at that time mining. Both were arrested on some frivolous charge by Mexicans, and incarcerated. There was no British consul in the city at the time, but there was an American consul. The American boy, for himself and for his Canadian friend, appealed for assistance to the American consul. Not one thing in the world was done. Finally a letter was smuggled out from the Canadian. At that time Great Britain had no consuls in Mexico. She had severed diplomatic relations with Mexico and had no consuls or ministers in Mexico; but a letter was smuggled out by this Canadian, which, after several months, reached his family in Canada. A British ship of war was at once sent to Vera Cruz Harbor and a telegraphic demand made for the immediate release of that Canadian. When he was released and reported to the captain of the British ship, a demand was also made for the release of this American boy, and it was acceded to. This demand was made through Great Britain.

This is a circumstance that happened to come under my own observation; but we had believed those days were past, because under more recent administrations an American citizen had some standing in Mexico, until the outbreak of the Madero revolution.

I have referred to the fact that the last administration, when called upon to investigate the cases of American citizens killed on this side, in a report to the House of Congress which at that time had under consideration a resolution on the subject, stated in a report made to them that as a legal proposition American citizens killed on this side must be referred back to local Mexican tribunals on the other side for any damages. They absolutely refused to take up the matter, even diplomatically.

Not only that, Mr. President, but they went further. Claim after claim, thousands of claims, were filed or attempted to be filed with this administration. A circular note was finally issued from the State Department, under the administration of Mr. Knox, notifying all claimants in Mexico that they could, if they desired, file claims with the American embassy in the City of Mexico, and that as an errand boy the ambassador would turn them over to the foreign department of the Mexican Government; that in no instance would the State Department treat the matter diplomatically in an attempt to obtain any damages whatsoever, and that the only advantage which the claimant would receive by filing his claim with the American embassy would be that they, through courtesy, would send it over to the Mexican foreign office.

There was not one effort of any kind or character made to press a claim or to recover a dollar of damages for the hundreds of millions of dollars of damage done to American property up to the time of the incoming of this administration. Since that time not only has the order been issued to Americans to remove themselves from Mexico, but the Knox circular has been maintained in force in Mexico, and no further efforts have been made by this administration than were made by the last administration to obtain reparation for damages done to American interests and to American citizens, or to obtain any satisfaction whatever for the deaths of Americans occurring either before or since the 4th day of March last.

I am aware that if it were considered proper to undertake to make it, an argument might be made to the effect that probably not so many Americans have been killed during the last year as were killed during the two preceding years. I am willing to admit that the records would likely show that to be the truth. Why, Mr. President, the Americans have been driven out of Mexico by herds. Not only have they been invited out by their own Government, not only have they been told to come out, but they have been driven out at the mouth of guns, not only one man at a time but a hundred, driven over the line and chased by Mexican soldiers; not only men, but women; and not only women, but children.

Mr. President, the Secretary of State in this administration seems to have the idea very thoroughly impressed on him, as he has stated openly, that the only Americans who are in Mexico are those who are there to exploit the country, to make money, to rob the people, or else corporations which are at work there which, in his judgment, may be outlaws in this country. Whenever an appeal is made such as was made by Price McKinney, of Cleveland, Ohio, and others for the protection of the men in his employ, trying to save his property, who were being robbed and maltreated, the American citizens making the protests are informed that they are not telling the truth; that what they want is protection for their dirty dollars. When such men as Warren from Michigan, Stevens from California, McKinney from Ohio, Pence from Illinois, and men of that kind ask for protection for American citizens in Mexico, they are told that they are not telling the truth. That is what was told W. W. Turner, a State senator from El Paso, Tex., one of the most responsible citizens in the western part of the State, and I think I may say until the time of that conversation one of the most ardent supporters and admirers Mr. Bryan has ever had since Mr. Bryan first began his political career. He was told that he was pleading for dirty dollars.

Mr. REED. By whom?

Mr. FALL. By Mr. Bryan.

Mr. President, a few days after this matter was made public, with the names of these parties and how they were helpless, I went to the Secretary of State myself, for the purpose of presenting to him a concrete case which occurred in the town of Cananea, where an American citizen was threatened with deportation by the so-called authorities of that Mexican State. During that conversation the same subject was brought up with me, and it was stated that the Americans who were in Mexico were not Americans who were seeking to make homes there and help the country, but they were solely representatives of corporations there for the purpose of exploiting the people, obtaining possessions, getting hold of dollars, and coming back to this country, and that they had no right to demand protection for their property.

I declined to discuss the matter; but I returned to my office and wrote the Secretary a letter in which I referred to the conversation. In that letter I stated to him that I had then in my possession a list, which I had very hurriedly obtained, of 284 men, 301 women, and 1,266 children, 1,100 of the children having been born in Mexico, and every one of the men, women, and children having lived there from 10 to 27 years, retaining their American citizenship under both Mexican law and concessions, and being driven out across the border at the head of Salazar's forces.

Mr. SHIVELY. Did the Senator say, in that communication, that they had been driven across the border?

Mr. FALL. I do not know whether I said they had been driven or not. I will read the communication, if the Senator wants me to. I was not going into private matters any further than simply to refer to the case.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator will suit himself in that respect.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has asked the question, and I am going to read it for myself, at any rate, to see whether I did refer to the fact.

JULY 28, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN,
*Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: A few days since, during a conversation with you in your office, you seemed to be under the impression that Americans in Mexico were simply there temporarily to get money and later to leave that Republic. I remarked to you at the time that your information upon this subject was not entirely correct.

I have now a list of 284 men, 301 women, and 1,266 children, all American citizens, who were residing in Chihuahua and Sonora, the heads of the families owning their homes, and 85 per cent of these children born in Mexico.

Under articles 14 and 15 of the treaty of 1831, these people, together with all other Americans, whether transiently or more permanently being or residing in Mexico, were and are entitled to the most absolute protection. These provisions of this treaty are still in full force and effect. These people whom I am now calling your attention to were American citizens, and under the treaty referred to, under the Mexican foreign code, and under the colonization code of Mexico and the general laws of Mexico, these people and their children are American citizens.

I can furnish you at any time with a list of the names of the heads of families and fathers of these 1,266 children. This, I may say, is only a partial list of the Americans who have been run out of Mexico who were actually residing on their little homes there and who have lost every dollar in the world, which they had accumulated by the labor of their hands. In the majority of instances their little cottages have been burned to the ground, and I have now two heads of families from these colonies working on my ranch in New Mexico; one of whom could have sold his holdings for $35,000 a short time ago, and who is now working for me for wages, with every dollar of this property gone; the other a year ago was the owner of 1,000 head of cattle running near his little home; the home is destroyed, the cattle and all property gone, and he is now working for me for $40 a month. These particular people referred to have been residing in Mexico each for from 10 to 27 years.

This list does not comprise more than one-half the American people who from Sinoloa, Sonora, and Chihuahua alone have been forced to leave their little homes and lose all that they had accumulated.

This for your information.

Respectfully.

---

I presume that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What reply did the Senator get?

Mr. FALL. I received the following reply, Mr. President:

JULY 30, 1913.

The honorable ALBERT B. FALL,
*United States Senate.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 28, in regard to American settlers in Mexico, in which you state that you have a list of 284 men, 301 women, and 1,266 children, all American citizens, who lived in Sonora and Chihuahua until they were forced to seek refuge in the United States, the adults having resided in Mexico and owned their homes there for from 10 to 27 years.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. J. BRYAN.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. President, since it seems that if in my own words I voice the slightest criticism of the State Department, they are somewhat objected to, I am going to use the words of a lifelong Democrat, an ex-mayor of the city of El Paso, a county judge of that city, forwarded me to-day, with reference to the manner in which he and others have been treated by the State Department when they have presented matters to that department. This is J. J. Ochoa, a native of Texas, a citizen of the United States who lived in New Mexico. I knew him there for 28 years, and saw him two months ago on the streets of El Paso or at the hotel:

On the 10th of February, 1914, we wrote to the Department of State about Mr. Ochoa's case, and from that letter I will quote the following extract:

"Our letter book shows that from the downfall of President Diaz on we have had occasion to lay many distressing cases before the Department of State, and that we have always in substance declared that delay of action would only increase the number and the gravity of the outrages. That the men who were temporarily in power in Mexico, or in any part thereof, would use the forms of international law to avoid responsibility for past misdeeds to secure the time to commit new."

You will note that this letter was written just before the Benton and Rauch outrage and distinctly foretold the methods which would be resorted to by the murderers to avoid the natural consequences of their crimes.

The house in which it is believed that Villa shot Benton and the yard in the rear thereof, in which it is believed that his mutilated and partially cremated corpse lies buried, belong to Mr. Ochoa. The house which Villa announces he is preparing for the residence in Juarez of Mr. Carranza is also the property of Mr. Ochoa. American diplomatic agents who have business with the last-named chieftain will visit him in Mr. Ochoa's house, and yet the Department of State informs us that that house has not been confiscated, because some shadowy clerk of a "civil" governor says that he has not ordered the confiscation.

The fact is, Senator, for three years last past, the Department of State, in the face of the plainest warnings, now amounting to fulfilled prophecies, has acted upon the apparent belief that the various temporary chiefs of Mexico were animated by a desire to do justice, and possessed the power to administer it. We can not believe that we are the only persons who long ago called the truth to the attention of our foreign office, and Lord knows we have done so often enough. Really, Senator, it looks as if we have incurred the ill will of a great American department by our frequent and always unsuccessful efforts to obtain some measure of redress for the many clients who have suffered and are suffering outrages at the hands of the various Mexican parties. Every Mexican excuse, evasion, or denial was accepted as gospel truth, and we regarded or neglected as irresponsible trouble makers, seeking to mar the friendly relations existing between two sister Republics. We have twice been solemnly reprimanded, because, speaking through us, our clients have been unable to modulate their groans to the pitch of diplomatic propriety suitable to the ears of the State Department, but no of our clients has ever received one particle of benefit from the State Department or the Government of the country to which he owes allegiance. It is a fit subject for the artist of a comic newspaper—an American citizen stretched on the rack of Mexican outrage, Orosco, Salazar, Villa, Mercado, straining at the levers and Uncle Sam standing by, and instead of coming to the relief of their tortured sufferer, magisterially rebuking him for his bad manners in shrieking in such distinguished and polished company. Such a cartoon, Senator, will be but a truthful representation of what is not only now the fact but has always been the fact during three continuous years.

Don't think that the Department of State is the only place in the United States where there is any knowledge of the outer world. We know better perhaps than its staff, certainly much better than the various Secretaries who have held that office in the last few years, the attitude of the Spanish-Americans generally in Mexico and out of it, toward the United States. We can surmise some of the other foreign embarrassments which occupy the attention of our rulers, and the advisability of a Democratic administration perfecting its internal reforms and not allowing its attention to be diverted therefrom by foreign complications; but is American citizenship a burden to be borne, his allegiance a duty, and yet protection not a right?

Senator, Mr. Ochoa is a citizen of Texas as well as of the United States

He happened, through inheritance, three or fours ago to become possessed of a very large amount of real property in the city of Juarez. Forty tenant houses are owned by him. As the letter continues to say, they have been taken away from him. They are being used by the rebels, and the house that Villa occupied and in which our diplomatic representative, Mr. Carothers, visited him is Mr. Ochoa's house.

Mr. GALLINGER. Who is the author of that letter?

Mr. FALL. The author of the letter is Mr. J. U. Sweeney, the first commission-form mayor of El Paso, a very prominent attorney, whose responsibility will be vouched for, I think, by any man in Texas who has even known him at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. A Democrat?

Mr. FALL. A Democrat.

[At this point Mr. FALL was interrupted by the expiration of the morning hour, when the unfinished business was laid before the Senate, which, by unanimous consent, was laid aside that Mr. FALL might conclude his remarks.]

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have referred to specific instances of outrages on American citizens—women and children—in Mexico, and I have referred the Senate for further information to the committee report before this body.

I wish to call attention to the fact that entire American colonies have been absolutely wiped off the face of the earth in the Republic of Mexico, their houses have been burned to the ground, and the Americans driven across the border or outraged and killed, and that this has not been confined to any one part of Mexico or to any one class of colonies.

The colonists of Las Mochis, for example, were compelled to surrender the homes which they had there because they were told they must do so by our sailors, who were out in the harbor near there, and that they would be allowed to take refuge upon our vessels. They were compelled to take what they could get for the supplies which they had on hand, and that in State scrip, with absolutely not even a promise behind it. Property which had been the accumulation of years had been taken from them in a moment.

This state of affairs commenced three years ago in Mexico and it so exists to-day. Within the last four weeks Mr. Carranza has confiscated the banks of Sonora and the business houses of the merchants there simply because they would not open their doors and continue to do business with State scrip to be handed over the counters, goods costing gold to be returned for it.

What has the Government done? It has had the protests. There is no doubt of that. It has had the protests from our merchants, from our miners, from others, that they are being compelled to part with everything they have, everything which is necessary for the operation of their mines and their other purposes, and they are being compelled to accept a piece of paper with absolutely nothing behind it, and if they do not accept it they subject themselves to a fine, and if they take this same paper money with which to pay their fine the paper money is refused by the officers of the law.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to imagine that a condition of affairs will exist so close to the American border; but, as a matter of fact, within a month, a man was arrested in Cananea because he refused to take the constitutional scrip. He went up to the court and admitted that he had refused to take the scrip, because he could not continue to give over his goods for nothing. He was fined $50 for his refusal, and when he paid that $50 in their scrip they refused it and sent him to jail until he dug up silver money to pay his fine.

What are we doing, Mr. President? Are we going to allow things of that kind to continue? An American settlement near which one of these horrible outrages was perpetrated has been practically depopulated, almost a little paradise in the valley of

the mountains near Tampico, inhabited by a prosperous American colony, driven out, and no protection afforded by their Government.

The same is true of the colonies of Garcia, Paceco, Juarez, Dublan, and other colonies throughout the States of Sonora and Chihuahua.

I have here an interview with a man I know very well, published in a paper July 26, 1913, referring to one of these colonies:

There must have been 125 houses destroyed in Colonia Diaz, and I believe this colony suffered more than the others. We had just three hours to get out, leaving all the accumulations of years of hard work. Oh, it was hard. I don't want to think of it. We left June 2—

This is 1913—

as the bandits burned my two-story granary and thrashing machine. I laid out that place 28 years ago, and, so to speak, grew up with it, so you can imagine how I feel in the matter.

Several times the Mexicans thrashed through the colony, playing havoc with it each time, until now it is an absolute ruin. Beautiful homes all destroyed, farm equipment burned. Everything those wretches could lay their hands on they burned or wrecked. I had 300 head of polled angus cattle; I saved only 29 head. Of 80 horses we had on the ranch, only 8 escaped the hands of the vandals. In that section there were 10 stallions worth $50,000. We did manage to save 3 or 4 from the bandits. I had 6,000 bushels of wheat on my ranch a year ago. It went quick when the revolutionists showed up. In the colony altogether there must have been 40,000 bushels, all of which went. There were about 4,000 people in the colonies; there are now only a few families left, and they are in danger.

Without respect to their own people, the band of one of these conflicting factions or the other goes into a town where there is anything to loot, and loots. It makes no difference whether they are Huerta's soldiers, so called, or whether they are the Villa bandits or the Carranza constitutionalists; the action is the same. When Urbina, who is the right-hand man of Villa, and has more troops than Villa himself in his own command, attacked the city of Durango, a city of 6,000 inhabitants, they looted every bank, they looted every store, and they outraged hundreds of women on the streets. They shot right and left and killed with impunity, and when the British and American consuls went to Urbina and demanded that some protection be extended, and then later that some punishment be meted out to the perpetrators of these outrages, what was the answer? "When did this particular offense occur?" "Day before yesterday." "Oh, no; that was within the 24 hours. I gave my men liberty for 24 hours to do what they pleased. None can be held responsible for any act committed during the 24 hours, and no investigation can be held."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. WORKS. In this connection I will state that while I was at home in California during the summer I had an interview with an American citizen who was a merchant in one of those cities. He told me of just that occurrence when the Americans there undertook to protect the American citizens who were in the city. They went to the commanding officer, and he told them in plain terms that he had no control over his soldiers during the first 24 hours; that under the arrangement that was made with them they were entitled to do what they pleased during that time. The Americans then got their people together the best they could to protect them during that time. Some of them were maltreated. After the 24 hours had expired they attempted then to have something done by the commanding officer, and he declined. He said that there could be no punishment for any act committed within the 24 hours. This man was himself a sufferer. He was a merchant there. He had two stores, and they were both looted and finally burned. He was then a fugitive. He had come out of Mexico under the order that had been given. He said he was left without a dollar in the world; that all his property was destroyed.

Mr. FALL. The outrages that I speak of at Durango, where both English subjects and American citizens were looted, robbed, and outraged, were reported not only through the consul, who sent out reports some 11 days after the occurrence—or, at least, it took the parties 11 days to go overland from there to Mazatlan—but they were reported in a sworn statement to the State Department, and then they were reported in a statement made directly to the President of the United States by an eyewitness of the outrages, who himself says that he, with his own eyes, witnessed 25 of these outrages upon women in the streets.

Mr. President, I have been at a loss for words with which to describe the conditions in Mexico. I have not wanted to appear to be drawing too lurid a picture of actual conditions there. I have not wanted to be placed in the light of an agitator or one urging, for selfish motives, action on the part of this Government such as I shall urge.

I am going to say one word with reference to myself now, and with reference to my attitude. I sit here representing the only Mexican constituency which is represented, I believe, upon this floor or in either branch of Congress. I have been in politics with Mexican people for 28 years in the Territory and the State of New Mexico, where a majority of the population are even yet of Spanish descent. I think that I know something of the people and of their characteristics. These people whom I have the honor to represent are of exactly the same character as the better class of people living in the northern States of the Mexican Republic.

I have been accused in the press and otherwise of being selfishly interested. In fact, it was discovered by one of the great papers nearly a year ago that from my biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory it appeared that I was mining in Mexico. That is true, Mr. President, but in this way: In 1906 I sold all interests which I had in Mexico except some odds and ends which I was unable to dispose of and which I still retain an interest in. Since that time I have been called back to the Republic by clients and friends with whom my business was almost inextricably entangled for several years, and particularly, Mr. President, because of the threatened death of a man who had been my partner. I have been in Mexico since. I have been closely identified with affairs in northern Mexico through my efforts to assist his family in some way.

Therefore I have kept up my interest, and I still have such interests, as I have stated, none of which was producing a dollar prior to the revolution, and certainly it has not produced any since. That is my interest, Mr. President, and I wanted to say that much in justice to myself. I have, as I said, hesitated for a time to express myself fully as to what I know from personal knowledge of the conditions in Mexico.

I have been in a position, Mr. President, with reference to all the factions of Mexico, where, while agreeing with none, and none of them agreeing with me as to the final action which should be taken, yet Gen. Huerta's attorney, Gen. Felix Diaz's friends, and myself meet in my office, not for consultation among themselves, but to talk over certain matters with me. I have brought the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee to the fact that there were prominent constitutionalists in the city, and took great pleasure in seeing that an officer on the staff of Gen. Carranza, who is now in charge of the attacking force upon Mazatlan, was afforded an opportunity first privately and then later, I believe, by the committee for a hearing. I am recognized I think generally, Mr. President, while temporarily they may not agree with me, by the different factions as having at heart really and sincerely the interests of Mexico.

In May of last year a prominent Mexican lawyer came to this country as the private representative of the Huerta government. He could not be received, of course, because no representatives of either factions were being received officially at the White House. This man is a lawyer of standing, a man of world-wide experience and education. After visiting 22 of the Mexican States, in the attempt to see if it was not possible for him to persuade others to join with him in the effort to support the Huerta government and restore order, he came to the United States as the representative of the government for the purpose of establishing a newspaper bureau, which he did establish, to influence the minds of the people of the United States in behalf of Huerta that they might bring pressure upon this administration to recognize Mr. Huerta.

Upon his arrival here he furnished me with duplicates of his communications which he had sent to the President of the United States. I answered his letter of transmittal, disagreeing with him entirely as to his ideas as to what should be done in Mexico. I had some little correspondence with him of quite an animated character. I had not heard of him for several months. This man holds credentials from Mr. Huerta as a member of the present Mexican Congress, and he has refused to use those credentials because they were not issued upon an election but by Mr. Huerta, so that he might have "a Congress on his hands." This man holds credentials in the present Congress. He has been offered high diplomatic office by the Huerta government. Under date of the 7th of this month, I have a letter from him in which he says:

Some time ago, in May last, I had the honor to address you a letter regarding the affairs of my country, and you had the kindness to answer it, stating, in turn, your views on the Mexican situation.

I have to confess, so far as recognition of the Huerta government is concerned, that what I considered a wise course when the Madero government was overthrown is quite different now, more so after the dissolution of the Mexican Congress October 10, 1913.

I hope that you will do me the favor to read the inclosed memorandum that will be published in the next two or three weeks.

Inclosed with his letter was a memorandum. As he did not give me authority to make any portion of it public, I telegraphed for such authority and received it last night.

Mr. President, I have said that I could not find words with which to express my ideas or conclusions as to the conditions in the Mexican Republic to-day. This man, who came here as Huerta's representative, this member of the Mexican Congress, has fortunately furnished me with a description of affairs such as I do not believe the Senators here ever read or dreamed of. He speaks of both parties, as you will see further along, both of Huerta and of the constitutionalists.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that I got from the Senator's statement a proper impression, perhaps, as to just for whom this gentleman speaks.

Mr. FALL. He speaks for himself, as a member of the Mexican race.

Mr. THOMAS. He does not assume to represent either one of the factions?

Mr. FALL. No. He was a representative of the Huerta government. He writes me now that I was right and that he was wrong. He wants me to read over—that is, I construed it to be personal—a certain memorandum which he sent me, which I wired for permission and obtained permission to read.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator made that statement; but I wanted to be sure now he does not represent anyone in the communication except himself.

Mr. FALL. No one else. He is an educated Mexican lawyer, and his only position is that he holds credentials as a member of the Mexican Congress.

Their only aim is to fight, they only take pride in winning, in killing, in shooting, in severing heads from bodies, in eating the raw flesh or burying alive their enemies; ferocity is their natural condition, temerity is their supreme virtue. What a lot of savages! And such cannibal feasts, such anarchical dances, such political orgies and dignified by some with the name of "government" and with the title of "constitutionalism" by others who don't know their ilk!

Not a single word about peace, not a single thought about harmony, not a ray of hope about conciliation, not a voice raised in remembrance, not a single soul which would throb in favor of order, country, and humanity.

The Government and the revolution, both of them are unhealthy and have gone mad, as their aim is none other than to thwart civilization and reestablish barbarism. With natural unconcernedness or in the clash of arms, in the light of day or in the darkness of night, they commit such violent actions and deliver themselves into such excesses that they are causing nausea and horror everywhere and have created a state of panic around them; they have lost the social respect; they have been wrecked in the human love; they have lost all standing; they have rendered themselves unable to govern Mexico in the years to come. Our motherland is truly ashamed, bleeding profusely, writhing in desperation and anger at seeing herself helpless, owned, and disgraced by these nefarious men. Similarly stupid, blind, and obstinate, lacking in prudence, dignity, and patriotism, both the men of the Government and those of the revolution are waging a personal struggle, so personal, in fact, that they are better known under the names of Huertistas and Carrancistas; it is a fight to the death, by revolution to revolution, by misgovernment to misgovernment, by anarchy to anarchy; it is a war deprived of reason, ceaseless, flagless, principleless, and aimless, carried along solely by hatred, by money, or by ambition; a savage war in which there is respect neither for age, sex, property, law, nor human lives. It is a struggle of seething passions, satanic abominations, cowardice, and infamies, of crimes and horrors, which are unknown even to the wild beasts; a struggle which resembles the unconscious fury of the elements, it is an anarchical illness whose sole purpose is to annihilate civilization, without knowing why and what for, but causing the misfortune, the ruin, the retrogression, and the death of the best people and the richest country on the face of the earth.

The Mexicans have forgotten Mexico, their Republic, their nation, their motherland. Poor country! Fifteen million peaceful inhabitants, blameless, for whom there seems to be no mercy, are enduring the burning sorrows of war and misery. Why? Through the stupid whim, the moral deformity, the original unfitness of a few conscienceless and honorless politicians; thus we see well-known highwaymen, their breasts and shoulders literally covered with medals, golden braid, and straps, suddenly transformed into heroes of extolled bloody orgies, demanding, under penalty of death, the ransom and homage of honest people; professional murderers filling the most prominent public offices, exercising an unlimited authority upon a frightened and defenseless society, and all that occurs before the throbbing expectation of the whole world.

* * * * * * *

Certain it is that they are entirely ignorant of the problem, would not know how to devise it, could not solve it at all if they were called upon to tackle it.

That is, constructing a government.

Worshiped as idols by chance, heroes by treachery and coup de barracks, victors by accident, generals by improvisation, lifted up in a jiffy from the cattle yard to the palace, we must retrace our steps before them because they carry weapons in their hands, threatening everybody with death, and overcoming the Government by sheer assault. The men who so recklessly behave themselves are lewd, intoxicated, cruel, and savage, and while they do not know the most elementary principles of either cleanliness, morality, politics, or social manners, yet they indulge themselves in numberless and endless blunders and infamies. The abstemious qualities displayed in all but the use of intoxicating liquors, the agility of the greyhound in running, the endurance shown against all privations and outdoor sufferings, the sublime manifestations of the wild beasts in rutting time, the love for gaudy beads and raw skins, the cold cruelty and impunity, the fierce exhibitions of insanity and sensuality, the obstreperous howling, the supine ignorance and supreme temerity which enter into the make-up of a cannibal are not, indeed, necessarily the specifications and gifts most highly appreciated in a genuine statesman, who, before all and over all, should be a decent, brave, and honorable man.

Fighting each other for the possession of pieces of land, of the spoils of war, of the trophies of crime, investing and taking this or the other place, losing or reoccupying this or the other village, that or the next town, the men who now hold sway in Mexico are shedding torrents of blood or spending millions of dollars in an aimless way, without any possible practical result.

* * * * * * *

The men who reckon their brave deeds by the number of their brethren they have killed, the men who reckon their wealth by the number of families they have ruined, the men who reckon the glories by the number of defenseless and innocent victims they have butchered can not govern a people.

* * * * * * *

Those who now rule in Mexico, both at the Aztecan capital and that of the revolution, are by their bloody deeds a legion of intoxicated demons who are courting fiat failure.

Mr. Presideht, I have given in the words of this man a picture which I can say, from my own knowledge of Mexico, is not overdrawn. The army of one of them—that of Huerta—all above the number of 7,000 men, is made up entirely of men impressed from the jails into his army—turning them loose upon a community—and they rob and loot and do even more brazen crimes in the open light of day than do the revolutionists, because the one travels under a badge of some kind of government and claims to represent something, while the other claims to represent—or, at least, they do represent—nothing.

Now, sir, I have no intention of attacking this administration upon the ground that it is intentionally allowing conditions to continue in Mexico, by its dealings with the two factions of that Republic, with any ulterior or selfish motive in view; of course, that would be impossible. I have the very greatest respect for the integrity, the sincerity, the ability, and the patriotism of the President of the United States; none of you Senators on the other side respect him more than do I; but, Mr. President, he knows absolutely nothing of Mexican conditions. He is mistaken, and has been mistaken, in every move that was made in Mexico. Huerta, of course, is impossible; a man who was placed by his President in command of soldiers to defend his Government and his President's life betraying that President and killing him—of course, he is impossible.

Mr. President, were this all it might be forgotten; but how many of you have heard of the fate of several of the different governors of the States of Mexico? Have you ever heard what became of Abran Gonzales, the duly elected governor of the State of Chihuahua, with which we are more nearly in touch than any other? Gonzales refused to acknowledge the Presidency of Huerta. He had been living in the State of Chihuahua, garrisoned by Federal troops, with whom he was working in perfect harmony. He was a Madero governor. These troops were Madero troops.

When he received a telegram that Huerta had killed the President and taken over the administration of Mexico he refused to acknowledge Huerta as President. He was immediately arrested, and he disappeared from view for days. I called upon the State Department here to ascertain if they knew anything concerning the whereabouts of Gonzales, a man known to all the Americans along the border. The State Department had resolutions sent to it from the Live Stock Association of Texas, which happened to be then in convention, practically every one of whom knew Abran Gonzales, a friend of America and prominent in Texas. He was arrested by Huerta's order; and they told our State Department that they understood that he was coming to the border under a guard of his own friends, when he was being conducted upon a train toward the City of Mexico. When he arrived near the little town of Santa Rosalia he was pushed between two cars, with hands tied together. When the train ran over him, and the "friends" who were guarding him, Gen. Rabago's soldiers, dismounted from the train and discovered that he was still living in agony and not dead, they backed the train over him again, and finished him.

Why, of course, Mr. President, the President is justifiable for more than one reason in not recognizing Huerta, and I do not intend to go into that; but, sir, if Huerta is a murderer, he is a murderer on a grand scale, at any rate. He does not stoop to murder a man just to see him kick; he does not stoop to shoot down an ordinary poor Mexican, who is begging on his knees for justice and for right; he, at least, leaves that to some underling; but, sir, while we have no diplomatic communications with Mr. Huerta, we have a special representative at the court of Francisco Villa, and we have had for months. We have sent a special representative of this Government past the consulate at Juarez, 225 miles north of Chihuahua, to meet Francisco Villa and to consult with him about certain matters, while we have at Chihuahua an American consul, Marion Letcher, from

Georgia, one of the most efficient men, in my judgment at least, who has ever been in the Consular Service in the Republic of Mexico.

Marion Letcher is ignored, while our special representative deals directly with Francisco Villa. George R. Carothers, of Torreon, is this gentleman. Mr. Carothers I know personally, and I think Mr. Carothers is going to do all that he can for the United States up to a certain point. He has no hesitancy at all in telling anyone just exactly what his position is. He is the consular agent of the United States at the city of Torreon, with business interests there, and he is not going to do anything for this Government which will in any way conflict with his business interests. He has said to me that he has so notified the Government. Whether or not that is true I do not know. Lately, within the last week or two, apparently this Government has been recognizing Marion Letcher; but for weeks he was ignored, and Villa had it communicated to him that the American consul in Chihuahua, which was Villa's headquarters, was ignored by this Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Mexico has characterized the provisional President, Huerta, in very caustic language, and I apprehend in just language. Has the Senator anything to tell the Senate and the country of the character of the man Villa?

Mr. FALL. I shall refer to Mr. Villa in just a moment. Villa's character is known, and has been known for years; known to every American in northern Mexico and on the border; known as an ordinary, common, ignorant, brutal murderer for hire. He is now being romanced about in the public press as having assassinated or killed an army officer because of the seduction of his sister by the officer.

The warrant shows for whom it was issued. The warrant was issued for his arrest in Chihuahua, and can be obtained by the authorities of this Government if they choose to investigate it, and is for "Doroteo Arango, alias Francisco Villa." It is for the murder of a peon, who was working for him in a butcher shop, where he was selling beef from stolen cattle. So much for the romance. He was said to have been loyal to Madero. He was with the Orozco forces in the attack on Juarez when that city fell. He then went to Parral. When the Orozco revolution broke out he looted the city of Parral, taking everything which he could find loose, and loosening some things which nobody else would have undertaken to remove. The loot amounted to something like $700,000, largely from Americans, because whenever a thing of this kind happens in a mining camp it is the American who suffers. He was arrested, and a report was made to Madero upon the subject. The report says that the measure of his looting was simply that of his capacity, and that was of 500 hands; that he took everything he could get. He was incarcerated in San Luis Potosi and at one time sentenced to be shot. It is supposed that he managed to escape because of the friendly feeling that Madero had for him, because he had been with him at Juarez when Juarez was captured and the Diaz government was overturned. He made his way through and came to El Paso, Tex., in February of last year. He there called upon myself. He made some statements with reference to his plans, largely to the effect that some of the loot which he had acquired at Parral he had hidden, and, as he was broke, he was going back to try to get it. He made his way across the border without any following at all. Within a few days, with eight men, he attacked the American bullion train near San Andres, just west of the city of Chihuahua, which was conveying bullion to the city of Batopilas from a mine belonging to former Gov. Sheppard, of Washington; bullion produced from a mine belonging to Joseph Qualey, of New York; and bullion produced from the Dolores mines, also owned by Americans, with headquarters in Chicago and New York, $180,000 worth of bullion being upon this train. He captured it, and, knowing to whom it belonged, notified Charles Qualey, the brother of Joseph Qualey, who was then in Chihuahua, that he was unable to get away with the bars of bullion because they were too heavy, and therefore he would sell them for $40,000. Qualey came over to the city of Washington with that telegram and went before the State Department; but nothing could be done for him, of course. In my office he wrote a telegram to pay $40,000 to get the bullion back. With this $40,000 Mr. Villa started out upon his career of establishing constitutional government in the Republic of Mexico.

On his way from the little station where he had robbed the bullion train he passed through the little Mexican town of Casas Grandes, a town of several hundred inhabitants, near one of the railroads that run south of El Paso, and situated in a beautiful valley, irrigated and in a high state of cultivation. When he arrived at the town they had 125 home guards—not soldiers, except that they had been armed by the Government for the protection of themselves and their property against just such marauding bands. These 125 men made the best fight possible, but finally surrendered. Then 115 of them were stood up against the wall and shot, one after another, by Mr. Villa, and 90 women, including 17 little girls, were outraged.

He came to the American border, remained for some time opposite Columbus, which is a port of entry into New Mexico, across from the little Mexican town of Ascension. He made his headquarters at Ascension, and finally started back. On the trip, which resulted in his capture of Torreon, when he went through this little town of San Andres, near which he had formerly captured the bullion, he attacked that town and captured it. Then he stood 100 of the men who had tried to defend the town up against the wall and shot them. When he was asked—these are his admissions; these are not mere statements; he admits them—when he was asked by this very man, Charles Qualey, why he had shot those men, his answer was that he had all he could do to feed his own men, and that he did not propose to feed these.

At Torreon he slipped in between the lines of the other rebels, Urbina and others—Carranzistas, as they call themselves—and made his way into the town with his command of something over a thousand men. Of course, then all the other rebels, who had been besieging the town for something over six weeks, came in. He demanded of the bankers and the business men of the town $3,000,000 as ransom, or else he would turn the town over, as Urbina had turned Durango over, for 24 hours to the tender mercies of his soldiers and of Urbina's.

The Spaniards were compelled very largely to put up the money, but every American and every other citizen there was compelled to donate his mite, until the amount of 3,000,000 pesos was raised and placed in his hands, when he left, leaving the other rebel soldiers there, and returned to Chihuahua. He thought that Mercado, who was defending the town, had already been paid, but they had not quite reached Mercado properly, and when Villa attacked the town a very strong defense was made, particularly by Orozco and Salazar, the two volunteer leaders in the garrison. Villa was whipped away and driven off. He came to Juarez and captured it at night, arriving when no one was expecting him, so the world is told—he is a great hero, this man—but the day before Juarez was captured the commander, Gen. Castro, was over in El Paso and received 50,000 pesos of Pancho Villa's money to turn the town over.

These are matters of proof. As it happens, I was in the city and in the Hotel Sheldon, in El Paso, when the deal was being made. I was not present, but I was in the city, and I was informed of the transaction as it was being carried on by the revolutionary agents.

Portillo had taken $2,000 for which he was to put some of his men in Salazar's command, and they were to kill Salazar. He had 2,000 pesos of Villa's money in his pocket. He had not carried out his promise, and when Juarez was captured Mr. Portillo was shot by Mr. Villa, and then, when this Government announced that it did not approve of those things, it was told by Mr. Carranza that it was perfectly all right; that the thirty-odd men who were stood up and shot by Mr. Villa were shot because they were traitors to their country. Mr. Carranza has announced through the columns of the London Times that, of course, they were not going to murder or kill everybody, but he went on to state, "Of course, you understand that we propose to kill every man who recognizes any president who is not the constitutional president of Mexico."

Domingo Flores, residing in El Paso, on February 22 of this year went across the river to have a settlement with Pancho Villa. His mother and sister lived on this side of the line. He had been smuggling arms for Villa, in partnership with another man. The partner had left, taking with him $3,500 out of the $10,000 which had been intrusted to them with which to buy arms and ammunition. Flores went over to account for $6,500, and to explain to Villa that his partner had left, taking with him $3,500, and that he could not deliver it. Villa put him in jail. The mother of Flores, living at El Paso, went over in an attempt to secure the liberty of her son, and was told by Villa that if she would raise $3,500 he would release him. The old lady returned to her home in El Paso, made every effort, and finally succeeded in selling her little house and lot—everything in the world that she had—and raised $3,200,

lacking only $200 of the correct amount. She went to Villa with that money and begged him to accept it and turn her son loose. Villa promptly accepted the money, and then refused to turn the boy loose until she paid the other $200. His sister finally managed to secure $200 and took it over to Villa. She was allowed to go to see her brother in the jail, expecting him to be turned loose when Villa had received the $200. Villa took the money and sent the girl into the jail to see her brother released. The brother was shot in her presence; she was outraged, and was told by Villa personally to get back into the United States and not to come to Mexico again.

A man by the name of Mestas was killed in Juarez by Villa under almost identical circumstances as those surrounding the killing of Benton. The residence of Mestas had been looted, and he went to Villa to protest, when Villa, telling him he would give him satisfaction, shot him down where he stood.

When the federals abandoned Chihuahua recently, they had in jail a man by the name of Andana, suspected of being a rebel spy. When they left they released this man and told him he could follow the army to Ojinaga if he liked. He left with the army, but returned to Chihuahua before reaching Ojinaga. When Villa entered Chihuahua he was received at the depot by the people who remained there, all sympathizers or would-be sympathizers. Among the crowd who met him was the wife of Andana, and she put a wreath of flowers over Villa's shoulders. Some days afterwards Andana himself arrived and went to see Villa. He approached Villa with words of congratulation on his lips, when Villa pulled his revolver and shot him dead in his tracks, because, as he said, Andana was a federal spy.

Mr. President, this man Villa is now engaged in stealing everything in the world he can lay his hands on in the State of Chihuahua or in any other locality over which he has temporary jurisdiction. He rounded up every Spaniard in the city of Chihuahua, after killing no one knows how many in Torreon and driving the others out of the State. He went to the Spanish stores in the city of Chihuahua, took charge of the stores, confiscated every dollar of the Spaniards' property in the city of Chihuahua, amounting to ₱10,000,000, and drove the Spaniards out, put them on a special train, went down to the train himself, counted them, and told them to get out of the country and never to return, or he would kill every one of them. When he found that on the train there were wives and children of some of the Spaniards and some of the wives had been born in Mexico, he took off the train the wives and children who had been born there, and would not let them go with their fathers to the American side of the line, where they might seek safety and have some means of support. This occurred while the American consul was there. The American special representative was in Juarez at the time.

Mr. President, the cause of the Benton killing was this: Villa had been stealing every head of cattle that he could lay his hands on in the entire State of Chihuahua, and had been selling them in the city of Juarez to Americans, who were bringing them over to this side. The International Live Stock Association of the United States and the Texas Live Stock Association under their rules and regulations attempt to protect the property of all their members. Nearly all the cattle owners of northern Mexico are members of these stock associations and their brands are of record with the associations. Under the custom of the range, the brand upon an animal is proof of the ownership. Where animals are run in herds of 10,000 or of a thousand, it is impossible to prove ownership otherwise. Under the laws of all the border States in Mexico, as well as in this country, proof of ownership of the brand and proof of the brand is proof of the ownership of the cow. The live-stock associations on this side, when Villa undertook to send the stolen cattle across, looked at the brands, and wherever there was on one of those cows the brand of one of their members they had their attorneys employed there to sequester it under the laws of the State. When Villa found that he could not ship the cattle over here, that it was almost impossible for him to get the cattle through and get payment for any stolen cattle, he became angry and issued a decree that no cattle whatever should thereafter be taken out of the State of Chihuahua by the owners or otherwise. He then had a butcher shop established in Juarez, Mexico, and he proceeded to butcher the stolen cattle, to pack the hides up in bales, and to send the hides into the United States for sale. When he found that they would also be held, he sent the hides through in bond to Canada and sought to dispose of the meat to butchers in El Paso and to those who would ship it out.

Mr. Benton had cattle, which he had had permission to bring out, and through which he expected to procure some funds with which to support himself and his family. Villa, however, stated that, as the Americans were not treating him right, he would not let any of them carry the cattle out. It was about that matter that Benton went to see him.

Carranza had issued a decree which had been posted up all along the border to the effect that cattle could be exported upon the payment of from $3 up to $7, an average of less than $5 gold per head. Any American or anyone buying cattle over on the other side had the right to export them under this Carranza decree. Mr. Villa, who it is claimed is recognizing the authority of Carranza and is a loyal follower of Carranza, decreed, however, that nobody should bring them out at all. It was because of this that Benton went across the line to see Villa and tell him that he needed the funds and wanted his cattle brought out. Villa killed him.

Mr. President, Villa now has in his hands in the city of Chihuahua Luis Terrazas, known as Luis Chico, to distinguish him from old Gen. Terrazas. He is the son of one of the few remaining men who made Mexico. Old Luis Terrazas was the man who restored Juarez to power. When Juarez was driven into this country, when he took refuge at El Paso, Tex., and lived there, old Luis Terrazas organized the Indians in the Sierra Madre Mountains, gained the first victory over the French which was ever gained by the Mexicans, drove them out of the city of Chihuahua and put Juarez in a position where he could finally make headway against their common enemy. This is his son, an educated gentleman, a man whom I have personally and intimately known for twenty-odd years. I have been associated with him in almost every possible way. He is a gentleman whose society either of you gentlemen might be honored to enjoy and which you would appreciate if you knew the man.

This man is one man of the entire Terrazas family who has always been against the Huerta government. It was impossible for Mrs. Terrazas, who was eighty-odd years old, and the other ladies to go with old Gen. Terrazas and the other members of the family across to Ojinaga when Mercado evacuated Chihuahua. They could not stand the overland journey on foot or on horseback. Therefore they remained in the city.

Luis Terrazas had always been a sympathizer with the revolution. They had always known him as a sympathizer with the revolutionists, although not with their methods. It was supposed that he was one man of the prominent Mexican family who would be absolutely safe if he remained in Chihuahua; but, to make assurance doubly sure, he took refuge in the office of the acting British consular agent, as Great Britain has no consul in Chihuahua nor in that part of the country. He took refuge at Capt. Scovell's office simply for the purpose of remaining there until the army came in, when he would be able to meet one of the generals in command—Villa or some of the others—without being stopped or interfered with by the rank and file of the army galloping through the streets. He feared that he might be injured if he ran into the army, but felt confident that as soon as the officers came in he would be at liberty to go where he pleased. He took all the title papers to their enormous estates with him to Capt. Scovell's office.

As soon as Villa found he was there, he sent a squad of soldiers after him and demanded that he come out. Scovell objected. He was notified that unless he produced Terrazas they would come in and take what they wanted and take Terrazas out of his office. For the purpose of avoiding trouble, thinking that he would be safe, Terrazas told Scovell that he would not put him to the inconvenience of having his office raided by these fellows, and he said: "I shall go out." He did; he walked out, and they captured him and have held him since.

They have demanded of him every dollar of money he had in the world, and they have received it. They then demanded of his father 500,000 pesos ransom for him. Other parties, friends of his, were attempting to secure his release. Representations were being made. Mr. Terrazas was hung by the neck until he was made to disclose the hiding place of $590,000 in gold which had been buried when the Federals evacuated the town of Chihuahua, one-third of which belonged to his father. That was, of course, taken. He was not at any time released from confinement. Again the demand was made for 500,000 pesos for his release.

They feel the need of a little money every now and then. Five hundred and ninety thousand dollars in gold does not last very long when the leader who gets hold of it sends it over on this side and stows it away in American banks for future contingencies. When the men call for the money they know the leader has secured in this way he must make some pretense of paying them something of the money he has acquired. Therefore he needs a little more.

Villa now demands of old Gen. Terrazos $250,000 in gold, not for the surrender of his son, but simply as an agreed price for the life of the boy at the present moment. If he is paid $250,000, he will not kill him. If he is not, he will kill him.

We represented to him, however, that this Government would not look with pleasure upon the killing of Luis Terrazas simply for failure to pay a ransom. The whole civilized world has passed the age where it looks with equanimity upon those things. Therefore we are notified to-day that he is not going to be killed, but that they are going to put him on the firing line when they advance against any federal enemies.

Why, Mr. President, the old men of 1848 could tell you what will happen. If you are not shot from in front, you will be shot from behind. It is just exactly as convenient as one of Villa's courts-martial. Of course if he ever goes to the front, Mr. Villa will report to the United States, and we will accept it, that he was killed in action, fighting gallantly for his country.

However, Mr. President, a little different state of affairs was recently brought about by the killing of Benton. It seems to have aroused a good deal of interest. Bauch had disappeared; others had disappeared; hundreds and hundreds of others had disappeared in Mexico; but when a British subject disappeared there was some little question.

There were read into the RECORD several days ago some resolutions adopted at a meeting in El Paso. They were pretty strong. One of the reasons was that at that meeting one of the speakers was an ordinary fireman on a railroad train, who had been running in and out of Mexico on the Mexican Northwestern road and had been driven out of there 11 or 12 months before. He had been compelled to work at any employment he could obtain on this side of the border. He had been run out by Salazar and Castillo and that brand of constitutionalists and patriots. He addressed this meeting. He was scarcely able to express himself as he desired. He was not a public speaker. He was just a common, ordinary, everyday American; but he said this in substance—of course I am not going to undertake to tell his exact words, but this was the sentiment:

Mr. Chairman, I have felt pretty sore at the United States. I have been run out of Mexico. My little house, which was all that I and my family had in the world, down here at Madero, was taken. I have spent years in accumulating a little money to buy a little home and a little piece of ground there. That was taken away from me and the home burned, and the train that I was running hurled over a precipice and destroyed. It is true that I was allowed to get off.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the superintendent under whom I worked was cremated in the tunnel through which I used to pull my trains.

He proceeded to mention the names of those whom he had known and worked with, who had all died a few days ago. He then said:

Mr. Chairman, no man can have any more sympathy with this man Benton or his family than I have. If there were anything in the world I could do to undo the death of Benton, to restore him to his family, I would do it. But, Mr. Chairman, if somebody else had to be killed by these scoundrels I thank God it was a citizen of a nation that knows how to, and will, defend her citizens.

Mr. President, that one speech was very largely the cause of the sending in of the resolutions which were adopted at that meeting and which were read here.

I do not intend to go into this matter in detail, as I might, for the next two or three hours. I have already detained the Senate a great deal longer than I had expected upon this aspect of the matter. But, sir, I think it is time that some one attempted to secure some expression as to the feeling in this country and to throw some light, if possible, upon the duty of this Government under such conditions as we are compelled to contend with and to face every day in Mexico. For that reason I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate while I explain what I conceive to be the duty of this Government.

Mr. President, the policy of this Government as announced, at least through the platform pledges of the two great political parties from 1860 to the present day, has been protection of its citizens and their property.

Democratic platform, 1860:

*Resolved*, That it is the duty of the United States to afford ample and complete protection to all its citizens, whether at home or abroad and whether native or foreign.

Republican platform, 1860:

That the Republican Party is opposed to any change in our naturalization laws or any State legislation by which the rights of citizens hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

Republican platform, 1872:

The National Government should seek to maintain honorable peace with all nations, protecting its citizens everywhere, and sympathizing with all peoples who strive for greater liberty.

Republican platform, 1876:

The United States of America is a nation, not a league. By the combined workings of the National and State Governments, under their respective constitutions, the rights of every citizen are secured at home and abroad and the common welfare promoted.

Democratic platform, 1884:

The Democratic Party insists that it is the duty of the Government to protect with equal fidelity and vigilance the rights of its citizens, native and naturalized, at home and abroad, and to the end that this protection may be assured United States papers of naturalization, issued by courts of competent jurisdiction, must be respected by the executive and legislative departments of our own Government and by all foreign powers. It is an imperative duty of this Government to efficiently protect all the rights of persons and property of every American citizen in foreign lands and demand and enforce full reparation for any invasion thereof. An American citizen is only responsible to his own Government for any act done in his own country and under her flag, and can only be tried, therefore, on her own soil and according to her laws, and no power exists in this Government to expatriate an American citizen to be tried in any foreign land for any such act.

This country has never had a well-defined and executed foreign policy save under Democratic administration. That policy has ever been in regard to foreign nations, so long as they do not act detrimental to the interests of the country or hurtful to our citizens, to let them alone; that as a result of this policy we recall the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, California, and of the adjacent Mexican territory by purchase alone, and contrast these grand acquisitions of Democratic statesmanship with the purchase of Alaska, the sole fruit of a Republican administration of nearly a quarter of a century.

Democratic platform, 1888:

It has adopted and consistently pursued a firm and prudent foreign policy, preserving peace with all nations while scrupulously maintaining all the rights and interests of our own Government and people at home and abroad.

Republican platform, 1896:

Our foreign policy should be at all times firm, vigorous, and dignified, and all our interests in the Western Hemisphere carefully watched and guarded.

Republican platform, 1900:

The American Government must protect the person and property of every citizen wherever they are wrongfully violated or placed in peril.

Democratic platform, 1904:

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad and to use all proper measures to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of laws and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties of friendship and commerce.

Republican platform, 1904:

We commend the vigorous efforts made by the administration to protect American citizens in foreign lands, and pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and equal protection of all our citizens abroad. It is the unquestioned duty of the Government to procure for all our citizens, without distinction, the rights of travel and sojourn in friendly countries, and we declare ourselves in favor of all proper efforts tending to that end.

Democratic platform, 1908:

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad and to use all proper methods to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of the law and enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under our treaties.

Republican platform, 1908:

We commend the vigorous efforts made by the administration to protect American citizens in foreign lands and pledge ourselves to insist upon a just and equal protection of all our citizens abroad.

Democratic platform, 1912:

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

Mr. President, that was not breaking precedents. It was simply following the doctrine announced by the Democratic Party from the time it first held a convention, acquiesced in and adopted by the Republican Party after its formation. It has been the doctrine of every party that has ever dared to appeal to the American people for votes, so far as I know; but apparently it is not now the popular doctrine.

I introduced a resolution couched in the exact terms of this plank in the Democratic platform, word for word, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i," and I never was able even to get consideration for it. That was over six months ago.

One of the great newspapers of the country, the New York World, which I believe at times assumes to represent the views of those high in authority, on July 26, 1913, replied to an invitation from the New York Times of the day before to extend an apology to me, saying that I had not been the author of this very obnoxious declaration of principles, but that it was in the Democratic platform. The New York World replied as follows:

The Times invites the World to join it in an apology to Senator FALL, because his Mexican resolution "was taken from the Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party."

The Times is mistaken, and it owes no apology to Senator FALL. The Baltimore platform contained a plank protesting against Russia's discrimination against American Jews. The plank was proper and

reasonable, but it was clumsily and crudely drawn in its attempt to define the equal rights of all American citizens regardless of "race or creed."

I have sincere respect for the utterances of the World, Mr. President, in the interpretation of Democratic declarations, but yet I can not believe that in this instance it correctly represents the attitude of that great party and its leaders.

I am in favor of the proper protection of the citizens of this country who may be classed as Jews; I am equally in favor of the protection of citizens of this country without reference to the blood which flows in their veins, even if it be the old Scotch-Irish or what is ordinarily known as the Anglo-Saxon blood.

This question is not political. The duty of the citizen to his State and the duty of the State to its citizens are reciprocal duties, lying at the foundation of organized society. As Halleck says:

So a nation is bound to protect its subjects in all their just rights.

Hall says:

A nation is not bound to allow them (its citizens) to be treated in defiance of law, even though they may be so treated in common with all the other inhabitants of the country in which they are.

And—

It is regarded as a pure question of expediency * * * or of the importance of the occurrence whether the State shall interfere, and if it does interfere, whether it * * * shall adopt measures of constraint falling short of war, or even resort to war itself.

Oppenheim says:

Now, a State may have a right of intervention against another State for several grounds * * *. Thus, secondly, the right of protection over its citizens abroad, which a State holds, may cause intervention by right to which the other party is bound to submit.

Judge Pollock, speaking for the circuit court, in the case of Hamilton v. McClaughry (Kansas), says:

It has been well said that the safety of the people is the supreme law of the land. The first duty of the State is the protection of the lives and property of its citizens wherever lawfully situate, by peaceful means if possible; if not, by force of arms.

In 1853, Martin Koszta, a Hungarian, banished from Austria for political offences, had declared his intention to become an American citizen. He was not even naturalized. He was seized by Austrian agents at the Turkish port of Smyrna and confined aboard the Austrian vessel *Hussa*. Capt. Ingraham, of the American vessel of war *St. Louis*, trained his guns upon the Austrian vessel, and by this argument enforced his demand and secured the release of Koszta, and Ingraham was extended a vote of thanks by the Congress of the United States. See Senate Executive Document No. 1, Thirty-third Congress, first session.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a memorandum prepared by the Solicitor for the State Department, entitled "Right to protect citizens in foreign countries by landing forces." I call attention, without reading, to pages 31, 32, 33, and 34 of this document, in which are set forth some 98 cases, I think, in which the United States, without any hesitation, for the protection of her citizens or for the purpose of retaliating or demanding from some official or from some individual reparation for injury done to her consul, an insult to her consul, or for some injury done to an individual, has landed her armed troops and sent them into a foreign country. I ask that these citations may be made a part of my remarks, and, if there is no objection, I should think it would be very advisable if this memorandum were made a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to printing the matter in the RECORD without reading? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

1. PURPOSES FOR WHICH FORCES HAVE BEEN LANDED.

The purposes for which forces have been thus landed may be roughly classified as follows:

(a) *Simple protection of American citizens located in disturbed areas.*

This was the purpose of the landing of forces in China, 1854 (Appendix, 52); Uruguay, 1855 and 1858 (Appendix, 54 and 55); China, 1859 (Appendix, 56); Africa, Kisembo, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Panama, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Japan, 1868 (Appendix, 58); Uruguay, 1868 (Appendix, 59); Egypt, 1882 (Appendix, 61); Korea, 1888 (Appendix, 61); Navassa Island, 1891 (Appendix, 62); Chile, 1891 (Appendix, 62); Hawaii, 1893 (Appendix, 63); Korea, 1894 (Appendix, 63); Nicaragua, 1899 (Appendix, 65); China, 1900 (Appendix, 65); Santo Domingo, 1903 (Appendix, 65); Honduras, 1907 (Appendix, 66); Nicaragua, 1910 (Appendix, 67); Honduras, 1910 and 1911 (Appendix, 69).

(b) *Destruction of pirates infesting certain areas, whether nationals of the disturbed areas or otherwise.*

This was the purpose of landing forces in Amelia Island, 1811 (Appendix, 47); Cuba, 1823 (Appendix, 49); China, 1854 (Appendix, 52).

(c) *Punishment for murder of American citizens.*

Sumatra, 1832 (Appendix, 51); Fiji Islands, 1840 (Appendix, 51); Samoa, 1840–41 (Appendix, 51); Fiji Islands, 1858 (Appendix, 56); Formosa, 1867 (Appendix, 58).

(d) *Punishment for insults or injuries to American citizens or American officers, such injuries not resulting in death.*

Porto Rico, 1824 (Appendix, 49); Falkland Islands, 1831 (Appendix, 50); Nicaragua, 1854 (Appendix, 53); Fiji Islands, 1855 (Appendix, 54); China, 1856 (Appendix, 54); Japan, 1863 (Appendix, 57); Korea, 1871 (Appendix, 59).

(e) *Reestablishment of American legation, collection of indemnities, and protection of minister.*

Japan, 1864 (Appendix, 57).

(f) *Suppression of local riots.*

Hawaii, 1874, landing at instance of Government to restore order (Appendix, 60); Egypt, Alexandria, 1882, landing to restore order, extinguish fires, etc. (Appendix, 61).

(g) *Preservation of order during interregnum between control of regular government and revolutionary government.*

Mexico, 1876 (Appendix, 60).

(h) *Establishment of presumed regular government.*

Samoa, 1899, joint action, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 64).

(i) *Protection of customhouse at the instance of regular local officials.*

Uruguay, 1868 (Appendix, 59).

(j) *Securing of indemnity.*

Island of Johanna, 1851 (Appendix, 52); Japan, 1864 (Appendix, 57); Haiti, 1888 (Appendix, 62).

(k) *Invasion of foreign territory for protection of American citizens and American territory.*

Spanish Floridas, 1817 (Appendix, 48).

2. LANDING OF AMERICAN FORCES IN TIMES OF FOREIGN REVOLUTIONS.

(a) *Without the invitation of either faction.*

This Government has repeatedly, both alone and jointly with others, landed forces in times of revolutions in foreign countries in order adequately to protect American interests. These landings were made as set forth below. Unless otherwise stated, our attitude seems to have been neutral as between the contending factions.

China, 1854, the operations were conducted against the regular imperialist troops, who had captured an American pilot boat in the harbor of Shanghai (Appendix, 52); Uruguay, 1855, operations directed against both factions (Appendix, 54); Uruguay, 1858 (Appendix, 55); Africa, Kisembo, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Japan, 1868, semble, neutral (Appendix, 58); Egypt, 1882 (Appendix, 61); Korea, 1888 (Appendix, 61); Chile, 1891 (Appendix, 62); Hawaii, 1893 (Appendix, 63); Nicaragua, 1899 (Appendix, 65); China, 1900 (Appendix, 65); Santo Domingo, 1903 (Appendix, 65); Nicaragua, 1910 (Appendix, 67); Honduras, 1911 (Appendix, 69).

(b) *At the instance of the regular local officials.*

Panama, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Uruguay, 1868 (Appendix, 59); Hawaii, 1874 (Appendix, 60).

(c) *Interference between two fighting factions, i. e., the revolutionists and the forces of the regular Government.*

Uruguay, 1855, massacre of insurgents prevented (Appendix, 54); Samoa, 1899, one faction actively supported (Appendix, 64); Dominican Republic, 1904, a zone established in which no fighting permitted (Appendix, 65); Honduras, 1911, a zone established in which no fighting permitted (Appendix, 69). See also Japan, 1864 (Appendix, 57).

3. LANDING OF AMERICAN FORCES IN TIME OF WAR BETWEEN TWO FOREIGN NATIONS.

Korea, 1894 (Appendix, 62); Honduras, 1907 (Appendix, 66).

4. OPERATIONS OF AMERICAN FORCES LANDED ON FOREIGN SOIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF AMERICAN INTERESTS.

(a) *Forces merely land and apparently undertake no hostile measures.*

Uruguay, 1858 (Appendix, 55); China, 1859 (Appendix, 56); Africa, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Panama, 1860 (Appendix, 56); Japan, 1868 (Appendix, 58); Uruguay, 1868 (Appendix, 59); Hawaii, 1874 (Appendix, 60); Mexico, 1876 (Appendix, 60); Korea, 1888 (Appendix, 61); Navassa Island, 1891 (Appendix, 62); Chile, 1891 (Appendix, 62); Hawaii, 1893 (Appendix, 63); Korea, 1894 (Appendix, 63); Nicaragua, 1899 (Appendix, 65); Santo Domingo, 1903 (Appendix, 65); Honduras, 1907 and 1911 (Appendix, 66 and 69); Nicaragua, 1910 (Appendix, 67).

(b) *Forces conduct belligerent operations.*

Amelia Island, 1811 (Appendix, 47); Cuba, 1823 (Appendix, 49); Porto Rico, 1824 (Appendix, 49); Falkland Islands, 1831 (Appendix, 50); Sumatra, 1832 (Appendix, 51); Fiji Islands, 1840 (Appendix, 51); Samoa, 1840–41 (Appendix, 51); China, 1854 (Appendix, 52); Nicaragua, 1854 (Appendix, 53); Fiji Islands, 1855 (Appendix, 54); Uruguay, 1855 (Appendix, 54); China, 1856 (Appendix, 54); Fiji Islands, 1858 (Appendix, 56); Formosa, 1867 (Appendix, 58); Korea, 1871 (Appendix, 59); Samoa, 1899 (Appendix, 64); China, 1900 (Appendix, 65).

5. USE OF THE NAVY TO PROTECT AMERICAN INTERESTS.

Japan, 1864, to open to navigation the Straits of Shimonoseki (Appendix, 57); Haiti, 1888 (Appendix, 62); Brazil, 1893, Navy interfered to secure noninterference with neutral commerce by insurgents (Appendix, 63).

6. ULTIMATUM DEMANDING SATISFACTION DELIVERED BEFORE LANDING MADE.

Porto Rico, 1824 (Appendix, 49); island of Johanna, 1851, indemnity paid without landing forces (Appendix, 52); Nicaragua, 1854 (Appendix, 53); Fiji Islands, 1858 (Appendix, 56); Formosa, 1867 (Appendix, 58); Korea, 1871 (Appendix, 59).

7. AMERICAN FORCES LANDED IN COOPERATION WITH OTHER POWERS FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREIGNERS.

China, 1854, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 52); Uruguay, 1855, United States, Great Britain, France, and Spain (Appendix, 54); China, 1856, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 54); Uruguay, 1858, United States and other powers (Appendix, 55); Africa, 1860, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 56); Panama, 1860, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 56); Japan, 1864, United States, Great Britain, France, and Netherlands (Appendix, 57); Japan, 1868, United States, Great Britain, and France (Appendix, 58); Uruguay, 1868, United States and other powers (Appendix, 59); Samoa, 1899, United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 64); Nicaragua, 1899,

United States and Great Britain (Appendix, 65); Honduras, 1911, United States, Great Britain, and Germany (Appendix, 69).

8. LANDING OF FORCES BY OTHER POWERS.

Great Britain: Bombarded Omoa, Honduras, in 1873 (Appendix, 59). Germany: Landed force in Samoa, 1899 (Appendix, 61). Great Britain: Landed force at Corinto, Nicaragua, 1895 (Appendix, 64); landed force at Greytown, Nicaragua, 1910 (Appendix, 66).

9. DISPLAY OF NAVAL FORCE TO SECURE PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Jaffa, 1858 (Appendix, 55).

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, not only is the doctrine I have just referred to recognized as a matter of right in a nation, not justifying another nation in declaring war, by all the legal authorities we have, and by all the precedents of which I have any knowledge, but it has been directly recognized by Mexico as a right on the part of this Government with reference to Mexico itself by the treaty of 1859, which they entered into and which it was provided did not need any ratification by the Mexican Government. That treaty, it is true, was rejected by this Government in the heat of the discussion growing out of the trouble between the States which finally resulted in the Civil War, but it was solemnized by Mexico itself in absolute recognition of the right of this Government to go across the line into Mexico, by permission of that Government if it was possible for us to reach its local or national authorities in time; but if not, and occasion demanded, they have permission to go across there without such permission for the purpose of protecting our citizens and enforcing our treaty stipulations.

I shall not undertake to read the treaty itself; but I desire to call attention to the language of two paragraphs of the letter accompanying the treaty, sent to the Senate by the President of the United States for two purposes, to which I shall refer.

Mr. McLane says:

Although I have on all occasions represented to the constitutional Government that I was instructed to adhere to the fixed policy of the United States and avoid all intervention with the domestic administration of Mexico, yet I have steadily insisted that it was the recognized duty of the Government of the United States to intervene and interfere whenever its own security or what was due to itself in the abstract or in virtue of treaty stipulations required such intervention, as also to protect and defend the lives and property of citizens of the United States within the territory of Mexico.

Then he says:

I am aware that I have acted very much on my own discretion and responsibility in concluding this convention, though I have endeavored to follow the spirit of your instructions, and I am persuaded that if the Government of the United States declines the responsibility imposed upon it by the adoption and ratification of this convention—

Now, Senators, listen:

further anarchy will prevail in Mexico until it will be terminated by direct intervention from some other quarter in the Federal politics of Mexico, or by an intervention of our own, caused by some sudden and unforeseen provocation that will expose us to the responsibilities of a general war and a conquest that few would desire to undertake or consummate.

The last paragraph is most significant in its application to the present condition of affairs, and as a prophecy, fulfilled on October 31, 1861, when, while involved in a struggle involving the very existence of this Union, we were compelled to see the Monroe doctrine violated, the American policy set aside, and the safety of this country jeopardized by French intervention in Mexico, following the withdrawal of Britain and Spain—intervention, as France claimed in her answer to our protest, for the purpose of protecting French citizens and obtaining reparation for outrages upon them and loss of their property. Fortunately for us, when we did intervene, as between France and Mexico, we were prepared for all eventualities with 800,000 veteran soldiers, the best whom the world has ever known, thousands of whom we threw upon the border, and thus were enabled to enforce our demands upon France and emphasize our warning to Austria.

Mr. President, is not our Monroe doctrine, our American doctrine and our safety as a Nation, in jeopardy now as it was in 1859, when McLane wrote so prophetically?

Should foreign troops effect a lodgment in Mexico now, would we be able to enforce our desires and preserve the prestige of this country, or even protect our safety, if we wait until that which now only threatens has become an accomplished fact?

It has been said that the Monroe doctrine is not international law, but it is certainly as much international law as is the balance-of-power doctrine of Europe, and Oppenheim, Lawrence, and others have insisted that this balance-of-power doctrine is international law.

Pradier Frodére says:

That the balance-of-power doctrine is intervention for self-preservation, and that the Monroe doctrine is of itself intervention, for to prevent other Governments from intervening is to intervene.

Edgington, in his discussion of the "Monroe doctrine," insists that the Monroe doctrine is merely the original foreign policy of this Government as promulgated by Washington, and only announced by Monroe in a more extended form.

The Monroe doctrine was and is no "mere abstraction," nor is it a nebulous theory. It was promulgated through no mere excess of enthusiasm for republican principles, nor antagonism to those of a monarchic state.

The fundamental principles of this doctrine are as old as society or as sovereignty.

The individual right of self-defense and self-preservation is a natural right as old as man. The national right of self-preservation and self-defense is as old as the family, and is a natural right of nations, so recognized by all authorities upon international law, public or private, and depends not at all for its full enjoyment and universal recognition upon precedents, customs, treaties, or decisions.

The right of the individual, because of the protection supposed to be extended to him by organized society, is to some extent a qualified right. The life of the individual is a limited span. The justification for the individual right of self-defense is usually the resistance to sudden and unexpected attack against which the more or less ponderous machinery of society could not protect him. The life of the nation is not measured by the arbitrary laws of nature, while it may extend into the future beyond any span of time which can be appreciated when compared with the human "ripe old age" of threescore and ten. The nation should not only be prepared for present defense but must look forward even into the centuries, and by constant care and precaution outline its policy for the future. Those charged with the destinies of the nation from time to time must, while bearing in mind history and precedent as prudent councillors, look forward with the prescience of the seers, realizing that the honor, welfare, and liberty of unborn generations are in their hands, together with the possible destiny of the nation itself.

The fiscal and other internal policies of nations may change from time to time, and while each stage may mark its effect upon some numbers of individuals, yet such policies may be changed or amended without causing appreciable effect upon either the present or the future of the nation. In dealing with other countries and with foreign affairs the life span of the nation itself may be cut short, or its history changed until the end of all things by an action or omission, or failure to act at a moment when such action or omission may seem of little or no importance.

The announcement made by Monroe was that of the doctrine of intervention by this country upon the ground of self-defense and future self-preservation.

Bonfils says:

By a strange abuse of words there is presented as announcing the theory of nonintervention the famous declaration of the President of the United States celebrated under the name of the Monroe doctrine. This declaration is contained in a message addressed to the Congress of the United States December 2, 1823, by President Monroe, on the occasion of the struggle of the Spanish colonies for independence. The message contained two declarations—the one without object to-day, which relates to the colonization of the American Continent; the other which refers to the attempts made to replace the Spanish colonies under the yoke of the mother country. Monroe has taken the opinion of Jefferson. Authors have interpreted the meaning of this message differently.

Halleck says (p. 92, Sir Sherston Baker's edition):

Briefly, the doctrine is not to interfere in the internal concerns of Europe, while it repudiates the interference of the allied powers with the American continents.

Mr. President, when the note of Adams and of Jefferson is read I do not believe any man will rise in the Senate and undertake to assert the doctrine of the Monroe doctrine is obsolete, and that it was announced simply for a purpose which has long since become unnecessary, or to meet which it is not now necessary, because there is no danger of Spain recovering her colonies by the assistance of the "Holy Alliance."

In our eyes, at the end of this message the United States poses as protector of the entire American Continent. The message admits the interference of the United States in all American affairs, north and south. Far from being an act of nonintervention, this declaration is itself a formal intervention. The President resorted to menace to prevent European States from mixing in the quarrel existing between Spain and her colonies.

The announcement of this doctrine was merely the declaration of the old self-preservation doctrine, directed specifically as a warning to European powers.

Acquisition of territory in this hemisphere or interference with the affairs of any country on this hemisphere by any country, European or Asiatic, which might be deemed to threaten our peace 100 years from now, would justify action and immediate action by this country as strongly as would threatened acquisition of territory upon this continent by any European country, and upon the same ground.

Disturbances between two or more countries, or internal troubles in one, upon this hemisphere which, in the judgment of those charged with the safety of this country and its institutions, might endanger our present or future safety or peace by tending to bring about complications between this and other countries or which in any other way might jeopardize our safety or our national interests would justify and demand action by this Government, and, failing peaceful means of avoiding any such danger, would justify the use of the necessary force to avoid and prevent it. The right of one country to intervene in the affairs of another, internal or external, when its own future may be threatened, is the natural right of national self-preservation, and is one of the natural principles of international law, of which the Monroe doctrine is a declaration.

Mr. President, I have here quotations from various authorities upon the Monroe doctrine, from the Canning letter down to the comments of the English press upon the Lodge resolution, which was passed by the Senate last year. I ask that they may be printed at this point as a portion of my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The initiatory steps which led up to the formulation of the so-called Monroe doctrine were taken by Great Britain.

On August 20, 1823, George Canning, foreign secretary of Great Britain, wrote to our minister at St. James, Richard Rush:

Is not the moment come when our Governments might understand each other as to the Spanish-American colonies? And if we can arrive at such an understanding, would it not be expedient for ourselves and beneficial for all the world that the principles of it should be clearly settled and plainly avowed?

For ourselves we have no disguise.

1. We conceive the recovery of the colonies by Spain to be hopeless.

2. We conceive the question of the recognition of them as independent States to be one of time and circumstances.

3. We are, however, by no means disposed to throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between them and the mother country by amicable negotiations.

4. We aim not at the possession of any portion of them ourselves.

5. We could not see any portion of them transferred to any other power with indifference.

If these opinions and feelings are, as I firmly believe them to be, common to your Government with ours, why should we hesitate mutually to confide them to each other and to declare them in the face of the world?

Rush communicated immediately with John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, and also directly with President Monroe. The latter wrote to Jefferson and asked the advice of the latter as well as that of Madison.

Jefferson's advice, at once given, was:

Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe.

Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs; America, North and South, has certain interests distinct from Europe and peculiarly its own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavors should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom.

One nation most of all could disturb us in this pursuit. She now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition we detach her from the bonds, bring her mighty weight into the scales of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke which might otherwise linger along in doubt and difficulty.

But the consequences in which the present proposition might engage us should be in its outcome not hers but ours. It is to maintain our principle, not to depart from it. But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion, that it will prevent instead of provoking war.

On December 2, 1823, Monroe, in his annual message to Congress, said:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. * * *

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the governments de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren if left to themselves would adopt it of their own accord.

It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them.

This message was sent in after a letter had been written by Secretary Adams on November 30 to Mr. Rush, in which the Secretary communicated to the minister the conclusion that under all the circumstances it was deemed best that this country should act alone and not by an alliance with England in the matter, and in which letter he used the following language:

As a member of the European community Great Britain has relations with all the other powers of Europe, which the United States have not, and with which it is their unaltered determination not to interfere. But American affairs, whether of the northern or of the southern continent, can henceforth not be excluded from the interference of the United States. All questions of policy relating to them have a bearing so direct upon the rights and interests of the United States themselves that they can not be left at the disposal of European powers animated and directed exclusively by European principles and interests.

Daniel Webster in 1843, with reference to Cuba, wrote as Secretary of State:

The Spanish Government has long been in possession of the policy and wishes of this Government in regard to Cuba, which have never changed, and has repeatedly been told that the United States would never permit the occupation of that island by British agents or forces upon any pretext whatever; and that in the event of any attempt to wrest it from her she might securely rely upon the whole naval and military resources of this country to aid her in preserving or recovering it.

Mr. Polk, in his message of December, 1845, says:

This principle will apply with greatly increased force should any European power attempt to establish any new colony in North America—

And—

In the existing circumstances of the world, the present is deemed a proper occasion to reiterate and reaffirm the principle avowed by Mr. Monroe and to state my cordial concurrence in its wisdom and sound policy. The reassertion of this principle, especially in reference to North America, is at this day but the promulgation of a policy which no European power should cherish the disposition to resist.

On September 6 Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, wrote Mr. Bigelow:

First. That the United States earnestly desire to cultivate sincere friendship with France.

Second. That this policy would be brought into imminent jeopardy unless France could deem it consistent with her interest and honor to desist from the prosecution of armed intervention in Mexico.

He closes this letter by saying that—

The United States will not recognize Maximilian, even if the French troops should be withdrawn from Mexico.

On April 4, 1864, the House of Congress passed the following resolution:

The Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to have the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of a deplorable event now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico, and they think it fit to declare that it does not accord with the policies of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

In April, 1866, Seward notified Napoleon to remove the French troops from Mexico, and later the Emperor of Austria, that no troops must be sent there. He reaffirmed in a letter to our envoy to Chile, then at war with Spain, the Monroe doctrine, saying that the United States would—

maintain and insist, with all the decision and energy which are compatible with our existing neutrality, that the republican system which is accepted by any one of those [Latin-American] States shall not be wantonly assailed, and that it shall not be subverted as an end of a lawful war by European powers.

Seward wrote in 1867, referring to the British North American act of the British Parliament confederating Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia:

British Columbia, by whomsoever possessed, must be governed in conformity with the interests of her people and of society upon the American Continent.

On December 5, 1870, with reference to Santo Domingo, President Grant said:

The acquisition of Santo Domingo is an adherence to the Monroe doctrine; it is a measure of self-protection; it is asserting our just claim to a controlling influence over the great commercial traffic soon to flow from west to east by way of the Isthmus of Darien.

And on May 31, of the same year, said:

The doctrine promulgated by President Monroe has been adhered to by all political parties, and I now deem it proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on this continent shall be regarded as subject of transfer to a European power.

In 1883 Secretary Frelinghuysen wrote to the American minister at Caracas, Venezuela, that—

In view of our interest in all that touches the independent life of the Republics of the American Continent, the United States could not be indifferent to anything that might impair their normal self-control—

And so forth.

Mr. Secretary Bayard wrote concerning the Haitian claims:

The United States has proclaimed herself the protector of the western world. * * * She can point with proud satisfaction to the fact that over and over again she has declared effectively that serious indeed

would be the consequences if European hostile foot should, without just cause, tread those States of the New World which have emancipated themselves from European control. * * * I feel bound to say that if we should sanction by reprisals in Haiti the ruthless invasion of her territory and insult to her sovereignty which the facts now before us disclose, if we approve by solemn executive action and congressional assent that invasion, it will be difficult for us hereafter to assert that in the New World, of those rights we are the peculiar guardians, those rights have never been invaded by ourselves.

On July 20, 1895, Secretary Olney wrote to Mr. Bayard:

Another development of the rule, though apparently not necessarily acquired by either its letter or spirit, is found in the objection to arbitration of South American controversies by a European power. American questions, it is said, are for American decision, and on that ground the United States went so far as to refuse to mediate in the war between Chile and Peru jointly with Great Britain and France.

And, in the same letter, said:

Those charged with the interests of the United States are now forced to determine exactly what those interests are and what course of action they require. It compels them to decide to what extent, if any, the United States may and should intervene in a controversy between and primarily concerning only Great Britain and Venezuela, and to decide how far it is bound to see that the integrity of Venezuelan territory is not impaired by the pretensions of its powerful antagonist.

When Mr. Olney's contentions were resisted by the British minister and Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Cleveland sent a message to Congress, in which, among other things, he said:

Without attempting extended argument in reply to these positions, it may not be amiss to suggest that the doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life and can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the Old World and a subject for our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and to their Government.

And, in his vigorous English, he further stated that—

There is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of self-respect and honor, beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness.

But the basis of the Monroe doctrine he further declared to be:

The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

President Roosevelt said in August, 1905:

When we announce a policy such as the Monroe doctrine we thereby commit ourselves to accepting the consequences of the policy, and these consequences from time to time alter.

Let us look for a moment at what the Monroe doctrine really is. It forbids the territorial encroachment of non-American powers on American soil. Its purpose is partly to secure this Nation against seeing great military powers obtain new footholds in the Western Hemisphere and partly to secure to our fellow Republics south of us the chance to develop along their own lines without being oppressed or conquered by non-American powers. As we have grown more and more powerful, our advocacy of this doctrine has been received with more and more respect; but what has tended most to give the doctrine standing among the nations is our growing willingness to show that we not only mean what we say, and are prepared to back it up, but that we mean to recognize our obligations to foreign peoples no less than to insist upon our rights.

And:

We can not permanently adhere to the Monroe doctrine unless we succeed in making it evident in the first place that we do not intend to treat it in any shape or way as an excuse for aggrandizement on our part at the expense of the Republics to the south of us; second, that we do not intend to permit it to be used by any of these Republics as a shield to protect that Republic from the consequences of its own misdeeds against foreign nations; third, that inasmuch as by this doctrine we prevent other nations from interfering on this side of the water, we shall ourselves in good faith try to help those of our sister Republics which need such help upward toward peace and order.

And:

Should any of our neighbors, no matters how turbulent, how disregardful of our rights, finally get into such a position that the utmost limits of our forbearance are reached, all the people south of us may rest assured that no action will ever be taken save what is absolutely demanded by our self-respect; that this action will not take the form of territorial aggrandizement on our part, and that it will only be taken at all with the most extreme reluctance and not without having exhausted every effort to avert it.

Again, referring to the debt of and conditions in Santo Domingo, Roosevelt used this language:

The Dominican debt owed to European creditors is about $22,000,000, and of this sum over $18,000,000 is more or less formally recognized. The representatives of European governments have several times approached the Secretary of State, setting forth the wrongs and intolerable delays to which they have been subjected at the hands of the successive Governments of Santo Domingo in the collection of their just claims, and intimating that unless the Dominican Government should receive some assistance from the United States in the way of regulating its finances the creditor governments in Europe would be forced to resort to more effective measures of compulsion to secure the satisfaction of their claims

If the United States Government declines to take action and other foreign governments resort to action to secure payment of their claims, the latter would be entitled, according to the decision of The Hague tribunal in the Venezuelan cases, to the preferential payment of their claims, and this would absorb all the Dominican revenues and would be a virtual sacrifice of American claims and interest in the island. If, moreover, any such action should be taken by them, the only method to enable them to secure the payment of their claims would be to take possession of the customhouses; and, considering the state of the Domingo finances, this would mean a definite and very possibly permanent occupation of Dominican territory, for no period could be set to the time which would be necessarily required for the payment of their obligations and unliquidated claims.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT delivered a speech in New York on December 22, 1904, in which he is quoted as saying:

All sovereignty in this world is held upon the condition of performing the duties of sovereignty. In the parliament of man the rights of the weakest State are recognised; the right of the sovereign ruler or the sovereign people to be protected against aggression is recognized and protected by the common influence of mankind.

But that right is held upon condition that the sovereign ruler of the sovereign people perform the duties of sovereignty; that the citizens of other powers are protected within the territory; that the rules of international law are observed; that national obligations are faithfully kept. And while we assert that we are entitled to say that no foreign power shall undertake to control an American Republic; that no foreign power shall take possession with or without the will of an American people of their territory, that assertion is justified only upon the same condition.

* * * * * * *

And if we are to maintain this doctrine, which is vital to our national life and safety, at the same time, when we say to the other powers of the world, "You shall not push your remedies for wrong against these Republics to the point of occupying their territory," we are bound to say that whenever the wrong can not be otherwise redressed we ourselves will see that it is redressed.

* * * * * * *

The most extreme declaration of the Monroe doctrine which I know of was made by Mr. Olney in his letter at the time of the Venezuela boundary question in 1895, when he said: "To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subject to which it lends its interposition." The tremendous scope and meaning of those words for the weak little Republics of Central and South America can not be exaggerated. "The United States is sovereign to-day upon this continent, and its fiat is law."

The Monroe doctrine has, of course, been the subject of discussion and controversy by writers and statesmen. It was discussed during the consideration of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in the Senate in 1853, those contending that it had answered its sole purpose and was an obsolete doctrine being led by Clayton, and those opposed to this idea by Douglas. This debate was referred to by Senator Sam Houston, of Texas, in the Senate in 1858. Houston had been a Member of Congress from Tennessee, when Monroe sent in his message, and the old statesman and warrior in the course of his speech, in closing upon this subject, said:

The Monroe doctrine has been repeatedly ridiculed of recent years, and by grave Senators, as the merest of abstractions—as unmeaning and valueless. But let me tell you, sir, that but for that doctrine Texas probably had never entered your confederacy. Canning might have yielded to Polignac for the consolidation of a monarchical or aristocratical form of government of the ci-devant colonies or have included it as one of those colonies, had it not been for the seasonable declaration of that doctrine, and the thrill of joyous delight with which it was hailed by the votaries of liberty everywhere. On this account alone I may be pardoned for fancying that it is deserving of a worthier designation, even by the most violent tongue, than an abstraction.

The English press commented upon the Lodge resolution passed by this Senate in 1912, the Spectator saying:

It is well within the purpose, if not within the actual words, of the original Monroe declaration. Foreign corporations and foreign governments are not identical things, but in certain circumstances the one may easily be turned to the use of the other.

From the point of view of Great Britain this action of the Senate need cause no uneasiness. With the principle of the Monroe doctrine we are familiar, and Mr. LODGE'S resolution does not really go beyond it. It is hardly possible that it should injure anyone in this country, and it certainly serves as a protection against a real danger.

While the Times stated:

Whether this (resolution) is to be described as an extension of the Monroe doctrine or as an application of the wider principle that each State may take what measures it deems essential for its safety is a question of words.

The new policy is not unexpected. It has been repeatedly pointed out in the Times that with the construction of the Panama Canal there was likely to be a reconsideration and extension of the Monroe doctrine. Admiral Mahan has indicated the strong objections to any power having a base within striking distance of the isthmus; and in commenting upon Mr. Knox's journey to Panama last February and the closer relations which must be formed between the United States and Central America, our Washington correspondent remarked: "It is obvious, even apart from the canal, Central America, and possibly Mexico, must now be the primary concern of those who are called upon to interpret and enforce the policy formuinted by President Monroe." In fact, each generation has its own version of that doctrine.

The Monroe doctrine has been reaffirmed repeatedly by both the great political parties in this country and neither has dared to repudiate it.

Monroe doctrine—Republican platform, 1888:

The conduct of foreign affairs by the present administration has been distinguished by its inefficiency and its cowardice. Having withdrawn from the Senate all pending treaties effected by Republican administrations for the removal of foreign burdens and restrictions upon our commerce and for its extension into better markets, it has neither effected nor proposed any others in their stead. Professing adherence to the Monroe doctrine, it has seen, with idle complacency, the extension of foreign influence in Central America and of foreign trade everywhere among our neighbors. It has refused to charter, sanction, or encourage

any American organization for constructing the Nicaragua Canal, a work of vital importance to the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine and of our national influence in Central and South America and necessary for the development of trade with our Pacific territory, with South America, and with the islands and farther coasts of the Pacific Ocean.

Republican platform, 1892:

We reaffirm our approval of the Monroe doctrine and believe in the achievement of the manifest destiny of the Republic in its broadest sense.

The Democratic platform of 1856 declared:

That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine. Their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction; they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

The Republican platform of 1864, at Baltimore, said:

That we approve the position taken by the Government that the people of the United States can never regard with indifference the attempt of any European power to overthrow by force or to supplant by fraud the institutions of any republican government on the Western Continent, and that they will view with extreme jealousy, as menacing to the peace and independence of their own country, the efforts of any such power to obtain new footholds for monarchical governments, sustained by foreign military force, in near proximity to the United States.

In 1896 the Republican platform contained the following plank:

We reassert the Monroe doctrine in its full extent, and we reaffirm the right of the United States to give the doctrine effect by responding to the appeal of any American States for friendly intervention, in case of European encroachment. We have not interfered and shall not interfere with the existing possessions of any European power in this hemisphere, but these possessions must not on any pretext be extended. We hopefully look forward to the eventual withdrawal of the European powers from this hemisphere and to the ultimate union of all the English-speaking part of the continent by the free consent of its inhabitants.

And the Democratic platform of this same year indorsed the Cleveland Venezuelan message of December, 1895, as follows:

The Monroe doctrine, as originally declared and interpreted by succeeding Presidents, is a permanent part of the foreign policy of the United States, and must at all times be maintained.

In 1900 the Republican platform said:

We assert our steadfast adherence to the policy announced in the Monroe doctrine.

While the Democratic platform followed with:

The declaration in the Republican platform adopted at the Philadelphia convention held in June, 1900, that the Republican Party steadfastly adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe doctrine, is manifestly insincere and deceptive. This profession is contradicted by the avowed policy of that party in opposition to the spirit of the Monroe doctrine to acquire and hold sovereignty over large areas of territory and large numbers of people in the Eastern Hemisphere.

We insist on the strict maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in all its integrity, both in letter and spirit, as necessary to prevent the extension of European authority on this continent and as essential to our supremacy in American affairs. At the same time we declare that no American people shall ever be held by force in unwilling subjection to European authority.

In 1904 the Democratic platform declared, shortly, that—

We favor the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in all its integrity.

The Republican platform language of the same year was:

Our foreign policy under his administration has not only been able, vigorous, and dignified, but to the highest degree successful. The complicated questions which arose in Venezuela were settled in such a way by President Roosevelt that the Monroe doctrine was signally vindicated and the cause of peace and arbitration greatly advanced.

* * * * * * *

A Navy powerful enough to defend the United States against any attack, to uphold the Monroe doctrine, and watch over our commerce is essential to the safety and the welfare of the American people. To maintain such a Navy is the fixed policy of the Republican Party.

Mr. FALL. I have for two years been calling the attention of Senators to Mexican affairs, with the hope that others might see, as I saw, the difference so well explained by John Bassett Moore, between interposition, or nonpolitical intervention, upon the one hand, and political intervention in the domestic affairs of Mexico upon the other.

The first, a duty due to our citizens for their protection and the protection of their property, and when necessary, because of the failure of the country in which they are residing to provide protection, in the eyes of all nations a national right, not justifying a declaration of war upon the part of Mexico, and a duty and right recognized and solemnly agreed to by Mexico in 1859, as I have shown.

But, Mr. President, while declining thus to interpose or intervene, the President has seen proper by his action in dispatching John Lind to Mexico, with the instructions, to which he referred in his message to this body on August 27, 1913, and by his subsequent actions, to intervene in the domestic affairs of that Republic.

Such intervention—"political" intervention—while often justifiable under the rules of international law, is of much graver consequence than interposition, and is always justification for a declaration of war by the nation with whose domestic affairs, form, or personnel of government the intervening nation interferes.

Such intervention, however, since March 4, 1913, has been an accomplished fact, and yet during the last 12 months we have fiddled while Mexico burned. We have seen more of our citizens murdered and outraged and hundreds of millions of dollars more of their property destroyed. We have declared that no government exists in Mexico, and have refused to bring to account for outrages upon our citizens and those of other countries those whom we should treat as de facto responsible.

We owe a duty to Spain, whose citizens have been murdered and driven like dogs from Mexico, where they had a right to be.

We owe a duty to England, to France, to Germany, whose citizens Pancho Villa has openly threatened to deal with as he has dealt with the Spanish.

We owe a duty to China.

The so-called constitutionalists whom we so much admire now, Mr. President, under their same hero when they took Torreon, which is now being threatened by his successor, Villa, dragged through the streets 300 poor, pitiful, defenseless Chinese and cut their throats—men, women, and children. We owe a duty to the citizens of Germany. When the German press gives an utterance with reference to German policy the world knows that that utterance is inspired, and when the German official press says that if German citizens are murdered Germany will not acquiesce as did Great Britain in the course to be followed by this country, then I say to you, Senators, there is imminent and threatened danger of a conflict between this country and one with which we always have been and always should remain at peace.

The same thing could equally well be said with reference to our policy to the citizens of all nations.

We owe the duty to ourselves to avoid the imminent danger of conflict with some other country growing out of the conditions in Mexico and our policy in dealing with that country.

We owe a duty to the Mexican people themselves; and, sir, we owe a duty to humanity which we can not escape.

I realize, Mr. President, and no one more fully, the consequences which might ensue from taking the necessary steps to discharge the duties to which I have referred. To defer action is to aggravate the conditions and invite more serious consequences.

With the solemn declaration that we do not war upon the Mexican nation nor people; that it is not our purpose to acquire territory, upset their laws nor overturn their constitution, and an invitation to the masses of the Mexican people to cooperate with us, we should immediately direct the use of the land and naval forces of this Government for the protection of our citizens and other foreigners in Mexico wherever found, and lend their assistance to the restoration of order and the maintenance of peace in that unhappy country, and the placing of the administrative functions in the hands of capable and patriotic citizens of Mexico, to be left with them to the end that under their own laws and customs, without interference from ourselves or others, elections may be held and those elected allowed to administer their own Government.

I might cite authority after authority and pile precedent upon precedent as justification under international law for such action, Mr. President, but I will only read from the message of the martyred McKinley, with the suggestion that we insert the name "Mexico" in lieu of that of Cuba and Spain:

* * * It is not to be forgotten that during the last few months the relation of the United States has virtually been one of friendly intervention in many ways, each not of itself conclusive, but all tending to the exertion of a potential influence toward an ultimate pacific result, just and honorable to all interests concerned. The spirit of all our acts hitherto has been an earnest, unselfish desire for peace and prosperity in Cuba, untarnished by differences between us and Spain, and unstained by the blood of American citizens.

The forcible intervention of the United States as a neutral to stop the war, according to the large dictates of humanity and following many historical precedents where neighboring States have interfered to check the hopeless sacrifices of life by internecine conflicts beyond their borders, is justifiable on rational grounds. It involves, however, hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement.

The grounds for such intervention may be briefly summarized as follows:

First. In the cause of humanity and to put an end to the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation, and horrible miseries now existing there, and which the parties to the conflict are either unable or unwilling to stop or mitigate. It is no answer to say this is all in another country, belonging to another nation, and is therefore none of our business. It is specially our duty, for it is right at our door.

Second. We owe it to our citizens in Cuba to afford them that protection and indemnity for life and property which no Government there can or will afford, and to that end to terminate the conditions that deprive them of legal protection.

Third. The right to intervene may be justified by the very serious injury to the commerce, trade, and business of our people, and by the wanton destruction of property and devastation of the island.

Fourth. And which is of the utmost importance, the present condition of affairs in Cuba is a constant menace to our peace—

Remember the declaration of the President with reference to the difficulties in foreign affairs—

a constant menace to our peace, and entails upon this Government an enormous expense.

For three years we have maintained almost the entire military force of this Nation on the border.

With such a conflict waged for years in an island so near us, and with which our people have such trade and business relations, when the lives and liberty of our citizens are in constant danger and their property destroyed and themselves ruined, * * * all these and others that I need not mention, with the resulting strained relations, are a constant menace to our peace, and compel up to keep on a semiwar footing with a nation with which we are at peace.

Mr. President, I have delivered my message poorly, but under a sense of duty, under a high sense of responsibility. I have believed that the time had arrived when it was necessary that this matter should be discussed openly. I am one of those who believe that the American people can be left to handle any critical condition or any circumstance arising, no matter of what character, no matter what the circumstances may be, provided they are allowed to be informed of the subject.

In matters of this kind, when the public press is full of the outrages committed on Americans and when it is from day to day detailing the horrible conditions existing in the Republic of Mexico, I am not one of those who believe that it can be incompatible with the public interest for the list of Americans who have been injured in Mexico to be sent here to the Senate, that appropriate action may be taken if we deem such action necessary. I am not one of those who believe, Mr. President, that the Constitution of the United States should be ignored and that one man should arrogate to himself legislative and executive power.

During the delivery of Mr. FALL's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not wish to consent to that except on the understanding that the unfinished business will not lose its place upon the calendar, but will be proceeded with as soon as the Senator from New Mexico finishes.

Mr. LODGE. When it is temporarily laid aside it retains its place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will not lose its place.

Mr. SWANSON. From the Committee on Education and Labor I wish to submit a report.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to state that I desire to have my notice regarding the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill hold its place on the calendar and apply to to-morrow. It is a very important measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be the order after 2 o'clock. It is only temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to my colleague on the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, who has charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, that he give notice that upon the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow he will ask for the consideration of that measure.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Very well; I give that notice now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Out of order I desire to submit some petitions.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New Jersey is out of order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I object to the introduction of any routine business.

Mr. LODGE. Under the rule it can not be received.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The rule distinctly provides that the Senator who has the floor may not yield for such a purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No one has the floor.

Mr. FALL. I thought I had been recognized.

Mr. LODGE. The unfinished business was laid aside that the Senator from New Mexico might conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not recognized anyone since the unfinished business was laid before the Senate and was temporarily laid aside.

Mr. FALL. I have asked for recognition several times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will give recognition to the Senator as soon as the report submitted by the Senator from Virginia is received.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I make the point of order that the report presented by the Senator from Virginia is out of order and can not be received under the rule of the Senate. The rule distinctly provides that the Senator having the floor may not yield for the purpose of the reception of a report or the introduction of a bill or joint resolution, and that it is the duty of the Chair to enforce the rule without the point being raised; but I do raise the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the rights of the Senator from New Mexico were concluded at 2 o'clock. He can only proceed on the unfinished business being laid aside, and only then upon the recognition of the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; and I make the question of order that the unfinished business has been laid aside, and therefore reports are now out of order and can only be submitted by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true. If there is any objection, the report can not be received.

Mr. LODGE. I make objection.

[The routine business referred to was subsequently submitted, and it appears under appropriate heading.]

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill to-morrow morning after the close of the morning business.

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

Mr. McCUMBER. I object to any unanimous consent of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the request. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the District of Columbia appropriation bill be taken up to-morrow morning immediately upon the close of the morning business. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. FALL's speech,

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, the Senator who just resumed his seat [Mr. FALL] has delivered what is evidently a long-considered and carefully prepared speech on the situation in Mexico and the relations of the United States to that situation. In this speech he has collated and recited a series of cases of violence and alleged violence suffered by citizens of the United States, citizens of Mexico, and subjects of other countries in the Republic south of us. No one will expect me to follow him in the details of these cases, as no one could foresee what cases occurring or rumored as occurring through over three years of revolution he would select for the purposes for which he has addressed the Senate.

In the course of his remarks the Senator informed the Senate of his 30 years' acquaintance and experience with Mexico and his former and present interests in Mexico, and his consequent qualifications to speak with knowledge of the real situation in that country. The Senator also assures the Senate that he is nonpartisan on this subject. In this I readily assent to his contention. He has drawn an indiscriminate indictment of both the administrations of President Taft and President Wilson on the subject of our relations with Mexico. To reinforce this indictment he invokes the series of cases which he has recited, the full accuracy of which recital and the fairness of his comments on which I deny.

But on his own premises, what is his purpose? If I recall his statements correctly, he himself says that the cases he recited have heretofore been brought to the attention of the public through the press of the country. Had he wished to impress his collated information on the special attention of the Senate, an executive session has been available to him at any time. It is manifest that he preferred a renewed publicity in the form he has chosen to present the case.

On the case as he has submitted it, what is his solution of the problem? Does he regard Huerta as a suitable person to compose conditions and reestablish order? Manifestly not. He describes Huerta as a man unworthy of power and incapable of handling the question. Would he turn to Carranza to compose the difficulties confronting Mexico? Manifestly not. Would he ignore Carranza and turn to Villa? Manifestly not. Villa is his pet aversion. Has he some figure in the background who he believes that with a friendly attitude on the part of the United States could compose the contending factions and bring order out of chaos? If so, he has not suggested any such possibility in his address to-day.

Then to what remedy does he remit the country? He presents only one. That is, intervention. Of what kind of intervention and what his proposed intervention means, I may speak later. But here I must be permitted to repudiate his contention of indifference on the part of the State Department to the rights

and interests of our citizens in Mexico. The difficulties confronting the department are manifest to all who reflect on the situation in that country. The topography of much of the country is rough. The revolution extends over a wide area of territory. The de facto governments in the region of the struggle change with the shifting fortunes of the contending forces. The task of extending aid and securing redress, and often even of ascertaining the facts, is a difficult one. The truth is bad enough. But it must be borne in mind that it is a part of the system of warfare in that country to send broadcast the most lurid fabrications or gross exaggerations as to atrocities committed, for the purpose of inflaming the public mind against the opposite partisans who are charged with the crimes. Despite the perplexities and embarrassments inseparable from such a situation, the department is aiding our citizens in every way within its means and power. It is fixing responsibility for loss of life or property suffered by them. When, because of present local conditions, present punishment or reparation is impossible it is gathering the facts and making up the record for the day of settlement.

As illustrating the activity of the department, I instance the case of Matthew Gourd. This was not a case of a powerful corporation about which the Senator was pleased to speak. It was not the case of some especially notable and influential individual. The report came to the department that on the night of July 26, 1913, a band of marauders entered on the premises of Matthew Gourd, an American citizen and farmer, residing with his family near Coco, in the State of San Luis Potosi; and that the trespassers tied Mr. Gourd to a tree, entered his household, and committed or attempted to commit violence on his daughter and his niece. The department immediately instructed our chargé d'affaires at Mexico City to investigate the case, and if the facts should be found as reported, to demand apprehension and punishment of the culprits. The local authorities in San Luis Potosi promptly pronounced the report a fabrication, and denied that anything of the kind had occurred. The Secretary of State was unwilling to accept the disclaimer, and after further exchange of telegrams with our chargé d'affaires, and under date of August 5, 1913, instructed him as follows:

> You are instructed to immediately and most urgently represent that this Government demands that the perpetrators of the dastardly crime on American women in Coco be at once apprehended and adequately punished. You are instructed to telegraph the result of your representations, keeping the matter before the authorities until the necessary action is taken. The victims of the attack have been brought from Coco to Tampico on the way to the United States.
>
> (Signed) BRYAN.

The literature in this case is voluminous. What I have here [exhibiting a bundle of papers] is scarce half of it. The presentation of the evidence of what has been done in all the cases would require the production in the Senate of tomes of documents. Like most others, the Gourd case presented many and serious difficulties. From a natural sense of delicacy, the women involved had been reticent and reluctant to testify. For like reasons the father was reluctant to testify. Despite the inevitable difficulties and because of the energy, resolution, and persistence of the State Department in following up the case, four of the culprits were apprehended, tried, convicted, and executed. Yet the report was circulated in the United States that this case was not even investigated.

As illustrating the exaggerations to which conditions in Mexico give rise, I instance the case of Durango. On the night of June 17, 1913, a force of 4,000 revolutionists assaulted the city of Durango and on the following day captured the city. On June 30 the then ambassador from the United States wired the State Department from the City of Mexico that personal letters received in that city from Durango stated that over 50 women of the best families had committed suicide after having been ravished. The same report was carried in a Washington paper of July 2, except that the number of suicides was fixed at 40 instead of 50. The report struck a shiver of horror through the minds of all who read it. In reply to the State Department, the American consul, who had been instructed to investigate and report, said that "except in a few isolated cases, nothing of the sort occurred," and that "life and honor were respected much better than anticipated." Not one American woman was molested. The one case I have cited is as typical of the activity and persistence of the department in enforcing redress for wrongs suffered by American citizens in Mexico as the other is of exaggerated reports going to the world from that country.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator is not in advance of me in his appreciation of the right of an American citizen to security. The value of his citizenship involves the sense of security it brings. This freely conceded, it must be remembered that revolution is not a novel thing in Mexico. From the first day of her independence to the accession of Diaz to the presidency her history was one of a long series of revolutions. The country always has been, and still is, politically volcanic. Under Diaz the country presented a state of smoldering insurrection. It was into a country with this background of revolution marking its history that our citizens entered and made their investments or sought employment. The history of the country was notice to all of the insecurity to life and property as compared with conditions within our own borders. This does not mean that the power of our Government should not accompany the citizen to a foreign land, but it does mean that the citizen should beware when he selects an environment where in a crisis the utmost exertion of the power of his Government may be unavailing to secure him against danger.

At the end of the year 1910, when the revolt against the Diaz government commenced, it was estimated there were 60,000 citizens of the United States in Mexico. The majority of these citizens lived far from our southern border, and many at long distances from the Mexican seaport towns. The aims of that and subsequent revolutions were purely domestic in character. The animus back of them was not against the United States nor against citizens of the United States in Mexico. And, however embittered the strife among the factions, all factions were a unit against intervention by a foreign power. The Senator has himself portrayed, and has read into the RECORD from others, the ferocities with which the native Mexicans conduct war. Had we intervened under these circumstances, who could have answered for the lives of these 60,000 men, women, and children scattered through Mexico between the time of our forces crossing the border and their arrival at the points of rescue?

President Taft did advise our citizens to withdraw from the theater of war. President Wilson, on mature consideration, approved the policy of his predecessor, gave like advice, instructing our consular agents to extend all possible assistance and to take charge of abandoned property. At the same time the President warned all those in authority in Mexico that they would be held to strict accountability for wrongs committed against American citizens in that country; and, amid all the vexations attending the situation since, he has steadily pursued a policy wise in itself and justified by the highest considerations of humanity.

Moreover, Mr. President, he who points to the record of violence in recent years in Mexico should not forget that this condition is not confined exclusively to times of war. In the periods of comparative tranquillity under Diaz every year brought its cases of violence to American life and property in Mexico to the attention of our State Department. In some cases the violence arose in a common brawl; in others in a general riot; in others it was assault from ambush by bandits; in others murder in cold blood. With such records in times of peace it is not strange that cases of violence should occur amid the turbulence of war. The situation is deplorable enough at best, but it should be noted that in exhausting the subject the Senator covered all the years of the war and that the vast majority of the cases occurred in the earlier period of the war. This may be claimed to be due to the fact that many of our citizens withdrew from Mexico, but this claim is a tribute to the wisdom that advised this course.

Mr. President, it has been illustrated to-day how easy is the task of attacking any given policy of government. They who attack are free to make their assault from any and all angles. They are free to project their criticism and censure from every sign in the zodiac and to give any complexion to a transaction that suits their purpose or their fancy.

The Senator referred to and commented on the cases of Salazar and Castillo. He called these men our "guests," and appeared to seek to leave the impression on the Senate that they are the cherished guests of the United States and the favored subjects of the courtesies, hospitalities, and amenities of the social life of the country. These men are restrained of their liberty at Fort Bliss. Of this conduct he doubts the constitutionality. What would he do with them? They are Mexican citizens. Their crimes were committed on Mexican soil. Would he remit them to the justice of any government in Mexico that he has described? One of them has been indicted in the United States district court in Texas for an inferior offense committed on this side of the line. He gave bond for $5,000. Would the Senator have him released from Fort Bliss, left free to return into Mexico, forfeit his bond, and resume his career of crime?

Then comes the cases of Abram Gonzales and Louis Terrazas. Gonzales was a citizen of Mexico. He was a former governor of the State of Chihuahua. There is no pretense that he was a citizen of the United States, or that he met his fate on American soil. In fact, the most harrowing details of the Senator's speech relate to atrocities committed by Mexicans

on Mexicans in Mexican territory. In December last the Senator wired the State Department from Three Rivers, Mexico, urging action in behalf of Louis Terrazas, the son of Gen. Terrazas, stating that Louis Terrazas was held for ransom by Villa and threatened with death in default of payment of the demanded ransom. Louis Terrazas is about 50 years of age. Gen. Terrazas, like his son Louis, is a Mexican citizen and always has been. Gen. Terrazas is the reputed owner of more than half the territory of the State of Chihuahua. Though neither the father nor the son is a citizen of the United States, the State Department is exerting its influence against violence to the son.

Finally, the Senator makes the climax of his recital the case of Benton, and suggests that only the death of a British subject aroused the State Department into activity. I am not disposed to retort in kind. But it will be recalled that the other morning the Senator presented to the Senate and had read into the RECORD a number of telegrams from El Paso, Tex., and a series of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in that city denunciatory of the death of Benton and demanding action by the Federal Government. It is true that Benton was a British subject. But which among any of the cases presented by the Senator this afternoon of the deaths of American citizens, whether at El Paso or elsewhere, produced a mass meeting, denunciatory resolutions, and a demand for action from the city of El Paso? Was the deplorable death of Benton only the pretext for this movement at El Paso? Were the unfortunate exigencies of the Terrazas family the real cause and inspiration of the El Paso propaganda?

Now, I come, Mr. President, to the proposition of the Senator for which all his recital of wrongs and alleged wrongs is the background. His proposal is intervention. What kind? The contending forces in Mexico have not united in any suggestion of a friendly intervention to compose the distractions and restore peace in that country. No one of the organized and armed parties to the conflict has invited intervention. All parties and factions have been and are opposed to intervention from any foreign quarter. Under these circumstances nothing but armed intervention is possible, and this means war. Does this country shrink from a necessary or just war? No. But for all the purposes for which the Senator proposes intervention, intervention is the long way, the dreary way, the last way. There are still American citizens in that country. These would prove the natural and nearest sacrifices to blind rage. The property interests of our citizens would become the special subjects of spoliation. Even when our forces should reach the Mexican Capital the same problems would confront us then that confront us now, except that they would be more aggravated and difficult of permanent solution. To produce and maintain order would mean to police substantially the whole country, and this for an indefinite period of time. Should circumstances require even this, we are equal to the sacrifice; but I repeat that intervention should not be thought of until all other resources of policy have been exhausted.

The demand for intervention presents no persuasive appeal to the courage and valor of the people of the United States. No theme could appeal less to these qualities. Is there a thoughtful citizen inside or outside of this Chamber who on reflection would not scorn to make an armed invasion of divided, distracted, mangled, and bleeding Mexico a test of the courage of our citizens or the valor of our soldiers?

Reference has been made to the watching and waiting policy. This is not a novel policy in the history of this country. It was the policy observed toward all the peoples of South America in their struggles for independence. It has been the policy observed toward them in their revolutions since. Because of our close neighborship with Mexico there are exceptional and aggravating circumstances in the situation. But while these circumstances increase the difficulties they do not relieve us from resolute observance of a rule of action conceived in wisdom and vindicated by experience, and which makes affirmative interference a last resort. It is worth while to try out the effect of a firm pressure of peaceful agencies before appealing to those which it is never too late to employ.

The Senator insists that the President has not sufficiently taken the Senate into his confidence and laid before us detailed information on our foreign relations. I have seen no disposition to withhold any matter from the Senate or the Congress which can be submitted compatibly with the public interests. But if I may digress, speaking only for myself, I must be permitted to say that the treatment of the subject of our foreign relations is not without difficulties. It will be recalled that some weeks ago the President invited all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations into conference at the White House. There the President took the committee into his confidence in the largest degree, giving them a full statement of the facts in relation to our foreign affairs, and especially with reference to the situation in Mexico. He stated clearly what in his judgment conditions required to be done and asked the judgment, confidence, counsel, and cooperation of the committee in handling the several problems. For reasons of the highest public importance it was understood and expressly agreed that the proceedings of the conference were to be regarded as strictly executive and confidential in character. Yet on the following morning a detailed account of the proceedings appeared in the press. The newspapers were not to blame. It is their business to print the news.

Of all measures, treaties are regarded as essentially the proper subjects of consideration in executive sessions. Not long since a series of treaties was before the Senate on the treaty calendar and under consideration in executive session. On the morning following a certain session the press published almost verbatim portions of the text of a number of the speeches made, and to others which were not quoted gave a complexion not at all warranted by the text. A few days ago a request came to me as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations from a Senator that two distinguished Mexican citizens might be heard before the committee on the situation in Mexico. The request was promptly granted and the gentlemen appeared before the committee. It was expressly agreed at the meeting that the hearing should be regarded as executive. The men who appeared before the committee were putting to the hazard the lives of their families in Mexico should their errand become known in that country. Every consideration of prudence and humanity suggested that publicity be avoided. Yet an elaborate report of the hearing with the names of those who addressed the committee appeared in the newspapers the following day. I mention these instances as showing that the conduct of our foreign relations is not without embarrassments, aside from any difficulties that may attach to the substantive questions involved in these relations.

But to return, Mr. President, I note with interest that the Senator produces an unratified treaty of the year 1859, negotiated by the diplomatic departments of the United States and Mexico, which contained a clause authorizing our Government, under certain conditions, to intervene in Mexico. He invokes this clause in support of his project of intervention. The Senator's argument proves too much to serve his cause. The question of making intervention in the affairs of Mexico the settled policy of this Government was then squarely presented to the Senate. The Senate declined to ratify the treaty, declined to commit the country to the burdensome policy, declined to reduce the sovereignty of the Mexican Government or relieve Mexico from the duties and responsibilities that go with sovereign power. If the history of that treaty means anything, it admonishes against intervention rather than invites it.

Nor is the Senator more fortunate when he cites the precedent of 1898. In that case the mortality of American citizens in a single night was more than twice that reported from Mexico in three years. It is known with what reluctance even then action was taken by those who were immediately charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. The consequences entailed on the country are sufficient to give thoughtful men pause before committing the Nation to the muster, the march, the camp, and the battle field. I repeat that it is not a question of courage. It is a question of steadily exerting the forces of peace to permanently compose a vexed situation to both the credit of our people at home and the security of our citizens and their interests in Mexico, rather than to choose the long way, wherein, after the certain success of our arms should be attained, the real and larger problem would confront us. The Senator points out that by proper public assurances to the Mexican people, how easy, simple, and effective would be the task of going in and coming out, but before that he gave a character to the Mexican people which utterly nullifies his program of simplicity and effectiveness.

On the President rests primarily the responsibility for our foreign relations. The difficult problems that confront him came as an inheritance. Before him lies the whole circle of our foreign relations and the bearing of each problem in them on other problems in them. It is not difficult to foresee that on the comprehension, discernment, delicacy, tact, and far vision with which the Mexican question is handled may depend for long in the future the temper of our foreign relations with all the other Republics south of us.

Mr. President, when I reflect on our own history as a people, I make some allowance for revolutions. Whatever of capacity for self-restraint, which is capacity for self-government, we boast is not the product of a day nor of a century. Its heraldry runs in unbroken strain through a thousand years. It goes back into the forests of Germany. It was not created by constitu-

tions and statutes. It is an intellectual and moral enfranchisement. The men who wrung the Magna Charta from the unwilling hand of King John did not do so to be freemen, but because they were freemen. The men who gave to the world our own Declaration of Independence did not do so to be free, but because they were free. Magna chartas and constitutions are created by freemen as barriers and breakwaters against power, and bonds to future security. It was a cherished doctrine of the founders of this Republic that revolution is a natural right. Our Republic is based on a revolution. Not long after the Republic entered on its career under the Federal Constitution an armed insurrection took place in one of the States of the Union.

The enforcement of our first internal-revenue laws was resisted by armed force. We had our four years of continuous war between the States of the Union and years more of exploitation of a portion of the States in which property interests of aliens were sacrificed. Even in times of general peace and with all the years of practiced self-restraint back of us the lives of certain classes of aliens have been destroyed by organized violence, for which our Government was constrained to respond in damages.

The history of the Mexican people is quite unlike our own. They have not had the advantages we enjoy. Their character, their traditions, their temper, their capacities for self-restraint are different from our own. The vast majority of those people are descendants from the aborigines of that country. But our own way to civil liberty and order was not a path of roses. Whatever of pledges to order we have were fashioned in storm, in struggle, in tribulation, in blood. In the wish that present conditions in Mexico were otherwise I freely join. The notion that our Government is neglecting anything that would make for the honor of our country or the security of our citizens in Mexico I repel.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, for three days I have been trying to get consideration of Senate resolution No. 42, the anti-smoking resolution; but things have changed about so and shaped themselves in such a manner that I do not know whether I ought to try to force it on this evening or not. I believe, however, I ask for its consideration now.

I move that Senate resolution 42 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be laid before the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 42), as follows:

*Resolved*, That Rule XXXIV be amended as follows:

Strike out the period at the end of the first clause and insert a semicolon, and then add the following: "no smoking shall be permitted at any time on the floor of the Senate, or lighted cigars be brought into the Chamber."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the Senator to move to take up this resolution. Would that set aside and displace the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take up the resolution.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not ask unanimous consent; I moved to take it up.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution, I presume he will secure it, which would be very much better than to move to take it up.

Mr. TILLMAN. I give notice that if consent is not given I shall then move to take it up. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to explain my reasons for pressing this resolution changing the rules. Nineteen years' service in the Senate has taught me to believe that two of its most distinguishing characteristics are courtesy and an insistent demand that each Senator shall have as much consideration and enjoy as many rights as any other Senator.

A majority of the Senators—a large majority, at that—are smokers; and, unfortunately, a pernicious habit has so mastered them that they are nervous and miserable when they do not get the nicotine poison which soothes their nerves. Consequently, as soon as the doors are closed for executive session they light their cigars and puff away, and the Chamber soon has the appearance of a beer garden. When the executive session is not on they have to go to the cloak rooms to smoke.

I did not mind tobacco smoke formerly, although I have never been a smoker myself; but since I was paralyzed four years ago the smell of tobacco smoke nauseates me and makes me sick. Consequently I do not remain in the Senate during executive sessions any more than I can possibly help, although I have almost always responded to my name on roll calls on any important matter, whether in executive session or not.

The point I desire to make is this: Senators who enjoy smoking and feel obliged to do it can retire to the cloakrooms to indulge in it; but I have to leave the Chamber, and that infringes on my rights as a Senator and compels me to seek relief.

It may be said, and has been said by some of my friends here who will vote against this change in the rules, that when they observe me in the Chamber they do not smoke; and I am very grateful for the consideration of those men who watch and cease smoking while I am present. I have noticed frequently, however, that men who have told me of their desire to protect me in my weakness—and I know they are sincere—forget it and smoke right along. Then, too, I have found my Democratic colleagues so intent on gratifying their feverish desire to smoke that they feel compelled to light cigars in the caucus—so much so that I have almost had to leave the caucus or sit by an open window, for my very life depends upon a full supply of pure air. So I am beset with the danger of being driven out of the party and of the Senate itself, and I do not know where to turn.

Tobacco, I have been told by physicians, is a narcotic or sedative, while whisky is a stimulant, as everyone knows. Many men use both, and are constantly on the journey from the garret to the cellar and back, being whipsawed and their nerves racked by the constant conflict going on in their systems while the stimulant and the sedative contend for mastery. It is the abuse, not the use, of whisky and tobacco that is so dangerous to health, for in moderation they are both harmless, I think.

When I first offered this resolution I wrote letters to every Senator, asking an expression of opinion and urging the adoption of this rule. I have replies from nearly all of them, but many made verbal answers on the floor of the Senate itself. I shall read extracts from several, but there are two typical ones which I shall read in full.

Considering that you are entitled to be in the Senate Chamber at all times, and that you wish and that your State is entitled to have the benefit of your services on the floor at all times that may be necessary, I will vote with you to have the rule passed prohibiting smoking at any time.

* * * * * * *

I sympathize with you in the matter, but I should feel a delicacy in urging prohibition against the wishes of a majority of the Senators. I do not, as you know, smoke at all.

* * * * * * *

While it is true that the smoking of tobacco is a very great pleasure and comfort, to my mind that affords no reason why an old Senator, and a sick one at that, should be driven from the executive sessions by tobacco smoke. I expect to vote for your resolution when the same comes up.

* * * * * * *

Although I am a confirmed smoker of many years' standing, I will, out of the respect and consideration which I have for you, do anything in my power to aid you in your effort in this regard.

I will let the Secretary read two letters that I have here, if you please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, May 12, 1913.*

Hon. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TILLMAN: I think the informality and freedom with which business is conducted in the executive sessions of the Senate has a very valuable influence in preventing friction and unnecessary delay, and I am inclined to think that that informality is a good deal aided by the fact that the Members are at liberty to smoke. That seems to be rather a visible evidence that the proceeding is informal and friendly.

I am, however, quite willing, so far as I am concerned, to forego the privilege if it inconveniences you. I should think that that might be accomplished by a general understanding as to the conduct to be observed when you are present without making a new rule.

Very sincerely, yours,

ELIHU ROOT.

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CUBAN RELATIONS,
*Washington, D. C., May 19, 1913.*

Hon. B. R. TILLMAN,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR TILLMAN: I have yours of the 16th, and your appeal goes straight to my heart. If I were a smoker, I know I would not hesitate a moment to give you an unqualified assurance that I would support you in your contention, because I hope I am sufficiently unselfish to make any reasonable sacrifice for you.

Not being a smoker—I never use the weed—I do not know but all the smokers of the Senate would think I was absolutely selfish in this matter, whereas the exact reverse is true. Much as I would like to have a change made in the manner you suggest, I feel that it is due to my brother Senators who smoke that I accept with best possible grace the discomforts that result from the gratification of their appetites for tobacco.

I think you catch my point, my dear Senator. I enjoy making sacrifices for my friends, and regard this as one of the qualities of a gentle-

man. I hope I am a gentleman, and I hope I am not deceiving myself when I reach the conclusion that in my own heart I love to be good and unselfish to my friends.

Now, Senator TILLMAN, you know that I count you among my list of dearest senatorial friends. You have always been more than kind to me, and I have never seen a moment when I would not have enjoyed a keen sense of pleasure in making any reasonable sacrifice in your behalf, but I would like to so act in this matter that I do not seem to be what I really hope I am not, selfish, and I should seem selfish if, disliking the intense smoke of the Senate, which sometimes reaches a density that is quite offensive, I should act from a selfish standpoint and vote against smoking in the Senate.

Of course you can not expect to win out in this contest unless you secure the votes of the smokers. I hope you will make your appeal to them and win out, and if I could manage to make my real position clearly understood by my brother Senators, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to support you in your contest for the abolition of smoking in the Senate Chamber, and, in any event, I am more than likely to do so, although from what I have above said you can see that I am placed in a position where I think that were I to vote against smoking my action would be misinterpreted.

I hope you will win out, and the chances are that I shall help you, but, in any event, I have written you with entire candor and am sure you will believe me sincere in what I have said to you.

With kindest regards and best wishes, believe me,

Always cordially yours, CARROLL S. PAGE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, taking them all together, the letters I have received are a very interesting study in psychology, showing how men differ about important matters and the numerous points of view which they have. One thing I have noticed is that the nonsmokers are far more anxious lest they have the appearance of selfishness than some of the smokers.

I hate to have the feeling of being a nuisance. It makes me very uncomfortable, because I am naturally kind of heart and desire to be courteous to everybody. But when I enter a place where Senators are smoking, as I sometimes do, in the committee rooms, I catch a glance from their eyes which I can only interpret to mean, "Here comes old BEN TILLMAN, and I have got to stop smoking," and that makes me very uncomfortable and, in a way, unhappy.

Since my illness four years ago I have learned more about the human body than during all the balance of my life put together, and I am sure I have discovered some of the secrets of nature and laws of health of which most men know nothing whatever. The pity of it is that I had to ruin my health before I discovered these things and learned how to live rationally. Had I lived 10 years ago as I am living now my health never would have broken down at all.

I believe I could lengthen the life of every man in this Chamber from six to fifteen years if I could only get them to believe what I tell them and follow my advice. But all men are prone to consider "old age, sickness, death, and hell" as for other people and not for themselves. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Order must be preserved in the galleries. Any disturbance at all in the galleries is absolutely prohibited by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. To give advice is the easiest thing in the world, for, as Shakespeare says:

> I can easier teach twenty what were good to be done,
> Than be one of twenty to follow mine own teaching.

I owe what degree of recovery I have made—and I am constantly being told I look a great deal better, and I know it is so—to will power and self-control in eating; the will power to exercise my muscles and nerves sufficiently to give them tone and keep the rust out of the joints; but the greatest help to my health arises from the self-control which enables me to keep from eating things I ought not to.

Since I was paralyzed four years ago, and read my own obituary, 25 Senators, including Vice President Sherman, and Sergeant-at-Arms Ransdell, who worked in this Chamber, most of them younger men than I, have died.

Think of it, Mr. President, 25 men in four years. Just for the sake of refreshing your minds and impressing you, I give the list as copied from the official records. I will send it to the desk and let it be incorporated in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES SERVING ON FEBRUARY 16, 1910, AND SUBSEQUENT TO THAT DATE WHO HAVE DIED.

NAME AND DATE OF DEATH.

McEnery, June 28, 1910.
Daniel, June 29, 1910.
Dolliver, October 15, 1910.
Clay, November 13, 1910.
Elkins, January 4, 1911.
Hughes, January 11, 1911.
Frye, August 8, 1911.
Carter, September, 1911.
Taylor, March 31, 1912.
Nixon, June 5, 1912.
Money, September, 1912.
Heyburn, October 17, 1912.
Sherman (Vice President), October 30, 1912.
Rayner, November 25, 1912.
Terrell, November, 1912.
Gordon, November, 1912.
Davis, January 3, 1913.
Briggs, May, 1913.
Johnston, August 8, 1913.
Cullom, January 28, 1914.
Bacon, February, 1914.
Massey, March 5, 1914.
Ransdell (Sergeant at Arms).

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES WHO SERVED WITH SENATOR TILLMAN PRIOR TO FEBRUARY 16, 1910, WHO HAVE DIED.

NAME AND DATE OF DEATH.

McLaurin, December 27, 1909.
Johnson, October 21, 1909.
Platt, March, 1910.
Call, August, 1910.
Hill, October, 1910.
Quarles, October, 1911.
Dryden, November, 1911.
Peffer, October, 1912.
Wilson, November, 1912.
Jones (John P., of Nevada), November 29, 1912.
Berry, January, 1913.
Palmer, June, 1913.
Teller, February 23, 1914.

Mr. TILLMAN. No wonder, as I look around the Chamber and see the changes that have come and miss the many old familiar faces of friends who are dead, that I feel as though I were serving with ghosts as well as living men. There is no doubt in the world to my mind that this great mortality among us is due to the way we live in Washington. The life here is indeed an arduous one; the mental strain is intense. There is a continuous succession of banquets, dinners, and receptions. Automobiles and street cars are used by Senators instead of walking, and pure air and sunshine are things of which we get too little. There is no surer way to undermine the health than eating too much or eating irregularly. All these explain the unusual mortality among the Members of Congress.

A fitting epitaph for most of the Senators who have died in service would be: "He lived not wisely, but too well, and killed himself eating." Indeed, that can be said about most men and women in official life in Washington.

There is nothing more deadly than to breathe air that has already been breathed by others and thus robbed of its oxygen, besides being poisoned in other ways. The ventilation of this Chamber is poor, as everyone knows; and when we increase its impurities by tobacco smoke, as is being done all the while, the air is never cleansed and is very unwholesome and unhealthy.

Let us stop this smoking in the Senate Chamber, and have the attendants open the gallery doors every night, as well as prop open the Senate doors, and have the windows leading to the open air outside opened all night so that pure air can come into the Chamber and wash it out and make it habitable and more healthy, and there will be fewer deaths among us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to unanimously.

## CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, representing the State of Texas in this body, I deem it my duty to give a brief expression to my views on the Mexican situation.

I have refrained from discussing the Mexican question heretofore on the floor of the Senate, because I have felt, and feel to-day, as I believe the American people have felt and feel to-day, that the President and the Secretary of State have handled, are handling, and will continue to handle this delicate and difficult problem in the best possible manner. Every day that passes without intervention and without war is an additional tribute to the ability with which they have handled this matter.

What would the critics of the administration have done had they been in control? Would they long ago have plunged the country into war? Could they have pursued any other course than that pursued by the administration without involving the country in war?

A publication by the State Department of the numerous appeals that have come to this country from Americans and others who claim to have been injured or to have been threatened with injury in Mexico will show that the department has rendered all possible assistance short of the declaration of actual war; and the publication will show that the national honor has been preserved.

In a number of instances I have transmitted to the department complaints of American citizens in Mexico, and in every instance the State Department has responded promptly and effectively. I wish to give the Senate one instance which is

somewhat different from the instances cited by the Senator from New Mexico.

A constituent of mine in El Paso went to Juarez, across the river, one day, and immediately disappeared. His friends and relatives were in a panic. They sent me telegram after telegram, urging me to have the State Department inquire as to what had become of this American citizen. They feared that he had been shot by the rebels. The machinery of the State Department was set in motion; and it turned out that while he had not been entirely shot he had been half shot with rotgut whisky, had been imprisoned in a lockup in Juarez, and was later released on the deposit of the necessary collateral.

The logic employed by the critics of the administration is peculiar. They say that they want bloodshed stopped; that they want outrages stopped; that they want these mutilations stopped; and yet any other practicable course than the course pursued by the administration would mean intervention; intervention would mean war; war would mean infinitely more bloodshed, infinitely more outrages, and infinitely more mutilations.

They say that they want to stop murder in Mexico, and yet intervention, which they say is inevitable, would mean the death of thousands of American citizens, the expenditure of unlimited American treasure, the creation of enormous war taxes and war debts, and of complications that would vex us for 50 years to come. They want to substitute for a condition which they now call bloody and distressing a condition vastly more bloody and vastly more distressing. Bad as present conditions may be, war would be infinitely worse.

I think I know something of the feeling of the people of Texas on this subject; and I think it due the Senate and the country to say that the people of Texas are almost unanimously in sympathy with Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan in the course they have pursued as to Mexico. They are not in sympathy with the governor of Texas on this question. They deplore his attitude, if I know anything about their attitude, and they deplore the position he has assumed as to the advisability of entering Mexico with rangers of Texas. I have been much relieved to hear this afternoon that an armed force of Texans did not cross the border and did not enter Mexican soil to recover the body of Vergara.

A short while ago a delegation of some six or eight representative Texans, who live along the Rio Grande border, came to Washington to assist me in pushing a bill I had introduced for a roadway along the Rio Grande. These gentlemen advised me that the American citizens along the border, outside of the refugees and some parts of the Mexican element, were almost solidly in sympathy with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan on the Mexican question. They said that Texans were crossing the border every day, were engaging in business transactions with both sides in Mexico, and that as long as they attended to their own affairs they were not molested.

If you will consider the Vergara affair and the Benton affair, you will recall that in both instances these men voluntarily crossed the Rio Grande and voluntarily invited trouble. These gentlemen said that the Texans going into Mexico realize that they cross the border at their peril, and that they subject themselves to the dangers that naturally exist in a war-blasted land. These Texans, fresh from the border, told me that probably 60 or 75 per cent of the people living close to the border on the Texas side are Mexicans, and that while they are citizens of the United States in name, so far as their political sympathies and interests go, they are more a part of the Mexican nation than of the United States.

Clement Vergara was one of these Mexican Americans, these Texans said, and in all probability became involved in some Mexican affair. They added that there was no excitement on the border over this incident, except in the imagination of the governor of Texas and a few adventurous spirits along the river; and that, in any event, all the Texans along the border, except as I have indicated, were entirely willing to leave the matter to Wilson and to Bryan.

Let me add here that the Mexican-American element along the Rio Grande has not as yet expressed any considerable sympathy or interest in Texan affairs or in American affairs. These misguided Mexicans, so far as Texas affairs are concerned, have been herded for years by the reactionary interests along the Rio Grande and have been voted solidly against the best interests of our State. I trust that this political slavery will soon be ended by the Mexicans themselves. The dawn of liberty in Mexico will also mean liberty from bosses on the Texas side of the Rio Grande.

Mr. President, if the American people will continue to lend their support and sympathy to Wilson and Bryan, they will guide us through Mexican affairs without war, without intervention, without imperiling a single American principle, without reflecting on the honor of the Nation or the glory of the flag. Mr. President, I pray, and I know the American people pray, that the foolhardiness of reckless men and the schemes of hostile politicians may not drive this country into war.

### CICERO L. LINCOLN, ADMINISTRATOR, V. UNITED STATES.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been requested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to ask to have referred to the Committee on Printing, with the view to having it printed as a public document, the opinion of the court delivered by Judge Howry, of the United States Court of Claims, in the case of Cicero L. Lincoln, administrator for Joseph Harvey, deceased, against The United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

### CIVIL WAR OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to give notice, if it does not conflict with any parliamentary rights which have been secured by notices already given, that following the conclusion of the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1 I will move to take up the bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. A notice has already been given to press another bill, the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes. I have begun to speak on that bill, and I have not finished my address as yet, owing to lack of opportunity.

Mr. KENYON. I did not know just the parliamentary situation. I wanted to save any right I might obtain for second or third place.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, March 10, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1914.*

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Lee Douglas, of Nashville, Tenn., to be United States attorney, middle district of Tennessee, vice Abram M. Tillman, whose term has expired.

### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John Y. Fauntleroy, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, in place of Walter Y. Kemper, superseded.

### SURVEYOR GENERAL.

I. C. Thoresen, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be surveyor general of Utah, vice Thomas Hull, term expired.

### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank A. McCall, of Sandpoint, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, vice William Ashley, removed.

Jacob A. Mayer, of Havre, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Havre, Mont., vice Louis W. Pierson, removed.

### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frank Langley, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, vice William H. Batting, term expired.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Alfred B. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Clarence O. Sherrill, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Ernest D. Peek, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. George R. Spalding, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Elliott J. Dent, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, vice Maj. Herbert Deakyne, promoted.

Capt. W. Goff Caples, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 27, 1914, vice Maj. Charles S. Bromwell, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward D. Ardery, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles K. Rockwell, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. James G. Steese, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Roger G. Alexander, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. Alfred B. Putnam, promoted.

First Lieut. James A. O'Connor, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. Clarence O. Sherrill, promoted.

First Lieut. Lewis H. Watkins, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. Ernest D. Peek, promoted.

First Lieut. Gilbert E. Humphrey, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. George R. Spalding, promoted.

First Lieut. Richard Park, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. Elliott J. Dent, promoted.

First Lieut. Daniel I. Sultan, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1914, vice Capt. W. Goff Caples, promoted.

Second Lieut. William C. Sherman, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Rudolph C. Kuldell, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Roscoe C. Crawford, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Earl G. Paules, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Edward D. Ardery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Bradford G. Chynoweth, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Charles K. Rockwell, promoted.

Second Lieut. Milo P. Fox, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. James G. Steese, promoted.

Second Lieut. John C. Gotwals, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Roger G. Alexander, promoted.

Second Lieut. Francis K. Newcomer, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. James A. O'Connor, promoted.

### POSTMASTERS.

#### CALIFORNIA.

Margaret Messick to be postmaster at Victorville, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

#### ILLINOIS.

R. A. Thompson to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill., in place of R. F. Rotramel. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

#### IOWA.

H. F. A. Hilmer to be postmaster at New Hampton, Iowa, in place of J. H. Kolthoff. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1914.

E. P. McManus to be postmaster at Keokuk, Iowa, in place of S. W. Moorehead. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

John R. Strickland to be postmaster at Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of Elmer E. Schrack, resigned.

#### LOUISIANA.

J. M. Cook to be postmaster at Oakdale, La., in place of James H. Leggett, declined.

#### NEBRASKA.

Byron Busby to be postmaster at Wakefield, Nebr., in place of C. H. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

John Canfield to be postmaster at Tekamah, Nebr., in place of J. M. Crowell. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

Patrick H. Green to be postmaster at Creighton, Nebr., in place of Charles A. Sweet. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

#### NEW JERSEY.

James A. Mahaney to be postmaster at Roebling, N. J., in place of Samuel L. Major. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

#### NEW YORK.

J. F. Lantry to be postmaster at Massena, N. Y., in place of J. B. Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1913.

#### OHIO.

Jacob D. Yocum to be post master at Mechanicsburg, Ohio, in place of Edward L. Byers. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

#### OKLAHOMA.

Mathias Schiefelbusch to be postmaster at Yale, Okla., in place of W. S. Hartshorn. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

#### TEXAS.

B. M. Richardson to be postmaster at Athens, Tex., in place of William A. Hawn. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Robert E. Speer to be postmaster at Fort Worth, Tex., in place of L. M. Barkley. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

#### WASHINGTON.

George B. Day to be postmaster at Walla Walla, Wash., in place of E. L. Brunton. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1914.*

### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Henry Clay Hall to be an interstate-commerce commissioner.

### INTERNAL-REVENUE COLLECTOR.

John Y. Fauntleroy to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John M. Boyle to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Edward N. Johnston to be major.
First Lieut. Henry A. Finch to be captain.
Second Lieut. Howard S. Bennion to be first lieutenant.

### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Asst. Surg. Irving W. Robbins to be a passed assistant surgeon.
Carleton I. Wood to be an assistant surgeon.
James M. Quinn to be an assistant surgeon.
Machinist Adolph J. Merkt to be a chief machinist.

### POSTMASTERS.

#### FLORIDA.

Robert O. Cresap, Lakeland.

#### MICHIGAN.

Elmer E. Hymers, Pontiac.
Herbert I. Wright, Three Rivers.

#### NORTH DAKOTA.

A. I. Koehmstedt, Langdon.

#### TENNESSEE.

Y. Q. Caldwell, Paris.
Frank W. Latta, Dyersburg.
James M. Scarborough, Dover.

#### TEXAS.

Robert E. Speer, Fort Worth.

#### VIRGINIA.

George N. Reed, Reedville.

#### WASHINGTON.

Jasper J. Cameron, Harrington.

---

## REJECTION.

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 9, 1914.*

Adolph P. Hill to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### MONDAY, *March 9, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the universe, Father of all souls, dispenser of every good, always ready to help those who would help themselves and do good unto their fellow men, make clear the obligations resting upon these Thy servants and quicken every noble impulse which leads on to new life and action, that with fidelity, patience, courage, fortitude they may discharge the duties of this day. In the spirit and strength of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

#### BUILDING REGULATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this being District day, I desire to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 8593) amending the building regulations of the District of Columbia by providing for the better protection of persons engaged in and about the construction, repairing, alterations, or removal of buildings, bridges, viaducts, and other structures.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the title and substance of section 157 of the District of Columbia building regulations be amended so as to read:

"REGULATIONS DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, REMOVAL, OR PAINTING OF BUILDINGS, BRIDGES OR VIADUCTS, AND OTHER STRUCTURES.

"SEC. 157. SUBSECTION 1. That any house, building, bridge, viaduct, or other structure being constructed or erected by any person, firm, or corporation in the District of Columbia shall be so erected and constructed as to give proper and adequate protection to the life and limb of any person or persons employed or engaged thereon or passing under or by the same.

"SUBSEC. 2. All scaffolds, hoists, cranes, stays, ladders, supports, or other mechanical contrivances erected or constructed by any person, firm, or corporation in the District of Columbia for use in the erection, repairing, alteration, removal, or painting of any house, building, bridge, viaduct, or other structure shall be erected and constructed in a safe, suitable, and proper manner, and shall be so erected and constructed, placed, and operated as to give proper and adequate protection to the life and limb of any person or persons employed or engaged thereon or passing under or by the same, and in such manner as to prevent the falling of any material that may be used or deposited thereon.

"SUBSEC. 3. Scaffolding or staging, swung or suspended from an overhead support more than 20 feet from the ground or floor shall have, where practicable, a safety rail properly bolted, secured, and braced, rising at least 34 inches above the floor or main portion of such scaffolding or staging and extending along the entire length of the outside and ends thereof and properly attached thereto, and such scaffolding or staging shall be so fastened as to prevent the same from swaying from the building or structure.

"SUBSEC. 4. All swinging and stationary scaffolding, platforms, and other devices shall be so constructed as to bear four times the maximum weight required to be depended therein or placed thereon when in use, and such swinging scaffolding, platform, or other device shall not be so overloaded or overcrowded as to render the same unsafe or dangerous.

"SUBSEC. 5. Any person, firm, or corporation in the District of Columbia hiring, employing, or directing another to perform labor of any kind in the erecting, repairing, altering, or painting of any water pipe, standpipe, pole, staff, dome, or cupola, when the use of any scaffold, staging, swing, hammock, support, temporary platform, or other similar contrivance are required or used in the performance of such labor, shall keep and maintain at all times while such labor is being performed and such mechanical device is in use or operation a safe and proper scaffold, stay, support, or other suitable device not less than 16 feet below such working scaffold, staging, swing, hammock, support, or temporary platform when such work is being performed at a height of 32 feet or more, for the purpose of preventing serious injury to the person or persons performing such labor in case of any accident to such working scaffold, staging, swing, hammock, support, or temporary platform.

"SUBSEC. 6. Any workman or mechanic whose duties require him to use a scaffold, hoist, crane, ladder, or other contrivance in connection with the construction, alteration, repairing, removing, cleaning, or painting of any building, bridge, viaduct, or other structure may notify the inspector of buildings, calling attention to any defect or weakness which, in the employee's opinion, renders the scaffold dangerous, and such communication shall be strictly confidential.

"SUBSEC. 7. Whenever it shall come to the notice of the inspector of buildings that the scaffolding or the slings, hangers, blocks, pulleys, stays, braces, ladders, irons, or ropes of any swinging or stationary scaffolding, platform, or other similar device used in the construction, alteration, repairing, removing, cleaning, or painting of buildings, bridges, or viaducts within the District of Columbia are unsafe or liable to prove dangerous to the life or limb of any person, the said inspector shall immediately cause an inspection to be made of such scaffolding, platform, or device, or the slings, hangers, blocks, pulleys, stays, braces, ladders, irons, or other parts connected therewith. If after examination, such scaffolding, platform, or device, or any of such parts, is found to be dangerous to the life or limb of any person, the inspector shall at once notify the person responsible for its erection or maintenance of such fact, and warn him against the use, maintenance, or operation thereof, and prohibit the use thereof, and require the same to be altered and reconstructed so as to avoid such danger. Such notice may be served personally upon the person responsible for its erection or maintenance, or by conspicuously affixing it to the scaffolding, platform, or other such device, or the part thereof declared to be unsafe. After such notice has been so served or affixed the person responsible therefor shall cease using and immediately remove such scaffolding, platform, or other device, or part thereof, and alter or strengthen it in such manner as to render it safe. The building inspector or any of his deputies shall have free access at all reasonable hours to any building or structure or premises containing scaffolding, platforms, or other similar device, or parts thereof, or where they may be in use.

"SUBSEC. 8. Any owner, contractor, subcontractor, foreman, or other person having charge of the erection, construction, repairing, alteration, removal, or painting of any building, bridge, viaduct, or other structure within the provisions of this act shall comply with all the terms thereof, and any such owner, contractor, subcontractor, foreman, or other person violating any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not less than $25 nor more than $500 or imprisoned for not less than three months nor more than two years, or both fined and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court."

SEC. 2. That there be added to the District of Columbia building regulations the following section:

"115a. It shall be the duty of the owner of every house, building, or structure (except a private house, used exclusively as a private residence) now under construction, or hereafter to be constructed, to affix and display conspicuously on each floor of such building during construction a placard stating the load per square foot of floor surface which may with safety be applied to that particular floor during such construction, or if the strength of different parts of any floor varies, then there shall be such placards for each varying part of such floor. It shall be unlawful to load any such floors or any part thereof to a greater extent than the load indicated on such placards. All such placards shall be verified and approved by the inspector of buildings."

SEC. 3. That section 192 of the District of Columbia building regulations be amended to read:

"SEC. 192. SUBSECTION 1. In all buildings in the District of Columbia in course of construction and in all buildings having elevators intended for freight lifts only, and not constructed, protected, and operated as required for passenger elevators, it shall be unlawful to use hoists and elevators for hoisting materials, etc., in any such building or buildings unless the wellholes or openings for such elevators or hoists on each and every floor of the building shall be closed to a height of at least 6 feet, with no opening greater than 2½ inches; and semiautomatic gates or doors at least 5 feet, with no opening greater than 2½ inches. By semiautomatic gates or doors it is meant to provide gates or doors which will close automatically when the car leaves the landing. Such other safety or equivalent appliances as the inspector of buildings may determine to be necessary for the protection of life and limb shall also be provided.

"SUBSEC. 2. Any hoisting machine or engine used in building construction shall, where practicable, be set up or placed on the ground, and where it is necessary in the construction of such building to place such hoisting machine or engine on some floor above the ground floor, such machine or engine must be properly and securely supported with a foundation capable of safely sustaining twice the weight of such machine or engine. If a building in course of construction is three stories or more in height, no material needed for such construction shall be hoisted or lifted over a public street or alley unless 15 feet or more of such street or alley shall be barricaded from use by the public.

"SUBSEC. 3. If elevating machines or hoisting apparatus operated or controlled by other than hand power are used in the construction, alteration, or removal of any building or other structure, a complete and adequate system of communication by means of signals shall be provided and maintained by the owner, contractor, or subcontractor during the use and operation of such elevating machines or hoisting apparatus in order that prompt and effective communication may be had at all times between the operator of engine or motive power of such elevating machine and hoisting apparatus and the employees or persons engaged thereon or in using or operating the same."

SEC. 4. That section 158 of the District of Columbia building regulations be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 158. Where the plans and specifications require the floors to be arched between the beams thereof, or where the floors or filling in between the floors are fireproof material or brickwork, the owner, contractor, or subcontractor shall complete the flooring or filling in as the building progresses to not less than within three tiers or beams below that on which the ironwork is being erected. If the plans and specifications of such buildings do not require filling in between the beams of floors with brick or fireproof material, the owner, contractor, or subcontractor for work in course of construction shall lay the underflooring thereof or a safe temporary floor on each story as the building progresses to not less than within two stories or floors below the one to which such building has been erected. Where double floors are not to be used, the owner or contractor shall keep planked over the floor two stories or floors below the story where the work is being performed. If the floor beams are of iron or steel, the contractor for the iron or steel work of a building in the course of construction, or the owner of such building, shall thoroughly plank over the entire tier of iron or steel beams on which the structural iron or steel work is being erected, except such spaces as may be reasonably required for the proper construction of such iron or steel work and for the raising and lowering of materials to be used in the construction of such buildings and such spaces as may be designated by the plans and specifications for stairways and elevator shafts."

SEC. 5. That there be added to section 21 of the District of Columbia building regulations the following provision:

"It shall be the duty of all architects or draftsmen engaged in preparing plans, specifications, or drawings to be used in the erection, repairing, altering, or removing of any building or structure within the District of Columbia to provide in such plans, specifications, and drawings for all the permanent structural features or requirements specified in the District of Columbia building regulations; and any failure to comply with these requirements shall subject the architect or draftsman to a fine of not less than $25 nor more than $200 for each offense."

SEC. 6. That for any injury to person or property occasioned by any willful violations of this act or willful failure to comply with any of its provisions a right of action shall accrue to the party injured for any direct damages sustained thereby, and in case of loss of life by reason of such willful violation or willful failure as aforesaid a right of action shall accrue to the widow of the person so killed, his lineal heirs or adopted children, or to any other person or persons who were, before such loss of life, dependent for support on the person or persons so killed, for a like recovery of damages for the injuries sustained by reason of such loss of life or lives.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Anthony | Davenport | Johnson, S. C. | Reilly, Conn. |
| Austin | Deitrick | Jones | Richardson |
| Avis | Dickinson | Kahn | Riordan |
| Bailey | Dillon | Key, Ohio | Roberts, Nev. |
| Baker | Dooling | Korbly | Rupley |
| Barchfeld | Doughton | Kreider | Saunders |
| Barnhart | Driscoll | L'Engle | Sharp |
| Brockson | Eagan | Lesher | Sherley |
| Brodbeck | Edmonds | Levy | Slemp |
| Brown, W. Va. | Evans | Lewis, Md. | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Browning | Fairchild | Lewis, Pa. | Stanley |
| Bryan | Farr | Lobeck | Steenerson |
| Bulkley | Fordney | Loft | Stevens, N. H. |
| Burke, Pa. | Foster | Logue | Stout |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Gallagher | McGuire, Okla. | Stringer |
| Burnett | Glass | Mahan | Sutherland |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Goeke | Maher | Switzer |
| Calder | Goodwin, Ark. | Martin | Taylor, Ala. |
| Cantor | Graham, Pa. | Merritt | Taylor, Ark. |
| Carew | Greene, Vt. | Miller | Taylor, Colo. |
| Carlin | Griest | Montague | Tuttle |
| Carter | Griffin | Morin | Underhill |
| Casey | Hamill | Mott | Vare |
| Chandler | Hardwick | Nelson | Watson |
| Clark, Fla. | Harrison | Norton | Webb |
| Copley | Hart | O'Brien | Whitacre |
| Crisp | Hayes | Oglesby | Wilson, Fla. |
| Cullop | Hobson | O'Shaunessy | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Dale | Howell | Plumley | |
| Danforth | Hoxworth | Porter | |

The SPEAKER. On this call 314 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House this day is set apart for the consideration of matters pertaining to the District of Columbia. Later along I propose to address myself briefly to the bill which is under consideration. Prior to that, however, I wish to make some remarks that are personal to myself. I will do that by inviting attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Herald March 1, 1914, which reads as follows:

"CITIZENS WILL START FIGHT ON BEN JOHNSON—COMMITTEE OF 100 TO BE APPOINTED TO URGE NEW HEAD FOR DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

"With a view to organizing a compact body to protest against BEN JOHNSON as chairman of the House District Committee, Brainard H. Warner yesterday publicly advertised a mass meeting to be held at the New Willard Thursday afternoon at 4 o'clock.

Mr. Warner was not in town last night to elaborate on his plan. It is known, however, he contemplates the organization of a committee of 100 citizens to urge a new chairman for the House committee."

Mr. Speaker, that article was first published in the Washington Herald. It has found its way into the press largely in the United States. The naked article itself may not be libelous, but the colloquium is. But to that I hope to pay no sort of attention, either now or hereafter.

If the chairman of so important a committee is to be removed, or if a body of citizens of the Capital City contemplate undertaking the removal of me as chairman of a committee, there must of necessity be a motive or reason behind it. So the question first arising is: What is the motive or reason which suggests that Mr. Warner should advertise for a meeting of the citizens of Washington, to be held at the New Willard Hotel on last Thursday afternoon at 4 o'clock, to remove me? The inference would follow that this movement was taken up because I, as chairman, had done something dishonorable. Let me say to you that this originated simply and purely for no reason except that I refused to do something that was dishonorable. [Applause.] I purpose to show to you that Mr. Warner offered to me a bribe but thinly disguised. Mr. Brainard H. Warner, who has grown rich here as a real estate agent, came to my office, accompanied by a gentleman whose name it is not now, at least, necessary to call, because that gentleman did not do the talking. Mr. Warner himself did the talking, and he did it in the presence of the gentleman to whom I have just referred, and also in the presence of my secretary, Mr. J. Rogers Gore. Mr. Warner came to my office and began to argue with me that I was getting in the way of some of his real estate projects and asked me to desist. Coupled with that request upon his part that I desist or get out of his way in furthering the schemes which he had, he went on to say that an ex-member of the Committee on the District of Columbia had cooperated with him in furthering some of his schemes; and that because of that cooperation upon the part of the ex-member of the committee, whom he called by name, that ex-member of the committee had made large sums of money. Upon that occasion Mr. Warner, figuratively speaking, took me to the mountain top and there showed me the great avenues of graft which permeate the Nation's Capital. He told me how the named ex-member of the District Committee had cooperated with him, and how, when this ex-member of the committee did not have the money, he, Warner, had put it up for him; and that when he had got his acreage ground plotted and laid out in streets, with the streets and pavements built through it, he sold it, and that without this ex-member having put up a cent of money he took to him his proportion of large profits. Under this thin veil this proposition was made to me. It is not necessary, I believe, before this House for me to say that that conversation came to a sudden termination. [Applause.]

I was not willing to let the matter rest there. This body of the people's representatives was entitled to know the method by which things had been accomplished here. I immediately came to this floor, and I got together the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. CLARK, and Senator OLLIE JAMES, of Kentucky. I told them that I thought I should have this man brought to the bar of the House because of his having offered that indignity not only to me but to this House. [Applause.] We talked over the matter, we three, the Speaker, Senator JAMES and myself; and after they had thought over the matter very carefully and deliberately they said, in substance: Here is a man who is a self-admitted corruptionist, who has brought in the name of an ex-member of that committee, who almost certainly had not been the tool of this self-admitted corruptionist; but if Warner is brought before the bar of the House, the other man, innocent though he may be, must have his name divulged to the public; and the rest of his life would have to be spent at least under the odium of having been charged with having received a bribe. Therefore the matter was not brought before the House. I could see the injury that would be done this innocent man, and if his name were brought here in a scandal of that kind he would never outlive it. For that reason, as I said, the matter was not brought before the bar of the House. But of Mr. Warner I will say a little more later.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. So far the gentleman has indicated that the Member of the House who was referred to in this conversation was an ex-member of the District Committee. The gentleman has not indicated whether he is at present a Member of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I purposely said no more than I did, because I did not believe the process of elimination should be begun.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not indicate whether he is now a Member of the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I shall decline to go into the process of elimination further than to say that he is not now a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the meeting called by Mr. Warner was held at the New Willard Hotel at 4 o'clock on Thursday last. Those who answered the call of Mr. Warner after gathering there were induced to drop the particular purpose for which the meeting was called, because they knew that it was an absolute impossibility to prevail upon this House to remove me as chairman of that committee. But they took up another feature of District matters. That other feature was, as they say, the repeal of the half-and-half principle; and their only claim that there was then actively going on a movement to repeal the half-and-half principle which they sought to defeat, is another measure, a measure which, I say, no man, except he be a single taxer, can oppose. The matter to which I refer is the amendment, written principally by me, which was adopted in the District Committee to what is known as the George bill. The District Committee struck out section 2 of the George bill and inserted in lieu thereof the following; and, since there is a systemized plan of misrepresentation upon the part of the press going on here, I will be very glad if those who are present will listen and ascertain for themselves just exactly what that amendment is. It reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. That, for the purpose of establishing a uniform rate of taxation in the District of Columbia, there is hereby levied upon the aforesaid real estate an annual tax equal in rate to that rate which is now or which hereafter may be imposed by Congress upon taxable personal property in the District of Columbia; and, further, the same rate of taxation is hereby levied upon all intangible property in the District of Columbia which would be taxable under existing law were it tangible personal property, including moneys, credits, shares of stocks, bonds, annuities, and all other evidences of indebtedness.

"Nothing herein shall be so construed as to impose a tax upon any bonds of the United States or of the District of Columbia. Neither shall a tax be imposed upon shares of the capital stock in any corpora-

tion which corporation pays to the District of Columbia the tax herein provided for upon all the property represented by its capital stock, or which pays tax on its gross income; and all persons, firms, and corporations shall be allowed to deduct from the total amount of their moneys, credits, stocks, annuities, and evidences of indebtedness any bona fide debt made or created for actual value received.

"Every parsonage and every rectory owned by a religious congregation or organization and used by its pastor, preacher, minister, or rabbi as a residence is hereby made exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia."

The local newspapers have heralded, notwithstanding they were assembled for the purpose of undertaking to remove me as chairman of the District Committee, the statement that their meeting was really for the purpose of seeing that the 40,000 humble homes in the District of Columbia should not be excessively taxed. The question arises: What was the real interest of those who assembled there? Their real interest can best be ascertained by giving the names and the occupations of the 100 men who were appointed as a committee to see that justice, in the way of taxation, be done to the District of Columbia. I have here a list of that 100 men. I have looked through the city directory and opposite their names I have put their respective occupations as shown by the city directory. Where the city directory gives no occupation I have supplied it from the best occupation I could get. The list is as follows:

Byron S. Adams, publisher; Elijah S. Alford, jr.; Frank E. Altemus, grocer; Col. George A. Arms, retired Army officer.

Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, physician; Connecticut Avenue; Mrs. W. D. Bigelow; Gist Blair, lawyer, Union Trust Building; Thomas Bradley, lawyer and real estate; A. A. Birney, lawyer; Warren W. Biggs, president Biggs Heating Co.; Sidney I. Bessellevre, consulting naval architect and secretary Citizens' Savings Bank; Lester A. Barr, real estate agent; Alexander Britton, lawyer; Aldis B. Browne, lawyer; Charles S. Bundy, judge municipal court; William J. Boardman; H. Marion Butler, Bureau of Corporations; Thomas W. Buckey, broker; Chapin Brown, lawyer (real estate practice a specialty); L. E. Breuninger, real estate dealer; Ralph Barnard, lawyer; Mrs. R. V. Belt; F. W. Bolgiano, dealer in seeds; C. J. Bell, president American Surety & Trust Co.; Miss Mabel Boardman; R. B. Behrend, lawyer; Southwick C. Briggs, real estate dealer.

Charles J. Cassidy, president Cassidy Co., contractors; J. Doyle Carmody, lawyer; S. W. Curriden, lawyer; Ashton G. Clapham, president Commercial National Bank; William A. H. Church, lumber dealer, chairman of board, the Commercial National Bank; Wade H. Cooper, president United States Savings Bank; John I. Costello, lawyer; Frank B. Crosthwaite, lawyer; George S. Cooper, architect; W. V. Cox, president Second National Bank; Myer Cohen, lawyer; Murray A. Cobb, of Story & Cobb, real estate loans and insurance; William McK. Clayton, lawyer; George H. Chandlee, patent attorney; D. J. Callahan, general manager Norfolk & Washington Steamboat Co.; C. I. Corby, baker; Charles H. Cragin, lawyer; John G. Capers, lawyer; William G. Carter, commission merchant; Levi Cooke, lawyer; Edwin Callow, speculative agent; Joseph H. Cranford, president and treasurer Cranford Paving Co.

H. Bradley Davidson, president Real Estate Trust Co.; John Dolph, superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. of New York; Carl Droop, vice president Edward F. Droop & Sons, musical instruments; Col. Edward Parker Dean; Mrs Henry Dimmock; Floyd E. Davis, real estate dealer; Jules A. Demonet, president "Demonet's," wine merchants; P. A. Drury, president Abner-Drury Brewing Co.; H. Rozier Dulany, real estate, loans, and insurance; Charles A. Douglas, lawyer; J. J. Darlington, lawyer.

John Joy Edson, president Washington Loan & Trust Co.; George W. Easterday, real estate, loans, insurance; William John Eynon, publisher; William Corcoran Eustis, capitalist.

Frederick A. Fenning, lawyer; Mrs. Duncan U. Fletcher, wife of United States Senator; Albert F. Fox, real estate broker; Edmund K. Fox, real estate broker; John W. Foster, lawyer; Daniel Fraser; J. W. Frizzell; Creed M. Fulton, lawyer; Roe Fulkerson, optician.

George H. Gall, journalist; H. T. Galloway, Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture; William T. Galliher, president W. T. Galliher & Co., lumber dealers; Isaac Gans, manager Saks & Co., merchants; Paul G. Garber, oriental rugs; Frank E. Gibson, physician; Charles C. Glover, president Riggs National Bank; Robert A. Golden; Edwin C. Graham, president National Electrical Supply Co.; G. H. Grosvenor, editor; William F. Gude, president Chamber of Commerce; Prof. J. H. Gore.

Charles B. Hanford, actor; Randall H. Hagner, real estate, loans, and insurance; D. Percy Hickling, physician; William D. Hoover, president National Savings & Trust Co.; Frank J. Hogan, lawyer; Samuel J. Henry, vice president and treasurer United States Trust Co.; Samuel B. Hege, passenger agent Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.; Thilman Hendricks, manager central eastern department Manhattan Life Insurance Co.; Robert N. Harper, president District National Bank; Thomas S Hopkins, lawyer; W. B. Hibbs, banker and broker; J. Phillip Herrman, furniture dealer; Chr. Heurich, brewer; Mrs. Archibald Hopkins; Percival Hall, liveryman.

Guy H. Johnson, lawyer; Bernar T. Janney, principal of school.

J. Miller Kenyon, president Sloan & Co., auctioneers; Lewis Kann, importer and retailer dry goods, etc.; William J Kehoe, capitalist; Rudolph Kauffman, managing editor Evening Star; Gen. G. C. Kniffin; D. J. Kauffman, merchant; A. M. Keppel; Clarence P. King, president Washington Railway & Electric Co.

John B. Larner, lawyer; Wilton J. Lambert, lawyer; C. A. Langley, contractor; M. A. Leese, wholesale and manufacturing optician; A. E. L. Leckie, lawyer; Charles C. Lancaster, lawyer; Benjamin F. Leighton, lawyer; Miss Constance Leupp; Norton M. Little; Colin H. Livingstone, vice president American National Bank; William A. Leetch, manager the Consolidation Coal Co.; A. Lisner, proprietor Palais Royal; L. D. Latimer, president F. H. Smith Co., real estate, loans, and insurance; James B. Lambie, hardware dealer.

H. B. F. McFarland, lawyer; E. B. McLean, capitalist; Archibald M. McLachlan, president McLachlan Co., bankers; John McElroy, editor National Tribune; George W. McLanahan, lawyer; William A. Mearns, banker; P. T. Moran, dealer in feed, etc.; Edward B. Moore, Commissioner of Patents; Edward P. Mertz, manager Orrine Co.; Daniel Murray, Congressional Library; Claude E. Miller, automobile supply dealer; William F. Mattingly, lawyer; Dr. Kelly Miller, professor; Oliver S. Metzerott, lawyer, and treasurer Columbia Theater Co.; Col. Henry May; A. C. Moses, president A. C. Moses Construction Co.; George C. Maynard, musician; Arthur C. Moses; Frank Munsey, president Washington Times; Thomas P. Morgan, jr., assistant manager Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Mrs. Guion Miller; G. T. Marye.

John L. Newbold, president Merchants' Transfer & Storage Co.; Theodore W. Noyes, editor in chief of Evening Star; H. T. Newcomb, lawyer; Clarence F. Norment, president National Bank of Washington; Frank B. Noyes, president Evening Star; Edwin A. Newman, real estate dealer; Edwin H. Neumeyer, broker; John H. Nolan, contractor and builder.

James F. Oyster, merchant; Clarence J. Owens, managing director Southern Commercial Congress.

R. Ross Perry, lawyer; T. H. Pickford, real estate dealer; A. D. Prince, with R. Harris & Co., jewelers; Andrew Parker, vice president Washington Loan & Trust Co.; Col. M. M. Parker, investments; Joseph Paul, real estate dealer; Julius Peyser, lawyer; A. K. Phillips, secretary Potomac Insurance Co.; D. S. Porter, manager Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; John Poole, president Federal National Bank; James L. Parsons, contractor; C. Pierce, lawyer.

Mrs. A. R. Quaiffe.

William H. Rapley, president National Publishing Co.; Albert M. Read, president Security Storage Co.; William B. Robinson; Dr. Charles W. Richardson, physician; Oscar Ricketts, general agent Equitable Surety Co.; H. L. Rust, real estate, loans, and insurance; William L. Robins, physician, the Rochambeau; Cuno H. Rudolph, ex-commissioner, hardware dealer; Charles Rauscher, caterer and confectioner; Miss Janet E. Richards, lecturer; Maurice D. Rosenberg, president Bank of Commerce; Hugh Reilly, president Hugh Reilly Co., paints, oils, etc.; Howard S. Reeside, vice president American Security & Trust Co.; Arthur E. Randle, president East Washington Heights Traction R. R. Co.; Arthur Ramsay, principal Fairmount Seminary; Mrs. S. C. Richey; Mrs. Wallace Radcliffe.

Joseph I. Saks, importer of fine furs, etc.; Frank T. Sanner; B. F. Saul, real estate, loans, and insurance; George F. Schutt, proprietor Ebbitt House; N. H. Shea, second vice president Federal National Bank; James L. Sherwood, produce dealer; Joseph Strasburger, president Joseph Strasburger Co., fine shoes; William E. Shannon, president Middaugh & Shannon, real estate; James Sharp, president Viava Co., proprietary remedies; Louis P. Shoemaker, real estate, loans, and insurance; Thomas W. Sidwell, president Friends School; Mrs. Thomas W. Sidwell; A. Leftwich Sinclair, lawyer; Henry K. Simpson, insurance; J. Henry Small, florist; Thomas W. Smith, lumber and millwork; Emmons S. Smith, fine pianos; Ellis Spear, lawyer; Orrin G. Staples, capitalist; E. J. Stellwagen, president Union Trust Co.; Joseph M. Stoddard, president Cook & Stoddard, automobiles; Charles P. Stone, president Stone & Fairfax, real estate, loans, etc.; John P. Story, jr., real estate, loans, and insurance; G. W. F. Swartzell, president Swartzell, Rheem & Hensey, real estate; Mrs. L. B. Swormstedt.

Edward H. Thomas, lawyer; Galen L. Taft, real estate dealer; Corcoran Thom, vice president American Security & Trust Co.; Leon Tobriner, lawyer; George Truesdell, real estate dealer; Robert R. Tuttle, president Commercial Fire Insurance Co.; Lewis M. Thayer, printer; Dr. W. H. Tunnell; Evans H. Tucker, real estate dealer; J. Selwyn Tait, president Washington & Southern Bank.

Bates Warren, lawyer; Somerset E. Waters, wine and liquor dealer; Harry Wardman, builder and contractor; Brainard H. Warner, capitalist; Oscar W. White, real estate, loans, and insurance; George W. White, president National Metropolitan Bank; John L. Weaver, real estate, loans, and insurance; J. I. Weller, real estate and insurance; M. I. Weller, president East Washington Savings Bank; Richard B. Watrous, secretary American Civic Association; John F. Wilkins; Edward O. Whitford, president National City Dairy Co.; Court F. Wood, principal Wood's Commercial School; Alexander Wolf, lawyer; Simon Wolf, lawyer and insurance; S. W. Woodward, president Woodward & Lothrop; William C. Woodward, health officer District of Columbia; M. A. Winter, president Winter Medicine Co.; George Y. Worthington, real estate, loans, and insurance; Henry K. Willard, real estate dealer; J. Lee Whitmore, Berry & Whitmore, jewelers; A. Coulter Wells, lawyer; Henry L. West, editor; W. R. Van Wickle, president F. G. Smith Piano Co.

Aquilla Yeakle, real estate, loans, and insurance; John W. Yerkes, lawyer, B. & O. R. R. Co.

There is one thing to which I wish to invite your attention now, and it is that that list is made up mostly of men who are themselves the owners of and trustees for others who own the stocks, bonds, and other securities that my amendment proposes to tax. [Applause.] Not one of them is the occupant of a humble home, for whose benefit they now pretend this assembly was held. Another feature that presents itself is this: That on that list there are men who have become professional jurymen here, to rob Uncle Sam every time a piece of property is to be condemned for public use. [Applause.] They would now like to hold it out that it was a meeting of those who own these 40,000 humble homes, and yet that meeting was in the "Red Room" of the Willard Hotel at the hour of 4 o'clock. That hour no doubt (?) was selected for the convenience of the owners of these 40,000 humble homes because, perhaps, they had been there that day to luncheon; and, smoking their Habana cigars, were loafing about there; and 4 o'clock would be a suitable hour for them. [Laughter.] Now, these 40,000 owners of humble homes assemble (?) there, and they take their luncheons there every day and, perhaps, their dinners, too. But last Saturday, day before yesterday, they held another meeting in the interest of these 40,000 humble homes; never for an instant, of course, turning their minds to the proposition that bonds and stocks and promissory notes and credits might not be taxed. Oh, no!

They printed a special bill of fare down at the Willard Hotel that day for the owners of those 40,000 humble homes, and down in the corner it is dated "Saturday, March 7, 1914," the same day of the meeting. Now, when a poor man goes there hungry, with all these things on the bill of fare that he may not have at his everyday meal at home, the supposition is that he

ordered them on this occasion. Now, to start with, we will take it that he ordered "caviar" on this bill of fare. That is quoted at $2. [Laughter.] The next thing on the list that these owners of humble homes would order served would be "seatags," at 40 cents. The next would be a portion of celery, which is on this bill of fare and priced at 60 cents. Then, if that poor man wanted some salted almonds, they are put down on the bill of fare at 25 cents. Then comes a plate of soup; and, taking the bill of fare, we find green-turtle soup is quoted at $1 a plate. Then comes planked shad roe, or, in other words, fish eggs, and that item is put down on the bill at $3.50 a portion. Then comes a broiled celery-fed duckling, and one of these owners of the humble homes must pay for that $3. Then, of course, he would want potatoes, and a portion of potatoes on this bill of fare is quoted at only 45 cents. Then, of course, he would take a little asparagus, which on this bill of fare is quoted at $2.25 a portion. Then peas are down at 40 cents a portion. Then beans are down at 45 cents a portion. Then comes a salad, and alligator pear salad is quoted at $1. A slice of hot gingerbread is quoted at 30 cents. That would go very nicely with ice cream, and that is quoted at 30 cents. Then a small piece of cheese, which is quoted at 30 cents; hothouse grapes, $1.50. They finally come to a portion of extra prepared coffee, quoted on this bill of fare at 50 cents. Now, those are the people who were down there upon that occasion, and these items which I have just enumerated all come to $18.10. [Applause.]

Where two prices are opposite an article of food the smaller price is for a "half" portion only, and the larger price is for a whole portion. I suppose the whole portion is for men, and the half portion for children.

The bill of fare in full is as follows:

THE NEW WILLARD.

WASHINGTON.

*Luncheon.*

Buffet russe: Lobster cocktail, 85 cents; Beluga caviar, $2; crabflake cocktail, 60 cents.

Oysters (oysters received daily by express from Cape Cod, Sayville, and Lynnhaven Bay, guaranteed by certificates issued by boards of health of those districts): Blue points, 30 cents; Seatags, 40 cents; Lynnhavens, 35 cents; Cape Cods, 35 cents.

Clams: Little necks, 30 cents; Cherrystones, 35 cents.

Relishes: Radishes, 25 cents; celery, 35 cents and 60 cents; salted almonds, 25 cents; olives, 25 cents.

Soups: Beef broth, a l'Anglaise, 30 cents and 50 cents; consomme celestine, 30 cents and 50 cents; chicken okra, 40 cents and 70 cents; clear green turtle, 60 cents and $1.

Fish: Broiled bluefish, 50 cents and 85 cents; scallops, fried, with bacon, 50 cents and 85 cents; filet of sole, Tartare sauce, 45 cents and 75 cents; smelts, split and broiled, 50 cents and 85 cents; halibut steak, maitre d'hotel, 50 cents and 85 cents; pompano, grille, 50 cents and 85 cents; planked Florida roe shad, half $1.75, whole $3.50; Chesapeake diamond-back terrapin, $3.25; English sole, $1.25; oyster crabs, $1.25.

Entrées: Ragout of lamb, Parisienne, 40 cents and 70 cents; stewed duckling, with olives, 65 cents and $1; pork chops, with fried apples, 40 cents and 75 cents; frog legs sauté, meunière, 80 cents and $1.50; chicken croquettes, with green peas, 40 cents and 75 cents; oysters, a l'Ancienne, 40 cents and 70 cents; fried oyster crabs, en croustade, 75 cents and $1.25; eggs, Bercy, 50 cents; broiled fresh mushrooms, $1.25.

Roast: Lamb, mint sauce, 60 cents and $1; ribs of beef, per cut, 50 cents; chicken, stuffed, $1 and $2; broiled squab chicken, 75 cents and $1.50; broiled chicken, $1 and $2; broiled spring turkey, $2 and $4; squab chicken, a la Dixie, $2; broiled Guinea chicken, $1 and $2; squab, broiled or roasted, $1; broiled celery-fed duckling, half $1.50, whole $3.

Cold: Crab ravigotte, 60 cents and $1; chicken, $1 and $2; lamb, mint jelly, 60 cents and $1; lobster, plain, $1.50; lobster, New Willard, $1.50.

Vegetables: Potatoes, Ortiz, 25 cents and 40 cents; French artichoke, 60 cents; hothouse asparagus, $1.25 and $2.25; fresh California asparagus, $1.25 and $2.25; spinach, 35 cents and 60 cents; Brussels sprouts, 40 cents and 75 cents; cauliflower, 40 cents and 60 cents; celery, braise, 60 cents; new peas, 45 cents and 80 cents; new string beans, 45 cents and 80 cents; Bermuda potatoes, 25 cents and 40 cents; beets, 30 cents and 50 cents.

Salads: Endive, 40 cents and 75 cents; chiffonade, 50 cents and 75 cents; alligator pear, 60 cents and $1; hearts of Romaine, Russian dressing, 40 cents and 70 cents; hothouse tomato, 40 cents and 70 cents; bijou, 45 cents and 75 cents; fetticus, 35 cents and 60 cents; cucumber, 35 cents and 60 cents; escarole, 30 cents and 50 cents; chicory, 30 cents and 50 cents.

Pastry and desserts: Cherry pie, 25 cents; cocoanut custard pie, 25 cents; hot gingerbread, 30 cents; mince pie, 30 cents; Rhine wine jelly, 20 cents; French pastry, 15 cents; assorted eclairs, 25 cents.

Ice cream and ices: Chocolate, pistache, vanilla, coffee, fresh strawberry, 30 cents; orange and raspberry ice, 30 cents; maple mousse, 40 cents.

Cheese: Roquefort, 20 cents and 30 cents; Gorgonzola, 20 cents and 30 cents; Camembert, 20 cents and 30 cents; Neufchatel, 25 cents; Edam, 30 cents; cream, 15 cents and 25 cents; Swiss, 15 cents and 25 cents; imperial, 30 cents; American, 15 cents and 25 cents.

Fruits: Fresh strawberries, 60 cents and $1; hothouse grapes, $1.50; coupe Florida, 75 cents; Malaga grapes, 40 cents and 60 cents; king oranges, 15 cents and 30 cents; grapefruit, supreme, 75 cents; South African peaches, 50 cents and 80 cents; South African plums, 50 cents and 80 cents; mixed nuts and raisins, 25 cents and 40 cents.

Demitasse, 15 cents; special coffee, 20 cents, pot 50 cents; café Turc, 20 cents; café Diable, per cup 50 cents.

Half portions served to one person only.

SATURDAY, *March 7, 1914.*

Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Times of March 7, 1914, which was day before yesterday, when that cheap bill of fare was gotten up for the owners of these 40,000 humble homes, there appeared in the Washington Times a cartoon which I have here before me. That cartoon represents the District of Columbia as a large man dressed in colonial style "winking his other eye," and opposite him are some roughly drawn things which might be taken for human beings, and they are topped off with blockheads. One of these blockheads is a Member of the House of Representatives District Committee from Iowa. [Laughter.] In that they refer to Judge PROUTY, of Iowa. The next blockhead is the chairman of the District Committee [laughter], which is myself. Then, down the row we have eight other blockheads. Those blockheads are the other eight members of the committee who stood up like men and said, "Yes; we will cast our vote in favor of taxing stocks and bonds in this community, and not permit the burden of that tax to fall upon our constituents at home." [Applause.] And who are those other eight? This newspaper does not do them the honor to name them, but they are Messrs. O'LEARY, REED, THOMPSON, CLAYPOOL, CARY, CARAWAY, MAPES, and HART. The other two, making 10 members, are Judge PROUTY and myself. The heads of them all are pictured as "square." But, gentlemen, there is another thing in connection with this cartoon which the casual observer might overlook. Down at the bottom of it is printed this:

The man representing the District of Columbia and "winking his other eye" is looking over this array of blockheads and saying: "It is very evident they are not owners of District property." Thank God, I am put in that class as not being an owner of District property, and voting half the tax upon my constituents.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Before the gentleman quits the meeting at the Hotel Willard, where these high prices prevail, will he tell us who the speakers were at that meeting at 4 o'clock in the afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I only know from the papers, as I was not there. [Laughter.] I do not own one of these "humble (?) homes."

Mr. MOORE. Was not one of the most distinguished Democrats of the Nation, and one who hails from Kentucky, a leading speaker that afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The papers say that ex-Senator J. C. S. Blackburn was one of the speakers.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that since the Democratic Party came into power there have been more Democrats dining at the Hotel Willard, many of them Members of Congress, than there ever were before in the history of the Nation? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will answer the gentleman very frankly by saying I do not know. I do not frequent the Willard Hotel. My pocketbook will not stand it, as I do not own property here.

Mr. HEFLIN. If my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] will allow me for a moment, the reason for that is that since the Underwood bill passed and reduced the tariff tax it has enabled the Democrats to pay a little more for their food.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield to me further?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that the prices have actually gone up at the Hotel Willard, even as high as they were last year, since the Democratic Party came into power?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That may be; but, I take it, they were reduced on this particular day for the 40,000 humble home owners. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know of his own knowledge that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], whose eloquence we frequently hear on this floor, and which we all admire, is one of those who occasionally drops into the Willard Hotel and partakes of one of these dollar-and-a-half luncheons that have been described by the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I imagine that he might be able to buy a dollar-and-a-half luncheon, but I do not suspect him of being one of those poor property owners that can pay $18.10 for a luncheon.

Mr. MOORE. He does not belong to the laboring class that works in the mill district of Kensington, but after hearing his speech the other day I imagine he lives on a farm in Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suggest that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would go down to Alabama and go to work on a farm he would be helped very materially.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Speaker, this article which stated that this meeting was to remove me from the chairmanship of the District Committee appeared in the Washington Herald. That paper has had many ups and downs, so the local people say. I know absolutely nothing about it myself, and I care less. But one hears it rumored around that this paper is kept for saying things that the other papers do not want to say. To say that it is a "kept" paper may not be wrong. The main part of the vilification, particularly of me, that comes out of the Washington Herald is written by a little fellow, about 4 feet high, who calls himself Joseph P. Annin. In order that he may avoid opportunity for criticism I imagine that he has purposely dropped the last three letters of what his name ought to be, those three letters being "l-a-s." [Laughter.]

He does not concern me any more than his newspaper does. He reminds one very noticeably of a cock snowbird in pin feather. He goes about everywhere, an active little fellow, even while the snow is on the ground. There is no danger from that. However, it might be that somebody, through accident, would spit on him and drown him.

Mr. MOORE. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman again——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. MOORE. I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] that the young man to whom he now refers is present in the gallery, can be seen by everybody, and is listening to what the gentleman says. That statement is fair to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let him stand up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not care whether he is present or not. I rather he would be.

Mr. MOORE. I know the gentleman is ready to speak in the presence of a man whom he denounces, and——

The SPEAKER. The House has no power to make a member of the press gallery stand up. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But, Mr. Speaker, there are many places where, if he were present, all that would be done is that somebody would go to the chimney corner, pick up a shovel, reach into the fireplace and get some ashes and sprinkle them on him, and then run the shovel in under him and pitch him out of the back window, burn a little sugar in the room, and the whole matter would be over. [Laughter.]

Let me return to Mr. Warner. This is not the first meeting of a "committee of one hundred" that Mr. Warner is said to have inaugurated. Some time ago I introduced a bill requiring the real consideration to be recited in all deeds of conveyance. The first man who raised himself against that bill was Brainard H. Warner. But I believe if there is any man in the District of Columbia who ought to rise and protest against the passage of the real-consideration bill, that man is Mr. Warner.

The real-consideration bill has for one of its purposes the prevention of fraud in the transfer of real property in the District of Columbia. The practice here is—and Mr. Warner himself has indulged in it—that when the owner of property goes to a real estate agent to have it sold he makes to somebody in the real estate office a deed of conveyance. The usual consideration recited is $10. Then when the real estate agent, whoever he may be, finds a purchaser for it this straw man, or this clerk or somebody in the office of the real estate man, makes a deed to the purchaser. The seller never knows what he gets; and only the purchaser and the real estate agent know what he was paid.

In the law reports in appeal cases, District of Columbia (vol. 11, p. 149) we find the case of Patten against Warner. The court, in rendering its opinion, recites the main facts, which are, in substance, as follows: That there were four sisters who were the owners of a piece of property on F Street. One of these sisters was married and the other three were not getting along with her any too well. In fact, I believe they did not speak. The unmarried sisters sought to purchase the interest of the married sister. They went to a reputable attorney by the name of Davis. His first name is Henry. I forget his middle initial. Mr. Davis told them he was not in the real estate business, but advised them that he would see a real estate agent for them. Mr. Davis then went to Mr. Brainard H. Warner. Mr. Warner set about to purchase the interest of the married sister. By and by he reported, through Mr. Davis, to the unmarried sisters that they could purchase the interest for $13,000. They paid the $13,000, and a deed was made to them. After a while those of the sisters who were unmarried and the one who was married became reconciled; and after their reconciliation it was disclosed that the married sister, Mrs. Glover, sold her interest in the property for $9,000, but that Mr. Warner collected $13,000 from the unmarried sisters on account of the sale.

It is but fair to say that the opinion rendered by the court was in favor of Mr. Warner, but only upon a technical ground, which is well set out in the syllabus of the case, which I will read:

"The mere reposing of confidence does not create a trust cognizable in equity or convert into a trustee the person in whom confidence has been reposed; but the assent, express or implied, of the person sought to be placed in such fiduciary relation, or where a trust has been devolved in consequence of privity of estate, or for any other reason, the assent of the person from whom such trust has been derived, must be shown in order to charge such person as trustee."

Upon that technicality the opinion was rendered in behalf of Mr. Warner.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I would be glad if in that connection the gentleman will state whether he, Mr. Warner, collected a fee from the unmarried sisters for his services?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can not say as to that, because I have no knowledge on the subject of my own, and the opinion does not say.

Now, gentlemen, the Washington Herald a few days ago started a movement that all of the Members of Congress were to be "seen." In that step, however, it honors me and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY] by saying that it is not necessary to see either me or him, and that even a postage stamp need not be wasted on either him or me. I feel especially complimented by that.

But, last Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock, this committee of one hundred met down at the Willard Hotel in pursuance to their previous appointment, not, of course (?) to see that stocks and bonds continued to escape taxation here, but that the homes of these 40,000 humble people might not be overtaxed. There the program was to call the roll, and as it was called each and every man on that committee of one hundred was asked to respond to his name and rise to his feet, and then to call the names of those in Congress with whom he was on such terms that he could take up this subject with them and prevail upon them to vote—not, (?) mind you, to let the stocks and bonds escape taxation, but that the homes of these humble people might not be overtaxed.

When they got to that feature of it one gentleman got up in the meeting and said, "Now, that arrangement is all right, but let us not use the words 'to be seen.'" He said, "You know, in the parlance of the day, that carries with it quite a significant meaning." And he said, "We must see them, but let us, at least out in public, avoid the use of the expression that they are to be 'seen.'"

Now, here is a movement that Members are to be "seen," but by whom are they to be seen? By the people who send them here? No; but by these philanthropic(?) fellows who care nothing about the taxation on stocks and bonds, but who do not want the homes of these humble people overtaxed.

I am not to be "seen," so the Washington Herald says; Judge PROUTY is not to be "seen," so the Herald says; and I hope none of you are willing to be "seen."

But, reverting just here to the cartoon of "blockheads" who do not own property in the District of Columbia, and referring to some statements made here the other day to the effect that owning property did not change anybody's views, let us see what the Washington Post thinks about it. This article appeared in the Washington Post:

"The drift of the well-to-do and influential toward this city could take no better turn than we see in the increasing number of congressional homes. Once they become interested, it is noticed that Members undergo a change of heart that bodes no ill for the municipality. Naturally they come to see that Washington really needs all that Washington people are asking for. Already we owe much to the efforts of Senators and Representatives who have made permanent investments here, and conceivably the good offices of many others would be quickened if proper influences were brought to accelerate the movement from the "deestrict" to the District."

[Laughter and applause.]

You all heard the statement made the other day that just a few trifling dollars paid for a lot upon which it was contemplated to build a home certainly would not influence a Member in his vote; but it developed that instead of being a lot upon which to erect a humble home, which never has been erected, there are nine lots charged up on the assessor's books, and those nine lots are assessed at the insignificant sum of $99,485, and the tax is $995.46.

Now, what does this cartoon in the Washington Times mean, that the 10 men upon the District Committee who voted to tax stocks and bonds did not own any real estate here? Down at the meeting the other day Mr. Warner insisted upon being 1 of 10 of an executive committee when he arose and said that the principal argument for his being put upon that executive committee was that he was one of the original committee of one hundred who had "seen" the Members of Congress when the half-and-half bill was adopted in 1878.

By the way, I was about to forget to give you the names of some of the poor who paid no taxes, or at least who should not be overtaxed in the District of Columbia, and if I can lay my hand on it quickly, I will give it to you. I find from court records that the Mary Leiter Curzon estate has $1,500,000 in stocks and bonds in the District of Columbia that are not taxed; and, because they are not taxed, a greater burden is imposed thereby upon the owner of a humble home—not only here, but that tax must be put upon the back of every constituent of every Member of this House.

The Blanchard estate has more than $700,000 in the District of Columbia in untaxed securities, and not one farthing of tax is imposed upon it.

The Clapp estate has more than $1,000,000 in securities which bear no tax. It has, however, some real estate, upon which it pays a tax of $1,295.

Then we have the Eugene Peters estate of $600,000; but that is taxed. He has the furniture stored down here in a warehouse, and that bears a tax of $27 a year. The rest of the $600,000 escapes taxation.

The Richardson estate has $150,000 in securities which pay no tax in the District of Columbia, but that estate does pay $30.98 in taxes on a piece of realty.

I, for one, shall not return to the people who sent me here and tell them that I have been "seen"; and in consequence, have voted to let these millions of dollars of securities escape taxation in order that a greater burden may be placed upon the backs of every man, woman, and child in Kentucky. That is the situation in the congressional district of every Member here. Because of this condition my State is bearing her proportionate part of this gift to the District of Columbia and is paying out $156,000 a year.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. DIES. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if property of the character which he is just now describing—stocks and bonds—is generally taxed outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The other day in committee I made the statement that this character of property is taxed in my State, and that I did not know of a State where it was not taxed. A gentleman arose in the committee and said that there are several States in the United States which do not have a tax upon securities of this kind.

Now, gentlemen, all this to-do has come up because of the George bill. The prominent features of the George bill are that there shall be "annual" assessments of real estate. The assessments are now made only every three years. Another part of the George bill provides that these annual assessments shall be made at full value instead of at two-thirds value, as now. It also provides for an increase of the salary of the assessor, and it creates nine new offices.

Another prominent feature of the George bill is that it provides for a flexible rate of taxation as to real estate, that rate to be fixed by the commissioners. To that I for one, at least, object. The George bill leaves standing the tax rate of $1.50 a hundred on tangible personal property, with a flexible rate to be fixed by the commissioners on real estate. Already there is a discrimination in the rate of taxation against personal property and in favor of real estate in the District of Columbia. Tangible personal property is taxed at the rate of $1.50 a hundred, full value, while real estate is taxed at $1.50 on two-thirds value, which makes it $1 a hundred on its real value. I have never been able to see, and I can not see now why the man who moves his taxable goods and chattels into a rented house should pay $1.50 tax upon them, while the owner of the house, the landlord, should be relieved of one-third of his taxation on the house.

They say that the commissioners should fix this rate. One of the commissioners is Mr. Siddons. He made a speech the other night at Georgetown, and in that speech he said this:

"Therefore as an essential part of the plan for the assessment of property at its true value is the further requirement of a fluctuating tax rate. If this were not a part of the proposed law the commissioners would not favor at this time a change in the present practice of valuing real property at two-thirds of its real value."

Now, if you are to let the commissioners fix the rate, you must bear in mind that we have before us the admission of one of the commissioners that he would not be in favor of permitting the present rate to be changed unless it was permissible by the act for real estate still to be taxed less than tangible personal property. Should we, therefore, put in the hands of this or any other set of Commissioners of the District of Columbia the right to fix the rate of taxation here upon real property, when it is announced in advance that they do not wish to advance above the two-thirds rate of taxation on real estate?

The fundamental principle from the beginning of civilization until now is that taxation must be "uniform"; yet in the Nation's Capital we have the little personal effects of a man taxed at the rate of $1.50 a hundred and the real estate of his landlord taxed at $1 a hundred. I am in favor of "uniformity" of rate upon taxable property, and there is no man of any consequence in the District of Columbia who has yet been brought face to face with that proposition who has had the temerity to say that any other system should prevail.

Not a great while ago Mr. Louis P. Shoemaker, one of the wealthy men of the District of Columbia and a large real estate owner, made a speech at Brightwood, and almost the first sentence of his speech contained the broad and equitable declaration that the rate of taxation should be "uniform."

Dr. Wiley, in opening this meeting at the Willard Hotel the other day, declared that taxation should be "uniform." The Washington Star last Saturday laid down the declaration that taxation in the District should be "uniform" as to all classes of property. And yet every mother's son of them is fighting to-day to prevent "uniformity" in rate of taxation.

Many people here have arrayed themselves in such a forcible way that they have at least put in jeopardy the passage of an amendment which strives at a system to obtain "uniform" taxation, and also to tax stocks and bonds and other intangible personal property. I take off my hat to them; they have arrayed against that proposition men whose philosophy is exactly opposed to them. In other words, they are playing "both ends against the middle" of these two conflicting propositions.

I see before me the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], who, when this question was up in 1902, made a great argument in favor of the proposition for which I now stand. His then colleague, the lamented De Armond, made one of the best speeches on that subject that ever was made in this Hall, and one which will go down in history as a sound economic proposition. I am glad to say that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] lent aid to them in that fight.

Now, let us talk a little about the history of this proposition. You all know, and the country knows, that these people here hold sacred, above the right of amendment or interference, what they call the "organic act." That act contains the half-and-half proposition. But let me invite your attention to one thing, that in the very clause of that act—June 11, 1878—which establishes the half-and-half principle follows a proviso, and that proviso is one of limitation, which says the half-and-half shall prevail, provided the rate of taxation therein fixed is maintained.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky may be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky how much time he expects to use?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have already spoken longer than I intended, but I would be glad to have half an hour more.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman has a prepared speech——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have not a prepared speech.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended half an hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the request, I want to say that I have understood that it was the expectation that the bill now before the House would be recommitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say that I have not been in charge of the bill—a bill to regulate building in the District of Columbia—and have not made a study of it. The subcommittee brought it before the whole committee and the whole

committee reported it out on the subcommittee's report. I have heard it suggested since it came in that some alleged defects have been discovered which were overlooked in the committee, and that probably it would be better to recommit the bill.

Mr. MANN. I only speak of it so that gentlemen interested in the Agricultural bill, which I presume will be taken up next, might have notice that they may be here.

The SPEAKER. It may elucidate the situation a little for the Chair to state that he has been notified that a Member would move to recommit the bill.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, I am the one who notified the Chair of a motion to recommit, and I am the one that spoke to the gentleman from Illinois about the matter. Such a motion will be made at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the time of the gentleman from Kentucky be extended half an hour?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The above-mentioned bill is not the one I am now discussing.

Mr. Speaker, I have alluded to the attitude of the Washington Star as to the "uniformity" of taxation. I find a little clipping from that paper which reads as follows:

"What Washington needs is 'uniform' application of the present system to everybody and all kinds of property."

The Washington Star forgets that there is no "uniformity" of taxation in the District of Columbia. When interrupted I was calling attention to the act of 1878, known as the organic act, which made taxation "uniform," and which taxes real estate and personal property of all kinds, including stocks and bonds and other securities.

The organic act of 1878 was not materially interfered with until 1883. That act broke into the organic act of 1878 in the way of annual assessment and made triennial assessments. The next breaking into the organic act was in 1902, by which intangible personal property, stocks and bonds and securities, were relieved from all taxation. At the same time "uniformity" of rate of taxation was destroyed by leaving tangible personal property taxed at $1.50 a hundred and by taxing real estate at $1 a hundred.

Nobody heard a cry from the people who are now raising all this noise for fear the organic act may be interfered with. They sat quietly by and acquiesced in the destruction of a fair assessment by saying that they were willing to accept two-thirds valuation on real estate and three-thirds valuation on tangible personal property. At that time they permitted to escape from taxation great wealth in stocks and bonds and securities of that character in the District of Columbia.

But before that act was passed the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to which commission you now propose, under the terms of the George bill, to give the right to fix the rate——

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is it not a fact that tangible personal property is now exempt from taxation to the amount of $1,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is correct; tangible personal property to the extent of $1,000 is not taxed.

Mr. HAMLIN. Can the gentleman give any reason for that exemption?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; I do not know certainly the theory on which that was done in 1902.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will say that in the city of Baltimore we exempt to the amount of $300, and we propose to increase the amount to $500, for the purpose of relieving those people who merely pay a small tax, perhaps, on furniture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think it a very good rule. In the State of Kentucky we exempt $250 of personal property, if it be on hand; and I will be very glad to see that limit increased.

But as I was endeavoring to say, the tax rate of the organic act was practically destroyed by the act of 1883 and by the act of July 1, 1902, and not one of those people now raising such a fuss lifted a voice in protest against it. Let me tell you how and the circumstances under which the change as to the taxation of real estate was made from $1.50 a hundred to only $1 a hundred. This House went on record emphatically in 1902 in favor of taxing all kinds of personal property. The bill passed the House in that shape. It went over to the Senate. The Senate put on some amendments, and then the bill came back from the Senate amended, and it went to conference, and while the subject had not been brought up either in the House or in the Senate, the conferees brought back to this House a proposition which was adopted, without debate and without a roll call, reducing the rate on real estate one-third.

Mr. Speaker, I just read from a newspaper clipping what Commissioner Siddons said relative to his attitude in taxing real estate. For fear that the question may come up afterwards as to whether or not Mr. Siddons did say that which I have read from his address, I addressed a communication to him, and I have an answer from him now in which he says he was correctly quoted. In addition to that, he was kind enough to send me a copy of his entire speech, which I now have before me, in which is the statement just as the newspapers copied it.

The right of the commissioners to make the rate upon taxable property in the District of Columbia is contended for upon the ground that practically all of the other cities have a body which fixes the rate of taxation other than the legislative body. I do not know whether that is true or not, but that has been urged before the committee; but if that be true, there is a legislative enactment upon the statute books of the State from which I come which fixes a limit of taxation, State, county, and municipal, and if it be true that a commission should be given the right to fix the rate of taxation, then I say that that should not be true here. My reason for that is this, that the commissioners must be appointed from among men who have resided in the District for three years next preceding their appointment. You can not find three men in the District of Columbia prominent enough to be considered as Commissioners of the District who can withstand the pressure that can be brought to bear upon them to fix a rate of taxation that will raise the revenue they need, if it should thereby relieve the United States from contributing to the support of the District. Baltimore and every other city in the country must levy a rate which will pay its operating expenses.

If they fail to levy and collect it, then they will have a deficit; but if this city—or, rather, the District of Columbia—should fail to make a levy sufficient in rate to meet its demands, then what? Then there is but one thing to be done, and that is for the Members here to put their hands into the Treasury of the United States and bring out the remainder of the sum which is needed but which has not been levied. If you will give to Baltimore the same authority which is given to the District of Columbia now, and say to them, "You can levy a rate of tax upon real estate which you think ought to be levied under all the circumstances, but if you levy less than will pay your expenses then the Federal Government will make it good," is there a man here or anywhere else who does not believe that Baltimore, under those circumstances, would make an insufficient levy? Every city in the Nation would do it, and Washington would do likewise. If the United States is to continue to contribute to the maintenance of the District of Columbia, then I say the Congress of the people whose money is taken should hold the right to fix the rate of this levy. No other proposition is equitable. Four hundred and thirty-five Members of Congress can better be trusted with that duty than three men whose selection must come from the immediate vicinity to be affected.

The amendment which I have just read and which has brought so much criticism does everything that the George bill does "and then some." It leaves the George bill stand as it is, except in section 2, and the proposed amendment does not give the commissioners the right to fix this rate of taxation, but keeps it with Congress, where it now is. In addition to that the amendment taxes intangible personal property such as stocks and bonds, and those two propositions are the only questions which arose in committee over this proposed amendment.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. If I understood that amendment, it exempts from taxation notes given for real estate in the District of Columbia that have not been paid?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There has been always a disposition on the part of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia not to tax any kind of personal property. When they first began to operate under the organic act of June 11, 1878, they were given the right to abolish all offices that they thought should be abolished. They abolished the only piece of machinery which could collect taxes on personal property, and but little tax was collected on personal property for years and years under that act, notwithstanding the fact that the half-and-half plan was conditioned upon and implied the collection of that tax. I just referred to the Peters case, which estate has $600,000 in untaxed securities in the District of Columbia. When the District Commissioners undertook to collect some sort of personal tax in 1901, I believe it was, from that estate, the attorneys for the estate brought suit of injunction to stop the

collection of the tax upon the personal property, and Justice Clabaugh, who died a few days ago, was compelled to grant that injunction upon the ground that the commissioners had abolished the offices of the only men who could collect that tax. However, later commissions have done some better, and they are collecting a tax upon personal property, but they are not—and can not, because they are not permitted by law—collecting tax on intangible personal property such as stocks and bonds.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, are there not some instances where there is a very large amount of tangible personal property kept in storage, and does not that entirely escape taxation because they can not investigate who is the owner?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know about that, but last Saturday I asked the assessor of the District of Columbia, naming an estate, whether or not he knew there was $60,000,000 of securities belonging to that estate now in the District of Columbia escaping taxation.

He said it was his opinion, but he had no way of getting at it as an absolute certainty, that that amount of securities was stored in the vaults of one of the banks of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SIMS. I had reference to the storage companies for household goods, furniture, and the like of that. If personal property was stored in a storage warehouse, the assessor has not the right to go and demand the names of those who stored it. That is one of the defects of the law, as I understand it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I understand so. Now, the amendment about which all this fuss has been raised proposes to go back to the organic act of 1878. It proposes, in substance, to reenact the taxing clause of the organic act, but those who say that the organic act is too sacred to be interfered with permitted that act to be outraged in 1883 and again in 1902; and now, when a proposition comes up to restore the system of taxation as it has been provided for in the organic act, they are the first people to raise a "holler." It is perfectly excusable for members of this community not to be familiar with the terms of the George bill and the proposed amendment to it, because their newspapers will not give them information. The first section of the George bill provides for an annual assessment of all real estate in the District of Columbia at its true value. That is contained in the George bill in the first two lines, yet here is the Washington Times of February 27, 1914, in double display type, making this statement. In speaking of the Committee on the District of Columbia, it says:

"The committee will also write into the George bill, over the protest of its author, provision that assessments shall be at full value."

That is one of the fundamental principles of the George bill, and the committee has shown no disposition to take it out, and it is still in the bill and, therefore, there is no necessity for the committee to write it into the bill, either with or without the consent of the author. The article further says:

"The result will be"—

If the committee writes that into the bill over the protest of Mr. GEORGE—

"that the District tax bills will raise annually at least $11,000,000 to $12,000,000, and the argument then will be advanced that the District is self-supporting and that further help from the Federal Government is unnecessary."

Are we to infer from that that when the act of 1902 reduced the rate of taxation upon real estate from $1.50 a hundred to $1 a hundred they were seeking to avoid the raising of that $3,000,000 or $4,000,000? If so, then they deliberately sought in 1902 to get through Congress, and they did get it through, a proposition which would destroy the rate of taxation fixed in the organic act of June 11, 1878, in order that they might not reach a point in income where they could pay their own expenses.

I say there has been a studied attempt to misrepresent the George bill as well as the proposed amendment to it. The papers have gone so far as to even undertake to arouse the poor people of the District of Columbia, upon the theory that if you tax stocks and bonds and promissory notes that the rate of taxation must of necessity be increased upon the humble homes. That argument, of course, will not stand the test. It is not worth anybody's while to assert to the poor man that a tax upon property which he has not got, but which other people have, is going to raise his rate of taxation; yet they have undertaken to arouse the poor people of this community with that kind of an argument. The Star said a few days ago that this proposition to tax intangible property was "inquisitorial." Is not the income-tax law "inquisitorial," and ought it not to be? But the Star goes further still and says that the committee amendment which is proposed to tax intangible personal property will induce untold perjury in the District of Columbia. I do not believe that; but I will enter into no argument with the editor of the Star upon that question, because he may know his own people better than I do. [Laughter.]

When the tariff bill was under consideration in the Senate every Member of the Senate was put under oath to state whether or not he had any interest in the provisions of that tax bill. That was "inquisitorial," and if that inquisition were extended a little further to the assessors' books in the District of Columbia you might find there are those in Congress who have interests in measures which come before Congress twice in every month. I, for one, would not object to that "inquisition."

Some of the prominent speakers at the meeting held at the Willard Hotel the other day said that the Government owns all the streets in the city of Washington, and therefore should bear half the tax. That was the false argument made by Boss Shepherd in 1874 in connection with his further erroneous statement, which has long since been exploded, that the Federal Government owns half the property in the District of Columbia. But it is easy enough to get up with a sympathetic, cheering crowd of those who have met, not (?) to prevent the taxation of intangible property but to protect the humble home owner in the District of Columbia, and make the declaration that the Federal Government owns the streets in the District of Columbia. The law in the case has been repeatedly stated in the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of Smith *v.* The Corporation of Washington (20 Howard), referring to the powers of the corporation of Washington, the court says:

"It is unnecessary in the consideration of this point to recur to the early history of the foundation of the city of Washington; suffice to say the land was originally conveyed to trustees, to be laid out as a Federal city, with such streets, etc., as the President shall approve. It has been so laid out and the streets dedicated to the public. As in all other cities and towns, the legal title to the public streets is vested in the sovereign as trustee for the public."

Then they tell you that the Federal Government ought to bear half of these expenses because it owns more than half. Every once in awhile some Rip Van Winkle, with real estate in the District of Columbia owned in his family, awakens to tell us that that is a fact, when, as a matter of fact, I say that the Federal Government does not own in the District of Columbia 100 acres which it uses "exclusively" for Federal purposes. Take Potomac Park, which the Federal Government owns. Does any man tell me that Potomac Park is owned for the Government, and not for the citizens of the District of Columbia? The Federal Government invested largely in the acquirement of about 2,000 acres for Rock Creek Park. Is that, as stated in the title of the Rock Creek Park act, for the benefit and pleasure of the people of the United States? Not at all. Rock Creek Park was acquired for the rich of the District of Columbia. I made the assertion once upon this floor, perhaps about a year ago, that nine out of ten, or an even greater per cent, of all the people found in Rock Creek Park were there in automobiles or in carriages. One gentleman who owns more than $100,000 of real estate in the District of Columbia said that that was not the case. He said that you could find thousands of pedestrians in Rock Creek Park to every one you could find in a carriage or automobile. I take it for granted that each and every one of you has been through Rock Creek Park, and I am willing to submit that issue to any man, whether he be a Member of this House or not, who has ever gone through that park.

Mr. BARTON. I would like, as a matter of information, to know where we would go to find exactly the amount of property the Government owns and how much is owned by the District of Columbia in the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. You would have to have an abstractor do that.

Mr. BARTON. But there is nothing of that kind now so that we can know definitely?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No.

Mr. GOULDEN. In the gentleman's judgment, about how much is owned by the Government and used by the Government for its own use?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Take the White House grounds; they are used exclusively for the Federal Government, and the Treasury grounds are used exclusively for the Federal Government. One can name different pieces of property like that that are used exclusively for the Federal Government. The ground on which this house stands is used exclusively for the Federal Government, but the park which surrounds it is not; and while the highways through the grounds are kept up by the Federal Government, the highways are used in exclusion to the others which surround the Capitol Grounds. In the last Congress and in the one before you have provided three and one-half million dollars to be invested in a park between the Capitol and the

Union Station. The District did not participate in the payment for that. Can anybody tell me that that is to be acquired for the use and enjoyment of the people of the United States and not for the people of the District of Columbia?

But you see it "harped upon" in every day's paper here, in speaking to the people back in the States, that the city of Washington is "theirs." You can take a search warrant and go to the householders in the congressional district in Kentucky from which I hail and ask them to point out the particular lot in the District of Columbia which anyone of them owns and I dare say you will find none. Let the casual stranger, a visitor to Washington, who comes here believing that this is "his" city, lay claim to a single piece of property and in an hour and a half he will be confined in the lunatic asylum over here at St. Elizabeth's.

In conclusion, let me liberally paraphrase what John says in the Good Book:

Because thou hast been "seen," thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not been "seen" and have believed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

REFERENCE OF BILL.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Kentucky has commenced to address the House certain matters in relation to the bill H. R. 8593 have been called to my attention as chairman of the subcommittee which seem to make it important to refer the bill. I move, therefore, to refer the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] moves to refer the bill mentioned to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend a few remarks in the RECORD on this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13679. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,245,026.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose on Saturday evening the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] had asked permission that it be permitted to offer an amendment to the item with reference to this bureau. Since that time he has agreed that his amendment ought not to come in at this part of the bill, but that he will offer it to the section relating to the Bureau of Chemistry. Therefore, I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,750; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, $2,500; 1 officer in charge of publications, $2,250; 1 landscape gardener, $1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, $2,250; 1 superintendent of seed weighing and mailing, $2,000; 1 executive clerk, $2,250; 3 executive clerks, at $1,980 each; 1 assistant superintendent of seed warehouse, $1,400; 1 seed inspector, $1,000; 9 clerks, class 4; 14 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 20 clerks, class 2; 52 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,080; 9 clerks, at $1,020 each; 33 clerks, at $1,000 each; 55 clerks, at $900 each; 30 clerks, at $840 each; 18 clerks, at $720 each; 1 laborer, $780; 42 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 12 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 26 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 1 artist, $1,620; 1 clerk or artist, $1,200; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 photographer, $900; 1 photographer, $840; 1 laboratory aid, $1,440; 1 laboratory aid, $1,380; 3 laboratory aids or clerks, at $1,200 each; 1 laboratory aid or clerk, $1,080; 2 laboratory aids or clerks, at $1,020 each; 5 laboratory aids, at $840 each; 8 laboratory aids, at $720 each; 6 laboratory aids, at $600 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, $720; 2 map tracers, at $720 each; 2 map tracers, at $600 each; 2 gardeners, at $1,440 each; 4 gardeners, at $1,200 each; 8 gardeners, at $1,100 each; 15 gardeners, at $900 each; 19 gardeners, at $780 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $960 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 3 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 1 assistant in technology, $1,400; 1 assistant in technology, $1,380; 1 mechanical assistant, $1,200; 1 blacksmith, $900; 1 carpenter, $900; 1 painter, $900; 1 teamster, $840; 1 teamster, $600; 21 laborers, at $540 each; 27 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; 4 laborers or charwomen, at $480 each; 2 laborers or charwomen, at $360 each; 2 laborers, at $420 each; 15 charwomen, at $240 each; 11 messenger boys, at $360 each; 6 messenger boys, at $300 each; in all, $476,520.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee the reason for increasing the salary of one officer in charge of records, on page 14, lines 11 and 12, from $2,100 to $2,250.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill last year as reported from the Committee on Agriculture carried an increase of $250, I believe, for this official. It was stricken out on the floor of the House by a point of order, went to the Senate, and the Senate restored the estimate of the Department of Agriculture and the recommendation of the House Committee on Agriculture. In conference it was agreed that the salary should be fixed as it is in the current law. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in presenting this roll made a very urgent appeal that this salary be increased $150, making a statement that this official had been connected with the department for a long time, and was a most efficient man, and that he ought to make the estimate in keeping with the recommendation of the committee itself, and the committee, pursuing its former policy and believing its former policy was wise, allowed it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman if he does not think these salaries ought to be classified, with a fixed salary for each class, so that there will be a regular line of promotion, and no opportunity for making distinction over employees of the same grade and of the same ability?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to my friend from Illinois that the salaries are in a large measure classified, so far as clerks are concerned. For instance, you have clerks of the first, second, third, and fourth classes; and then, of course, it is necessary in a great big department like the Department of Agriculture to have people filling these extra places that can not be called, accurately, "clerks," such as gardeners and keepers of records and files, and places of that character. It would be almost impossible to classify those; but, so far as the clerks are concerned, I think the department has classified them pretty well, and I think it ought to classify them.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to call the attention of the chairman to what he already knows, and that is, that in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads we never make an appropriation for a salary above that which is fixed by law, and that all of the employees are graded in the Post Office Department.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I would say to my friend, in that connection, that, so far as the clerks or the compensations in the Department of Agriculture are concerned, they are classified in the same way under a statute which I read a moment ago. I happened to put my finger on it.

Mr. FOWLER. That is true as to some of the clerks. I am sure of that. But I believe they all ought to be classified, so that there would be no chance for anyone to even suspect that a salary is increased for any other reason than because of merit.

Mr. LEVER. It would be a very hard matter to do that; but, if we could, it would be very desirable, I will say to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of this committee, further, how many increases in the force in that Bureau of Plant Industry are made by this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Illinois that the only promotion whatever and the only new place whatever, except in the way of transfer from other bureaus or from the lump fund, is this official to whom he has called attention. The fact is that the salary roll of the Bureau of Plant Industry shows an increase of only $30, there being transfers to and from it, the only actual promotion being the one to which the gentleman has referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be permitted to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. In line 16 of page 14 there are 20 clerks of class 2, whereas the last bill carried only 17. That is on line 16 of page 14. Twenty clerks are there provided for, whereas the former bill provided for only 17. And following that are 52 clerks of class 1, whereas the former bill provided for only 49.

Mr. LEVER. The explanation of that is this: There is an increase there of 3 clerks in lieu of 6 clerks, at $720 each, dropped, making a net decrease in the statutory roll of $120. It is an actual decrease, although I am frank to say there is a small increase in the salary of these 3 clerks.

Mr. FOWLER. There must be an increase, because the appropriation is increased from $427,690 to $476,250.

Mr. LEVER. There have been 6 clerks at $720 dropped and 3 clerks of class 2 provided for, making an actual difference of $120 as a decrease.

Mr. FOWLER. There is something like a $50,000 increase over the last bill.

Mr. LEVER. There have been transferred from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements 1 clerk of class 3, with transfer from lump funds of this bureau clerks whose salaries total $48,800, making an apparent increase of $48,120, but an actual increase of only $30.

Mr. FOWLER. On the same page you have increased a laborer from $720 to $780.

Mr. LEVER. That is a transfer from the lump fund.

Mr. FOWLER. And one photographer, on line 1 of page 15, beginning on page 14, line 25; one photographer at $840.

Mr. LEVER. That is a transfer from the lump fund at the same salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, I do not desire to make a point of order against this increase on the explanation of the chairman, but I do desire to say that I am not in favor of this character of increases of salaries. I do not think it is healthful. I do not think it can bring any good to the department; neither do I think it can bring satisfaction to the employees. But I am disposed, under this explanation of the gentleman, who is a very high-minded and conscientious gentleman, to allow it to pass at this time.

Mr. LEVER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his reservation of a point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, while discussing the question of "order," and in view of events recently transpiring, it occurs to me that this incident would explain some of these matters of order: In the seventies and the early eighties, when the Comanche Indians swooped down on Texas and robbed, scalped, and murdered people, the Texas Rangers had run them out. After peace was restored an Indian went to the Indian agent at Anadarko and said, "I want a rifle." The agent said to him, "You can not have it. You might shoot a soldier with it." The Indian replied, "No; I don't want it to shoot a soldier. We kill soldier with a stick; but I want it to shoot a Texas Ranger with." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the ginning, handling, grading, baling, and wrapping of cotton, and the establishment and demonstration of standards for the different grades thereof, and for carrying into effect the provisions of law relating thereto, $80,580: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $60,000 is to be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades of cotton as standardized by the Government in order to determine their relative spinning values and for demonstrating the results of such tests.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning in line 18, page 17, and insert the following:

"For investigating the ginning, handling, grading, baling, and wrapping of cotton, and the establishment and demonstration of standards for the different grades thereof, and for carrying into effect the provisions of law relating thereto, and for investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, and for carrying into effect the provisions of law relating thereto, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $60,000 is to be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades of cotton as standardized by the Government in order to determine their relative spinning values and for demonstrating the results of such tests: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall organize in the Bureau of Plant Industry of his department a section of grain inspection and grading, and shall, according to the rules of the civil service, appoint such experts and other employees as may be deemed by him necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. That said Secretary shall also appoint, in accordance with the rules of the civil service, at each of the following cities, to wit, Portland, Me.; Boston; New York; Philadelphia; Baltimore; Chicago; Minneapolis; Duluth; Superior; Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis; New Orleans; Seattle; Tacoma; San Francisco; Galveston, Tex.; Atlanta, Ga., and at such other important centers of interstate trade and commerce in grain and cotton as he may consider necessary or proper for carrying out the provisions of this act, one chief inspector and such assistants as may be required to inspect and grade grains and cotton as herein provided: *Provided, however*, That said Secretary may appoint a chief or deputy inspector at such important point of intrastate grain or cotton trade as shall furnish sufficient inspection service to fully pay the expenses of maintaining an inspection at such point, when the said Secretary is assured that the grain or cotton trade interests at such point are desirous of securing Federal inspection; but in no case shall such inspector inspect or grade such intrastate grain or cotton except upon request of the owner thereof or his agent.

"SEC. 3. That said inspectors shall be paid a salary or compensation to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, which shall correspond as nearly as possible to salaries and compensations paid other officers or employees of the Government performing similar duties.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make all needful rules and regulations governing the inspection and grading herein provided for.

"SEC. 5. That said Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and required, as soon as may be after the enactment hereof, to determine and fix, according to such standards as he may provide, such classifications and grading of cotton, wheat, flax, corn, rye, oats, barley, and other grains as in his judgment the usages of trade may warrant and permit. In the inauguration of the work herein provided he may, if in his judgment the best interests of trade and commerce in said grains or cotton require it, adopt the standards of classification and grades now recognized by commercial usages or established by the laws of any State or by boards of trade or chambers of commerce, and may modify or change such classifications or grades from time to time as in his judgment shall be for the best interests of interstate and export grain and cotton trade, but the grades established shall be uniform throughout the United States.

"SEC. 6. That when such standards are fixed and the classifications and grades determined upon the same shall be made matter of permanent record in the Agricultural Department, and public notice thereof shall be given in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, and thereafter such classification and grades shall be known as the United States standard.

"SEC. 7. That from and after 30 days after such classifications and grades have been determined upon and fixed, and duly placed on record as hereinafter provided, such classification and grading shall be taken and held to be the standard in all interstate commerce in grain and cotton.

"SEC. 8. That it shall be the duty of any railroad company, steamship company, or other firm or corporation or private individual engaged in the transportation of grain or cotton destined to any State, Territory, or country other than that in which it is received for inspection, or received from any other State, Territory, or country than that to which it is consigned, to notify the chief inspector at the place of destination of any consignment of grain or cotton, within 24 hours after its arrival, that a shipment, cargo, or load of grain or cotton is in its, their, or his hands and the place of destination of said grain or cotton.

"That it shall be unlawful for any person herein named to willfully unload or otherwise discharge any load, cargo, or consignment of grain or cotton which has been at any time during the period of its transit an article of interstate commerce and which has not been inspected in accordance with the provisions of this act, until the same has been inspected as provided herein.

"Upon the receipt of such notice the said chief inspector shall cause the said grain or cotton to be inspected and graded in accordance with the classification and standards fixed by said Secretary, and to issue and deliver a certificate of inspection showing such grade and classification in such form as may be provided by rules prescribed by said Secretary.

"SEC. 9. That it shall be the duty of said inspectors to inspect and grade all grain and cotton which at the time of inspecting and grading of the same has been shipped from any other State, Territory, or country than the State, Territory, or country in which the same is inspected, or is intended for shipment into any other State, Territory, or foreign country before the same is unloaded from the car, vessel, or other vehicle in which the same was or is being transported, and to charge and collect from the owner thereof such fees for the inspection of said grain or cotton as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall have the power to fix the rate of charges for the inspection of grain and cotton and the manner in which the same shall be collected, and which charges shall be regulated in such manner as will, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, produce sufficient revenue only to meet the necessary expenses of the inspection service, said fees to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, in the same manner as for other miscellaneous receipts: *Provided, however*, That such inspector, upon request of the owner or agent of any grain or cotton at the point or place where an inspector may be located, whether or not the grain has entered into interstate commerce, shall inspect the same and deliver his certificate therefor in the same manner as other inspections are made and for the same charge; and whenever the owner of grain or cotton at such place shall request and furnish facilities therefor, said inspector shall also weigh such grain or cotton and deliver to the owner or his agent his certificate showing the gross and net weight of such grain or cotton, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 10. That no inspector or deputy inspector of grain or cotton shall, during his term of service, be interested, directly or indirectly, in the handling, storing, shipping, purchasing, or selling of grain or cotton, nor shall he be in the employment of any person or corporation interested in the handling, storing, shipping, purchasing, or selling of grain or cotton.

"SEC. 11. That any person interested in any consignment of grain or cotton inspected under the provisions of this act may appeal from an inspection made by any assistant inspector to the chief inspector at the point where such grain or cotton is inspected, and from said chief inspector to the Secretary of Agriculture. Said Secretary shall make all needful rules and regulations to govern appeals.

"SEC. 12. That when any grain or cotton which having been inspected and certificate of inspection issued hereunder is mixed with any other grain or cotton not inspected or with grain or cotton which has been inspected and certified at a different grade, the same shall not be shipped out of the State where such mixing is done without being reinspected and graded; any such person or corporation shipping such grain or cotton as aforesaid without reinspection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

"SEC. 13. That the shipment or consignment of any grain or cotton aforesaid from any of the places mentioned herein to another State or foreign country without the same being inspected and graded as herein provided is hereby prohibited; but where grain or cotton has been once inspected hereunder, and remains unmixed with other grain, the same need not be reinspected at the place from which it is exported: *Provided, however,* That said Secretary may in his discretion reinspect any cargo of such grain or cotton before the same is exported.

"SEC. 14. That it shall be the duty of the inspectors and assistants to investigate the handling and weighing of grain and cotton inspected by them, and to make such report thereon as the said Secretary may require; and it shall be the duty of every person or corporation weighing such grain or cotton to allow inspection of such weighing and handling by said inspectors.

"It shall also be the duty of the inspectors and assistants to inspect and grade "samples" of cotton, grain, and seeds when received for inspection and grading at any of the places named herein, and the inspector shall make a report specifying the grade and transmit the same to the owner or sender of such sample of grain or cotton.

"SEC. 15. That any person or corporation who willfully does any act prohibited herein or who willfully refuses or neglects to do or perform the things required of him under the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine in a sum not to exceed $5,000.

"SEC. 16. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after the 1st day of January, 1915."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. It is undoubtedly subject to a point of order. I thought perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota might want to make some statement about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is quite so certain that it is subject to a point of order as some gentlemen seem to think.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt about it himself.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not care to discuss the point of order, if the Chair has made up his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is no question about it. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain and the fixing of definite grades thereof, $76,320.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if this paragraph is intended to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate the handling, grading, and transportation of grain and the fixing of definite grades thereof for export or for domestic use?

Mr. LEVER. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Maryland permit me to say that these grades, after being fixed and established, must, of course, be accepted voluntarily by the trade. There is no provision of law anywhere of which I am aware which forces upon the grain trade the acceptance of these grades after they are fixed.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. That is all I want to know.

Mr. LEVER. My information is that standards of grades for wheat, oats, and barley have not as yet been fixed, and the probability is that it will be at least two years before they can be definitely fixed upon. The standard for corn has been fixed, and a promulgation of the grades has already been published, to become effective July 1, but there is no authority anywhere under which the Secretary of Agriculture could force these grades upon the grain trade, either for domestic consumption or for export.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I am much obliged to the gentleman. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This has been carried in the bill for some years, has it not?

Mr. LEVER. This provision has been carried in the bill for many years—as long as I have been a Member, according to my recollection.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is only about three years since this was put into the bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think it is probably six or eight years. It is quite a while since it first began to be carried.

Mr. MADDEN. I remember very well when it was inserted in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will give the gentleman the information desired. This is not a new item. Congress has for years made appropriation for the investigation, the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, also for investigating the ginning, handling, grading, baling, and wrapping of cotton, and the establishment of a standard for the different grades thereof.

The appropriations on account of grain have been as follows: In 1907, $15,000; in 1908, $40,000; in 1909, $53,700; in 1910, $52,440; in 1911, $51,000; in 1912, $57,080; in 1913, $55,640; for the fiscal year 1914, $15,000, a total of $389,880. On account of cotton the appropriations have been as follows: For 1909, $7,350; for 1910, $12,250; for 1911, $36,650; for 1912, $32,350; for 1913, $26,000; for 1914, $46,120; total, $160,720. Total for grain and cotton, $550,600.

It is now proposed to appropriate for grain $76,320 and for cotton $80,580, which will bring the amount up to $707,500.

Mr. Chairman, if the grading and fixing of grades of cotton or grain are of any value whatever, I submit that now is the time to provide for the machinery for inspection and grading, and if Federal inspection and grading are not desired, as contemplated, then it is time that we discontinued these appropriations. We have appropriated $550,000 for investigation, which is of no value whatever unless followed up by legislation authorizing the fixing of standards of inspection and grading.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, then, it does not do any good to expend all this money?

Mr. HAUGEN. The expenditure of $550,000 is of no value whatever, and the proposed appropriation of $76,000 for grain and another appropriation of $80,580 for cotton will be of no value whatever.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I think.

Mr. HAUGEN. If this inspection is desired, I believe that now is the time for Congress to provide the machinery to provide for efficient inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask to be recognized in my own time.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is the point of order pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been withdrawn.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, all I wish to say in the matter is that if the inspection service is desired, if it is of any value whatever, we ought to authorize the department to inspect and grade cotton and grain and provide money and machinery necessary to inspect and grade cotton and grain. Of what value can the proposed investigation and appropriation be if we do not authorize the inspection and grading?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Is the gentleman in favor of striking out the item?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am in favor of standardizing inspection and grading; that is the purpose for which the appropriations have been made.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That could be done by amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amendment has just been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and it was ruled out of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I only wanted to know if the gentleman wanted to strike out the appropriation. A motion to strike it out would be in order.

Mr. HAUGEN. The proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] was to provide for inspection and grading.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Suppose a cargo of grain is sent from Chicago to New Orleans, and on its way it passes through a wet and damp climate and absorbs moisture, so that when it arrives at the destination it is not the same grain as when it was shipped from the consignor. Do you propose to have it inspected at the point of delivery? If you do, it would amount to confiscation.

Mr. HAUGEN. The contract between the buyer and seller would determine where it should be inspected and graded.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government does not inspect the grain under this provision at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. That question would be determined by the buyer and the seller.

Mr. SHERWOOD. All boards of trade have first-class inspectors.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman buys a car of grain for delivery in New York, he would naturally arrange for its inspection in New York. If he buys a carload of grain to be delivered in Chicago, he would have it inspected and graded in Chicago. The trouble now is that we have the grain graded in Minneapolis and St. Louis and different places, and we have three or four different grades. The testimony before the Senate committee was that very often No. 2 grain shipped into Chicago and other terminals would be shipped out as No. 1 grain. We want a uniform system of grading and inspection, so that the seller and the buyer may know what they are doing and what they are getting, and we should have competent inspectors to determine the grade of cotton and grain. If inspection and

grading is not contemplated, then this appropriation is useless. If it is to be of value, then Congress should provide for inspection and grading. If standardization, inspection, and grading are not contemplated or desired, why have we appropriated money for the investigation? If the service is not of any value, why should we expend $155,000 next year for something not desired and of no benefit?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I say it ought not to be appropriated.

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly if it is not the purpose to standardize, inspect, and grade, then strike it out.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The boards of trade now have inspectors under the State law; they have their own inspectors. Do you propose that the General Government shall take charge of the inspection?

Mr. HAUGEN. What does the gentleman mean by "their own inspectors"?

Mr. MADDEN. State inspectors.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken. If he will read the testimony before the committees, he will see that the States do not have inspectors of the kind.

Mr. MADDEN. They do in Illinois.

Mr. HAUGEN. The testimony is that the boards of trade control the inspection.

Mr. MADDEN. They are controlled by the State under the State law.

Mr. HAUGEN. The contention is that the inspectors are controlled by the board of trade; that is the testimony before the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. But they are under the State law, under the railroad warehouse commission.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may have time, I think I can tell the gentleman what Chicago wants. I believe I know. Chicago wants to be let alone. It wants its own inspection, thus making the manipulation of grades possible. I know what the farmers and shippers want. I have had 35 years of experience in farming, some 15 or 20 in shipping, hence I have not only come in contact with the farmers and shippers, but I have had actual experience, and claim to have some knowledge of the needs and desires of the farmers and shippers. What they need and desire is a square deal, the fixing of standards, Federal inspection and grading, or, in other words, uniformity in grading grain and cotton. They have been here before Congress ever since I came here, and that is 15 years ago. I take it that they were here a number of years before that. There is practically no difference of opinion between the farmers, the independent millers, and shippers on that proposition, hence the terminals want one thing, the farmers, the independent millers, and the shippers want another, so if Congress wants to act in accord with the wishes of the farmers, for whom so many of its Members profess great friendship, then let it do away with this diverse system, this manipulation of grades which always works to the detriment of the producer, miller, and shipper, and provide for uniformity in grading. The farmer, the miller, and shipper are opposed to one grade for one market and one for another, and against one grade fixed for one buyer and another for another; or, in other words, they are opposed to the terminals or interested parties determining the grades as is now being done in many of the terminals. On the other hand, the terminals are in favor of delay. As before stated, they want to be left alone; they want cotton and grain graded to suit themselves; they do not want to be interfered with; they want cotton, wheat, corn, and other grain coming in graded No. 2 or No. 3, or a low grade, and graded No. 1, or a higher grade, going out; they want the cotton and grain inspected and graded by inspectors under their control; they want the board of appeals composed of persons either directly or indirectly interested or controlled by the purchaser of the cotton or grain to be inspected; they believe in the present system of robbing the producer, miller, and shipper of the difference in value of a low and high grade through the process of imposing upon the shippers' grain a low grade and to have a better grade fixed on grain going out by inspectors dominated by great elevator interests; they believe in buying on one grade and selling on another, thus robbing the producer and shipper outside of the ring; they believe in continuing the fraud perpetrated in certifying grain to suit their sweet will, or, in other words, improper certification.

The Government inspects meats at the packing houses at its own expense. Why not give the cotton and grain producers Federal inspection and grading which the farmers and independent grain dealers and millers outside of the ring so much desire? Why should not this Congress, professing so much friendship for the farmer, now come to his rescue? Certainly this universal and earnest plea for inspection and grading coming from the farmer as it does ought to appeal to those who have so eloquently and persistently proclaimed their friendship and interest in the matter. The delay has cost the farmers, millers, and shippers outside of the ring millions of dollars. They have been led to believe that the $550,000 appropriated in the past really meant something; that Congress in making the appropriations had for its object standardization, Federal inspection, and grading of cotton and grain. Five hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the people's money has already been appropriated, and so far no inspection nor grading has been done by the department; that is, the portion allotted to the fixing of definite grades is a waste of money unless followed up by legislation authorizing and providing for Federal inspection and grading. Federal inspection and grading can harm no one except those benefited by the present unjust and wrongful system—they have made their millions at the expense of the producers, millers, and shippers. Why should they continue the practice? The amendment providing for the proposed inspection and grading of cotton and grain will do away not only with the injustice and fraud perpetrated in the past but will provide for an inspection and grading which can be relied upon and will establish a better market for our grain, as everybody knows. Not only the people of our own country but foreign countries have no confidence in the grading of cotton and grain in the great terminal markets where our cotton and grain are sold. It goes without saying that if the foreigners can get a square deal in grades they will purchase more, and instead of going to Canada and other countries, where they do get a square deal, they will come here. Under the present system the purchasers at the terminals are compelled to accept the certification of the terminals; they have no recourse, they must accept, good or bad, and as a result we lose millions of dollars every year in trade with foreign nations. Why continue a practice detrimental to the producer for whom so many tears have been shed in this and previous Congresses? I submit that $550,000, if appropriated simply to deceive, ought to be sufficient, and that the time has now come when Congress can be of some real service to its farmer constituency. Gentlemen, in my opinion the proposed increase in appropriation and the authorization of standardization, Federal inspection, and grading will prove of greater benefit to the farmer than all the other money appropriated in this bill. Will you do it? Oh, the gentleman says that it can not be taken onto the Agricultural appropriation bill; that the question has not been considered. My answer is that it has been considered for at least 15 years. How much more time is needed? A bill providing for inspection and grading grain has been reported to the Senate; it is now on the calendar; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is identical with the bill reported by the Senate committee, hence it is not a new matter.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the bill has not been reported to the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. Bills have been considered every year the gentleman has been here. It is not a new matter. I read from the Senate report:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having had under consideration the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes, begs leave to report the bill with amendment.

Your committee incorporates and makes a part of this report the former report made upon similar bills favorably reported in the Sixtieth, Sixty-first, and Sixty-second Congresses, which report is adopted by this committee, and is as follows:

"Full and complete hearings were had before the committee, and every question raised by this proposed measure quite exhaustively considered. Many witnesses were heard, both for and against the measure.

"Our grain trade has grown up from the rather ancient and simple system of barter between the producer and purchaser, upon personal inspection of the product, to the present almost universal system of contracts for vast quantities by grades in great central markets hundreds of miles from the place of production and in a different jurisdiction. The producer, for the most part, is without any voice in determining the rules or regulations governing the handling or grading of his grain, the price which is fixed by such grading, and helpless to reform or eliminate the many abuses which have entered into the system of handling and grading grain at these great terminals, and which operate as a fraud and injustice upon both the producer and consumer.

"These evils, which have been established by both the positive evidence of witnesses and the record admissions of the boards of trade and State warehouse commissions, for the most part govern the commerce in grain."

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] says that the State of Minnesota regulates the grading. I will tell the gentleman that that is not the fact. I will refer him to the reports made by the State warehouse commission, where he will find that in one city in his own State 99,711 bushels of No. 1 northern were put in and 196,288 shipped out from the very same terminals—more than double. For the benefit of the gentleman, I read from the Senate report:

(11) The reports of the State warehouse commissions, where such reports are kept, show that there are shipped out from the great terminals from two to four times as many of the higher grades as are received into the elevators at such places, while nearly all of the lower

grades, such as No. 4, no grade, and rejected, purchased in, disappear entirely in the out shipments.

(12) A report from a committee appointed by the Bankers' Association of North Dakota, which takes its figures from the records of the grain-inspection department of Minnesota, shows the following table of receipts and shipments of a single terminal elevator for only three months:

| | Receipts. | Shipments. |
|---|---|---|
| | *Bushels.* | *Bushels.* |
| No. 1 northern | 98,711.40 | 196,286.30 |
| No. 2 northern | 141,455.10 | 467,764.00 |
| No. 3 northern | 272,047.20 | 213,459.30 |
| No. 4 | 201,267.20 | [1] |
| No grade | 116,021.10 | [1] |
| Rejected | 50,742.30 | [1] |
| | 880,245.10 | 877,512.00 |
| On hand (estimated) | | 12,733.10 |
| | | 890,245.10 |

[1] None.

The profit in mixing at this elevator for three months, as shown by their report, over and above the regular elevator charges, was $83,720.69. There should be added to this the amount realized from the screenings at about $8 per ton.

A glance at this table will show that there were shipped out of this elevator about twice as many bushels of No. 1 northern as were received in; that there were shipped out about three and one-half times as many bushels of No. 2 northern as were received in. It will also show that 201,000 bushels of No. 4 were received in and none shipped out; that 116,000 bushels of "no grade" were received in and none shipped out, and about 60,000 bushels of "rejected" were received in and none shipped out. In other words, about one-half of the entire grain received in passed from No. 4, "no grade" and "rejected," to No. 1 and No. 2. Anyone acquainted with the grain trade will know at a glance that this great difference arising from changing a grade from a low grade to two or thre grades higher, whereby all of the lower grades are entirely lost, could not be produced by any system of mixing if both the inspection in and the inspection out were made by the same standard.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the gentleman know what the laws of Minnesota are upon the subject of the inspection of grain and how it is done?

Mr. HAUGEN. I know what the practice is in Minnesota.

Mr. DAVIS. I will state this——

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman may have more confidence in the inspectors of Minnesota than I have. I am not questioning the integrity of the inspectors, but he will find all over this country farmers and elevator men who will, I believe, question in some degree the integrity of the inspection of that great terminal.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman is placing me in a very false light in this matter.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no reason on this floor to sustain or maintain any system of inspection that there is now in Minnesota or elsewhere. If the gentleman has insinuated that I am, I wish he would withdraw the statement.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no; I am not insinuating anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to make this statement, however: My memory has been refreshed within the last two or three days by reason of the testimony before the Committee on Rules on the Manahan resolution. The law of Minnesota, without giving the exact words, is as follows: The grain and warehouse commission of Minnesota are given full power to inspect and weigh grain in Minnesota. They appoint the inspectors; they appoint the weighmasters. There is no grain received at any of these terminal elevators or shipped out of these without the inspection of those State inspectors and weighmasters.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis does not have anything to do with the inspection, unless, as the gentleman insinuates, and it was insinuated the other day, they do it by getting possession or control of these State inspectors.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS. That I know nothing about, but the law of Minnesota is positive and strictly adhered to, so far as the employment of inspectors and weighmasters is concerned, and no member of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis has anything to do with grain at all. It is laid down on the table, with State inspection, and the chamber of commerce simply deals with it as thus inspected. Now, as to the number of bushels that go out of those terminal elevators. I am somewhat posted. There are perhaps more bushels of a certain grade of grain shipped out than there are placed therein originally.

Mr. HAUGEN. Two to one.

Mr. DAVIS. But there is no law to prevent the mixing and cleaning of grain. For instance, grain of high character comes in there and the law of the United States permits the mixing of the different characters of grain. Higher grades of grain may come in and it may be by this mixing that the elevators raise it, so that the two will grade the contract grade, and thus a greater number of bushels will go out of a certain grade than went in there, but that is not the fault of the inspection, it is not the fault of the chamber of commerce, and it is not the fault of anybody except the man who mixes it in the elevator, which the law permits.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Is there any complaint among the farmers of the gentleman's section?

Mr. DAVIS. There are among a certain class, and among others there is not. If the gentleman had listened for two or three days to the testimony before the Committee on Rules, he would have seen the class that were objecting and the class that were not.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman contend that we should fix the grades?

Mr. DAVIS. I am in favor of standardizing the grades.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HAUGEN. I reserve the right to object. I do not care to take up much of the time of the House——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing before the committee.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman seems to be placing me in a false light.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not opposed to proper standardization or grading of grain. My people are all interested in that, and I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois said, that I think it is probably the duty and should be the duty of the Agricultural Bureau down here to fix and standardize all grain, and then pass that along to the buyers and handlers of grain, the elevator men, or the men on the chamber of commerce, and make them conform to that.

And I am not opposing that, and when I was on the Committee on Agriculture that was the object. I do not know what your appropriation is now, but let the great department down here standardize the grain and I think you will find no man honestly dealing in grain will object to it at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I did not question the gentleman's integrity. If this House ever had a conscientious and industrious Member, one who has had the best interest of the farming community at heart, certainly it has been the gentleman from Minnesota. [Applause.] But I do not deem it necessary here to pass bouquets. I was simply suggesting that if the gentleman is in favor of fixing standards, now is the opportune time. The gentleman referred to appropriations made in the past. He ought not now oppose this appropriation——

Mr. DAVIS. Am I opposing it? Have I said a word about opposing it?

Mr. HAUGEN. If it is the purpose to standardize grain, why not do it now, when we have the opportunity?

Mr. DAVIS. I have no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then I want the gentleman to join with the rest of us.

Mr. DAVIS. Wait until the time for voting comes and I will do it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly; that is what I am after and what I am trying to get——

Mr. MADDEN. How many are there to join with?

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, I would like to know. I know what the people out in the country think. If I am alone here, very well; I have stood up alone here before——

Mr. DAVIS. So have I.

Mr. HAUGEN. This is not the only time that I have stood here practically alone. The gentleman's city has many industrious, enterprising, law-abiding, and well-meaning men. It also has a few selfish men, and this is not the only time I have taken issue with some of the people of that great city. I recall one instance when certain interests with headquarters in Chicago were opposing appropriations and rigid inspection of

meat products; that after a Federal inspection was made necessary in all packing houses in order to dispose of the product, appropriations for the inspection were held down to an amount sufficient to provide only for the inspection of Beef-Trust-owned plants, thus giving the Beef Trust, with headquarters in Chicago, an absolute monopoly of the packing industry. Some 86 independent packers were denied the inspection necessary to continue their business. The department was helpless in the matter. Congress stubbornly refused to appropriate the money necessary to extend the inspection to the smaller and independent packers. I took up the fight, and on the division of the House I stood up with 15 other Members out of a total membership at that time of about 250, practically all then, as now, proclaiming to be friends of the farmer and shipper. The fight went on; the President with the big stick came to our rescue, and six months later we obtained not only the legislation desired, but a permanent annual appropriation of $3,000,000, so that since then the independent packer, the farmer, and the shipper have not had to come to Washington, on bended knee, asking for an appropriation; and as a result the inspection service has been extended to about a thousand establishments, while then only 36, and all practically owned and controlled by the Beef Trust, were inspected. Three packing houses have been built and are doing a large and successful business within 30 miles of my home town, and as a result hogs and cattle are killed practically at home, thus largely eliminating transportation charges not only in the shipping of stock to Chicago for slaughter, but the shipping of beef back into the country, in many instances from the point where the live stock started, as was done under the scheme of the benevolent Beef Trust. I have no apology to offer. I stood up practically alone then; I am willing to stand here alone on a proposition that is of even greater importance. I survived then; I will take my chances now.

Mr. DAVIS. I have not objected——

Mr. HAUGEN. If this is going to go out on the point of order, what is the use of discussing a proposition that is not before the House? I am not in the habit of taking up the time of the House simply to hear myself talk.

Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House, I append to my remarks extracts from resolutions passed by independent grain dealers:

(1) Lack of uniformity in the grading of grain at the various terminal markets. A resolution adopted at Salina, Kans., January 15, 1907, by independent grain dealers succinctly presents the injustices resulting from this evil. The portion referred to reads as follows:

"Too much can not be said and done in favor of a national inspection law. We have no uniform inspection of grain and cotton, the principal farm products which are so largely dealt in and which are of such great importance to both the producer and consumer. A shipper of grain can not send a car of wheat from one point to another with any degree of security at the present time, take all the precaution he may. A shipper at some point in Kansas may have a car of grain inspected at some point in the State as No. 2, send it to Missouri, where it is inspected by the Missouri State grain-inspection department as No. 3; the same car of grain may be forwarded to Illinois and there inspected as No. 4, and from Illinois it may be sent to New Orleans and there inspected as 'no grade'; discounted from place to place anywhere from 1 to 15 cents per bushel, until it falls into the hands of the trust exporter, when it is again inspected as No. 2 and sold for No. 2 at No. 2 price, the difference falling into the hands of the trust instead of the farmer and producer."

The grain raised on a farm in Iowa may be shipped to three different points—Minneapolis, Chicago, and Kansas City. The rules of grading in Minneapolis for a certain grade of grain would require that it weigh a given number of pounds per measured bushel, contain a certain percentage of a particular kind of grain, possess a certain color, etc. The Chicago rule for determining the same grade will differ considerably from the Minneapolis standard, and the Kansas City standard will be different from either of the others. Now, as the price of the grain is dependent solely upon the grade it receives, this same grain would have three different values placed upon it at these three different terminals. These divers systems open up an immense field for manipulation in grades, which always works to the detriment of the producer. Because of this lack of uniformity one shipment of grain may receive as many different grades as there are different markets through which it passes.

(2) Practically all grain passes through one or more great terminal markets before reaching the consumer. Its value is fixed by the grade that is placed upon it at such terminals. Under the present system, whether under State laws or board of trade rules, the parties in interest as purchasers at the great terminals dominate and control all rules governing the handling of grain, its inspection, and grading. That such rules should be in the interest of the terminal purchasers under such a system is not surprising.

(3) The appointment of inspectors and the fixing of grades are under the control of the boards of trade. The relation between the inspection and grading power and the purchasing interest is most close and intimate.

(4) Appeals from the decision of inspectors are almost invariably taken to a board of appeals composed of persons who are either directly or indirectly interested in the purchase of grain, from the inspection of which the appeal is taken.

(5) That the inspection and grading departments at these great terminals are subservient to and dominated by the great elevator interests is established beyond question.

(13) One single example of the inefficiency in inspecting and grading will be sufficient. The testimony shows that a short time ago one inspector in the city of Chicago inspected in about half a day 250 cars of grain. This required the inspector to walk about 5 miles in going down one side and returning on the other side of the cars. The inspection certainly could not have been very thorough unless he inspected both sides, and with proper implements could determine not only what was at the top but in the bottom and in the middle of each car. He earned for the board of trade in that time $73 at the regular charges for inspection. The very most that could be said of his inspection would be that he made 250 guesses as to what was inside of those cars, and that these 250 cars were sold in the markets upon those guesses.

(14) Under the present conditions an enormous system of mixing or adulteration of grain has been built up, and this adulterated grain is forced on all the home markets and also into the foreign market, destroying all confidence in our grades and working to the detriment of the grain trade. That the manipulators and mixers reap enormous benefit through this system is beyond question, but always at the still greater detriment of the producers.

(15) Due to the improper certification and the almost impossibility of securing a high grade of American grain abroad, our grain is being discredited in all foreign countries to such an extent as to rapidly decrease our export trade in many sections, while that of Argentine Republic, Canada, and Australia is increasing in the same proportion that our trade is decreasing.

(16) Under the present system purchasers are compelled to accept the certification at the great terminals, and have no recourse when the product received fails to measure up to the standard of certification.

(17) The independent buyers at the country elevators dare not trust their own judgment in the matter of grades, because they have no confidence in the grades at the great terminal markets where they must dispose of the grain purchased. From experience, however, they know that on the whole the grain will be graded lower than it is entitled to, and they are therefore compelled to resolve every doubt against the producer.

(23) It is estimated that less than 4,000 men, comprising the various boards of trade, control the trade of the country in grain and arbitrarily fix the grades and price to be paid the producer. These boards of trade are banded together for the purpose of controlling the business, while the farmers or producers and small shippers are unorganized and unable to secure adequate justice.

(24) In those sections where the great terminal elevators have their line of smaller elevators throughout the country they are enabled not only to fix the price, but in many instances give instructions as to what grade shall be given at any elevator, irrespective of what the grain would properly grade.

(27) The Federal Government could adopt a uniform system that would answer all practical purposes and would meet the demands of the commercial world. This would eliminate the present injustices that are perpetrated against dealers, producers, and consumers alike. The employees would be free from obligation to the power that secures their appointment.

(28) Federal inspection and grading can not possibly harm anyone except him who is being benefited by the present wrongful system.

(29) Federal inspection would do away with this rigid and loose system of inspection and grading under which the greater proportion of frauds and injustices are perpetrated, and in its place that certainty in grades so essential to the grain business would be substituted.

(32) But it has been suggested that by the adoption of a Federal system of inspection we would force a double system upon the country. This is not true. Ninety per cent of the grain handled at the great terminals is interstate grain, and no board of trade or State would attempt to continue its inspection system over the other 10 per cent.

(33) Again, every producer who desires to secure the actual grain desires also that that grain measure up to the standard of its certification, and such purchasers would demand the Government certificate because it would carry the greater confidence.

(34) So, too, the foreign demand is universal for a Government certification, and they would purchase on the Government certificate only.

(35) Under our present system of meat inspection all meat at the packing house is inspected by the Government without regard as to whether it is intended for domestic or foreign use. The packers desire this to be done for their own benefit. If the Government can do this for the packers at its own expense, it certainly would not refuse to inspect and grade the other 10 per cent of intrastate grain at these terminals for the fees which would be charged and which would cover its expense. This would do away entirely with State inspection.

(36) It is safe to say that all the grain producers of the Northwest heartily desire Federal inspection. All of the independent grain dealers desire it. The great majority of the millers desire it. The foreign purchasers ask it. The legislature of at least one of the States, and it is one of the greatest grain-producing States in the Union, has petitioned repeatedly by resolution for Federal inspection. This universal demand of itself should be sufficient to secure this proposed legislation.

(37) Those who are charged, and, in our opinion, justly charged, with profiting by the misuse of the authority and powers placed in their hands under the present system are the only ones who are objecting to Federal inspection. And the only reason that they have attempted to urge it is that it is not feasible to have uniformity or Federal inspection. A complete answer to both of these propositions is that the Government can certainly do as well as is being done under the present system. It can enforce uniformity of grading and it can eliminate the present injustices in grading.

39. We believe that the only efficient remedy for the present injustices is the absolute divorce of the purchasing interest from the inspection and grading of grain, and this can alone be done by Federal authority.

The enactment of this law will not cause any additional expense to the Government for the reason that under the terms of the bill the service will be self-supporting. To have a competent corps of inspectors at the present markets, it is estimated, would require from 300 to 500 persons, including laborers and clerical force, at salaries ranging from $500 to $3,500 per annum. At an average of $1,200 per annum the expense of the service would be from $350,000 to $600,000 per annum. The present charge for inspection is from 35 to 75 cents per car or thousand bushels, and from one and one-half to two million cars are inspected annually, which, at the present price of inspection, would bring in a sum largely in excess of what would be necessary for the service. It is believed by your committee that under the terms of this bill the inspection charges will average much less than the present charges and still produce an adequate sum to cover all the expenses of the service.

The passage of the bill is recommended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this item for investigating and handling and grading the transportation of grain and fixing the definite grades thereof came into the agricultural appropriation

bill some years ago. It came in about the time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was then a member, had given protracted hearings upon bills which proposed to have the Government of the United States grade all grains that entered into interstate and foreign commerce instead of having it graded by States or boards of trade. In most of the States where large amounts of grain are handled it is now graded by State inspectors. When the item was first placed in the bill my recollection is, although I may be mistaken, that I made a point of order on it, and it was stated then expressly by the gentleman in charge of the bill that it was not designed or proposed—and I call this to the attention of my friend from Iowa, who I think was a member of the committee at that time—that it was not designed or proposed to have the Government grade the grain or inspect the grain, but it was desirable to have the Government study the subject and fix standards for the grades. I remember it very distinctly, because after the Government organized its plant the board of trade at Chicago asked the Agriculture Department to establish one of its stations in Chicago, and the department replied to the Chicago Board of Trade that Mr. MANN on the floor of the House had said that they did not want anything of the kind in Chicago, for they did not need it. They made me take back water on the proposition. They said that they did want it to study the subject as to the moisture content.

That proposition is still up in various ways. Bills are pending desiring to have the Government inspect the grain. At the hearings before our committee, which were somewhat exhaustive and which lasted quite a while, the result was that after the hearings the committee did not recommend the passage of the bill, or any bill, that proposed to have the Government of the United States appoint inspectors and do the inspecting and grade the actual grain in interstate and foreign commerce. This provision, I think, is proper, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Iowa has said about it as useless, because we have not yet learned all there is to know on the subject of grading grain, especially as to moisture content, and no one yet has devised a method, so far as I know, by which you can be certain that grain shipped from New Orleans will have the same moisture content when it leaves as when it arrives at London. They are working on that subject, trying to ascertain what change of moisture will take place or how to avoid the change of moisture. You can not be certain in shipping grain from San Francisco that the moisture content will be the same when it starts as when it arrives. You can not be certain in shipping it even from Chicago to Baltimore, a great export center, in reference to the same thing. We do not know it all yet, and hence I think it is desirable to keep the item in and learn what we can and determine afterwards—but that can not be done by offering an amendment on the floor of the House to the agricultural appropriation bill—whether we will proceed to have the Government do all the work which is now done by all the numerous inspectors throughout the country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But it says here:

It has been proven that there is fully 5 per cent between the highest and lowest moisture in 50 grams, or, say, 150 to 170 kernels, of corn——

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is an article gotten up by somebody who may be biased on that side.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There is an absolute change in the moisture. The gentleman will admit that.

Mr. MANN. There may be.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to understand what is the real crux of the controversy. In order for the United States to properly establish grades for grain it will certainly be necessary to expend much more than $76,320.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. In a moment. My colleague from Iowa thinks there ought to be a much larger appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the gentleman did not understand me. I want to fix the grade, and that is all I am after.

Mr. TOWNER. And a larger amount is necessary for that purpose. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] thinks that there ought to be a much larger appropriation made for that purpose. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the real matter now for determination, because the point of order, as I understand it, has been made.

Mr. HAWLEY. No; it has been withdrawn.

Mr. TOWNER. Not against this paragraph, but against the preceding one it has been made and sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order pending against this paragraph.

Mr. TOWNER. Not against this paragraph, but against the preceding one, which increases the appropriation. Now, the question before the committee for consideration is as to whether or not the appropriation in this paragraph ought to remain. I think it ought to remain, because I think even with this appropriation of $76,620 much may be done that will aid in this work. For instance, it is a well-known fact that out in the Central West there are different standards for grain, in Minneapolis and St. Paul, and Chicago, and also in Kansas City, Mo., so there is no uniformity between the markets regarding grades and standards. Much may be done by the National Government to bring these various standards that are in effect in the various cities into correlation and more into harmony with each other, and to that extent at least this appropriation may be valuable. I think that an investigation might be instituted by the department and very much done that would really be beneficial to the farmer.

My colleague from Iowa says the farmers know what they want. They want to be able to determine on some kind of standard that is fixed. They want to know what grade their grain is going to be when it reaches the market. They do not want to have it done in either a haphazard sort of way or determined by the whim or caprice of men who may be acting in their interests. It is of vast importance to them whether it is graded No. 1 or No. 2, or what the grade may be. It is of vast importance when it comes to be considered that these bushels of grain are numbered by the million and that a very slight increase or change in the grades means millions of dollars to the farmer, and so I certainly hope that this item may remain in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not wish to be misrepresented here. I do not know of anybody who has offered an amendment here to strike out the appropriation or who has offered an amendment to reduce it; but what really I had in mind was the fixing of the standard——

Mr. TOWNER. I know.

Mr. HAUGEN. And providing the machinery.

Mr. TOWNER. I am not suggesting that the gentleman from Iowa, my colleague, is doing that.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is absolutely nothing before the committee; no motion pending to strike this item out or to increase or decrease it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] moves to strike out the last word. However, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, $10,840.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the item, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee whether or not it was ever estimated for.

Mr. LEVER. I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Illinois that this item was not estimated for in the present bill. It has been carried in former bills for several years. After the cross-examination of the gentleman who has charge of this line of work before the committee and upon the personal statement of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] the committee came to the conclusion that there were other lines of work which had not been touched upon and which might lead to valuable results, and we thought we should continue this work for several years to come.

Mr. MADDEN. But it was the opinion of the department that it was no longer necessary?

Mr. LEVER. The opinion of the department was expressed in language about like this: That they felt sure that there were other more important lines of investigation than this to which they could put their money; but the committee felt that it could still afford, on account of the commercial possibilities of flax from which paper of a very high grade could be made, it would be a good investment to continue this work for a short time.

Mr. HAWLEY. And I would like to ask the chairman if this is not true also, that one of the reasons leading the department not to estimate for this work at this time was the fact that under the new tariff law the importation of pulp wood and pulp for making paper from outside had lowered the price of paper, so that possibly the flax paper could not be sold in competition?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. HAWLEY. And that the flax paper would make a grade of paper much in demand, and would not come in competition with the outside paper?

Mr. MADDEN. They thought it was wise to continue it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee.

Mr. PLATT. Can the fiber of this flax in North Dakota be used to make linen cloth from?

Mr. LEVER. I would like my friend from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] to answer that question.

Mr. HELGESEN. What is the question?

Mr. PLATT. It can not be used to make linen cloth from, can it?

Mr. HELGESEN. It probably could. The trouble with flax is it is not raised for linen, but for the seed alone, and there are about 400,000 tons of flax tow used for upholstering, and such other things, but we would like to have experiments made for paper for this reason:

There is a report before the committee in which it says that undoubtedly flax will produce a paper that is strong, and, ranging all the way from writing paper down to packing paper, that is much stronger and more expensive than ordinary paper. They say because of economic conditions now prevailing, which I presume is the tariff question and the way the tariff affects the newspaper industry, you can not make print paper out of flax to compete with pulp paper. You can make expensive paper from writing paper down to the strongest kind of packing out of flax. From their experiments they have found it advisable to continue them.

Mr. PLATT. As I understand, this flax, in order to get the seed which is necessary, has to be carried on to a greater maturity?

Mr. GOULDEN. How long have these experiments been going on in North Dakota?

Mr. HELGESEN. I think they have been going on for two years.

I will insert herewith the memorandum to which I have referred, as follows:

[Statement accompanying letter of Dr. Galloway to Mr. LEVER of February 7, 1914.]

MEMORANDUM ON PROGRESS OF TESTING CROP AND WILD PLANT MATERIALS THAT MAY BE SUITABLE FOR PAPER STOCK.

The current appropriation act, and for several years back, has carried an item "for testing and breeding fibrous plants, including testing of flax straw, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making."

EXPERIMENTS WITH FLAX STRAW.

Flax straw, because of the unusually promising nature of its fiber, has lured a great many inventors and promoters into projects involving its utilization. At the present time there is practically no commercial industry based on this material for paper-making purposes, although between three and four hundred thousand tons per year of tow for upholstering furniture is produced. In addition, very considerable quantities of binding twine are made from flax straw, which is specially handled, and which is grown chiefly in southern Minnesota and adjacent parts of Iowa.

Flax straw has proven very refractory in the experiments of the department, but the work of the present season has been more successful than any previously conducted. This is due in part to an improvement of our methods due to careful study and experiment, and in part to a new digestor, constructed especially for our experiments, which was installed and used for the first time during the past summer.

An examination of the samples designated with pink-numbered tabs in the sample book will illustrate the range of papers and pulps that have been prepared from flax straw.

In cooperation with the Dickinson branch of the North Dakota Agricultural College and Experiment Station a carload of flax straw, grown under typical North Dakota conditions, was secured and transported to Cumberland Mills, Me., to the cooperating paper mill for experimental working up. The experiments have not been completed, but the progress thus far made indicates a strong possibility of producing fine white writing paper, extremely strong paper suitable for flour and cement sacks, and wrapping papers from flax straw. As the cooks have been made in lots of 200 pounds or less it has not been possible to get accurate cost figures, but it may be said that the experiments gave evidence of a sufficiently low chemical requirement for digestion and bleaching as to give commercial promise. In this connection it should be borne in mind that several million dollars have been wasted through stock selling in insolvent and ill-conceived companies, and in promotional enterprises without establishing an industry based on the material. The experiments indicate good promise, but prospective investors should not be misled into financial loss through failure to scrutinize most carefully solicitations to purchase stock in companies organized to exploit flax straw as a paper stock.

The yield of pulp in proportion to raw material used has been more satisfactory than in any previous experiments, averaging for a considerable number of cooks at least 46 per cent.

The ultimate commercial success of flax straw as a paper material would depend not upon its cheapness, but upon its adaptability for special uses requiring unusual strength for which unusually high prices are paid. The experiments, while incomplete, are certainly promising.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This is a recent appropriation, and it proposes to continue it at this time, as suggested a moment ago, because it is proposed to continue a line of investigation which promises results, and the committee wishes to put it in for that reason.

Mr. HELGESEN. The last paragraph of the letter which I have inserted reads:

The ultimate commercial success of flax straw as a paper material would depend not upon its cheapness, but upon its adaptability for special uses requiring unusual strength for which unusually high prices are paid. The experiments, while incomplete, are certainly promising.

Mr. GOULDEN. From whom is that letter?

Mr. HELGESEN. This is a letter from Dr. Galloway to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. GOULDEN. Dr. Galloway is the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and a very good one, too.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I wish to refer to the following paragraph:

For the investigation and improvement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production and handling, $25,000.

You will see that only $25,000 is appropriated. This is a reduction, if I remember correctly, of about $6,000 from the amount allowed last year. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what brought about the action of the committee in reducing that appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I will be very glad to read what was the statement of the department itself in submitting its estimates. It says:

NOTE.—There is a decrease in the above item of $6,630. The decrease in this item is due to a proposed modification of the work which will involve the abandonment of some features of the field work, including variety testing, curing, etc., a great deal of this work having reached a point where it is believed that it can be very satisfactorily carried on by the State or local organizations. It is proposed to utilize the funds chiefly for laboratory work, there still being a number of important problems to solve. Experiments will also be made looking to the development of crop rotations which will include tobacco, which has heretofore been grown largely as a special crop.

In other words, the department's statement is to the effect that certain lines of work have been completed and that they do not need the money.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will remember that about two years ago, I think it was, the House, by an amendment proposed and adopted on the floor of the House, increased the appropriation at that time by a certain amount for the purpose of placing a Government expert at Clarksville, Tenn. That was the real object of the amendment. That expert has been sent there, and he has been there now a little more than a year, possibly, and he has given great satisfaction. The tobacco growers are very much pleased with the fact that he is there and pleased with the work he has accomplished and is expected to do in the future. I wondered whether this contemplated the abandonment of that work.

Mr. LEVER. I think not. This report is furnished me by the department:

The investigations in Ohio have advanced to the point where the principal factors have been largely completed and the investigations will be brought to a close at the end of the present year.

I take it from that statement that there will be no interference with the gentleman's work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is entirely satisfactory. I am gratified to know that this place at Clarksville is not to be discontinued. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] withdraws his pro forma amendment.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, from the item now under discussion as good results may be reasonably expected to follow as from almost any other item of appropriation in this bill. Under existing farming methods every year throughout the country millions of tons of flax straw containing valuable fiber is allowed to go to waste. It has, of course, been known for centuries that most durable and most beautiful cloth can be made from the fiber of the common flax plant (Linum usitatissimum), which produces the seed now of such great commercial importance. The best linen cloth is made from fiber of the plant which is gathered before the seed ripens. When the seed is allowed to ripen the fiber becomes hard, and it is then found difficult to manufacture it into cloth or any other commercial product at a profit to the manufacturer. A few years ago experiments were begun by the Department of Agriculture to discover, if possible, a method of converting the fiber in flax straw into paper in such a way that the manufacturing process would be commercially profitable. Considerable success has been met with in the experiments already made. While it has not yet been found that the cheaper qualities of paper can be manufactured from the fiber in flax straw it is now thought that with some slight improvements in the best method of manufacture already discovered the finest qualities of paper can be manufactured from this fiber at paying profits to the manufacturer. The discovery of an economical method of manufacturing this by-product of the flaxseed grower into the cheaper qualities of

paper will mean millions of dollars of profits each year into the pockets of American farmers.

The acreage of flax in North Dakota in 1909 was more than one-half that of the whole United States. Thus it is most fitting that the experiments provided for in this appropriation should be carried on in connection with the agricultural college of our State, which, as many gentlemen here know, is one of the best and most useful institutions of its kind in the country. From reports that have already been made on experiments conducted along this line, I am confident that the final results from the experiments contemplated to be continued and conducted under this specific appropriation will be ample justification for every cent of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For beet-sugar investigations, including studies of diseases and the improvement of the beet and methods of culture, $41,495: *Provided*, That of this sum $10,000 may be used for investigations in connection with the production of table sirup, including the breeding, culture, and diseases of cane, and the methods of manufacture, standardization, and marketing of sirup, and the utilization of cane by-products.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] reserves a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking an explanation from the committee. I wanted an explanation of the item. It is apparently new.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, that is really an item that was carried back in 1902. It is really an old item. For a few years the experiment was carried on. I presume the gentleman understands the object of the appropriation. In four or five of the Southern States, namely, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and perhaps Texas—in the eastern part of Texas—they grow a quality of cane known as ribbon cane for sirup. It is not the sugar cane that is grown for sugar. The great trouble about this proposition is that, though this particular quality of cane makes a very delicious sirup, if it is not properly handled it does not turn out satisfactorily. It seems that the little planters throughout the country have not discovered a way to do it. If it is too green or not cooked quite enough, it sours; and if it is cooked too much, it granulates.

Now, this investigation is for the purpose of discovering the best methods of growing this cane and manufacturing this sirup.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that the purpose of this appropriation is to encourage the growth of this kind of cane in sections where it is admitted that the sugar-cane industry will be destroyed?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. No. The gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. It is an entirely different kind of cane. It has been grown for 50 years, I take it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Are they trying to grow a sorghum cane that will make sirup that is not so strong but that northern people can eat it?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. We are growing a kind of cane that the gentleman has probably not eaten.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; I have eaten it. It is too delicious for me to eat. It is too strong. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEE of Georgia. This sirup is not too strong. If you keep it too long, of course it might get too strong.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I had it sent to me from Georgia a number of times by kindly disposed gentlemen. It is delicious sirup, except that it is too strong.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Well, if you eat too much of it it has a bad effect, perhaps. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, not too much of it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This character of sirup, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will permit, is not too strong. It is very mild and sweet and delicious, and commends itself to everybody's appetite.

Mr. MANN. It requires a vicious and false appetite. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Oh, no. I have tried some of it, and I recently had my better half in my household, my wife, try it, and she was very much delighted with it. I think the gentleman must have gotten a different variety.

Mr. MANN. No. I will say that when we passed the pure-food law Dr. Wiley, who was very strongly in favor of pure sirups, convinced me that sirups ought not to be adulterated, and so forth. He said, "I will send you some that you can eat; it is good Georgia sirup." He did. I tasted a little of it. It was very strong. If you adulterate it, it makes it very good sirup, but without adulteration it is too strong. You can not get a market for it.

Mr. COLLIER. Doubtless the gentleman has never tasted the Mississippi sirup.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. The only adulteration you need for this sirup is a hot biscuit and a little butter. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota withdraws his reservation of the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, and for farm demonstration work, $400,000: *Provided*, That of the amount hereby appropriated the sum of $9,180 may be used in the investigation and utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants as food for stock.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 19, by striking out the figures "$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$518,800"; and at the end of line 22 insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be used in paying salaries or expenses of officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees who are paid in part by contribution of money from any source whatever outside the State where such officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees carry on their work; and hereafter in carrying on the work of the Department of Agriculture, and in all work or service in connection therewith, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not employ or permit employment of any person unless such employment or service is or hereafter shall be authorized by law, or unless the compensation and expenses of such person be paid wholly by the United States or partly by the United States and partly by a State or some agency, association, or authority within the State in which the work or service is to be performed."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment believing thoroughly that all work done by the Federal Government, or for which the Federal Government is responsible, ought to be paid for by the Federal Government, and that assistance ought not to be received from private sources. For the purpose of assisting in carrying on this very important and necessary work of "farm management" and "farm demonstration" private contributions have been made, some of it coming from sources which are, I think, objectionable, and from which no money ought to be received. In order that the work may be carried on by the Department of Agriculture in the manner and on the scale contemplated by the department without receiving contributions from outside sources, I have offered this amendment increasing the amount sufficiently, I believe, to take the place of the contributions from private sources.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman give us a statement of the sources from which some of this illegal money has been received and the use to which it has been put?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In answer to the gentleman, I might speak of the work done under this paragraph and the work done under the following paragraph, the "cooperative demonstration" work in the boll-weevil section of the country.

In speaking of the latter first, I will say that the general education board works with money contributed by Mr. Rockefeller. If my friend wishes to call it tainted money——

Mr. DAVIS. I did not call it that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] did. The Government has for several years accepted $250,000 a year, and some 600 men are employed by the Government and carried on the rolls of the department at $1 a year each, the remainder of their salaries being paid out of moneys received from the general education board, which board receives its money from Mr. John D. Rockefeller.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it the idea of the gentleman from Michigan that the work done by these men may not be as well done because of the private contributions, or is it his idea that it may be done in such a manner as to favor some private interest?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Speaking plainly, I will say there is abundant evidence of the fact that the gentlemen who furnish the money or control its distribution demand or request the

uming and selection of the men who are to be employed by the department and who are to receive their money.

Mr. MADDEN. Then all that the Government does is to give the authority and the title?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The secretary of the general education board assumes to dictate, or asks the privilege of selecting the men; asks the department to clothe them with the dignity and authority attaching to and possessed by agents of the Federal Government. The department directs the work and accepts it.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government is responsible for what they do?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The Government is responsible for what they do.

Mr. MADDEN. And it is said to be a Government service, while, as a matter of fact, it is a private service. Is that it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. My point is, and the reason of my objection is, that it is or may be a private service while it appears to be a public service. As I understand it, these gentlemen who furnish the money insist that they be permitted to dictate the appointment of the men, and it is believed that they wish so to dictate because they wish their particular doctrines disseminated by these men amongst the people with whom they do their work.

Mr. MADDEN. What difference can there be between their particular doctrine and the doctrine of the Government?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Illinois knows as well as I do what their doctrines are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is there not a great amount of press-agent work that goes on in connection with this work, apparently done by the Government?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I believe there is more or less objectionable work done along these lines or growing out of it. I am not going into a full discussion of it. I am stating only a few facts and giving briefly some evidence in support of them; am calling the attention of the House to a very objectionable practice into which we have fallen. I have not time for full discussion of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks permission to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan whether an account is rendered by the Government of the amounts received and disbursed given by private contributions?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I suppose a record is kept. I do not know whether any report is made. I have never seen any.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a report or account of this fund on page 130 of the hearings, and I direct attention to the fact that all this money is spent in some 10 Southern States.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a report of a contribution of $250,000 a year by the General Education Board, which we all know uses money contributed by Mr. Rockefeller. Now, I do not wish to question the quality of the work done by the men employed in this way and paid out of this fund, but it seems to me no authority except the United States itself should make the selection of the men to do this work, and that it ought to be carried on in such a way that no suspicion whatever can attach to it, so that no question whatever can arise as to who these men are, how they are employed, and what they are doing.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the gentleman undertake to make the statement that all of the employees who are employed in the expenditure of this fund are arbitrarily selected by the people contributing the fund, and that it receives the approval of the people of the United States Government, and that the United States Government thereby adopts that work and is responsible for it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, I will say I do not make the charge that the employment of all of these men is dictated by the persons who contribute the money; but I will say there is abundant evidence of the fact that the men who contribute the money try to dictate the appointments, and I have it from one of the highest officials of the Department of Agriculture that he has refused further offers of money from the General Education Board because its secretary has offered the money on condition that he be permitted to dictate the appointment of the men.

Mr. MADDEN. These men only endeavor to show the farmers how to improve the methods of farm management, do they not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They are employed to go out among the farmers, to meet them and talk with them about their work and endeavor to assist them. I would very much prefer, and I think it absolutely ought to be required, that men going out in that way, bearing the stamp of the Federal Government, be really and in fact the employees of the Federal Government, paid by Federal money, not selected by any other authority and not responsible in any manner or respect to any other authority.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman know whether any member of the directorate of the Rockefeller fund is an identified official of the Government?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture has been, if he is not now, a member of the General Education Board.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I never heard any criticism of the expenditure of this money. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota seems to be troubled because the money is spent in Southern States. If the people want to contribute money to spend in the Southern States, they have a right to have their money spent where they please.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that while I have offered this amendment to the paragraph beginning in line 7, which provides money to be used largely in the North, I shall be pleased to offer a similar amendment to the paragraph occupying the last three lines of the page, which appropriates $378,000 for work in the South. I spoke of the work in the South because more of the General Education Board's money is used in the South, or in connection with the $378,000 appropriation, than in the North, although some of the $400,000 appropriated in the paragraph above is used in work in the South. I find by examination of statements made by the officials of the Department of Agriculture that under that $400,000 appropriation 84 men are employed at $1 a year, and the balance of their salaries and all their expenses are paid by money contributed by the General Education Board; that there are 30 more men paid out of that fund whose salaries run from $100 to $200 a year. It is evident that these men must be paid more than that; their expenses must be paid, and the Government pays no part of them, except the trifling sums stated above. They get their pay, or most of it, from this private fund of which I speak.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. What occasion is there for this contribution? The gentleman has excited my curiosity. Is it done through benevolence? Why should not the Government do the whole of it? Why does Mr. Rockefeller make such a contribution? Does the gentleman know the reason, or has it ever appeared in the hearings?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know why Mr. Rockefeller makes these contributions. I think it would not be so objectionable if no strings were attached to them. Answering further, I will say that the Government is abundantly able to do this kind of work, and it ought to do it, especially when some suspicion attaches to the character of the work of the employees who receive the money and to the source from which the money comes. It is time for the Government to refuse these contributions and furnish all the money itself.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In your investigation of this matter, have you ascertained whether or not any of these gentlemen appointed at the dictation of the men making these gifts to the Government are made use of as advertisers of something that the donor has to sell, such as fertilizers, or anything of that kind?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I know in the North that the International Harvester Co. contributes a million dollars a year for work similar to this, and the same amount of money has been contributed by one of the great department houses of Chicago—Sears, Roebuck & Co.—for carrying on work, or assisting in carrying on work similar to this.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of the United States is abundantly able to carry on this work itself. Knowing something of the character of the work, how it is received throughout the country, I believe it ought to be continued and it ought to be enlarged. And because I think it ought not to be curtailed I have offered this amendment increasing the amount to $518,000 over what is carried in the bill—$400,000.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the gentleman know, as a matter of fact, that Dr. S. A. Knapp, in charge of the cooperative work, appeared before the educational board and secured the first contribution that was ever given to engage in this work through the South as well as through the country?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I never knew the origin of it. I never knew how the contribution was made in the first instance, but I do know that an attempt is now being made by gentlemen who control the distribution of this money to dictate the appointment of the men to whom the money shall be paid.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. We will all agree that that ought not to be. But the origin of that donation came from that source. Dr. Knapp came before the educational board and set forth the developments which might be secured, and it was satisfactory to them and they made the first appropriation. Dr. Knapp would never engage in anything improper or dishonorable to this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks that his time be extended five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I would not have the gentleman understand that anything I have said was intended as a reflection on Dr. Knapp. I knew him during his life, and I believe I appreciate the value of the work he did. I would be the last to say anything reflecting upon him.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I did not mean to insinuate that the gentleman would for a moment suggest anything of the kind. I merely suggested it as the source from which the first original donation came. I know the gentleman would agree with me in saying that Dr. Knapp would not engage in anything that was not proper and honorable.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am speaking about the men who make the contribution, who control its distribution. I am speaking against the system of Government cooperation with any private individuals or firms or corporations like the Standard Oil Co. or any other agency whatever. I do not think it is right; it is certainly unnecessary. I think the work ought to be carried on in such a way as to be altogether above suspicion.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how much this general education board contributes?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year for this work in connection with the $378,000 appropriation in the cotton States.

Mr. MANN. That is contributed to the Government?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. To the department.

Mr. MANN. They pay it into the Treasury?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I believe they do.

Mr. MANN. Who has control of this amount when paid in?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If it is paid into the Treasury, it is controlled by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. The department is not obliged to appoint a man unless it wishes, is it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Of course not.

Mr. MANN. What real objection is there, if we are going to let these people contribute the money, to their having something to say about the men who are to receive the salaries where the Government contributes one dollar and the other people contribute a thousand, so long as those employees are under the control of the Government?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If we were unable to contribute the money ourselves——

Mr. MANN. We are unable to. I want to get some for my county, and I can not do it. I have been unable to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is because Congress refuses to make the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I know; and it will continue to refuse. That is the trouble.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And I will remind the gentleman that only two years ago, when I asked for a substantial increase in this appropriation, out of which money to his own county might be paid, he opposed it on the floor of this House and said the work ought to be done by the States.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I have always supported this proposition, so far as I recall. Of course, if the gentleman has read a speech of mine lately on the subject, very well. I have helped to maintain all of these items, and my State gets nothing, although our counties all over the State would like to have this work. The gentleman may get it in Michigan, but I do not think he gets very much there.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman from Illinois will read the debate on the Agricultural bill before the House two years ago, when I offered an amendment increasing the appropriation to $250,000 and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STONE] offered an amendment increasing the appropriation to $251,000, the gentleman will find that he joined with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Lamb, then the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and opposed these amendments.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I expect that is likely. I have supported the Agricultural bill every year for years, but not upon the ground stated by the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I believe the gentleman stated earlier in his remarks that these men were carried on the rolls at an annual salary of $1?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. One dollar per year.

Mr. TOWNER. And subsequently I understood the gentleman to say that they were paid their salary out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know how they receive their salaries. I know that the only call on the Treasury of the United States for these men is $1 a year.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that no money is paid out of the Treasury of the United States to these men, except that $1, which carries them on the roll, and that all of the rest of the expense is paid from the Rockefeller fund?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know just the manner in which these men are paid nor just how the bookkeeping of the department is done, but I do know that these men are taken and accepted as employees of the Department of Agriculture, and this work is done as if it were work of the Department of Agriculture. The department vouches for it and approves it, while it is paid for by money from private sources.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. How much money was donated to the Government last year in this way and for this purpose?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I know of only the $250,000 which was used in connection with this boll-weevil appropriation in the South.

Mr. McKENZIE. To whom is that paid?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know the modus operandi, but I know that $250,000 came from the Rockefeller fund, and I know that the Department of Agriculture pays only $1 a year for each of these men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is a very influential member of the committee and a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, and I think the gentleman knows the chairman's own feelings in this regard. I exceedingly regret the gentleman, as a member of the committee, has not brought this matter to the attention of the full committee. It surprises me and other members of the committee that it is brought here now for the first time. It is clearly subject to a point of order. It has already provoked a great deal of discussion, and I would like very much to get along with the consideration of the bill. I will say to my friend that I am bound to make the point of order, although, in the main, I agree with his proposition; but it is not a proposition that the committee has considered. I shall not object to his request, of course, if he desires to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not bring this before the committee. Perhaps I should have done so; but it is a matter of great importance, and I trust that I am not out of order, that I am doing nothing unbecoming in bringing this important matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I do not want the gentleman to think my words carried that insinuation. The gentleman has a perfect right to offer his amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And I feel sincerely, Mr. Chairman, that the Government, abundantly able to furnish the money itself, ought not to receive money in this way, especially when it comes or is offered under such circumstances as to arouse suspicion. As I say, one very important official of the department told me that he was offered money to carry on this work, and, speaking of contributions made by the General Education Board.

said that he had found it objectionable to receive money from that source because its secretary had assumed or requested the right to name the men who should be employed and paid under this appropriation or out of the money contributed by the board. And the same kind of work also is being carried on throughout the States. The secretary of this education board goes to a State and asks the State to accept money from that board and to refuse money from the Federal Government, on condition that the secretary of that board be permitted to dictate the selection of men who shall be paid out of the fund. Now, it seems to me that it is time for this House to know where this money comes from, the condition on which it is offered, and how it is being used, and of the suspicion that attaches to it. If we are poor and unable to make the appropriation ourselves, then we may perhaps be humiliated by being compelled to accept money from outside sources, but we are abundantly able to furnish all the money ourselves, and I insist, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to do it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman has stated that certain suspicion attached to it. That is a very indefinite term. What suspicion attaches to it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have told the gentleman officials of the department have told me——

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Has the gentleman got any specific charge? If his suspicion has any vitality——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have learned that the department dislikes to receive money because there is a string to it, and that the secretary of the General Education Board wishes to dictate the selection of men.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. There might be a string to it, but that would not be a suspicion. The word "suspicion" indicates something wrong, something corrupt, something that is not proper; and the gentleman has used that word three or four times, and I want to know what the extent of that suspicion was.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure I am right in saying that suspicion has been, and ought to be, aroused on account of the source from which these large contributions of money come, on account of the manner in which the money has been used, and on account of the improper and very offensive demand of the secretary of the General Education Board that, in consideration of further money which he offers to supply, he shall be permitted to name the men who will receive the money and carry on the work among the farmers of the country.

I am not assailing Mr. Rockefeller, who supplies the money with which the General Education Board carries on its work. This House and the country know Mr. Rockefeller. I am calling attention to the fact that Mr. Rockefeller's money is, and for several years past has been, contributed to and used by the Department of Agriculture in its farm-demonstration work in the cotton-growing sections of the South. The general plan of the work is good, and it ought to be continued and extended, but I believe, under existing circumstances, the Federal Government ought not to accept the money. It certainly ought not to accept the Rockefeller contribution, in view of the fact that the secretary of the board is demanding the privilege of naming the men who are to receive the money and who are to go out among the farmers of the country, giving the impression that they are employed by the Department of Agriculture. There is a well-founded suspicion that the donor of this money and the secretary of the board, who directs its distribution, are seeking to employ their own men, or men of their own kind, who will go about the country bearing the stamp of the Department of Agriculture and ostensibly working for the department while they are really employed by Mr. Rockefeller and are disseminating ideas and doctrines favorable to him and to his methods of business. The people of the United States ought not to carry on the Government by cooperation with any man or set of men, and this Congress ought not to be beguiled by an offer of large sums of money from a private source, made for the purpose of supplementing the Federal appropriation, when it is made clearly to appear that the offer of money has a string attached to it or that the money is used in such a way as to arouse suspicion of the motives of the person who offers it. I think it is very objectionable indeed to have men employed to go out among the people of the country, men ostensibly representing the Department of Agriculture and for whom that department vouches, whereas in fact they are men employed by the General Education Board, paid out of money furnished by Mr. Rockefeller, and who represent him instead of the Government of the United States.

The work of farm management and farm demonstration, carried on in part by this appropriation, is very helpful to the farmers of the country when carried on right. The department has expended untold millions of money in making experiments and investigations, the results of which are piled up in the department. These are the only appropriations ever made for the purpose of taking those results to the men whose money produced them and who have a right to know and have the advantage of them. The people of the country wish these appropriations made and wish men employed to assist farmers in learning and applying the information which has been obtained for their use and benefit, but I am sure they will resent the employment of men and the presence among them of men who come to them under suspicion of employment by one who is suspected of using his money solely for his own benefit. The Government of the United States is not a mendicant; it is abundantly able to provide money for every legitimate purpose; and every appropriation of money and every use of money ought to be above suspicion.

What the chairman of the committee has said is an admission of my charge to the effect that the secretary of the General Education Board has attempted to dictate the selection of employees of the Department of Agriculture, or improperly to influence their appointment, and that suspicion attaches to the acceptance and use of the money contributed by this board. The chairman says that the Committee on Agriculture will consider a measure and present it to the House to make contribution of money from objectionable sources impossible in the future. Such a bill can apply only to appropriations hereafter to be made and to the work of the department in future years. The amendment I have offered, if adopted, will stop the objectionable practice now and enable the department to carry on its work, as I know it wishes to do, free of all suspicion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for farm-demonstration work in the South has been carried in this bill, according to my recollection, for about eight years. It was carried in this bill long before I became chairman of the committee. It has been understood by all the members of the committee that a portion of the funds for farm-demonstration work in the South was contributed by the general education board. The truth is, not a dollar of the general education board money is expended in the boll-weevil section of the South. My understanding is that the general education board fund is expended only in sections outside or beyond the boll-weevil sections—that is, in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, and probably Kentucky.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is not the money contributed by the general education board used to supplement this appropriation, this particular appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. The money contributed by the general education board is not used to supplement the boll-weevil fund, but is used in sections outside the boll-weevil district; but that makes no difference. It does not change the principle involved at all. What I wanted to do was to call the attention of the gentleman——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If what the gentleman says is true, it means this money is being improperly used because this money is to be used to meet the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil.

Mr. LEVER. I am afraid my friend does not understand my proposition.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman is referring now to the last paragraph of the page; the amendment is to the next to the last paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I am speaking of the farm-demonstration work in the South—the boll-weevil work. I understand what the gentleman from Michigan has in mind. What I want to call his attention to is the fact that these contributions from the general education board have been going on for the past six or eight years. I myself believe that probably the time has come, probably it has been here some time, when the Federal Government, through Congress, should prohibit any of these contributions for work that the Federal Government can do. I think the gentleman from Michigan is willing to admit that I suggested that to him in a private conversation not long ago, but I do not believe that legislation of this important character ought to be put upon an appropriation bill without the consideration of any committee or without a full understanding of what its general effect will be. The fact is there is a number of items in this bill which are being contributed to by private donation. I recall there is the provision of the Forestry Service, a new provision, by which we permit that very thing to be done. It was put in the bill this year; but, upon the whole, I think probably it is not wise to have these things done, but I do not want to have that change made in this appropriation bill with-

out a full consideration at the hands of the proper committee. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what proportion, in the judgment of the committee, is contributed by this general educational board?

Mr. LEVER. None of that.

Mr. GOULDEN. What proportion in any part of this bill is contributed? What amount do they contribute, if anything, in this bill to general education?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection of the figures here—but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] may be right and I may be wrong about it, because I have not looked up the facts lately—is that the general board's contribution to the work in the South is $120,000 a year. I accept his statement.

Mr. GOULDEN. I agree with the chairman of the committee that the time has arrived when the people can afford to do this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I think there is quite a number of members of the Committee on Agriculture who know the feeling of the chairman of the committee in this respect. It has been my intention to introduce a bill along these lines prohibiting such contributions, not only for work in the Department of Agriculture but in all other departments where contributions may be made, but I do not want to see that legislation go through without the thorough consideration of a committee, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment is new legislation and contrary to the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] desire to be heard?

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] withhold the point of order for five minutes?

Mr. LEVER. I will withhold it for five minutes, with the understanding that I will make the point at the end of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it should be thoroughly understood just what it is against which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] is protesting. Here are a number of men who are carried on the rolls as Government employees and who are paid from the Government Treasury only the sum of $1 for a year's services. As a matter of fact, these men are paid their salaries and their expenses by private persons and from private funds. We are in this situation, then, in regard to this matter. There are men who are authorized to go out into the country and call themselves Government employees, and who proceed to act with governmental authority, who are being paid from private funds both their salaries and their expenses. It certainly can not be, Mr. Chairman, that this House or the people of this country will approve of that. The other day we had under consideration a bill that came from the Committee on Education, in which the Commissioner of Education asked for authority to receive from private contributors money to aid in the extirpation of illiteracy in the United States. It was objected by gentlemen on the floor of the House that the bill ought not to pass and that authority ought not to be so given for a good many reasons. It was argued that men who act ostensibly for the Government, but who are under pay received from private individuals, would recognize that the real source of their authority was not governmental, but would be influenced in the performance of their duties by those from whom they received their compensation.

I was convinced that was a good objection to that provision of the bill and agreed that it should be withdrawn. And here is a situation vastly worse than that, because there the Government could expend the money as it chose; it was to be considered as an absolutely unqualified donation, to be used by the Government employees as they should deem best; but here the amount of the salary is fixed, the amount of compensation for expenditures is fixed, all by outside parties, and the Government employee, in order to please those who employ him and pay him, must do it in accordance with the desires of such private individuals and not primarily for the best interests of the Government. It seems to me the time has come when we should abandon that practice, and I can hardly see how anybody can object that a proviso should be here inserted saying that this practice should not be longer continued.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I just wanted to suggest to him that I could hardly see how so vigilant a man as he had not discovered that this thing is being done and has been done for 10 years.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is nothing in this bill or in any other bill that has ever been reported that would apprise the House or apprise the country that such conditions existed. I will say to the gentleman that no vigilance would apprise anyone of that fact, so far as could be ascertained from any Government document or committee report, not even from the able report that the chairman of the committee has furnished us.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Possibly the latter half of the amendment, the second clause, is objectionable. It is suggested that the chairman rule on the matter, and then I will offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken, especially as to the last proviso.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, then I offer another amendment, which is the same as the first half and without the last clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 19, by striking out the figures "400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "518,800," and at the end of line 22 insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be used in paying salaries or expenses of officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees who are paid in part by contributions of money from any source whatever outside of the State where such officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees carry on their work."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I will state to the Chair very frankly that I am in doubt whether or not the point of order is good. I make the point of order, and if the Department of Agriculture is now doing the class of work set out in the amendment proposed by the gentleman they must have authority to do it, and this would be a limit upon that authority, and hence legislation.

Mr. MANN. This amendment, as the gentleman will see, is only a limitation on the appropriation in this bill. It does not affect the authority of the department to make these employments at all, but would not permit the use of the money in this bill appropriated in connection with such persons. That is purely a limitation upon the appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to have the Chair rule. I am rather of the opinion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so. The Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken, and therefore overrules it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair has ruled, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 19, by striking out the figures "$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$518,800"; and at the end of line 22 insert the following: "*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be used in paying salaries or expenses of officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees who are paid in part by contribution of money from any source whatever outside the State where such officers, agents, collaborators, or other employees carry on their work.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things. First it increases the appropriation in this item $100,000. That is a proposition which the committee did not consider and which the Department of Agriculture did not estimate for. The committee on its own initiative increased the appropriation for this item $35,000.

Mr. MANN. No; $25,000.

Mr. LEVER. No; $35,000, I will say to my friend.

Mr. MANN. It was $375,000 in the current law, I think.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. There was a reduction of $10,000 on account of a transfer.

Mr. MANN. The real increase on this item is $35,000.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. In the second place, the amendment seeks to make a prohibition of policy, which probably is not a bad proposition. But I repeat, as I said a while ago, that that matter has not been well considered by the members of the committee. At least I think it is too important a piece of legislation to be put upon this bill without full consideration. Therefore I hope that the committee will vote down the amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 22, after the word "stock," insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any purpose for which a specific appropriation is made."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention, in connection with this item, carrying an appropriation of $400,000, to the close resemblance that that appropriation bears to the next one of $378,240, which is designated especially for demonstration work in connection with the ravages of the boll weevil.

Now, there is no way whereby this first item, to which I refer, can be eliminated from use also in connection with demonstration work regarding the cotton-boll weevil or any other of the various specific appropriations made in this bill. I call attention to this fact because several statements have been made here as to the relative position and relative amounts of appropriations carried in this and other bills wherein the South is directly affected.

We have had the Smith-Lever agricultural extension bill, we have had the Shackleford good roads bill, and I think I am not raising a sectional or a partisan issue when I say that it is clearly demonstrated that the appropriations in these bills are very much more favorable to the South than they are to other sections of our country.

Now, in connection with the amendment I have offered, I wish to say that we of New England, and I of Massachusetts, wish to see more farm-demonstration work and encouragement for improved agricultural methods pushed in that section of our country. We want some of these appropriations arranged in such a way that there may be a fair chance for New England and Massachusetts. No section of our country offers a greater opportunity for agricultural improvement than that. We would like to have this item so limited and arranged that all of these appropriations do not go for the benefit of the Southern States.

Let me just call attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that in this one bill which we are considering here to-day there are eight distinct items, footing up $1,025,020 out of a total of less than $19,000,000 carried in the whole agricultural appropriation bill, which are directly limited in such a way as to be beneficial entirely to the South. Therefore I ask that this item here be so specified that it can not be used in the places where will also be used the items of $1,025,020, already designated. I would like to see various improvements made in the expansion of farm-demonstration work throughout our section of the country. I would like to see the Federal authorities assist in that line of work to the full capacity of our section to absorb it, and I do ask that we be given a fair chance under this item.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the statement made several times during the consideration of this bill that the bill was sectionally drawn and that the South was getting too much of the funds carried in it. I have been greatly surprised at that. It is the first time during my connection with this bill that the charge has been made, and I know that if I had the time I could go through the bill item by item and demonstrate to the satisfaction of any fair-minded man here that the bill we are now considering is drawn in exact keeping with the bill last drawn, when Mr SCOTT was the Republican chairman of this committee, and that the increases in all the items have been in about the same proportion.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman think he ought to congratulate New England, and especially the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], in waking up an interest in the farmer at this late day? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to answer my friend who so successfully supports the Angoras in the South, I may say that I have been here only one year. I am serving my first term, and I have not waked up at a late day. I have always been awake. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. The country, and especially the State of Massachusetts, is to be congratulated on the sending of such a distinguished gentleman here, and one who will take an interest in farming. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. The Department of Agriculture was largely built up under the magnificent leadership of Secretary James Wilson. [Applause.] I have no apologies whatever for paying my tribute to that grand old man. The South has had no better friend than Uncle Jimmy Wilson showed himself to be. He knew that we had great problems down there. He came to our committee with his estimate, and the then chairman of that committee [Mr. SCOTT], and the ranking Republican member, my friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] were too big and too broad and too patriotic to raise the miserable cry of sectionalism. [Applause.] I resent the idea that there is any sectionalism in this bill, or in the bill to which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has referred.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. LEVER. I do not yield just now. I do not believe the fact that the South is getting its proportionate share of these funds, or even more than its proportionate share, would be a sufficient basis upon which to predicate the charge of sectionalism. I was particularly pained to have my friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] in his opening statement make that charge, because he is as beardless as I am, and I thought the young men of the South, the young men of the North, the young men of the West, and the young men of the East would get together and forget the differences of the past. [Applause.]

Oh, they say it is a sectional bill. I congratulate myself upon the compliment they pay me in that charge. If you will take your Congressional Directory you will see that the Committee on Agriculture is composed of 21 Members and one Delegate. If you will read down the list you will find that of those 21 Members, 6 come from below the Potomac River, and 15 Members and the Delegate from above it. Oh, great is GORDON LEE, great is JIMMY YOUNG, great is TOM HEFLIN, great is ZEKE CANDLER, great is JACOWAY, great is LEVER, that these six men from the South are so much more able than these gentlemen from the North that they can absolutely take the committee, hog tie it, and do anything they please with it. [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, the charge is so ridiculous that it is absolutely absurd, and I hope and trust it will not again be repeated on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have not occupied much of the time of committee. I ask five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I called upon the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to give me a statement about this proposition, because I wanted to meet it once and forever, and I want to read his letter. It is dated March 5, 1914, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, March 5, 1914.*

Hon. A. F. LEVER,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. LEVER: Answering your inquiry as to whether it would be practicable to estimate the manner in which the funds appropriated for the department are expended, with special reference to geographical districts, I beg to say that this would be difficult. As you are well aware, the organization of the department is such that men engaged in one project frequently assist also in other projects. For this reason there are constant changes and shifts being made in expenditures, making it extremely difficult to give anything like definite figures along the lines you desire.

From the best of our information, however, we have prepared and submit herewith a summary statement as to the distribution of expenditures made by the department during the past four fiscal years. You will note this statement shows expenditures during that period of $71,077,433.48. In the division of the country we have followed the census plan, and titles of divisions, therefore, correspond with those adopted by the census in each of its 10-year periods of work.

The figures speak for themselves and show that, for all practical purposes, the distribution of the department's funds, so far as work is concerned and so far as expenditures are concerned, are practically uniform throughout the entire country. The large amount of money expended throughout the mountain section, including Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada, is accounted for from the fact that it is in these States that we administer the Forest Service, which, as you know, is an expensive service. The same holds true to a considerable extent for the Pacific district, including Washington, Oregon, and California. You will note we have estimated the ex-

penses for the Washington office for the four years at $8,484,092.64. This is given as a lump item, but, of course, applies uniformly to all of the districts in question and should be equally prorated.

Trusting this information will be of service to you, I am,

Very sincerely,

B. T. GALLOWAY,
*Acting Secretary.*

Then he submits the following table:

*Summary of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913, showing the amount used for each census district.*

| | |
|---|---|
| New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut) | $3,959,049.93 |
| Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) | 4,548,695.13 |
| East North Central (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin) | 7,143,617.05 |
| West North Central (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas) | 7,657,552.16 |
| South Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida | 6,111,045.98 |
| Washington office | 8,484,092.64 |
| East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi) | 2,751,472.57 |
| West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas) | 4,413,637.26 |
| Mountain (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada) | 16,468,144.68 |
| Pacific (Washington, Oregon, and California) | 9,540,126.08 |
| Total | 71,077,433.48 |

So that even last year the Pacific division—Washington, Oregon, and California, three States—received the expenditure of $3,400,000 more than was expended in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

That is the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. I did not prepare it. I believe it is true; but whether it is or not, I think the time has come when men representing great districts on the floor of this House ought to make up their minds that this is one country, one flag, and one people [applause], and that we are devoting ourselves to one purpose—the glory, prosperity, happiness, and development of our common country. [Applause.] Gentlemen, let us stop the cry of sectionalism. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee and the department have been criticized; it seems proper that I should say at least a few words in reply. It has been charged that the committee and the department have discriminated against the North in favor of the South. All that it seems necessary to say in reply is that the Committee on Agriculture has pursued along the same lines as other committees have, and generally lump-sum appropriations have been made for a specific line of work or project or projects; in other words, Congress has specified for what purpose the money should be expended, and has left it to the discretion of the department how and where the money should be expended.

Attention has been called to the $378,000 appropriation for farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil. Appropriations have been made for that purpose for many years. First, the appropriations were made for the eradication of the boll weevil, and when it was found that the weevil could not be eradicated appropriations were made for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the weevil. No direction has ever been given by Congress as to where the money should be expended. It simply directed for what purpose the appropriation should be used; and inasmuch as cotton is grown down South and not up North, of course it was fair to assume that the department's activity and the money appropriated would go to the South, where the cotton-boll weevil was to be found, and not to the corn or wheat fields of the North. When it became known that the money thus appropriated was not being used for the eradication of the cotton-boll weevil, but simply for farm demonstration down South, it was suggested that an equal amount be appropriated for farm demonstration up North, and the committee has reported $400,000 for farm management and farm demonstration, and last year's appropriation bill carried an appropriation of $365,000 for the same purpose, or as an offset—or, rather, to balance the account between the North and South—that being the understanding, of course it was assumed that the department would expend that amount in the Northern States. Now, it appears that a large portion, or $33,285, of that amount, has been expended in the South. That, of course, is contrary to the purpose for which the appropriation is made and as generally understood; and if so diverted, that is a matter for the department to explain.

The committee has had confidence in the department. If the department can not be trusted in justly apportioning the money between the various sections of the country, then the committee has misplaced confidence. My understanding is that its aim is to render assistance where assistance is most needed; if so, in my opinion there are no grounds for criticism; on the other hand, if it yields to pull and fails to give due regard for the needs of assistance and results, and if appropriations are made available for political expediency or as an auxiliary to a political party for the return of Representatives or Senators to Congress, then the department should be abolished; but I can not believe that a great department like the Department of Agriculture is guilty of entertaining any such view or purpose. To the contrary, I believe its head, the heads of the bureaus charged with the responsibility of apportioning appropriations, have due regard for the needs of the country; that the patriotic and well-meaning men who take a deep interest and pride in our Nation's growth and greatness, in speeding on the wheel of progress and in sympathy with this marvelous expansion, that in making these apportionments and expenditures of this money they give due consideration to every section of this country and to the development of our natural resources and every worthy and legitimate enterprise of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is the good fortune of the agricultural interests of the country that the problems we deal with in this bill are localized. The bill is made up of difficulties or problems that in each section of the country find need of solution. There is an appropriation for the eradication of the cattle tick in Texas. I am sorry that the people of Texas have to bear that burden, but it is the extraordinary good fortune of the people of Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois and every other cattle-growing section that we have been able to limit the ticks to Texas and that section of the country.

They have the cotton-boll weevil in the South. If we grew cotton in the Northern States or the Pacific coast, the appropriation would cover every part of that country where the cotton-boll weevil makes its ravages. I have studied this bill carefully along this line because it has been suggested several times in the course of the preparation of the bill, the question whether it is a sectional bill, and I must say that the matter never disturbed my mind. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who is known for his commendable activities in the House, has called attention to many items and thinks that too much is being expended in certain sections.

Now, they have certain problems in New England which I am afraid will cover an area of the country larger than it does now, and that is the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth. We appropriate nearly $300,000 in that section for those two pests alone. We are sorry that you have them there, but we want to keep them in that part of the country.

Mr. TREADWAY. They were imported into that part of the country.

Mr. LEVER. So was the cotton-boll weevil and the cattle tick imported into the South.

Mr. HAWLEY. I know that those pests were imported into this country, and it was a most undesirable immigration. We want to keep the moths in the country where they are now. If they spread into the great portions of the Pacific coast they will do incalculable damage; they would destroy the forests in that part of the country and our fruit industry.

The solution of the problem and the great salvation of the country is that we can keep these pests where they now are. The bill is made up on that theory clear through. Wherever there is a problem of agriculture we provide the sinews of war to attack it. If all the problems affecting the South were spread over the entire country, if all the problems that affect New England extended in an equal measure over the entire country, if all the problems that affect the Middle West extended over the entire country, we would be powerless in the face of that situation. There are many Southern States in which the boll weevil has not yet come. We want to restrict it to the area that it is now occupying. The more we can restrict the evil the greater possibility of its final eradication. If they finally extend over the entire country, it becomes a problem so great in magnitude that we never could find the amount of money to get rid of them. I can find nothing in the bill which entitles it to be called a sectional bill. [Applause.]

Some sections are more unfortunate than the rest. They have more problems to deal with, more difficulties to cope with. I would be willing, if I could be assured, or if we had solved all the problems in the State that I have the honor to represent affecting agriculture and we had no problems existing there, I should be perfectly willing to have not a dollar of money expended there. I would be glad if the conditions were such that no money was needed to be expended there. And so would the gentleman from South Carolina be glad if the conditions were such in his State that he had no need of any money to be expended in that State, and the gentleman from Mississippi would

take the same position, and so would the gentleman from Georgia. It is a misfortune that we have these evils, and it is our good fortune that they are localized in certain sections. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the question of any sectional appropriations in this bill. I desire to speak entirely independent of that question. I am at a loss to understand how anyone can oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. If there was any purpose in making up this bill—and I say at this time that I do not for a moment insinuate or intimate that the gentleman from South Carolina or any other member of the committee would have any such purpose—but if there was any purpose in making up this bill to put under one head or one item an appropriation which was intended to apply to that which was already covered by another item, I think such purpose would be highly improper.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MANN. This item is farm-demonstration work. If this amendment should prevail, would the farm demonstrator paid under it be permitted to teach the farmer anything that was covered by other items in the bill, in work we are investigating? Take, for instance, the investigation and improvement of cereals and cereal productions. Would the farm demonstrator be permitted to teach the farmer anything about the method of cereal production and the improvement of cereal production under this amendment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I insist that the House is entitled to know how much is expected to be expended for any particular purpose, and when the amount is specified in a paragraph of the bill the House ought to understand that that is the amount which it is expected will be expended for that purpose. We have here an item of some $378,240, to be expended for the extermination of the boll weevil, or for meeting ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, for I believe it is now agreed that it can not be exterminated.

Mr. MANN. That is not what the item says.

Mr. HAUGEN. We are on the $400,000 item.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that; but what the gentleman from Massachusetts wishes to accomplish by his amendment is this: That no part of the $400,000 should be expended for meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, which is already appropriated for, and the House ought to know that that is the sum which is expected to be used for that purpose and not any more. I think it is ample and more than ought to be expended, but I yield to the judgment of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that that item of $378,240 is not expended for the purpose of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, or the major portion of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know what the bill recites.

Mr. MANN. The item is:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, $378,240.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very well; but it all applies to the boll weevil, and that does not alter the situation in the least.

Mr. MANN. It is farmers' demonstration work in the South, and that is all it covers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the House ought to understand it.

Mr. MANN. The House does understand it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It ought not to be put in in that way. If the gentleman from Illinois is correct, then few Members in the House understand this bill or can understand it with the language used in it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the appropriation is made making it available for the department to send its people down there in the cotton district and demonstrate to those farmers how to grow their crops.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In connection with the ravages of the boll weevil.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is demonstration work and nothing else.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In connection with the ravages of the boll weevil.

Mr. HAUGEN. Under that name; yes.

Mr. MANN. This item at the bottom of the page has been carried in the bill for years. The item just above it, which is now under consideration, is a comparatively new item.

The language in the item at the bottom of the page includes, among other things:

And for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil.

That is the fund used in the farm demonstration work in the South. The other item was put in the bill for the purpose of appropriating money for farm demonstration work in the North, but neither item is confined to ravages of the boll weevil and does not say so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I only want about two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Granting what the gentleman from Illinois has said, it shows that we have a bill here before us which nobody can understand to what the money is to be applied, and nobody knows about the limitation. There may be some understanding on the part of the committee with the experts of the department or the officials of the department. Now, then, I submit that is not the proper way for a bill to be drawn. It ought to be so drawn that the House can know what the money is going for, and therefore I submit the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to be adopted.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will state for the information of the gentleman that the House made several efforts to change the language and adopt the language referred to, but the committee or Members of this House never succeeded in doing it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. COOPER. Reading on page 21 of the report of the committee, I see this particular item, page 19, line 23:

This item has for its purpose the improvement of agricultural conditions of the farmers by inducing them, through actual demonstrations and otherwise, to put into practice the best methods known for farming along all lines, including systems of cropping, rotations for soil improvement, production of home supplies, and proper attention to animal husbandry, and to enable the farmers in the cotton-boll weevil States to meet the ravages of the boll weevil by diversification and the adoption of better methods of farming, including the raising of cotton under boll-weevil conditions.

So the interpretation put upon it by the gentleman from Illinois seems to be the one the committee itself had in view.

Mr. LEVER. It is the interpretation the committee put upon it——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will pardon me, I can not yield for an interruption, as I have but two minutes. Granting all that, I still insist that that is not a proper way to draw a bill.

Mr. COOPER. That is true; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. The language ought to be changed entirely.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my friend is evidently mistaken when he criticizes the language of the bill, because the appropriations made in this bill are well defined and well understood, not only by the Agricultural Department but by the Treasury Department, and the appropriations can not be made for one purpose in this bill and used for another purpose, because it has to pass not only the approval of the Agricultural Department itself but has to pass the approval of the Treasury Department and the auditing authorities of both departments before they can ever be paid, hence the provisions of this bill are specific and well known and are for the specific and direct purposes for which the appropriations are made.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Do not these two items overlap each other?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; one is for one purpose and the other for another purpose, and they are well defined.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why not accept the amendment?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will observe that $400,000 is for part of the farm demonstration work.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice and for farm demonstration work. That is the language, and it is thoroughly understood.

Mr. COOPER. But the $400,000 is for farm-demonstration work, and part of the $378,240 is for farm-demonstration work, according to the report of the committee; and under a fair interpretation of the language of the bill the two provisions do, in my judgment, plainly overlap, and the language ought to be changed.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. But it is thoroughly understood for what purpose these appropriations are made, and they are used for the purposes for which the sums are appropriated. The intent of the legislative body is always considered.

Mr. COOPER. This language ought not to permit them to do anything else.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It does not permit them to do anything else except to use money for the specific appropriations for which they are made.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that $33,000 from the $400,000 intended for the North, as the gentleman stated, was used of the appropriation last year for the South?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Not so far as my information goes.

Mr. TOWNER. I have been told it was, but I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am not specifically advised in reference to that, and I am not prepared to give full credence to that statement unless I have the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask his attention to the hearings on that subject and the statement filed by the department in connection with it? If he will look on page 124, he will find under this item of farm management investigational work, not demonstration, in West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma, $33,285. That was not demonstration work, and it was taken out of the $400,000.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Where is it stated it was taken out of this $400,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement says it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. According to the gentleman's conclusion it states that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the witness state in these inquiries that it was taken out of this $400,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement says that.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the witness state, or any official of the department state, that it was taken out of the $400,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Here is the statement rendered by the department to the committee, which in itself shows this $33,000 was spent as I have stated.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Out of this $400,000 instead of out of the $378,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not out of this one, but the appropriation of last year.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Out of the $400,000 instead of the $378,000? For what purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. For the purpose I have stated—for investigational work.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I want to call attention now, in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] a moment ago, to exactly the work that is being done, to show that there is no sectionalism or divisions in this bill. Take the item of $400,000, to which attention has just been called, which is intended to be expended in the North for farm-demonstration work.

The next item is $378,240, and is to be used in the South, as was stated a moment ago. The next item is for the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under semi-arid or dry-land conditions in the West, $145,000. The next is for studying the methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing, in cooperation with the States, companies, or individuals, or otherwise, $5,000.

That is for the western country. And then, for investigation in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, $70,380.

And for the investigation and improvement of fruits and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping, and for experimental shipments of fruits from the United States into foreign countries, $107,500.

That is for use upon the Pacific coast. All of this shows that every section of this country is represented almost in every item of this bill. When a man can charge sectionalism in this bill it shows that his imagination can go a long ways. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes, please?

Mr. LEVER. I sincerely wish that the gentleman would not delay the passage of this bill. I have been as patient as a man could be, I think, and the gentleman has made his speech.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman have three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. With the understanding that the debate shall be closed on this paragraph at the end of that time?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in three minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That does not cut you off.

Mr. ANDERSON. They are closing debate on the paragraph, and I would like to offer an amendment, and, besides, the gentleman has made reference to me, and I would like to answer.

Mr. MANN. Suppose you take five minutes on a side.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 13 minutes, 3 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and 5 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, 3 minutes of which shall be used by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], 5 by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and 5 by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] made references to certain evils that exist in rural communities in various sections of the country. I for one am only too glad to vote for any appropriation eradicating those evils, and I am very sorry that any of them exist anywhere, whether it be in New England, on the western line of our country, or in the South. He referred particularly to the item for the extermination of the boll weevil. I shall be only too glad to support that item or any similar one.

My particular reference was that I want a chance for the agricultural interests of New England and of my own State of Massachusetts to have the support of appropriations which will develop agriculture, which will aid bringing back the use of the farm in every desirable sense. Many of these items to which I have referred are for demonstration work, rather than for the study and extermination of existing pests.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] has said that this item which we are considering, of $400,000, is to apply to the North. There is absolutely nothing in the phraseology of the bill, Mr. Chairman, to show that it is to be used there. And that is what my amendment calls for—to show that it will be used in a certain line of work not otherwise specified. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has also said that out of a similar appropriation last year $33,285 was used absolutely in the same line of work as the next item appropriating $378,000 for boll-weevil extermination and demonstration work. My request is that this demonstration work be continued more fully, and be more thoroughly done, and more to the advantage of the country, not limiting it anywhere, but that we do not overlap these appropriations in the way it has been shown we do in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman is in error with reference to the $33,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. I stated it on the authority of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. GARNER. I do not doubt that the $33,000 was used for the purpose stated by the gentleman, but the purpose was to investigate and to encourage in the matter of improved farm management. Does the gentleman think that no investigation or encouragement of the adoption of improved farm management ought to be conducted in the South?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have just stated, Mr. Chairman, that I approve of that in every way, but I would like also to see some of that same work done in Massachusetts. There is no section of the country that needs protection of the farmers' interests more than does Massachusetts, nor is there any section where farm-demonstration work can be done to better advantage than Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the previous amendment disposed of, and then I shall offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was reserved against the pending amendment. Does the gentleman from South Carolina withdraw his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I withdraw the point of order for the purpose of asking for a vote on that particular amendment. Then the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] can offer his amendment and can take his five minutes under that. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 19, after the figures "$400,000," insert: "of which not less than $300,000 shall be used outside of Washington in educational and demonstrational work, in seed selection, and in intensive cultivation of cereal crops, with a view of increasing the per-acre production."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, anybody who makes any investigation at all of the statistics of cereal production will be struck with three very important facts. One of them is that the per acre production of cereals in the leading agricultural countries of Europe is very much greater than it is in this country; and, second, that the ratio of increase per acre of production in the agricultural countries of Europe is also greater in the last two decades than it is in the United States; and, third, that the per acre production is greater in the New England States than it is anywhere else in the United States.

The reason for this situation is, in my opinion, comparatively obvious. One of the reasons is that the longer period of cultivation, both abroad and in the New England States, and the denser population there have necessitated more intensive methods of cultivation. The fact of the matter is that, out in the West especially, the possibilities of profit in turning grain into cattle and hogs have caused us very materially to neglect the matter of cereal production, and incidentally, in my opinion, the bureau has neglected instruction and demonstrational work in cereal production.

Now, anybody who knows anything about farming at all must know that underlying the increase of the production of cattle and hogs must be an increase of the cereal production, and the purpose of my amendment is to compel the Department of Agriculture to use the funds intended for farm management work, or at least a large proportion of them, in demonstrational and educational work in increasing the per-acre production of the cereal crops. They have not done this in the past. Of $375,000 for this purpose during the current year but $157,000 was used in the field.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], for whose intelligence, ability, and integrity I have the greatest admiration, and for whom I may say I have the kindliest feelings of friendship, has made some complaint because I and a few other gentlemen have found it necessary to criticize this bill. Does the gentleman from South Carolina think that he ought to bring his bill in here and have it passed without any debate or criticism whatever? The gentleman knows that the membership of the House is so large that more and more of the work is done in committee, and if we are not permitted to discuss this bill, if we are not permitted to criticize his bill, if the gentleman from South Carolina and his colleagues are not to be put to the test as to the items which his bill contains, then we may as well pass the bill without any debate or consideration whatever.

Now, I want to say that the little speech that I made the other day was made without any spirit of sectionalism or antagonism to the South, or to any other section of the country. My intention was simply to call attention to some irregularities, to some discriminations, in order that the chairman might insist, as I hoped he would, upon the department's removing these occasions for honest criticism. I made my criticism not with any idea of arousing the antagonism of the gentleman from South Carolina, not with the idea of setting one section against the other, but with the idea of pointing out certain facts; and I challenged the gentleman from South Carolina or the department or any Member of the House to show that the comparisons that I made were not borne out by the testimony and the statements submitted by the Department of Agriculture to the committee in its hearings.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] himself raises the issue of sectionalism, because he is unable to defend these discriminations, and so raises the cry that gentlemen on this side are raising the sectional issue to befog the real situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] provides that of the $400,000 appropriated to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice and farm-demonstration work, $300,000 shall be used outside of Washington.

I rise to oppose that amendment for these reasons: The Office of Farm Management in the Department of Agriculture, up to two years ago, engaged itself solely in investigational work. The first farm-demonstration work ever undertaken outside of the South by the Department of Agriculture was begun in 1911. The appropriation for that purpose was then small. It has been growing by leaps and bounds until it has now reached the sum of $400,000. It is a good work. It has had the encouragement of every member of the Committee on Agriculture, among whom none has been more enthusiastic within reasonable limits than myself. But the Office of Farm Management is concerned not only with the matter of doing demonstration work, but it is engaged also in doing investigational and research work—gathering facts. I will read my friend the figures, so that we may know just exactly how much of this appropriation is going to be used for one purpose, how much for another purpose, and how much for the demonstration work pure and simple.

The estimates coming from the Secretary of Agriculture call for an appropriation for the fiscal year 1915 of $365,520, allotted as follows: $23,935 for administration purposes, $53,157 for farm economics, $42,122 for special farm-management studies, $237,126 for field study and demonstration, and $9,180 for the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; just a moment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that last year their statement was that they were going to spend $240,000 in the field, and they did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. LEVER. I am going upon the allotment suggested by the department itself.

Now, as I figure it out, under the allotment proposed by the Department of Agriculture, there will be expended for purposes other than farm demonstration in the field the sum of $127,000 and for field work $273,000. In other words, the committee allowed an increase of the estimate of $35,000, which the committee are sure—at least I am sure—will be spent for the demonstration work and not for the investigational and research work. So the amendment of the gentleman carries out of the city of Washington only $27,000 more than is going to be carried out, anyhow, under the allotment of these funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wanted to make certain that the prophecy which the gentleman makes will come true.

Mr. LEVER. I think if the gentleman had had the experience with the Department of Agriculture that the members of the Committee on Agriculture have had he would agree that the Department of Agriculture is very anxious to follow the will of Congress in the distribution of its funds. I am satisfied there will be no doubt about that.

I withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in line 19, page 19, I move to strike out "$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 19, strike out "$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, $378,240.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In 1908–9, when there was a proposition in the Agricultural appropriation bill to appropriate $896,200 for the plant industry, a reservation was made of $10,000, for immediate use, for the purpose of dealing with the boll weevil. Since that time nearly $2,000,000 have been appropriated, mostly under that head. I believe it has been demonstrated that no means has ever been devised for the purpose of destroying the boll weevil as we destroy other insects and farm pests.

Mr. Chairman, I regard this subject as one of the greatest that demands the attention of the people and of the Department of Agriculture to-day. [Applause.] I am only too sorry that we have not been able to devise some means of destroying this most devastating pest on one of the greatest industries of the world.

Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago there was a wise proposition submitted by Mr. James Berry, the Chief of the Climate and Crop

Division of the Weather Bureau, in an official letter to the Chief of the Weather Bureau, suggesting that that portion of Texas which had then lately been invaded by the boll weevil from Mexico should be segregated from the other portions of the cotton belt in the South. At that time but little damage had been done by his pest, and its operations were confined to a very small area adjacent to the Rio Grande River. At the time when this suggestion was made it would have been a comparatively inexpensive matter to have suspended the cultivation of cotton in the affected area for a number of years, which, in all probability, would have resulted in stamping out the boll weevil entirely, as developments since that time have revealed that segregation is the only remedy against its ravages. I commend the wisdom of this far-sighted proposition and submit Mr. Berry's letter in full for the benefit of the Members of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
*Washington, D. C., December 9, 1904.*

Prof. WILLIS L. MOORE,
*Chief United States Weather Bureau, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: As a means of checking the progress of one of the most destructive pests that has ever appeared in this country I beg permission to suggest that there be brought to the attention of the honorable Secretary of Agriculture the question of considering the advisability of recommending the enactment of legislation to prevent the cultivation of cotton during 1905 and in subsequent years if necessary within the area affected by the Mexican cotton boll weevil.

Some recent estimates place the value of the cotton crop of 1904 at more than $600,000,000, and the total production at 11,000,000 or more bales, about one-third of which is produced in Texas where the boll weevil is practically confined, only a few border parishes in Louisiana being affected as yet.

As I understand the investigations conducted by the entomologists of the department, it is impossible to produce more than half a crop in regions where the boll weevils are most numerous. It will thus be seen that if the boll weevil overspreads the entire cotton belt, as in the opinion of experts seems inevitable unless some effective remedial measures can be applied, the value of the cotton destroyed by this pest will eventually approximate $300,000,000 annually. The problem of dealing with this pest, therefore, is a very important one, and the danger which threatens so large a part of the United States is most grave.

The spread of the boll weevil over the entire cotton belt would take away almost the entire profit to be derived from the cultivation of one of the most important products of the country and would practically destroy all profit in the cultivation of the principal staple of the South. The suppression of the boll weevil is not a matter that concerns Texas alone or even the entire South, but in a measure the civilized world, especially the countries that depend upon the United States for their supply of cotton.

From what I have read of the pest and of the measures that have been employed so far in dealing with it, I am of the opinion that one of the best means of dealing with it that could be devised would be the prohibition of the cultivation of cotton for a year or two within the limits of the region now affected. As the matter is of grave concern to the entire country the National Government should do its part. If the Legislature of Texas should enact a law prohibiting the cultivation of cotton during the year 1905 in the affected region and the National Government should provide relief for those whose interests would be injuriously affected by the payment of some proportion, possibly 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the value of the crop grown in such area in 1904, I believe the experiment would be worth the trial and the cost. If the prohibition of the cultivation of cotton in the area affected cost the Government $50,000,000 annually for a year or two, and if such a course led to the extermination of the boll weevil, the outlay would be more than justified, for unless this pest is successfully dealt with it will eventually cost the Southern States two or three hundred million dollars per year.

The suggested method of dealing with this pest would be very costly, but nothing in the way of expense should prevent the adoption of any means promising to be effective in dealing with the most serious evil that has confronted the agricultural interests of the Southern States in their entire history.

Very respectfully,

JAMES BERRY,
*Chief Climate and Crop Division.*

Senator D. U. FLETCHER, of Florida, in commenting upon Mr. Berry's suggestion on the 29th day of July, 1913, expressed himself in a letter to Mr. Berry as follows:

I think it a great pity your suggestion of 1904 was not acted upon. It differs somewhat from the plan proposed now in that your idea was to discontinue growing cotton in the infected area, whereas the present suggestion is to quarantine the boll weevil by leaving a strip of territory 100 miles wide east and north of it free from the growing of cotton for one year.

If current information can be relied upon, the question of dealing with the boll weevil is a very grave one, and if some remedy can not be devised to check its spread and ravages, it will cost the American people an immense sum to handle it in the future. Ten years ago, when Mr. Berry made his suggestion, it was confined to a small horseshoe-shaped area in Texas, but now it has spread out over a vast area and threatens the extreme eastern and northern districts of the cotton belt.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. James Berry gave 32 of the best years of his life in the service of the Weather Bureau, during which time he built up the climate and crop division of that bureau to a degree of efficiency not surpassed in any civilized nation of the world. He originated and for years edited what was popularly known over the country as the Climate and Crop Bulletin, a bulletin most highly prized by the farmers of the country because of the valuable information it contained concerning current weather conditions and their effects upon farming operations and the cultivation and growth of crops.

Mr. Chairman, the value of the services which Mr. Berry has rendered to this country can not be too highly estimated. He was not only a man of ability in scientific knowledge of the subjects to which he had devoted a long service, but he was a man of conscience, which armed him with the courage to oppose evil and wrongdoing in high places, a man who, when confronted with the choice to consent to wrongdoing in the Weather Bureau or surrender his position, had the courage to tender his resignation to the Secretary of Agriculture and go back to private life in order to preserve his own honor and the honor of the bureau in which he had served so long and so well. [Applause.]

[Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. ANDERSON, by unanimous consent, were given leave to extend remarks.]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There has been much discussion in recent years of the boll-weevil item carried in this bill, and I am glad to have the expert opinion of my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], who has just preceded me, living, as he does, a thousand miles from the cotton belt, expressing an opinion as to how to grapple with the pest that has destroyed land values and property rights of the people in the great cotton belt. The gentleman's idea, as I gather it, of segregating the infested section is by establishing quarantine lines over which the boll weevil should not pass under pain and penalty of the law. I would suggest to my friend that he is forgetful of the fact that this pestiferous insect has feet to walk and wings to fly and refuses to be bound by quarantine regulations.

I want to say that in the cotton belt we have for years been grappling with the boll weevil and its ravages. It has been a serious problem that has brought forth the best thought and energies of as great a people as live on this continent, and the problem has not been solved. I think that the Government in entering on this line of work displayed wisdom, because it went to the relief of that great industry in the South that not only is the mainstay of the people who live in that section of the country but to other great sections, whose citizenship must be clothed, and of the manufacturers, whose spindles must run. But for the cotton crop the balance of trade would be against this Nation of ours. [Applause.] Sixty-five per cent of this crop goes abroad and brings our gold supply in return.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a State where the boll weevil first made its appearance. It is supposed that this pest originally came from Mexico, and the Lord deliver us from any more Mexican troubles. [Laughter and applause.] When it came across the line and entered the southern border of Texas there were great cotton fields that had theretofore produced three-quarters of a bale or a bale of cotton to the acre in the rich valleys of the Brazos and other streams, and I have seen magnificent areas of farm lands swept until the farmers would not enter them, because there was nothing to gather. What was the effect of it? It carried the land values down from $300 and $200 an acre until they could not be sold at any price. The individual citizenship was forced to move to other sections of the country that they might have sustenance. Every man made an effort to find some remedy for this pest. I have seen men, women of the household, and children walking up and down the cotton rows gathering the punctured bolls and fallen squares, one by one, carrying them and burning them, seeking to destroy this pest. We have cut the fields clear of stalks and burned them. We have tried early planting and intensive cultivation; improved seed, rotation in crops—in fact, every method that could be thought of—and we have succeeded to some extent.

Mr. Chairman, the boll weevil is nearing the Georgia line. I want to say to the Members from Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Georgia, and other cotton States that they and their citizenship should not be foolish, as we were in Texas, and sacrifice their land values as our people did. There is a brighter day coming. I believe this great cotton industry will survive, as it has survived. Texas year before last made its record crop of 4,500,000 bales of cotton, notwithstanding the boll weevil. [Applause.]

Last year we made almost equally as good a crop. Our land values have jumped again. In the district I have the honor to represent I have seen these land values crumble, farms abandoned, the citizenship moving to other sections and entering other lines of business, many sacrificing their acres, the earnings of a lifetime. To-day not a foot of the choice land can be bought for less than from $25 an acre to as high as $200 an acre. We are winning this fight, and no braver or more patriotic people ever set about a task than the cotton grower of the South, who knows no repulse and will not cease his efforts till the fight is won. [Applause.]

The $378,000 carried in this bill and referred to as the boll-weevil appropriation covers the expense of the whole farm-demonstration work in the cotton States of the South. A very small part of it is spent on the boll weevil directly. Intensive and more scientific farming is being taught and practiced. Thrifty orchards, successful trucking, and a variety of crops are being successfully grown all over the Southland. The perseverance and the indomitable courage of our people will not admit defeat at the hands of a myriad of insects, and this Government can not better expend the taxes taken from the whole people than the investment it has been making and is now proposing to make in the $378,000 under controversy. And I am sure this Congress delights to make the investment. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under semiarid or dry-land conditions, $145,000: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 3, strike out the figures "$145,000" and insert the figures "$200,000."

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment I desire to say briefly that I believe the appropriation carried in the bill for this work is not commensurate with its necessity and importance. Representing, as I do, in large part a constituency living in the arid region, I believe that no work the department can do will return more in benefit than that which can be done and should be done for the dry farmer. We have seen a section of the country that 20 years ago was devoted entirely to open-range industry becoming rapidly settled with those who are building homes, and through the policy pursued by the Agricultural Department we are learning that the possibilities of this region along agricultural lines has not yet been reached. I believe that with an adequate appropriation not only in the State which I represent but also in the neighboring States in which there are large areas of dry farming land great increase in production will be brought about. What is needed, in my judgment, to develop and increase the settlement of this particular region is that the Department of Agriculture should give to the settlers in our dry-farming country adequate means of information and demonstration.

The farmers complain that while the department is profuse in its dissemination of literature, there is a lack of that practical knowledge which comes in the way of demonstration, which is so much needed at the present time. When the settler in the arid region takes up his claim and settles upon it, he too often adopts methods of agriculture which have been followed in the Eastern States, and which prove to be unsatisfactory and unproductive. He needs the knowledge that can come to him only through practical demonstration to inform him of the most successful and remunerative methods of work. Therefore I believe that we should increase this appropriation to the amount named in the amendment, which will provide the department with larger means for touching the life of the dry farmer and bringing to him that aid which is quite apparent to those who are directly acquainted with it, of giving him practical and efficient demonstration work.

In this connection I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the great increase in population in nine arid-land counties in Colorado and also a statement from an agriculturalist showing just what practical work is being accomplished in the way of practical demonstration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to are as follows:

*Table showing the growth of population in nine of the counties in the eastern part of Colorado, known as the ary-farming region, during the decade 1900 to 1910.*

[Taken from the Thirteenth Census Report. Accurate comparison of the other counties in this dry-farming region is not obtainable for the reason that they were all restricted and changed in boundaries during the decade.]

| County. | 1900 | 1910 | Increase. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Per cent.* |
| Baca | 759 | 2,516 | 1,757 | 331 |
| Elbert | 8,101 | 5,331 | 2,230 | 171 |
| Kiowa | 701 | 2,899 | 2,198 | 415 |
| Kit Carson | 1,589 | 7,483 | 5,903 | 473 |
| Logan | 3,292 | 9,549 | 6,257 | 290 |
| Phillips | 1,583 | 3,179 | 1,596 | 200 |
| Sedgwick | 971 | 3,061 | 2,090 | 315 |
| Washington | 1,241 | 6,002 | 4,761 | 485 |
| Yuma | 1,729 | 8,499 | 6,770 | 491 |

WHAT ONE COLORADO COUNTY IS DOING FOR ITS FARMERS.

[By W. H. Lauck, agriculturist for El Paso County.]

The work that is now being done in El Paso County is the outgrowth of a pressing need that has been felt for many years in the county. There are in every locality those persons who see ahead, who recognize certain valuable results to be obtained while the matter is still unnoticed by the majority. This was true in El Paso County. It is only of late years that the agricultural possibilities of this county have been recognized. In the past the land was used largely for grazing cattle, horses, and sheep. A constant influx of new settlers has increased the rural population. Most of these filed on homestead land on the plains and started farm operations. The severe droughts of 1910 and 1911 brought the settlers who in many cases were not well established to the spring of 1912 with a shortage of feed for stock and no seed for planting their fields. This came to the notice of several of the older settlers and also to some of the business men in Colorado Springs, who saw the need of assisting these people and the value they would be to the county if they could be helped in developing the plains section. A delegation of business men with the county commissioners made a tour of inspection, holding several meetings to get direct from the farmers the exact conditions. It was evident that the failure of the crops in the majority of cases was not due to the neglect or inability of the farmers. Conditions were against successful crop production because the farm land had been only recently broken and because of the protracted drought.

GOING THE FIRST MILE.

Acting on the theory that "a friend in need is a friend indeed," those interested started a campaign to secure money to be loaned out to those farmers needing assistance in $40 amounts, $16 for seed and $24 for horse feed, so as to make the farm operations possible. A favorable season followed and the farmers in almost every instance were able to meet their obligations when due. Besides this, there was seed for another year, feed for the stock, and some produce to sell. One of the requests made of the farmers was that they report on the crops grown, so that the agricultural committee of the chamber of commerce, as well as the business men, might know the possibilities of the plains as an agricultural section. Acting on the information obtained, the agricultural committee set about devising a plan to help these and other farmers in the county to solve their problems and to develop the agricultural resources of El Paso County to the fullest extent.

Through the education work of the agricultural department of the Rock Island line, representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and the chamber of commerce were brought together and plans were evolved whereby an agricultural expert for El Paso County could be secured. In the maintenance of this work the board of county commissioners is in partnership with the United States Department of Agriculture. The county pays $1,800 and the Federal Government $1,200 a year, besides the franking privilege. It also has the cooperation of the Colorado Agricultural College and the Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce. Each cooperating party has faithfully supported the work for "better agriculture" in El Paso County.

The agriculturist began his work October 16, 1912. He has had the hearty cooperation of the farmers, business men, and county officials. A preliminary survey was made of the several farming sections to ascertain the most important problems to study and work out. To increase the farmers' crop yields is only one of the things to consider. Distance from market, pure-bred live stock, cooperation in marketing, better farm management, better home conditions, better schools, etc., are among the things to plan for and consider.

Fifty or more silos have been built the past season as an outgrowth of the educational work carried on in the county.

Seven farmers' clubs have been organized for the social, educational, moral, and financial benefits to be obtained. At these club meetings timely subjects are discussed. The Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce has supplied the agriculturist with a stereopticon and slides besides furnishing money for some photographic work. The stereopticon is used as a means of entertainment as well as education.

A carload of new seed potatoes was imported with the idea of replacing the potato industry of the county on its former basis.

A campaign against the prairie dog and other pests has been started.

Education work in the selection and testing of all farm grains for seed was carried on.

Ten farmers' institutes were held besides the farmers' club meetings. There were six silo day meetings with business men from the cities and towns in attendance which resulted in a tour of the farming section. Another tour of 125 miles was made by 50 Colorado Springs business men and bankers to learn the conditions and visit some of the farms in the plains section of the county. A delegation of six farmers from different vicinities met the business men at the point where lunch was served. These farmers made short talks telling of the conditions of their several vicinities and the possibilities of development.

THE SECOND MILE.

"And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." After most of the loans from the seed and feed fund had been repaid, the question of what should be done with the fund came up. A meeting of the subscribers was held, and they voted to turn the money over to the Farm Loan Co., organized at that time for the purpose of loaning money at a low rate of interest to farmers. This company is operated independently of the chamber of commerce. The tour of business men helped to strengthen the company financially, so that to-day money is being loaned at reasonable rates of interest for farm improvement and development. The main object of loaning this money is to encourage the dairy industry of the county. We are making dairying our leader.

Good roads have been and are being extended throughout the farming districts, which aid much in the development of the agricultural resources.

In conclusion, may I say that while the results of the past year's work are very gratifying there still remains much to do.

The agricultural acres are not producing as they can be made to produce; very few farmers are following crop rotation judiciously or intelligently. We need more and better milch cows, the keeping of records of the cows to eliminate the unprofitable ones. We want more silos. The keeping of farm records should be more common. It will be necessary to replan and reorganize the farm work of many farms, so that the farmer will realize a better income on his investment and have a better labor income than he has now. When these are brought about he will then improve his conditions and add to conveniences about the home he now has, and he and his family will be better satisfied, because of better farm management.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado. I appre-

ciate the fact that the committee has dealt fairly with this item and that the amount carried in the bill is perhaps sufficient to carry on the work in the way in which it has been carried on for a number of years past; but I believe the committee would be justified in the increase suggested. I know of no class of agricultural development more hopeful than that class of development which seeks to convert into farms lands that have heretofore been considered only valuable for pasture purposes. As the tide of settlement has moved westward we were constantly reaching the territory of gradually diminishing rainfall, and we finally reached a point where in the opinion of the average farmer it was impossible to attempt agriculture without irrigation. In those regions we began agricultural development under irrigation; but that is a slow and costly process, and it has its limitations in the comparatively small amount of water available for irrigation purposes; but in that territory between the actual desert and the land of sufficient rainfall there are very considerable areas having a precipitation of from 12 to 15 inches. Formerly it was not believed possible to carry on successfully farming operations with that amount of precipitation; but by the adoption of improved methods, by deep plowing, by surface cultivation, by the rotation of crops under the method of biennial cropping, the American farmer in that frontier territory has demonstrated the possibility of raising most of the cereals and a very considerable variety of hardy vegetables on those lands that were formerly believed to be valuable only for grazing purposes.

Several millions of acres of land of that character have been brought under the plow in the last three or four years. There is a large area still available for farming of this character. Under what is known as the enlarged-homestead law, passed several years ago, farmers from the Middle States have been going upon these so-called dry lands, and though their efforts are in some cases doomed to failure owing to the fact that the lands they have selected do not contain the soil adapted to dry-farming methods, because of the fact that some of them have gone into regions where the rainfall is too small, still a great many of those men have been and will be successful, and we are looking forward to a time when very largely increased areas in all the intermountain States will be brought under the plow and made profitable for agricultural farming purposes. Fifty cents an acre is the estimated value of the average western grazing land for grazing purposes. If these lands——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Just one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. If these lands can be made to produce a fair agricultural crop once in two years—and most of them can where the soil is of the proper kind and where the precipitation is not too small—we shall increase their productive capacity from 50 cents to at least $10 per acre per annum. That is equivalent to increasing twenty times the productive capacity of those lands and adding to our area in its productive capacity 19 acres every time we transform an acre of grazed land into an acre of farming land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman for or against the amendment?

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to support the amendment offered. I believe if it were possible for Members of Congress and members of this committee to see the conditions in the semiarid country along about harvest time, when the water is needed, and needed badly, that the little appropriation asked by the Member from Colorado would be granted. No one can tell the great results that would come from an investigation by experts. In the district I have the honor to represent we have suffered for six or seven years with a partial crop failure. What we need in that locality is a doctor to diagnose the case. The wealth is there, the men are there, the settlers are there, and have been there and will remain there, and when we ask for investigations along this line we are met with the reply that there are not sufficient funds to carry on the investigation. Now, I believe if there is any item in this bill—and, by the way, I have heard it all read, and have not lifted my voice yet to take up the time of the committee—if there is an item in this bill that deserves the support of this body, it is this item, because it makes productive a country that is practically nonproductive, and this request should be favored by every Member of this House. I gladly vote for an appropriation to wipe out the boll weevil, the cattle tick, or the hog cholera. I deplore that those conditions exist in any part of our country, and I think that sectionalism should never creep into this bill, for we are for the betterment of the entire country; and I do trust that your generosity will extend and that the same reasoning will be applied to the semiarid conditions in the West. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair puts the question I would like to be heard for one moment. I desire to say to members of the committee that the committee allowed the estimates submitted by the department and those estimates carried an increase of $15,000 for this work, and the committee thought that a liberal allowance.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point it is too late.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 19.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing, in cooperation with the States, companies, or individuals, or otherwise, $5,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have not read any hearings on this subject and I do not know whether any hearings were had upon it. I wish the chairman would give me some information as to any expert or anybody else sent out by the Agricultural Department who can tell those people anything about how to clear up logged-off land, and test powder for the purpose of blowing up stumps, and so forth.

Mr. LEVER. In reply to the gentleman I will say that the best-informed man on that subject is my friend from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HAWLEY. This provision is for this purpose: There are in the West lands already cut over or that are being cut over—burned-over land—that are open to settlement, and homesteads are being made upon them——

Mr. COX. Now, to get down to a concrete proposition. How can they teach them anything? I do not see how they can tell an old farmer how to clear off logged-off land. I was raised in a wooded country myself, and I know that farmers can get rid of those old trees and stumps without the assistance of the Department of Agriculture or anybody else.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are a number of questions involved in this. First, as to the large pine and fir stumps; many of them can be used if properly blown out with powder. A great many of them are very pitchy, and from them turpentine and other products can be extracted.

Mr. COX. And they want that general knowledge as to how those by-products can be utilized for certain things?

Mr. HAWLEY. No. How to get them out.

Mr. COX. How do they test the powder?

Mr. HAWLEY. I am not advised as to that particular operation, but there are a number of different powders, and there are different ways of putting them under the stumps in order to accomplish the results, so that a certain amount of powder——

Mr. COX. All that literature is sent out by the du Pont powder people, and all of my people who live in a wooded country get that literature which is sent out by that company. They either use powder or dynamite, without any aid or assistance from the Agricultural Department or any other person to tell them how to use it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. In addition to that, they tell them how to use it. That is true. But it is not sufficient just simply to tell people who come from places where they have never seen stumps removed——

Mr. COX. But these experts that go out there, do they actually take an auger and bore a hole down into the stump themselves and then tell the farmers how to put the dynamite in there? Do they perform the work themselves, or do they go there and boss and superintend it?

Mr. HAWLEY. They have so far gone upon the ground and tested the value of various powders, and told them how to use them. They have instructed the people. Now, for instance, there are large colonies coming in there from other portions of the country, buying up from the lumber companies vast areas of this logged-off land and settling them. These people are not accustomed to a logged-off country. The land, however, is very

fertile, and if they can find a way of getting rid of the stumps and the snags and the bigger logs they can make a good and profitable living out of their places. But they have never been used to that, and they do not know how to accomplish the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to oppose the amendment to strike out the last word.

Take a stump that is as wide as from where I stand to where the gentleman from Iowa sits——

Mr. COX. Twelve to fourteen feet?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. And down from that size to from 6 to 8 in diameter—and they occur very frequently. And there are certain dead trees and snags of trees, dead but yet standing, logs that can not be used for lumber purposes because they are crooked or have some other defect, scattered all over that land. That land, I know, will support a cow for a year, and the cow will earn $110 in that time. But the land is now so covered with logs and stumps as to be practically useless. Now, it is a great problem to get rid of those stumps at such a cost that the farmer or the homesteader can afford to do the work and pay the cost. For instance, there are some new machines that have been designed——

Mr. COX. Stump pullers?

Mr. HAWLEY. No; not stump pullers. They would be too expensive. How would you pull up a stump 14 feet in diameter?

Mr. COX. They do that in my country before they get the stumps out, but they are stumps ranging from 4 to 5 feet in diameter.

Mr. HAWLEY. They go on top of the stump. They probably were cut 10 feet above the ground in the old days of logging, and with a gasoline engine of 4 or 6 horsepower, costing $60 or $80, they bore a hole down through the stump——

Mr. COX. That is the point. Do these experts do that work themselves?

Mr. HAWLEY. They go out and investigate the matter and take with them the machine. For instance, a gentleman connected with the State Agricultural College in Oregon told me that they go out there and watch these men and supervise the work and determine whether those methods are efficient or not, and whether they can be improved and what improvements can be made.

Mr. COX. Where have these men obtained their training who do that? Did they get it in the first place from practice?

Mr. HAWLEY. I could not tell where they got their information.

Mr. COX. Are there not two propositions here—first, the work; and second, the money? Can not any man do that who has enough sense to operate a farm?

Mr. HAWLEY. No. But, going on with my illustration, they bore another hole in that stump at an angle, and in that hole they put a pint of kerosene, and with an asbestos-tipped rod they pump gasoline in and start a fire in that stump; and if it is properly done the whole stump will burn out with its own fuel, and all that is needed is a couple of hours' work to start it.

Mr. COX. The farmer learned that 40 years ago out in my district.

Mr. HAWLEY. Then there is another method. One of the most important is where they bore a number of holes in the stump all around it, start fires in these holes, and keep them burning with jets of air through iron piping to convey compressed air from a pump run by a gasoline engine, and so burn it out, roots and all, just as far below the surface as they want to go with the plow.

I may say, further, that problems that are old in one part of the country are new in another part. We are doing work over and over again in this bill every year. People are coming in from the East all over that western country, and they want to buy these lands, but they do not know the solution of the problem of clearing them up.

That area is as large as all the area of New England, and it seems to me it would be a justifiable expenditure and a good expenditure to put land which is as valuable as that under the plow and under cultivation. I think the gentleman will agree that if that land can be made available for cultivation, where one acre will support a cow for a year, and where that cow will earn $110, it is a valuable proposition.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman that it is a valuable proposition, but the question that occurs to my mind is that it is not a matter that requires an expert to teach a man how to do it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] must remember, if I may be allowed to interject a remark, that he comes from a country where they raise the finest forest timber in the world——

Mr. COX. Yes; that is correct about the quality of the timber produced in Indiana——

Mr. MANN. And what is trite in the gentleman's district may be new in another man's district. If you were to take the gentleman from Indiana out there to Oregon, they would not have need of any more information about timber.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, $70,380.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 14, after the figures "$70,380," insert the following: "*Provided*, That $10,000 of this sum shall be used on the semiarid plains of western Texas, at or near the city of Plainview."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that, and I desire to say that I trust the gentleman will not use over five minutes, because I want to move to rise at 6 o'clock, and I would like to get along a little on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this amendment is shown by the following letter from the board of trade of the city of Plainview, Tex., and is as follows, viz:

PLAINVIEW, TEX., *February 25, 1914.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS, M. C.,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In looking over some old newspapers a few days ago I came across an article from you in one of them dated September 20, 1912, in which you stated you had taken up the question of an agricultural station for this place and expected the passage of your bill the following winter. You also stated that the Agricultural Committee had passed favorably on it. Since the second winter has come and almost gone without any word on the subject, we ask you to kindly inform us if any further progress has been made for securing the station for this place. We are in sore need of something of this kind, and believe you are the one man who can work it through for us.

If your coworkers could only be on the ground and see the great progress we are making along irrigation lines without the aid of Uncle Sam in any way, we do not believe they would hesitate for a minute to give what you are asking for us.

I presume you are perfectly conversant with the situation here. Up to date we have in 75 to 100 wells, and by the end of 1914 there will be in enough additional ones to run the number up to over 200, which will mean over 20,000 acres under irrigation, and that is just the beginning of the development that will in the end place close to a half million acres under water from well pumping.

Not only has the Texas Land & Development Co., after an exhaustive investigation of soil and water conditions here, shown their faith in the proposition by purchasing 60,000 acres of land in the Plainview shallow-water district, but the "blue-sky" law States of Ohio, Kansas, and Nebraska, after an investigation by their representatives, also passed favorably on it, and Mr. W. L. Rockwell, the Government irrigation man situated at San Antonio, is also more than favorably impressed with what he seems to think are unlimited possibilities along this line.

Comparatively speaking, our Government has spent but little money in the aid of development in west Texas. Most of the appropriations have gone to the central, eastern, and southern portions of the State. If we can get some help now when we need it most, we will show to the world the garden spot of the earth in the course of a little time.

Hoping you can see your way clear to push the matter for us and assuring you of our appreciation of your efforts in our behalf, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

O. M. UNGER, *Secretary.*

Mr. Chairman, to further show the necessity and justice of this amendment, I desire to state that the State of Texas has within its borders more semiarid lands than any other State in this Union, and we have never received a cent of the vast irrigation fund, amounting to $70,000,000, within the borders of our State. But if this point of order is sustained and this small sum denied us, we will still remain on the map and continue to raise more live stock and cotton than any other State, and, in addition, we will as always roll up a larger Democratic majority than any other of our States.

Mr. Chairman, the following statement will more clearly show the necessity for this appropriation than I have time now to present to this House. I can verify by personal observation the statement and letters, which are as follows:

Plainview is the county seat of Hale County; is located on the Pecos & Northern Texas Railway (Santa Fe), and is reached through connections at Amarillo and Sweetwater. A branch line of the Pecos & Northern Texas Railway extends from Plainview to Floydada and Lockney.

Plainview has a population of more than 5,000; has $50,000 invested in public school buildings, with an annual enrollment of more than 1,000 students; has the Wayland Baptist College and Seth Ward Methodist College, with an average enrollment of more than 200 pupils each; has 10 churches of various denominations; has three national

banks with a capital stock of $100,000 each; has 40 brick and cement stores; has a modern $35,000 opera house; has a $24,000 Elks' home; has a Masonic temple costing $25,000; has a 100-barrel flour mill, 2 elevators, and other institutions

The Plainview irrigation district includes all of Hale and portions of Swisher, Lubbock, Lamb, and Floyd Counties in northwest Texas. Plainview is at the center. The elevation of Plainview is about 3,000 feet.

The area is covered with a deep, rich, residual soil varying from a chocolate sandy loam to clay loam in texture and ranging from 3 to 10 feet or more in depth. There is a general slope to the south and east of about 10 feet to the mile.

There are no rocks, no roots or grubs, no alkali in either soil or water, no ravines or gulches, and no hills.

IRRIGATION IN THE PLAINVIEW DISTRICT IS BOTH PRACTICAL AND PROFITABLE.

In 1910 our citizens decided to drill a test well to determine the quantity and quality of water underlying this section. The well was drilled on the farm of J. H. Slaton. A wonderful amount of fine, pure water was struck, which gave rise to much excitement, and many individuals drilled wells.

Being desirous of knowing the value and extent of our water for irrigation purposes, we requested the United States Department of Agriculture, at Washington, D. C., to send us an irrigation expert to conduct an examination and make report of the facts found here.

This request was complied with, and Mr. P. E. Fuller came, and, after a critical and thorough examination of the logs of the several wells then in operation, together with the soils, climatic conditions, and the source of water, he made his official report to the department at Washington, approving the Plainview district as being feasible and practicable for profitable irrigation by pumpage. In his report Mr. Fuller stated that the water was of excellent quality, abundant in quantity, and lasting in character. A copy of this report can be had by anyone applying to the Department of Agriculture at Washington, D. C. According to this report and the demonstrated facts, this water is found in numerous strata, the first being encountered at depths varying from 20 to 60 feet.

NOT A SINGLE DRY WELL.

From this it will be seen that the quantity of water obtained is dependent on two things: First, the number of strata of the underflow you drill through, and, second, the size of your pump and engine. There have been over 50 wells drilled in Hale County, and they produce amounts ranging from 400 to 3,000 gallons per minute, being 576,000 to 4,320,000 gallons in 24 hours' run. These wells range in depth from 130 to 300 feet, the deeper wells furnishing the greater abundance of water, for the reasons above given.

It is gratifying to all concerned to know that of all the wells so far drilled in the Plainview district not a single one failed to get ample water.

In 1912 the attention of what is known as the Pearson Syndicate, of New York and London, England, was called to the wonderful possibilities of the Plainview irrigation district. This company sent their expert irrigation engineers here to investigate and verify the Government report made by Mr. Fuller two years previous. After a most thorough investigation, they gave their approval of the proposition as an ideal district for irrigation.

PEARSONS INVEST $3,000,000.

Relying on these reports and the demonstrated facts shown by the numerous wells in operation, this great syndicate incorporated under the laws of Texas under the name of the Texas Land & Development Co., and its initial purchase was over 60,000 acres of this land, the purchase price of which, together with the cost of development for irrigation purposes, represents an investment of more than $3,000,000.

This company has shown its faith by its works and by the expenditure of its millions. Why should other wide-awake business men hesitate to follow its lead?

The question is often asked, "What can be grown here?" This question is answered by stating that all the staple crops, such as alfalfa, corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, and millet, can be successfully grown here every year by supplementing the annual rainfall by irrigation.

Almost every variety of garden vegetables, such as Irish and sweet potatoes, beans, peas, onions, turnips, cabbage, lettuce, tomatoes, celery, asparagus, beets, pumpkins, etc., all do well here.

We can raise as fine grapes, plums, and cherries as California, and we can beat that State growing peaches. Apples, pears, and, in fact, nearly all other fruits and berries, do well here, except such as are confined to tropical climates.

PROOF OF THE PUDDING.

As proof along this line we submit statements from men who live here and have produced the articles by them severally mentioned, which follow:

PLAINVIEW, TEX., *September 9, 1913.*

*To the Plainview Chamber of Commerce.*

GENTLEMEN: I have a No. 7 Advance pump, a 40-horsepower Herr engine. I did not get my well completed until about the last days of April, 1913. At this time the wheat and alfalfa were both suffering for water. I thrashed 40 bushels of wheat per acre on 17 acres. I had 15 acres set to alfalfa and got an average of 5½ tons per acre. I watered the wheat twice and the alfalfa four times, and each watering of the wheat and alfalfa averaged $2 per acre. I am sure I would have gotten at least 10 bushels more of wheat per acre and a ton of alfalfa per acre if I had gotten my well completed in time.

By leveling my land properly and correcting other errors I feel sure I will be able to reduce the cost of watering my land from one-third to one-half the cost for this year.

The cost of my pumping plant, complete, was $2,250.

C. S. EBELING.

SOUTH PLAINS NATURAL VINEYARD.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1913.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Plainview, Tex.*

GENTLEMEN: Nearly 23 years ago I planted one of the first vineyards on the plains. This vineyard was about 1 mile east of Plainview, on a place I settled in 1889. In planting my grapes I first communicated with T. V. Munson, of Denison, Tex., who was decorated by the French Government with the Legion of Honor for his superior ability in grape culture, and is a leading authority on grape growing in the world.

Mr. Munson furnished me with a list of grapes he thought would succeed here. I planted over 40 different varieties, such as Concord, Delaware, Worden, Niagara, etc. At the same time I planted most all the California varieties.

From this experience I can frankly state that there is not another part of the United States where the eastern varieties of grapes can be grown as well as on the South Plains. This conclusion is deduced from actual test of over 20 years. The California grapes will not succeed here. They winter kill. I venture to say that more and better Concords, Niagaras, Wordens, etc., can be raised here to the same amount of space than any other part of the country.

Respectfully,

(Signed) L. S. KINDER.
*Judge Sixty-fourth Judicial District of Texas.*

Mr. MANN. I think the amendment is subject to a point of order. It is not a limitation upon the appropriation at all, and while under the organic act of the Department of Agriculture we have the authority to make an appropriation for this purpose, when the appropriation is made it must be left in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to where it shall be expended. Now, here is not a limitation, but a direction that a certain amount of it shall be expended in a certain place. It has been repeatedly held that such a proposition is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the Chairman to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken, because, by law, the Secretary of Agriculture is given certain discretion in the use of these appropriations, and this would restrict his discretion. Therefore the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing, in cooperation with the States, companies, or individuals, or otherwise, $5,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman how long he intends to run to-night.

Mr. LEVER. It is my hope to run until 6 o'clock. I will move that the committee rise promptly at 6.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is within 10 minutes of that hour.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish first to inquire how long the gentleman plans to run, and next point out to the gentleman that there is not a very large attendance here at the present time.

Mr. LEVER. I was in hopes, I would say to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin, that he would let me go as far as the seed item, which may provoke some discussion. If we can get there in 10 minutes, I shall be glad to do it. If not, I will move to rise at 6 o'clock.

Mr. STAFFORD. On Saturday evening, near 5 o'clock, to accommodate the gentleman, we passed over an item on which I wished to obtain certain information, and that was as to certain buildings that were being constructed by the Agricultural Department on some experimental farm over here in Maryland, at Beltsville. We have another experimental farm somewhere in the State of Virginia, nearby, on the Arlington estate. Recently I was surprised, after my 10 years of service, to learn that the Government had experimental farms. I find by following this bill closely that the department has several experimental farms; that it has one over here at Beltsville that has a Guernsey bull and 11 Jersey cows. Last year there was an appropriation recommended of some $15,000 for modern buildings for the accommodation of the Guernsey bull and the 11 Jersey cows. In this item we find a similar appropriation of $15,000 for necessary improvements, I suppose for housing some needed caretaker's family. Now, will the gentleman explain how many experimental farms we have, whether we have them for hogs, for cattle, for horses, and for other incidents of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the work at the Arlington experimental farm is really the outdoor laboratory work of the Department of Agriculture. There is where they test out various seeds. There is where they propagate plants. There is where they make experimental tests. There is where the outdoor laboratory work is conducted. It is very important work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is only $15,000 expended on that Arlington estate farm?

Mr. LEVER. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. For maintenance and everything connected with this farm?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. It has been carried in the bill for many years. There is no increase at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. So this $15,000 is not to be expended for buildings?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. It is for the experimental farm simply.

Mr. STAFFORD. How about the farm at Bethesda?

Mr. LEVER. The work at Bethesda is the study of the diseases of animals. It is run in connection with the Bureau of Animal Industry, and there they study various serums and various maladies and diseases of animals, like tuberculosis, blackleg, the foot-and-mouth disease, and other animal diseases. There they bring diseased animals of all kinds for investigational study and experimentation upon them. Of course, it is necessary to have buildings, but the improvements of the buildings last year cost practically nothing—$600 is my recollection. The subcommittee went out to Beltsville and made a very careful inquiry into that situation, and were much pleased with the work being done. Beltsville is 12 miles distant from Washington, between here and Baltimore. I will say to my friend that we are doing two general lines of work there. The Dairy Division is doing a great deal of investigational work. They are making, also, some very important breeding investigations, making experiments in regard to the proper kind of silos, and experimenting as to proper ventilation and heating of dairy plants. Of course, these are only a few of the lines of work being carried on.

Then there are being made by the Chief of the Division of Animal Industry experiments as to the mixture of feed for different animals—hogs and cattle—experiments with reference to the subject of inbreeding and other experiments along that general line of research. It is scientific work with reference to both animals and poultry, and is regarded as very important and necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask my friend if he will press these inquiries further to-morrow if I move that the committee do now rise?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I am pressing these inquiries in good faith. There are several more questions that I wish to direct to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that Tuesday is a very important day for committees; many committees meet on that day.

Mr. LEVER. We have not a quorum here to enforce my proposition. The gentleman from Illinois understands that we have not read but about six pages of the bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. I think we will get through with the bill this week, and that is all that is expected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 10, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Narragansett Pier, R. I., with a view to the construction of a breakwater at or near the life-saving station (H. Doc. No. 818); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Black Lake Harbor, Mich., with a view to obtaining a uniform depth of 21 feet from Lake Michigan to the turning basin opposite the city of Holland (H. Doc. No. 817); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Fox River, at Kaukauna, Wis., consideration being given to any proposition involving cooperation on the part of local interests (H. Doc. No. 815); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, report on preliminary examination of Crooked Channel, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 816); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 352), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 117) to amend the act of June 23, 1910, entitled "An act providing that entrymen for homesteads within the reclamation projects may assign their entries upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years the same same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 353), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14331) to amend section 19 of an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 356), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14330) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 358), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13133) to provide for the payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Oklahoma, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 359), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11166) for the relief of Wilhelmina Rohe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 354), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11256) granting relief and an honorable discharge to Jacob Barger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 355), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3843) for the relief of the heirs of the late Peter Deel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 357), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1829) for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 360), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Utah, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 540) for the relief of

Joseph Hodges, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 361), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 14376) to regulate the wages of laborers and mechanics employed in or under any and all departments of the Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14377) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 14378) to prohibit common carriers, telephone companies, and telegraph companies from engaging in the sale of merchandise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 14379) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Midville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14380) providing for the purchase of site and for public building at Darien, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14381) providing for the purchase of site and for public building at Oliver, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14382) providing for the purchase of site and for public building at Springfield, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GEORGE: A bill (H. R. 14383) to establish a commission to inquire into the financial relations between the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 14384) to regulate the assessment of property for taxation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 14385) to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14386) providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court for the District of Kansas at Salina, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZHENRY: A bill (H. R. 14387) to amend chapter 1, section 17, and chapter 6, section 120, of the Judicial Code, and to repeal chapter 1, section 18, of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14388) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 4415, 4416, 4423, 4426, 4449, 4452, 4470, 4472, 4498, and 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to steamboat inspection," approved March 3, 1905; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14389) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the trustees of Rhine Center Cemetery, in the town of Sheboygan, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin, two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to investigate, through the Commissioner of Corporations, the organization, conduct, and management of Follansbee Bros. Co., a corporation of Follansbee, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the Hamill bill to pension civil-service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio in favor of action by the United States Government for the eradication of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, in favor of action by the United States Government for the eradication of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, in favor of action by the United States Government for the eradication of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEVY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the United States Government to protest against the anti-Semitic demonstrations in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14390) granting a pension to Fannie Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14391) granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Bowen; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14392) for the relief of Drs. Langworthy & Langworthy and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14393) granting a pension to Fred Tish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: A bill (H. R. 14394) granting a pension to Edward Dzengolewski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 14395) granting a pension to William Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to William Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14397) granting a pension to Clarence J. Hoskins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14398) granting a pension to Irvin M. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14399) granting an increase of pension to George P. Leroux; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14400) granting an increase of pension to Homer C. Ried; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 14401) granting an increase of pension to John A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 14402) granting an increase of pension to John O. Drawbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14403) granting a pension to Regine Arentsen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 14404) for the relief of E. F. Anderson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14405) for the relief of C. F. Jackson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 14406) for the relief of Gray & Adkins; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to Hannah A. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14408) granting a pension to Catherine Longshore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 14409) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 14410) granting a pension to George C. Emmert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 14411) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Ragan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14412) granting an increase of pension to Permelia A. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14413) granting a pension to Harriet A. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 14414) granting a pension to Hattie E. Pringle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14415) granting an increase of pension to Henry Venning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14416) for the relief of Revilow N. Spohn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14417) granting an increase of pension to Nellie M. Gaunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 14418) granting a pension to Hannah Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 14419) granting a pension to Charlotte D. Bainbridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14420) granting certain lands to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14421) granting a pension to Edwin L. Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14422) granting a pension to Hattie A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14423) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pleasant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14424) granting an increase of pension to James R. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14425) for the relief of David H. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 14426) granting a pension to Robert Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 14427) granting a pension to Sarah Hinds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14428) for the relief of the estate of Edgar S. Dudley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 14429) granting a pension to Darius Spitler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of J. Wesley Brown, of Marshalltown, Iowa, asking that a law be framed to the effect that no subject of Great Britain shall hold any office in national soldiers' homes of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of J. Wesley Brown, of Marshalltown, Iowa, asking that a law be framed granting a pension of $30 per month to every person in the Civil War who was in any hospital by reason of wounds or sickness incurred while in the Army and without regard to the length of service of said soldier in the Army or to his present disability; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of the Haines (Alaska) Democratic Club, favoring additional appropriation for providing exhibit from Alaska at Panama-American Exposition at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of the New York Chamber of Commerce, favoring repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of sundry citizens of Greencastle, Evansville, and Terre Haute, Ind., protesting against practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the National Sons of the Revolution of Louisville, Ky., favoring passage of bill for "One hundred years peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Anderson, Ind, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of L. C. Fillmore and 26 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 400 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of the First National Bank of Troy, Kans., suggesting an amendment to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the German Pioneer Society, Ohio, also J. A. Himes and others, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Hyndman, Pa., favoring House bill 8047, relative to extension of free-delivery Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Altoona, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of Harry Lichtfield, Oakdale, Ill., and sundry citizens, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of sundry citizens of Homestead, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, favoring certain conditions to be inserted in contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Heights Taxpayers' Association, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph, telephone, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring a two-battleship program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Remonstrance of the Rev. F. J. Bliefernicht, of Hartford, Wis., and 13 other ministers of the second congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, and similar prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Jefferson, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring constitutional amendment forbidding polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of C. Bartsch, George Sieglitz, C. Reinhard, C. Darnkert, B. Lemke, H. Schmeker, Paul Trepazyk, John Helm, George Hirsch, E. Kalb, Charlie Dunam, Frank Schallitz, Mike Kirsch, Robert Bayle, Joseph Theinn, Frank King, H. Kallath, Ferd Feller, B. C. Pagek, B. Lange, Adam Albert, Joseph Dudenkocpt, George H. Marsh, John Gresnunehl, jr., J. Schoenfelder, Reed Herrelbein, William Fleischer, Philipp Kissel, Peter Mather, George Schlegel, William Klehm, Aaron Pawock, William L. Bollow, John Zickuke, Martin E. Wilde, Joseph J. Albert, Henry Pafenkunb, T. Peffer, August Villiock, John Mabkes, Frank Nouck, Calude Wegier, Edward Pawelsky, Hugo Roemer, Richard Knuth, W. J. Nolan, Fergus M. Nolan, Felix Kasza, Albert Kolwitz, George Burke, William Mesler, Math Zimgbluth, George J. Keid, John Lemmer, Arthur Huennekem, and Ernest Janren, all citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures introduced in Congress, as an unwarranted interference with the rights of all American citizens and a usurpation by the Federal Government of a domestic question belonging to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Jack Raedel, John M. Johnson, Walter Reetz, Fritz Holtsinger, Atto Pape, Frank Mackow, Sam Akey, Charles Thomas, Hugo Albert, Martin Peterson, A. Olson, Ewalt Zutter, Joseph Stein, Henry Lass, Fred Bloulein, Fred Zutters, S. J. Rue, A. M. Johnson, August Holim, William Sandman, R. F. Collun, Peter Sneider, Theodore Batalia, and Leo Martin, all citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, or any other prohibition measures which will interfere with the rights of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of clause for free tolls in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frank Knizek Naval Camp, No. 49, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044 for pensions for widows and orphans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., relative to provision exempting certain persons from literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the George Washington and New Britain (Conn.) Branches of the American Continental League, against

"One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., relative to exemption for certain persons from the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Hoboken, West New York, Guttenberg, Weehawken, West Hoboken, Union Hill, and Jersey City, all in Hudson County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Federated Central Body, of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, favoring passage of House bill 9292, relative to classification of salaries of employees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of various voters of the seventh congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of W. C. Dimmitt Post, No. 400, Department of Iowa, protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of William Walsh and 37 other citizens of Cuyahoga County and of C. W. Bradway, of Mentor, Ohio, and 47 other citizens of Lake County, protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88 or any other similar prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. L. Kaufman and 915 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88 and similar prohibition measures introduced in Congress as an unwarranted interference with the rights of all American citizens and a usurpation by the Federal Government of a domestic question belonging to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, favoring investigation of publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal bill for free tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., favoring House joint resolution No. 1, for right of suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petition of the Salina (Kans.) Retail Merchants' Association, relative to establishment of a term of court at Salina, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brown Shoe Co., of St. Louis, Mo., realtive to Ransdell-Humphreys bill for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah (by request): Petitions of Nathan Offer and 16 other citizens of Utah, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING: Petitions of sundry citizens of Pueblo, Colo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Subert, Colo., favoring passage of the Linquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Braddock, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mad River Grange, No. 71, of Waterbury, Conn., favoring adoption of a rural-credit system (H. R. 11897); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the Cigarmakers' Union of Keokuk, Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Covington, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the National Association of the Bureau of Animal Industry, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring Lobeck bill, relative to classification of salaries of employees in Department of Agriculture (H. R. 9292); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of M. J. Blick and A. G. Myse and others, of Appleton, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Theodore Roosevelt Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring House bill 13044, to provide pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of the Evansville Office Equipment Co., the International Steel & Iron Construction Co., the Evansville Desk Co., P. H. Reddinger Carving Works, Richardt Realty Co., Klamer-Goebel Furniture Co., the Buehner Chair Co., the Lindenschmidt Co., Koch Outfitting Co., and the Wm. E. Meier Grocery Co., all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHAN: Memorial of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizes of Michigan, favoring investigation of Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METZ: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Kirkland Grange, No. 684, Patrons of Husbandry, of Redwood, N. Y., and North Hannibal (N. Y.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 672, favoring House bill 11897, relative to farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Telegrams from the San Francisco Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, S. Bachman Co. (Inc.), and 15 other wholesale cigar dealers of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 13723, known as the Underwood anti-coupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of the Clinton (Mass.) Branch, German-American Alliance, and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Paul Revere Branch, American Continental League, of Leominster, Mass., against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, against literacy test in Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Patrick McGreevy, of Winooski, Vt., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of clause for free tolls in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the New Britain (Conn.) Branch of the American Continental League, protesting against "One hundred years peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., favoring provision in immigration bill exempting certain persons from literacy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chamber of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of clause in Panama Canal bill for free tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the executive board of the Connecticut Federation of Labor, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Oceanic Steamship Co., of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a bill providing for construction of revenue cutters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Vikings, favoring passage of bill to erect monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers, of New York City, protesting against passage of House bill 1873, anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the city council of Chicago, protesting against literacy test in immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of James A. Raske, of South Amboy, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions to be inserted in contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the city of Newark, N. J., relative to dredging in Newark Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring House bill 12873 relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of 13 business firms of Wendell, Idaho, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Freeport, Ill., favoring plan for park extension in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions of the East St. Louis Bar Association, in reference to Baltz resolutions changing boundaries of the Federal judicial districts in Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Vikings, favoring passage of bill for monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Excelsior Stove & Manufacturing Co., of Quincy, Ill., protesting against passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Doctor Page Camp, No. 59, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring placing veterans of Spanish War on same basis as veterans of Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Local No. 7, International Brotherhood of Foundry Employees, of Belleville, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Pike, Will, and Adams Counties (Ill.) Bar Association, protesting against moving United States court from Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the National Association of the Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, favoring passage of House bill 9292, relative to classification and salaries of employees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Wiley Church, Fulton Co., Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against immigration bill in present form; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of P. O. Robinson and 60 other citizens of Plain City, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. A. Scott and 16 other citizens of Crawford County, Ohio, against House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester County, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of North Dakota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of D. C. Poindexter, of Bismarck, N. Dak., and others, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### TUESDAY, *March 10, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost give to us but little time, and yet Thou dost require great things at our hands. Thou dost put us in a place to build a mighty empire and to cooperate with God in the establishment of a kingdom of righteousness, and yet our time is but a day, a step, a span. So we find our need of God; for who is sufficient for these things? Who then can be saved? By Thy power alone can we be fitted for the great duties of life and empowered to meet the responsibilities of life.

We pray that through Thy power we may address ourselves to the tasks of this day, and with a passionate devotion to duty and a true estimate of the greatness of human life may so discharge all duties as to bring God's favor and blessing and help to us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

#### RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and I ask that the report be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JONES. Of course, I should like to see it adopted right away, but the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I think, is interested in it. I would dislike to have it adopted in his absence, as he wanted to submit some remarks on it.

Mr. CUMMINS entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Nevada will withhold his request for a little while, I am quite sure the Senator from Iowa will be in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is in the Chamber now. The question is on the adoption of the conference report on the Alaska railroad bill

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Senate adopts the conference report it will have surrendered the most important amendment which was made to the bill during the course of its consideration in this body. I desire to put before the Senate as briefly as I can the reasons which seem to me to be conclusive against the abandonment of the amendment to which I refer.

The situation there is known to all Senators. There are two railroads that I have especially in mind, beginning with the tidewater and extending into the interior or toward the interior of Alaska. One of them, the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, begins, I think, at Cordova Bay and runs up two or three hundred miles into Alaska. The other begins at Resurrection Bay and runs a lesser distance into Alaska.

We are authorizing the President of the United States to spend $35,000,000 in the construction of a Government railroad or railroads in that Territory. We are investing him with very great power, probably greater power than we have ever before conferred upon an administrative officer of the Government. I think it is wise to confer upon him great power, because it is impossible for the Congress of the United States to exercise the discretion which will be required in the location and construction of a transportation system in that Territory.

The objection to the bill as it was reported by the Committee on Territories was that it permitted the President to begin the work of constructing the Government railroads at the termini of the railroads already there and to build it or them into the interior and then make such traffic connections or such leasing arrangements as might be feasible with the privately owned railroads now in Alaska and operate them as an entire system or lease them to be operated as an entire system. This condition would leave the United States thus: It would own detached parts of railroads in the interior and have no way of reaching the harbors of Alaska over its own lines.

I know just what the people of Alaska want. It is natural for them to want what they do. I am betraying no confidence whatever when I say that it has been the hope of many people in Alaska that the Government would spend the entire amount authorized here in the construction of new lines of railroad so that in the end the Territory would have not only the roads that are already built and privately owned but would have also the miles of railroad that can be built through the expenditure of the $35,000,000 here provided for. It is a natural feeling upon the part of those people; but it contravenes, as it seems to me, all the policies and all the principles that underlie this undertaking on the part of the Government.

I am unalterably opposed to the proposal that the Government shall take up the lines of road already there and build from their northern termini into the interior of the Territory. I gave my reasons for that belief when the bill was on its passage. I will repeat them now with such brevity as I can.

First, let me say that it is no answer to my position to insist that the President will not do this thing. I do not know whether he will or not. I do know, however, that all the influences that arise from what I have called the pride of the people of Alaska and all the influences which can emanate from the ownership of the railroads already there will be brought to bear upon him to induce him to pursue that course.

One gentleman from Alaska, whose name I will not give, although I feel at perfect liberty to give it if it should be demanded, a very well-known man from Alaska, a very eminent man, a man of whose integrity I have no doubt, a man whom I have never heard criticized or disparaged in any way, came to me and sought to induce me to forego my advocacy of the amendment which was adopted by the committee and afterwards adopted by the Senate. Why? He said to me that if the Government would extend the two lines already there and build a thousand miles of railroad, or substantially a thousand miles of railroad, according to the cost, with the appropriation we are now making, then Alaska would have not only the Government-constructed railways, but would have the railroads already there and that they could be used in conjunction to the great advantage of the Territory.

I will not speak of the other influences, because they have not sufficiently crystallized under my observation to warrant me in speaking of them. I know, however, that they exist, and I know the direction in which they have been and are now being exerted.

But, Mr. President, if we authorize the Chief Executive to do what the people of Alaska want and what this conference report will permit him to do, we will finally reach this condition. We will have a reasonably long line of railroad already built from Cordova Bay into the interior owned by the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad Co. It is not a valuable property now. It is not a revenue-producing property now, as we are informed. We will have, however, 300 miles of railway added to this fragment, this unprofitable venture, reaching toward the north, toward Fairbanks or some other point upon the navigable interior waters of Alaska. We will then have a privately owned railroad constituting part of a line to the sea and the Government-owned railroad constituting a part of the line toward the interior. Then the Chief Executive or Congress will have to consider one of two alternatives. Either the Government will then be called upon to buy the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad and thus complete its line from the interior to tidewater, or it will lease the line that we have constructed to the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad or to some other corporation that will operate them both.

There can be no other alternative, because we can not lease the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad and we can not operate the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad without the assent of that corporation, and I doubt very much whether this bill gives to the President the right to take a lease of that railroad.

If we exercise then our power to buy the Copper River road we must make another appropriation for that purpose, because the entire $35,000,000 that we here propose to expend in order to benefit Alaska and give its people an opportunity for development and growth will have been expended, or we must lease our line to the Copper River & Northwestern or some other corporation that takes them both over.

Assume now that we find it to be the best plan to buy the Copper River & Northwestern at that time, we will buy it under the most disadvantageous conditions that can possible be imagined. We will, by the expenditure of our money, have converted a fragment of a railroad, reaching nowhere save a copper mine, into a trunk line touching the interior navigable waters of Alaska; and we will have added in that way an immense value to the property which it does not now possess and which its owners ought not to receive, because they would receive it from the enterprise into which we are now entering, and they would receive it through the expenditure of the money of the people of the United States.

Is it not obvious, Senators, that if we ever intend to buy the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, now is the time to buy it? The price at which it can be bought is vastly less now, or the condemnation price, if we resort to condemnation, must be vastly less now than it will hereafter be. Personally I am not in favor of ever buying the road. I am not in favor of locating a line of railroad into the interior of Alaska from that point. I think it would be most ill advised. I think that the men who have built that road ought to operate it as best they can. If they can make it profitable, let them do so; but if they have incurred a loss through their ill judgment, let them bear that loss. What we now propose to do will be in effect to relieve the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate from the loss which it has suffered through the building of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad. I am very far from asserting that that is the purpose of this surrender on the part of the Senate; but that will be its effect, and no one can gainsay it, if the President takes that course and locates the railroad at that point.

I think the President of the United States ought to know the price of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad before he exercises his judgment in the location or the designation of a railroad of which this already constructed line constitutes a part. That ought to be one of the things that he should consider in order to determine the availability of the route or the wisdom of expending the public money by constructing or creating a line into the interior. That is one alternative. What is the other?

Unfortunately, we have granted in this bill to the President the right to lease the railroad line or lines that we are to construct. That is a mistake—an unfortunate mistake. We ought not to give the President the power to lease the railroad to any person or any corporation without we ourselves understanding the situation as it exists at that time and exercising our own judgment with respect to the propriety of leasing it as distinguished from operating it. But I made myself understood upon that point when the bill was before the Senate, and other Senators expressed their opinions about it. I have not changed my opinion; but that is not the chief point of my present objection.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator just on that point will allow me to interrupt him, I wish to ask does not the conference report leave the President little or no option in that matter? The conference report, as I read it, allows the Government to operate the road only on one condition, to wit, that the President is unable to lease it to other parties.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not sure that it is the interpretation of it, though I think it will bear that construction.

But, to pursue my point, if the President does not buy this railroad, and buy it with a value which we ourselves have added and which it does not now possess, then he has the right to lease the road that we have added at the end of it to some one who will operate them both. I want Senators just to think a moment of what the conditions will then be. Imagine the

President engaged in a negotiation for the leasing of the property that we have built. I do not know what President will then occupy the presidential office, but I assume that he will be an intelligent patriot, and will do whatever he can do to preserve the rights of the people and to accomplish the purposes for which we make this vast appropriation; but the argument will be—and it will be overpowering; it will be unanswerable—that if the Government can lease this property so that it will receive 3 per cent on its investment, it ought to do it. The bonds of the United States bear 3 per cent; that is the ordinary rate of interest for an investment in the obligations of the United States; and the danger, if not the certainty, of that negotiation will be that the road that we build will then be leased to the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate, or whoever owns the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, for a 3 per cent return upon our investment. One can easily understand that any private ownership of a common-carrier system would be very glad to pay 3 per cent for capital invested in that system. The railroads are now paying more than that; they are earning a great deal more than that.

But we have given the President of the United States by this bill power to lease this road, and unless we do connect it in some way with the sea, he will lease it, and he will be compelled by the very circumstances which surround him to lease it, and he will lease it at the ordinary rate at which the property of the United States, namely, its bonds, its obligations, bear; and we, with all the patriotism which underlies this bill—and there is no man in this Chamber who is more earnestly in favor of the Government owning and operating a railroad in Alaska than am I—with all this patriotism, with all this sentiment, we will simply have furnished some private corporation with a railroad capitalized at 3 per cent. To me it is a most shocking outcome, and I can not contemplate it with any sort of tolerance. We know that is wrong; we know it ought not to be done. I am willing to give the President all the discretion that he needs in determining between two or three or four things that may be right, but I am not willing to give him the discretion to do anything that we know is wrong, even though we may assume that he will not exercise that discretion.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I understand the Senator is objecting to the proposition to permit the President to lease the road.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am objecting to the proposition that the Government can take the $35,000,000 that we here appropriate and build detached portions of railroads from the northern termini of railroads that are already there; and I am pointing out that the power to lease, coupled with the construction of these railroads in that way, will inevitably bring disaster upon the undertaking we are now authorizing.

Mr. JONES. As to the first proposal, I may have something to say a little later on. I merely want to suggest that the power to lease was given to the President by both the House and the Senate, and the conferees could not change it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly. I said in the beginning that I was not objecting to that, because it had passed the point of objection. We did object to it here, but our objection was unavailing. It was in both bills, and was not before the conference committee, and I am not assailing the report of the conference committee on that ground. I am assailing it on the ground that we are about to expend $35,000,000 to build 750 or 1,000 miles of railroad in Alaska without a single road touching a harbor; without a single facility for reaching the commerce of the sea; without a chance to do the very thing for the people of Alaska that this bill was intended to do.

Now, turning from the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, which I think never ought to be bought, which I think ought not to form any part of a Government line, I come to the other railroad which has been discussed here, namely, the one called, I believe, the Alaska Northern, running from Resurrection Bay north. There, I think, the chief main line of railroad into the interior of Alaska ought to be built by the Government. But I do not insist upon my judgment with respect to that. I am willing to give the President the discretion to adopt that line or some other, for he may be better informed and will be better informed when he comes to exercise his power than I can be; but it is nevertheless true that the Alaska Northern will in all probability form a part of one of the lines of railroad upon which we are to reach the interior of Alaska. I will ask the Senator from Oregon how long is the Alaska Northern Railroad—70 miles?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. About 70 miles.

Mr. CUMMINS. About 70 miles in length. I am just as much opposed to the proposition of the Government building a line beginning at the northern terminus of the Alaska Northern as I am to the Government building a line from the northern terminus of the Copper River & Northwestern. There is a road now—a broken, dilapidated, unsuccessful venture—and it is not the business of the Government to restore to the people who invested their money in that property the losses which they have incurred. We are not bestowing a largess or a subsidy upon the men who have undertaken to build railroads in Alaska. We are undertaking to furnish to the people of Alaska a facility which they do not now possess, but we are giving the President the power to leave this little fragment of railroad line reaching the sea—touching a harbor—in private ownership and extending it toward the north to the navigable rivers of the interior with Government money, and then to be compelled to deal with the Alaska Northern Railroad, either by way of lease or by way of purchase, is a proposal so shocking to the common sense of all who have studied this subject that it ought not to be entertained for a single moment. If the President chooses that route, we ought to know from the time we expend our first dollar that the Government will own a railroad from Resurrection Bay or some other harbor in that vicinity; we ought to know that when we come to move the products of Alaska we can reach tidewater, that we can reach the open ocean, that we can reach the ships which are to convey these products to and from the shores of Alaska.

Mark my word, that if the Government expends $35,000,000 in building a railroad from the northern terminus of the Alaska Northern Railway, with its branches and its feeders and its other facilities for reaching particular enterprises, and we then come to deal with the Alaska Northern Railway concerning either its purchase or its lease, we will have guaranteed to these investors every penny that they have invested, and, in my opinion, vastly more; we will have contributed to them a value which our efforts have created.

I should like to know—and I suppose I will presently hear—why it is that the conference committee believes that the President should be given the power, the discretion to do this thing. I know, as I have said before, why the people of Alaska want it. It is perfectly natural for them to want it; they would be very glad if we would appropriate a hundred million dollars instead of $35,000,000; they are not so much interested in governmental policies as we are; they are not the custodians of the Public Treasury; they are not the directors of governmental problems, and it is therefore to be expected that they would like the Government to spend the $35,000,000 in building new lines of railroad, even though not a single rail touched the sea or gave any outlet at all to the world. They understand that private enterprise would be glad to connect the interior portions of railroads with the sea; and I suppose that they are not particularly concerned as to whether or not the Government operates these railroads.

I think, from what I have heard, they are entirely willing that they shall be operated by private corporations—of course under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. For us to spend this money, however, and then arrive at the miserable outcome of 700 miles of railroad in the interior of Alaska that either must be operated through some sort of an arrangement with the existing railroads or must be leased to these railroads for a rental which represents the ordinary interest upon Government investments, or else that we must buy these railroads when we have made them going concerns and profitable railroads and have given them an increased value, I look upon as entirely wrong.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I am not sure that I do not agree with the Senator about many things he has said; but I should like to know if the Senator really means to assert that if these railroads are hereafter leased they will be leased at merely the amount sufficient to make the interest the Government is paying on its bonds, or is that something that he anticipates may be possible?

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course I do not know. It is impossible for anyone to know. I say that will be the natural course of affairs.

The railroads in Alaska will not be remunerative in the first instance. We will have invested the $35,000,000. Morgan and Guggenheim will come to the United States and say: "Now, you have built this road. Lease it to us and we will pay you a fair rate of interest upon the money you have expended."

What is a fair rate of interest for the Government to receive? That, of course, will depend largely upon the situation as it exists at that time, but the argument in favor of excepting a guaranty of the rate of interest which the Government ordinarily pays upon its own bonds will be exceedingly persuasive. I do not want any man to have the power even to listen to an argument of that kind.

Mr. REED. The Senator simply anticipates that whoever may be President when the situation arises may do something which the Senator thinks would be wrong, and which, it seems to me, would not only be wrong, but exceedingly foolish.

I rose, however, to ask the question, because I thought the Senator was really discussing the bill as though the result of leasing at the mere interest rate were the inevitable result, but I understand it now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If the Senator will permit me a word. I trust we may never come to a situation where the Government will lease the railroad built by the Government in Alaska. I want these railroads operated by the Government for the people. I am not going to anticipate that they will be turned over to the Guggenheim interests or any other interests.

This great conservation should take place for the people, and the great avenues or highways of commerce should be built by the people. We ought to build the road, and when we have done so, in Heaven's name let us reap the benefit of it and not parcel it out to any private interest. I believe public sentiment will sustain that position to-day in this country with éclat.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is right. We ought not to have given the President any power to lease this property. I did everything I could do, on the passage of the bill through the Senate, to take away that power; but it is in the bill and the time is past when we could have changed it so far as the conference committee is concerned. The bill is so devised at this time that the President will be compelled to lease these detached portions of road which we build with our money to these other railroads which reach the same part of the country. He will be compelled to lease them unless we appropriate more money to build parallel roads to the sea.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. PITTMAN. Is there anything in the bill that would compel the President to build detached roads?

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; there is nothing in the language of the bill that compels him to do so.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then would it be a wise thing to build detached roads?

Mr. CUMMINS. I only know this, and the Senator from Nevada knows it, too, perfectly well: The influence which has succeeded in substituting the conference report for the Senate bill—and I am not saying it is a corrupt influence at all; I have described it several times—is an influence which intends that all the money we now appropriate shall be expended in the construction of new roads, and that no part of it shall be spent in the acquisition of railroads that are already there. If that influence prevails with the President, then he will begin the construction of this line in the interior of Alaska.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I understand the Senator, the building of these detached roads would be foolish; it would be an economic mistake; and the Senator himself, if in charge of the matter, would not build them. Does the Senator believe the influences he has spoken of, that might work on the President, would work on him if he were building these roads?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is very difficult, of course, for me to prescribe limits to the influences of which I speak. I know what they are and I know that they intend to accomplish their object if they can.

If those influences were of an improper or corrupt character, I might be willing to assume that they would not prevail; but they are not. They are influences which have reached and which have controlled the men who brought forward this proposition, and have controlled them because they are inclined to believe that this money ought to be expended in the construction of new lines of railroad, instead of beginning at the sea and being sure that we have a line of railroad from the sea to the interior before we expend a single dollar.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Iowa says the necessity will be imposed upon the Government of leasing the road it constructs to the short lines now in existence, provided they form a portion of the entire route to the seaboard.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe we ought to have anything to do with the private lines or any connection with the private lines. I think the Government ought to own all that is necessary in order to give the people of Alaska the relief to which they are entitled, and that it ought to operate the line for their benefit.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the position of the Senator, but I did not understand why, in his view, it would necessitate leasing the roads which the Government is to construct. Does the Senator dismiss altogether the idea of entering into a traffic arrangement either by voluntary agreement or under the direction of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not. I recognize that that is provided for.

Mr. WALSH. Then how does the Senator come to state that it necessitates leasing the railroads which the Government proposes to construct?

Mr. CUMMINS. Because I know a little about railroading. I was brought up in the business, and I have an opinion about the practicability of doing certain things. I have never known an enforced joint traffic arrangement that was satisfactory to either of the parties to it. There must be a voluntary arrangement in order to move traffic successfully and properly over two connecting lines of railroad.

If we were ever to reach that point and were to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to see what sort of traffic arrangement we should make with the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, and were compelled to struggle over that and accept such a decision as the commission might make, and then attempt to run our engines and our trains to the meeting point with the Copper River & Northwestern, or the meeting point with the Alaska Northern, and there transfer the freight from the Government railroad to the private railroad, we would encounter such difficulties, we would be so embarrassed, that we would have spent our money in vain for the benefit of the people of Alaska.

It is therefore that I say that at the time of which I have spoken there will be just two alternatives, namely, the leasing of our railroad or the acquisition of their railroad.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As I understand the Senator, he insists that the Government ought not under any circumstances to utilize any portion of any railroad that has been already constructed in Alaska. I understand from the reading of this bill that the President may, in his discretion, condemn or purchase either one of the lines now constructed there. Assume, however, that he exercises his power and his duty of constructing a line from tidewater into the interior, and he concludes that the route of which the Senator speaks, from Resurrection Bay over the Alaska Northern, is the best route, and he has an opportunity to parallel it, because the evidence does show that he can parallel either one of them. If he finds that he can purchase the Alaska Northern, for instance, from tidewater into the interior cheaper or as cheaply as it is possible for him to parallel it, does the Senator still say that he ought not to purchase the Alaska Northern?

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary, I think he ought to purchase it. I think the very first thing that should be ascertained is the price at which either of these railroads can be purchased; if that price is not satisfactory, then the cost of condemnation; and the further construction of the railroad ought to depend upon whether the President of the United States is willing to take these railroads, or either of them. If he can not acquire them at a fair cost in their present condition, then he ought to parallel them; or, if not that, he ought to choose some harbor that would come within the provisions of the bill and commence construction there.

I do not want to see parallel roads built, provided the existing railways that form a part of the route which is finally determined upon by the President can be acquired at their fair value; but I am unalterably opposed to changing conditions with our money so that when we do come to condemn or do come to acquire we shall be compelled to pay twice as much for the existing roads as we would be compelled to pay now.

That is the whole proposition. I am unalterably opposed to the expenditure of any money in Alaska for the purpose of building a railroad, unless the Government owns the railroad from the sea, and has the ocean to which to give the freight that it may bring from the interior. I reassert that if the President begins the construction of these roads in the interior, and builds them in the detached way that I know is anticipated at this moment, when the roads are built we shall either be compelled to buy the existing railroads at an exaggerated price, very much more than they would cost now, or we shall be com-

pelled to lease our roads to the existing railroads at a compensation which I fear will be very inadequate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I dissent from the view of the Senator from Iowa in insisting that under this bill the President will be compelled to commence the construction of the road in the interior of Alaska.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not say he would be compelled to do it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That he may do it, then.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; he may do it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I dissent from that view of the Senator. I wish to say now that I am in sympathy with the Senator in most of the contentions he makes as to the impropriety of the Government expending its money to enhance the value of roads already constructed. My insistence is, and I differ from the Senator to that extent, that the President of the United States is compelled to commence to locate and lay out a road from tidewater into the interior; and in doing that, if he finds that he can do it more economically by taking one of the roads already constructed, he can do it. I do not think the Senator would deprive the President of that power.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It would not be a business proposition if he did.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Copper River & Northwestern road should form a part of the line which the President thinks ought to be built—I hope he will not think so; I do not think we ought to expend a penny in that locality, but I am willing to give him that discretion; I think he can exercise it, probably, better than I could exercise the same discretion—if he concludes to adopt that line, then I want him to know how much that line will cost before he enters into the construction, and I want him to acquire that road before he expends the Government's money in building the line from its northern terminus into the interior.

It may very well be that if the President takes the necessary steps to ascertain what that road will cost the United States, that will determine him at once not to build a road from that point; to abandon that point and go to some other. He can not exercise a wise discretion without knowledge as to the cost of any roads that it is probable the United States may desire to acquire as a part of the line to be built.

As I have said before, however, if there is a man here who believes that we ought to build these isolated portions of railroads in the interior of Alaska without knowing how we are to reach the sea or upon what terms we are to reach the sea, without knowing what conditions may be imposed upon us by the private corporations that now own these properties, then I will hear an argument in favor of vesting this discretion in the President. If, however, we all believe that this would be an unwise policy, then I hope that we shall not give to the President the power to do a thing which we all agree ought not to be done.

In concluding what I have to say at this moment upon the subject, I repeat that I want a bill on this subject to pass. I want this bill rereferred to the committee, with a vote of the Senate with regard to this particular subject. I do not know just how to reach that end in a parliamentary way, and therefore I may stumble; but if I do, I am sure that I have friends here who will promptly lift me up.

I move that the bill be rereferred to a conference committee—of course I am perfectly willing it shall be the same conference committee—that a further conference be requested with the House, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be instructed that it is the sense of the Senate that no amendment be agreed to that will make it possible to build Government railroads in the interior without connection with the sea. I am not at all sure that I have made a parliamentary motion, but I have indicated what I want.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I rose not with reference to the particular matter which the Senator from Iowa has been discussing, although I thoroughly agree with him. I will go a little further. It seems to me from the reading of the bill that the main purpose is to build this road for the purpose of leasing it to other people. It is only to be operated by the Government in the event that the President can not make a satisfactory lease of the property. I think that is quite plain from the conference report. But it was another part of the report—which is purely technical, probably—to which I want to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada. It is a part of it which might necessitate its going back to conference for that purpose alone.

The Senator will notice in this House document, which I understand is the conference report, and I ask the Senator from Nevada if I am correct in that——

Mr. PITTMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon, but there was so much noise in the Chamber I could not hear what he said.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understood the Senator yesterday to say that the conference report is to be found in a House document that also presented the report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; Document 341.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is 337 that I have.

Mr. PITTMAN. The last report is 341.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is the same?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it is an amended report.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then there have been two reports. I will say that the amended report, to which I have not had my attention called, remedies the matter of which I intended to speak.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this matter was debated for several days on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator from Iowa devoted a great deal of time to the question that he has debated so extensively to-day. Particularly did he debate the question as to granting the power to the President to lease these roads, and that question was disposed of.

The other amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa was adopted by this body, and I believe that every member of the conference on behalf of this body voted with the Senator.

As I construed, and do now construe, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, its meaning is plain. Its meaning is that the President shall construct or buy or condemn one continuous road from some harbor on the coast to the interior waterways. The present bill means exactly the same thing. The bill as reported by the conferees provides that the President shall lay out a continuous road or roads from harbors on the coast of Alaska to interior points on the waterways. It also provides that he shall acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and therein the bill reported by the conference is broader than the other bill, because the bill as it passed the Senate only allowed the President to acquire by condemnation and purchase, while the present bill allows the President to acquire by condemnation, purchase, and otherwise. But it might include the power of leasing.

Now, then, the only distinction between the two bills is this: This bill directs the President to build a continuous railroad or railroads from the coast to the interior, giving him the power to utilize existing roads as a part of that line when acquired by condemnation, purchase, or otherwise, while the amendment of the Senator from Iowa went further and stated that the line so located, embracing any part of another line, could not be utilized even to the extent of commencing construction until the existing line was acquired by purchase or condemnation. It is reasonable; it seems to me that it will occur to any reasonable man, to any man of plain, common business judgment, that you should acquire or have the power of acquiring by option or contract a part of a line that is to become part of a main line before starting in to build the main line.

We all agree on that, and we all agree that if the President is a man of that character, is a man of common business judgment, you would not have to tie him with handcuffs to compel him to do something that would appeal to the common judgment of an ordinary business man.

As for the influences the Senator from Iowa speaks of, I want to say that those influences would not affect any honest man. They would not affect the judgment of any plain, common business man, because the subject is too plain, it is too easily understood. If we are afraid that the power to which we have intrusted the building of these roads has not the ordinary judgment of a common business man, we should not grant any of the powers included in the bill.

I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that if you can not trust the President to conduct this as any ordinary business man, then you can not trust the President to select the routes for the roads to be laid out from the coast to the interior. If you can not trust him to obtain an option to buy a road before he connects it, then you can not trust him in the building of any of these roads, because if he has not sufficient business judgment, or if he can be so easily influenced and deceived, he might build such roads in the most extravagant manner and to parts of Alaska that will least benefit that Territory and the people of this country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the argument of the Senator from Nevada were carried to its logical end, the result would be that

we ought to take out of the bill every guide, every restriction, every suggestion save the one which appropriates $35,000,000 and devotes it to the building of railroads in Alaska. If we can trust the President—and the Senator from Nevada has no higher opinion respecting his ability and his integrity than have I—if we can trust the President, then why surround him with any conditions at all? We have put into the bill scores of conditions and provisions, all of which limit in a way the discretion of the President. If the Senator from Nevada agrees with me that the thing I seek to accomplish is right, that no sane man of good judgment would do the thing I fear may be done, why should we give the President the discretion to do it?

Mr. PITTMAN. I was just getting to that point. That arose by reason of the efforts of the conferees to agree. There are some things in the bill that we as Senators did not want. There are some things in the bill that the conferees on the part of the House did not want. The object of the appointment of the conference was to reach an agreement if possible on a working bill.

Now, the Senator asks why put any restrictions in the bill if we have confidence in the President. I do not believe in putting any restrictions in the bill that I would not place upon any other business man to whom a business enterprise is intrusted. The bill expresses the principle. As to limiting the President as to the details of carrying it out, I think it is an utter mistake. The principle involved is the building of a railroad from the coast to the interior. The bill provides for that. The Senator says that the road may perhaps start and be built from the interior to the coast, and he wants to limit the President in that regard. I say that is limiting the President as you would not limit the superintendent of any such works, as such limitation would be unnecessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is in error about that. It does not provide for the construction of a railroad from the ocean to the interior. It provides for the designation of a route from the sea to the interior, but the plain purpose is to enable the interior part to be built first and to use the privately owned railroads to reach the sea.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Both Senators are mistaken, because it does not say the road shall be built from the ocean to the interior. It says it shall be located and constructed so as to connect the interior and the ocean. I want to ask the Senator's construction on one part of the conference report which changes the wording of the Senate bill. I ask for the construction put by the conference committee and by the Senator himself on that part of the first section which provides that the President may lease the road so constructed. I will call his attention to the exact words:

> In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion, under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

I ask the Senator what he thinks that language really imposes as a duty upon the President. Would not the proper construction of it be, after constructing, equipping the road, to lease it, and in case he can not lease it, then to operate it?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think that is a matter of discretion left to the President. I think it was the intention of both bills to leave it to the discretion of the President.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have no question whatever but that it was the intention of this body, but if it was the intention of the other body, I can not understand just why the Senate language was o changed, at least as to throw into the conference report and into the bill, if the conference report shall be adopted, language that is open to very different construction.

Mr. PITTMAN. It says the President shall have power to lease.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. It does not state that the President shall lease, and if he can not lease that he shall operate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; but it gives him the power to operate in case he can not lease.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what it does.

Mr. PITTMAN. It says that he shall operate it if he can not lease it——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If he can not lease it?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If he can not lease it, what then?

Mr. PITTMAN. If he can lease it on terms satisfactory to him, he is empowered to lease it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; but he is directed to lease it. Then, if he can not make satisfactory terms for a lease he may operate it as a governmental utility.

Mr. PITTMAN. As a matter of fact he is not directed to lease it. He is empowered to lease it in his own judgment and discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. If he does not lease it, he shall operate it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes; but I will ask the Senator what would be the first step that the President is directed to take under the language of the conference report?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think the first step that he would take is that he would ascertain——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I mean after the road is constructed.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think the first step would be to ascertain the best way to operate the road, and I think that that determination would require an investigation of both the leasing and the operation by the Government.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I asked for the Senator's opinion on that matter, not intending to express my own; but it strikes me that if that was the purpose, the language should be turned around and he should not be directed to operate in case he can not lease, and in that case only; as the language now stands, he must first make an effort to lease, failing of success in that, he may then operate it, but not otherwise.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will deal in a few minutes with the language that we had under discussion in the conference committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I must dissent from the apparent agreement between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] with regard to the action of the Senate. The Senate did not express the opinion that the President ought to lease the roads; the Senate did not——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I want to say that I do not agree to any such proposition as that, and I did not so intend to express myself.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood it to be said by the Senator from Nevada, and agreed to by the Senator from Wyoming, that the conferees did what both Houses had decided upon, namely, to give the preference to leasing; and that, therefore, the conference report was an expression of the judgment of both Houses in that respect.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not think my language conveyed that idea.

Mr. CUMMINS. All that the Senate did was to refuse to strike out of the bill the provision which gave the President the power to lease; but it did not in any way suggest that it was better to lease than to operate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I can hardly understand how the Senator from Iowa could have understood me in that way, for the very purpose of my rising was to dispute that proposition. The Senate bill gave the President authority to contract for the operation by lease, but did not intimate in any way that his first duty was to attempt to make a lease; he could lease or operate by the Government, at his discretion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If I may interrupt the Senator from Nevada for just a moment, Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the view that the Senator from Wyoming places upon the construction of this language is that the President in his discretion may lease; but if he does not see fit to lease, then he shall operate; in other words, that the President must first try to lease. I think that is the view of the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say in this connection that I, personally, if I had had my own way, would have left the leasing proposition entirely out, but the Senate, after discussing the matter, determined to lease, and they vested in the President the discretion to lease. The other House passed the bill with that same discretion vested in the President; and when the conference committee got together, after many days of discussion, we simply adopted the House language; that was all. If, however, Mr. President—and I challenge contradiction of the proposition—if you take the whole of the first section of the bill, it means plainly, on the face of it, and the language is susceptible only of that construction, that the President has the power to operate, without any regard to the question of leasing or not—if I may take the time of the Senator for just one moment—in other words, the President has the right to receive compensation for the service performed by the railroad, and to perform generally the usual duties of a common carrier by rail. What are those duties? The carrying of passengers and freight, the operation of the railroad. It was the purpose of the bill, after having given that absolute power to the President, to go further and say that if he did not do that he could, in his discretion, lease the road for operation; and if he did not exercise that discretion, then, in that event, he could continue to operate it until further action of Congress. There was not anything

secret about that proposition; it was fully discussed in the other House.

One of the peculiar situations about this—and I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to it—was that after we had fully discussed the provision which the Senator had inserted in the bill, and it went over to the other House, protecting the Government against the purchase of a railroad already in Alaska—we thought we had safeguarded that—the House took the very position which the Senator says he sought to avoid, namely, that that provision which the Senator had inserted in the bill would have compelled the Government to have purchased the Guggenheim rights before they did anything at all. We know over here that that was not the purpose of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. We know more——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. We know it was the purpose of the Senator to protect against that very thing.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not a question of purpose; but that is not the effect of it. No one but the most superficial observer could put such an interpretation upon it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will observe the House discussion, he will see that it is the construction they put on it, though we know the Senator had no such purpose. His purpose in offering the provision was to protect against that very thing.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the question whether the President has the right to lease is not before this body at the present time. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has stated, that was determined by the Senate adversely to his position, and was determined by the other House adversely to his position. Both bills contain the provision allowing the President the right to either operate or to lease this road, so we need not discuss that subject any further. The conference report at the present time before the Senate says that the President is authorized—

to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska, and with a coal field—

And so forth.

The bill provides that that line is to be so located as to connect the harbor with the interior. Now, what next?

to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate.

There is an absolute instruction to the President to lay out a continuous line from the coast to the interior and to construct a continuous line from the coast to the interior. In the bill as now framed he is granted the power to purchase lines to become a part of the system so laid out. The Senator from Iowa proposed to provide that the President should buy those intermediate lines before construction should commence. As I say, we had no objection to that. Now, the Senator says if the President is not compelled to buy the intermediate lines before construction by the United States that he may go to the northern terminus of the Copper River Railroad and build from there to the interior. It is true he may do that. The Senator says that that would be an economic mistake, and the Senator has shown clearly that that would be almost an outrage upon the people of this country; the Senator has shown that it would be a violation of the theory upon which this bill was passed, and he has shown it so plainly and so clearly that that fact would naturally occur to any man of ordinary judgment. It certainly would occur to the President of the United States, and if the President of the United States did see it in the light in which we see it, in which the Senator sees it, he would not make such error. He could only do it under one of two conditions, namely, that he is not a man of ordinary business judgment or that he is subject to influences to which the Senator referred, none of which we believe and none of which the Senator will admit. Therefore I state that the Senator is urging some particular language which he himself has formulated and which he would like to see in the bill to protect against a mistake, to protect against an outrage, which he says is so apparent that anyone can see it. I want to state that when you say to the President of the United States that he shall build a continuous line from the coast to the interior and that he may utilize by purchase or condemnation existing lines, it is unnecessary to tell him not to commence to build in the interior and build down to an existing line. I say that would be an absurdity on the face of it. To do such a thing as that would be casting suspicion on every power which you have granted the President in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Nevada believe that the influences which have been so successful in authorizing the construction of a railroad in Alaska will also be directed toward the immediate completion of a railroad from the northern terminus of the Alaska Northern road to Fairbanks?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I do not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Surely it is deemed very desirable that that road should be completed.

Mr. PITTMAN. But not under present conditions, because the Senator from Iowa has shown how unfortunate that would be.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; but here are 70 miles of railroad practically unused, on which not an engine or car are moving. What is more natural than that the influences which have been so successful in authorizing the construction of a Government railroad in Alaska will be directed toward the prompt completion by the Government of the remainder of that line necessary to connect Seward with Fairbanks?

Mr. PITTMAN. The influences which have been used for the building of railroads in Alaska have been good influences for a good purpose; the influences of which the Senator speaks, if utilized for the purpose of connecting the proposed road with existing railroads, would be bad influences for a bad purpose, as has been stated by the Senator from Iowa, and I am not willing to concede, and neither does the Senator concede, that the President of the United States would be subject to any bad influence.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, anybody at all familiar with the Alaska situation knows that the Alaska Northern Railroad is practically useless now. They have no charter upon which they can go ahead; they are unable to raise money; and it would seem the point of wisdom, at least, not to put ourselves at the mercy of that company, who are foreigners, I believe, for the most part, and whose property, if used at all, should be acquired by the Government while it may be obtained reasonably. I am not inimical to the work which the Government is about to undertake. I would prefer, however, to see the experiment limited to one road, therefore I did not agree with the Senator from Nevada that we should invest $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 at one time in railroad building in Alaska. I have felt that one road from tidewater to Fairbanks, well directed and carefully built, would serve every purpose of Alaska's needs for many years to come. I think there is very good reason for the apprehensions of the Senator from Iowa, and wish the conferees would avoid all doubt as to the desire and intention of the Senate in this matter.

Mr. PITTMAN. Now, Mr. President, we come down to the question as to why the conferees representing the Senate receded from their demand for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I was stating that we had no objection to that amendment, because it simply required of the President that which we knew the President would do, that which we knew any business man would do. I know the Senator was very earnest in his desire to prevent the Government from favoring the Guggenheim-Morgan syndicate, but I want to tell him that the Members of the House of Representatives misinterpreted his language in the amendment. If he had followed the speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives on this bill, he would have seen that it was there charged that this amendment was in the interest of the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate and for the purpose of compelling the President to buy their road.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not unaware of that; but that does not frighten me at all. It is a very common thing for one who is attempting to accomplish a purpose to ascribe or impute an improper purpose to his opponent. I have never given that a thought. I am quite willing to submit the amendment, of which I am the author, to intelligent judgment. As I have said before, the man who says that the amendment which I offered can be utilized even for the benefit of these railroads is either a shallow thinker or a malicious slanderer, and the man who says it can take his choice as between those two alternatives. I do not know that anyone has ever said it, and I am not thinking of any person. The Senator from Nevada knows, and has said over and over again, that he is in favor of not doing the very thing that my amendment would prevent, and when I have the support of his judgment in the matter I am quite indifferent to any criticism that may be uttered elsewhere.

Mr. PITTMAN. However, the criticism was uttered by men for whom we have the highest respect. Members of the House of Representatives for whom the Senator has the highest respect. I have no doubt of that. I am satisfied, as I said before, that it was a misinterpretation of the Senator's language and a misinterpretation of the intention of the Senate, yet, nevertheless, during the debate that took place over there, that was the construction placed time and time again upon that amendment. The House came very near defeating the bill on the ground that that amendment was placed in the bill, if not for the purpose of accomplishing, at least that it would accomplish the purpose

of forcing the President to buy the Guggenheim railroad; and men who afterwards supported that bill when that provision was eliminated fought it from start to finish while that provision was in the bill. That amendment was the subject of the principal fight on this bill in the House, as the Senator will see if he will read the debates that occurred over there.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that, and I only retort that the amendment that has been insisted upon elsewhere, and that is in this conference report, gives the President the only power that the bill confers to favor the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate. I am not saying or even suggesting that the President would use that power in order to favor that company of men, but I do assert, and I want it to be understood here and elsewhere and everywhere, that it is this conference report insisted upon by the House which gives the Chief Executive the only chance that he would have to do anything for this railroad, that is now a losing venture upon the hands of its owners.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am only bringing this matter up for the purpose of showing to the Senator the reason why the conferees receded from the language used by the Senator from Iowa. It was contended in the debate in the other House that the Senator's amendment provided that any road which became a part of the system as laid out should be purchased before the construction commenced or should be relocated. What did that mean? It was said that the railroad commission had reported favorably on the Copper River route. It was said that the Copper River route did not have room for the relocation of two roads in that valley and that it meant buying the Copper River road, and it meant that it should be bought first before construction started; it meant the same influence that the Senator from Iowa was talking about, and that is the thing they were afraid of.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nevada has said over and over again, and I know he is sincere about it, that if the Copper River road is to be bought it ought to be bought before we add value to it by building an extension into the interior. As I said before, I had hoped the President would never even consider the purchase of the Copper River Railroad. I do not think he ought to do so. I think every obstacle we can put in his way to prevent him from buying the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad ought to be put there. The Senator from Nevada believes just as I do about that, for I have heard him express the view a dozen times on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is not any question about it, but I am telling the Senator that his language has been misinterpreted. They do not put upon his amendment the construction that the Senate put upon it. That language, left in the bill, would have defeated the bill in the House, and would have defeated it on the ground that it was a "joker" in the bill for the purpose of compelling this country to buy the Guggenheim road.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Nevada if he believes that the idea itself, if incorporated in the bill, would defeat the measure in the House? If the idea is right, if the principle is right, as I think it is and as the Senator from Nevada says it is and as the Senator from Oregon believes it is, I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Nevada shall put the idea into any form that will properly express it. It is not in the form in which I prepared it, anyhow. I submitted my amendments originally to the committee, and the committee took those amendments and separated them because they consisted of various parts, and put them into the bill just exactly as they saw fit.

I do not want to stand here and take up the time of the Senate a single moment with regard to the phraseology of the amendment or bill as it passed the Senate. I give to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Oregon carte blanche to express this idea in any way they may see fit to express it.

Mr. PITTMAN. When this matter was under consideration we had the Senator from Iowa come before the conference committee, and we suggested to him this very difficulty; we suggested the rock upon which we had split; and we asked him to suggest some other language, some other form, something else. Is not that true?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; that is to say, it may be true, but I do not remember it. I do not recall that I was asked to do anything of that kind.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator was there when we read it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was before the conference committee, but, as I understood, the objection there was to the thing itself and not to the way in which it was expressed. If I could correctly draw a conclusion from the argument around the table, it was that we must not take away from the President the power to build these interior portions of the road, to connect those portions with roads already in existence, and operate them through a traffic arrangement.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not understand it as the Senator understood it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not say the Senator from Nevada is not right, but I did not understand that any such suggestion was made.

Mr. PITTMAN. But the matter was discussed while the Senator was there. Now, the situation has come down to this: There was an awful fight on this bill in the House. There would have been a more bitter fight had the bill gone back to the House with any material changes in it. I want to say to you that the members of the conference committee from this body were sincerely anxious for the development of the Territory of Alaska, and they would rather surrender the details than sacrifice this bill. I want to say to you now that some of those who seem to be for this bill seem also to be more anxious for some policy or some principle not necessary to the construction of this road than sincerely in favor of the development of Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator there just a moment?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I may say to the Senator from Iowa that the conference committee, after thoroughly discussing this matter, concluded that if the President exercised any business judgment at all, even under the terms of the House bill, he would do exactly what the Senator's resolution suggested that he should do; that is, before he undertook to construct the line into the interior, if he was going to use a line already there he would purchase it in advance.

The Senator, however, seems to assume that the President of the United States would exercise the unbusinesslike judgment of starting the road in the interior and building it up to one of the termini of the present road. We could not assume, in the discussion of the matter before the conference committee, that any such result would follow the President's action.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I can only say that people from Alaska who have been very much interested in the matter, and I believe interested from a public-spirited standpoint, have been arguing with me, hoping and insisting that I should withdraw the opposition I have felt toward the House provision, on the ground that the President would do that very thing; that he would take up these railroads from their northern points, or one of them, and build them into the interior, and that then Alaska could have the benefit of the expenditure of $35,000,000 in new roads without having had to expend anything for roads already constructed. That is the very thing the people from Alaska, or some of them at least, desire to accomplish, and it was the argument made to me, that the President ought to spend the entire appropriation in new railroads, so that the people could utilize the roads already there under private ownership. Now, it is useless to try to disguise from ourselves that that is the view taken by a great many of the people in Alaska.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I was simply trying to state why the conference committee apparently receded from some of the provisions of the Senate bill. I have shown the view that the House took of the amendment of the Senate. The Senator now says: "Why not place an amendment in this bill embodying practically the same thing, in the same manner—that is, the same principle?"

My answer to that has been given time and time again. That is, while we had no objection to the amendment, because it stated something that we knew the President would do, we do not consider it worth while to fight for an amendment which will accomplish no more than the President himself will accomplish, just for the purpose of satisfying the desires of this body or any of the Members of this body.

The Senator from Iowa is sincerely in favor of this bill, and I know it. He is just as sincere and earnest in behalf of it as any member of this body. He has fought for it; but some of the amendments he has suggested, a number of us believe, are dangerous to this bill. We believe that they might cause the defeat of the bill in the House.

I know the Senator will say: "Why should we have principles interfered with by reason of the fear of defeat in the House?" I want to say here that we believe that when you can accomplish the same thing by yielding language it is your duty to do it; and the members of the conference committee were satisfied that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa was not necessary; that it did nothing except to compel the President to do what any intelligent, fair, honest man would do who had charge of the building of that road.

I want to say to you now that if you amend this bill in any material respect and send it back to the House you are in danger of having the bill defeated. The Senator knows that a great many Members of the House of Representatives voted for

the bill largely against their own judgment. They voted for the bill because it was stood for by the administration. The Senator from Iowa knows that a great many of these Representatives, coming principally from the South, have been bitterly criticized in their own homes for having supported the bill; and the Senator should know that the passage of the bill is in danger if he sends it back to the House with any material amendments.

For these reasons the committee asks you and asks the Senate to stand by the conference report.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada. I did not know that any opposition had been aroused against the bill since its consideration here.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, of course, that there are people who believe that the Government ought not to enter upon the enterprise. I said when the bill was on its passage here that I should be very glad to exclude, by positive amendment, the purchase or acquisition of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad in any way. Now, I ask, if that is the difficulty in the House does the Senator think that if we should put in the bill, as I should like to see put in it, a provision entirely excluding the purchase or condemnation of the Copper River & Northwester Railroad, it would obviate the difficulty and avoid the opposition?

If he is of the opinion that it will, I do not believe there will be any difficulty in this Chamber in agreeing to that exclusion.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think it would arouse debate in the House that would last for weeks.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he really thinks a majority of the House of Representatives is opposed to this legislation and has been coerced by the administration into supporting it?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I did not say they had been coerced into it, nor do I think they have been coerced into it, nor do I think the party was coerced into passing the monetary legislation; but I am satisfied that the administration has given a great deal of beneficial information to this body and to other bodies, and I am satisfied that the Senator from Massachusetts himself has profited by it to a certain extent.

Mr. WEEKS. One more question. Does the Senator think that if it were not known that the administration wished the Alaska railroad bill passed, the House of Representatives would have supported it?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think it is very probable that had it not been for the fearless stand taken by the administration on this bill there would have been Members in the House of Representatives from various parts of this country who, through fear rather than through judgment, would have voted against the bill.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, before the unfinished business is taken up I should like, if I have the right to do so at this time, to address the Senate briefly on a matter of personal privilege, which I wished to do yesterday, but had no convenient opportunity.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The unfinished business is laid aside, and the Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, on Saturday last I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday an allusion to myself by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], in which he quoted what he styled a purported interview published in the Washington Post with myself, referring to the question of my changed attitude on the question of the Panama Canal tolls exemption.

I do not understand that the Senator from Washington impugned my motives in his remarks, but it does seem to me that he has possibly confounded the statements made by the President and the statements made by myself.

I wish to say in this connection there was never any personal interview with me by any representative of the press nor any personal interview between the President and myself on this matter. What the Senator mistook for a personal interview was really an extract from a signed statement furnished by myself to the reporters of the press gallery in the Senate on the afternoon of the 2d of March. I hold in my hand a carbon copy of that statement which I will ask permission to have read by the Secretary in order that the matter may be fully understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SIGNED STATEMENT BY SENATOR THORNTON FOR THE PRESS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1914.*

When the question of exempting American vessels engaged in our coastwise trade from the payment of Panama Canal tolls was before the Senate, I spoke and voted in favor of the exemption.

I did so believing that the United States had the legal and moral right under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to enact such legislation, and hoping its passage might stimulate the upbuilding of our merchant marine and help our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific seaport cities, and without any injury to the interior sections of our country.

Having now concluded after careful thought that when the question of repealing this exemption clause comes again before the Senate it will be my duty to advocate its repeal, I wish in justice to myself to give the reason for my changed attitude.

I believe now just as firmly as before that the exemption clause of the Panama Canal act is not a violation of our treaty obligations, but I recognize now, as I always did, the substantial difference between our right of exemption and our enforcement of that right.

Understanding through newspaper reports only that the President believed our national interests would be subserved by the repeal of the exemption clause in the present law, I have appealed to him directly for an expression of his views.

Responding to my request, he has answered that in his judgment the repeal of the exemption clause is necessary for the continuance of our present friendly relations with foreign powers and the success of our foreign policies.

Considering the canal tolls exemption law previously enacted to be a question of policy and not of principle, and recognizing the great responsibility resting on the President for the successful conduct of our foreign relations, and also the delicacy of the present trying situation in regard to those relations, I feel it my public duty to assist the President in carrying out his wishes in this matter.

Of course, my change of attitude, based on my conception of duty, must not be construed as the slightest criticism of my brother Senators who think it is their public duty to maintain their former attitude on this question.

J. R. THORNTON.

Mr. THORNTON. It will be observed that the only statement attributed by myself to the President was "that in his judgment the repeal of the exemption clause is necessary for the continuance of our present friendly relations with foreign powers and the success of our foreign policies." The subsequent statement, "recognizing the great responsibility resting on the President for the successful conduct of our foreign relations and also the delicacy of the present trying situation in regard to those relations," is my individual statement.

On account of physical disability due to illness to call at the Executive office, this interchange of views between the President and myself was entirely in writing on my suggestion. The matter originated entirely on my own initiative, the President's part consisting in a courteous compliance with the request that I addressed to him in writing.

### RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. PITTMAN. I think that the conference report is still under consideration. I believe that it is privileged.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that it is a matter of very high importance, and it is before the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. And it is always in order. I ask for a vote on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I beg to suggest that a conference report is not always in order. The submission of the report itself is always in order, but it must take its chances for consideration with other business. I have no objection to continuing the consideration of the report, but under our rules it has no special privilege at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair meant to rule that either by a majority vote on motion or by unanimous consent it is in order to take it up now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly that is so.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not desire to take the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, with the intentions of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] with reference to what is desired in connection with this matter I am in hearty agreement for his purpose to be accomplished in reference to the building of this railroad. I am very strongly in favor of the Government having a line from tidewater to the interior wholly and entirely under its control. If I did not think that the language of the conference report itself provides for that very thing I would not have agreed to it.

I think there has been a misconception of the situation growing out of the impression that the House provision did not require that. I will say that I had that impression myself when I went into the conference. I am satisfied that those to whom the Senator from Iowa refers as interested in having all the money appropriated by the bill expended in the construction of entirely new lines of railroad in Alaska had that impression, but I do not think the language of the bill as it has been agreed to in conference warrants any such construction.

There is not any question but that the language provided in the Senate bill in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa was perfectly clear. There was not any room for doubt about what it meant or as to what it required. I was heartily in favor of it and should have been glad if we could have had it in the conference report, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I interrupt the Senator now because I will have to leave the Chamber very soon. I think it is very unfortunate if there is a difference of opinion as to the construction that may be put upon the language. I could not vote to adopt a report that leaves it at all doubtful as to whether the President can construct at the end of the private line or whether he has either to buy the private line or build a road from the harbors.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator that I think I can speak for all the members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate when I say they were convinced that there was no room really for doubt that the President by the language of the bill as it was adopted is required to have a Government line made under Government control from the seacoast the the interior. I do not think I violate any of the confidence of the conference committee when I say that the House members came around substantially to that view.

I want to call the Senators' attention to the language of the bill, because if I am mistaken in the construction of it I would be very much inclined to think the bill ought to go back to the conference, for I believe the Government ought to have its railroad from the coast to the interior. The language of the bill is—

> That the President of the United States is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed * * * to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska, and with a coal field or fields.

It seems to me that language is plain. The President can not locate any line that begins at some point in the interior and ends at some point in the interior. He must locate a line from a harbor on the coast to connect "with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska, and with a coal field or fields."

Mr. BRISTOW. But does not the leasing provision enable him to lease and thereby make this connection?

Mr. JONES. I think not. I want to call the Senator's attention to some other language further on. Here is further power to the President "to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes." That is the only place that he is authorized to build or construct a road. It is "along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate, with the necessary branch lines," and so forth. So after the President locates a line or lines from the seacoast to the interior he has power to build a road only along the line so designated and so located. Then, further, the bill provides as follows:

> To purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire, upon such terms as he may deem proper, any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him.

That gives him authority so that if in locating a line of road and constructing upon it a Government road it shall be necessary to acquire some part of an existing line as a part of the Government road he may acquire it by purchase, by condemnation, or otherwise. As I understand the words "or otherwise" this would authorize him to lease, but it must be a part of the Government line, and it must be under the control and operation of the Government. It does not authorize him to lease a part of our line to private companies and to make it a Government road.

Mr. BRISTOW. But I am just as much opposed to the Government having an interior road and being compelled to lease another line in order to get to tidewater as I would be opposed to the Government leasing its end of the road to the road that already existed.

Since we had the question as to the construction of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution up, where the Senate was within one of a majority of putting a construction upon it that nobody had ever thought about when it was before the body, I think we ought not to pass a bill where a large number of Senators can not understand what it means. That is the objection I have to this conference report.

Mr. JONES. I agree with the Senator on that. I think probably I was more insistent upon the Senate provision than anyone else. We did not recede from our contention for the Senate provision until the House members simply said "we do not feel that we could take this language back to the House and have the controversy over it there which would come by reason of an agreement to the Senate provision." By taking this language and putting it altogether it seems to me that there is really no room for the construction sought to be placed upon it.

There is this difference, I think, between this provision and the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. Under this proposition the President could begin the construction of a line in the interior after he located it from the coast. He could begin the construction from the interior toward the coast without having first made arrangements to acquire any existing line that he might consider necessary. The President could do that, but to me it is inconceivable that he would do it. Suppose he should locate the line that we thought the Government ought to have along the Copper River Railroad to the navigable waters of the Yukon or the Tanana, it seems to me it is almost inconceivable to think that the President, after having located that line and ascertained that it would be necessary to have the Copper River road as a part of the Government line, before making any arrangements to acquire that road would begin the construction of the Government line from the Tanana downward, depending upon the future for making satisfactory arrangements with the Copper River road. I conceive that the President would simply do this: If he should decide that the Government road should be from Cordova, or the Copper River line, through to the Tanana or the Yukon, he would say to the agencies he might designate to construct the road, before we begin any construction we must make satisfactory arrangements with the Copper River road. First, we must either get a satisfactory agreement with them to buy it upon satisfactory terms or we must begin the condemnation proceedings and get it that way, or else we must make satisfactory arrangements by way of a lease, for instance, a long-term lease. While I would rather have the Government, of course, own the road outright, I can not see any insuperable objection to it if he should make a 99-year lease for the road, because if he were to make that lease before he had started the construction of a Government line, I am satisfied he would make it upon terms reasonable and fair to the Government of the United States.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I am sorry to interrupt the Senator——

Mr. JONES. That is all right.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator knows that I have been as strongly in favor of this legislation as anybody.

Mr. JONES. I do know that.

Mr. BRISTOW. And am now.

Mr. JONES. I know it.

Mr. BRISTOW. But I could not think for a moment of supporting a measure that would enable the President of the United States to lease this road and make it a part of the Government line and not have the ownership, even if the lease was for 50 years or 100 years, because in the development of that Territory we would have developed this private property to what I believe would be an enormous value. There is but one thing to do, to build the road from tidewater, new and outright, or buy the tracks from there, one of the two, and we ought not to leave any other opportunity open. If it is thought best to construct a road from the beginning and pay no attention to the existing lines, all right. If it is thought better to purchase the roads that are there, let us purchase them and then construct the additional lines that are necessary.

It has been said to mean that it will take too much of this $35,000,000 to purchase these roads; that Alaska needs the $35,000,000. That very statement alone is what has given me apprehension in regard to the provision being left in this loose

and doubtful way. I would rather make the sum $50,000,000 and let the Government own every foot of the track from tidewater to the interior where it proposes to build the line. I do not think we ought to take any chances on that proposition.

Mr. JONES. The Senator and I are in entire agreement as to what should be accomplished.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to make just one suggestion to the Senator. I think he said a while ago that under the terms of the bill the President might lease one of the roads that is now in operation, or that has already been constructed. There is absolutely no authority in the act conferred on the President to lease any of those roads.

Mr. JONES. It says he can otherwise acquire it. I do not know of any other way of acquiring it, except by a long-time lease.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is, if only by purchase he shall acquire it——

Mr. JONES. "By purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

Mr. BRISTOW. Or otherwise. That is the very doubtful point I have in mind.

Mr. JONES. I think probably that that language would authorize the leasing of the road. I do not know what these words would mean if they did not mean that; but while I would rather see these words out and see the straight-out requirement that he should acquire it by purchase or condemnation, I do not believe that there is any possibility, on account of the conditions up there, of the President acquiring by purchase or condemnation or leasing the Copper River Railroad. I would be perfectly willing myself, as the Senator from Iowa suggested, to have a provision absolutely prohibiting that to be done, but it was beyond the power of the conference committee to cover that.

I will say that the conference committee took the language of the House amendment, as it was an amendment, and we endeavored to have it modified in every way that we possibly could to carry out the purposes of the Senate bill in the language of that bill. The House conferees insisted that they would have very great trouble in the House if we changed the language of the House much more than we actually did change it.

It seemed to me that on account of the conditions up there, and because of the language of our bill, which requires the President to locate the line from the coast into the interior, I understand it would authorize him to do absolutely nothing that the provision of the Senator from Iowa would not permit him to do, except, possibly, to make a lease of any existing line and make it a part of the Government line, and also permit him, possibly, to begin the construction into the interior before he had made an arrangement with an existing line; but our language does require him to have a Government line from some point on tidewater to the interior that the Government will absolutely control.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Washington is wrong about the last statement. It does not require the Government to own a line from tidewater. The very purpose of the bill as passed by the House and as accepted by the conferees is to enable the Government to own a line in the interior and connect with a privately owned line and thus reach tidewater.

Mr. JONES. I beg the Senator's pardon. I went over that point when he was not here. That, in my judgment, is not the purpose of the House bill. It was the thought of a good many people without any examination of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. It may not be the purpose, but that is its effect. That is the authority which it gives to the President. But I was about to suggest——

Mr. JONES. That is the very point. The sole issue is right there, to my mind, because if the bill does not require the President to locate a line from tidewater to the interior, then I am with the Senator from Iowa, because I believe that the Government ought to have its line.

Mr. CUMMINS. It does not.

Mr. JONES. I think it does.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am willing to argue that question before the Senate and allow the Senate to decide it.

Mr. JONES. I think that is the whole point.

Mr. CUMMINS. The very thing that is desired is to spend the $35,000,000 in building new roads.

Mr. JONES. I know that is the desire of a good many people in Alaska, but that is not authorized by the bill. Under the bill they can not require to have the President to do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, let us see. The Senator from Washington said that the bill requires the President to acquire a line from tidewater to the interior. If that is so, when does the Senator from Washington think the line already there should be acquired, if it is to be acquired?

Mr. JONES. I think the Senator was not here when I pointed out the difference between his amendment and our provision—that the language of the bill does not require the President to make his arrangement about an existing line before he starts the construction to the interior.

Mr. CUMMINS. So the Senator from Washington is willing to give the President power to build a detached line to the interior knowing that the bill itself absolutely commands him after that to acquire the roads already there to tidewater.

Mr. JONES. Yes; because I am satisfied that the President would not consider the proposition of doing that for one moment. It is not that I want to do it, but simply because it seemed that was the only proposition we could get from the conference committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well.

Mr. JONES. I do not believe the President would think about beginning the construction of a part of a Government line for one moment before he had made a satisfactory arrangement for acquiring the other lines, and if he could not make such an arrangement he would go to some other line.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yet you are willing to give this President or some other President 5 years, 10 years hence, whose name you do not know, whose character you do not know, whose disposition you are entirely unfamiliar with, the power to do the very thing that you say would be fatal to the interests of the whole enterprise. I can not understand why you are willing to do it.

Mr. JONES. I do not suggest that the Senator questions the character, the integrity, the honesty, and the patriotism of any man who may be President when I say I have no doubt that we will ever have any President in whom such a power can not be safely trusted. I am satisfied that we will never have any President who would say we want a line from Cordova to the Tanana, but before he would make any arrangements with the Copper River road he would begin the construction of a part of the line from Tanana down.

Mr. CUMMINS. Let us see about that.

Mr. JONES. It would be so inconceivable that I can not allow a suggestion of that kind to have weight.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose that were so, it is generally asserted that the Copper River & Northwestern road, if bought, will require $22,000,000 or $25,000,000.

Mr. JONES. That is asserted; but I do not think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, that is asserted.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, do you think the President ought to take $22,000,000 or $25,000,000 out of this $35,000,000 appropriation to buy the Copper River & Northwestern road and leave $10,000,000 for the rest?

Mr. JONES. I do not believe the President would consider that for a moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. You do not think so, but you are saying to him he can do it if he wants to. That is my objection to it.

Mr. JONES. We are giving the President, of course, a great deal of power. I have been willing, so far as I am concerned, from the beginning to give the President a great deal of power in this matter, because I have the utmost confidence not only in the present President but in whoever may be President after him.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is the Senator from Washington willing to give him power to take this appropriation of $35,000,000 and spend $10,000,000 of it in extending the Copper River & Northwestern road and $25,000,000 of it then in buying the Copper River & Northwestern road? The Senator from Washington has stated that he thinks the bill absolutely commands the President to acquire a line to the sea; and if he extends the Copper River & Northwestern road he is bound, according to the Senator's interpretation, to buy the Copper River & Northwestern.

Mr. JONES. If I thought that the President would entertain any proposition of that kind for one moment, of course I would not be in favor of giving him the power; but I do not think so. Then, furthermore, there is another point that has some weight with me. Under the bill as it is now reported the President can not complete any purchase until Congress has made the appropriation for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Congress has made the appropriation.

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. It makes an appropriation in this bill.

Mr. JONES. No. We appropriate only $1,000,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. $35,000,000.

Mr. JONES. No. We simply provide that the money spent under the bill shall not exceed $35,000,000, but we appropriate only $1,000,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. But when you have given the President authority to obligate the United States to the extent of $35,000,000, of course the appropriation inevitably follows——

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. Because there is no Congress that has assembled, or that ever will assemble, that would repudiate a contract made by the President of the United States under authority given by Congress.

Mr. JONES. Well, I think that if the President were to make a contract along the lines suggested by the Senator under the authority given in this bill Congress would be very slow about appropriating the money to carry out such a contract, because every man who negotiates with the President and every company that negotiates under this conference report and under this bill would know that any contract the President might make could not be consummated until Congress appropriated the money to carry out such contract; and I think that is a further check upon the exercise of unwise power by the President.

Now, Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, this bill is not as I would like to have it; it is not worded as I would like to have it. I preferred the provision of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], because it was perfectly clear; there was not any doubt about it; and it made a restriction that I should really like to see placed in the bill, which required the President, before he began construction, to make whatever arrangements were necessary to acquire any existing line that he deemed to be necessary; but the other House, as I have said, came to the conclusion that the construction of the language that is in this report would require the President to have a line from the seacoast to the interior, and all of the Senate conferees agreed that that was the logical and reasonable and fair intendment of the language of the report. So we were willing to do that and to omit the provision to require the President to make his arrangements before he began any construction, because we believed that it was inconceivable that any President would be so unwise and act in such an unbusinesslike way as to begin the construction of a line that would become a part of a Government line with an existing road before he had made any arrangement with that road.

But, Mr. President, without going over what I said in the beginning or quoting the language of the report, I will say that I do not believe that there is any doubt whatever that the language employed does require the President, at any rate, to have a Government line from the coast to the interior, and there is not any doubt that it does direct him to begin the construction before he acquires the existing line. Of course, if any Senator fears that the President would begin to construct before making such a line, he is fully justified in voting against this conference report. I can not believe that the President would do it.

Now, just one word with reference to the leasing provision. As has already been said, the Senate voted to authorize the President to lease this line. I was against that proposition. I would much prefer that we should operate it until Congress, at least, otherwise provides; but the Senate voted in that way and the other House voted in that way, so the conferees had nothing to do but to accept that proposition.

Then, the only question between the other House and the Senate was as to the language of the House provision regarding leasing and the language of the Senate provision regarding it. As I say, we started out taking the House text as the basis for our work, because it was an amendment presented and adopted by the other House. We wanted to change the House language just as little as possible where it would convey the meaning that we could agree upon. The House language in regard to the leasing is as follows:

> In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

I do not think, resolving it down to its real meaning, that that means anything except that the President may lease the road for a period of 20 years, as we provided in our provision, if he obtains terms that are satisfactory to him. He is the sole judge; he is the sole arbiter.

There may be some force in the contention that we suggest to the President in this language here that he ought to lease the road. I think there probably is some force in that suggestion, but nevertheless we do not command him to lease it; we do not require him to lease it; we do not compel him to lease it, but we expressly say that in his discretion he may lease it. So, while the language may be unfortunate, still the power is left in the President to determine just as we provided in the Senate, whether or not he can lease it upon terms that are satisfactory to him. If he can not get such terms, of course he will not lease it. It seems to me that is all there is to that provision.

I think that the language of the Senate bill is much better. I think that the language of our bill, or almost the whole of it, is much better than this, because the House bill goes into details, after stating general propositions, and we always get into trouble in legislation when we do that. Nevertheless the House Members wanted to be sure that they would be able to get the report accepted in the House, and we felt that this language in regard to the lease was practically the same in effect as the provision in the Senate bill. Therefore we accepted it, and the President has full authority and full discretion under this language used to accept the terms of any lease that may be proposed or to reject it as he sees fit.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I intend to vote against this conference report, and I am induced to do so more on account of the leasing provision than any other one provision that has been mentioned. Since the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has just discussed that question, and has done it so frankly, as he always does such things, I want to call the matter to the particular attention of the Senator from Washington and of the other conferees, so that, if this report does go back to conference, they may make an attempt to remedy this defect, which I think, to give a fair construction to the Senator's own words, he admits is a defect, and one that the conferees have made no particular effort to rectify.

Like the Senator from Washington, I was one of those who were opposed to giving to the President the right to lease these roads after they were constructed. I did everything I could in my weak way to strike out of the bill that particular provision that gave the President the power to lease the roads. That, as has been well said by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], is now past, because those of us who thought that way were defeated in the Senate, and the provision was left in the bill giving the President the power to lease the roads after they were constructed.

The Senator from Washington has himself admitted that this language brought in by the conferees at least is suggestive to the President that he should first make an attempt to lease the roads before he tries to operate them.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Is the language not something more than suggestive?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the admission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I myself think it is more than suggestive; but the Senator from Washington, who agrees with me that the power to lease ought to be entirely taken away from the President, has in reality, as I understand it—and I should be glad to have him correct me if I am not putting the proper construction on his words—admitted that the language brought in here by the conferees is, at least, not so favorable toward the idea of taking that power away as is the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. JONES. I think that is correct. I admit that myself.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I should like to ask the Senator if there was any controversy in the conference over this particular point?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suppose it would not be improper to answer that question, as some suggestions have been made here as to what occurred in the conference room. I will say to the Senator that I myself suggested that the language did indicate or suggest to the President that he ought to try to lease the roads; but the majority of the conferees thought that the language left the matter entirely to the discretion of the President; and the House conferees were particularly insistent, unless there was something especially pressing or controlling to change their language, that their language should be left, because they said that there was a very strong division over that proposition in the House, possibly much more so than in the Senate. As I say, I suggested that proposition in the conference, but the majority of the conferees thought the provision as reported did leave the matter entirely to the discretion of the President, and so I did not feel justified on that account to refuse to sign the conference report.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the two Houses agree that the President shall have the discretion to operate the road or to lease it, and that no instruction either directly or indirectly be given to him to prefer one to the other,

that ought to be satisfactory to both the House and the Senate, and if the language——

Mr. JONES. I will say that I agree with the Senator on that, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. And if the language here did no more than that, I would not be finding fault with the conference report on this particular account. I want to say to the Senator from Washington and to the other conferees that, in conversations which I had with various Senators here, most of them, at least those with whom I have talked, considered this as a serious defect. I have heard expressions from some of those, at least from one Senator who was one of the original advocates of the Government building the road in Alaska, to the effect that he would rather see the bill fail than to see the language left in the bill just as it is here.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Nebraska is discussing, as I understand, the clause with reference to the leasing contained in the middle of the report, beginning—

To make and establish rules and regulations—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Where the language is:

To make and establish rules and regulations for the control and operation of said railroad or railroads; in his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

If that were a contract running between one individual in private life and another individual there would be no question about the fact, in my judgment, but that he would have to first make every effort to lease the road before he would be permitted to operate it at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator; and that was the idea I was going to convey when I got along a little further in my argument.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, being binding only upon the Executive, it does not make very much difference, as he has a large discretion and not reviewable.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to read, Mr. President, the language of the bill as it passed the Senate. After providing for the construction of the road, the bill as passed by the Senate contained this proviso:

*Provided further*, That the President may cause said road or roads to be operated by contract or lease or by the Panama Railroad Co., but no contract or lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years.

Now I desire to suggest to the Senate, and particularly to the conferees, that that language can not be objectionable if we are going to give to the President a free hand either to operate or to lease; and, as I understand, that was the object of those who insisted that that provision should be retained in the bill. Some of those who voted in favor of retaining that provision in the bill themselves said that personally they would rather it were out, but they wanted to give a broad discretion to the President. When the bill comes back from conference we have the language which has been read by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. If you wanted to leave it open and give the President a free hand, then, why should you not stop with the word "years," so that it would read in this way:

In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years.

I submit that language is fair that far, and gives the President the right either to operate or to lease without either directly or indirectly giving him instruction as to what he had better do first. That language is followed by this clause:

Or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

In other words, if that language means anything, it means that this proposed law instructs the President to lease these roads if he can; and I would say, if we pass it in this form, that it would be his duty to lease them if he could, and that he would only be authorized to operate those roads after he had made an honest and a fair attempt to lease them; so that it is practically an instruction to the President, and says to him, "After this road is constructed, lease it; but if nobody will lease it, operate it." I do not believe that is the kind of a law Congress desires to pass; I do not believe that is what the Senate wants to enact into law; and I believe, Mr. President, if this bill is passed in this form that we will never, so long as that law remains on the statute books, see the Government operating any of the roads which it will construct in Alaska. It would be possible, it is true, for the President to do otherwise. Of course he could make an attempt to lease, and might demand terms that perhaps those who wanted to lease would not be willing to give, but it seems to me that it is an expression on the part of Congress, the lawmaking body, that it shall be the duty of the President to lease if he can do so on any fair or reasonable terms.

Mr. BORAH. And, Mr. President, it is a direct——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. It is a direct instruction from Congress that the Congress desires that the President shall use every reasonable effort to lease before he operates the road; that it is the expressed wish and judgment of Congress that the first step shall be toward a leasing of the road.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; I agree with that exactly. I think that that is a fair construction of the language; and, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am in doubt whether I would support a bill providing for the building of railroads in Alaska if the law provided that, after they were built, they should be leased and not operated by the Government. As to those who are opposed to the Government having anything to do with the building of railroads or their operation, who have voted for this bill on the theory that this is an exceptional case and that it is perhaps a good place for the Government to try out this experiment, it seems to me, in order to be consistent, they ought to insist that the experiment be tried clear through to the other end, and that when the Government undertakes to build railroads, if they consider it an experiment, they should also insist that the Government go on and operate the railroads.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I can not agree with either of the Senators who have discussed this subject as to the meaning of this expression:

Or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

It seems to me that it is at most merely suggestive. It is not a direction that the President shall undertake to lease; but, failing that, that he shall operate the road. If that were the intention of Congress, we should have said, "In the event of inability to lease."

Mr. NORRIS. We might have used other language.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The two words "failure" and "inability" have a very different meaning. What we do say here is that "in the event of failure to lease."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, that failure might arise either from the desire of the President not to enter into a lease at all, when there would be a "failure to lease," or, conceding his desire to make a lease, his inability to procure anybody to take it. If the President concluded that he wanted to operate the road and should make no attempt to lease it, then there would be a "failure to lease" in the meaning of this provision.

Mr. NORRIS. That would be a failure, it is true, but——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So it seems to me, if the Senator will allow me to conclude, that the utmost that can be said about it is that the language is suggestive, but it is not in any manner binding upon the President; in other words, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] suggested a moment ago that if it were a contract between two private parties, it would bind the party against whom it was directed to first attempt to lease.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it would.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think so, because if that had been the intention, the framers of the provision would have used the other word—that "in the event of 'inability' to lease," not "in the event of a 'failure' to lease."

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, the word "failure" implies an effort to do a thing and a falling down upon it; and would not the Senator from Utah say that, before there had been a failure, the President must have in good faith undertaken to lease?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think so; I do not think that the word "failure" can be construed quite so strictly as that——

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Because, if the Senator will allow me to finish, that would be to give the word "failure" the meaning of "unable"; and obviously it has not that meaning. The Senator may fail to do a thing because he does not want to do it, and not because he is not able to do it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not believe that anyone can put that construction on this language. I do not believe we ought to say here that the President is going to disregard the wishes of Congress, if he can gather the wishes of Congress from the law it enacts; and, even though, as the Senator says, the President might be opposed to leasing, as this provision does not compel him to lease therefore he would not lease, and therefore there would be a failure to lease, and then he could operate; we ought not, it seems to me, say that the President, even though he himself were opposed to leasing the road, would not make an honest effort to lease it if the law said he should do so.

Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Suppose he were President and this language were put up to him and he wanted to comply—as he would, of course, if he were President—with the law of Congress, would he feel that he would be justified under this language in going ahead and operating that road without making any effort whatever to lease it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think so, Mr. President. In the first place, the preceding clause is—and that is set off by itself by a semicolon—

In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof.

Now, evidently that leaves it to the discretion of the President to lease or not to lease.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then he has a choice in the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Then what is the use of putting in the other clause? What good does it do?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not finished. Suppose the President concludes that he does not want to lease and does not lease, although he would be able to obtain a lease if he tried, he has exercised his discretion under the terms of the law; he has exercised his discretion against making a lease.

Mr. NORRIS. But he has made no effort to lease.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, he does not have to do so, because "in his discretion" he may lease. That means, if it means anything, that he can exercise his discretion either to undertake to lease or to decline to undertake to lease.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if the Senator's construction is right, what good does it do and what does it add to the proposed law to say:

Or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The words may not have been happily chosen; but I am simply undertaking to show that the President would not be violating the terms of this law if he were to decline to lease at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Technically that may be right.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Or to decline to make any attempt to lease, because, in the first place, the whole matter of leasing is put in his discretion. Then, either having determined that it is not wise to undertake to make a lease, and for that reason exercising his discretion not to make any attempt to do so, or, having made the attempt and failed to make the lease, then the second clause becomes operative upon a failure to lease either by his own desire or by his inability.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was going to say that I am only interested in the matter, perhaps, in an intellectual way, because I am indifferent as to whether or not the language means what the Senator says. I am opposed to the whole proposition; I think it is clearly unwise. I voted against the bill; and I am not so very particular about the details in that respect, but it does seem to me, from a critical consideration of the language, that it can not be made to mean what the Senator claims it means.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator tell the Senate what it does mean if it does not mean that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it means what I have already undertaken to show, and I will repeat it. The language is, speaking of the President—

In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof—

And so on. If there were nothing else in the bill but that, it would be clearly a matter for the President to exercise his discretion——

Mr. NORRIS. I think everybody will concede that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to whether he would make the lease or not.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We will suppose that the President has exercised his discretion, and has determined that he will not undertake to make a lease, deeming it better that he should operate the road himself. Then he looks for his authority to operate the road, and he finds in the next clause the provision—

or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. And that is his authority to operate the road.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In the event of failure. Now, he has failed to make a lease.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The reason the President has failed to lease is because he has deemed it unwise to make the attempt at all, and he is warranted in refusing to make any attempt under the first provision.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What does it mean by saying "in his discretion to lease"?

Mr. NORRIS. Under this clause, "or, in the event of failure to lease"——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us suppose——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Let me answer the Senator. As he has said, when the President looks for his authority to operate the railroad he finds it in this clause.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume without that clause he would not have any right to operate the railroad?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the clause that gives the President authority to operate the railroad. Now, let us see what it is:

Or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same.

When he finds his authority to operate, it is coupled with language that only gives him the authority to operate if there is a failure to lease.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that any well-meaning President would certainly construe that language to mean that he ought not operate the road if he could lease it, because he must first fail to lease it before he can operate it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator did not answer my first question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I am yielding.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When the President is considering the question whether or not he shall lease, he goes to the law and he finds that in his discretion he may lease the railroad. Now, what is he warranted in understanding—that he may or may not exercise his discretion; that he may or may not make any attempt to lease? If he determines that he will make no attempt whatever to lease this property, is he not exercising his discretion under the law?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then he is warranted in declining to make any attempt.

Mr. NORRIS. I think when he construes that with the modifying clause that follows, he is not warranted in operating it unless he has first made an honest attempt to lease it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If that had been the intention of Congress, he would have found language far different. In the first place, there would have been no provision of the law vesting discretion in him. It would have directed that he lease it, and then it would have said that being unable to lease he should operate the road.

Mr. NORRIS. There are two things he can do. There is no dispute but that he can build the road. I think nobody will dispute that. After it is built there are two things to do. One is to lease it and the other is to operate it. Now, let us look for his authority for each one and see what the language is.

First, what is his authority to lease it? Now, we will find that—

In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines—

And so forth.

That is his authority to lease, modified, it is true, by the words "in his discretion." That is his authority to do one of the two things. Let us look at the law and see what his authority is to do the other one, and see whether they are put on an equal basis. The other one, the authority to operate it, comes from this language:

Or, in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same.

I can not for the life of me understand how any fair-minded man in construing that law would not have to say that the real intent of it is to have the President lease the road if he can, and operate it if he fails to lease it.

Mr. LANE and Mr. SUTHERLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. To the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. When the language of the bill is "in his discretion," does it not mean the same as if it said "he is hereby empowered to lease; and in the event of his failure to do so, then he may operate it"? Is not that what it means?

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that construction might be put upon it; yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does not the Senator fail to do a thing notwithstanding he intends to fail?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; I think so. I would fail if I intended to fail, to be sure. There is not any doubt about that, because I would not try.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Equally as though he intended to do the thing and was unable to do it? He has failed in either instance.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Whether he intends to fail or not.

Mr. NORRIS. I think he has failed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I do not agree that there would be a failure, in the contemplation of this provision of the statute, if there were no effort whatever made to lease this road.

We are imposing here upon a public servant the performance of a duty. We say to him, it is true, that he has the discretion to lease; but that discretion is to be exercised with reference to whether or not he can make fair terms, whether or not he can make a desirable contract. When you take it in connection with the proposition that until he does exercise that discretion he is not permitted to operate—because you say "in the event of failure"—it presupposes an effort upon the part of the President for the honest exercise of the discretion which we have vested in him.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe anybody, not even the Senator from Utah, will dispute that the failure presupposes an effort to do something. If the President is going to follow the instructions given him by the law—and I feel that any President would, regardless of his individual opinion as to what ought to be done—it seems to me that if you put this language before it, he would feel in duty bound to make an honest effort to lease the road.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It does not seem so to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It seems to me very clear that taking the two clauses together, one of which invests the President with full discretion—because there is no limitation upon the word "discretion"—to lease these railroads or not, as he pleases, having failed to do it, either because he did not want to or because he could not, then there has been a failure. If I give my promissory note to a bank, I have failed to pay it, whether I make an effort to pay it or not.

Mr. NORRIS. The man who held the note would have a reasonable right to expect that you would make an effort to pay it. If he did not think you would, he would not have given you the money in the first place.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Still, I would have failed if I did not try.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And so the President would have failed if he did not try.

Mr. NORRIS. The President would be different from a man borrowing money from a bank who did not intend to pay it. He would not go on that kind of a theory. He would say, "I have gotten this money, and here is the note, and it is my duty to make an effort to pay it."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He would go to the same dictionary to find out what was meant by the word "failure."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. As I understand, the bill first provides clearly that the President may either lease or operate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it does not say it in those words.

Mr. McCUMBER. But, I mean, it gives him discretion either to lease or to operate.

Mr. NORRIS. It does not say it in that language, by any means.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to get the definition or construction that should be given to the word "failure." Suppose, instead of using the word "failure," it should read "if he fails to lease, he shall then proceed to operate." If we should use the word in that way, would the Senator still claim that the words "if he fails to lease," taken in connection with the previous paragraph, would mean that there must be an attempt? Would he make any distinction between "if he fails to lease" and "in the event of his failure to lease"? Would not the Senator give the same construction in either instance?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know that there would be much difference in the construction if you put it in that language.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I say a word?

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota. If we put it in the identical language that the Senator does, perhaps it would not be quite so forceful, as I understand the words he has used, as it is here; but if we did not want him to make an attempt, we would not use the word "failure." If we wanted to give him full discretion to operate or lease, and express no legislative opinion as to which he ought to do, we would not use the words that are used here. No man in the Senate would use that language if he wanted to give to the President the absolute discretion of leasing or operating without giving him any legislative opinion in the law as to which was his duty. We would say, "The President, in his discretion, may either lease or operate the road."

Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire simply to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if in a former part of this bill or any other part of the bill power had been given to the President to lease or operate, then his suggestion might have had force; but this particular provision is the only provision that gives him power either to operate or to lease.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so. Now I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose we read this clause with these controverted words left out and see how it reads:

> In his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion, under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or to operate the same until the further action of Congress.

That would clearly leave it with the President to choose whichever course he saw fit to pursue, either to lease or to operate, without anything being dependent upon any presupposed effort to do one or the other before he accepted the latter.

Mr. NORRIS. In other words, if that is the construction which is to be put on it, this language ought to be left out?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. NORRIS. That is just what I have been contending for.

Mr. BORAH. If the language is to have any effect at all, if it is not entirely surplusage, it presupposes an effort upon the part of the President to do the thing that is suggested.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. In other words, if this language has any meaning whatever, it is in the nature of an instruction to the President to attempt to lease before he operates; and the President, like a court, if he submits this question to his Attorney General for legal advice as to what it means, will give, if it is possible, full force to all the language used. That is one of the fundamental principles of construction, known to everybody who construes language, and particularly to courts—that if they can they will give effect to all of the sentences used in the disputed matter.

Mr. BORAH. Since this bill came up for discussion and since its passage there has been a vast amount of discussion, in the public prints and elsewhere, as to the inadvisability of the Government operating the road at all. The most severe attack has been made upon the Government operating the road. It was bad enough to build it, but it was worse to operate it. In view of the public discussion, and in view of the public sentiment as thus expressed, this is clearly a suggestion to the President that he must first make an effort to get rid of the proposition to operate the road, and it is a modus operandi by which they will arrive finally at the proposition that it should not be operated at all; that it was the clearly expressed will of Congress that it should be leased, and the President is therefore under obligation to lease this road, even under obligation to lease it at a disadvantage rather than that the Government shall operate it. It will take the vital force out of the proposition of the Government operating the road.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no doubt whatever but that if we agree to this conference report, and make this statutory law, that is what will be immediately said, and I believe it would be a fair construction for the Attorney General to put on the law. I believe it would be the duty of the President, under the law, to lease these roads if he could. I should like to have the Government operate them; and I am satisfied that the President, at least when he delivered his message, was not only in favor of Government building but Government operation of the road. When this bill was before the Senate, and the leasing clause was up for discussion, I called attention to the language of the President himself, and that of the Secretary of the Interior in his report. The President, in the message he delivered to Congress, said, "to build and operate a railroad in Alaska." He used the word "operate."

As the Senator from Idaho said, some newspapers and others have been finding fault with the bill since it passed the Senate and have made an attempt—legitimately, of course; I am not finding fault with it—to get us in a position, I think, where the President would be almost compelled to surrender one proposition in connection with this matter of railroad building in Alaska, namely, the operation of the railroad, and to lease it.

I for one am not willing to go any further than we went in the Senate bill. I was opposed to going that far, and I thought we ought at least to leave it in the law so that the President would have the right to do either one. If it were within our power now to take away from the President the right to lease the road, I should be very glad to have it done; but, as has been said, the parliamentary situation now has gone beyond that point. We ought, however, at least to insist that the discretion shall remain open to the President, and that we shall not give him any instruction in the law or in any other way as a result of which any such meaning could be given to the words that he would first have to make an attempt to lease before he operated.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield. I will yield the floor if the Senator wishes to speak on the matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NORRIS. All right.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, as the Senator from Nebraska does and as the Senator from Idaho does, that there is no need of this phrase in the law. In my judgment it does not add anything to the meaning of the law, but I think it is suggestive. I have already said that; but I do not believe it compels the President in any sense whatever to make an effort to lease.

I wanted to ask the Senator whether he could point us to any dictionary or to any case where it has ever been said that the word "failure" was equivalent to the words "can not." The word "failure" is equivalent to the words "do not," and it is as though the phrase were, "in the event that the President do not lease, he shall do this other thing"; not "in the event that the President can not lease," which would have been the equivalent of the word "unable" or "inability." If that had been the intention of Congress, it would have said either "if the President can not lease" or "in the event of inability to lease" then he shall do the other thing; but it says "in the event of failure," which is equivalent to saying "if he do not lease."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, suppose the President were standing in the position of a private individual, and were seeking to enforce specific performance of a contract, and he should undertake to show that he had a right dependent upon the failure to accomplish another thing. Suppose a man had contracted with him that "in the event you fail to do so and so, he would do so and so," and the individual comes into court and shows that the President did not make any effort at all; that is, that he was calling upon this man to perform his part of the contract without his ever having made any effort to perform the other part. Would the court enforce that contract as a matter of specific performance if the President had failed to make any effort at all to do his part?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; if the contract had provided, as this bill provides, that as to the first alternative he may do as he pleases; that is, if it had said "in his discretion he may do this or the other thing," he may do that thing, "and if he fail to do that thing, he shall do another."

Mr. BORAH. The discretionary power of a public officer and the discretionary power of a judge with reference to these matters is not a mere ipse dixit, nor the unbridled will of either of the individuals, but it is a matter which has a well-defined meaning at law. For instance, a judge is given discretion with reference to certain matters, but he can not act pro forma in regard to them. He must exercise a sound discretion, or else his action will be reviewed and reversed. So if a public officer is called upon to exercise a discretion, it does not mean his mere ipse dixit, or what his will may suggest, without any effort at all to comply with the law; but it means, in this case, an honest effort to make a lease which would be beneficial to the Government. Failing in that, he would be expected to operate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator think when the law says that the President, in his discretion, may lease, that binds him to try to lease?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If it does, then he is not exercising discretion at all. He is proceeding under a mandatory provision of the law.

Mr. BORAH. He has a discretion when he comes to take up the question of the lease with reference to the second proposition, whether he thinks it is advisable or wise, or whether he can get proper terms in a lease. When, however, you say that he must lease, or in the event of his failure to lease he must do another thing, I can not see it otherwise than that it presupposes an effort upon his part fairly and in good faith to try to do the first thing, and that is to lease.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator from Idaho a question. Suppose the Senator from Idaho were in favor of leasing the railroad as opposed to its operation, and he desired by the law to make it certain that the President must lease if he were able to do so, and he could operate it only in case he were unable to lease it. Would he express it in this way?

Mr. BORAH. Not at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would he not say "In the event of his inability to lease," and not use the word "failure" at all?

Mr. BORAH. I undoubtedly would, to be exact; but we are discussing the language as it is.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It seems to me that the Senator from Idaho, in discussing the discretionary power that is vested in the President, entirely overlooks the proposition in the bill before he reaches the point of discretion. It provides in terms, just a few lines above the clause which vests the discretionary power in the President, that he is authorized—

> To receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property, and to perform generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad; to make and establish rules—

And so forth.

Evidently that is equivalent to an instruction to the President to go ahead, not only to locate and construct the road, but further to operate it as a common carrier is operated. Not only that, but before the discretionary clause is reached it provides that no free passes shall be granted, and that the employees can be carried only under the terms of a former act of Congress.

In other words, the bill provides specifically for the operation of the railroad as a common carrier by the President of the United States before it attempts to vest in him a discretionary power to lease.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like the Senator to point out that language.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is just above there. The Senator has House report 341.

Mr. BORAH. I see the language, and I do not want to take issue with anyone who supposes that the President will be compelled to do either thing under this law, because we are dealing with the Chief Executive. I am not speaking now of the individual, but I am speaking of the office. I have no doubt, however, but that this will be interpreted by the President as a clear and explicit suggestion, if not a direction to him, to make an earnest effort to lease this road before he operates it, and that he will feel compelled under the law to exercise his discretion in good faith to enter into a lease. The objection I have to it is that I prefer to make the suggestion to operate rather than to lease.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I must say if I were acting as Executive and had the power of doing the work provided for in this act, I should consider that I was instructed to operate the road first, but would have left in me the discretion to lease it if I saw fit to do so. That was the purpose of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon what is the use of this language: "or, in the event of failure to lease"?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There might have been a happier expression used than the word "failure." We might have used the words "and if he fails to exercise the discretion vested in him, then and in that event he shall do so and so." It would have been a happier expression, but the language means the same thing.

Mr. BORAH. It would have been better, then, to have omitted it entirely.

Mr. NORRIS. Why put it in there at all? What is the use of this language? If the meaning is what the Senator contends, what is the earthly use of the words I have read?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does not impair the force of the act. It does not strengthen it. Better language might have been used. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. NORRIS. But what is the use of using any?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It might have been left out. It was used by the conference committee simply because it is the exact language of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me if those who put the construction on it which the Senator from Oregon does believe, that it means that with the words there, and they will read it with the words out, they will certainly come to the conclusion that it means that with the words out, and therefore there would be no objection to omitting those words.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I contend for that, and that was the view of the conference committee, I think—that it was only intended that in case the President did not exercise his discretion to lease the road he should then go ahead and operate it.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that to be right, there is no earthly use of the words I have just read. If that is the intention, if that is the construction which a fair-minded man must put on this law, you certainly ought to leave out that language, because that would remove it from any doubt and give it the same construction.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho, or to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say to the Senator from Oregon that in looking at the definition of the word "failure" you will find that the dictionary says it means the act of failing or the state of having failed to accomplish a purpose. When the President comes to operate this road he must stand in the position of having failed to accomplish the purpose of leasing, and he can not stand in that position in the eye of the law and in the discharge of a public duty as a public servant until he has made an honest effort to lease it. Failure must necessarily include an effort upon the part of the President, and a failure after the effort is put forward. I do not mean to say that that is what the committee intended, because I think the committee, perhaps, was more in favor of operation than leasing; but that must necessarily be the construction which a court will put upon it. But I am aware it will be construed by the Executive and not necessarily in a technical or strict way.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have listened very attentively to this debate, and I think the Senator from Idaho is absolutely correct in his interpretation of the language—that the President must first make an effort to lease the road, and, failing to do so, that it shall be operated in the name of the United States. I think, however, we need not worry much over this matter. Nobody will ever lease that railroad, costing $35,000,000 or $40,000,000, and pay a dividend to the Government of the United States. We shall not have any trouble on that score.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I simply wanted to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that we undoubtedly would provide a bonus to go along with the railroad. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I think certain Senators would have to forego their opposition to subsidies and grant a very substantial subsidy. That is my judgment.

Mr. NORRIS. To avoid that, Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that if we will eliminate these words and let the Government operate the road, we could avoid the embarrassment of giving subsidies; so, at least, we ought to go that far.

Mr. GALLINGER. And we will pay the subsidy in the deficiency bills when we reach them.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. If the Government operates it, there will be no subsidy.

Mr. GALLINGER. A subsidy would be necessary in either event, in my opinion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate longer. I wish to say, in conclusion, however, that from the admissions of the Senator from Washington, who himself says he thinks this is at least a suggestion to the President, and the construction put upon the law by the Senator from Utah, who practically agrees with that construction, it seems to me that if we went no further and put no other construction on it that would be a sufficient reason why the conference report should be rejected. It is conceded by everybody, I think, as far as they have expressed themselves, that at least this language is a suggestion in favor of leasing.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska is primarily in favor of operation, and so am I. I should like to ask, though, whether he thinks that right would be very valuable if three or four hundred miles of interior line were attached to the Copper River & Northwestern road, and we were trying, as a government, to operate that isolated line in connection with a railroad that belonged to a private corporation that owned the line between our railroad and the seaboard?

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand the Senator's question, it is whether I think it would be a profitable proposition if we should build one end of a trunk line and have the Copper River Railroad at the other end.

Mr. CUMMINS. Whether with the Government operating the interior end and the Guggenheims operating the sea end we would be able to afford very much relief to the people of Alaska?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not believe we would, and of course I am not in favor of anything of that kind occurring. I would not favor the bill if I thought that were going to be the result.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska sees, of course, that we are giving the President—not necessarily the present President, but some President—the power to do that very thing.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, that goes back to the Senator's proposition which he has so ably argued. I agree mainly with what he has said, but the Senator from Iowa must understand that I was not depreciating that point at all. I was arguing an entirely different one.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know it.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to argue it again, because the Senator from Iowa had already covered the ground much better than I could.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am in entire concurrence with what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Inasmuch as we are both in favor of operation rather than leasing, and the President will have to determine as between operation and leasing, the Senator from Nebraska can easily see that if we own two or three hundred miles in the interior and the Morgan people own two or three hundred miles running out from the seacoast, the President would very likely come to the conclusion that rather than operate his end he would lease it.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is the milk in this coconut.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a very good suggestion on this point, and I hope if the bill goes back to the conference that the conferees will take it into consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think that under the bill, either as it was passed by the Senate or as it was reported by the conference committee, the unfortunate possibilities which have been described by Senators could very well occur, and I think that they could occur under the one as well as under the other. I voted, as did the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Nebraska, when the bill was pending in the Senate against the discretionary power to lease, but nevertheless we were outvoted and that power was contained in the bill as it passed the Senate, in my judgment, to as full an extent as it is contained in the form reported by the conference committee.

The bill as it passed the Senate provided that the President "may cause said road or roads to be operated by contract or lease." The language of the bill as reported from the conference committee is that the President "may in his discretion lease said railroad or railroads." It takes an astute lawyer like the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Iowa, and the

Senator from Idaho to distinguish any substantial difference in the effect of this language. One trouble on the part of courts is that there is so much ingenuity and ability expended by lawyers and judges in finding out something that is different from the very plain meaning of the language.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Washington has been engaged in that business quite as long as the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That does not justify it, of course.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator from Washington think that it is a pretty good idea to expend our technical knowledge here rather than after the bill has been signed by the President?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Undoubtedly. The Senator's object is exactly the same as mine, so far as shaping the bill to at least leave out of it anything that would encourage the leasing of a railroad after it shall have been constructed; but, in view of the situation that we are in here, I fail to see any such difference in the language of the two bills as would justify one in voting against the conference report. Under either form it is entirely possible that an economic tragedy might happen in the exercise of the discretion vested in the President. But we need not suppose that it will happen because possibly it may happen. I think it would be a vast misfortune if the President should use his discretion to purchase the Guggenheim railroad at undoubtedly a liberal price, as the Government would always have to pay, and turn around and lease that road back to the Guggenheims on such terms as the Government would be called on to make as were profitable to them. That is one of the possibilities under the bill. But those of us who voted for the bill have been induced, through the great desire we have to see something done in Alaska, to see some steps made toward the development of the rich dormant resources of that vast land, to take those chances.

As to the other objection which the Senator from Iowa urged with a great deal of cogency, I am not entirely in agreement with him upon that proposition; certainly not to such an extent as, it seems to me, ought to induce us to defeat the bill at the final stage of its progress.

I do agree with the Senator from Iowa that it would be a misfortune for the Government to have anything to do with the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, either to purchase it or to build an extension to it and operate it jointly with the present railroad. That road is already there, and it will remain there whether we pass this bill or not. It is in the power of the Government, to a certain extent at least, to compel a reasonable use and operation of that railroad, and it would be still more in the power of the Government, and still more practicable, to compel reasonable rates, to prevent extortion, to prevent discrimination and lack of uniformity in the service and in the rates of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, if the Government, unfortunately, should own a railroad from the terminus of the Copper River & Northwestern into the Yukon Valley, connecting with water transportation on the 2,000 miles of navigable water of that stream.

I can readily see the full power and full opportunity of the Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission and the President, by the rules and regulations which may be made under the inherent authority granted by the bill to insure a reasonable joint traffic arrangement between the extension of the road which the Government might possibly build—but which I hope it will not build and which it ought not to build—and that part of it which is now owned by the Alaska Syndicate.

It will cost, in my judgment, though Senators have differed with me in that opinion, at least $25,000,000 to buy the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, and I am not in favor of the Government expending that amount of money to buy a railroad which is already in operation in Alaska, simply in order to acquire the difference between Government operation and private operation, even though we should build the 300 miles of extension from Chitina to Fairbanks.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The junior Senator from Washington and myself agree upon that entirely. I think it would be utterly unpardonable for the Government to buy that railroad. I hope that the junior Senator from Washington has noted the admission made by or construction given by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], one of the conferees. I suppose that the other conferees, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], concur with the senior Senator from Washington in his interpretation of the conference report. The senior Senator from Washington has said that the bill as reported by the conferees compels the President to acquire the railroad from the interior to the seacoast, and if the President designates the route now occupied by the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad as the route or one of the routes to the interior, then he is compelled to acquire that railroad.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that is the object which the Senator desires.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not want to acquire it at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Iowa proposed the amendment which was incorporated into the bill as it passed the Senate which required the President to do that.

Mr. CUMMINS. But that is an obstacle in the way of acquiring it and not an instrumentality for acquiring it. But pursuing the thought, I wanted to ask the Senator from Washington a question after I made the statement. If it is the view of the conference committee that their bill means that, if the President adopts that route as one of the routes or the only route to the interior, he must buy or acquire the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, then the only difference between that construction of the conference report and the position for which I am struggling is that I say if he does it, he must do it before we expend money in extending it, for I know, and the Senator from Washington knows, that if we attempt to acquire the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad now and any such value as he has suggested is put upon it, that route will be at once abandoned; but if we spend ten or fifteen million dollars in extending it, then we are at the mercy of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, because we not only have to acquire it in order to preserve what we have expended, but we have added millions of dollars to its value.

I ask the Senator from Washington whether, if the interpretation put upon the bill by his colleague is correct, we ought not to say now that before the United States expends this money in the extension of that road we shall find out what it will cost us to buy it, so that the President can know what expenditure will have to be made before he adopts the route and expends the money.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am opposed, Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator's question in the first place, to the purchase of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad at all, and consequently I am opposed to putting anything into the bill which deals with that subject. I am going on the assumption and in the hope that the President will not purchase the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad.

In further answer to the Senator's question, I fail to see any substantial result which would be accomplished by changing the language in the manner the Senator desires. If the President approves the plan to develop the Copper River & Northwestern route extending into the Yukon, and as a part of that plan under the construction of the law the Senator from Iowa says must be put upon it, that he shall be required to acquire the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, if he knows that he must acquire that railroad he will take into consideration in making his plan the amount of money which it would cost the Government to buy it, whether he buys it before or after he makes the extension.

Mr. CUMMINS. But——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Furthermore, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not believe there would be any substantial difference in the amount the Government would be required to pay for that road if it should unfortunately acquire it at any time, whether we buy it before we build the extension or whether we buy it after we build the extension, because if we proceed to acquire it everyone knowing the minute that we take the first step in that direction—and this was argued in the Senate when the bill was on its passage—not only that it was the intention of the Government to extend it to the Yukon but that the Government would be required to do so, it would instantly acquire the value which would come from that knowledge and from that law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is a provision in the proposed law as it is reported from the conference committee which fixes the measure of value for this road at the physical valuation. It is true that it has left out of the Senate bill the words "the cost of reproduction," which was a much better provision than that which was reported from the conference committee; but, nevertheless, the proper construction of the words "physical valuation" will have substantially the same meaning as would be given to "physical valuation and the cost of reproduction," because the two, properly defined, are substantially synonymous.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Unless the Senator wants to ask me a question, I have concluded what I desire to say.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do. It will be remembered that the construction which I stated as being the construction of the Senator's colleague is not the interpretation that I put upon the

conference report. I used it solely as the interpretation that has been stated for it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand the Senator supposed that that construction would be put upon it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes. I do not concur in it, and I will give my reasons for that presently. But the Senator from Washington is mistaken, I think, in one thing, and that is in assuming that the standard or test of ascertaining value, first the cost of reproduction and second the value of the physical property or physical value of the property are the same. I think they are very different. I do not know whether the Senator from Washington——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I admit, Mr. President, that there may be a difference, but whether there is a difference and the extent of the difference will depend very largely upon the circumstances.

Mr. CUMMINS. In the case we have had occasion to examine recently in connection with the appointment of a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission there was found to be a difference of 47⅞ per cent between the cost of reproduction and the physical value of the property. That is to say, there is what is known as a going value, which inheres in the physical property and which adds to the value of the physical property, which is not a franchise value or an intangible value in that sense. If it should be found in the future that the going value is to be considered in determining the cost of the property condemned by the Government, there might be a very vast accession to the value of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, with an extension reaching to Fairbanks, on the Yukon, as compared with its present value.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that under the circumstances surrounding the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad the physical value would probably be less than the cost of reproduction instead of more. In the first place, the road was built under a peculiar sort of contract, by which the contractor got 10 per cent of the money he spent. Of course, there was not any especial desire to limit the expenditures under that sort of a contract. I do not mean to say that there was any effort to make the expenditure unduly large, but it is undoubtedly true that there were a great many difficulties of construction of the road and, as a railroad, it has very little value at the present time, except to the Guggenheims in getting out their ores from the Bonanza copper mines. They are fortunately situated in regard to it in the circumstance that they did not have to put up the money to build the railroad. They induced Mr. Morgan to do that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think I am in sympathy with the proposition of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I voted against this bill. I voted against it because I do not believe in Government ownership or Government operation of railways. I believe that the Government should exercise only the function of governing and make the laws that shall govern the operation of railroads and other business rather than attempt to do the business itself. I am still firm in my conviction that the Government ought not to enter the private industrial domain in opposition and in competition with its own people.

But the Senate and the House have seen fit to vote that we shall construct the railway, and inasmuch as it is to be constructed out in Alaska I am perfectly willing—in fact, a little desirous now—that the Government shall try its 'prentice hand in the operation of railroads just as far from the United States as it is possible.

Therefore, if I am compelled to differ from the Senator from Iowa upon this proposition by my vote, it is a difference in the matter of a conviction as to what certain words mean. I put to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] the question whether he can give a different construction to the words "in the event he fails to lease" from the words "in the event of failure to lease"? The Senator admitted that there might be a distinction in the use of the two terms. The Senator from Iowa immediately stated that the only power for operation was in the subsequent paragraph, which related to the leasing, and therefore, as it was in a different paragraph and there was no provision in a preceding section relative to the right of the Government to operate, my contention could not be correct.

Then I thought I was right in my assertion that there was a provision preceding this which allowed the President to either operate or lease, and while I was looking it up the attention of the Senate was called to the same provision by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I think the Senator will find that preceding the proposition of which he speaks is the proposition clearly granted that the President may either operate or lease.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I may have been inaccurate in the way I stated the matter. I can not recall just what language I used. My purpose was to say that there is not in the bill, as I recall it, any authority to the President to operate in direct terms the railroads to be built, except in the clause which was under discussion.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] called attention to the fact that there was authority given to make rates and exercise the other functions of a common carrier. That I know, but I do not believe that the Senator from North Dakota will find in the bill the authority to operate in those terms except in the clause that was so long under discussion. If I am wrong about that, I will be very glad to have the Senator call my attention to it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator is in error, and I will call his attention to it in a moment. The whole question devolves upon the construction of the word "failure." I generally doubt my own convictions, when they do not agree with those of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the constitutional lawyer from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and also the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]——

Mr. CUMMINS. It has nothing to do with the Constitution. I thank fortune for that.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I have been in the habit of forming my own judgment upon the construction of words and I am compelled to follow that ancient rule of mine. I know of no word in the English language that has not some degree of mobility about it. That is not only a feature of the beauty but of the force of expression that may be obtained by the use of words in our language.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in one moment. So the question arises here whether the word "failure" means an ineffective attempt or whether the proper construction would be a lack of attempt. That depends entirely upon the language both preceding and succeeding. It depends simply upon its connection with other words and the intent and purpose of the balance of the provisions of the bill.

I will call the attention of the Senator to the provision which authorizes the President to operate. He will find it in these words:

> To receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property and to perfrom generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad.

He is not only authorized to take the money but to perform all the usual duties of a carrier by railroad. While that might have been expressed in simpler language in a statement that he might operate it, I can not imagine how you can give the power to exercise all the rights and duties of a common carrier and also to receive the compensation for the transportation of passengers and freight unless you concede that the power was given in the words "to operate" that railroad.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator, with his usual clearness and conclusiveness and remorseless logic, has demonstrated to a certainty that the words "in the event of failure to lease" have no business in there at all, and if they have any meaning at all it is to suggest strongly to the President that he proceed with the leasing first.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has stated that before. If he means to suggest to me that this might be expressed in some other way more clearly, I will agree entirely with him; but I will not agree with him that the word "failure" here means after an ineffectual attempt. To that extent I disagree with him, although I may agree with him that it was unnecessary to put those words there. However, I am speaking now upon the question whether preceding the use of this word the power to either operate or lease appears in the instrument. I think the Senator will agree with me that this language clearly gives the power to operate and to receive compensation for that operation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have never doubted that. I would not doubt that if there was nothing more given than the power to construct. I think the mere fact of ownership would carry with it the power to use the property created or constructed.

Mr. BORAH. That is not true, though.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not agree with that.

Mr. BORAH. That would refute and answer the Senator's argument with reference to the Panama Canal.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, the Senator has answered his own argument. As I was about to say, when he made the delightful allusion to the Senator from North Dakota, undoubtedly what the Senator from Idaho meant by his reply was that the Sen-

ator from North Dakota was making the most persuasive argument possible in behalf of our position, and I think he was. I think he agrees in the object sought to be attained; but what I said, or intended to say, was that the word "operate" had not been used; that distinct, definite power had not been given in the previous part of the bill. If it is true—and I do not question it—that the inferential power to operate exists in the previous part of the bill, why in the world did the conference committee follow that statement with one to the effect that, if there was a failure to lease, then the President might operate? Why duplicate the authority? If he had been given that full authority, as I am ready to admit, why repeat that, in the event of a failure to lease, he shall operate, when that duty had already been charged upon him? It can be susceptible of no other explanation than that Congress wanted to arrange an order in which these respective powers should be exercised—first, the power to lease, and, second, the power of operation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall have to disagree with the Senator again upon his first premise, that the right of ownership or the right to construct carries with it the right to operate. It is not necessarily so. The property as constructed may belong to the Government, but all of the power in reference to its operation must be granted by the Congress; and unless Congress, in its supreme power over the matter, has granted authority to the President to operate, he would have no authority to operate the road simply because we empower him to construct it.

With that statement, I will come to the next proposition of the Senator, that this power is a mere inference. I deny that it is an inference. I do not know any clearer way you could indicate the operation of a railway than by saying that you shall do everything that is usual and ordinary for a common carrier by railroad to do, and that in addition you shall receive the fees and compensation for that service. That is no inference; that is a direct authority to operate and to receive the compensation for that operation.

We have, then, in this proposition, first, authority on the part of the Government of the United States to operate or, in the discretion of the President, to lease. We can not avoid those two propositions. The President has the right to operate, under the language which I have read, and, in his direction, he has the right to lease. Now, in the event of his failure to lease, the bill then provides how the operation may be carried on. It has, first, provided for the operation; then it says "in the event of his failure to lease." What does that mean when taken in connection with the previous declaration that he can either operate or that he can lease? The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I know, says that the word "failure" there means that he must first make an attempt to lease and, if he fails, that he may then proceed to operate; but if we once admit that the power to operate or to lease is given in the alternative in the first instance, then an entirely different construction, it seems to me, will follow. The meaning that then should be given to the word "failure" would be "neglect"—if he fails to do or if he neglects to do the one, that he shall then proceed to do the only other alternative that is given him.

With that view of the proper construction to be given the language, I shall vote, in order to get rid of this bill, that the conference report does not compel the President to first attempt to lease the road before he proceeds in the matter of its operation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have taken some part in this discussion with reference to the interpretation of this clause, and I am quite certain that the interpretation for which we have contended is the correct one. I feel that this bill will unfortunately be construed as an instruction to the President that it is the desire of Congress that he shall lease the road rather than operate it; but I do not think I shall vote to return the bill to conference. My reason for that is that I am advised by those who are in touch with the situation and by those who are in a position to know, that it would endanger the passage of the bill; that there are conditions surrounding the passage of the measure at this time which have been accentuated by reason of conditions on the outside—public discussion, and so forth—which might lead to a long delay and possibly to the defeat of the measure. I prefer infinitely more, Mr. President, to have the measure as it is than to have no measure at all, although I should have liked very much to have seen the language so clear and conclusive as to the question of operation and leasing that there could be no doubt as to the desire of Congress to operate rather than to lease. But I do not feel that I would be justified in jeopardizing the measure on this account, for after all the President will likely do what seems best in the light of public opinion as to leasing or operating.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Oregon, for information, if there is not an opportunity to send this bill back to conference and to have this language corrected? It is indefinite and not specific enough.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, there is not any question about the power of the Senate; they can send the report back to conference if they will; but I have not any doubt, in my own mind, as to what will be the fate of the bill if it goes back to conference and an amendment is made there which would not be acceptable to the other House. This matter was very thoroughly discussed there, and was very thoroughly discussed in the Senate. It is simply a question of passing the bill with that language in it, subject to criticism, or defeating the bill with language in it which meets the concurrence of the whole Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not exactly understand the Senator. Do I understand that, if this bill goes back to conference, there is no possibility of an easy adjustment of a matter which is not really a matter of dispute? I do not understand that there is any dispute as to the real desire of both Houses of Congress in this matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think, Mr. President, that we discussed this matter at very great length—this very clause—and I do not believe it would be possible to change the language of the bill with the possibility of again getting it through both bodies.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Certainly the conference committee have no other desire, as I have understood from the discussion, than to give the discretion to the President as to which he should do—leasing the roads or operating them under Governmental control. I understand that that is the purpose of the conference. Now, it has developed in the discussion on the floor that that purpose is not carried out in the view of some of the Members of the Senate by the language of the conference report. I can hardly understand, if we send the report back with the simple suggestion of a change in the language so as to meet the view of both the House and the Senate conferees and the House and Senate, how it would endanger the bill.

Mr. LANE. That was my object. I understood from one of the members of the committee, at least I gained the impression, that perhaps it would not be a difficult matter to arrange when their atttention is called to the effect of what in my opinion is rather an important matter.

I am in favor of the railway in Alaska and the opening up of that country, but I want to see the money expended in a way which will be of the greatest benefit to the people of Alaska and in which the Government will take the fewest chances of making a failure in the expenditure of the money. If this binds the Government to the construction of a railroad at the end of an existing road, so that the Government will not be in possession of an outlet to the sea in addition, and then it is to come up in contact with a glacier or buy an interest in a glacier, I am opposed to it. I would as soon own a railroad across a live and active volcano as I would one crossing in front of a glacier. I would be put out of my misery quicker perhaps with the volcano, but not more surely than I would in bucking a glacier.

Another thing I think should be made clear, and that is that it is the wish of this body, as I think it is, that the Government, through the President, should operate this road, as the first choice, instead of to lease it. The President is instructed, almost ordered, to lease the road, and in the event that he fails to do so, then he may operate it. I think that clause is open to difference of construction and will do harm in the future. I fear that it is going to lead to trouble, and that it ought to be changed. I should like to ask the committee themselves if they could not agree to take the bill back to conference for a few days and see if that language can not be improved so as to make it more clear and make sure that the bill will accomplish the results which we all want to attain.

I do not like to vote against the adoption of this conference report, yet I feel almost as if I were bound to do so. I think the language is loosely drawn and that we are not going to get the benefit that we should receive or have the assurance of results that we should achieve in the expenditure of so large a sum of money.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am unwilling to believe that a reconsideration of the questions that have been presented to-day in the light of the argument that has been made upon the conference report will imperil the passage of the bill. I am not impressed with these vague suggestions that somebody who formerly was for the bill will at another time be against the bill. I have too much confidence in the stability of human nature; I have too much confidence in the prepared and reflective judgment of Members of Congress; I have too much con-

fidence in the justice of the end sought in this bill to be at all alarmed with regard to its ultimate fate. It will pass Congress, and it ought to pass Congress, but it ought not to pass until we have made every fair and reasonable effort to secure those things that we believe ought to be secured.

The argument or address made by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has greatly strengthened the attempt that I made in an earlier part of the day to show that the bill should be changed. I especially ask the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. The Senator from Washington says that the proper interpretation of the bill as reported by the conference committee requires the President to acquire a railroad or two railroads from the sea to the interior of Alaska. I should like to know from the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Nevada whether they concur in that interpretation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, my interpretation of the bill is that the President is required to construct a road from tidewater into the interior of Alaska, to the navigable waterways in Alaska. In locating and constructing that road he is at liberty to parallel any line that is built there or to build a line over any route he wants to or, if he finds it is cheaper and better for the Government of the United States, he can acquire a road already constructed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely. I should like to know if the Senator from Nevada holds that view.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I hold that view, and I also hold the view that the President can be trusted to build that road properly; that he can be trusted to build it from the seacoast to the interior, instead of from the interior to the seacoast, and therefore I see no necessity for amending the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I may say, in passing, that I do not concur in that interpretation of the bill as reported by the conference committee, but for the purposes of this argument I accept it. So we are finally reduced to this issue: The conference committee has a bill which requires the acquisition of a railroad or two railroads from the southern shore of Alaska into the interior, and the authority and direction given to the President would not be fulfilled until the Government had acquired such a railroad or railroads.

The proposal that I make is that, before we expend money in the extension of railroads already there, some provision be made for the acquisition of the railroads that are there, if they are to form a part of the governmental line. The proposal of the conference committee is that the President shall be authorized to extend these lines and then acquire the roads already there. The issue is nicely defined; it is clear-cut.

I do not want to give the President of the United States or any other person the authority to build a line of railroad from the northern terminus of either of the railroads there until we know whether we are to acquire the existing lines and what will be the cost of acquiring the existing lines. I am so fully persuaded that this position is unassailable that I intend to vote for a motion to recommit the report to the conference committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the fact—I know the Senator wants to be fair—that this bill provides, as the Senator will see if he will refer to the conference report, in express terms that the President shall have the power to construct a railroad? It provides that he shall have the power—

> To designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska.

That is the power given to him to designate and to locate a route from tidewater, from one of the open ports to the interior of Alaska. The Senator suggests that the President has not power to acquire, if he wants to acquire, one of the roads that has already been constructed; but that power is expressly given him if he sees fit to acquire the road, and the methods are pointed out by the bill itself, because it says, in express terms, if the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, that the President shall have power—

> to purchase—

This is further down in the bill, defining further his powers—

> to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire upon such terms as he may deem proper any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him.

And the use is declared a public use, and the power of eminent domain is conferred upon him. What more power could you give the President?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not questioned that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator said a little while ago that the President did not have the power——

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And insisted that the power should be given him; and not only that, but that Congress should be advised practically what it would cost him to acquire that road if he saw fit to acquire it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt whatever that the President has the power of acquiring those railroads under this act. I have no doubt that he may designate the route, the location of the line, from any of the harbors on the south coast to the north, but if it is the purpose of the United States to acquire either of the railroads which are there now, I want the cost of that railroad to be ascertained before we have made it valuable by the extension of the line.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, just a moment. I suggest to the Senator that the radical difference between the Senator and myself is that I have absolute confidence in the integrity of purpose and the ability of the President to do the right thing, which the Senator does not seem to have; and there is not a bit more power conferred upon the President of the United States in this case than was conferred upon the President with reference to the Panama Canal.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, vastly more, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no comparison between the two, but I will not enter upon that inquiry.

I have confidence in the Senator from Oregon; but if I were a millionaire, which I am not, and I were about to invest my money in the building of a railroad in Alaska, I would not be willing to say to the Senator from Oregon, "Go on and build this railroad wherever you like; acquire whatever roads you want to acquire; and not only acquire whatever roads you want to acquire, but when you want to acquire them." I think the custodians of the public purse ought to have a little more regard for the rights of the people than to repose such vast, unlimited, and unrestricted authority in the hands of any one man. The same reasoning would lead us to the opinion that this country ought to be governed by a single man, without limitation as to law, without limitation put about him by any representative body of men. I know the Senator from Oregon does not mean that, and yet such it seems to me is the tendency of the times.

Mr. President, if the suggestion that I have made prevents but one thing—and that is a thing which every Senator here has declared ought not to be done—I do not know why we should bestow the power upon the President to do it.

Moreover, the Senator from Oregon has great confidence, as have I, in the Chief Executive. Years may elapse before the full authority granted by this bill is exercised, and we can not assume—I am sure the Senator from Oregon will not assume—that every man who may occupy the presidential office can hold his confidence in the same high and complete degree that is true of the present occupant of that office.

Moreover, the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon have both said that the only objection raised upon the part of the House conferees, the only objection on the part of the House itself, is that in some fashion the Senate bill might be used to the advantage of the owners of the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad. I can not believe that any such suggestion was ever made sincerely; but grant that it was, it is the easiest thing in the world for the conferees to remove that objection and to phrase this idea in such language as to make it incapable of being construed, even by one who is opposed to the bill itself, to any such effect. Therefore it seems to me that the report should be recommitted, and that we should make one more earnest and sincere effort to do the thing that every Senator here agrees should be done.

I made a motion, Mr. President, when I was on my feet before, but I have been advised by those who are more skillful than I in parliamentary law that there are some things included in it that can not be properly embraced in the motion to recommit. I therefore withdraw that motion, and simply move to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada will state his point of order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I make the point of order that that motion is not in order; that it is involved in the original motion to agree to the conference report.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I was just going to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that the proper course would be to vote down the motion to agree to the conference report, and then, if that is done, he can make the motion to recommit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if Senators will turn to the precedents they will find that it has been frequently ruled—never otherwise except in one instance, and that ruling was subsequently overruled—that a motion to recommit is in order. I read from Gilfry's Precedents:

Mr. Sherman, the President pro tempore, on January 14, 1887, decided that a motion to recommit the conference report on the bill "to regulate commerce," with instructions, was not in order, according to a previous decision of the Senate. * * * He held a simple motion to recommit in order.

The same ruling was made by Mr. Edmunds and others. So I think, Mr. President, the precedents of the Senate justify the Senator from Iowa in making his motion.

I would refer to page 189, the fourth paragraph, headed "Conference reports may be recommitted." I shall not stop to read it. The first sentence is:

It is in order in the Senate to recommit a conference report to the committee of conference, but not with instructions.

And it is elaborated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion, of course, that it is in order to recommit a conference report; but the Chair, as now constituted, is of the opinion that the original motion to agree to the conference report is first in order. That does not prevent its being sent back to conference if the original motion is not adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not take issue with the Chair; but it seems to me that under the precedents of the Senate the motion made by the Senator is manifestly in order at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been looking up the matter all day, and there are precedents on all sides of the question.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not found the others, but perhaps they exist.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It seems to the Chair that it is not at all material which motion is put first, because the result will be exactly the same.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall not attempt to discuss the question of order, because I do not feel competent to speak upon the parliamentary law relating to the subject; but it seems to me that a motion to recommit ought to take precedence of a motion to agree. The Senators can not fairly express their views upon the subject upon the motion to agree until they have tested or voted upon the question of recommitment. However, I am not sufficiently familiar with the matter to advise the Chair, and therefore must submit to whatever ruling the Chair may make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not at all desirous of being arbitrary about the matter; but it is the impression of the Chair that if the Senate wants the bill to go back to conference it will not agree to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say so, the principle which underlies all motions in regard to conference reports is that the motion must have precedence which tends most quickly to bring the two Houses into accord. I think that general principle is maintained by all the best writers on the subject—that the motion that will bring the Houses together most quickly has precedence. Therefore a motion to concur must take precedence of any other motion, according to that general principle, which I believe to be a sound one.

If the conference report is disagreed to, then it is unquestionably open to asking for a new conference, to appointing conferees with instructions, to recommittal, or to anything that the body chooses to do. I confess, however, that I do not see how you can set aside the motion which will bring the two Houses most quickly into accord.

Mr. GALLINGER. Without desiring to enter into any controversy about the matter, I will ask the Senator a question. If the conference report is rejected, will it not automatically go back to the conferees?

Mr. LODGE. Not necessarily. It will not go back to the conferees unless steps are taken to send it back to the conferees.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is mistaken in that.

Mr. LODGE. I think not. I think this body is not bound to have a further conference unless it asks for it. It may want new conferees, and it is open to it to appoint them then. My point goes simply to the general principle governing what I think is the precedence of the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, the question is, Shall the Senate agree to the conference report?

Mr. CUMMINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gore | Martine, N. J. | Sheppard |
| Bankhead | Gronna | Norris | Shields |
| Brady | Hughes | Oliver | Smith, Ga. |
| Brandegee | James | Overman | Smith, Md. |
| Bristow | Jones | Owen | Smith, Mich. |
| Bryan | Kenyon | Page | Smoot |
| Burton | Kern | Perkins | Sutherland |
| Catron | La Follette | Pittman | Thomas |
| Chamberlain | Lane | Poindexter | Thompson |
| Chilton | Lea, Tenn. | Pomerene | Thornton |
| Clapp | Lee, Md. | Ransdell | Townsend |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lewis | Reed | Weeks |
| Cummins | Lodge | Robinson | West |
| Dillingham | McCumber | Saulsbury | Williams |
| Gallinger | Martin, Va. | Shafroth | |

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on account of illness. I also wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and to say that he is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. REED. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE] on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent on account of sickness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am not opposed to this bill. I voted for it when it passed the Senate. I do believe, however, that it should be recommitted to the committee of conference so that the provisions that seem to be ambiguous may be made plain. Knowing, as I do, the patriotism of the membership of the other House, I can not believe that it would in any way endanger this bill to send it back to the committee of conference in order to have its provisions made plain.

It seems to me that there is but one interpretation to be placed on this language. The language of the bill makes it the duty of the President of the United States to lease these railroads, but in the event of failure to lease them he may operate them. I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report, but not because I am opposed to the legislation. I heartily favor the appropriation of this amount of money by the United States for the purpose of constructing and operating, but I believe the Government should operate as well as construct a railroad in Alaska. I can not, however, make myself believe that we should pass this bill in such form that it can be misunderstood by anybody. I believe it is our duty to make the language so plain that it can not be misconstrued. Certainly it seems to me the membership of this body and the membership of the other body should be able to write a statute so plain that it could not be misunderstood.

No one can have any higher opinion than I have of the honesty, the integrity, or the good judgment of the President of the United States; but it is our duty to make the law plain. It is our duty to write it in such language that it can not be misunderstood.

I believe there is at least one provision in this bill that is ambiguous. I believe the bill should go back to the conference and be corrected, and if is not sent back and corrected I can not vote for the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Senate by illness. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CATRON (when Mr. FALL's name was called). My colleague is necessarily absent.

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] on account of sickness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. During his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present and I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I am paired with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], and on account of his absence withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the affirmative). I inadvertently voted a moment ago. I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Since making the announcement which I made a few moments ago, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] informs me that if his colleague were present he would vote "nay" upon this question, the same way I would vote. I therefore take the liberty of voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He has a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I notice that he is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], and will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—42.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Jones | Overman | Shields |
| Bankhead | Kern | Owen | Shively |
| Borah | Lane | Perkins | Smith, Ariz. |
| Brady | Lee, Md. | Pittman | Smith, Ga. |
| Bryan | Lewis | Poindexter | Smith, Md. |
| Chamberlain | McCumber | Pomerene | Smith, S. C. |
| Fletcher | Martin, Va. | Ransdell | Thompson |
| Gore | Myers | Robinson | Thornton |
| Hollis | Nelson | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Hughes | Newlands | Shafroth | |
| James | O'Gorman | Sheppard | |

NAYS—29.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brandegee | du Pont | Norris | Townsend |
| Bristow | Gallinger | Oliver | Warren |
| Burton | Gronna | Page | Weeks |
| Catron | Hitchcock | Reed | West |
| Clapp | Kenyon | Smith, Mich. | Williams |
| Clark, Wyo. | La Follette | Smoot | |
| Cummins | Lodge | Sterling | |
| Dillingham | Martine, N. J. | Thomas | |

NOT VOTING—24.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bradley | Culberson | McLean | Stone |
| Burleigh | Fall | Penrose | Sutherland |
| Chilton | Goff | Root | Swanson |
| Clarke, Ark. | Johnson | Sherman | Vardaman |
| Colt | Lea, Tenn. | Simmons | Walsh |
| Crawford | Lippitt | Stephenson | Works |

So the conference report was agreed to.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM FLOODS IN TEXAS (S. DOC. NO. 444).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $9,709.71 to reimburse certain appropriations of the Quartermaster Corps for the value of supplies furnished for the relief of sufferers from the floods prevailing in Texas during the month of December, 1913, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 445).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting items of appropriation for consideration in connection with the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, one involving an appropriation for the marine hospital, San Francisco, Cal., $8,000, and the other embracing a credit in the accounts of S. R. Jacobs, disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, $3.61, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KERN. I present a number of memorials, signed by 550 members of the Alliance of German Societies in the State of Indiana, and also a number of memorials, signed by 305 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented petitions, signed by 200 citizens of Bicknell, 600 citizens of Warren, 300 citizens of Richmond, 450 citizens of Knightstown, and 200 citizens of Liberty, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Stone River Post, No. 65, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, and a memorial of Rich Mountain Post, No. 42, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, and of Rich Mountain Corps, No. 125, Woman's Relief Corps, of Lebanon, Ind., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of General Francis Marion Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of Rochambeau Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Hazel Glen Lodge, No. 1043, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Pittsburgh; of Conshohocken Council, No. 241, Order of Independent Americans, of Conshohocken; of Washington Camp, No. 576, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Halifax; of Washington Camp, No. 329, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Reading; of Washington Camp, No. 585, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Grover; of sundry citizens of Ellwood City; of Washington Camp, No. 557, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lancaster; of sundry citizens of Rankin, Swissvale, Braddock, and Wilkinsburg; and of Washington Camp, No. 303, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Scranton, Etna, Sharpsburg, Allegheny County, and McKeesport; of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, Branch No. 10, of Royersford; and of Local Union No. 107, Cigarmakers' International Union of America, of Erie, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of sundry citizens of Moorhead and Lakefield, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fish Lake, Sauk Center, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Farmington, Mankato, Owatonna, Hanley Falls, Crookston, and Duluth, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Spring Grove, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DU PONT presented memorials of sundry citizens of Greenville and Newport, in the State of Delaware, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lakefield, Sebeka, and Moorhead, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importa-

tion of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Duluth, Alexandria, Vernon Center, Park Rapids, Pequot, Kasson, Blue Earth, Hallock, and Windom, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of Rich Mountain Post, No. 42, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, and of Rich Mountain Corps, No. 125, Woman's Relief Corps, of Lebanon, Ind., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Temperance Society, of Berne, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Frederick A. Hill Camp, No. 15, United Spanish War Veterans, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors who served in the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented a memorial of Stanton Post, No. 37, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Stanton, Mich., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Shiawassee County Medical Society of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of the Federation of Labor of Flint, Mich., and of sundry citizens of Detroit, Battle Creek, and Lansing, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Parliamentary Study Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring an appropriation for the control and regulation of rivers and for the prevention of floods, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of the Arbeiter Society, West Side, of Saginaw, and of sundry citizens of Detroit, Lansing, Battle Creek, Mount Pleasant, Flint, and Owosso, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Evan W. Cornell, of Adrian; of the congregation of the Church of Christ, of Adrian, and of the faculty of Adrian College, of Adrian, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Parliamentary Study Club, of Detroit, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the control and prevention of floods and for the regulation of the waterways of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Fisher Grange, No. 790, Patrons of Husbandry, of Harrisville, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Colonel E. R. Shumway Camp, No. 28, United Spanish War Veterans, of Worcester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers of the Spanish-American War, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Frederick A. Hill Camp, No. 15, United Spanish War Veterans, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Ben Miller Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Danbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CHILTON presented resolutions adopted by the Trans-Alleghany Good Roads Association at a meeting held at Union, W. Va., favoring the enactment of legislation for the construction of good roads, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 4735) granting an increase of pension to Brazil Van Dusen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4736) granting an increase of pension to John W. Preston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 4737) granting an increase of pension to Susan Arthur (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4738) for the relief of Frances L. Snell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4739 granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Tallcott (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4740) granting an increase of pension to William L. Wilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4741) for the protection of the water supply of the city of Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4742) granting an annuity equivalent to $30 per month to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have been awarded medals of honor for gallantry and heroism involving great personal peril, and authorizing the President of the United States to make rules and regulations for carrying the act into effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4743) granting a pension to Ida M. Goodwin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4744) granting a pension to James S. Holmes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4745) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Headley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4746) granting an increase of pension to James E. Horn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4747) granting a pension to Harrison Fox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4748) granting an increase of pension to James Fowler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4749) granting a pension to Arch B. Crawford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4750) granting a pension to William B. Ingraham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4751) granting an increase of pension to Marcene Harvey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4752) granting a pension to Hugh Chambers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4753) granting a pension to Jesse Craft (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4754) granting an increase of pension to Sampson H. Wade (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4755) granting a pension to Elizabeth G. Wood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4756) granting a pension to Anna Warthan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4757) granting a pension to Henry Totten (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4758) granting a pension to Allen R. Vickers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4759) granting a pension to M. M. Sayre (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4760) granting a pension to Susan Brobst (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4761) granting a pension to Fannie A. Bordeaux (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4762) granting an increase of pension to Azuba Burch (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4763) granting a pension to John R. Boso (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4764) granting a pension to Homer T. Bowling (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4765) granting a pension to Elizabeth Pierson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4766) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda E. Nelson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4767) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Penwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4768) granting an increase of pension to George G. Young (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4769) granting a pension to Riley Adkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4770) granting a pension to Ebb Workman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4771) granting a pension to J. C. Matheny (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4772) granting a pension to David McCollum (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4773) granting a pension to Calvin S. Morehead (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4774) granting a pension to George D. Miles (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4775) granting a pension to Samuel W. Reid (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4776) granting a pension to Bernard Savage (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4777) granting a pension to Mary E. Sheppard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4778) granting a pension to Abraham Lanham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4779) granting a pension to James Lynch (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4780) granting an increase of pension to Theresa Reed;

A bill (S. 4781) granting an increase of pension to Granville Lanham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4782) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Deboe (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4783) granting a pension to Nancy J. Johnston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4784) granting a pension to Sarah M. Goff (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4785) granting an increase of pension to James H. Givens (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4786) granting an increase of pension to Emmie M. Lemley (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4787) granting a pension to G. W. Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4788) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Jones (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4789) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Traugh;

A bill (S. 4790) granting an increase of pension to J. Forsyth Harrison;

A bill (S. 4791) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. C. Henderson; and

A bill (S. 4792) granting a pension to Eliza Ganoe-Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4793) for the relief of P. H. Harper (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4794) for the relief of George Miller (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4795) for the relief of the Hurricane Baptist Church, Hurricane, W. Va. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4796) for the relief of Sarah Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4797) for the relief of Drusilla Adkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4798) for the relief of F. F. Morris (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4799) for the relief of the heirs of John R. McClanahan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4800) for the relief of G. N. McClung (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4801) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Isaac C. Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4802) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. McGinnis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4803) for the relief of Leroy Douglas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4804) for the relief of Wildly Lodge, Charles Town, W. Va. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4805) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Craig (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4806) for the relief of W. H. Cooper (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4807) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Conley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4808) for the relief of C. F. Cook, administrator of John Cook (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4809) for the relief of M. E. Russell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4810) for the relief of Oakaley Randall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4811) for the relief of James A. Showen (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4812) for the relief of the legal representatives of Isaac Stanley, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4813) for the relief of George W. Stanley (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4814) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church, Keyser, W. Va. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4815) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Pyne, deceased (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4816) for the relief of James W. Ward (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4817) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. W. West, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4818) for the relief of Celicia Jordon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4819) for the relief of the heirs of J. G. Hayman, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4820) for the relief of Emma N. Warwick (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4821) for the relief of J. P. Huddleston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4822) for the relief of the heirs of L. B. Lawson;

A bill (S. 4823) for the relief of J. B. Johnson;

A bill (S. 4824) for the relief of the heirs of Russell White;

A bill (S. 4825) for the relief of Andrew J. Weese;

A bill (S. 4826) for the relief of the heirs of Elias W. Phares, deceased;

A bill (S. 4827) for the relief of Granville Perry;

A bill (S. 4828) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased;

A bill (S. 4829) for the relief of Daniel Nihoof;

A bill (S. 4830) for the relief of heirs of John Morgan;

A bill (S. 4831) for the relief of lockmasters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River, in West Virginia;

A bill (S. 4832) for the relief of the heirs of Timothy Adkins;

A bill (S. 4833) for the relief of Frances Arbogast;

A bill (S. 4834) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist college at Blue Sulphur, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 4835) for the relief of J. D. Coleman;

A bill (S. 4836) for the relief of the heirs of William Ewing, deceased;

A bill (S. 4837) for the relief of Anthony Lawson;

A bill (S. 4838) for the relief of heirs of Mary A. Rock, deceased;

A bill (S. 4839) for the relief of J. R. Clifford; and

A bill (S. 4840) for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4841) to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4842) for the relief of David N. Kinkaid (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4843) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent census office," approved March 6, 1902; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4844) to indemnify depositors in "member banks" as defined by the Federal reserve act, against loss in the event of the failure or suspension of business of such bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to place upon the books of the Treasury to the credit of that portion of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan the sum of $426,672.33, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that all permanent officers of the Quartermaster's Corps created by the act of August 24, 1912, on the active list and below the grade of brigadier general shall be arranged in each grade according to the date of original entry into either the Quartermaster's, Subsistence, or Pay Departments of the Army, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500 for assisting the county commissioners of Stevens County, Wash., in the construction of a county road across the Spokane Indian Reservation, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CHILTON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Manufactures or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and that said stenographer be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page, out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. REED subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which had been referred the foregoing resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

### CHARLESTON (S. C.) COALING STATION.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask may be read, and then I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 291) was read, as follows:

Whereas in view of the early completion of the Isthmian Canal and of its importance to the United States Navy and the national defense generally, to the development of an American merchant marine and to the development of trade with Central and South American countries, the establishment of adequate coal-supplying facilities south of Cape Hatteras is deemed imperative, and the only available harbor having sufficient depth of water for the modern battleships and larger merchant vessels, as well as extensive water frontage for the proper handling of coal, is located at Charleston, S. C.; and

Whereas the usefulness and efficiency of said harbor as a coaling station must depend upon the facilities (first) of the coal producers for reaching that port, and (second) of the coal carriers in the matter of assembling the product at the port of Charleston, including coal docks and other facilities for loading and handling, which should be accessible to all shippers and carriers alike on the same terms and conditions; and

Whereas it appears from numerous complaints now before the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as from other sources, that the power and influence of the so-called Coal Trust is being persistently used through the management of the railroads reaching Charleston to prevent the free movement of coal not belonging to said Coal Trust, practically all of such roads being actually dominated by the same financial interests that control the great coal combines finding outlet chiefly through New York Harbor, Philadelphia, and the Chesapeake Bay ports: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized and instructed to investigate the natural and strategic advantages of Charleston, S. C., as compared with Norfolk and other Chesapeake Bay ports, as a permanent point for coal distribution, and included and embraced in the scope of said investigation the said committee is further authorized and instructed to investigate into the character and proximity of the coal supply, the rates obtainable on coal from the coal fields near by Charleston Harbor and Norfolk, the relations between the railroads leading into Charleston and other South Atlantic seaports between each other and between said railroads and the owners of the bituminous coal fields of Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and the condition, character, and ownership of the wharfage property in said city or cities, with instructions to said committee to report to the Senate its recommendations in the premises. Said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of Congress, and its hearings shall be open to the public, and it is authorized and empowered to employ counsel, coal experts, railroad-rate experts, and such other clerical and stenographic and expert assistants as it may deem necessary. Said committee shall have power to compel witnesses to testify, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths to witnesses, and do anything necessary to arrive at all the facts. The expenses incident to the investigation herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The said Committee on Naval Affairs may, in its discretion, conduct this investigation by a subcommittee of not less than seven members, to be appointed by the chairman, and shall make its report as soon as possible.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before the resolution is adopted I wish to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. WARREN. It can not be agreed to now, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand it is not going to be adopted at this time; but I wish to suggest to the Senator that when it goes to the committee he add after "Charleston" the cities of "Southport and Wilmington, N. C."

Mr. TILLMAN. Put the words between "Norfolk" and "Charleston."

Mr. SWANSON. This resolution has been offered for reference, has it not?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; it will go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SWANSON. It goes to the Committee on Naval Affairs with full opportunity for amendment and vote?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. Then I have no objection to its reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and printed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I desire to submit statements to accompany the resolution which I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that action will be taken.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENTS.

(1) The efficiency of the fleet, and the usefulness and efficiency of Charleston as a coal-distributing center must necessarily depend upon the facilities of the coal producers for reaching that port, and of their ability to procure distributing facilities, and upon the ability of the shipping interest to procure rating and handling facilities in a manner which should be unqualifiedly accessible to all shippers and carriers alike on the same terms and conditions.

(2) The Southern Railway is dominated by financiers who are not financially interested in the coal mines of the territory traversed by the Southern Railway, but who are interested in coal properties elsewhere, and due to the power and influence of these men, it is believed that the Southern Railway is not allowed to move coal through the port of Charleston, which coal might become competitive to their larger interests elsewhere.

(3) As a concrete example of the flagrant abuse of power, the Southern Railway, having had for 10 years its own rails reaching from Charleston to the great developed coal fields of Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and reaching developed mines with a present annual capacity of from twelve to fifteen million tons of coal, which has no other outlet to tidewater, has moved no coal for outlet at that port and has made no provision for docks, notwithstanding the fact that it controls its own riparian privileges at Charleston.

(4) It is believed that efforts are now being made by individuals acting for the so-called Coal Trust, to acquire the rights for coal docks and terminal facilities in Charleston so as to monopolize the terminal facilities there in the same way that the big interests now dominate New York Harbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the ports on the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) It is believed that the so-called Coal Trust is using other railroads leading to the coal fields in a similar manner, not only to destroy private property but, in many instances, wholly against the interest of the railroad thus used and tyranically unjust to the country in which these railroads are located and from which they receive their revenue and protection.

(6) It is believed that these railroads, all being dominated by the same influence, maintain a secret rate-making body of men in defiance of the law, who "farm out" the territory and make freight tariffs in such manner as to be free from every element of competition, and who have practically destroyed the usefulness of the Interstate Commerce Commission in so far as it affects the average shipper and the small shippers on account of the great expense and the extraordinary delay brought about by the tactics of the railroad whose agents resort to every method known to political trickery.

(7) It is not only necessary in the interest of the naval station and of Charleston as a commercial port, but for the protection of the whole country and particularly of that section of the country served by the railroads which lead into Charleston, that a thorough investigation be forthwith made to ascertain the whole truth to the end that these abuses may be permanently stopped by the enactment of proper laws or the amendment of existing laws, and that the port of Charleston may not be controlled by any trust or faction or individual, but be open to the use and needs of the United States and to all carriers and to all shippers on the same basis.

### COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced the appointment of Mr. GALLINGER to succeed himself as a director on the part of the Senate of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum in the District of Columbia, as provided for in the act of June 10, 1872.

### REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced the appointment of Mr. HOLLIS a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Hon. Augustus O. Bacon.

### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it was my purpose to-day at the close of the morning business to conclude my remarks on the grain-inspection bill; but the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has given notice of his desire to bring up the Dis-

trict of Columbia appropriation bill, and with the hope that the bill may be concluded to-day, I desire to give notice that I shall endeavor to finish my remarks to-morrow after the conclusion of morning business.

TREATIES AND CONVENTIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate (S. Con. Res. 11) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 357, Sixty-first Congress, and Senate Document No. 1063, Sixty-second Congress, being a compilation of treaties, conventions, etc., between the United States and other powers, which was, in line 3, after the word "thousand," to insert "and for the House, 3,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HUDSON RIVER BRIDGE, NEW YORK.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3742) to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York, which were: On page 1, line 7, to strike out "viaducts and"; on page 1, line 8, to strike out "for railroad purposes only,"; on page 1, line 9, after "point" to insert "suitable to the interests of navigation"; on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 2 inclusive; and on page 2, line 6, to strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ADOLPH GRIMSINGER.

Mr. HUGHES. I have a copy of a brief on the jurisdiction of the United States courts in China in the case of Adolph Grimsinger, which is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask that the paper be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., March 10, 1914.*

*To the President of the Senate:*

I hereby tender my resignation as member of the following committees of the Senate:
Committee on Conservation of National Resources;
Committee on Engrossed Bills;
Committee on Pacific Railroads.
Yours, truly,

WILLARD SAULSBURY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Delaware is granted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., March 10, 1914.*

*To the President of the Senate:*

I ask leave to be excused from further service on the following committees:
Coast and Insular Survey;
To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands;
Industrial Expositions.

N. P. BRYAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Florida is granted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C.*

*To the President of the Senate:*

I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Claims and ask to be excused from further service thereon.

KEY PITTMAN.

MARCH 10, 1914.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Nevada is granted.

On motion by Mr. KERN, it was

*Ordered* (1), That JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, a Senator from Illinois, is designated and appointed as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the recent amendment of Rule XXV, providing for an additional member of said committee.

2. That WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, a Senator from Georgia, be, and is hereby, designated and appointed as a member of the following committees:

Committee on Military Affairs, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Johnston, of Alabama;

Committee on Industrial Expositions, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation therefrom of Senator BRYAN, of Florida;

Committee on Pacific Railroads, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation therefrom of Senator SAULSBURY, of Delaware;

Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia;

Committee on Private Land Claims; and

Committee on Railroads, to fill the vacancies on said last-named three committees occasioned by the death of the late Senator Bacon, of Georgia.

3. That BLAIR LEE, a Senator from Maryland, be designated and appointed as a member of the following-named committees:

Committee on Claims, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation therefrom of Senator PITTMAN, of Nevada;

Committee on Conservation of National Resources and Committee on Engrossed Bills, to fill the vacancies on said two last-named committees occasioned by the resignation therefrom of Senator SAULSBURY, of Delaware;

Committee on Coast and Insular Survey and Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, to fill the vacancies on said two last-named committees occasioned by the resignation therefrom of Senator BRYAN, of Florida.

4. That HOKE SMITH, a Senator from Georgia, be designated and appointed as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Bacon, of Georgia.

5. That WILLIAM E. CHILTON, a Senator from West Virginia, be designated and appointed as a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Johnston, of Alabama.

6. That WILLARD SAULSBURY, a Senator from the State of Delaware, be designated and appointed as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Bacon, of Georgia.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KERN. I offer a resolution providing for an amendment to the rules and give notice that I shall call it up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That so much of Rule XXV of the Senate as relates to the membership of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard be amended to read as follows:

"A Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators.

"A Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, to consist of 9 Senators."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over, under the rule.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10523, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the formal reading of the bill, that the bill be read for committee amendments, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. NORRIS. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I presume that would not preclude amendment to committee amendments being offered on the floor of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is only that the amendments of the committee are first to be considered, and all other amendments will be in order afterwards.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, before the Secretary proceeds to read the bill there is one item in it to which I wish to direct the attention of the Senate. It is the item providing a new municipal hospital for the District of Columbia.

This is a sorely needed improvement, as the present hospital is utterly unworthy of the Capital of the Nation, or, indeed, of a city even of the tenth class.

To the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the District of Columbia it has seemed appropriate that this municipal hospital, because it promises so much improvement to Washington and so much relief from sickness, care, and misery to the people, be named in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, JACOB H. GALLINGER. I am convinced the Senate, regardless of faction or aught else, will unanimously recognize the peculiar justness and fitness of this tribute to extraordinary worth.

For over 12 years the senior Senator from New Hampshire, in addition to other active and responsible duties, presided most ably, though without ostentation, as the chairman of the District Committee, and he has been a member of the committee for

over 20 years. Fortunately for Washington and for the country, his was a prophetic vision, so farseeing and broad that his influence tended always to shape the destinies of this city in right channels toward a point of perfection never before realized in any capital of any nation. Yet his work was not complete when he was succeeded by one far less worthy, but who is wise enough to recognize the talent, the honesty, and great experience of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The present chairman always sought Senator GALLINGER's advice, always sound, and looked to him for support. And that aid, advice, and support have always been frankly and freely given in the service of the people and without grudging. No man in the country, I am convinced, has a more thorough knowledge of the needs and possibilities of this Capital than the Senator from New Hampshire, and no one is in deeper, quicker sympathy with any effort from any source to promote the moral and material welfare of this District.

Throughout the Senator's long and most useful service as chairman of the District Committee the shafts of slander, charges of corruption, incompetence, or favoritism have never been directed at him, and the future alone can measure the full value of his services.

Differing from the senior Senator radically on those principles which divide the two great parties, I would despise myself if for partisan reasons I closed my eyes or blinded others to the sincerity of his acts, the simplicity and perfection of his character, and to his wonderful influence for good here and elsewhere.

I am sure I voice and share the feelings of the great majority of the people of this District, and also of those throughout the country at large, who know of his quiet, diligent, and self-sacrificing service to his country, that while it is in a way timely and fitting to name this hospital in his honor, skillful physician and accomplished statesman that the Senator is, nevertheless this act of ours, extraordinary though it be, is, after all, but a partial and inadequate recognition by Congress of the Nation's debt to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on line 5, page 2, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to read:

Two commissioners, at $6,000 each.

Mr. KERN. With the consent of the senior Senator from Maryland, I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be laid aside now, in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I also ask that it be laid aside without prejudice, and that it be taken up to-morrow morning, immediately after the routine business, as unfinished business.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. Immediately after the routine business.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That was my request.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. At the close of the morning business.

Mr. SMOOT. Not to interfere with the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; I shall ask that it be taken up immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to ask that it be made the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; immediately after the routine business.

Mr. SMOOT. All right.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to give a notice?

Mr. KERN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

### WATERWAY FROM GREAT LAKES TO ATLANTIC OCEAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next, the 17th instant, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate upon the subject of a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to make a short statement in the nature of a correction of the RECORD?

Mr. KERN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for that purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, during the debate in the Senate on the Post Office appropriation bill I stated that the Rural Delivery Service was not self-supporting by about thirty-five or forty million dollars, and gave as my authority for this statement the honorable Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. James I. Blakslee. On reflection and investigation I find that in this statement I did Mr. Blakslee an injustice. It was not he who made the statement.

I feel that it is proper for me to correct the statement and to do the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General justice by exonerating him to the fullest possible degree. I know how embarrassing it must be to an official in the Post Office Department to have a statement like this appear in the RECORD when he is entirely blameless. I make this correction on the floor of the Senate in order that it may have the same publicity which the statement made in the debate had.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 11 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1914.*

### ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

John L. de Saulles, of Pennsylvania, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay, vice Nicolay A. Grevstad, resigned.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Robert W. McNeely to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913, to change the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

Lieut. John C. Fremont, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 20th day of December, 1913.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Earle J. Johnson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 20th day of December, 1913.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10, 1914.*

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William W. Ray to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Nicholas F. Reed to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

### POSTMASTERS.

#### ARIZONA.

Bertha M. Rees, Wickenburg.

#### CALIFORNIA.

C. H. Francis, Loomis.
W. R. Gore, Fairoaks.
R. C. Hannan, Corning.
Virgil W. Norton, Sutter Creek.
W. A. Rice, Saratoga.
Hiram A. Rudd, Walnut Creek.
David C. Simpson, Courtland.
Will Smith, Soldiers' Home.
Edwin L. Story, Anderson.
J. N. Tibessart, Orland.
Frank C. Thompson, Garden Grove.
J. W. Townes, Pinole.
M. S. Trigueiro, San Miguel.

#### FLORIDA.

F. M. Brown, Miami.
William D. Sanford, Cocoanut Grove.

#### HAWAII.

M. K. Keohokalole, Paia.

#### IDAHO.

J. J. Caldwell, Meridian.
W. A. Criswell, Mackay.
W. B. Stone, Driggs.

ILLINOIS.

William Baskerville, Coal City.
M. L. Briscoe, Westfield.
Gustav L. Burmeister, Elmhurst.
M. B. Dolan, Durand.
James N. Hall, Delavan.
E. P. Hectorne, Avon.
Fred H. Henckler, Columbia.
George Hoffman, Crete.
Thomas Mercer, Sandwich.
Joseph A. Roesler, Ashton.
David Schein, Waterloo.
John L. Schmidt, Hinckley.
Louis A. Stoll, Aurora.
Charles E. Wescott, Sheffield.
Bert C. White, Downers Grove.
Charles M. Wright, Gilman.

INDIANA.

William H. Beaty, Worthington.
Curtis Butler, Oakland City.
R. Philip Carpenter, Noblesville.
Joseph P. Cummins, Middletown.
John J. Cleary, Terre Haute.
Frank W. Dalton, Plainfield.
George E. Erdmann, Greensburg.
Franklin M. Field, Spencer.
Allen P. Green, Shelbyville.
Benjamin F. Hoopingarner, Syracuse.
John B. Lawler, Madison.
William A. King, Danville.
Dennis O'Riley, Remington.
John R. Paine, Clinton.
Frank J. Retterath, Goodland.
Charles H. Salm, Rockport.
Allen Swope, Seymour.

KANSAS.

Adelaide Brandenburg, Frankfort.
J. P. Fern, Scammon.
E. S. Irwin, Liberal.
R. C. Logan, Smith Center.
James E. Miller, Walnut.
John L. Paden, Fowler.
J. H. Plummer, Westmoreland.
Harry Spurrier, Kiowa.
Richard E. Thoes, Alma.
Bowles Unsell, Caldwell.

LOUISIANA.

Lillian D. Richardson, Independence.

MINNESOTA.

Eugene H. Mangskau, Breckenridge.
Will J. Sarff, Eagle Bend.

MONTANA.

Joseph E. Pickens, Huntley.
J. H. Rutter, Hinsdale.

NEBRASKA.

Andrew J. Caldwell, Walthill.
Fred H. Davis, Madison.
Gustav A. Koza, Clarkson.
W. C. Tredway, Cedar Rapids.

NEVADA.

R. W. Gale, Gardnersville.
John P. Reynolds, Sparks.
Benjamin Rosenthal, Goldfield.
Fred L. White, Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edrick S. Avery, Franklin.
John L. Fulton, West Lebanon.
Benjamin C. Garland, Whitefield.
Arthur D. Sloan, Enfield.

NEW JERSEY.

George H. Abel, Haddon Heights.
Leo M. Danerhirsh, Woodbine.
William H. Eicks, Leonia.
George N. Harris, Newton.
Cyrus B. Honce, Belmar.
E. Furman Hooper, Trenton.
Benjamin F. Smith, Ocean City.
Edward C. Wheaton, Cape May Courthouse.

NEW YORK.

William A. Cochran, Southold.
Thomas Conners, Camillus.
George D. Cunningham, Schaghticoke.
Joseph E. Downs, Islip.
Charles M. Estell, Friendship.
Sumner I. Houghwout, Falconer.
Verne Seeber, South Dayton.
Henry S. Sutherland, White Plains.
Herbert W. Rackett, Greenport.
H. S. Ransom, Ransomville.
Robert E. L. Reynolds, Amsterdam.
Lee Van Vredenburgh, Rhinebeck.
John E. Walker, Philmont.
Samuel N. Wheeler, Hancock.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Joseph G. Senger, Harvey.
Robert E. Wessel, Oakes.

OHIO.

Charles L. Hunter, St. Marys.
Orrin E. Jones, West Salem.
Joseph L. Riesser, Ripley.
Freda M. Smith, Lowellville.

OKLAHOMA.

M. E. Didlake, Quinton.
Laura Houston, Woodward.
James W. Smith, Grandfield.
W. J. Strange, Chelsea.

OREGON.

Paul C. Belt, Willamina.
M. M. Fitch, Sherwood.
Victor P. Moses, Corvallis.
C. W. Holloman, Haines.
Archie Parker, Monmouth.
Russell H. Sullens, Prairie City.
J. H. Young, Hermiston.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Albert L. Reinhold, Ardmore.

PORTO RICO.

Fernando Callejo, Manati.
Manuel S. Pacheco, Fajardo.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

N. C. Andrews, Irene.

TEXAS.

Clinton Bybee, Willis.
Thomas W. Cain, Bastrop.
F. W. Easterwood, Hearne.
F. P. Henry, Floydada.
Archie N. Justiss, Corsicana.
Frank Leverton, Grapeland.
Maxey McCreary, Calvert.
A. L. Melton, Leonard.
J. J. Sutton, Stockdale.
Arthur T. Terrell, Eagle Pass.
J. D. Williams, Sinton.
Joe Wren, Normangee.

UTAH.

Noble Warrum, Salt Lake City.

WASHINGTON.

Andrew Hunter, Issaquah.
F. H. McCroskey, Sprague.
Charles A. Ramm, Davenport.
T. T. Richardson, Northport.
F. L. Whitney, Ferndale.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Benjamin L. Brown, Kingwood.
W. W. Johnson, Glenville.
William G. Keyes, Philippi.
William L. Reinhart, Shepherdstown.
Burton B. Rohrbough, Belington.

WISCONSIN.

Jeremiah J. Cunningham, Janesville.
J. D. O'Brien, Randolph.
Edward Schroeder, Granton.
James C. Thomas, Poynette.

WYOMING.

James B. Delaney, Saratoga.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### TUESDAY, *March 10, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, quicken, we beseech Thee, our receptive faculties, that we may have a clearer vision, a keener ear, and feel more profoundly the indwelling of Thy spirit; that we may realize with greater certainty the far-reaching purposes of life and lend ourselves with diligence to every demand laid upon us, and thus further Thy plans in the redemption of mankind from the sins which doth so easily beset us, and leave behind us a clear record and the world a little better that we have lived and wrought. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th day of last June the statue of Zachariah Chandler was unveiled in Statuary Hall with appropriate exercises. I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, April 12, 1914, be set apart by the House of Representatives for the acceptance of the statue and the delivery of appropriate addresses on the life, character, and public services of Zachariah Chandler, late a Senator from the State of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that Sunday, April 12, 1914, be set apart for the purpose of accepting the statue of the late Senator Zachariah Chandler and the delivery of appropriate addresses upon his life, character, and public service. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that last evening I was accorded the privilege of proceeding five minutes longer to get further information regarding the experimental farms. Can the gentleman inform the committee when this experimental station at Beltsville was established?

Mr. LEVER. It was established during the last year of the chairmanship of the Agricultural Committee of Mr. Scott, of Kansas—in 1911, I think it was.

Mr. STAFFORD. At whose instance was it established; at the request of the Department of Agriculture or at the instance of some Representative in Congress or some person who had some abandoned farm to give to the Government?

Mr. LEVER. It was established at the urgent request of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. When was the experimental station established at Bethesda?

Mr. LEVER. The experimental work has been going on there for very many years; ever since I have been on the committee. I do not remember the date.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman advise the committee why this work could not be confined to one farm rather than having two or three experimental farming stations in the immediate proximity of the city of Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman that the work at Bethesda is of an entirely different character from the work being done at Beltsville. The work at Bethesda is scientific investigation touching the various animal diseases and is really a field laboratory for the Bureau of Animal Industry. The work at Beltsville is confined largely to investigating animal breeding, poultry breeding, inbreeding, the feeding of dairy cattle, the feeding of horses, mules, sheep, and so forth, and the gathering of information as to the best kind of dairy barns that should be constructed, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there is nothing in the character of work carried on at these respective places that would prevent it being carried on in separate parts of the same establishment.

Mr. LEVER. I think it would be impossible to put them together.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not mean to mix them, but the work could be carried on in separate parts of the same establishment, so as to relieve the Government of the expense of upkeep of different establishments.

Mr. LEVER. Let me illustrate: At the Bethesda farm there are a dozen or more badly diseased animals, having diseases of highly infectious and contagious character, while at Beltsville the animals are all in good health and are being experimented on with a view of getting information as to the feeding value of different kinds of food, and also for the gathering of information along other lines. If you mix them, the likelihood is that you would have an outbreak of disease among them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not have in mind the mixing of them in the same building, but having them on contiguous farms, where the expense of upkeep would be eliminated as to one establishment.

Mr. LEVER. I think it would be very bad judgment and very dangerous to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says his committee visited this model dairy farm at Beltsville——

Mr. LEVER. Oh, it is more than a model dairy farm.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee the necessity of expending money for the construction of additional buildings at that station, and why the committee increased the amount allowed over the estimate?

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did not the committee make an increase over the estimates? Were not the estimates $15,000, and did not the committee increase the amount $1,000 or more?

Mr. LEVER. We allowed the estimate exactly.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall, from my examination of the estimates, the committee increased it $1,000.

Mr. LEVER. The estimated sum was $16,500, and the committee allowed that sum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year it was $15,000?

Mr. LEVER. Last year it was $16,500, the same appropriation, no change whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the need of spending this large sum of money for these buildings?

Mr. LEVER. I will state to the gentleman very frankly that I had the same query in my own mind and I was not satisfied to take the mere estimate of the department that they desired this work, but I had the department furnish me a detailed statement as to how they intended to expend the money.

In addition, as I said yesterday, the subcommittee made a visit to Beltsville and looked the entire station over and came back and was unanimously of the belief that the work out there was important and the request of the department for $16,500 to erect some additional buildings for the extension of that work would be money well spent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the time of the committee with further inquiry upon this item if the gentleman says the subcommittee was satisfied and that he has a detailed statement before him.

Mr. LEVER. I have the detailed statement in my hand which I will be glad to put in the RECORD if the gentleman so desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will accept the statement of the chairman of the committee that it was entirely satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I heard the gentleman refer to the experimental work at Beltsville, Md. I had the pleasure of visiting that establishment last summer, and was very much pleased with the work being done, but I would like to ask the gentleman one question in connection with it, and that is just what is expected to be accomplished by breeding the zebra stallion out there, and that sort of experimental work?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that he is misinformed about the use of the zebra stallion for breeding purposes. The stallion is now out here in the National Zoological Park, and is not being used for that purpose at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it is more important to have him on exhibition than at an experimental farm; and I am glad to know that since my visit to the farm a change has been made in the purposes for which the zebra is used.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman fully.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not an important fact for this Government to investigate for the purpose of obtaining breeds of animals which will be useful in the arid parts of this country, and there are qualities of the zebra that are developed in crossing with other animals known to be useful, and I think the Department of Agriculture, instead of being deterred from this, should be en-

couraged in doing the Burbank business, as far as animals are concerned, that is engaged in by that eminently experimental scientist in plants?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the inquiry of my friend from Nebraska I will say if zebra breeding appeals to him in the section of country that he has the honor to represent, I shall be very glad to vouchsafe him the right to continue the work. So far as the country which I represent here is concerned, we do not need to cross our horses with zebras to carry on our farm work. We have an excellent grazing country and no arid section of country to which my friend from Nebraska refers, so that the zebra-breeding proposition does not appeal to me perhaps as much as it does to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Coming from a country where acre for acre it is worth twice as much as it is in Massachusetts, I think that I am speaking with some information and I think that if this Government can discover types of animals useful upon the farm or elsewhere the Government should be encouraged to do so.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman may have noticed, Mr. Chairman, I was endeavoring yesterday to have a certain line of work done in Massachusetts in order to improve our land so as to increase its farming value. I should be glad to have the gentleman's cooperation along that line, and in the same way I shall be glad to cooperate with him if he wants help in his zebra breeding.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman think this zebra breeding is a reflection upon the Missouri mule in his value for farm purposes?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not think the Missouri mule appreciates cross breeding.

Mr. MANN. I believe the Missouri mule never takes occasion to resent reflections upon it.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that the Missouri mule will take care of himself in any community whether there is an appropriation in the agricultural bill or anywhere else.

Mr. MOORE. In this respect the Missouri mule is very much like the hound dog, is it not?

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; a much more valuable animal; but the hound dog has its place in society the same as other people. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds, and for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, $166,500: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $100,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the comma after the word "seeds," at the end of line 18, page 21, and insert the words "of which sum $10,000 shall be immediately available."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FOWLER. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. After a point of order has been reserved to a paragraph, is it in order then to offer an amendment until the point of order is settled?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, under the practice of the House the Chair will state it is. The point of order is not made, but simply reserved, and the Chair thinks, under the practice we have been operating under, that it would be in order to offer an amendment under those circumstances.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, that has not been the ruling heretofore.

If there is to be a point of order made against the paragraph and that point of order is sustained, it is a waste of time to consider an amendment or entertain it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the point of order being reserved, discussion on the paragraph is in order, and my purpose is to discuss the paragraph under my amendment while the point of order is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserved his point of order. It is privileged at any time to make a point of order. Until he makes it, of course, there is no point of order pending against the paragraph, and the Chair thinks the amendment would be in order.

Mr. FOWLER. The regular order is the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair will say that the offering of an amendment is tantamount to demanding the regular order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am recognized, the point of order having been reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] demands the regular order, which is to make or reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Asking for information, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the chairman of the committee whether th's item is not new?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me——

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will indulge the Chair for a moment, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] demands the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order for the purpose of asking for information from the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is new legislation, and not heretofore carried in the appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Chair, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two. I would like to ask whether this is a new paragraph in the appropriation act?

Mr. LEVER. It is a new paragraph in the sense that it is a combination of three paragraphs. It is a combination of a paragraph that heretofore has been devoted to forage-crop investigations, for which an appropriation of $25,000 was carried, and one for drought-resistant seeds, for which an appropriation of $39,000 was carried, and this appropriation is an increase of $102,500 for work of that character over the appropriation bill in the current law. It is not a new paragraph in the sense the gentleman uses the word "new."

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice the committee incorporated a provision that heretofore has been carried in the so-called congressional seed distribution, which is the second paragraph following.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that there is a departure here, as incorporated in this provision, in that it is planned to give to Congressmen the right to send out these new and rare seeds?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. I gained that information by reading the hearings.

Mr. LEVER. There has been no plan set forth in the language of the bill, but, as a matter of fact, in the practical working out of the plan I take it that Members of Congress from time to time might furnish the names of progressive farmers in their districts who would be willing to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture in making the test of the value of such seed as would be sent out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this intended to be supplemental to the congressional seed distribution?

Mr. LEVER. This is intended to do a kind of seed-distribution work that I would like to see done only. This is intended to distribute new and rare seeds, such as alfalfa, such as the best type of cotton, such as new varieties of corn, such as the department in its stations has developed, such as Sudan grass, such as new varieties of sorghum, such as feterita, and such as Tepary beans, and a number of other rare and valuable seeds that the department itself on its own plats, in cooperation with progressive farmers, is developing from time to time. I will say to my friend that this is a kind of work that I think promises great good to the country. I would much prefer to increase the appropriation in this item if I were handling the situation personally, and do away entirely with the congressional seed distribution, but that is not for me to say. The committee has acted upon that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, although I represent a city district almost exclusively, I am in hearty sympathy with anything that intends to advance the welfare of the farmer. I am not in sympathy, and have not been for years, with the so-called congressional seed distribution. This item which we are now considering recognizes a departure, and to have some

real work that will be of value to the farmer established, and therefore I do not press the point of order, but withdraw it.

Mr. LEVER. I submit that the point of order was not well taken, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the comma after the word "seeds" at the end of line 18, page 21, and insert the words "of which amount $10,000 will be immediately available."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to enable the department to purchase some seeds and distribute them as soon as this bill shall become a law under this head of appropriation. The necessity for it arises out of this fact: That since the department began the distribution of seeds of forage plants there has grown up quite a demand for seeds of that sort. The farmers either write directly to the Department of Agriculture or to Members of Congress with regard to these seeds.

In my own State there has recently grown up a very lively demand for the kind of seeds which the department has been furnishing under this item of appropriation, and farmers have been writing directly to the department and to me for Grimm alfalfa and for certain kinds of sorghums and for certain new varieties of millet and for other seeds that the department has been furnishing under this item of appropriation. Recently the Secretary notified me that their supply was exhausted, and exhausted at a time when there were, I think, some 300 or 400 requests from my State for this class of seeds, and I have no doubt a very considerable number of requests from other localities.

Mr. LEVER. When was that?

Mr. MONDELL. That was within the last two weeks. The department had some of these seeds up to within two or three weeks ago. These particular classes of seeds are now exhausted. The Assistant Secretary, in a communication I had with him a day or two ago over the telephone, said that it was barely possible that they might find a remnant of an appropriation which they could use for this purpose, but he doubted it, and if he did not find it he expressed the hope that in some way there could be some funds made available—a small amount in the near future, to supply the present pressing demand.

Now, the chairman realizes this fact, that this is not of the nature of the ordinary congressional seed distribution. These requests come from men who know of this distribution and who have knowledge of the character of the seeds which the department is sending out, and who desire to test them. Ordinarily the department furnishes to each applicant enough of alfalfa and other forage plants to plant an acre. It is exceedingly important that we shall supply these men who have taken the trouble to write in and ask that they be supplied.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Wyoming will permit, I will suggest to him that the first appropriation for this character of seed distribution was carried in the bill last year, as I remember it, with an appropriation of $39,000. I agree with the gentleman that it is a valuable line of work. The department has not made any request upon the committee to make any of this sum immediately available, and I think the gentleman can easily depend upon the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to be able to find some means of handling the situation until we can reach the Senate. If it then appears that we need a portion of this fund made immediately available, I shall not object to it.

Mr. MONDELL. No harm would be done by making $10,000 of this immediately available. If they find other funds—and at the last talk I had with the Assistant Secretary he had not found any other fund, although he was hopeful of doing so—if this was found not to be necessary, it could be stricken out in the Senate.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary has the right, as the gentleman no doubt knows, under the act of Congress, to transfer 10 per cent of some other appropriation to this item. That would amount to $3,900, and I take it that the Secretary of Agriculture, with a total appropriation of $18,000,000, would find somewhere an opportunity to make a transfer, and thus tide over the necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, accepting the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina, and feeling confident that the Secretary of Agriculture will do all he can to meet this demand, I will withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming withdraws his amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigation, including the office of the chief of bureau, the assistant chief of bureau, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, $32,490;

In all, for general expenses, $2,320,455.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. TOWNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Which gentleman from Iowa?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, simply for the purpose of asking the chairman a question with reference to this item in regard to seeds on page 21, although my interrogatory may not be directly in connection with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to inquire whether the department makes any investigation with reference to new varieties of corn or furnishes any samples of corn?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they do. They are doing work all the time with reference to the staple seeds of the country—cotton, corn, wheat, oats, barley, and the like of that—and if they distribute anything that they see is worth more than the ordinary kind that a community is using, it will be available under this language.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman from South Carolina know whether they have furnished any new samples of corn?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina will yield to me for a moment, I may furnish the information desired. Some eight years ago I made a request on the Department of Agriculture to furnish one or two constituents in Waukesha County with some special hard Dent corn that would mature early. In response to my request the department furnished to a certain farmer a special variety of hard corn from the North Dakota experiment station. The special seed was planted, and during the growing season one of the inspectors connected with the department made his inspection and made a report. That corn was distributed generally under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture to the farmers of that neighborhood, and where before the farmers of Waukesha County had difficulty in getting a corn that would mature early enough before the frost came, under this method they did obtain this superior seed corn; and so I take it that this item is designed to furnish the department with a sufficient appropriation to meet those very conditions.

Mr. LEVER. That is true; and to supplement that, the department is doing a great deal of work to find a hardier alfalfa seed, and that is true also of cotton. I know that personally, because I know more of cotton than of these other crops.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TOWNER. I do this, Mr. Chairman, merely for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of the agricultural products of the State of Iowa for the last year.

That statement shows that the live-stock products of Iowa last year amounted to $470,272,000. The showing is also made that the field crops of Iowa for the year 1913, together with the poultry, wool, and dairy products, amounted to $522,479,227; a total, Mr. Chairman, in one year of the agricultural products of the State of Iowa alone of nearly $1,000,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a certain statement that he indicates. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the statement referred to:

IOWA IN BILLION-DOLLAR-CROP CLASS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SAYS NEW RECORD IS ESTABLISHED—LEADS IN LIVE STOCK—STATE'S SUPREMACY IN FARM PRODUCTS UNQUESTIONED, REPORT SAYS.

Iowa's crops in 1913, added to the value of the live stock on farms on January 1, 1914, total practically $1,000,000,000, a new record for this State, according to a report published by the Department of Agriculture in "Greater Iowa," which was sent out yesterday from the Capitol.

The statistics on live stock compiled by the Government show that Iowa's live stock on January 1 was worth $470,272,000. The field crops

for Iowa in 1913, together with the poultry, wool, and dairy products, amounted to $522,474,227.

The department says:

PRODUCTS WORTH BILLION.

"The total value of farm products together with that of farm animals show Iowa's farm products and live stock on January 1, 1914, were worth practically $1,000,000,000. This establishes a new record on the value of Iowa farm products and live stock. The total figures for Iowa live stock are only a little in excess of last year's, being $470,272,000 as against $459,396,000, but the total farm products amount to $522,747,227, making the total value of live stock and farm products $992,746,227.

"No other State in the Union approaches this remarkable record of the Hawkeye State. Iowa leads in so many products and in so many kinds of live stock that the sum total for the last few years has surpassed other States in a marked degree. Iowa is coming to be a great draft-horse State. Horses are high in price and run up into money so that Iowa's horse industry is now the most valuable of any of her live-stock industries.

"The total value of her horses on January 1 was $186,912,000. She had a total of 1,584,000, valued at an average of $118 per head. Illinois ranked second of all the States in the Union in the number and value of her horses, having 1,497,000, valued at $169,161,000. Texas is third, Kansas fourth, and Missouri fifth in number of horses, but in value Ohio is third and Missouri fourth.

IOWA LEADS IN HOGS.

"In spite of the ravages of hog cholera, which the past year has cut down Iowa's herds more than any other State in the Union, Iowa still maintains her supremacy in swine. On January 1 she had 6,976,000 head of swine, valued at $87,898,000. Illinois ranked second in swine, with 4,358,000, valued at $47,066,000.

"In cattle other than milch cows Texas holds first place, with 5,173,000 head of cattle, valued at $137,084,000. Iowa ranks second among all the States, with 2,555,000 head, valued at $100,156,000. Nebraska is third, Kansas fourth, California fifth, and Missouri sixth. In milch cows Iowa ranks third, with Wisconsin first and New York second.

"In the total value of live stock on the farms January 1, including horses, mules, swine, beef cattle, milch cows, and sheep, Iowa leads all other States, her total being $470,272,000, with Texas second, having a total of $393,471,000, and Illinois third, with $341,898,000. Iowa has fewer beef cattle and fewer swine than she had a year ago. There has been a decline of 2 per cent in the number of beef cattle in Iowa and of 20 per cent in her swine. In milch cows she has gained 1 per cent. In sheep she has held her own and in horses she has gained 1 per cent and in mules 2 per cent as compared to 1913.

DECLINE IN BEEF CATTLE.

"Throughout the United States as a whole there has been a decline of 5 per cent in the number of beef cattle as compared to a year ago. A gain of 1.2 per cent in milch cows and a decline of 3.4 per cent in sheep, a decline of 3.7 per cent in swine, a gain of 1.9 per cent in horses, and a gain of 1.4 per cent in mules.

"The Government figures on the losses in swine in Iowa are not as high as those given out by the Iowa State college. The college reports that cholera killed 2,827,907 swine in 1913, or 34.3 per cent of all the hogs in the State. This loss is estimated to be about $33,000,000. Notwithstanding that fact, however, Iowa still maintains her supremacy as a swine State."

Mr. TOWNER. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $257,000. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, particularly against that part of the paragraph on page 23, line 3, beginning after the words "United States" and extending down to and including the word "department," in line 5, on page 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] makes a point of order against the paragraph, and particularly on that portion beginning with the word "An," in line 3, on page 23, and extending down to and including the word "department," on page 24, line 5.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman make a point of order against the entire paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but particularly against the portion indicated.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins, I desire to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized. But first the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will be heard on the point of order.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the part of this paragraph against which the point of order is directed provides for what is ordinarily known as the congressional distribution of seeds. I beg to direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that in the act creating the Department of Agriculture in 1862 and defining its duties, among those duties is enumerated the duty to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Another section of the same act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture—

shall select new and valuable seeds and plants; shall test, by cultivation, the value of such of them as may require such tests; shall propagate such as may be worthy of propagation; and shall distribute them among agriculturalists.

Mr. Chairman, this is all the law there is with reference to the distribution of seeds. I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that the method of distribution is left to the Secretary of Agriculture, with the single limitation indicated in that section.

Of course it was not intended by those who enacted this law that the Secretary of Agriculture should himself, in person, distribute these seeds. The purpose was to have him direct that distribution.

The part of the paragraph against which the point of order is especially directed provides that—

An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine.

Now, the original act provided that the Secretary should distribute these seeds among the people of the United States and among agriculturalists. This section of the paragraph provides that he shall not do that, but that he shall distribute five-sixths of them among the Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to ask him a question right there?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The law provides for the distribution of these seeds by the Secretary of Agriculture, but does not say how he shall do it. Now, is it a change of existing law if Congress indicates to him how it wants him to distribute these seeds, whether through the Members of Congress and Delegates, or whether directly by himself? That is one proposition. Is it a change of existing law if we do that?

The second proposition is, having given him the authority to distribute these seeds, does it violate that other rule in taking from him the discretion given him by law when we direct him to distribute a portion of them through the congressional delegation?

Mr. SUMNERS. I answer both those interrogatories in the affirmative, if the Chairman please; but I desire to direct my remarks especially to the latter inquiry of the Chairman, because if that is sustained the point of order is sustained.

Mr. Chairman, who is it, under this proposed provision, that is to determine where the seeds are to go or to whom they are to go? Clearly the law places upon the Secretary of Agri-

culture—there can be no question about that—the duty to determine where and to whom these seeds are to go; and this provision in the pending bill takes from the Secretary that discretion. Not only is that true, but the Secretary of Agriculture does not distribute the seeds under this proposed section. Why does he not distribute them? His department acts merely in a clerical capacity for the Members of Congress, because they, in the exercise of their judgment, tell him to whom these seeds are to go and where they are to be sent. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will suggest, but the point seems to me to be so clear that I scarcely know how to discuss it to the Chair. It is as plain as human language can make it. This provision says that five-sixths of these seeds, which the law declared the Secretary of Agriculture should distribute among the people, shall, instead of being distributed among the people by the Secretary of Agriculture, be distributed among the Members of the Congress, and that the Members of the Congress shall distribute them among the people of the United States. I am a new Member here, and I do not know just what the procedure of the House is. I shall not discuss this further; but I should like to have the right, if under the rules I may have it, to close the debate on this matter after the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has stated the reasons why, in his judgment, the point of order should not lie against the paragraph.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman think this provision on page 23 of the bill does anything else except provide for a method of distribution among the people of the United States by the Department of Agriculture? Does the gentleman think the fact that it uses Members of Congress as a means of distribution affects the law at all?

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not agree with the gentleman in his conclusion. I think instead of the Department of Agriculture using Members of Congress for the distribution of seeds, it is clear that the Members of Congress use the Department of Agriculture for the distribution of seeds, because they tell the Secretary of Agriculture where to send them and to whom to send them. The Agricultural Department does not call upon Members of Congress for their service. And I may say in passing, though it has no bearing on the point of order, that the Secretary of Agriculture has suggested that this method of distribution ought to be discontinued in order that the appropriation may be used in a constructive way.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to section 526 of the Revised Statutes, which contains this language:

> The Commissioner of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office by the collection of statistics and by other appropriate means within his power; he shall collect new and valuable seeds and plants; he shall test, by cultivation, the value of such of them as may require such tests; shall propagate such as may be worthy of propagation; and shall distribute them among agriculturists.

Clearly, there is no doubt of the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and distribute seeds. The statute gives him that right. The only proposition involved is whether or not the language in this bill is a limitation upon the means of distribution which the Secretary may employ in getting these seeds out to the people. That is a close point, but I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that no matter what the opinion of the Chair may be as to whether or not this is a limitation upon the means of distribution at the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture of these garden and flower seeds, the House itself, on at least one occasion, has held that this language is not obnoxious to the rule. I do not remember in what Congress it was, but the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD, now a Senator from that State, made the point of order against this identical language. The Chair sustained his point of order. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], who sits on my right, immediately appealed from the decision of the Chair, and on a direct vote of the House the appeal of the gentleman from Mississippi was sustained.

My recollection is that a similar appeal was taken from a later ruling of the Chair, but of that I am not entirely certain. My recollection is that, again, on that occasion the House sustained the appeal and overruled the Chair.

Now, it seems to me that upon a question of so much doubt as this the Chair should take judicial notice of the former action of the House, for, after all, the House and not the Chair makes the rules.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman quite sure that Mr. Powers in the chair sustained the point of order and the House overruled him?

Mr. LEVER. That is my recollection. I have not looked the matter up, and my recollection is concurred in by the recollection of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. As I recollect, the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Foster, was in the chair and not Mr. Powers, of Maine.

Mr. MANN. I have the RECORD before me, and perhaps the gentleman had better wait until I make this statement. On that occasion, May 1, 1906, no appeal was taken. The point of order was withdrawn. Mr. Wadsworth, of New York, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, made the point of order. I think the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Foster, was in the chair, and after discussion the point of order was withdrawn. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Lamb, in making his argument, made this statement:

> But we are not without precedents in this case. Every gentleman who was in the last Congress—

The gentleman was mistaken about this—

> remembers when a point of order was made by my friend from Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD, and the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Powers, was in the chair, that this very question was discussed. I will not stop here to read the ruling of the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Powers, on that occasion, because so many of these gentlemen who are interested in this subject have read it and know just as much about it as I do. The ruling is familiar. Mr. Chairman, you can not rule against us in this matter unless you overrule the decision of the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Powers, in an exactly analogous case, one standing on all fours with this.

I do not know which gentleman was in error, but the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Powers, took part in the discussion and stated that they could not rule this out on a point of order, in his opinion.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say that I have a very distinct recollection of the fact that Representative SHEPPARD made a point of order against this language. I can place him standing right back here now. The Chair sustained the point of order. There was a good deal of interest in the item. The House was filled that morning, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] promptly rose and appealed from the decision of the Chair. That was in 1907, and the appeal was sustained.

Mr. MANN. The decision of Mr. Powers was before 1906. In 1906, May 1, the point of order was made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Wadsworth, and, after discussion, was withdrawn. In 1907 I made the point of order on this paragraph and subsequently withdrew it. It was renewed by some one else.

Mr. LEVER. By Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. MANN. No; by Mr. JONES of Washington. I have now the RECORD before me, and this is the time when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] appealed from the decision of the Chair. This was the ruling of the Chair at that time:

> The CHAIRMAN. This question was raised before the committee in almost similar terms a year ago and was discussed fully. It was admitted at that time that it was a close question. Finally the point of order was withdrawn, and the Chair, therefore, was not called upon to rule. If this were a new question, it seems to the Chair that there could be no doubt in any mind as to the duty of the Chair to sustain the point of order. While, owing to some decisions and some precedents in the past, the question is somewhat complicated and there is some doubt about it, the Chair feels that this question should be determined by the House once and for all, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.
>
> Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I have very great respect for the opinion of the Chair and the highest personal regard for the gentleman who now occupies the chair; still I am constrained to respectfully appeal from the decision.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?
>
> The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. I demand tellers.
>
> Tellers were ordered.
>
> Mr. Wadsworth and Mr. Lamb were appointed tellers.
>
> The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 84, noes 136.
>
> So the decision of the Chair was not sustained.

I call that to the attention of the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Chairman stated that he submitted it to the House to be settled for all time.

Mr. MANN. No; he decided the question himself, and an appeal was taken.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied that if we search the RECORD we will find that a similar action took place on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think I can be wrong about it.

Mr. MANN. That was on the decision I have referred to when the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Powers, was in the chair.

Mr. LEVER. Then I was not so far wrong.

Mr. MANN. It was not identically the same question, but very similar.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which the Chair has had read to him, and which the Chair himself has finished reading, it seems to me that upon a question so close as this the Chair is bound to take cognizance of the judgment of the Committee of the Whole in the past on this proposition.

Mr. MANN. Let me say that it was the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Foster, who was in the chair when the decision of January 29, 1907, was overruled by the House.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I would like to ask in what respect the language in this bill for the purchase and distribution of seeds differs from the language of the last bill, and if it is the intention of the committee to frame the language in this bill so that there will no longer be a distribution of seeds take place as at present, and that it will be strictly in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to distribution?

Mr. LEVER. There are only three changes in the language of this bill against the language of last year. The first change you will find, on page 22, line 2, where you will see that we have added the word "congressional." Then we have cut out a little further down the language "of which amount not less than $257,000 shall be allowed for congressional distribution," because we added the word "congressional" above. Then we have cut out the item for distribution of drought-resistant seeds, because we put it in another paragraph and have reduced the amount. There is no real change; the seeds will be distributed as they have been before.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee with furthering discussion of the point involved. The only suggestion that has come from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] indicating a possible reason why the Chairman of this committee should rule against the point of order is that at former sessions of Congress other men occupying the position which the Chairman now occupies have ruled against the point of order. I recognize that some weight should be given to precedents, but I also recognize that in the nature of things if there is to be any progress and improvement each man charged with responsibility must act upon the responsibility of his own judgment, and I respectfully submit to the Chairman that no argument or statement has been submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina in opposition to the statement that this paragraph in the bill not only takes from the Secretary of Agriculture discretion with reference to the distribution of these seeds but takes from him the distribution of these seeds and makes him merely an instrument, an agent, of the Members of Congress. Whether the Secretary of Agriculture distributes these seeds or Members of Congress distribute these seeds seems to me very easily determined by submitting it to this test—who is it that determines where the seed is to go? Who is it that determines to whom the seed is to go? Whoever determines those two points makes the distribution, regardless of the clerical agency used to do the work.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the argument on this point of order gentlemen who are opposed to it and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], have emphasized unduly the action of a former Committee of the Whole in overruling the ruling of the Chair upon this question. This is not a matter for the decision of the committee. This is a matter of law; it is a matter of the observance of the rules of the House of Representatives, and the present occupant of the chair is charged with the responsibility of deciding this point of order, not upon any former action of the committee, but upon the facts as they exist and whether this is contrary to the rules of the House.

I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that, to say the least, the law on the statute books regulating the distribution of these seeds by the Secretary of Agriculture left to him the power and the right to distribute them as he pleased. The language of this bill and the bills that have gone before it have written into the law a limitation upon that power, limiting the Secretary of Agriculture in the discharge of the duty that was imposed upon him by the law creating the department, and the only point that I care to call especially to the attention of the Chair is the fact that after all is said this limitation is legislation upon an appropriation bill and obnoxious to the rules of the House.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, just one moment in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE]. Let me suppose this situation for the benefit of the Chair. The Chair has been called upon time after time to rule on the same proposition. The Chair has uniformly ruled the same way, and the House has universally on appeal overridden the judgment of the Chair. Would it not be reasonable for the Chair to take notice of the judgment of the House on a proposition of that kind? The Chair has been overruled in this particular instance only once, because the question has been brought to the direct attention of the Chair only once and passed upon; but the Chair was overwhelmingly overruled in that instance, and it does seem to me the Chair is not going beyond his jurisdiction or right when he accepts the judgment of this House on its construction of a rule of the House as his own judgment. I ask for a ruling.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to this discussion, except that the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] have just suggested to my mind this point: The Chairman has not yet received the judgment of this House upon this parliamentary question. This threat to overrule the Chair reminds me of the recall of judicial decisions. The question the Chair has to decide is a question of parliamentary law, and the Chair has no right to delegate to the committee of this House or any former House of Representatives the duty of deciding that question.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I beg to submit that I believe in the consideration of this point of order the Chair ought to take cognizance of the will of the House. My interpretation of law is that it breathes the heart and the sentiment of the people. These Representatives come from the people. We are the mere functionaries for the people we represent, and they form our opinions for us. The people of America, when we come to the fundamental principles of our Government, make the law, and the strict technical ruling of this Chair should be the sentiment of this House. If the House of Representatives, the people's representatives, believe that the distribution of garden seeds to the farmers, the people of this country, should be committed to their Representatives, the Congressmen, instead of to a centralized power, one head far removed from the people, then I think the ruling of the Chair should express that sentiment. I believe that it is proper for the Chair in considering this ruling to consider the will of the House, and I believe that the Members of this House should distribute the garden seeds.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to suggest this about the parliamentary question involved. For a period of 25 years, ever since the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, a uniform construction of this statute has been had. It has been the uniform custom from 1889 until the present time to distribute these seeds in this way. It seems to me that when the parliamentary question is presented to the Chair the natural thing to do would be to follow the uniform construction of statute by the parties, by both the Department of Agriculture and by this House, during all of these 25 years. As I understand, it has never been departed from. It has been the same; it has been uniform from the beginning until now—that is to say, the seeds have been distributed by Members, as at present—and I suggest that the burden is certainly upon the gentlemen who are attacking it, and not upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture or upon the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, if he should be in doubt about it. In case of doubt, the doubt should be resolved in favor of that construction of the statute which the parties themselves have uniformity given to it all these years. Of course, I am in favor of the provision and believe the seed should be distributed as heretofore, and that the only amendment should be that a larger quantity of seed should be provided.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is the duty of the Chair, in rendering a decision upon parliamentary law, to pay any attention whatever to the feelings of the House, to the sentiment of the House, or to the wish of the House; nor is the fact that this item has been in the statute for years any guide, because many items that are subject to points of order remain in bills because the points of order are not made. I can not see how the Chair has much chance for individual opinion in this case. It was a controverted proposition here for years as to whether this seed item was in order. In 1906, on a point of order to an amendment offered by Capt. Lamb, the point of order was discussed at considerable length, and such eminent parliamentarians as Mr. Olmsted, Mr. Dalzell, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and others, took part in that discussion, all admitting that it was a somewhat close question under the law. The point of order was withdrawn and the amendment went in. In 1907, when the bill was again before the House, a point of order was made, and the Chair sustained the point of order; but the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, on appeal, overruled the Chair. It is not necessary to be a lawyer to

know that a decision of a court in one case ought to be, at least, somewhat binding on the same court when the same question arises in another case. Without that decisions become purely arbitrary and personal, and it has always been the rule in parliamentary bodies that where the Chair decided a parliamentary question and subsequently another chairman was called upon to decide the same question that he paid great deference to the former decision; and it has been the universal rule, I think, in parliamentary bodies that where the Chair decides a parliamentary question and an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair and the decision was overruled by the parliamentary body that that would guide the next chairman in the decision of the same question—not upon his individual opinion, but upon the former ruling of the parliamentary body over which he presided. Now, if the Chair sustains the point of order here or overrules the point of order, it still leaves the power in the committee to overrule the Chair; but if the House heretofore in Committee of the Whole has decided itself upon this parliamentary question, the Chair is bound by that decision, and then if this House desires to reverse the ruling of the Chair, that can be done on appeal.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only one word upon this point suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. The previous Chairman, Mr. Foster of Vermont, when this question was presented to him, no doubt knowing at that time an appeal would be taken from his decision, stated at the time he rendered his decision sustaining the point of order that he did so that it might be submitted to the House, in order that it might be forever and eternally settled, and the House settled it at that time by overruling the decision of the Chairman. In the construction of all statutes passed by legislative bodies the supreme courts of the various States take into consideration the intention of the legislative body in the passage of any law; hence in the construction of this statute the intention and the purpose of the House certainly should be considered by the Chair in ruling upon this question; and if the present Chairman does so, he will overrule the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair recognizes that this question is not entirely free from difficulties in reaching a proper conclusion on the law in reference thereto, but it is a question that has arisen every time for a number of years when the Agricultural appropriation bill has been up, and the Chair will say to the gentleman from Texas that the Chair thinks he is in error as to the ruling on this proposition by former Chairmen, and that the rulings have heretofore been largely in favor of the gentleman's contention; so the question is not without difficulty to decide. Section 527 of the Revised Statutes reads:

> The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another.

In 1904 the gentleman who represented in part then the State of Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD, made a point of order against a certain provision of the Agricultural bill which was identical with the provision we are now considering, to wit:

> The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of the country to another.

After the debate the Chairman, who was then Gov. Powers, of Maine, said:

> The question raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] presents some difficulties. The Chair is inclined to construe the bill somewhat as if it read in a little different manner—as if it read thus: "And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, only on the following conditions: For the purpose of testing and distribution," etc.
>
> And while admitting that you can not place a limitation upon the discretion of the Secretary where the law gives him a right to exercise it, yet construing this paragraph not as a limitation upon his discretion, but rather an addition, and a limitation upon which the appropriation is granted, I shall not sustain the point of order to the whole section—
>
> And so forth.

And then the Chair went into a discussion of another feature of the bill that is not in this section under consideration now. The Chair observes that he ought not and could not, because it is unnecessary, take into consideration the opinion of the present committee, but he does feel that he ought to be governed somewhat by the recorded decisions of former committees upon this identical proposition. The House makes the rules; it is the duty of the Chairman to follow those rules as he understands them; and if in the past a Chairman so construed those rules or any part of them in a way that he thinks they ought to be construed, and the House overrules him, the Chair is of opinion that a succeeding Chairman ought to be governed rather by the decision of the House or by the committee than by the individual opinion of the Chairman. On that the Chair finds a record, of date of January 29, 1907, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made a point of order on this practically identical proposition when Mr. Foster, of Vermont, was Chairman, and the gentleman from Illinois having withdrawn the point of order, it was renewed by another Member, so that the identical question was passed upon. The gentleman then occupying the chair said this:

> This question was raised before the committee in almost similar terms a year ago, and was discussed fully. It was admitted at that time that it was a close question. Finally the point of order was withdrawn, and the Chair therefore was not called upon to rule. If this were a new question, it would seem to the Chair that there could be no doubt in any mind as to the duty of the Chair to sustain the point of order. While, owing to some decisions and some precedents in the past, the question is somewhat complicated and there is some doubt about it, the Chair feels that this question should be determined by the House once and for all, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

There was an appeal taken from that decision, and the Chair was overruled by a vote of 84 to 136.

Now, the present occupant of the Chair feels inclined to think that he ought to attach some importance, at least, to the decision of the committee at that time when the matter was squarely and fairly before them. And therefore recognizing there is some doubt about it, and, in fact, great doubt about it, thinking perhaps that former decisions may have been erroneous in holding that the provision was out of order, because this section is undoubtedly very broad, and being of the opinion that the law that gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to make this distribution would perhaps entitle a succeeding Congress, without being charged with enacting new legislation, to indicate the manner in which this distribution may be made—how the Secretary of Agriculture may make this distribution—but I say, leaving that question out of it, it seems to the Chair that a former committee having so emphatically construed this rule itself, the Chair ought to be bound by it, and therefore overrules the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. SUMNERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend by striking out all of pages 22 and 23, down to and including line 14, on page 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds and plants, for the investigation and improvement of grasses and forage crops, $175,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $100,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such seeds and plants."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will not reserve a point of order, because I do not think it is subject to a point of order. I would like to arrange, however, if I might, to limit the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many gentlemen may want to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. You had better make it an hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it an hour. A lot of us will want to talk on it.

Mr. LEVER. An hour is a little long.

Mr. MADDEN. It may take longer than that if you do not agree to it.

Mr. MANN. Better make it an hour.

Mr. LEVER. In deference to the gentlemen who seem to want to talk on this proposition I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in one hour's time, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there ought to be any agreement as to who is to control the time. I think it ought to be done under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in one hour. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just read by the Clerk is intended to have the same effect as the point of order made by myself against the paragraph dealing with what has come to be known as congressional distribution of seed. This amendment is in line with that part of the last report of

the Secretary of Agriculture in which he suggested the advisability of discontinuing the present method of seed distribution in order that the seed might be used in a constructive way. I have the honor, Mr. Chairman, to represent in part, as Congressman at Large, the State of Texas, which ranks high in agriculture. In my campaign for the nomination I promised if elected to oppose the method of distribution of seed known as congressional distribution. The act creating the Agriculture Department and defining the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to procure, propagate, and distribute certain seed and plants among the people.

The act does not authorize promiscuous distribution by any agency. There is no more authority under this or any other act for distribution of seed by Members of Congress than there is for their distribution by the doctors or lawyers of the country. Members of Congress belong to an entirely different branch of the Government from that to which the Secretary of Agriculture belongs. But notwithstanding that fact, this bill sets apart five-sixths of the seed, the purchase of which is provided for in the section under consideration, to be distributed as Members of Congress direct. Under this appropriation bill Members of Congress are to determine where and to whom the seed are to be sent. This is in direct violation of the law, which places that discretion and duty with the Secretary of Agriculture. But my objection to this method of distribution goes beyond the mere matter of its violation of enacted law. I believe that custom to be against public policy, contrary to the substantial interest of the agricultural classes, and that it works injury to the prestige of the Congress of the United States. It is well understood that many Members of Congress consider this privilege to be a valuable political asset. They believe that these packages of seed, paid for out of the Public Treasury, bearing upon each package their name, aids them in getting reelected. If it does aid them, it is an improper aid. Members of Congress seeking reelection by agricultural constituency should have to trust to their record in dealing with the great interest, agriculture, rather than to trust in part to the impression created upon the minds of the credulous that the package of garden seed, paid for by the Government and sent out under the Member's frank, addressed by his secretary from the poll tax or other general list of names, is an evidence of the Member's personal concern in their welfare.

There is no wisdom in a public policy which would permit that distribution of garden seed to profit in a political way the people's representative in Congress. I want the day to come when the Members of Congress, facing their constituencies, must answer to them with reference to their efforts to deal effectively with the great economic and constructive problems of the farmers. It is not a spoonful of garden seed that the farmers of this country need each year and a lot of hot air during the campaign, but a better system of credits and a better system of marketing for their products. They do not need the charity of the Government. They want justice only and the recognition on the part of the Government that their vocation is not a mere commissary, valuable only to feed business, but that theirs is a great business, and should be dealt with as such in shaping the economic and governmental policy of the country. They should not be treated as children, to be pleased and obligated to their Congressmen by a few seed. They should be treated as full-grown, independent American citizens. If Congress is determined to have these seed sent out as now, let it direct by proper legislation the Secretary of Agriculture to send them to each family, to the schools, and to whoever or whatever else it is determined to have them sent. We belong to the legislative branch of the Government.

The Secretary of Agriculture belongs to the executive branch. The distribution of seed is not a legislative, but an executive service. What warrant is there for us, under the letter or the spirit of the Constitution, which we have sworn to uphold, to invade the province of the executive branch and become the distributors of the seed, which the law says is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture? We would have no right to pass such a law, much less do we have such a right in this appropriation bill. This is not ordinary legislation, this is an appropriation bill. Congress in the passage of such a bill is limited to the provision of the money necessary to put into effect existing legislation. Existing law limits seed distribution to the Secretary of Agriculture. There is not one word in the law authorizing congressional distribution. In the face of the Constitution, in violation of the law, which has left whatever discretion there is to the Secretary of Agriculture, we propose to give to Members of Congress, acting not even as the Congress but as individual Members, the power to direct the Secretary of Agriculture where and to whom five-sixths of these seed are to be sent. In this appropriation bill we illegally deprive the Secretary of Agriculture of the discretion, which the law gives him, and gives this discretion, with reference to the exercise of a duty belonging to a part of the executive branch of the Government, to ourselves as individual Members. Is it any wonder that people seeking for the reason which prompts us to do this extreme, and as I believe clearly illegal, thing conclude that we are seeking to do ourselves a political service?

We are the censors of the official conduct of all the officers of the Government, from the President of the United States down. We owe the duty to ourselves, to our respective constituents, and to the country at large, to free ourselves from the suspicion that we are breaking through the constitutional barrier which separates us from the executive branch of the Government, taking from an officer of that branch of the Government the discretion vested in him by law; that we are going even to the Treasury of the United States, and then with the money which we get there, and with the Secretary of Agriculture deprived of his legal discretion, we make him our agent to do for us the work of sending out these seeds, and that in so doing we are not unmindful of the incidental political benefit to ourselves. Mr. Chairman, it is absurd to talk about the Secretary of Agriculture being permitted under the language of this appropriation bill to distribute the five-sixths of the seed referred to. He has no discretion. He has no say. He has no choice. There is not one thing left for him to do, except to do as the individuals who happen to be Members of Congress tell him to do. He is their clerk, that is all. His office merely does the clerical work of pasting on their franks and sending this seed for them to those to whom in the exercise of their discretion Members of Congress direct him to send them. They may send them only to the members of their respective parties, and, as a matter of fact, many Members of Congress do this. They may send them to their party committeemen to be distributed by them. Some Members do this. All of them have the power to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to send out their quota of seed this way. This is wrong, and ought not to be continued. I do not purpose to reflect upon Members who differ from me. In a measure they are the victims of a custom which has grown up here; when Members come to Congress they find it here. This custom is deeply rooted now, and I fully realize the hopelessness of my efforts on this occasion. But the day will come when this custom will have to go, just as other things have gone which in former times were not questioned.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. I do not agree with him at all that the distribution of these seeds through Members of Congress has anything whatever to do with the politics of the country. We men who come from great cities——

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time. I have only five minutes. We men who come from great cities feel that we can do no better work than distribute seeds to the children who attend the public schools and, under the direction of those who are paid out of the public treasury to teach these children, enable them to learn how to cultivate the seeds and to enjoy the beauties that come from the development of them. No such work can be done through any distribution of seeds made direct by the Secretary of Agriculture. No such systematic distribution of the seeds can be made in any other way.

I recall very well that in the public schools of the district that I have the honor to represent, where we have more than 50,000 children attending those schools, demands far in excess of my ability to provide come for the seeds which are furnished as the result of this legislation. The children are happy in the work which they are able to do by reason of the cultivation of these seeds. They receive an education which no curriculum can afford by reason of the opportunity which the distribution of these seeds supplies.

I do not know how it is in the agricultural districts of the country, whether the people want the seeds or not; but, strange as it may seem, the men and women and children everywhere throughout the densely populated sections of the country, in the cities, are not only anxious to receive them and to have them distributed in this way but their requests are far in excess of the ability of the Member to supply. By reason of the opportunity afforded through this legislation, we find in the tenement-house districts in the great cities flower boxes in every window, flower gardens in every back yard, flower gardens surrounding the houses that otherwise would know no color of verdure of any kind. This, in my judgment, is not only salutary legislation, but, by all means, it is the manner of

distribution that ought to apply. This is not money expended in vain. It is no waste of public funds. It is not only no extravagant expenditure of the public funds but, in my judgment, it is one of the best expenditures that can be made.

I sincerely hope that the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, if one has been made, that this system of distribution be discontinued, will not be adopted, nor that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will prevail. The distribution of seeds by the Secretary of Agriculture must necessarily be limited in its scope, but the distribution of these seeds through the Members of Congress reaches almost every household in the land.

Is there any other activity that we could employ that would interest the people more? Is there any activity that the people could engage in which would be more beneficial to the communities in which they live than to be given an opportunity to develop these rare seeds that are purchased at high prices by the Government of the United States in order that the people of the country may know exactly what can be done by their development? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the farmer and his sons and his daughters getting their usual allotment of garden and flower seed, and I am in favor of its being received by him under the frank of his Congressman, just as he has been accustomed to getting them. [Applause.]

I know there are a lot of smart people all over the country, some of them in Washington and some of them at home, who poke fun at us because we send packages of garden seeds to our farmer constituents. I am not dismayed when I go home and some fellow makes fun of the package of garden seed that I sent to him, because almost every day's mail brings me some acknowledgment from some little boy or some little girl or some humble farmer in the country thanking me for the package of seed that had been received from the Congressman; and there are a good many of them in my district who, when they get a package of garden seed, get about all that is left for them after we have paid the bills for pensions and battleships. [Applause.]

I am for the farmer's package of garden seeds. I know that the newspapers want to make fun of the congressional seed distribution. They use it somewhat as they do the mother-in-law joke, as something pert and smart and funny. But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Congressman who sends a package of seed out into the country where some farmer's boy or farmer's girl may plant them in the back yard and learn the rudiments of agriculture, and watch them grow with all the pride of proprietorship, propably does about as much good in that regard as he does in a good many other things.

What is the object of this amendment? It is to strike out the farmer's garden seed. And what do they propose to put in its stead? A provision for the expenditure of money in the way that is already provided for in the bill. Is it economy that the gentlemen seek in striking out the pitiful sum for the farmer's garden seed? If so, where were they on last pension day, when in this House and in this committee we suffered the enactment of a private pension bill which took the equivalent of $8,000 in behalf of a man who had drawn two pensions and who had defrauded the Government, according to the admission of the commissioner himself.

It is a far cry to give any credence to the carping critics of this country who make fun of the garden-seed distribution and who demand that it shall be discontinued. I want it to go into the household of every man in my district. I want every child in my district to learn the way I sign my name. [Laughter and applause.] I want to be known by them, and I want to be loved and respected by them; and I am none too good and none too big in this age, when we are voting vast sums for big battleships, and for big Army and Navy appropriation bills, and for automobiles for Cabinet officers, and pensions for clerks, and pensions for men who draw two pensions, to be ashamed of the package of garden seed which I send out; and I would be ashamed of myself if in the interest of economy I were to assist in striking down the little package of garden seeds, which is about all that some farmers get out of Congress.

At any rate, I am not afraid of the gimlet-headed dude in the town who will make fun of me at home because I send out a package of seed. I send it to the men and their families who I know have used it to good purpose. Down in my district they are putting the little back yards into gardens, and in the cities and in every other place in this country we are teaching the people to turn the unused earth into a garden and feed the human family. And now some wise economist says that because some carping newspaper critic has criticized him, because some gimlet-headed dude has made fun of him, the farmer's seed must go. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it will never go by my vote. I will vote to give him a package of garden seed, and to give every member of his family a package of garden seed; and we will not leave it to the Secretary of Agriculture and his clerks to send them out, but we will send them out ourselves, with our names on them, and our franks on them. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment, but for reasons different from those proposed by the mover thereof.

I am opposed to the provision in the bill as it stands, not because I do not believe there are benefits derived therefrom, but because I believe the benefits derived therefrom are not in proportion to the amount expended. But I am more especially opposed to the provision as it stands because I think the manner of distribution has a tendency to bring discredit upon Members of Congress; not that I think it is improper, but because of the manner in which it is continually harped upon and talked about, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who has just taken his seat, has stated; and I think it would be better for us to dispense with the few benefits that may be derived from this provision than to continue to have this discredit cast upon Congress.

As I stated, I am opposed to this provision because I think the benefits are not in proportion to the amount expended. We all know that a large number of these seed packages reach people who care nothing for them, and who will make no use of them, and they are wasted in that way.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman think the benefit derived from the expenditures for rivers and harbors is in proportion to the amount expended?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I must decline to enter into a discussion of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman think the benefit derived from the expenditure for battleships is in proportion to the amount expended?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not care to discuss that question. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who made this motion, has asserted that the object of this provision was that Members of this House might use it for their political benefit. I deny that the provision is any benefit in a political way to any Member of this House. It has been no benefit to me, and I believe other Members have had the same experience. On the contrary, it has been a large expense and quite a burden, and I am getting tired of being charged with this provision as a sort of congressional graft, when, in fact, as I have stated, it is an expense and burden. I send out these seeds because when this provision is put in the bill a large number of my constituents expect them, and I intend that they shall have them if the provision is continued in the bill, as it may be.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, this provision has a tendency to cast discredit on the Members of Congress, because we exercise our privilege of selecting the persons to whom the seeds shall be sent. In the majority of cases, and, I think, in practically all cases we do it fairly, sending the seeds as much as possible to those who will make the best use of them and those who desire them, and not with any purpose to make political capital out of them; because, whether we desire it or not, we are bound to lose more than we will gain out of this provision. In my judgment it is more of a liability than an asset to any Member of Congress. Therefore I support the motion.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, whether the distribution of these seeds is a liability or an asset, I am against this motion to strike out this provision. Some men are trying to take away from the farmers of the United States what little they have. Who is it that would object to the farmers of this country getting each a nice package of a special variety of garden seeds? We are always talking about telling the farmer what to do. We have a Bureau of Biology down here, and you have got men walking around over the conservation parks of the United States picking bugs off the trees and digging into the bark, and yet gentlemen here object to the farmers having garden seeds sent to them by their Congressmen. We may not accomplish much here, but I want to say that, as one Congressman, I want the privilege of sending my farmers a package of garden seed. I know that they appreciate them. I know that the great majority of them plant these seeds; they watch them grow; they cultivate them; they do their best to make them profitable.

The plants grow up, and the farmer appreciates them. He feels that the Federal Government has an interest in him, and, instead of being a liability, I believe this is an asset to every Congressman. [Applause.] I know that, for my part, I am going to send every package of seeds the Government allows me and then some. [Laughter and applause.] The farmers of this country appreciate the interest that the Government takes in them. They appreciate what this Congress is endeavoring to do for them. The farmers of the United States are entitled to consideration. This little dab of $257,000 to give a choice variety of garden seeds and flower seeds to 22,000 people in each congressional district is worth a great deal to the people of this Republic.

When the Government gets willing to do more for the agricultural class, then we will be on the road of progress; the people of this country will see the dawn of a brighter day.

Mr. DIES. Does my friend from Mississippi realize that this pitiful $257,000 that we are sending to the farmers in the way of seeds would buy another 14-inch gun for one of these $15,000,000 battleships that we are going to authorize in a day or two?

Mr. QUIN. I did not know it would buy a whole gun.

Mr. DIES. Yes; it will buy a whole gun.

Mr. QUIN. I know there are many Congressmen who would rather put it into a gun to go out and waste the people's money than to distribute it to 10,000,000 farmers in the United States to raise vegetables and start the trucking business in their community. Why, sir, this little pitiful allowance that would be enough for one gun will raise vegetables enough for 40,000,000 people next summer, and they will save the seeds and plant them in the fall, and then have a good fall and winter garden.

Mr. DIES. I hope the gentleman will remember that in a few days it is proposed to create six vice admirals and increase their pay from $9,000,000 to $11,000,000 a year, and we need some money for that.

Mr. QUIN. That is very true; but here is one Member of the House of Representatives who is going to jump on that thing with both feet. The excuse for it is that the Navy needs some officers qualified to play royal society in foreign ports. If this House follows the Senate and creates this position of vice admiral for six promotions, then the Army will want places created for six additional officers of corresponding rank. I am going to stand here and fight against that proposition. I am going to do everything I can on this floor for the farmer, too. [Applause.] I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has a heart for the great mass of the people who work for a living in the United States. I know that he is in sympathy with the toiling masses.

Mr. DIES. Does my friend realize that we will be made fun of for voting to give packages of garden seeds to the farmer?

Mr. QUIN. I know that. I have noticed this thing in a few papers and in some of the Washington papers. I have noticed that they call the distribution of garden seeds by the Congressman a species of graft.

Mr. DIES. They are afraid some of this money will get away from them, are they not?

Mr. QUIN. They are afraid it will get away from the District of Columbia. It seems to me that every time it is proposed to tax the people of the District of Columbia like our constituents are taxed back home the Member who proposes that is a blockhead; he is not a progressive man for the people; but just as soon as a Member gets up on this floor and says one word for the District of Columbia to be kept up and maintained by taxing our constituents to the utmost, they either have his picture in the paper or great, big headlines telling what a noble statesman he is. [Laughter.]

Sir, I am against this pending motion. The people are entitled to these garden seed and should have them. Who is it that hath the "gall" to take away from the farmers the little "mite" now allowed in seeds? I favor giving the American farmer more encouragement. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, having on several previous occasions marched up against this congressional distribution of seeds, I realize the fate of this amendment at the hands of this committee. I realize also and I appreciate the frankness of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN], who have just addressed the committee. They are to be commended for frankly admitting that this is to them a political asset. No man on this floor appreciates more the esteem of his constituents than do I, but I want to obtain and retain the esteem and respect of the agricultural constituency that I represent on some other ground than sending them a package of garden seeds. [Applause.] The Department of Agriculture was instituted and inaugurated for the purpose of serving the agricultural classes of this country and of furthering the great interests of that productive class that feeds all of us. I believe there is just as much warrant in the law for an appropriation in this bill or any other bill to send to the farmers or any other class of citizens in this country a hoe to cultivate the garden with as to send him seeds to plant the garden.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. With pleasure.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman consider that it would be any different to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to send it through a clerk in the office than the proposition contained in the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do; I recognize a great difference, because the provision in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, which is the provision submitted to this committee by the Agricultural Department itself, that seeds worth having will be sent to the agriculturists of this country and seeds of new species and new varieties that will mean something to the producing agriculturists of the country.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; I can not. I have not the time. As I said, I can not but know what the result of the vote is going to be. I will tell you something else. There is not an audience in the United States of America of a like size that you can address on this subject that will not agree with me except this audience. There is not another body of men of this size that you can gather in the United States of America, in my humble judgment, that will make the same decision on this question that you are going to make. For five campaigns in my district I have the honor to represent on this floor ever since I have been in this body I have consistently voted against congressional distribution, and making it an issue in the district I represent. I never yet mentioned it to an audience of agriculturists that they did not agree with me. There is not a newspaper in the district I represent that is not opposed to congressional graft, because it is that and nothing else.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not possible that the gentleman's speeches have convinced his constituents on the subject?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think not.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not a fact that the National Grange is on record against the free distribution of seeds?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Every farmer's organization in the United States of America is against it. I can produce resolutions from hundreds of local organizations of farmers' unions in my district and the district represented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] who have passed resolutions against this distribution, and which were forwarded to me because of my opposition on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not specially interested in the discussion of this appropriation, but one principal source of argument for this amendment has not been mentioned. The gentleman from North Carolina speaks about the number of farm organizations favoring this amendment. I presume that every seed-selling establishment in the United States would also agree with him.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I never have been able to see why the seed-producing establishments in the United States should object to this. They sell the seed to the Agricultural Department. It is bought in the open market. There is no force in that argument.

Mr. SLOAN. Well, I will leave that to the House.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If the gentleman will pardon me, we tested that several years ago and held very extensive hearings before the committee. All the seed houses in the United States were here present opposing this congressional seed distribution. Not only that, but they maintained an office in the city of Washington, in charge of a gentleman employed by them to create sentiment against it.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to emphasize this proposition. The great value of the seed distribution lies in the fact that they go to the homes of millions of people throughout the United States. Every man who has seeds to sell, either by wholesale or retail, knows, as a matter of fact, that in millions of gardens, back yards, and fields throughout the country their seeds are to be measured up against the seed furnished by the United States Department of Agriculture, which are standard seeds. The great value of the distribution of seed from year to year has not been a political value or an asset, but it has tended toward the standardization of seed in every part of the United States. Every dealer in seed knows that his customers, who are liable to receive good, pure, vital seed from Washington, will know that the seed which he tenders them will be measured by

weight, by handling, by its production in the bed, the patch, or in the field. The greatest opposition comes from the people who desire to sell seed throughout the country without having it from year to year measured up against the millions of packages of seed that are distributed to the people of the United States in every State and in every section from the Department of Agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House recognizes the fact that one of the great needs of this country is the beautifying of the home and making it attractive. I have sent great quantities of flower seed into my district, at considerable personal cost, but I feel amply paid for the trouble and expense in realizing that my constituents appreciate them and in knowing that many of these seed reach the homes of good families of limited means, thus affording them pleasure and adding to the table comforts. It is a source of pride to me to see the flower beds and green gardens as I travel through the county and hear the honest housewife tell of her successes with the Government's contribution to her garden and flower yard.

I send flower seeds into my district as well as vegetable seed. They seem to appreciate flower seeds as much as, if not more than, garden seeds. Not only the people who are not able to buy the seed appreciate them, but people who are wealthy appreciate them. As we grow older I think we like flowers more than we do in youth.

Mr. Chairman, since the Christmas holidays, I have received, I can safely say, as many as 3,000 requests for additional seed. These letters tell me of the success of the Government seed and the joy they bring to the home. I am in favor of increasing the appropriation instead of defeating it.

Many of these requests come from people who can not write very well, who can not spell some of their words very well, and I have some difficulty in reading some of their letters. But O Mr. Speaker, I find a heart in these letters. I understand these good people and love to grant their requests. Many letters come to thank me for the seed that I have sent them. This appropriation for seed is so small that no man should object.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this occasion, but gentlemen stand here and try to defeat this seed appropriation in the name of economy. When I see such inconsistency on the part of gentlemen I can not remain silent. Millions upon millions are appropriated for purposes that never benefit the great common people who pay the taxes, and yet this little pittance, that carries comfort and pleasure to the very heart of the masses, is held up and denounced as extravagant. I call attention to the fact that during the month of December I stood on the floor of this House and called attention to the fact that an appropriation for the District of Columbia carried $123,390 for the purpose of paying janitors in the District of Columbia. I now remind you that the janitors for school buildings in this city paid out of the National Treasury is about one-half the amount carried in this bill for seed distribution. Think of it! Janitors, $123,390, that should be paid by the citizens of this city if they need janitors; $257,000 seed distribution for all the people all over the United States. Gentlemen should not begin to practice economy on the farmer. Be it understood that I shall favor increases for agricultural purposes, retrenchment and economy where it is needed in other departments, and you will never take the small pittance appropriated for the farmer's seed without a protest from me.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, this seed war is 17 years old, according to my personal knowledge. I came here 17 years ago, and the amount allowed to each Member then was about 4,000 or 5,000 packages. The small amount caused considerable trouble, for we could not send the seed to a third of the people who wanted them. I used to go out and buy seed at my own expense—not from the Government, of course, but from seed dealers—put them in an envelope, and send them out. The people of my district wanted them, and they wanted them badly. We kept on with our war until we got the appropriation to where it was a little more decent until we could send out 20,000 packages to each congressional district, and even now I have a demand for over 30,000 in my district. None of them are ever returned, and they could have been, for they are first-class mail. If anyone has any doubt about it, I wish he would come over to my office and see a package of letters a foot high from people whom I have left out unintentionally. Objection is made to a little, insignificant package of seed that enable some people to know the National Government exists, who have no other evidence of it in the way of direct personal benefit, in order that they may cultivate vegetables in their gardens and to some extent reduce the cost of living. Some gentlemen will stand here and vote for a $15,000,000 battleship and then balk at giving a farmer a package of seed. It is a strange thing to me that we should waste so much time every time this bill comes up about this little, insignificant seed appropriation when we throw away money by the millions on less meritorious appropriations. I know the people want them. They are tested and approved. Some people talk about the seedmen selling to the Government and therefore not opposed to this distribution. They want to sell to the people who have no means of testing their seeds, and if it were as profitable to sell to the Government as to private purchasers they would not always fight this appropriation. I say it is a waste of time to take up the time of the House every time this seed question comes up in talking about graft.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if this is not about the only appropriation in this bill that does not pass through the hands of some expert, somewhere, where he gets some part of it?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; who gets a rake-off or a commission or something for doing it.

Mr. BOOHER. Where it goes through an expert or a demonstrator.

Mr. SIMS. It is a whole lot of trouble to address these seeds; it is a whole lot of trouble to get lists of names. I pay money out of my own pocket for lists of names with post-office addresses every year in order to send seeds to the people of my district.

Mr. LOBECK. And is it not a fact that the real demonstrator gets hold of these seeds at home?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; the best demonstrator on earth is the man who plants them and grows his own vegetables.

Mr. BOOHER. It is a demonstrator that does not cost the people any money when you get it into the hands of the farmer at home.

Mr. SIMS. That is true. He is not a Government demonstrator. I am at a loss to know why gentlemen who are great statesmen, who are men of great ability, waste their brain power in opposition to sending out a package of garden seed to some poor constituent that otherwise might not know he lived under the flag. I hope this amendment and all others like it will be voted down. Stop the leaks that amount to something, and let these seeds go to that class of our citizens that never get anything directly from the Government otherwise, and who take the time to write and thank you for the seed and tell you the success they have had with them. We know that seeds sent from one section of the country to another section produce better results than to plant the same old seed in the same locality year after year. There is no question about that. We are not losing anything. The people are making something out of this appropriation. The cost of living is getting to be the greatest problem that now faces us. I saw a little back yard in this city last summer, owned by a policeman, not much larger than the space in the well of the House, and he told me that he raised vegetables enough in that back yard during the season to save him $6 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly glad to know that the Committee on Agriculture has brought in a bill here recognizing the head of every family in the United States. I am in favor of this provision in the bill as it is written, and if there should be an amendment offered to increase the amount, I would vote for it. I do not believe that 20,000 packages of seed to the congressional district are enough. Talk about graft! It is very easy to say "it is graft" when the poor people of the country are getting the benefit of the appropriation, but it is a disgrace to suggest graft when the millionaires of the country are getting the benefit of the graft. Let us have legislation for the people, the men who are needing it. The fellows who have plenty do not need any legislation at all. Go back to the farm, go back to the village and the city, where labor is living in rented houses with a little piece of ground in his back yard. Give him an opportunity to raise some potatoes——

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. In just a minute. To raise some potatoes, some beans, some peas, so that he can have something fresh to eat as a change from the stale stuff usually found on the markets. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would favor a provision that would provide that the seeds be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, so that the name of the Member of Congress sending them would not appear upon the frank? [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Think that over.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to say to my friend from Iowa that if I were working for my own personal interest to save labor and money which I have been expending in buying seeds, I would answer him in the affirmative, but when I have at heart a consideration for every family in my district alike, I say no, because the Secretary of Agriculture does not know my people and I do. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. The reason I asked the question of the gentleman is this: There is a question raised, I think, in the minds of a great many people as to whether the sending out of these congressional seeds with the name of the Member of Congress appearing on the frank, the seeds only going to the congressional district in which he lives, is a sort of a purchase of his support and his vote. Now, my object in asking the question was simply to ascertain if it would not be better if the Member did not——

Mr. FOWLER. That idea comes from an idiotic source and not from an intelligent source. [Laughter.] I am surprised that any intelligent man should suggest the idea that any man would sell his vote for a package of garden seed or a package of flower seed. My constituents——

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. No; not yet. My constituents stand on a plane of honor the same as I do. [Applause.] And it is an aspersion upon their good name for any man to indicate that they are purchased in any way whatever. It is the loyalty that throbs in their bosoms and for the good of their country that causes them to go to the polls and vote and no other consideration, and that is the reason I am here to represent them to-day. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentlemen from Texas, in particular, raise the question of battleships in a discussion affecting seeds for farmers. It seems to me to be an unfortunate illustration.

The propriety of appropriating $257,000 for the purchase of seeds has nothing to do with the cost of battleships. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] has also made that kind of an argument. It is not a good argument, especially at this time, when the Nation is in the throes of uncertainty and may need the services of battleships to the extent of inducing some of those who have been preaching peace to reverse their votes. When the gentlemen from the farming districts asked for good roads I voted with them because I believed the country ought to have good roads, notwithstanding that in my city good roads had already been paid for by the inhabitants thereof. I voted for good roads not because some gentleman wanted to stop building battleships to protect this Government against foreign foes and to maintain its honor and dignity upon the high seas, but because I believed that in the administration of the affairs of this country the time had come to do what we could to provide good roads and afford better transportation facilities for the farmers of the country, and the city folks as well.

As a city man, who does not have an unimproved acre of ground in his district, I have supported nearly every proposition that has been advanced by the farmer, and at the same time have withstood the assaults that have come from the farming districts against the industrial districts. I have done this because I believe in keeping the farmer prosperous, and I have observed that from year to year the appropriations for his benefit have been increased and the allowances by Congress have been growing greater and greater all the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think that is exactly right?

Mr. MOORE. I think it is, or I would not vote that way. I voted against reciprocity because I did not believe it to be in the interest of the farmers of this country; and I am prouder of that vote to-day, when the farmer is beginning to complain of tariff legislation, than I was the day I voted.

SEVERAL MEMBERS on the Democratic side. Oh, no!

Mr. MOORE. Oh, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] may say "Oh, no!" He is the one particular star of "the masses" who seem to congregate solely in his district in Illinois, but he may laugh upon the other side of his face in a very few months when he finds that the farmers of his district will need these seeds perhaps as much for soup as they will for agricultural purposes. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of voting this appropriation without question to the farmers of the country. It is not altogether special to the farmer, for every congressional district shares in the distribution. And as the seeds are now distributed, it is a perfectly fair proposition. The Secretary of Agriculture could not improve, no matter what powers we might give to him, upon the present method of distribution. These seeds go into my district, as they go into yours, and I want to say to you that there are as many worthy people in the district I represent, wherein the ground is all built over, to whom these seeds are of genuine service, as there are in the districts represented by some of you gentlemen, where there are large areas of farm lands. These seeds go into the homes of the people; and if we do not use the vegetable seeds, that are more useful to you than they are to us, we can very readily exchange with you, as we do, for the flower and the garden seeds which our people use and which serve, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] said a little while ago, to ornament and beautify the home.

They tend to bring the youthful mind to a realization of the value of agriculture. They make the children in the public schools, where I send many of them, think of the fresh air of the country, and as they grow and develop in the little city gardens they serve as useful object lessons to the children of the city in teaching the wholesomeness of country life. They go not only into the homes of those who live upon the asphalted streets, but they go into the hospitals also, where they are a great benefit and comfort to the sick and distressed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to find my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and myself agreeing upon this very important question, one that means so much to the people of the country, especially the farmers. I am surprised that any gentleman would offer an amendment here to strike this provision from the act. It is not much, gentlemen, and yet you give the people in the rural districts the opportunity through this plan once a year to get the very best seed grown in the various sections of the country—in the South, in the North, in the East, and in the West. We learn what they are growing up in the North, and they learn what we are growing in the far South; and so with the East and the West. Care is now exercised in selecting seed and good seed are being sent out. Gentlemen, the organic act creating this Department of Agriculture provided that these seeds should be distributed amongst the people. I think that it was a wise provision, and I never cast a vote for anything in this House that I cast more cheerfully than the one for seed distribution amongst the plain people of this country. [Applause.] They are entitled, gentlemen, to this little recognition at the hands of Congress. A great deal that the farmers do is paying taxes that support the Government, and they do not get much directly in return except seed, and some gentlemen would take away from them their seed. [Laughter and applause.]

Why, I want to say to my good friend from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who is now representing the State of Texas at large, but who will, I hope, come from a congressional district some day—and I hope to see him continue to come to Congress—that when he goes through his district and sees a little stick standing at the end of a row in the garden and on the stick a little envelope telling the kind of seed that came in it, and up in the corner of it he beholds his name just above the letters "M. C.," and he sees the little green stuff peeping above the ground, growing from the seed that he sent the farmer, he will be thankful that we did not allow him to strike out the provision of seed distribution. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. LEVER] has requested me to close the debate on this question on the part of the committee, and at his request I do so. As was stated by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], this objection and this obstruction to this appropriation has been offered for many, many years. It has met with the same fate at the hands of the Congress of the United States every time it has been presented, and I dare say that it will meet the same fate to-day, because the Representatives upon the floor of this House are going to respond to the sentiment of the people and continue to send them the seeds which they so much desire. [Applause.] It has oftentimes been said that people do not want them. If Members will examine their mail morning after morning, they will come to the conclusion themselves that they are mistaken in that view. In my mail there comes to my office every day, without a single, solitary exception, letters from people all over my district, requesting me to send them garden seed, and to send them flower seed, and to send them bulbs, and to send them all the variety of seed it is possible to secure for them. It always gives me pleasure, it gives me happiness, to respond to their request, and to do that which they desire to be done at my hands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In regard to bulbs, how many requests does the gentleman receive?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I receive a great many more requests than I can supply, because the gentleman no doubt knows we get a very limited number of boxes for distribution—only 20, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not that lack appear also in regard to the number of packages of seeds for a district?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. There are 20,000 packages of garden seed for each congressional district, which is not enough, because I have to get more, and if the gentleman responds to the requests from his district, I dare say he has to secure more.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do.

Mr. GORDON. Suppose you got a lot of requests for money from your constituents?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If I had it, I would send it to them. Unfortunately, I have not. [Laughter.] There is one rule I have followed since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States, and that is to respond to every request of every constituent of mine when it was in my power to do so. And so long as I continue to have the honor to represent them upon this floor I expect to continue to pursue that course. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman include some of us outside of his district in the distribution of money?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I would include my good friend from Pennsylvania. I would give him anything I possessed.

Mr. BUTLER. All right. I will come early and avoid the rush.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would like to say to my friend that these Ohio and Indiana and Iowa fellows usually send money out to their constituents, do they not?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I can not speak advisedly and with knowledge on that subject.

Mr. CALLAWAY. They sent out about $50,000,000 last year and this year in pension bills. Do they not every other Friday here send out money? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman from Texas knows I have not in the past and do not now favor these pension bills. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call specific attention to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. It says:

Amend by striking out all of pages 22 and 23 down to and including line 14, on page 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds and plants, for the investigation and improvement of grasses and forage crops, $175,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $100,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such seeds and plants."

Now, in the bill, just preceding that, there is an item which has already been passed and is now a part of the bill providing as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds, and for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, $166,500: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $100,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

The gentleman's amendment is almost an identical copy of the provision immediately preceding this proposition, which is offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may have five minutes more [applause] and that the general time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] may have five minutes more, and that in order to give him five minutes more the general time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for his kindness, and I am grateful to the House for its indulgence.

I was just calling attention to the fact that the provision offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is almost identical, word for word, a copy of a paragraph preceding, in this identical bill, and hence if this provision were adopted, as suggested by him, it would be a duplication of the appropriation made in the preceding paragraph. Therefore, if he is insistent that this paragraph ought to go into the bill and his amendment is adopted, this other paragraph certainly ought to go out of the bill. But it has already been adopted, and will become a part of the law as it stands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the distribution of seed is no new proposition. I read:

The purchase and distribution of seeds and plants by the Government may be said to date back to colonial days. As early as 1743 the British Parliament granted $600,000 to promote the cultivation of indigo and other crops in the American Colonies, and the assemblies of various Colonies appropriated small sums from time to time to encourage the cultivation of plants new to the country, such as hops in Virginia, mulberry trees for silk culture in Georgia, and vineyards for the establishment of an American wine industry.

Franklin, while in England as agent for Pennsylvania, sent home silkworm eggs and mulberry cuttings. Thomas Jefferson during the five years he represented this country as minister to France (1784–1789) forwarded numerous seed samples of grasses, rice, peppers, and olives to correspondents at home, especially to the Society for the Improvement of Agriculture at Charleston, S. C. It was to this society that he sent samples of rice seed, from which some of the best rice in the world was raised in the Carolinas. Other representatives of our Government in the early days of its history followed the example of Franklin and Jefferson, until during the administration of John Quincy Adams instructions were given to all United States consuls to forward rare plants and seeds to Washington for distribution. A botanical garden was later established at Washington, in which were grown many of the rare and interesting plants imported from foreign countries, and considerable quantities of such seeds and plants were distributed by the Commissioner of Patents.

Notwithstanding these efforts to introduce new seeds and plants, many varieties of fruits and vegetables with which we are familiar were scarce or unknown in the early part of the nineteenth century. There were but few seed farms, nurseries, or seedsmen, and the illustrated seed catalogues of our day were unknown. Seeds were mostly grown by the farmers themselves, and there was no improvement from year to year. Interest in better seeds and in securing new seeds and plants resulted largely from the agricultural fairs inaugurated by the various societies for "promoting agriculture" which were organized at Charleston (1784), New York (1785), Philadelphia (1791), Boston (1792), and Washington (1809).

In 1839, through the efforts of Hon. Henry L. Ellsworth, Commissioner of Patents, an appropriation of $1,000 was made for the purpose of collecting and distributing seeds, prosecuting agricultural investigations, and procuring agricultural statistics, with which 30,000 packages of seeds were purchased and distributed. This appropriation marks the beginning of our present Department of Agriculture. Similar appropriations continued to be made, increasing in amount from year to year as the importance and value of the work came to be recognized, but prior to 1865 the appropriations were always for the combined purposes of purchasing seeds and collecting statistics, so that the actual amount expended for seeds alone can not be determined. From 1839 to 1862 the work was handled by a small force of clerks in the Patent Office, but in 1862 it was transferred to the newly created Department of Agriculture. For 40 years thereafter the work was carried on by a group of employees known as the "Seed Division," until 1901–2, when various affiliated but hitherto independent branches of the department were brought together to form the present Bureau of Plant Industry. During the period of 72 years from 1839, when the first appropriation of $1,000 was made, to 1911, when $289,680 was appropriated, the quantity of seed distributed has steadily increased and the methods of handling it have undergone many changes.

The law under which the Department of Agriculture was organized provides—

"There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants." (Sec. 520, R. S.)

There can be no doubt that the purpose of the earlier legislation for the purchase and distribution of seeds was to introduce into this country new and improved varieties of vegetables, fruits, flowering plants, and new crops in order to increase the horticultural and agricultural products of the United States, and for many years attempts were made to confine the distribution to new varieties of vegetables, grains, sorghums, and fruits. The distribution of such seeds has undoubtedly left a decided impression upon the agriculture of this country. As the demand for the new seeds and plants introduced by the department increased, however, such demand very naturally found expression in requests made to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, and the number of these requests soon became so great that it was impracticable to fill them with strictly new varieties of seeds. The practice of sending out larger and larger quantities of vegetable seeds thus developed. These seeds, while in no wise new, were useful in the new communities to which they were largely sent.

During the years from 1889 to 1893 practically the entire seed appropriation was expended for standard varieties of vegetable and flower seeds. In 1894 a change was advocated and action was taken to discontinue the customary distribution. This action was not approved by Congress, which in the act approved April 25, 1896, changed the wording of the previous acts, which for many years had read "for the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds," etc., to read as follows:

"For the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in the localities adapted to their culture, $150,000. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, directed, and required to expend the said sum in the purchase, propagation, and distribution of such valuable seeds, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and is authorized, empowered, directed, and required to expend not less than the sum of $120,000 in the purchase at public or private sale of valuable seeds, the best he can obtain, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which same are to be apportioned and in which the same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include varieties of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States."

Under the wording of this act the Attorney General, to whom the question was submitted for decision, held that the purchase and distribution of seeds, including vegetable and flower seeds, were mandatory and left the Secretary of Agriculture without discretion.

So it will be seen that the author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the Democratic Party could even hear the call for seed across the waves of the ocean, and he responded to it. [Applause.] Franklin, the great philosopher, who stood, away back yonder in the olden days, for the rights of the people and published a great periodical known as the Saturday Evening Post, which is still propagating the gospel that he believed in at that time and is still dispensing the philosophy that he advocated, favored seed distribution. [Applause.]

Why, the distribution of seed, gentlemen, is an evidence of statesmanship [laughter] and an evidence of the very best philosophy and thought, as is evidenced by its advocacy by Jefferson and Franklin. [Applause.] He who would be a great statesman at any time, on any occasion, should always respond to the pulse beats of his people and always hear their requests and always heed their desires and meet their wishes; and the man that fails to respond to the requests of the people who have honored him and who respect him fails to show the appreciation of their confidence which he ought to show, and fails to realize the patriotic duty that devolves upon him to respond to their wish and their call, and to send them whatever they may desire when he can legitimately secure it, no matter what it may be. [Applause.]

Talk to me about graft. It makes me sick and tired to hear people talk about graft when you are sending the people what they desire and what they want themselves and what they request at your hands. [Applause.] Why talk about graft, and say it is graft, simply because it is sent out by Members of Congress under their name? Why, it was patriotically said by one of the gentlemen who preceded me, "I am glad to have the honor to send out a package of garden seed under my name. I am glad to have the people see my name come to them, even on a package of garden seed or anything else." [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. With pleasure.

Mr. SLOAN. According to the gentleman's new version, speaking of Franklin and Jefferson, is it true that Patrick Henry said, "Give me seed, or give me death"? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Oh, no. He said, 'Give me liberty, or give me death," but "liberty" meant "seed.' [Laughter and applause.] Because the seed is what goes down into the ground and produces the wealth of this country, and without seed there would be no production of any kind, and without production we would soon be dependent and have no liberty, and hence seed is a great thing. [Applause and laughter.] Patrick Henry stood for liberty, and the farmer for whom these seed are intended is the greatest exponent and defender of liberty in this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Has my time expired, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Let me say just this word, and then I shall have finished. I want each and every man in this House to have the opportunity to send seed to the men who write to him, and especially to the ladies and the bright-eyed, rosy-cheeked girls, wheresoever they may live. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The announcement of the result was greeted with applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, $3,053,975.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, a day or two ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], in answer to some remarks which I had made favoring the extermination of the southern cattle tick and the promotion of the cattle-feeding industry in the Southern States, as provided for under one of the items of this bill, took occasion to fire what I believe to be intended as a political shot at the Democratic tariff bill. He placed in the RECORD a statement showing the importations of cattle from Mexico during the months of October, November, December, and January, just past, by which it appeared that the total importation was 271,387 head; and he made the statement that that was twice as many cattle as were imported during the similar period one year before from all sources.

Evidently his purpose in so doing was to lead the American farmer, in some way or another, to believe that the free-cattle and free-meat provision of the Underwood tariff bill was working a hardship or an injustice to the American farmer; that by reason of the free-cattle provision cattle were rushing in here as never before and it was due entirely to that change in the tariff law.

It is not necessary to justify the free-meat and free-cattle provision of the tariff law to the wage earners of the cities. They know well enough that the diminishing supply of beef cattle in this country is responsible for the high cost of meat. The American wage earner is a highly efficient man. He is accustomed to a good supply of meat, and he is entitled to have it. The number of beef cattle in this country has decreased in the last seven years from 52,000,000 head to 35,000,000 head, while the number of meat eaters has increased. It is poor politics for our standpat, high-tariff friends to lay tribute upon the food supply of the great toiling and producing masses. They will not stand it.

But he seeks to appeal to the cupidity or fears of the farmers by representing that they are being ruined by a flood of cheap cattle from abroad. He is all wrong about his facts. Now, let us see if he is not.

I said to him then what I believed to be the fact, that the importation of cattle from Mexico at this time is not and can not be a normal importation. I believe the Mexican herders are driving off their herds and selling them on this side of the line for the purpose of realizing what cash they can. I believe, in other words, that that importation of cattle from Mexico is due to the disturbed conditions there; that cattle herding in northern Mexico is unsafe, and consequently there is an unusual importation into this country. The Mexican authorities do not regard the exporting of cattle from Mexico to the United States as a good thing, as is evidenced by the fact that they have tried in every way to stop the exodus of cattle from Mexico. They realize that their ranges are being depleted and they have put a very heavy export charge on the exportation of cattle from Mexico. If the cattle are coming in from Mexico in alarming numbers it must be due to conditions down there, which are temporary in their nature and not due to a steady market for cattle in this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; if I can get more time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How does the gentleman account for the increased importation of cattle from Canada? Does the Mexican situation have anything to do with that?

Mr. BORLAND. I am coming to that question. The question which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] raises was the increased importation from Mexico. I have no figures on the increased importation from Canada, if there be an increase, and the gentleman from Nebraska had figures only on the increased importation from Mexico. Now, I want to say that the increased importation from Mexico which the gentleman from Nebraska cited as being so unusual, so large, and so alarming has had no effect in lowering the prices of cattle at the nearest great cattle market north of the Mexican boundary.

Mr. BALTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALTZ. I have heard it stated numerous times on the other side of the aisle that the importation of cattle into this country from these other countries since the Underwood tariff bill passed has decreased the price of these cattle. I want to say right here that I sold one beef animal the other day that brought $155.

Mr. BUTLER. That will not reduce the cost of living in this country.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me say to the gentleman that the cattle coming in from Mexico, as I believe, are not all of them fat cattle. They are not all of them butchers' stock. The great majority of the cattle that have come from Mexico for the last four or five years have been thin cattle, grass cattle, which, when they came over into this country, have gone into the hands of the farmers and stock raisers, who have fed them with winter feed to put flesh on them and fatten them for the market. Mexico has been a source of supply, I will say to the gentleman

from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], as Canada now is a source of supply for stockers and feeders. The price of land in the country surrounding our cattle markets has become so high that farmers can not afford to raise their own feeders. Now, listen to what the effect has been. I will read from the Kansas City Star of last Saturday, giving a review of last week on the cattle market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think it is only fair to say that when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has had an opportunity to reply, as I presume he will want to reply, I trust that the debate on this tariff proposition will not be continued in the time that ought to be given to the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I only want to insert a few figures that will take no time. The gentleman will not object to that, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. As a matter of fact, I defended on the floor of this House the free cattle and meat provision of the Underwood tariff bill. I did it on the theory that we have not now in this country a sufficient supply of stockers and feeders to eat up the grass and the nubbins of corn and the winter feed that we have on our farms; but if we have an ample supply of feeders to bring onto the farm, where they can be fattened and put onto the market, the importation of feeders will be a good thing for the stockmen and farmers. I still think that is true, and I am going to show you why it is true by this weekly report of the cattle market:

THE WEEK'S TRADE IN LIVE STOCK.

To-day's Kansas City live-stock receipts were about a low record—only 240 hogs, 100 cattle, and no sheep. There was no trade in cattle and sheep. The hogs sold at $8.30 to $8.40, about steady prices. Packers said choice hogs would have brought $8.55 to $8.60. Chicago received 7,000 hogs and the five western markets 14,740. * * *

Following a moderate decline on Monday, the cattle market turned up and the week closed with prices net unchanged to 15 cents higher. Native steers yesterday were 10 to 25 cents higher than Monday. From Tuesday on receipts were light, but total receipts for the week were about 3,000 larger than last week.

A new March record was made for fat steers at $9.25. Nineteen steers, weighing 1,346 pounds, sold at that price. The former record, $9, was paid in March last year. Some Texas steers sold at $8.80, also a March record on that class. The marketing zone widened and several bunches that sold at $7.70 to $8.50 were hay-fed steers from Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. Native-fed steers are far below normal supply.

Trade in butcher cattle was active. Prices fluctuated 10 to 15 cents and closed strong. Some choice cows sold at $7.55 and heifers $9. * * *

Demand for stockers and feeders was active. Prices were firm.

Native-fed steers are far below normal supply. Now, where do the native-fed steers come from? They come from the feeders that are bought and fed by the farmers and then shipped when fat to Kansas City or some other primary market. Native-fed steers fell below the normal supply, and that accounts for the $9.25 beef. If we had an ample supply of steers as stockers and feeders for the western farmers you would have lower prices for beef and more active trade in cattle and more money for the stock producers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the gentleman enlighten us as to the price a year ago, and how it compares with the price now?

Mr. BORLAND. That is stated right here in what I read. Nine dollars was the high-water mark in March, 1913, and $9.25 is the new high-water mark for 1914. It is 25 cents higher. This article says:

Trade in butchering cattle was active. Prices fluctuated 10 to 15 cents and closed strong. * * * Demand for stockers and feeders was active.

Now, some of you gentlemen understand, as my friend from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] certainly does, that the cattle-feeding market not only controls cattle, but also hogs, because a man who is feeding cattle with winter feed—with corn—is also feeding hogs. The economical way to get the best use of feed is to let the hogs run with the cattle. A farmer feeds hogs along with the cattle when he has a bunch of cattle that he is fattening.

This market report shows that the demand for stockers and feeders was active. That shows that the farmers and stockmen of the Missouri Valley are not scared to death by the so-called flood of free cattle coming in from Mexico or from Canada, either. If they were afraid their business of feeding cattle was about to be ruined by the new tariff law, the demand for feeders and stockers would not be active. Good feeders are selling up above $7 a hundred. And yet our standpat friend is trying to throw a scare into the farmers. He will not succeed, because he is wrong on the facts in two important particulars.

First. The so-called flood of imported cattle has made no impression on the prices in the great cattle market of the Southwest. Cattle are higher now than they were a year ago, because the supply is short and the demand is great.

Second. The demand for stockers and feeders is active. The stockmen need more feeders and they ought to have them, if the cattle business is to be saved; and, goodness knows, the wage earners need the meat. Let us quit trying to throw scares into the farmers and other business men and give them some constructive legislation that will help them. The stock business has changed wonderfully in the last generation. I do not claim to know about many businesses, but I do know something about the stock business. I worked on a stock farm when I was a boy, and I spent three years as a boy at the Kansas City stock yards. In those days we used to get the range cattle from the plains. Meat was cheap because cattle were abundant. There were millions of acres of free pasture in the Southwest. Oklahoma was still Indian Territory and was an open range. We used to get train loads of the long-horned fellows from Texas. The cattlemen of Kansas City built up a great market in those days that has benefited the entire country. While we still have the great market, conditions of doing business have changed radically. The range has been fenced up into little farms. Cattle are now fed on the farm in small bunches. A farmer who has pasture and good water will come to a market like Kansas City and buy a bunch of feeders to take home and fatten. With the increased price of land very few farmers can afford to raise their own young stock. The stock business is done on as close a margin as any mercantile business, and it takes a careful and experienced man to come out with a profit. Often the stockman must borrow the money from the bank to pay for the feeders, and he must market them within a limited time to pay his note.

The Missouri Valley is the greatest corn belt and blue-grass belt in the world. It is an ideal stock-feeding country. Our beef cattle are the best in the world and bring the best prices. The best way to use corn and grass is to feed it on the farm. It saves the land from impoverishment and uses up feed of the farmer and his neighbors that might not be good to ship. But we need cattle to stock the pastures, or the cattle business will suffer and the cattle market of Kansas City will suffer. The drought last summer caused the farmers to sell off most of their stock, and they are now trying to restock their pastures. Anything that helps the farmer and the stockman helps Kansas City, and anything that hurts the live-stock industry in the West hurts Kansas City. The stockman is not hurt by free cattle coming in on the hoof, because they are not fat cattle that come in competition with his stock, but thin cattle that go on his pasture and eat his corn. The demand for food products in this country is growing faster than the supply, and it only needs to be intelligently handled. The stockman is not afraid of free cattle—the only thing he is afraid of is scare-breeding politicians.

The cattle market is controlled all over the Mississippi Valley by the supply of the stockers and feeders. To-day, the middle of March, 1914, when the gentleman says this extraordinary number of cattle is coming in from Mexico, the demand for stockers and feeders is still active. Does any man of average intelligence pretend to say that cattle coming off the range or from grass, sold in a hasty market in February and March, is butcher stock? Not 10 per cent of it is butcher stock. They may go to the butcher, but they ought not to. The cattle that come in from the grass reach the butcher from September to November, and after November little grass cattle come in ready for the butcher. All cattle that come in February or March ought to be sold as stockers and feeders, and there is where the farmer in the Mississippi Valley who has corn to sell makes his market. He can not ship the corn now in interstate commerce unless it grades up to a certain point. All the corn that is below the standard fixed by the Agricultural Department, that has too much moisture or is too dry, the nubbins, must be fed on the farm. What are you going to feed it to? You have stopped the farmer from shipping his corn. What are you going to give him to feed his corn to unless you give him stockers and feeders? If you will give him stockers and feeders that he can feed this corn to, you will make his business active and aid him not only to make money but to bring down the price of beef for the wage earner in the city. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent of the committee that I may insert a few figures in the RECORD, drawing a comparison of

the imports of wool between the month of January, 1913, and January, 1914, that I have clipped from the Philadelphia Ledger.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the matter referred to:

LOW TARIFF TRIPLES IMPORT OF WOOLENS—FIGURES FOR JANUARY, 1914, $4,670,348 COMPARED WITH $1,468,228 IN SAME MONTH LAST YEAR—FULL EFFECT NOT YET FELT BY EITHER PRODUCER OR CONSUMER IN THIS COUNTRY—PHILADELPHIA INTERESTED.

WASHINGTON, *March 5.*

Astounding increase in the importation of manufactured woolen articles, the duty of which was greatly reduced by the Underwood tariff bill, is seen in the figures for January, 1914, to-day obtained by the Public Ledger. The importation for January this year of wool manufactures amounted to $4,670,348, as compared with a total valuation of the same character of importations of $1,468,228 in January, 1913, during the operation of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law.

The importations were three and a half times as great under the reduced tariff schedules as they were a year previously. The experts say that the full effect of such importations has not as yet been felt either by the producers in this country or the consumers. The flooding of American markets with foreign-made goods has not caused an appreciable effect upon the mills here and will not until some months later. The price of clothing has not been reduced in any wholesale way, although one New York firm has advertised a slight reduction in ready-made clothing.

The figures made public to-day are of great interest to Philadelphia, which will be most affected in the end by the importations of manufactured wools. The following table shows the contracts:

*Imports of wool manufactures for January, 1913.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Carpets, etc., 66,610 square yards | $300,426 |
| Cloths, 504,360 pounds | 625,981 |
| Dress goods, 1,650,516 square yards | 345,402 |
| Wearing apparel | 104,293 |
| All other manufactures | 92,126 |
| Total | 1,468,228 |

*Imports of wool manufactures for January, 1914.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Wool press cloth | $25,864 |
| Wool wastes, 802,091 pounds | 129,058 |
| Wool carpets, 96,091 square yards | 363,814 |
| Wool cloths, 1,723,987 pounds | 1,962,233 |
| Wool dress goods, 1,151,928 pounds | 1,217,981 |
| Wool wearing apparel | 213,003 |
| All other wool manufactures | 545,968 |
| Manufactures of angora, alpaca, etc | 210,428 |
| Total | 4,670,348 |

The difference in the basis of valuation of dress goods appears to be a discrepancy. In 1913 they were valued by the square yard, whereas under the new system the basis is square yards.

The figures showed such a remarkable and unexpected heavy importation that the experts in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce held them up for a careful investigation. As the result they were not given to the public until to-day and then pronounced absolutely correct.

The importations of raw wool for January, 1914, were:

| | Pounds. | Dollars. |
|---|---|---|
| Wool, raw, free: | | |
| Class 1 | 14,217,699 | 3,282,269 |
| Class 2 | 2,047,118 | 496,092 |
| Class 3 | 7,846,187 | 1,337,561 |
| Total | 24,111,004 | 5,115,942 |
| Angora, alpaca, etc., dutiable | 354,636 | 103,196 |
| Total, free and dutiable | 24,465,640 | 5,219,138 |

An increase of 75 per cent in the imports of raw wool for January, 1914, over the same period last year is seen in the figures on these importations.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

Salaries, Forest Service: One forester, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; one administrative assistant, $2,000; 1 chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, $2,500; 7 district fiscal agents, at $2,000 each; 1 forest supervisor, $2,700; 1 forest supervisor, $2,600; 8 forest supervisors, at $2,400 each; 20 forest supervisors, at $2,200 each; 48 forest supervisors, at $2,000 each; 66 forest supervisors, at $1,800 each; 5 forest supervisors, at $1,600 each; 1 deputy forest supervisor, $1,800; 4 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,700 each; 27 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,600 each; 31 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,500 each; 18 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,400 each; 7 forest rangers, at $1,500 each; 21 forest rangers, at $1,400 each; 78 forest rangers, at $1,300 each; 286 forest rangers, at $1,200 each; 650 assistant forest rangers, at $1,100 each; 80 assistant forest rangers, at $1,100 each, for periods not exceeding six months in the aggregate; 1 property auditor, $1,800; 1 clerk, $2,100; 3 clerks, at $2,000 each; 13 clerks, at $1,800 each; 26 clerks, at $1,600 each; 9 clerks, at $1,500 each; 18 clerks, at $1,400 each; 8 clerks, at $1,300 each; 97 clerks, at $1,200 each; 69 clerks, at $1,100 each; 51 clerks, at $1,020 each; 30 clerks, at $960 each; 128 clerks, at $900 each; 2 clerks, at $840 each; 1 game warden, $1,400; 1 game warden, $1,200; 1 compiler, $1,800; 1 draftsman, $2,000; 3 draftsmen, at $1,600 each; 2 draftsmen, at $1,500 each; 6 draftsmen, at $1,400 each; 4 draftsmen, at $1,300 each; 8 draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 2 draftsmen, at $1,100 each; 3 draftsmen, at $1,020 each; 1 draftsman, $960; 4 draftsmen, at $900 each; 1 artist, $1,400; 1 artist, $1,000; 3 map colorists, at $900 each; 1 map colorist, $720; 1 photographer, $1,600; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 photographer, $1,100; 1 lithographer, $1,200; 1 lithographer's helper, $780; 1 machinst, $1,260; 1 carpenter, $1,200; 2 carpenters, at $1,080 each; 1 carpenter, $960; 1 electrician, $1,020; 1 laboratory aid and engineer, $900; 3 laboratory assistants, at $900 each; 1 laboratory assistant, $800; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 1 laboratory helper, $660; 1 packer, $1,000; 1 packer, $780; 4 watchmen, at $840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $960; 3 messengers or laborers, at $900 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at $780 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messengers or laborers, at $660 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $540 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 12 messengers or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 apprentice boy, $480; 1 charwoman, $540; 1 charwoman, $480; 1 charwoman, $360; 11 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $2,305,160.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to page 24, line 25, and ask for the necessity of creating a deputy forest supervisor at $1,800. It is a new position.

Mr. LEVER. This is not the creation of a new place. It is a transfer, in accordance with his own idea, of this man with the same salary from the lump-sum appropriation, which lump sum has been reduced accordingly.

Mr. FOWLER. What lump sum?

Mr. LEVER. The lump sum for the Forestry Bureau, the general expenses.

Mr. FOWLER. You had in the bill before a forest supervisor at a salary of $1,700, and now you have increased it to $1,800.

Mr. LEVER. No. I will say to my friend from Illinois that the policy of the Department of Agriculture is that as rapidly as possible a transfer to the statutory rolls of all classes of employees shall be made that should go there under the act of Congress. Of course it has been impossible to get them all so transferred at first, and hence these transfers which we have from time to time. It is an effort to have, as the gentleman would have it done and as I would have it done, the placing of all these employees on the statutory rolls as far as possible.

Mr. FOWLER. I think they all ought to go in classes according to the character of the work done.

Mr. LEVER. That is the same man at the same salary.

Mr. FOWLER. In line 21, you have increased the forest supervisors from five to eight.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. In the Sixty-second Congress you carried an appropriation of five forest supervisors at $2,400 each, and now you have eight at $2,400 each.

Mr. LEVER. The explanation of that is this: The chief of the Forestry Service intends to reduce the number of supervisors' positions in the Forestry Service. With that in mind, he has dropped five forest supervisors, at $1,600, and increased the number—three—at $2,400, making a net decrease for that work of $800.

Mr. ANDERSON. What does the gentleman think of that kind of economy?

Mr. LEVER. It is a decrease of $800.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but there are two men less.

Mr. LEVER. These men are dropped from the service.

Mr. ANDERSON. But their services ought to be worth more money.

Mr. LEVER. They are not in the service.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand it, the Secretary drops five supervisors, at $1,600, and retains three of them, at $2,400.

Mr. LEVER. It is an increase of the number at $2,400 by three and a decrease of five at $1,600, making a decrease of the total of $800.

Mr. ANDERSON. And the saving of $800 results in the loss of the services of two supervisors.

Mr. LEVER. If we dispense with the services of two it is economy to that extent.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that it was an economy to increase the salaries in that way.

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe that is a fair statement, to say that it is an increase of salary of $800 to three men. You propose to drop five employees serving at $1,600 a year and raise the salaries to $2,400 a year.

Mr. LEVER. There is a decrease of $800 in the amount. There is a decrease of the $1,600 position of five and an increase of the $2,400 position of three, making a total decrease in the $1,600 grade of $800.

Mr. ANDERSON. The result is that you save $800 and decrease the number of employees three.

Mr. LEVER. Not necessarily so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. There is no increase of $800 in salary. Here are three supervisors at $2,400, but there are supervisors at $2,200 and $2,000 and $1,800. Of course, this will give an opportunity to increase the salary of several gentlemen $200 possibly.

Mr. LEVER. The probability is, as it will work out, that this will provide a line of promotion to the lower-grade men. But it does not so show on its face.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not drop the $2,400 men and increase the salary of the $1,600 men and get more men?

Mr. LEVER. The probability is that the department——

Mr. FOWLER. For the same money or less money?

Mr. LEVER. The chances are that the Forestry Service desires to promote certain valuable men, and at the same time, by making the promotions, make a saving of $800 in the total.

Mr. FOWLER. There is really quite an increase of something like $65,000 in salaries above what was carried in the bill a year ago.

Mr. LEVER. No; that is not a real increase, but an apparent increase, due to the fact that the increases in this statutory roll have all been transfers from the lump-sum appropriation, which lump sum has been reduced accordingly, and from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements. There is really not a single increase in this statutory roll, except the one to which I have just referred.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly there is an increase in the deputy forest supervisors, because the bill carried four of them a year ago at $1,700, and now you have five, one at $1,800 and four at $1,700.

Mr. LEVER. The statutory roll does show such an increase, but it is a transfer from the lump sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Were there deputy forest supervisors carried in the lump sum?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why, then, did you carry any deputy forest supervisors in the bill? Why didn't it all come out of the lump sum?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that the committee is trying very hard, and I think the department also, to put on the statutory roll all classes of clerks that can be properly classified as statutory clerks, but the work was begun only a few years ago, and the work of transferring these people from the lump sum to the statutory roll is going to take some time.

Mr. FOWLER. If the chairman of this committee will permit, I will say to him that I think that he is a big enough man to classify this whole service, and that he is able to do it, and that I will hail the day when he begins this work, and will cheerfully cooperate with him in my feeble way in whatever services I can render.

Mr. LEVER. My friend will find me very energetic in that direction in the future, with the time at my disposal.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there was a provision a year ago carrying a fixed salary for all of the employees who were designated in the bill, and inasmuch as this is an effort to increase the salary of a very good salaried office, I make the point of order against the salary of one deputy forest supervisor of $1,800. I think the discussion has thoroughly brought out the entire evidence surrounding this increase. The rule of law is, as has been the practice in this House heretofore, that where a class of employees has been established, such as deputy forest supervisors—and the last bill carried, say, four forest supervisors at $1,700—the chairman of the committee might report a bill adding to that service any number of increases in number but not in salary, and a point of order made against such an increase of salary has been sustained. I am aware that the chairman of the committee says there has been a transfer from the lump-sum employment of deputy forest supervisors to the bill; but, Mr. Chairman, if there was a transfer from the force that was paid out of the lump sum to the statute, then there is no provision of law fixing the salary above what was fixed by statute a year ago, of $1,700. This is an effort to increase the salary of one man above that of the other men doing the same character of service, and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that this one deputy forest supervisor at $1,800 is merely a transfer from the lump sum of the Bureau of Forestry. It is not in any sense the creation of a new place, but I submit to the Chair that the point of order would not lie even if it were the creation of a new place, because the Chair is familiar with section 169 of the revised statutes, which permits heads of departments to make employment of such persons as they see fit to carry on the work of their respective offices.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this an increase in the salary of this particular person?

Mr. LEVER. It is a transfer of the same man at the same salary, and there is a corresponding reduction in amount in the lump sum. It is exactly the same man and there is no increase or change except that the department is trying to get the employees of this class to the statutory roll and away from the lump sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman says that this deputy forest supervisor was paid out of the lump sum at $1,800 heretofore?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I ask the gentleman if there has been any statute heretofore passed, either in current or permanent law, fixing his salary at $1,800?

Mr. LEVER. No; not that I know of, except the general statute which permits the Department of Agriculture to fix the salaries for scientific men up to a certain point, not to exceed $4,000, and I presume this man heretofore has been carried as a scientist. The department wants to transfer him, at the same salary, to the statutory roll, where we can keep a line on him.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the gentleman not think these deputy supervisors all do the same character of work?

Mr. LEVER. In a general way; yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not the gentleman think they all ought to receive the same salary?

Mr. LEVER. Not necessarily so, because I can easily see why a deputy supervisor in one district might have a different character of work and a much more difficult kind of work to perform. I think there ought to be some discretion in the Department of Agriculture to take care of the more efficient men and encourage more efficient service.

Mr. FOWLER. When you transfer them to the statutory roll do not you place them all on a level in the grades?

Mr. LEVER. When we do that we will have to depend upon the whim of Congress as to the promotion of the more deserving men.

Mr. FOWLER. You can grade them and put them in different grades. For instance, you could put them at different grades of service in the Forest Service; you could organize grades in the service.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, we have done this very thing. Here are deputy supervisors at $1,400, $1,500, $1,600, $1,700, and——

Mr. MADDEN. My parliamentary inquire is, whether or not this colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from South Carolina is on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is presumed to be.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks it would be establishing a pretty dangerous precedent to throw open the doors for transfer from one department to another and claim it does not infringe upon the rule in respect to the creation of new places, because if that were done, it seems to the Chair, that all sorts and kinds of new places could be created by transfers from one department to another, or from one division to another, and as this seems in fact to be a new place in the service——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, if the Chair will permit me, I did not anticipate the ruling just indicated, or I would have been a little more specific. The Chair has been holding, I will say to the Chair, that these transfers from the lump-sum to the statutory roll did not constitute the creation of a new place at all. That has been the ruling of the Chair itself all along the line; and this is not, in fact, the creation of a new place at all, but a transfer of a man who is in the department now from the lump-sum roll to the statutory roll, so Congress may know what we are doing with him.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question there?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. When men are placed on the lump-sum appropriation roll and afterwards by legislation transferred from that roll to the statutory roll, are they required to stand a civil-service examination, or do they have to do that in the first instance?

Mr. LEVER. They have to do that in the first instance. I desire to call the Chair's attention to the fact that a few years ago Congress enacted a statute requiring that all clerks should be transferred from the lump-sum fund of the Department of Agriculture to the statutory roll. Now, if the Chair will look on the statutory rolls of these various bureaus which we have passed, say the Bureaus of Plant Industry and Animal Industry, he will find we have transferred a number of men from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements and other bureaus to the statutory roll of the bureau in which they were really doing the work, and the Chair has held that points of order against such transfers were not well taken. Now, this is exactly the same case.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to differ entirely with the gentleman. The Chair has been holding in a very few instances where a man who did the same identical work that was provided for in one division and yet he happened to be carried in another division, that it was proper to transfer him over to the division where he had been doing the work; but here is an effort to transfer by legislation from that which has never been known to the current law a man who is said to have been paid out of the lump-sum appropriation, creating a new place entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair make an inquiry, that he may get a clear conception of this. The Chair might have had a wrong idea as to the facts. This man has been doing the same kind of work, being paid out of the lump sum at this same salary?

Mr. LEVER. That is the understanding of the gentleman who is in charge of this bill, and it is the statement of the officials who are in charge of this man.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair held the other day on practically the same proposition that where a man was engaged in identically the same services and was paid the identical salary the fact that his position was called by some other name did not change existing law, and the Chair desires to find out if this particular place is in fact identical with the one ruled on heretofore.

Mr. LEVER. The fact is that it is the same man at the same salary, and he is called by the same title. The only difference is that he is now being paid out of the lump-sum appropriation of the Bureau of Forestry, and it is our intention in this bill to allow the department to transfer him to the statutory roll, increasing the statutory roll that much and decreasing the lump-sum fund that much, making no change whatever.

Mr. FOWLER. In fact, Mr. Chairman, he never was known in the current law before. This is his advent therein.

The CHAIRMAN. But let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, we do not want to split hairs in this way, and I know the gentleman does not. The gentleman has looked it up, and the Chair will ask him if he understands that this man is to do the identical work here that he was doing in the other place, and that there is no charge in salary and no change except in the fact that he would be paid out of a different fund than the lump sum?

Mr. FOWLER. Now, there is an effort to create a new place in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is exactly what the Chair wants to find out, namely, whether in fact there is a new place created.

Mr. LEVER. This is not the fact, I will say to the Chair, at all. This is an effort to do what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has been contending that the committee ought to do, namely, to put these men on the statutory roll and classify them and take them away from the lump fund. And now the gentleman, instead of permitting that to be done, is standing here taking the time of the committee and protesting against his own baby.

Mr. FOWLER. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I am not. [Laughter.] I am contending, Mr. Chairman, against the creation of a new office, and that is exactly what this is. It was never known in the statute before, either current or permanent, and this is the first time that his visage ever came up above the statutory horizon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has suggested that he can give the Chair some information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps I may be able to enlighten the Chair and also some members of the committee, but maybe not all the members of the committee. I have before me the Book of Estimates referring to this item, which says:

One deputy forest supervisor (by transfer from lump fund), $1,800.

Unquestionably the item in controversy is that which is referred to. Besides that which is printed in parentheses it refers to the act of February 1, 1905, and the act of March 4, 1913. That of 1913 is the last Agricultural appropriation act. The former act is that which transfers the Bureau of Forestry from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture and carries this language, which gave full authorization to the Forester to employ, I assume, this individual out of the lump-sum appropriation. I direct the attention of the Chair to the following language:

SEC. 5. That all money received from the sale of any products for the use of any land or resources of said forest reserve shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for a period of five years from the passage of this act and shall constitute said fund, available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the protection, administration, improvement, and extension of Federal forest reserves.

I assume that the Forestry Service has been employing this man by authorization of law, under the lump-sum appropriation. Now, the question before the committee, I assume, is whether this individual has been receiving a salary of $1,800. If he has been receiving that salary, and we have the assurance of the chairman of the committee that he has——

Mr. LEVER. And also the statement of the department itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. And also the Book of Estimates to confirm that. Then, I think it is in order to incorporate the item in this appropriation act.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will permit——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOWLER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will yield——

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not control of the time, but with the indulgence of the Chair I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that one of the rules of evidence is that the best evidence must be produced. Now, the best evidence as to what this man received, if he ever did receive a salary, is what the last bill provided for, and the provision in the last bill for these deputy forest supervisors was $1,700. Now, I am not denying the right to provide for five supervisors at $1,700, but I am denying the right to provide for a forest supervisor at a salary above $1,700, because that is the fixed salary for this position. The salary fixed in the last current law has always been regarded as the salary to govern future legislation, unless there was a permanent salary fixed by a permanent statute different from that in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The only question in the Chair's mind was whether this is in fact a new position or not. From the statements made by different gentlemen, the Chair is of the opinion that it is not. The Chair believes it is his duty to keep constantly in mind the good of the service, and would suggest that the old axiom is absolutely true that, "While the letter may kill, the spirit keepeth alive." I believe the spirit of this rule is, and of the law is, to try to do that which is best for the service. The Chair, feeling that way about it, concludes from the statements made that this is not in fact a new position, but is the same party, receiving the same salary, doing the same work, but is designated under a different title. A rose by any other name would smell just as sweet. And therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] a question or two. Under the Forestry Service, for salaries, this bill provides for the expenditure of $2,305,160, and for general expenses, $3,238,096, making altogether $5,543,256. Now, I want to ascertain from the gentleman from South Carolina how much the revenue of the Forest Service amounts to. It has been said in years gone by that within a year or two this service would be self-sustaining. I would like to know how nearly self-sustaining it is or how much the increase of the loss is from year to year.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Illinois that in 1912 the receipts from the sale of timber in the national forests amounted to $1,089,702.04; for grazing, $968,842.26; for special uses, $98,811.27; or from all sources, $2,157,356.57. For the fiscal year 1913—and this is according to the report of the Forester—the receipts from timber were $1,341,337.63; from grazing, $1,007,739.51; from special uses, $118,012.93; or a total of $2,467,090.07, or an increase for the fiscal year 1913 over the fiscal year 1912 of a little more than $300,000.

Mr. MADDEN. So that for 1912 there was a loss to the Government in the Forestry Service of $3,386,000 and in 1913 there was a loss of $3,075,066.

Not long ago we were given to understand that this service would be on an increasing revenue basis and that the time would soon come when it would at least be self-sustaining, and we were led to believe that a profit might accrue to the Treasury of the United States from the conduct of the Forestry Service. But I notice, Mr. Chairman, that as time goes by

the expenses increase very rapidly and the income increases very slowly, so that instead of getting anywhere near a balance between the expenses and the receipts we are running behind millions of dollars every year.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if my friend will permit me, I would say that the present deficit below the total cost of the Forest Service, including the Washington office and the research work—that is, matters in Wisconsin and the like—is $2,956,404.

Mr. MADDEN. That is for 1913?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is for 1913.

Mr. MADDEN. How does the gentleman figure that? The items in the appropriation bill this year for the Forest Service amount, for salaries, to $2,305,160, and for general expenses $3,238,096, making a total of $5,543,256, from which must be deducted the income from all sources, and that leaves the balance of the deficit, amounting to $3,075,666. Where does the difference come in?

Mr. LEVER. The difference is caused by the fact that the gentleman is figuring some of his expenses in one bill and some in another bill, and he does not account for the receipts from the national forests of $300,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I am accounting for it.

Mr. LEVER. I took these figures from the statement of the Chief of the Forest Service, and I think that his figures are accurate; and he says, speaking on December 11, that the deficit is $2,956,000.

Mr. MADDEN. There is about $100,000 of difference between us, then?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. That could easily be adjusted, I think.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to know from the gentleman from South Carolina, if he knows, what excuse the Forest Service gives for this large deficit, in the face of the promises they have been making from time to time, that the deficit would grow gradually less every year?

Mr. LEVER. I can say to my friend from Illinois, without any hesitation, that if it is the will of Congress to exploit the national forests, to make them self-sustaining, without regard to how we use them, it is entirely feasible and possible to do it, in my judgment, in the course of three or four years. But I do not believe, nor does the committee believe, that it is the intention or wish of Congress to make the national forests of the United States a business proposition which is going to pay a profit. What we are engaged in primarily is the conservation and preservation of these forested areas—168,000,000 acres of land.

But I am glad to say to my friend that the hope held out to us by Mr. Graves, Chief Forester, that this service is ultimately to become self-sustaining, is encouraging, and as an incident to the main purpose of creating the forests it would be desirable if they shall become self-sustaining. His statement before the committee was that there are a number of forest units now which are, in fact, self-sustaining, that there are a number of other forest units which are almost self-sustaining, and there are some in which there is a large deficit, of course. But he believes that the entire service will become self-sustaining in 12 or 15 years.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that my criticism of the deficits that have occurred from year to year is not based on the idea that we ought to exploit the national forests that are held in reserve by the United States, but it is based entirely upon the promises of those in charge of the Forest Service from year to year that we might hope and reasonably look forward to a profit from the Forest Service rather than a large deficit.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think or believe that while the national forests ought not to be exploited, yet the Forest Service ought to cut more than 7 per cent of the natural increase of the forest reserves; or, in other words, stop letting 93 per cent rot in the woods?

Mr. MADDEN. I really must confess frankly that I am not sufficiently familiar with what ought to be done to be able to answer the gentleman's question intelligently, but I am familiar with the promises made by the various men who have been in charge of the Forest Service, to the effect that we might reasonably look forward at an early date—and I thought that date had arrived—to a profit, rather than a loss, in the service.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will ask the gentleman whether or not, as a business man, he does not believe that the Forest Service ought so to manage a billion dollars' worth of property as to at least be able to sell enough forest products to pay their own salaries, which they have not done?

Mr. MADDEN. It looks to me as though it ought to be done on a business basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman believe that to be a business basis?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not; because otherwise I would not be criticizing the Forest Service. I believe it is a service that ought to be encouraged, but not encouraged to such an extent as to leave to the officers of the service the widest possible latitude as to the expenditure of public money without holding them to a strict account for the proper administration of the properties under their jurisdiction.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think my friend from Illinois would charge the Forest Service with being unduly extravagant. On the contrary, I do not believe that there is a service in the Government——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more in which to elucidate this question, if he can.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Considering the wide range of work that it must necessarily take, I do not believe there is a service of the Government that is more economically administered than the Forest Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. In a moment I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. All right.

Mr. LEVER. The receipts from the national forests have increased during the past fiscal year over $300,000, and if my recollection is not at fault that is the largest increase that we have had in a single year for many years.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state right in that connection——

Mr. LEVER. The increase asked for in this estimate by the Bureau of Forestry is only $143,000.

Mr. MADDEN. All told?

Mr. LEVER. All told.

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to know what the increase in the expenses was, and the gentleman has answered that without my asking.

Mr. LEVER. It is $143,000.

Mr. BOOHER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks that the Forestry Service is conducted on a business basis?

Mr. LEVER. I will answer that in this way: I think it is conducted in as nearly a businesslike way as any Government service can be. The gentleman understands that the construction of a public building by the Government costs, in my judgment, about twice as much as it would cost a private individual.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not the fact if the specifications are the same.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not the fault of Congress that we permit that to go on?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not the fact if the specifications are alike in each case. For example, if a private individual was going to erect a building under exactly the same specifications that the Government erects it, the cost to the two would be the same.

Mr. LEVER. I agree to the gentleman's proposition; and I realize, of course, that in the construction of Federal public buildings the specifications are very much more exacting than if the building were to be constructed out of private funds; but the purposes for which the building is to be used could be just as well served with a very much smaller expenditure of money. I think everybody will agree to that.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true, but——

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] that I believe the efficiency of the administration of the Forestry Service has been increased year by year since I have been a member of this committee; and I believe now it is up to the highest point that I have seen it. I do not think it is perfect, by any means. When you are trying to protect 168,000,000 acres of land, which is an enormous territory, as my friend will realize, and when you have between 4,000 and 5,000

employees, there will necessarily be some lost motion and probably some lack of efficiency; but I believe the man at the head of this service is sincerely devoting his time to bringing value received to the Government for the appropriations we are giving.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture think that if we had 168,000,000 acres of territory under the management of a set of business men they would so conduct it that it would pay expenses?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend, as I suggested in answer to the gentleman from Illinois a moment ago, that undoubtedly the Forest Service can be made self-sustaining, but to do so might be at the expense of the national forests in the future. It is the hope of the committee, and it is the intention of the Forest Service, to increase the receipts of the national forests as rapidly as possible by the cutting of mature timber and by encouraging the use of the forests so that they will get to the point of self-sustenance pretty soon; but we do not want to go more rapidly in this direction than is warranted by good judgment and a wise administration of the forests. It is the people's service, and we must deal with it as a trust fund, using it for the benefit of those to whom it belongs and not for exploitation or commercial gain.

Mr. BOOHER. In that connection I should like to call the attention of the committee to this fact and ask why it is that pasturage for sheep on land just outside of national forests rents for 3.6 cents per head per month and in the forest reserve that is so well taken care of by the Government the same pasturage for sheep rents for 1.4 cents per head per month? Why this difference?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has the time.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask to be recognized in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] is recognized in his own right.

Mr. LEVER. If my friend will permit me, I shall be glad to answer that question. It is a pertinent and important inquiry. The Forest Service is between two fires—one on the part of men who want to get into the forests to exploit them; the other from another class of men who want to go in and use the forests but not exploit them. Now, here are cattlemen and sheepmen who desire to go into the forests. These forests are national property, which belong to all the people. I take it that the Forestry Service believes it is a wise policy to make the national forests as attractive for grazing purposes as possible, because the more sheep and cattle we raise upon these forests the greater the meat supply of the country, and all the people are thereby benefited. That seems to be the policy of the department.

Mr. BOOHER. Why should there be a different rule in relation to renting pasture lands in the forests than there is for the sale of the timber? Why does not the department put up the pasture land to the highest bidder, the same as it does the timber?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend in that connection that the department is right at this moment considering a general proposition right along the line that he has suggested.

There is now before another committee of this House—the Committee on Public Lands, I think—a bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], a grazing bill, which has the purpose of which the gentleman from Missouri speaks.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, who has justified the practice of the department in reference to grazing on the ground that it would help increase the food supply, if it would not help to increase the food supply if the rich agricultural lands held in many reserves were thrown open for settlement?

Mr. BOOHER. I think so.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that the policy of opening up the national forests for homestead entry was begun by this committee in this Congress a year ago, and this committee has allowed an increase of $85,000 for that work in this bill.

Mr. WINGO. Why does it take the action of a committee of Congress and an appropriation to throw open the great agricultural territory that under a mistaken policy has been included in forest reserves?

Mr. LEVER. The purpose is to provide for detailed surveys of these lands so that they can be patented and the title passed to the homesteader. The quicker they do that the quicker the man gets his title.

Mr. WINGO. At the present rate you are going it will take 40 to 100 years to complete it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; at the rate we are going we ought to get all of the agricultural lands out of the national forests within the next few years. That is the statement of the forestry officials.

Mr. WINGO. I have not observed that they make any progress; certainly not any in my district.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is taking these matters up out of turn, so that it is a little confusing to me, because I can not carry all these figures in my mind.

Mr. WINGO. Then I will let it rest until we reach the provision.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the chairman's attention to the testimony in the hearings on the question of grazing lands:

The CHAIRMAN. You have not stated, Mr. Potter, the fees received from grazing.

Mr. POTTER. About $1,000,000 is the total revenue from grazing at the present time.

Now, that was the revenue by renting the grazing land for sheep at 1¼ cents per head per month, when outside the same quality grazing land brought 3.6 cents per head per month, almost three times as much. If you had charged twice as much you would have had $2,000,000 and would have done away with a million-dollar deficit.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, this testimony continues:

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. Why should not the same rule for the sale of timber be followed in the sale of forage—to the highest bidder?

Mr. POTTER. Mainly for the reason that it would work against the bona fide settler.

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. I mean, after taking care of the bona fide settler, why should not the cattlemen who want the privilege of using the forest reserves pay for that the same as they do for timber?

Now, I want to call special attention to his answer.

Mr. POTTER. It is entirely a matter of policy, sir, as to what should be the basis of the charges. If it is desirable to increase the revenue and place the grazing on a commercial basis, that would be the proper way in which to do it.

Mr. BOOHER. Are you not placing the Forestry Service on a commercial basis, trying to get the most out of it you can?

Mr. LEVER. On the contrary, as I have said, the committee does not believe that the national forests, which belong to all the people of the country, should be exploited. We believe that in time we ought to go to a basis where they will be self-sustaining, but we do not want to go so rapidly that we are going to allow any undue and expensive exploitation of public property by private interests.

Mr. BOOHER. You have more than 7,000,000 sheep on the forest reserves, and they would not eat any more or destroy any more at 3⅗ cents than they would at 1⅖ cents.

Mr. MADDEN. If it is reasonable to charge 3⅗ cents for grazing sheep per head per month outside the forest reserves, and the pasturage is just as good inside as it is outside, does not the gentleman think it is just and reasonable to charge the same rate for sheep that may be allowed to graze within?

Mr. LEVER. Let me answer the question by asking this: We sell timber in the national forests upon bids. We have the right, if we desire to do it, to put the timber on the market at a price fixed by ourselves very much below the price of timber being sold on the outside. Does the gentleman say that in order to reduce the price of lumber in the local market the national forests should reduce its price below the actual price of the timber as fixed by the laws of trade on such markets?

Mr. MADDEN. If the policy to reduce the cost of living is to be pursued to its legitimate conclusion, I say yes.

Mr. LEVER. If the policy is to be pursued to its legitimate conclusion you would make every obstacle against the grazing in national parks as small as possible.

Mr. BOOHER. I will answer it in my own way. I think the Government ought to conduct this business as any man would conduct his own important affairs, and if it is worth 3.6 cents for grazing on the outside it is worth 3.6 cents on the inside. It ought to be governed by the same rule. You ought to put it up in certain quantities, as you do the timber, and make a sale. Put it up for sale to the highest bidder, get the most money you can, and put it into the Treasury without injuring the forest reservation.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows that the committee would have no jurisdiction to fix the rates.

Mr. BOOHER. I am asking why the officials of the Forestry Bureau do not do this thing.

Mr. LEVER. Because the committee does not look upon the national forests as something they ought to exploit from a commercial point of view, but to preserve and protect them for use of the public.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to this statement in the hearings:

Mr. MAGUIRE. This $2,000,000 a year of which the cattlemen are getting the benefit might be used to protect the forest reserve if they paid it?

What $2,000,000 was that? I have been unable to find out, but in some way, somehow, that has come in here.

Mr. LEVER. It is the $2,900,000 deficit to which I called the attention of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOOHER. Then the cattlemen are getting the benefit of that, and I notice the expert, Mr. Potter, did not answer it or pretend to answer it.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the cattlemen particularly are getting the benefit of it or the sheepmen, any more than are the lumbermen. I simply think that we have not reached the point where the Forest Service is prepared to say that it is on a self-sustaining basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman something about the salary roll, but before I do that I want to submit a few observations in regard to the question raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] as to when these forests are going to be self-sustaining. Seven years ago Mr. Pinchot, the great light of forest conservation, made the statement that in five years from that time these forests would be self-sustaining.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken in his time. It was 10 years ago he made that statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will accept the amendment. As I recall, President Roosevelt repeated that statement in one of his messages. We now have some light on when these forests will be self-sustaining. If you will turn to the hearings, at page 48, you will see that there are now 44 of the national forests that are self-sustaining out of 163, that the estimate is that in one year 22 more will be self-sustaining, and then they estimate that 15 will not be self-sustaining for 25 years, and that 18 are of such an indefinite character that they will not even undertake to make a guess.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I decline to yield at this time. Then Mr. Graves ends with this statement:

This would make, as my estimate to cover all expenses—I think a conservative one—12 to 15 years to make the Forest Service, including Washington office, investigational work, and the entire work which the service might have to do, self-sustaining.

Compare that with Pinchot's prophecy and get what comfort you can.

If you will look over the history of the Forest Service you will find that up until the last report the total cost has been $23,323,000 and the total revenue $11,495,000, and that includes the receipts from the rent for pasture. In other words, the Forest Service has not been able with 163,000,000 acres of land to sell enough timber to pay more than about one-half of the salaries expended in administration. The chairman of the committee says that the Forest Service is a very economical and effective branch of the Government service. If that is true, I would like to ask him how he can explain the fact that over in British Columbia they can so operate their forest reserves that last year instead of having a deficit upon their small forest reservation, as compared with ours, they had a net profit of over $3,000,000? Yet we have a Forest Service that can not take $2,000,000,000 worth of property, according to the estimate of Mr. Pinchot, and so manipulate it as to pay one-half of their salaries. I now want to ask the chairman of the committee just a question or two before we leave this paragraph. How does he account for the fact that they need 447 clerks?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that there is absolutely no increase in the number of clerks, and I take it that the service needs such as we have provided in the control and management of these forests. That is the idea the committee has about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I submit this to the gentleman and ask if this is correct. It is my understanding that there is a clerk for every forest reserve in the country.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that is entirely correct. I think some of the larger units do have a clerk in connection with the supervisor, but such clerks have other than mere clerical duties to perform.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is my understanding that in the Chugach Forest Reserve in Alaska, to illustrate, there are six men, and that one of those men is a clerk who receives from $1,200 to $1,400 a year for keeping the accounts of the other five men.

Mr. LEVER. I will state very frankly that I do not know whether that is the fact or not—it is probably true.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hold in my hand a list of the different forests and the number of men employed upon them. I find several of them running down as low as 5 and 10 men, and it is my understanding that there is a clerk on each of these forest reserves to keep the accounts of the few men employed. I would like to know what the clerk does to earn $1,200 or $1,400 a year keeping the accounts of 5 or 6 men?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. We have in that forest, the Chugach, as I have it here, employees as follows: A forest supervisor, a deputy forest supervisor, and two other men, making a permanent force of four men, with a temporary force of six men. In other words, there are four permanent men and at times they will have six. The expenditure for this forest for 1914 was $22,530.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How much did they receive?

Mr. BOOHER. $22,530.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no; that was the expenditure. They did not receive anywhere near that amount. My recollection is they received about one-fifth of that.

Mr. LEVER. We have that information here, but I can not put my hands on it right now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman can hand it in later.

Mr. LEVER. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, the question is, Does the gentleman know whether one of these five men is a clerk?

Mr. LEVER. I really do not. I do not know whether he is a clerk or not. It does not say in this book whether he is a clerk.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As I said awhile ago, I may be in error, but it is my understanding; for instance take the Okanogan National Forest in my State that has some 10 or 12 men, and I understand that 1 of those 12 men is a $1,400 clerk to keep the accounts of the others. Now, another question. Which one of those items in this particular paragraph is to pay the publicity agent of the Forest Service?

Mr. LEVER. If there is any publicity agent of the Forest Service the chairman of this committee does not know it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can say for the gentleman's information, I think there is one and that he bears the honored and classic name of Smith, and that is the only information I can get.

Mr. LEVER. That is a classic name, and if the gentleman will point out that position I am sure both the chairman and the committee will be glad to strike it out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will pardon me, and I am not trying to criticize the committee at all, but it does seem to me if I were chairman of the committee or a member of the committee and had the Forestry Service head before me I would find out something upon that point. I do not want to criticize the gentleman, because I know by experience it is almost absolutely impossible to get any information from anybody connected with the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER. I am of the opinion myself that if the gentleman were chairman and the views of the committee concurred with his in three years' time there would not be any national forests at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest the gentleman makes the statement that there are 12 people employed in the Okanogan National Forest and that 1 is employed as a clerk to keep the accounts of the others, and if the gentleman states that as a fact the thing to do is to take it up with the officials.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am stating my information. I do not know whether it is correct or not. I wish I did. I want to call attention to the fact that there is evidently a publicity man connected with the Forest Service. We used to have a whole army of them when Pinchot was at the head of the force. Then we paid more for publicity than for fighting forest fires. Here is one of the pieces of information which was sent out: "Squirrels aiding as collectors." Here is a great

item telling of the great work that has been done by squirrels in assisting in reseeding of forests.

Mr. LEVER. Just one minute on the proposition of the publicity agent. Several years ago there was put into this bill this provision by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]:

That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

Now, that is the law, and if these gentlemen of the department are violating the law and the gentleman has any evidence of that fact, the committee would certainly be glad to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have a number of these clippings taken from the papers right here now, and it is perfectly evident by looking at them that somebody connected with the Forestry Service prepared them.

Mr. LEVER. I regret that the gentleman, who has an intimate knowledge of the Forest Service, living, as he does, out there in close contact with the practical operations of the service, did not come before the committee and produce his evidence, thus affording the committee an opportunity to look into it, instead of bringing it here on the floor of the House, and giving us no opportunity to make an investigation, to send for the officials and make a cross-examination of them, to ascertain if the conditions as represented are correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman had an opportunity to do it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the gentleman has had as much opportunity to come before the committee——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is proper to say that the committee has accepted the statements of the officers and chiefs of the bureaus. Now, if we have misplaced our confidence and the gentleman has some information on the subject the House ought to know, I think he is rendering a very valuable service if he will submit that statement, and nobody will more cheerfully——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know whether the statement is true or not. I have here a lot of these publicity stories. Here is one I show to the House. There is one of the articles to which I referred [exhibiting].

Mr. Chairman, I have here an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of March 4, 1914, entitled "British Columbia forestry." It is interesting as showing the efficiency of that service as compared with our own. I spoke of this matter a few moments ago. It reads as follows:

BRITISH COLUMBIA FORESTRY.

The report of the provincial chief forester of British Columbia is an instructive document. It shows that the Province during the past year has received a net income of $3,000,000 from the sale of timber on the public lands. Further, it is the only Province in Canada which is not overcutting its forest lands. The forester believes that the revenues will grow greater year by year until the annual forest cut "keeps pace with the normal forest growth," which is not the case at present.

The timber growth of British Columbia is identical with that of this State, and logging and milling conditions are similar in both. In the Province all of the Crown lands, the title to which is theoretically in the King of England, are administered for the benefit of the people of the Province, by local officials, under the immediate control of the people of the Province.

In this State of Washington the forest lands, the title to which is theoretically in the Federal Government, are administered under the direction of a bureau at Washington City, 3,000 miles away. As a result the cost of administration here is more than the income from the lands. Further, the cutting of timber on the Federal reserves is but a petty fraction of the annual growth. Moreover, there is a tremendous economic loss every year because of the failure to cut the matured timber, which is deteriorating probably as fast as the new growth of young trees is proceeding.

British Columbia has practical forestry administration, for the benefit of the people of the Province. This State has theoretical forestry administration, ostensibly for the benefit of the Federal Treasury, but practically at a loss to the Federal Treasury of $3 for every dollar of revenue collected.

No better or more practical argument for the State administration of the State's resources could probably be furnished than the contrast between results in British Columbia and those seen in this State in handling forests of identical character, under identical climatic and other natural conditions.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how far the Forest Service may be giving out information to the Members, but I do know this, that I never have employed a publicity agent myself, and I think the gentleman from Washington has never employed a publicity agent, but I suspect one could collect more clippings relating to myself than he can in reference to the Forest Service.

I do not think it becomes necessary to employ a publicity agent for the purpose of disseminating certain information. I have no doubt certain press agencies regularly visit the Forest Service and other services in the Government to obtain such information as they can, although I have noticed that most of the information which I have seen in the papers relating to the different bureaus of the Government is taken from public documents which I have read, receiving them as they come out and before they appeared in the newspapers. I have frequently called the attention of newspaper correspondents to some interesting things I have seen in some of the public documents which came to the House, which few Members look at but which I go over, and afterwards I have seen this very interesting information going the rounds of the newspapers. I think it is a good thing. I believe that the more disseminated the information is which comes from the bureaus of the Government the better it is. We did take exception at one time to the idea that the man should be employed in one of the bureaus for the purpose of advertising the good qualities of the bureau and the bureau chiefs; but giving the information which they acquire so that it is accessible to press agencies, so that it may appear in the newspapers throughout the country, in my opinion is a matter to be praised rather than to be condemned.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] if the Florida National Forest referred to on page 30, line 23, includes the Choctahatchee Reservation?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell my friend from Florida offhand. I will put the information in the RECORD for him. All the information in reference to these forest units—and there are 163 of them—I think is included in this book which I hold in my hand, and it is a very hard matter, as the gentleman knows, for anybody to carry all these details in his head. If the gentleman desires the information put in the RECORD I will be glad to do it.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I do not care anything about its being put in the RECORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. May I offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not want to offer it to that paragraph, because we have not come to it yet.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In some instances there may be ground for criticism of the Forestry Service appropriations. I venture to assert, however, that no governmental work undertaken in recent years is of such great importance and capable of producing such grand results for the present and future generations as that of the Forest Service of this Government in its efforts to conserve and protect what is left of the great forests which were the birthrights of this Nation.

The water supply necessary for the very existence of ninety millions of people in continental United States and the hundreds of millions that these States will eventually contain can only be maintained and continued by preserving and increasing our forests.

The streams that create the water powers which our people will, as time goes on, become more and more dependent upon for light, heat, and to move the wheels of industry will shrink to insignificance, if not disappear from the face of the earth, unless the forests at their source are preserved.

When President Washington was sworn in as the first President of the United States, a magnificent forest swept the whole length of the Atlantic seaboard, from Maine to Florida; to-day it has practically disappeared; only a remnant of this great timber wealth in its virgin state remains, and, strange to relate, that remnant is in the earliest settled section of the country, the State of Maine. The coast of Maine was settled as early, if not earlier, than Jamestown, Va.

The Appalachian White Mountain forest-conservation policy adopted by the Government two or three years ago was so important and wise a step in the right direction that no man or party would dare to advocate its abandonment, yet the money expended in those sections will be largely to restore the forests that have disappeared. In Maine, at the headwaters of the great Maine rivers in the Mount Katahdin region, are virgin forests that this Government can and should continue. I hope before it is too late that the forest-conservation policy of this Government and its Forest Service will be extended to that wonderful mountain forest and lake region that it may become a national asset. I hope at some more opportune time to address the House at length on the desirability of the passage of the Mount Katahdin national park and forest reserve bill which I have introduced in this Congress. In the meantime, and now, I want to express my most emphatic indorsement of the desirability of the continuance of the appropriations in this great supply measure for the continuance of

the Forest Service and the general forest-conservation policy of the Government.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that the gain of the Government is not measured in the amount of lumber that is sold or the timber that is sold, or by the bookkeeping that takes into account the salaries and expenses paid and the amount of lumber sold. These do not represent the real gain, profit, or loss to the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman tell how much they have sold during the past year?

Mr. SLOAN. I am not taking up that feature of it. I am taking up an entirely different one. That was discussed and this was not, and I want to call the attention of the committee to it. I want to direct attention to the statement of the Forester, on page 17 of the hearings, where he was asked:

Do you figure that during the last five years there has been a substantial increase in the lumber or stumpage in these forest reserves; in other words, has the growth greatly exceeded the destruction and removal?

Mr. Graves said:

Without any question, the forests are increasing in the production of timber. In other words, when we took hold of the forests there were a great many gaps; not only large areas which had been burned over and where reproduction is very slow, but a great number of smaller gaps where there were still seed trees in the neighborhood. These areas are seeding up with great rapidity. This summer I was astonished, on visiting some of the California forests in the Sierras, to see the result our protection is securing in actually extending the conifers down into areas where a number of years ago they did not exist. There is not any question but that the forests are on the increase, whereas previously, on account of unregulated fires, the forests were on the decrease.

And in point of value, covering the five years that have been discussed by gentlemen here to-day, I have no doubt that the real living timber supply has been increased a great many per cent, and that, together with that which has been marketed, would more than equal the excess of expenditure which has been complained about. In other words, if the protected lumber and the growth that has come out of that protection had been marketed by the Government, instead of the balance sheet showing against the Government it would show a large surplus to the credit of the forest-reserve protection given by the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will ask if Mr. Graves does not say in the same hearings, and show, that they are only cutting about 7 per cent of the natural increase and leaving 93 per cent to decay in the forests?

Mr. SLOAN. They are only cutting that amount, and the balance becomes a valuable asset owned by the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. When does it become a valuable asset—when it rots? They could cut 6,000,000 feet instead of what they are cutting and not decrease the supply. The Forester has said that repeatedly in the report, and he repeats it in the hearings.

Mr. SLOAN. I know of no forest reservation containing live trees that rot.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman probably knows forest reserves contain ripe timber that rots?

Mr. SLOAN. There has been a great deal greater growth than there has been decay, and that fact has appeared in the hearings.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I see that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] about to rise. I suggest to him that he first let us read the general expense item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 751. An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate concurrent resolution No. 11, to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 357, volumes 1 and 2, Sixty-first Congress, and Senate Document No. 1063, Sixty-third Congress, being a compilation of the treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols, and agreements between the United States of America and other powers from 1776 to 1913.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed $650: *And provided further*, That hereafter no part of the appropriation made by this act shall be used for the construction, repair, maintenance, or use of buildings or improvements made for forest-ranger stations within the inclosed fields of bona fide homestead settlers who have established residence upon their homestead lands prior to the date of the establishment of the forest reservation in which the homestead lands are situated, without the consent of the homesteader; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State, Territory, or the District of Alaska in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests, in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and medical supplies necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that of the total appropriation carried in this bill supposed to be for the benefit of the farmers of this country almost one-third of it is to maintain the Forest Service that in no way benefits the farmer. The only result that comes to the farmer from the Forest Service is to be compelled to pay more for his timber, as the Forest Service joins with the great timber owners of the country in keeping up the price of lumber and other forest products. One reason why we have no larger sales of timber by the Forest Service is that they prefer that the trees shall decay in the forests rather than put them upon the market.

I call the attention of the committee to some of the statements made in the hearings when the Agriculture bill was being considered by that committee. I read first from page 26 from the testimony of Mr. Greeley, who was connected with the Forest Service. Here is the question which was propounded to him:

"Mr. PATTON. How does your stumpage price compare with the local price?

"Mr. GREELEY. The stumpage price for national-forest timber is usually rather higher than the local price, because of the fact that no interest is required on deferred payments. You can readily appreciate that in a long-term sale this is a very important factor to the operator. It greatly reduces the investment which is required and that should justly be compensated for in the price paid for the timber. For that reason our prices probably range a little higher than the prevailing price for private timber in the same locality."

Then a little further on they asked this question:

"Mr. PATTON. And that makes it more expensive to operate?

"Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. In no case have you attempted to influence the market price of the lumber?

"Mr. GREELEY. Not at all.

"The CHAIRMAN. You follow the market price?

"Mr. GREELEY. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Your scale of prices would be higher on account of the reasons just given by you?

"Mr. GREELEY. I think so, although that is a point, Mr. Chairman, on which I would not like to make a sweeping statement."

Then, on the very next page, the examination continues:

"Mr. HOWELL. You do not maintain that this timber which you have, if it were disposed of at a lower stumpage rate, would not have some influence on the price of lumber?

"Mr. GREELEY. It would not reduce the price of lumber. It would simply give the purchaser from the Government a much larger profit. He would get the same price for his lumber that other manufacturers obtain, as a result of these broad, competitive conditions which I have just described."

I desire to place in the RECORD some history of this so-called conservation policy. I have heretofore called the attention of this House to the fact that the Santa Fe Railroad secured

1,200,000 acres of the best part of the public domain for an equal number of acres of worthless, barren, treeless land. This transaction was consummated through the influence of those who have been back of the forest "conservation" movement. I have also called attention upon the floor of this House to the fact that the Northern Pacific Railway has secured some 690,000 acres of the best timbered land on this continent for an equal number of acres of practically treeless land of very little value. This transaction also had the approval of those who were back of this movement to "conserve" our forests.

I will give some interesting history of the men who conserved our forests, and will try to give some of the men and interests who furnished the money and the brains for the propaganda. I need hardly say that those who have done this have reaped their reward.

Read the names and the occupations of those prominent in this movement. Read the names of the officers, contributors, and supporters of the American Forestry Association. It is worth while. The Forest Service and the timber barons have worked together for a common purpose.

It is an illuminating story.

FORCES BEHIND "CONSERVATION."

During the past 10 or 15 years there has been created in the United States a definite public opinion that only by Federal reservation and administration may the coal, timber, water power, and other resources of the public lands be saved from being looted by "the interests."

What force created it?

The public has been educated to believe that the States wherein those public lands and resources lie have no right to them whatsoever over the rights of the States which contain no public lands.

It has been taught that the individual public-land States are too powerless or too corrupt properly to administer the resources within their borders as the older States administered theirs.

The lesson has been driven home that the public lands in the new Western States belong to the whole people of the United States, and must be administered for the benefit and revenue of this "whole people."

Gifford Pinchot has produced figures purporting to show that in these lands and resources "there is about $700 in sight for every man, woman, or child in the United States."

The fact that the original thirteen States administered their own public lands to their individual benefit is entirely disregarded in the treatment of the subject, or else met with the statement that conditions are different; that Pennsylvania, for instance, as a distinct commonwealth of prerevolutionary birth, inherently had the right to her public lands, whereas the territory of the Western States was acquired by the expenditure of the "blood and treasure" of the people of the Eastern States.

In other words, the idea has been fostered that the public-land States are mere Federal provinces. It is assumed that only by Federal control of their resources can the rights of the whole American people in these resources be protected.

Any opposition to these new ideas of the treatment of a State's natural resources is condemned by Gifford Pinchot, his adherents and his newspaper and magazine supporters, as being animated by "the interests," meaning thereby the predatory corporations.

Historical facts and the basic law are swept aside by the proponents of the Federal reservation and control idea.

In the law it is a matter of acknowledged truth that the Federal title to the public domain is but that of a trustee for the States. This has been determined by the highest tribunals time and time again. Furthermore, so far as the "Oregon country" is concerned—that region now containing the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, the western part of Montana and the northwestern part of Wyoming—it cost the older States not one drop of blood nor one cent of treasure. Title was won to the United States by pioneer "occupation and discovery."

The Federal-control propaganda has disregarded the fact that all of the past evils complained of in the treatment of the public domain have been through Federal, not State, maladministration.

Any plea in behalf of the public-land States that they be permitted to get possession of the lands granted to them in their enabling acts, any argument that the States are in better position than the Federal Government to deal with the administration of water powers, instantly brings the charge that such pleas and such argument are made solely in the interests of the "land thieves" and the "Water Power Trust."

Extravagant estimates have been placed on the value of the coal, metalliferous, and water-power-site lands remaining in the trust possession of the Federal Government.

The result is that wholesale Federal reservations have been established covering great areas of the public-land States, removing those lands from the possibility of taxation by the States and thus curtailing the State's legitimate sources of revenue.

The promoters of the movement teach that title to coal and other mineral lands must never pass from the United States; that water-power sites must never be sold; that timberland must never be sold; but that all operations on these properties shall be on leasehold, the revenue derived therefrom going to the Federal Treasury.

Resources in only 13 States would be materially affected by this plan. There are 48 States in the Union. Thirty-five States, having secured the undivided benefit of their own resources for themselves, would have a share also in the resources of the 13 new ones.

Federal tax—or royalty, or lease, for it is all a tax—on the resources of the 13 States imposes a handicap on the development of those resources. It imposes a charge that does not exist on the same kind of resources in the older States nor on the resources in the newer States to which the Federal Government has already passed title.

Thus, Federal control of and Federal tax on mines, fuel supply, and sources of power for manufacturing must inevitably hold back the development of the newer States in the interests of the older ones, and also in the interests of those favored corporations and persons in the newer States who have secured their patents from the Federal Government. Instead of preventing monopoly, the Federal-control policy promotes monopoly.

If the manufacturing, transportation, coal-mining, and power-owning interests in the older States be selfish, it is hardly probable that they would oppose the advance of the Federal-control propaganda.

Equally, it is hardly to be supposed that those aggregations of capital which have secured large land grants in western States, or, through Federal negligence, have been enabled to secure vast areas of valuable lands by other means, would oppose the Federal reservation plan. They have "got theirs."

It may be noted in this connection, and for illustrative purposes, that the creation of national forest reservations aggregating 12,000,000 acres in the State of Washington sharply and extravagantly advanced the value of the 1,200,000 acres of timberland owned in the State by the Weyerhaeuser interests, and also increased the value of the Northern Pacific granted timberlands.

Hence it seems highly improbable that the "interests" cited by the Federal-control advocates as the enemies of their policy can be the same interests that are generally known in the country as the "vested interests."

But probabilities should not be considered. Facts as to the exact source of the Federal-control propaganda are more valuable than conjecture.

Trace back through any of its many channels the flow of Federal-control advocacy and it leads to the one fountainhead—the American Forestry Association. It was in this association that the movement had its birth. It is due to the agitation of this organization that it has grown to maturity. From this association came the money to pay for the maintenance of press bureaus, traveling lecturers, and all the other mediums so lavishly used to "educate" the people of the country.

Formed as the American Forestry Congress at a tree-planting festival at Cincinnati in 1882, the American Forestry Association has grown into a great and powerful body, with about 7,000 members, having permanent offices in Washington, where it may watch legislation closely, and publishing a monthly magazine of large circulation.

It is the membership of the American Forestry Association that furnished the funds for the propaganda, with this qualification: After Gifford Pinchot secured control of the Forest Service of the United States Federal funds of that service were available for publicity of various sorts.

In the membership of the American Forestry Association there has been represented for years every corporate interest that would be benefited by the Federal-control policy.

A large proportion of the officers and membership is and has been for years made up of representatives of Pennsylvania coal and iron companies, New England manufacturing interests, electric and water power interests, the wood-pulp interests, the land-grant railways, and the great timberland barons and great lumber-manufacturing interests of the country.

Frederick Weyerhaeuser, who acknowledges the title of "lumber king," was vice president of the association for years and also a member of its advisory board.

The coal railroads, such as the Reading and the Lehigh Valley, have long had their representatives in powerful place in the association.

The Morgan-owned Southern Railway, which handles much Atlantic range coal and southern lumber, kept a place on the list of officers for years. When President Spencer, of the Southern, lost his life the new president, W. W. Finley, promptly was elected director of the association in his place.

The great financial interests of Wall Street, the Pulp and Paper Trust, the huge privately owned irrigation enterprises—all these have been contributing for years to the treasury of the American Forestry Association to assist in carrying on the work in favor of the Federal control idea.

A reading of the list of officers and members for years past is like reading a directory of the vested wealth of the United States and Canada. Canada from the beginning has had a prominent part in the association. For many years Sir Henri G. Joly de Lotbiniere, now dead, a man of wealth, formerly premier of Quebec and later lieutenant governor of British Columbia, was a vice president of the organization and several times presided over its annual deliberations.

It is impossible and would be tedious to the reader to set forth just what all the individual members of the association represent. Some of them are dreamers who believe wholly in the theory that the propaganda is for the public good; some of that great class which has been aptly termed the "unintelligent intellectuals," some of those who are disciples of the uplift for salary only, and many of those who know precisely what they are there for. Here, however, are some of those whose money, through their membership in the association, has been poured out to create public opinion:

Charles Francis Adams, Boston (member), president of the Union Pacific Railway, 1884–1890; Government director Union Pacific Railway, 1877–1890. Of the famous Adams family of New England, which gave two Presidents to the United States and has had a powerful finger in the Government ever since. Mr. Adams has a winter home in Washington. The family has been identified with the Union Pacific Railway from its inception and from the time the prodigious land grants and financial aid from the Government were obtained. Mr. Adams is heavily interested in privately owned irrigation enterprises in the West, notably, the Lewiston-Clarkston project in Asotin County, Wash.

Charles Francis Adams, 2d, Boston (member), vice president of the City Trust Co. and of the electric corporation; trustee of many Massachusetts gas and electric power companies.

Edward D. Adams, New York (life member), the chief figure in the company which controls the power of Niagara Falls, representative in the United States of the Deutsche Bank, of Berlin, since 1893, and one of the most powerful financiers in the United States. The Deutsche Bank played a considerable part in financing the Northern Pacific Railway at the time of Henry Villard. In recent years Mr. Adams has paid particular attention to water-power development and the creation of hydroelectric powers. He is president and director of the Cataract Construction Co. and its allied companies at Niagara, and has been since 1889. He figured in the reorganization of the Northern Pacific Railway Co. (a land-grant road) and was chairman of the board of directors of that company in 1896. He is still a large stockholder in the road. He is chairman of the board of directors of the Empire Engineering Corporation; president of the Bullock Electric Manufacturing Co.; director of the Allis-Chalmers Co., of the Allis-Chalmers-Bullock (Ltd.), of Montreal; of the American Cotton Seed Oil Co.; of the Central & Southern American Telegraph Co.; of the Union Petroleum Co.; and of the Guatemala Railway Co.; also of many other corporations. He wears the Prussian order of the crown, second class, conferred upon him by the Kaiser for services to German capital in the United States.

J. Edward Addicks, Wilmington, Del. (member), "Gas" Addicks, the subject of some lurid remarks by Thomas Lawson in "Frenzied Finance." He is president of the Bay State Gas Co., Boston, and president of gas companies in Brooklyn and Wilmington, with dependent interests in coal mines.

James S. Ames, Mrs. F. L. Ames, Susan Ames, and Mary Ames, North Easton, Mass. (three life members and one member). These are representatives of the famous North Easton or Oakes Ames branch of one of the richest manufacturing families in America. Oakes Ames's name will be recalled in connection with the Credit Mobilier and the presidency of the Union Pacific Railway. Robert Ames, son of Oakes, is president of the Ames Shovel & Tool Co., Oliver Ames & Son Corporation, T. Rowland's Sons (Inc.), Wright Shovel Co., R. M. Myers Co., Elwood Fuel Co., Easton Investment Co., American Trust Co., First National Bank of Easton, Kensley Iron & Machine Co., and Carver Cotton Co. Another member of the North Easton family is Oliver, who is president of the Ames Plow Co., Fisher Manufacturing Co., director of the Kensley Iron & Machine Co., Washington Mills, Emery Manufacturing Co., Union Copper Mining Co., vice president and treasurer of the Oliver Ames & Son Corporation, director of the Chicago & North Western Railway, Oregon Short Line, Union Pacific Railway, Old Colony Railroad, Western Union Telegraph Co., General Electric Co., Electric Corporation, Edison Electric Illuminating Co., and many other corporations.

Samuel P. Avery, New York (now dead, sustaining member), wealthy merchant, who was a figure in New York high finance.

Joshua L. Bailey, Philadelphia (vice president; director, 1909–10), millionaire dry-goods merchant of varied interests; member of many philanthropic societies.

John Birkinbine, Philadelphia (member executive committee, 1897), consulting engineer, reporting on mines and industries, also interested in the manufacture of charcoal. Editor for nine years of the Journal of Iron Workers; editor of Forest Leaves.

Cornelius N. Bliss, New York (now dead; life member), Secretary of the Interior, 1897–1899; treasurer Republican national committee, 1892–1908; director of the American Cotton Co.; trustee American Surety Co., Central Trust Co.; director Home Insurance Co. and of the Fourth National Bank of New York.

James H. Bowditch, Boston (life member), representative of the Bowditch family of cotton spinners and manufacturers. Among the family interests are the Massachusetts Cotton Mills, with mills both in the Bay State and in Georgia; the Pepperill Manufacturing Co., the Saco Water Power Co., and similar corporations.

William M. Canby, Wilmington, Del. (now dead; vice president 1898 to 1904, inclusive), president of the Wilmington Institution; once receiver of the Wilmington & Western Railway.

Hugh J. Chisholm, New York (life member), the "wood-pulp king." A Canadian-born promoter, who developed the wood-pulp business and in a measure controls it. In 1881 he established the Umbagog pulp mill at Livermore Falls on the Androscoggin River, and later organized the Otis Falls Pulp Co.; developed water power at Rumford Falls, organized the Rumford Falls Power Co., and organized and is president of the Portland & Rumford Falls Railway, the Rumford Falls & Rangeley Lakes Railroad, and, with W. A. Russell and others, organized the International Paper Co. and is now its president. He is president and director of a number of other pulp and paper companies.

Austin Corbin, New York (sustaining member), banker; executor of the estate of his late father of the same name. President Rockaway Park Improvement Co.; president Manhattan Beach Co.; treasurer New England Mortgage Security Co.; was associated with relatives in backing railway and other enterprises in the State of Washington and in British Columbia, promoted by D. C. Corbin.

Frederick A. Delano, Chicago (vice president; life member), president of the Wabash Railroad; president of the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad; chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railroad, Chicago; director of the Hamilton National Bank, Chicago, of the Union Mining Co., of Maryland, and of various other corporations.

P. H. Dudley, New York (life member), consulting engineer of the New York Central lines.

Arthur F. Estabrook, Boston (life member), senior member of the banking firm of Estabrook & Co.; director of the Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co. and other corporations.

W. W. Finley, Washington (director 1907; vice president 1908–9), president of the Southern Railway and of the Mobile & Ohio Railway.

Addison G. Foster, Tacoma, Wash. (vice president 1902–1904), Senator from the State of Washington 1899–1905; vice president of the St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Co.; president of the Consolidated Lumber Co.; owner of large areas of timberland; "active in the development of coal mines and in railroad building," to quote his authorized biography.

David R. Francis, St. Louis (vice president 1909–10), Secretary of the Interior under President Cleveland 1896–7; president of the St. Louis Exposition. Made his fortune in the grain trade. Trustee of the New York Life Insurance Co.; vice president of a St. Louis bank; and interested in many financial and industrial enterprises.

John L. Gardener, Boston (now dead; life member), husband of Mrs. Jack Gardener, Boston's famous and eccentric millionaire society leader and art patron. The Gardener money is chiefly in manufacturing.

Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me. (member), director of the Arlington Mills, Webster & Atlas National Bank, Cochrane Chemical Co., the Falls Co.; trustee the Boston & Albany Railroad.

Robert Garrett, Baltimore (director 1908), partner in the banking firm of Robert Garrett & Sons; director of the Western National Bank, the Provident Savings Bank, and the Colonial Trust Co.

Edwin Ginn, Boston (life member), head of the firm of Ginn & Co., publishers of school and college textbooks, and interested in paper manufacturing.

Curtis Guild, Boston (president 1909–10, vice president 1913), recently ambassador to Russia; twice governor of Massachusetts; owner Boston Commercial Bulletin; heavily interested in manufacturing.

Warren Higley, New York (president, 1885–86), highly successful corporation lawyer; president of the Adirondack League, 1901–1906.

Gen. Thomas H. Hubbard, New York (life member), member law firm of Butler, Stillman & Hubbard; vice president and director Southern Pacific Railway Co.; president Mexican International Railroad, 1897–1901; Houston & Texas Central, 1894–1901; president Guatemala Central Railroad, 1901; president Pacific Improvement Co., 1903; director National Bank of Commerce; director and chairman executive committee Chicago & Alton Railroad, Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad, American Light & Traction Co; director and member executive committee Wabash Railroad, Western Union Telegraph Co.; director and member finance committee Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; director Equitable Trust Co., Philippine Railway Co., and other corporations.

Archer M. Huntington, New York (life member), son of Collis P. Huntington, who for years was at the head of the Southern Pacific Railway. Mr. Huntington is the inheritor of much of his father's wealth.

D. Willis James, now dead, New York (patron), vice president and trustee United States Trust Co.; director Ansonia Brass & Copper Co., Ansonia Clock Co., Commercial Mining Co., Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Co., Northern Pacific Railway, and United Globe mines.

Morris K. Jesup (now dead), New York (life member), banker; once president of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

William M. Ladd, Portland, Oreg. (life member), president Ladd & Tilton Banking House, with large and varied interests through the Pacific Northwest.

Amory Appleston Lawrence, Boston (life member), president Salmon Falls Manufacturing Co., Ipswich Mills, Gilmanton Mills; vice president Provident Institution for Savings; director National Union Bank, Boston Manufacturing Co., Waltham Bleachery & Dye Works, Dwight Manufacturing Co., Cocheco Manufacturing Co., New York, New Haven & Hartford Railway, Boston & Maine Railway, Maine Central Railway.

Cyrus H. McCormick, Chicago (member), president International Harvester Co.; director Chicago & North Western Railway, Merchants' Loan & Trust Co., National City Bank, of New York.

Abraham Gilbert Mills, New York (life member), vice president of the Otis Elevator Co., president of the Adirondack Co., and director of various financial and industrial enterprises.

D. O. Mills, New York (now dead; life member), the great banker of the bonanza days in California; largely interested in the Southern Pacific Railroad.

George H. Maxwell, Chicago, and Sonoma, Cal. (director 1909–10), organizer of the National Irrigation Congress, editor of an irrigation newspaper, and interested in various irrigation enterprises.

George T. Oliver, Pittsburgh (vice president, 1909), United States Senator and millionaire steel manufacturer and investor; president Youngstown Car Manufacturing Co.

Charles L. Pack, Lakewood, N. J., formerly Cleveland, Ohio (director), for a quarter of a century one of the largest manufacturers of lumber in the country; owner of thousands of acres of timberlands in the West; formerly operated in Michigan; president National Conservation Congress; director Seaboard National Bank, of New York.

William Jackson Palmer, Colorado (now dead; life member), president Denver & Rio Grande Railroad, 1870–1883; president Mexican National Railroad for seven years; president Rio Grande Western Railroad, 1883–1901.

John E. Parsons, New York (life member), corporation lawyer; director Metropolitan Trust Co.; trustee Bank for Savings.

George Foster Peabody, New York (director, 1907; vice president, 1908–1910), banker; treasurer Democratic national committee, 1896–1905; vice president and director of the Mexican Northern Railway, the Potosi & Rio Verde Railway Co., the Mexican Coal & Coke Co., the Alvarez Land & Timber Co., the Compania Metalurgica Mexicana, the Montezuma Land Co.; director of the Mexican Mineral Railway Co., Conquista Coal Railway Co., and Southern Improvement Co., of New York.

Henry Phipps, New York (life member), next to Andrew Carnegie the largest owner in the Carnegie Steel Co.; director of the United States Steel Corporation and of the Mellon National Bank, of Pittsburgh.

H. A. Pressey, Washington, D. C. (director, 1906–1908), vice president Spencer Water Co., Colonna Dry Dock Co.; director Southern Public Service Corporation, Oxford Water & Electrical Co., Graham Water & Electric Co., Morgantown Water Co.; consulting engineer New York State Water Supply Commission.

Redfield Proctor (dead), Proctor, Vt. (vice president, 1893–1902), United States Senator and head of the largest marble producing company in the world.

Frank West Rollins, Concord, N. H. (vice president, 1902), governor of New Hampshire, 1890–1901; first vice president E. H. Rollins & Sons, bankers, Boston.

Isaac N. Seligman, New York (life member), member of the banking firm of J. & W. Seligman and one of the financial powers in New York.

Charles Axel Smith, Minneapolis (vice president, 1908; member advisory board, 1909–10), president C. A. Smith Timber Co., Northwestern Composition Board Co.; director Swedish-American National Bank and several other corporations; "has vast timber holdings in Minnesota, Oregon, and California," to quote his authorized biography; director and treasurer Northern Pine Manufacturers' Association. In September, 1910, the Government recovered by court decree 5,000 acres of Oregon timber land which Mr. Smith had attempted to acquire for himself from the public domain. Fraud in the entry was alleged by the Government.

Samuel Spencer (dead), New York and Washington (director, 1906), president Southern Railway; one-time president and director Alabama Great Southern Railroad, Georgia Southern & Florida Railroad, Mobile & Ohio Railroad; director Central of Georgia, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, Erie, and Northern Pacific Railways.

Charles Warren Stone, Warren, Pa. (member), heavily interested in lumbering, oil producing, and coal; represented twenty-seventh district of Pennsylvania in the Fifty-first to the Fifty-fifth Congresses.

George C. Thomas, Philadelphia (sustaining member), retired banker; formerly a member of the banking firm of Jay Cook & Co., which financed the Northern Pacific Railway. Later of the firm of Thomas & Shoemaker. From 1883 to his retirement was a member of the banking firm of Drexel & Co., Philadelphia; Drexel, Morgan & Co., New York; and Drexel, Harjes & Co., Paris. Has been director of the Lehigh Valley Railroad, the Philadelphia & Reading, the Reading Co., and the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.

Louis C. Tiffany, New York (sustaining member), president and director of the Tiffany Glass & Decorating Co.

George W. Vanderbilt (now dead), New York (life member), son of William H. Vanderbilt. Has a private park of 150,000 acres near Asheville, N. C., devoted to forestry. Gifford Pinchot originally was his forester.

Thomas F. Walsh (now dead), Colorado and Washington (life member; director, 1901–2; vice president, 1903–4), mine owner and engineer and also interested in private irrigation enterprises.

Samuel D. Warren, Dedham, Mass. (life member), lawyer and manufacturer. Partner in S. D. Warren & Co., manufacturers, and part owner in Cumberland mills, Portland, Me.; Copescook mill, Gardiner, Me.; and Forest Paper Co., Yarmouth, Me.

George Peabody Wetmore, Newport, R. I. (vice president, 1904; life member), United States Senator 1894–1913.

Frederick Weyerhaeuser, St. Paul (vice president, 1904; member advisory board 1908–1910): The "lumber king" of the world. President of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.; president of the Weyerhaeuser Syndicate; president of the Duluth & Northeastern Railroad and of the Missabe Southern Railroad. Purchased from the Northern Pacific Railway much of its granted timberlands in the Northwestern States, and also purchased from the same much forest-lieu land scrip, by which he was enabled to increase his timberland holdings vastly.

James S. Whipple, New York (director, 1909–10): Lawyer. President and director of the Fair Haven Ore Co.; secretary and director of the Elko Paint Co. Has extensive lumber interests. Forest, fish, and game commissioner of New York for several years.

Nathaniel Wilson, Washington, D. C. (director, 1897–98): Lawyer. Attorney for the American Security & Trust Co., the Great Falls & Old Dominion Railroad, and other corporations.

All of the foregoing were active in the association at the time of its greatest growth and during the period when it was building up in the country the so-called "conservation" sentiment.

Officers of the American Forestry Association for 1913 are as follows:

President: Dr. H. S. Drinker, president of Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.

Vice presidents: Joshua L. Bailey, Philadelphia; John R. Clancy, New York; Frederick A. Delano, president of the Wabash Railroad; Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard; Dr. B. E. Fernow, dean of forestry, University of Toronto; Walter L. Fisher, former Secretary of the Interior; Henry S. Graves, chief of the United States Forest Service; Curtis S. Guild, recently ambassador to Russia; Everett G. Griggs, of Tacoma, Wash., president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association; Hiram Johnson, governor of California; Asbury F. Lever, Member of Congress from South Carolina; Gifford Pinchot; Filibert Roth, dean of forestry, University of Michigan; Dr. J. T. Rothrock, secretary Pennsylvania State Forest Reservation Commission; Joseph N. Teal, chairman Oregon Conservation Commission; Oscar W. Underwood, Congressman from Alabama; Dr. Robert S. Woodward, president of the Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer: Otto Luebkert, Washington, D. C.

Executive secretary: P. S. Risdale, Washington, D. C.

Assistant Secretary: J. A. P. Farnham, Washington, D. C.

Directors: E. T. Allen, secretary of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association; Robert T. Bass, former governor of New Hampshire; W. R. Brown, president of the New Hampshire Forestry Commission; Herman H. Chapman, professor of forestry, Yale; Dr. Henry S. Drinker, president of Lehigh University; John E. Jenks, Washington, D. C.; Otto Luebkert, Washington, D. C.; Chester W. Lyman, International Paper Co.; Thomas Nelson Page, author, Washington, D. C.; Charles F. Quincy, New York; J. E. Rhodes, National Lumber Manufacturers' Association; Ernest A. Sterling, Pennsylvania, forest and timber engineer; John L. Weaver, Washington, D. C.; J. B. White, Kansas City, lumberman and former president of the National Conservation Congress.

Auditors: E. A. Sterling and C. F. Quincy.

In addition, there is an advisory board consisting of three members from each of the following organizations:

Yellow Pine Manufacturers' Association, National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, Northern Pine Manufacturers' Association, Massachusetts Forestry Association, Lumbermen's Exchange, Philadelphia; Camp Fire Club of America, North Carolina Forestry Association, National Association of Box Manufacturers, Carriage Builders' National Association, Boston Paper Trade Association, Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, New Hampshire Timberland Owners' Association, Empire State Forest Products Association, California Forest Protective Association.

These, then, are the men who control the activities of the National Forestry Association. The predominance of interests that have profited and will continue to profit by the federalization of western lands and resources is evident in the list of officers and in the preceding statement as to the class of people whose money has kept up the propaganda.

And still Mr. Pinchot would have the public believe that the "interests"—the public fondly believing that he means the timber and lumber barons by the term "interests"—are opposing his so-called conservation policy. In truth, it is the men who control those very interests that have financed the gigantic work of creating a false public sentiment that has approved the iniquities perpetrated in the sacred name of conservation.

An examination of the membership and the history of the American Forestry Association demonstrates that it is a sordid commercial body, organized and maintained to forward the fortunes of those whose wealth has been acquired from the exploitation of natural resources, and who want no further exploitation of the remaining resources in order that the value of their holdings may be enhanced thereby.

Federal control, it has been demonstrated, spells stifling of development and nonuse of resources on the public domain. Federal control is what the interests behind the American Forestry Association are and have been demanding.

It is interesting to trace the development of the federalization idea in the American Forestry Association and the throttling of the State-control idea. In the body from the beginning was a group, headed by Bernhard Edouard Fernow, strenuously insistent upon Federal control of western lands, while, in the earlier days, was a group that vainly attempted to resist the progress of such a policy, but this group years ago was swept aside.

Mr. Fernow, or Dr. Fernow, as he is now known, spelled his name in the earlier days Bernard Edward. He was a young Prussian, who, equipped by a splendid German technical education, had arrived in this country in 1876, and in 1882 was employed as a chemist at Lehigh furnaces in Pennsylvania. He attended the first meeting of the American Forestry Association at Cincinnati in 1882 with credentials from the Journal of the Iron Workers' Association of Philadelphia. Since then he has been attending all the association meetings, usually as an officer.

To him rather than to Mr. Pinchot belongs credit for creating the idea of Federal control. Mr. Pinchot in the early days was a pupil at the knees of the Prussian, and in time came to hold more imperial ideas than his tutor.

In 1884 Mr. Fernow became corresponding secretary of the association. He has held office in the organization practically ever since, for many years past being a vice president.

Mr. Fernow in 1896 became Chief of the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture and served as such through the formative period until 1898 when he retired to become director and dean of the New York College of Forestry. He remained there five years, going thence to the University of Toronto as dean of forestry.

The Cincinnati meeting, where the association was organized, was the outgrowth of a celebration held there incident to a public planting of trees for the beautification of the city. A leading figure in the meeting was Dr. G. B. Loring, of Massachusetts, commissioner of agriculture in the Department of the Interior. This was before the establishment of the Department of Agriculture as a separate department of the Government. The work of Dr. Loring as commissioner had much to do with enlarging the division to Cabinet proportions. He was elected president of the forestry congress (association later) and was reelected in 1883 at the annual meeting held at St. Paul, and was again reelected at the annual meeting at Sartoga in 1884, but that finished him. His ideas, which were for the promotion of individual forestry, were not in accord with the imperial theories of the Fernow group.

In addressing the first meeting at Cincinnati Dr. Loring expressed impatience at the reiteration of examples of success from Government control of forestry in European countries. He said:

"The nature of property in timberlands as adjusted for the State and the individual in all those countries where the forests have attracted the special attention of the Government, particularly in the Old World, has so much exclusiveness and reservation for the gratification of personal desires that we can derive but little benefit from its study. The rights and powers and duties of State and Federal legislation as regards our forests require the most careful and ingenious consideration."

Again, in his annual address at the third meeting at Saratoga in September, 1884, he pointed out emphatically that the proper work of the association was in securing State rather than national legislation, advice which was not taken, save in few States. Then he passed out.

Dr. Loring, like Gen. Chittenden, Prof. Willis Moore, and other scientists of to-day, stubbornly resisted the Fernow doctrine that deforestation of an area resulted in a change of climate and promoted floods over such area. In a discussion of the subject at a meeting of the Massachusetts board of agriculture at Haverhill in 1884 there was quite a row. Dr. Loring there said that he did not believe that the climate would be one degree different from what it was "if there was a forest from here to Minnesota." Of course, this was heresy, and an anonymous correspondent wrote to the New York Tribune about it, protesting that Dr. Loring, holding these ideas, was no right manner of man to be president of the forestry congress.

There remained, however, in the body some men who believed that the States could best handle the problem, and that in justice and equity they should do so in the interests of preventing waste. At the Denver meeting of the congress, in September, 1886, this, among other resolutions, was adopted:

"That the public lands at the sources of the streams, necessary for the preservation of the water supply, should be granted by the General Government to the States to be held and kept by such States in perpetuity for the public use, with a view to maintain and preserve a full supply of water in the rivers and streams."

There was a flash of State development ideas at the 1887 meeting of the congress, held at Springfield, Ill., when a letter was read from Joaquin Miller, the Poet of the Sierras, in which this passage occurred:

"Let the few remaining millions of forest lands be ceded to the States, and then on down to the counties and even smaller divisions such as school districts. Then let the foresters—men

of plain, hard, common sense—follow the Indian's simple method of preserving his property. * * * Whoever heard of either flood or fire in the Indian's home until the white man came to make it his monopoly?"

But no action was taken on the suggestion.

At the 1888 meeting at Atlanta, Fernow, then entrenched at the head of the Forest Bureau and striving for more power, put down the last effort for work among the individual States and assumed leadership under the banner of federalization. At the same time a movement was started within the organization, backed by the theorists but opposed by the lumbermen, to have the tariff taken off of lumber in the interests of conservation. This is one point on which all the elements in the association never entirely agreed. J. D. W. French, of Massachusetts, at the Atlanta meeting, offered a resolution praying Congress to put lumber on the free list, but after a hot discussion it went over until the next year.

The session of 1889 was held at Philadelphia, and was presided over by Vice President H. G. Joly, later known as Sir H. G. Joly de Lotbiniere, of Quebec. Mr. Fernow, who now appears as Dr. Fernow, made an earnest plea for free trade in lumber and the admission without duty of the Canadian product, saying that the tariff "tends to the destruction of our forests." Mr. French offered his resolution again, but a Pennsylvania delegate named McPherson raised such a fuss about it that it was tabled. Mr. McPherson objected to a convention presided over by a Canadian and containing many Canadian delegates making suggestions to Congress regarding the United States tariff laws.

To leap ahead a bit, the Fernow group, later the Pinchot group, urged free trade in lumber for a number of years, but finally, as the association grew more and more powerful and more and more commercialized, changed to a policy of protection. In 1909, when the House Ways and Means Committee was making what later became known as the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, Mr. Pinchot testified before that committee, and later repeated the statement in a letter to Chairman PAYNE, that the duty should be retained on lumber, but threw a sop to the publishers by urging that the duty be taken off wood pulp and reduced on print paper made from wood pulp.

To digress for a moment, Mr. Pinchot was aided in his fight for protection on lumber, in 1909, before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Edward Hines, of Chicago, president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Hines then was and had been for several years active in the work of the American Forestry Association and also in the work of the National Conservation Association. But Mr. Hines got himself mixed in the matter of the election of Senator Lorimer, of Illinois, and subsequently obtained some unpleasant notoriety. Since then he has not appeared in either the forestry or the conservation organizations.

However, since the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association has such a community of interest with the National Forestry Association the former still is represented in the latter. Everett G. Griggs, of Tacoma, president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association in succession to Mr. Hines, is now vice president of the Forestry Association, and Mr. J. E. Rhodes, also of the lumbermen's organization, is a director.

"The National Lumber Manufacturers' Association," to quote a speech made by Mr. Rhodes before the directors of the American Forestry Association, at Asheville, N. C., March 25, 1913, "is a federation of practically all of the associations of lumber manufacturers in the United States, and represents a combined membership of about 1,500 of the largest sawmills of the country, having an annual output of over 14,000,000,000 feet of lumber."

And now to return to the chronology of the American Forestry Association.

At the annual meeting of the association at Philadelphia in 1889 Prof. Fernow eloquently urged that the United States get into practical forestry at once. He frankly declared for the Government entering the lumbering business. He pleaded that the Federal Government was not properly backing up the States in their efforts to protect the forests, and that the States were getting discouraged. He spoke of this as a lack of cooperation between the States and the Nation. Oddly enough the argument to-day is that the States do not cooperate with the Nation.

Carl Schurz, who addressed the meeting at length, urged a qualified national control of forests. He said: "It seems to me that the policy of the Government should be wherever the forests cover the headwaters of great rivers the Government should keep possession." But that was as far as he would go.

There was a flareback of State control sentiment at the 1891 meeting at Washington, but it was choked off speedily. The suggestion was advanced that Federal control was abortive and that the forest lands remaining in the public domain should be ceded to the States for administration. Edward A. Bowers, corresponding secretary of the association and Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, expressed the views of the majority in saying that such a "policy would be ruinous, because a new and raw State, where land is not esteemed properly, would not take the necessary care of the reservations."

The association declared unequivocally for national forest reserves, and that year the first of these were secured, although no definite forest policy was adopted by the Government.

It was at the Philadelphia meeting of the association, in 1892, that "Prof. Gifford Pinchot, of New York," appeared for the first time of record in the affairs of the organization. He read a paper on "The Development of a Protective Forest Policy in Europe."

The next few years were ones of rapid development for the organization. The Pennsylvania group of forestry advocates, a number of whom were allied with the coal and iron trade, grew in power in their own State and also in the affairs of the national association. In Pennsylvania the agitation they kept up for "scientific forestry" made rapid advances, and the State was induced to take it up. As a beginning the coal and iron companies sold to the State for "forestry" purposes some 600,000 acres of waste land, which they had gutted above and below ground, on which the State was to begin its forestry work. This area, by increased purchases, has now risen to about 800,000 acres, at a total cost to the State of something more than $3,000,000.

The American Forestry Association was incorporated in the District of Columbia on January 25, 1897, for 20 years. As set forth in the incorporation papers, "The objects of the organization are the discussion of subjects relating to tree planting, the conservation, management, and renewal of forests, and the climatic and other influences that affect their welfare; the collection of forest statistics and the advancement of educational, legislative, or other measures tending to the promotion of these results."

The incorporators were Edward A. Bowers, Gardiner G. Hubbard, Joseph C. Hornblower, B. H. Fernow, Nathaniel Wilson, George P Whittlesey, and Samuel Maddox, all of Washington.

At the fifteenth annual session, held in Washington on February 5, 1897, the Federal reservation idea, so long advocated by Fernow, Bowers, and others, was in full flower, and there was not a breath of State-control opposition. Pennsylvania was furnishing most of the backing for the idea. At that meeting the executive committee reported that, pursuant to instructions, it had induced the Secretary of Agriculture to ask the advice of the National Academy of Science regarding the adoption of a policy for the treatment of the forests on the public domain. The national academy then, as now, revolves chiefly about the University of Pennsylvania.

The academy committee, appointed at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, reported learnedly, advocating the national forest system much as it is now in force, and in favor of giving increased power and authority to the Forestry Bureau.

At the sixteenth annual meeting of the association, held at Washington on December 8, 1897, the executive committee reported that on the report of the National Academy's committee, of which Gifford Pinchot was secretary, the desired legislation for a national forest service had been secured. In view of what has subsequently transpired in the way of the acquirement by land-grant railroads and other special interests of forest lands, and in view of the facts contained in this article, the following from the report of the executive committee as to how the legislation was obtained is of peculiar interest:

"And while it was brought about by motives and interests extraneous to those which had hitherto any concern with the forestry movement, nevertheless such legislation was possible only as a result of the preparatory work of education which the association has carried on within and without congressional halls."

It is well to bear in mind that the legislation referred to gave to President Cleveland authority to do, as he did on February 22, 1897, 10 months before the above report was presented, namely, create forest reserves to the extent of 21,000,000 acres.

But possibly that is not the legislation the committee had in mind. It was about that time that Congress enacted what is known as the lieu-land legislation. This gave to the land-grant railroads the right to trade the mountain tops and barrens, which might be included in forest reserves, for timberland elsewhere. This more fully explains the "motives and interests" hinted at in the committee report above referred to.

By this time the association had a membership of 608, of which only 70 were life members.

But in the succeeding 10 years the association gained in membership more than ten times that number. The same "motives and interests" apparently had awakened to what a good thing for them was the national forestry and conservation movement.

Whatever the cause, the securing of the legislation desired, the beginning of the Federal administration policy, the certainty that forest reservations were to grow rather than to be curtailed, brought to the association a large number of those representatives of great wealth and landed proprietorship that now makes up its membership.

It was contemporaneous with this movement that the "western land thief" began to figure in the journals of the day as the modern villain. No stress was laid on the fact that the eastern-owned land-grant railroads and unwise Federal administration of Federal land laws had created the frauds and had alienated great areas of the public domain. It was taught that the westerner was the only thief.

All this talk led Elwood Mead, the famous irrigationist, a member of the association, to remark, in the February, 1898, number of the association magazine:

"Their cooperation [the westerners] ought to be invoked instead of their being treated as they have been, with distrust and abuse."

However, he brought about no material change in the association's attitude toward the "raw States" and their inhabitants.

The association magazine and the output of the association press bureau began to teem at this time with matter emphasizing the revenue idea in the treatment of national forests. A favorite example held up in these articles was Bavaria, a German kingdom, with a total area somewhat smaller than that of South Carolina. It was shown that Bavaria, with national forests of 2,091,930 acres, received more than $4,000,000 a year revenue therefrom, to the reduction of taxes and the benefit of the whole people.

Strangely enough, this was used as an argument for national rather than State control of forests in the United States. Though Bavaria is merely a State of the German Empire, a unit in the Confederation of German States, all of that $4,000,000 revenue goes to the State and not to the federal or imperial treasury, the Bavarian rather than the Empire's coffers.

It is interesting to note that while national administration of national forests in the United States has been a reality since 1897, and that the Forester's report for 1912 showed an area of 165,027,163 acres under his charge, the total revenue therefrom in that year was only $2,157,356.57, while the cost of administration was $5,217,847.51.

In other words, the policy advocated 15 years ago as a revenue producer has resulted, by adoption, in a net deficit of more than $3,000,000 a year.

The year 1905 marked a high tide in the affairs of the association. That was the year of the conservation meeting of governors in Washington. The Forestry Association held its annual meeting in Washington also, on January 2 to 6. Here are some of those who were on the committee of arrangements: A. J. Cassett, president of the Pennsylvania Railway; Howard Elliott, president of the Northern Pacific Railway; John Hays Hammond; T. J. Grier, superintendent of the Homestake Mining Co., of Lead, S. Dak.; and Frederick Weyerhaeuser.

National control was never more strongly advocated and commended; the corruption, ineffectiveness, and general uselessness of State governments never more strongly condemned. George H. Maxwell, of Chicago, the irrigationist, was heartily applauded when he said in a speech:

"There was one thing the President said yesterday that I as a western man can not fully indorse. He said, in substance, that if the forests of the West are to be saved, the people of the West must save them. I say to you that if the forests of Oregon and Idaho and Washington and Colorado are not to be saved unless the people of those States save them, they never will be saved. If they are to be saved at all, it will be by Theodore Roosevelt and the people of the East."

More militant than ever became the association after this meeting. For 1907, Dr. Thomas Elmer Will was installed as secretary and also as editor of the association magazine. At the same time Mr. Pinchot had him on the pay roll in the Forest Service as "agricultural collaborator." In his official biography Dr. Will says that his work in the Forest Service was to edit and lecture, but "agricultural collaborator" is a sufficiently obscure title to cover most anything in a pay roll.

Dr. Will is an aggressive individual and his stay in the office of secretary and editor of the association produced internal discord. He resigned in October, 1909, and since then he has been selling Florida lands and lecturing on Washington street corners in advocacy of home rule for the District of Columbia.

The association magazine was known originally as The Forester, and its publication was begun at Hays Landing, N. J., in 1895 as the organ of the New Jersey Forest Association. With the number for January, 1898, it passed to the control of the American Forestry Association, and in 1907 to the ownership of that body. For the first seven years of its life, beginning in 1895, it was known by its original title, but volumes 8 to 14 bore the name "Forestry and Irrigation." Dr. Will changed this and called the magazine "Conservation." After he departed the name was changed to "American Forestry," with this explanation:

"The change of name to Conservation, made without due consideration in 1908, never met with the approval of the majority of the association, and the directors, with the approval of the members of the advisory board and other officers, determined that, beginning with the present volume, it should be published under the name American Forestry."

Edwin A. Start, formerly a Tufts College professor of history, succeeded Dr. Will as secretary of the association and editor of the magazine. Two years ago he drifted away to the West to a professorship in the University of Washington, and was succeeded by P. S. Risdale, who was brought, properly accredited by the interests behind the association, from Scranton, Pa.

The two chief agitations now being kept up by the Forestry Association are making more secure the federalization of lands in the West and the exemption of privately owned forest lands from taxation. Work on the tax-exemption plan began in 1905. At the annual session of the association in that year resolutions were adopted commending to all States the enactment and enforcement of laws "for reducing the burdens of taxation on lands held for forest reproduction in order that persons and corporations may be induced to put in practice the principles of forest conservation."

Since then impetus has been given to this movement by all the forces commanded by the association. Timberland owners are heartily in sympathy with it.

About the time, or just prior to it, that this agitation started, another agitation started in the State of Washington and in other western timbered States. It was an agitation to compel the timberland owners to pay something like their just proportion of State and county taxes. It was notorious that they had escaped taxation by getting county assessors to put absurdly low valuations on their holdings. The political power of what was known as the "sawdust ring," otherwise the lumber and timber men, was great.

But the people had revolted from the domination of this ring. In Washington, for example, there was established in the various counties a system whereby expert timber cruisers were employed to value timberlands. This system compelled timber companies for the first time to pay taxes on a reasonable valuation. Forced to justice by the people of the States, the "sawdust ring" turned for sympathy and help to the American Forestry Association and secured it.

The association magazine and numerous unthinking uplift editors, knowing nothing of the subject, have vigorously espoused the cause of the landowners. Mr. Frederick Weyerhaeuser, then vice president of the association, at the 1905 meeting read a paper on the iniquity of taxing standing timber. Since then Outlook and the Review of Reviews have printed articles taking the same view. The association magazine in its monthly issue never fails to have something to say in favor of the Weyerhaeuser idea.

Mr. Pinchot believes with Mr. Weyerhaeuser. In his letter to the Ways and Means Committee of the House in March, 1909, Mr. Pinchot said:

"The States * * * have failed to provide adequate fire protection. They have often taxed standing timber so heavily that the owner was forced to cut it off as quickly as possible and then let the land go back to the State, without provision for a future crop."

J. E. Rhodes, of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, who is a director of the Forestry Association, in addressing the directors of that body at Asheville, N. C., on May 25, 1913, dwelt on the subject. "The timbermen generally," he said, "are looking to agencies like the American Forestry Association to work out these problems—the problems of taxation—for the benefit of the future." He might very well have added, "but particularly for the benefit of the timbermen themselves."

A full report of Mr. Rhodes's remarks appears in American Forestry for May, 1913.

"The lumbermen feel," said Mr. Rhodes, "that the foresters alone can show the public that nothing can be done toward preserving the Nation's resources so long as forests continue to be taxed on the basis of an annual crop."

He gave some more light on the attitude of the lumber and timber interests toward the federalization idea when he said:

"They (the lumbermen) are almost unanimously opposed to the Federal Government transferring any of the national forests to the States in which they are located."

And still Mr. Pinchot would have the public believe that the timber and lumber interests are those that are opposing his federalization idea. Opposition to that idea comes from no aggregation of wealth.

It is not too much to say that the whole agitation for Federal control of forest lands has been built on false statistics. The country for years has been led to believe that "the end of the timber is in sight," and presently there will be no timber standing in the country.

The only available statistics are those presented by prejudiced sources—the Forest Service of the United States. But an analysis of the showing made by that service shows some remarkable things. It shows, for example, that we have one-third more standing timber to-day in the United States than the same service said we had eight years ago, and more than three times as much standing timber as the statistics showed we had when the agitation started in 1882.

"The Timber Supply of the United States" is a Forest Service bulletin, written by R. S. Kellogg, forest inspector, and issued April 24, 1907, as Forest Service Circular No. 97. On page 8 thereof Mr. Kellogg presents a table showing the Government and other estimates of standing timber in the United States, beginning with the census returns of 1882, on which, as said, the original forest reservation agitation was started. Shorn of extraneous matter Mr. Kellogg's presentation shows the figures for the years named were as follows:

| | Board feet. |
|---|---|
| 1880 | 856, 290, 100, 000 |
| 1898 | 1, 400, 000, 000, 000 |
| 1900 (census) | 1, 390, 000, 000, 000 |
| 1902 | 2, 000, 000, 000, 000 |
| 1905 | 1, 970, 000, 000, 000 |

Herbert Knox Smith, Commissioner of Corporations, in his investigations into the alleged Lumber and Timber Trusts, had occasion to go exhaustively into this subject of standing timber in the United States, and in that research he had the expert assistance of the Forest Service. His report, printed first in February, 1911, raised all previous estimates as to the amount to 2,800,000,000,000 board feet, an increase of more than 30 per cent.

His results have been accepted by the Forest Service. Forester Graves, in his report for 1912, says that the Government owns in its national forests about one-fifth of the total timber stand of the country, and he gives that one-fifth as 600,000,000,000 feet. This 600,000,000,000 feet is one-fifth of 3,000,000,000,000 feet, as against the less than 2,000,000,000,000 feet estimated by the Forest Service no longer ago than 1905.

So in reality we have one-third more standing timber than when Mr. Pinchot and his supporters were shouting to high heaven that the end of the timber was in sight.

The Forest Service report for 1912 shows that the Government is permitting to be cut on the national forests only 7 per cent of the estimated annual crop, leaving 93 per cent to go to waste and rot. Further, it maintains high prices for Government timber. If there was a gentlemen's agreement between the timbermen and the Government, nothing better could be devised to fatten the coffers of the big timberland owners.

It will be seen from the foregoing presentation that the so-called forest-conservation movement has operated solely to bull the lumber and timber market, and that some very excellent gentlemen have lent the power of their personality to this commercial undertaking in the mistaken belief that they were aiding the uplift. Unfortunately the uplift that they have aided is the price of forest products to the consumer.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the national forests were not created for the sole benefit of the farmers of this country, and this is the first time I have ever heard that suggestion as the purpose of their creation. The national forests were created for the purpose of serving all the people of the country. They were created for the purpose of preventing the forests from being gobbled up by big private interests.

We have a great public territory, comprising 168,000,000 acres of land. That territory does not belong to the State of Washington nor to the State of South Carolina, but it belongs to all of the States of this Union. Congress has undertaken to preserve this great territory to all the people. It is the duty of Congress to protect it and to protect it in such a way that it does not become of less value as time goes on.

Now, the statement is made that a large part of this money is spent in salaries. That is true. A large part of all of the funds appropriated for the Department of Agriculture is expended for salaries. For what other purpose could you expend it? For what other purposes could you expect to expend these funds? What we are doing in the national forests is to employ men to protect the national forests and to make the national forests useful to the public. The salaries of these men must be paid.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I will in one second. But I think it is only fair for me to say that any criticism which would make it appear that a large part of these salaries is being spent in overhead charges in Washington is an unjust criticism and not founded upon the facts.

Now, for salaries for 1913 there was expended a total outside of Washington of $2,039,000. I will give the figures in round numbers. In Washington there was expended for salaries only $193,000—20 to 1 out of Washington. Of the lump fund $1,092,000 was expended out of Washington and $140,000 in Washington. For transportation $130,000 was expended out of Washington; $16,000 in Washington. For meals and lodging $180,000 was expended out of Washington; $19,000 in Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In a moment. For wages $537,000 was expended out of Washington; $1,502 in Washington. For subsistence supplies $123,000 was expended out of Washington; $300 in Washington.

The statement or insinuation that would bear the idea that the bulk of these expenditures is being made in Washington for overhead charges is not supported by the cold-blooded testimony and the facts.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman say why it is necessary to spend any part of this fund for meals and lodging in Washington?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I take it that when a man is brought here from his post, for instance in Idaho, following the custom, he is given subsistence when he is away from his post. The gentleman understands that custom. It is a law, I think.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to call the attention of the committee at this time to something further on the grazing question, which will be found on page 37 of the hearings. I read it in connection with what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] said concerning the sale of timber.

I can not see why the same rule should not apply to pasturage that applies to the timber business. The timber on the reserves sells higher than timber outside; yet the pasturage on the reserves sells for less than one-third than the pasturage outside sells for. I want to call the attention of the committee to the hearing, so that you may see just exactly the condition of things, and see if there is not some remedy for it some way. I call the attention of the committee to it because I think it is a situation that ought to be remedied. I believe that the Forestry Bureau can be made self-sustaining if it is only conducted in a businesslike way, and it could be made self-sustaining by selling this pasture for what it is worth.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Can the gentleman imagine any reason why the Forest Service in this country can not be as well handled as it is in British Columbia?

Mr. BOOHER. It ought to be as well handled. It ought to be self-sustaining. Why, the little forest reserves in British Columbia are so conducted that they put $3,000,000 into the treasury every year. We are so conducting ours as to take money out of the Treasury every year, and we have twenty times as much in forest reservations as they have in Canada. But I want to read this testimony, in connection with what I read before. This is found on page 37:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Another question: Of course, you know every year this bill is up there is an attack on the policy of the department in making a charge for grazing, and the charge is made that the cost is too high. I would like to have your opinion on that and some comparison between the Government's charge and private charges for the same kind of privilege.

Now, listen to this:

Mr. POTTER. We made a very careful study of that question because of the protests that have been made from some sources against the payment of a fee, and also to the claim that the fees were out of proportion and unreasonable in certain regards. We found, from a compilation of some 900 cases, in the use of lands outside of the national forests, that the average rental paid for the grazing of cattle was 11.7 cents per month, while the average charge for grazing cattle on the national forests is 3.9 cents per month.

Now let us go on and see whether the conditions are the same. If the conditions were not the same, then we might conclude the bureau was justified in the manner it was handling the grazing proposition.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does that comparison include the value of the area for grazing purposes?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir. It only included lands on the outside which were grazed under comparatively the same conditions as the lands within the forests.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course, the comparison would be valuable if the same kind of forage grew on one acre as grew on another. If it did not, it would not be.

Mr. POTTER. These were comparisons with comparatively the same kind of land and used under practically the same conditions.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the same amount of forage per acre?

Mr. POTTER. Practically the same amount; yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. And in contiguous or neighboring territory?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir; in neighboring territory to the national forests. We found as to sheep that the average price per month which was being paid for outside land was 3.6 cents per head, as compared with a charge on the national forests of 1.4 cents per head per month. Compared with the use of practically the same kind of lands outside of the national forests and under practically the same conditions, the stockmen were voluntarily paying three times as much money for privately owned land as for the Government lands.

Now I do not believe this Forestry Bureau is doing its duty so far as the pasturage of these forest reserves is concerned.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to my friend, if he will permit, that the sale of timber, under the law, is made upon competitive bidding.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee, as I recall it, with reference to grazing, is that if we put grazing upon a competitive basis the effect would be absolutely to shut out the little fellow and to give a monopoly to a few of the big grazers.

Mr. BOOHER. That claim is without any merit whatever. The bureau could make regulations which would shut out the big man and let the little man in. That is what could be done, just as easily as to shut out the little man and let the big man in. I trust the Committee on Agriculture will look closely into this situation and provide a remedy.

NOT PROPERLY THE WORK OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I want to say to the committee that I come from a district which I believe is the most heavily conserved of any district in the United States. There are three large forest reserves in my district, and I am of the opinion that the people there do not want to break down conservation at all. Personally, I want to thank this agricultural committee for the great work it has done on this bill; but I do feel that the handling of the Forest Service, and the great expenditures which are necessary, should not be a part of the work of the Committee on Agriculture. The expenditure of $5,500,000 for this great Forest Service, not including purchases in the East, and the care of the enormous forests which were a part of the public domain in the West, and which belong to all the people, constitutes a gigantic project; and the probabilities are that instead of the sum carried in this bill, these expenditures ought to be three times that sum. In my own county, one-half of which is in the forest reserve, there is in the half outside of the reserve so great a stand of green timber that if we keep on cutting it at the same rate that we now cut the timber, it will not all be cut in 100 years. There is nearly as much in the half of the county in the forest reserve to the north of us which has fine agricultural bottom lands in it, where people homesteaded lands before the Forest Service was thought of. Now, we have become accustomed, out my way, to hearing all the people of the United States, except in the 11 Western States, shout that these forest reserves belong to all the people. I grant that; but let me tell you that in my own county this very year we, the taxpayers of that county, have spent $100,000 for building roads in the forest reserve. Why should the taxpayers of my county have to pay that sum on the property of the Government? And what is more, to do a complete job of road building in the Olympic reserve, three times $100,000 should be spent and will in time have to be spent. We have about given up all hope of the Government doing it. Is this fair?

The point is exactly this: If these great forests belong to all the people, then all the people should not begrudge us enough to properly care for these great timbered areas.

The whole heart of our country is chopped out by these forest reservations. The trails are of little use as roads. I may say for your information that it costs $10,000 a mile to build a wagon road in that country, and we have had to go on doing that in the United States reserves at our own expense, and yet we are unable to get relief.

LAID UP WHERE NEITHER MOTH, RUST, NOR TAXES CAN CORRUPT.

Every alternate section in some of these forest reserves in that part of the country belonged at one time to the railroads. Since then these sections have been sold to great timber interests, and the people everywhere fondly dream that the remaining sections of the great checkerboard belong to all of us of all the States—belong to the people; but under the lieu-land system there came up from the Santa Fe Forest Reserve down in New Mexico, where there is not a tree in a hundred miles, the holders of lieu-land scrip, and that scrip has been plastered over the remaining sections that did not belong to the railroads. Mr. Chairman, I am a newspaper man and have been a bit of an observer; I discovered in my country that Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives are all exactly alike; if they get a chance to lay up a little scrip they do it gladly, for they seem to know they have laid up wealth where neither moth, rust, nor taxes can get at it. [Laughter.]

If you try to look into the forest reserves you are buffeted about from the Land Office to the Forestry Service, from the Interior Department to the Agricultural Department, and back again. I have always contended that the land lying in the great forests unsurveyed, and not likely to be surveyed for 50 years, that is being held by scrip should be forced to come under patent after a reasonable length of time and to pay taxes to the county and the State. Whole counties in western States have been stripped and almost broken down by the Forestry Service, which is so much larger than the people generally can possibly conceive.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, by unanimous consent, was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration meets with my approval. I am, and always have been, in favor of legislation that provides for appropriations for the maintenance of the Department of Agriculture and for extension in educational work in that department.

Statistics show that our production of meat and wheat is not keeping pace with the growth of the population of the country. Unless the productiveness of our agricultural resources can be increased we shall be confronted with a serious situation.

The bill carries for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of permanent appropriation, the sum of $18,947,232. This sum is not a dollar too large, in view of the remarkable work of the Department of Agriculture. The activities of the department are carried on in every direction and come into the most intimate contact with all the people of the country, reaching them through the 15 main groups into which the department is divided—Office of Secretary, Weather Bureau, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Plant Industry, Forest Service, Bureau of Chemistry, Bureau of Entomology, Bureau of Biological Survey, Division of Accounts and Disbursements, Bureau of Soils, Division of Publications, Bureau of Statistics, Library, Office of Experiment Stations, and Office of Public Roads.

The Connecticut district, which I have the honor to represent, is especially interested in all matters relating to agriculture. The census figures show that Hartford County, which comprises the first district, contains 5,201 farms, averaging 63.1 acres, and of this land 33.2 acres on an average is improved. The value of our total farm property is $35,416,482, and of this 41.4 per cent represents land; in fact, 70.3 per cent of the entire area of Hartford County is in farms and 52.6 per cent of Hartford County is improved farm land.

HARTFORD COUNTY'S FARMS.

Of special interest is the fact that 4,567 of Hartford County's farms, or 87.8 per cent, are operated by their owners. This shows that in the last 10 years there has been an increase in farms owned by the people who work them of over 200. It is pleasing, also, to find from the census that 2,265 of those farms operated by the owners were entirely free in 1909 from all mortgage debt. The value of farm buildings and domestic animals in 1909 was over $35,000,000.

In this fertile and well-managed agricultural district, in addition to tobacco, in 1909—the last figures available—we raised 685,000 bushels of corn. Our 115,000 apple trees yielded over

274,000 bushels. Our 111,000 peach and nectarine trees gave over 25,000 bushels, and our 23,000 vines yielded over 220,000 pounds of grapes.

24,000,000 POUNDS OF TOBACCO.

But, after all, Hartford's major agricultural crop is tobacco, and the Department of Agriculture has conducted many experiments with the view of helping the agriculturist of the Connecticut Valley in his work of raising tobacco. Our function is to supply the cigar type of tobacco, and we have made great advance in growing Sumatra tobacco under shade. Certainly to-day Hartford's 24,000,000 pounds of tobacco makes it difficult to believe that the following statement from the early history of the tobacco industry issued by the Department of Agriculture could have been true:

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century the manufacture of cigars had its infant beginning as a household industry in some of the Connecticut Valley country towns. The industry grew very slowly at first, and correspondingly slow progress was made in the growing of the cigar leaf, which likewise had its beginning in the Connecticut Valley in the section between Hartford, Conn., and Springfield, Mass.

The agricultural lands of Hartford County are recognized by experts as including acreage as fertile and valuable in certain sections of the county as can be found east of the Mississippi River.

The tobacco land of Hartford County is of such a high degree of fertility that it stands in a class by itself. Credit must be given to the ability, industry, and enterprise of the men who work the farms. A fine opportunity is afforded Connecticut boys to learn farming in all its branches and on practical and scientific lines through the Connecticut Agricultural College, at Storrs, Conn. At that institution the boys are admirably equipped for agricultural life, and it is to be regretted that larger numbers of them do not take advantage of the opportunity offered.

If a sufficient number of people will take the right interest in farming and will demand a maximum of productiveness, the markets of this country can be supplied by its own people. Fertilization and cultivation are important factors in securing fullest measure of production. There are 711,980,000 acres of undeveloped public land in the United States. Any proper movement for the extension of agriculture should be encouraged.

CIRCULATING LITERATURE.

That there is widespread interest in agricultural life is evidenced by the fact that there is a great demand for the publications supplied by the Department of Agriculture. Thousands of these requests were made the last year in the first district, and all applications for publications were filled, so far as possible, by the Division of Publications of the department.

It was not many years ago when the department relied wholly on the issuance of printed bulletins to get this information into the hands of the farmer. It frequently took a great deal of time to prepare these bulletins and a number of weeks to get them printed. Their circulation then was more or less accidental and it was not at all certain that a bulletin dealing with some condition in Connecticut would reach all the farmers in that State affected by the conditions or that it would get to them in time for them to apply the measures recommended to the saving of growing crops. Frequently the department's discoveries, to be of value to the farmer during the season, must be put within his reach in from two to seven days.

The department, therefore, has established a weekly news letter, which goes to the 20 leading farmers of every county, in which warnings as to crop dangers, advice as to methods, and the results of discoveries of seasonal application can be communicated each week in official form to the agricultural population. This weekly news letter the crop correspondents who receive it are requested to communicate to the local newspapers, and in this way put the information quickly within the reach of all farmers.

In addition, the department frequently sends out, in the form of typewritten notices to the papers, information which they should receive before the weekly news letter can be issued. This matter is printed extensively in local papers and agricultural papers, so that instead of this valuable data reaching only those who receive the limited editions of farmers' bulletins, it now goes to many millions of American farmers through this medium.

Of special interest to the farmer also is the newly created Office of Markets. This office will conduct extensive investigations to determine the best methods for the farmer to market his produce, and, if possible, to overcome any waste between the farm and actual consumer. The work of the Office of Markets will be carried on for the present under the following headings:

1. Promulgation of market grades and standards.
2. Cooperative marketing and distribution.
3. Surveys of supply and demand and demonstrations in the organizations of consumers.
4. Study of methods and costs of distribution in the matter of terminal markets, etc.
5. Study of transportation problems, shipping and distributing organizations, etc.
6. The investigation of the feasibility of a market news service for perishable products.

A line of educational work which the Department of Agriculture has commenced and which should receive the encouragement of the residents of rural towns is the forming of boys' corn clubs. These clubs have been formed in many States and have been conducted with marked success. On the recent visit to Washington of the large number of champions from the various States—the boys who were the prize winners in the corn-club contests—there were boys whose yield ranged from 55 bushels to the acre in North Dakota to 235 bushels per acre in Alabama. Some of the most effective and conspicuous results are found in the boys' demonstration work in the South, where 480 members of the boys' corn clubs in the various Southern States produced yields of over 100 bushels of corn to the acre. The boys who are organized in the corn-club movement, and who visited Washington recently, came from North, East, South, and West. The present enrollment in this work amounts to about 60,000 boys and girls, who are systematically organized into boys' corn clubs, girls' canning clubs, potato clubs, sugar-beet clubs, vegetable garden clubs, and so forth. The average yield per acre of all the corn-club members reporting this year was 74.5 bushels, with a net profit of $25.55 per acre; 480 made 100 bushels or more, and 1,078 made over 60 bushels per acre. The boys have proved that in countless instances the yield of corn per acre can be doubled. The Department of Agriculture supplies detailed information to the boys, giving full directions on all phases of corn raising. The corn-club movement is an excellent way of aiding the boys to get more out of the soil than they have been getting in the past. Such clubs could be formed in instances where the superintendents of schools and school boards take the initiative, forming the organizations of boys and interesting them in work which will be good for body and mind, and at the same time contributing to the sum total of the agricultural advancement.

I regard it very important that attention be directed to the necessity of doing all possible to increase the corn yield. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows that during 1913 the corn crop, the most valuable farm product of this country, according to the estimates fell below 2,500,000,000 bushels, which is smaller than any crop since 1903, and about 660,000,000 bushels smaller than the record crop of 1912. The estimated yield is 23 bushels, compared with a yield of 29 bushels in 1912, and an average yield of about 27 bushels. In only 9 of the past 47 years has the yield per acre been less than 23 bushels.

Another activity in which the department is showing creditable interest is the matter of experimenting in irrigation for tobacco. The millions of dollars derived from tobacco raising render the crop far too valuable to be left dependent on the elements. The department is taking steps to solve this problem, which is one that is perplexing many growers.

One firm in the first district has contracted for an irrigating system at a cost of upward of $20,000. With Government assistance it is to be hoped that the practicability of irrigation will be demonstrated and will be put in general use in the near future.

Among the items of this bill is one appropriating $25,000 for the investigation and improvements of tobacco production and handling. I am pleased to note this appropriation, for under it there will be investigated the questions of growing, curing, fermenting, and handling the tobacco; also the question of improving the yield and quality through breeding and selection, crop rotation, increasing the quantity of humus in the soil, proper and profitable use of fertilizers.

I note with satisfaction the change that has been recommended with reference to seed distribution. The Secretary of Agriculture says on the subject in his annual report that the beneficial results from distribution of such field seeds as alfalfa, feterita, kafir, milo, millet, Sudan grass, and other forage crops and certain cereals suggest the advisability of radically changing the seed distribution so as to accomplish the purpose for which it was originally established, namely, the introduction into practical farming of new and valuable crops needed in the improvement and development of agriculture. In the past there have been instances where valueless seeds were sold to the Government and these were distributed promiscuously, too often to be discarded in the homes in which they were sent, or else planted and because of their lack of quality failed to bear. I am pleased to know that this is to be guarded against in the

future, and that the $166,500 appropriated in this bill, exclusive of the appropriation of $257,000, will largely be expended for the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of such rare and new seeds as may be found valuable for agricultural purposes. A great saving can be made by confining the distribution upon congressional order or application to the department of flower, vegetable, and other seeds to those who have a desire to use them, avoiding the errors of the promiscuous distribution method, with the attendant wastefulness of the past.

The State of Connecticut, which I have in part the honor to represent, appropriates large sums of money annually for the construction and maintenance of public highways, and farmers, in common with other residents of the Nutmeg State, are getting the benefit of the State's improved highway system. Good roads are indispensable in agricultural districts and facilitate the transportation of products to market.

The loss is too great between the grower and the consumer. Facilities for handling the products of the farm can be improved. Market places should be provided for the farmer for the purpose of facilitating the disposal of his products and enabling the consumer to receive them at the least possible outlay in cost and time. I am in entire accord with the Secretary of Agriculture in his statement:

We have been suddenly brought face to face with the fact that in many directions further production waits on better distribution and that the field of distribution presents problems which raise in very grave ways the simple issue of justice. That under existing conditions in many instances the farmer does not get what he should for his product, that the consumer is required to pay an unfair price, and that unnecessary burdens are imposed under the existing systems of distribution, there can be no question. Just what part of the burden is due to lack of systematic planning or inefficiency and economic waste or to unfair manipulation one can not say. As difficult as are the problems of production, they are relatively simple as compared with those of distribution, and there is danger not so much that nothing will be done but that pressure will be brought to bear on the department to take action everywhere before it is prepared to act intelligently anywhere.

It is fitting that it is during the present administration that the Department of Agriculture reaches its highest degree of efficiency, for this administration is especially distinguished as regards achievement in every department. One of the important facts established during the months past has been the determined movement to legislate for the welfare of those who constitute the bone and sinew of the Nation. It would be difficult to single out the greatest accomplishment of this remarkable legislative year; much would depend upon the point of view: to some it would be the downward revision of the tariff, to others the income-tax law, and to others currency reform. And when judged by its record, fair-minded critics must concede that the present administration has established in one short year a record for constructive legislation beneficial to the country which has few if any parallels in American history.

One of the most important subjects with which we have to deal is that of food supply, and the close relation existing between agricultural development and food production is apparent to all. Let it be clearly understood that the good resulting from judicious agricultural legislation is not by any means confined to the farmer; it directly affects the household of the consumer, no matter what his occupation may be.

Meat and bread are the staffs of life; these and countless other necessities come from where? The farm. It would be difficult to conceive legislation which more closely affects every man, woman, and child than those laws which have to do with the development and extension of our agricultural resources. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Angeles National Forest, Cal., $16,774.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a remark or two about the expenditure of money by the Forestry Service. The chairman of the committee a while ago was talking about salaries. I call attention to the fact that out of the total expenditure of $3,164,463 for the service, $1,233,218 was for salaries. And I call the committee's attention to another item. The most important duty of the Forestry Service, it seems to me and I believe that is the general opinion, is to classify these national forest lands, and while they can expend $1,233,000 a year for salaries, they expended only $32,505.55 for the classification and surveys of lands.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman realizes that for the first time in the history of the service Congress allowed last year an appropriation for doing the very work to which the gentleman calls attention, and this year we give an increase of $100,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know, and I compliment the committee on that fact, but it only emphasizes the policy pursued by the Forestry Service. It is a fact that no one will dispute that practically one-third of all the land in the forest reserves has no merchantable timber on it and never has had. No man can find out how much nontimberland there is in the forest reservations. The Chief Forester will not tell you how much, the Secretary of Agriculture will not tell you. They can tell you how many feet of timber there is in all the forests combined, or in any particular reserve, but you ask anyone connected with the Forestry Service how much of the land is nontimbered and you will be unable to get a reply. I have been trying for two years, both by cross-examination when talking with the Forester and sending letters, and he will not hazard a guess. There is a reason for concealing this information. It is a fact that a great many of the forest reserves do not have a single tree upon them.

Why do not they classify the lands? They have started to do this, but they will do only what they are forced to do.

Now a word or two in reply to the statement of the chairman of the committee that the Forestry Service is efficient and that it is competently conducted. I want to call his attention to the fact that for the last eight years the Forestry Service has so conducted our forests of 163,000,000 acres that they have sold 1 cent's worth of timber to the acre and that is all. They have so conducted the Forestry Service that it brings 6 per cent on a valuation of 16¼ cents per acre; yet our forest reserves include some of the most valuable timberland on the face of the earth. Do you tell me that is competency, that the service is efficient when they can not find a sale for only 1 cent's worth of timber for each acre under their control?

The Clerk read as follows:

Apache National Forest, Ariz., $8,610.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman how much merchantable timber there is on this Apache National Forest Reserve in Arizona?

Mr. LEVER. The only information that the chairman of the committee has is as follows:

The Apache National Forest is situated in Apache and Greenlee Counties of central eastern Arizona. It consists of a gross area of 1,276,400 acres, of which 1,256,376 acres are owned by the Government.

The southern portion of the forest lies in the Clifton district of the Arizona highlands, which is characterized by the lack of any well-defined mountain system. The northern portion includes some of the highest peaks of the White Mountains and lies for the most part at high altitudes.

About 66 per cent of the area is timbered. The total stand of timber is estimated at 2,172,000,000 board feet and 275,000,000 feet of cord wood. Over 65 per cent of the timber is western yellow pine.

This is a very heavily timbered forest, having one of the heaviest bodies of timber in Arizona. It comprises the headwaters of important tributaries of the South and Gila Rivers, the most important sources of water for irrigation in Arizona.

I can set out, if the gentleman would like to have it, the number of sales of timber.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not care anything about that.

Mr. LEVER. The grazing permits, the special uses, and the number of fires extinguished, and the number of trespasses, and so forth. The receipts from that forest amounted to $21,360.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is not one of the reserves that was made out of the more than 1,200,000 acres of treeless land that were exchanged with the Santa Fe Railroad for timbered lands? For this worthless land the railroad secured timbered lands all over the country?

Mr. LEVER. I really could not say.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman this question. Does he know of a single instance since we commenced the creation of our forest reserves where timbered land outside of forest reserves was exchanged for nontimbered land and the timbered land put into the forest reserves?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that I quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will put it in this way: I have been able recently to trace over 2,000,000 acres of land that were put into forest reserves that do not contain any merchantable timber, much of it not a single stick, and in return for that land, that nontimbered land in the forest reserves, the railroads—the Northern Pacific and the Santa Fe—were permitted to select an equal number of acres of heavily timbered land; but I have never been able yet to find where the Forest Service has exchanged nontimbered land for timbered land and put this timbered land into the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman have the date of that transfer?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; I can give you the dates of all of them.

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad to have the dates.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can give the gentleman the date of the one in Montana.

Mr. LEVER. When was that?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can not give him the date without looking it up.

Mr. LEVER. Was it within the last two years?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it was not within the last two years, but within the last six or seven years.

Mr. LEVER. Was it under the present administration or a different administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The transfer of the Santa Fe was under Secretary Hitchcock, before the Forestry Service was transferred to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, the gentleman would not expect me to know anything about that. That was before I was born. [Laughter.] When was the one in Montana transferred?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think it was about 1907, but in any event I can fix the date in this way: The gentleman probably remembers a bill was brought into the House to prohibit the further exchange of lands in forest reserves by lieu-land scrip.

Mr. LEVER. I recall that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was just at the time that bill was pending. While that bill, as I recall, passed the House and was pending over in the Senate a forest reserve was created in Montana containing about 240,000 acres of land, or it was extended to that amount, practically all nontimbered land, and the land of very little value, and while that bill was being held in the Senate the Northern Pacific Railway, with the consent and active assistance of the Forest Service, was permitted to exchange those 240,000 acres of practically worthless land, acre for acre, for some of the best timbered land on the Pacific coast, a great deal of it in my State.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, of course, will be fair enough to say that that happened at a period when the present Chief of the Forestry Service was not connected with the Government at all, and when the present Secretary of Agriculture was not the Secretary of Agriculture, and the gentleman will also be fair enough to say that he has permitted this iniquity upon the Government, as he describes it, to grow hoary with age without calling attention to it until this late date.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I have called attention to it before.

Mr. LEVER. Not before this Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is fair to put the responsibility on the Secretary. If I recall, the Congress authorized the exchange of land. If my recollection serves me right, two years ago it went on in the Senate.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman from Iowa has a different case in mind. We did that in one case, I remember.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. Congress never authorized the exchange of land in any of these cases. What Congress did was this: We passed a law and then the Secretary of the Interior held that it applied to railroads, a construction Congress never intended; and, over the protest of the people of Arizona and the West, after it was called to his attention, he permitted this exchange to be made. It must be remembered that the law in no way compelled the Secretary to make these exchanges. It gave him only the privilege where he thought it was to the best interest of the Government. The law left it entirely to his discretion. You might just as well say that a judge would be responsible because he appointed a guardian and that guardian went out and stole the funds of his ward as to say that Congress was responsible for these gigantic frauds. The responsibility rests solely with the executive officers that ratified the exchanges.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Who was responsible for this transfer?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary of the Interior was responsible for a part of it, and since that time the other officials whose duty it was to approve them. The Forest Service is mostly responsible, if not entirely, for this last transaction with the Northern Pacific.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How many acres of land were involved in that transaction?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Two hundred and forty thousand acres; but the point I am making is this, that while word has gone out to this country that the Forest Service is a thing sacred and holy, that you can look through the history of it from the beginning and while those gigantic frauds and steals have taken place by the railroads—and no man denies that they have taken place—the men connected with the Forest Service, while it was their duty to speak, stood silent; and yet the same men who stood silent and permitted the railroads to loot the public domain of millions of acres raised a protest if, perchance, a settler in my district or anywhere in the West attempted to get a homestead. If he went on a piece of land and claimed it for a homestead, they said he was trying to rob the Government of that much timber; but these same men could not see the Santa Fe Railroad grabbing 1,200,000 acres at one time. They could see no danger in the looting of the public domain when that bill was being held up in the Senate and 240,000 acres were given to the Northern Pacific Railway. They could see the small steal by the weak, but not the giant steals by the rich and powerful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may have his time extended for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am perfectly willing if somebody wants to ask me a question, but I have finished my statement at the present time.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not think the gentleman had finished. He is on a very important question to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington states he does not desire more time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Unless gentlemen have questions they desire to ask.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield if I have the time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the gentleman know of any other forest reserves which were practically robbed in the way in which the gentleman stated the Northern Pacific robbed the United States of the valuable timber area?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was not the Northern Pacific that did that, but those who were in authority who permitted it to be done. I understand what the gentleman means. Now, I referred to the exchange of lands by the Santa Fe. In that exchange there were 1,200,000 acres of land, which was valued by the railroads at from 5 to 18 cents per acre, as I recall, for taxable purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the value of the lands transferred in lieu thereof to the Government?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They received in lieu for those lands which were taken in the forest reserve scrip which permitted them to go out and select, acre for acre, any of the public domain of the United States anywhere. They used that scrip in 22 different States of the Union, and they took up something over 50,000 acres in my own State that I have been able to trace, and some of the land they took out in our State under that scrip is worth $200 per acre for the timber alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I just want to say this: I hope the chairman of the committee will not think I am criticizing the committee in making these statements, because I am not. On the other hand, I think the committee is doing good work. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon the splendid way in which he has handled this bill and the fairness and courtesy he has shown during its consideration. None of my remarks are intended to criticize any member of the present committee.

Mr. LEVER. I am very much obliged to my friend from Washington for the compliment, but I know that his remarks were not so intended. I ask that the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bighorn National Forest, Wyo., $15,100.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has referred to some interesting history. Among other things he referred to the passage of the bill which prohibited the creation of forest reserves in certain Western States except by act of Congress. Prior to the passage of that act forest reserves were created and extended by Executive order. Acts of the Executive in connection with the passage of that bill have been frequently criticized. It has been said that

after the bill had passed both Houses, or, at least, after both Houses had passed upon the matter affirmatively, but before the bill was signed, which took from the President the right to create or extend forest reserves, a number of forest reserves, I think some 19 or 20, were largely increased in area. The fact is that the statements that have ordinarily been made of the matter are not entirely correct.

It has been said that after the Congress had acted and before the bill was signed the areas of these reserves were increased by many millions of acres. What actually happened was this: That between the time when Congress had passed on the proposition and declared that thereafter no addition should be made to reserves except by act of Congress and before the Executive signed the bill some sheets were signed that contained words something like this: "The Bighorn Forest Reserve," for instance, "in the State of Wyoming"—using that as an illustration. I do not know that that was one of them—"shall from and after this date consist of the following areas, or shall be described by boundaries as follows."

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is the date of that transaction?

Mr. MONDELL. These headings or captions were signed prior to the signing by the Executive of the act of Congress.

Mr. SHERWOOD. What was the date? What year was it?

Mr. MONDELL. March, 1906, I think. These title pages or captions were signed before the bill taking from the Executive the power to enlarge reserves was signed. That occurred, I think, on the 4th of March; but in quite a number of cases the actual area to be included in the reserve was not set out and described until some time after.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. The delimitation of the reserve, the description of the actual area of lands included, was not made until along during the summer, the last, I believe, about the 1st of the following July.

Mr. MADDEN. So the papers were signed in blank, were they?

Mr. MONDELL. The title sheets—the captions—were signed before the bill actually became a law, but the areas were described on separate sheets, and in quite a number of cases, I am told, and believe, these descriptions were not made until some time after Congress had passed the law taking from the Executive the power to extend reserves. These new descriptions included increased areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I think my time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chiricahua National Forest, Ariz. and N. Mex., $3,750.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask the chairman a question. I would like to ask him if we can not by agreement pass over the next item until to-morrow morning? I mean the one in reference to the Chugach National Forest.

Mr. LEVER. In Alaska?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection, if you will make the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the request, and I will say to the gentleman that it is in my judgment very important, and I do not want to interfere now with the reading. I feel there ought to be more people present than there are now, to consider this item. I ask unanimous consent that the next item, relating to the Chugach National Forest in Alaska, be passed for the present, to be taken up immediately on the next consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent that the item referred to be passed over, to be taken up at the next consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not think I shall occupy more than two or three minutes of the five minutes that perhaps would be allowed to me. I have stood here and listened for the last few moments to a statement by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] on the subject of certain methods used in extending the area of forest reserves.

I gather from his remarks—and I might say insinuations—that those proceedings were had in an illegal and unlawful manner. Now, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if it is his intention, in making his last remark, to say that the extension of those forest reserves in the manner he has indicated was an illegal method of transacting the public business, either by the Executive or by any other officer connected with the Government at that time?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Minnesota has had quite as much experience in public affairs as I have. He understands the meaning of laws and limitations quite as well as I do, and he can form his own opinion and judgment from the statement of the facts as I have made it.

Mr. DAVIS. To proceed a little further, if the gentleman please, was there any law prohibiting the proceeding from being had in the manner that has been suggested by the gentleman? Does he know of any law, national or otherwise, to prohibit it as a matter of law?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not the law before me to which I referred, but the effect of that law was to prevent or to prohibit the creation or the extension of forest reserves except by act of Congress. The act recited, as I recall it, that hereafter no forest reserves shall be created or extended within certain States except by act of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. One word more, and then I shall have finished. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD the statement that any forest reserve was extended, as a matter of fact, in contravention of law after the signing of that bill by the Executive?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will leave in the RECORD just what he has said, and the gentleman from Minnesota heard what I said. I stated the facts. The gentleman may draw his own conclusion as to whether that was an entirely proper procedure or not.

Mr. DAVIS. Anything the gentleman has said concerning the legality of that is based, in my opinion, wholly upon circumstances that do not show that there was any law or custom prohibiting it.

Mr. MONDELL. I have said to the gentleman that the law I referred to was a law that provided that from and after its passage and approval no forest reserves should be extended except by act of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. Was one extended? That is the question I wish to ask the gentleman. Was one extended after the signing of that law?

Mr. MONDELL. I have said to the gentleman that after the signing of that law certain descriptions were filled in.

Mr. DAVIS. Was that illegal?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman is a lawyer; I am not.

Mr. DAVIS. I should judge not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What does the gentleman say about it?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know, and I do not think the gentleman knows; and I will say, further, that I do not think anybody connected with the service at that time or the Chief Executive would do anything prohibited by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cochetopa National Forest, Colo., $7,000.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I have just listened with great interest to the colloquy between the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. Living, as I do, within a State that contains forest reserves to the amount of almost one-third of its area, I was very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Wyoming to the effect that some of those forest reserves were created in a rather peculiar manner.

It was my privilege to be connected with a legislative body in which a rule prohibited the introduction of bills after a time limit of 30 days, and it grew to be a custom in that body that members having measures to introduce would avail themselves of the privilege of introducing bills in what was known as a skeleton form. In other words, we introduced a bill with the enacting clause in it and leaving the matter to be covered blank, which might be filled in at a later time.

I inferred from the remarks made by the gentleman from Wyoming that some of these forest reserves might have been created in skeleton form, leaving the flesh and blood and substance of the skeleton to be filled in at a later day. I would like to ask those who have had experience in this matter of for-

est legislation if there is anything in connection with the administration of the law which would justify that assumption?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I was addressing myself to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I will be glad to hear from him.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was going to suggest to the gentleman that if that was a proper procedure, of what force and value was the law we passed? If the Forest Service could have unlimited blanks ready to sign at any time that they pleased, what was to prevent them under that system from placing in the forest reserves all the rest of the United States?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, while it might not have been a technical violation of the law, yet I consider it a willful violation of the law both in spirit and in form.

Mr. DAVIS. I am unfortunate in not knowing the State from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I come from Colorado.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if that was the method of procedure in the legislature out in Colorado?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It was only resorted to under extraordinary conditions or on extraordinary occasions.

Mr. DAVIS. It was permitted in Colorado? It took place in Colorado, did it?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Well, it grew into a custom. It was probably unwise.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not asking whether it was wise or unwise, but whether it was permitted.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It did not conduce to good government.

Mr. DAVIS. It took place in Colorado, did it?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It did. I did not know that the custom had taken place in Washington. I am sorry to learn that some of the unwise customs of our State have even extended to the operations of the General Government.

Mr. DAVIS. I am glad it did not take place in Minnesota. I am glad to say that nothing of that kind occurred in Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. The pro forma amendment will, without objection, be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dakota National Forest, N. Dak., $835.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking a question for information; and in asking the question I want it to be understood that it is not an insinuation or a criticism. But I have had the curiosity to know why it is that in this forest reserve and in at least one other there is only one man employed. What does one man do in charge of a forest reserve?

Mr. LEVER. Which one?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is on page 30, line 12.

Mr. LEVER. Dakota National Forest, N. Dak.?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes. Unless I have been mistaken in running through this list there is only one man in that forest. I would like to know what one man does in a forest reserve alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He harasses the settlers. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. We will see if we can give the gentleman the information he desires. The Dakota National Forest is situated in Billings County, in eastern North Dakota. Its gross area is 13,920 acres, of which 6,734 are owned by the Government. Deep, winding gulches and ravines in a "bad-land" country above, with stretches of rolling, grassy mesa country, with an occasional solitary butte, constitute the principal and prominent topographic features of the Dakota forest. The total stand of timber is 800,000 board feet, consisting almost entirely of western yellow pine, the larger portion of which has local markets only. This forest was created at the direct request by petition of the people living in the vicinity of it. Its main purpose is conservation of the small supply of timber for the local market.

I take it this one employee is kept there for the purpose of protecting that timber. The forest has a very small area, and hence he can protect it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I find, further, that in the Marquette National Forest, in Michigan, you have one man; but the man in North Dakota only receives $835 a year, while the one man in charge of the forest in Michigan receives $1,170 a year. I have wondered what the different duties of the two men are, and why one is paid so much more than the other.

Mr. LEVER. The difference is just exactly this, and I think it is a compliment to the efficiency of the Forestry Service: In the forest unit to which the gentleman called attention a moment ago there are about 13,000 acres. In the one to which the gentleman now calls attention there are 31,843 acres. The amount of work is greater, and hence the compensation of the gentleman in charge of it ought to be greater.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman really think, where there is a forest reserve like that one in Dakota, there is any necessity under heaven for keeping a man out there? You do not sell any of the timber.

Mr. LEVER. I do think there is a necessity for keeping a man there.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. For what purpose?

Mr. LEVER. The sale of the timber is by no means the important part of the reason for the keeping of a national forest.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What is the important part?

Mr. LEVER. The important reason for having employees to take care of the national forests is the protection of the forests. Every national forest is a national asset. It belongs to the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know——

Mr. LEVER. And while the sale of timber and the renting of the grazing privileges are incidents, the protection of the forests for the benefit of all the people is the fundamental purpose of the original creation of the forests.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The thing I had in mind was the absurdity of a single man protecting a forest reserve.

Mr. LEVER. Let me show the absurdity of the gentleman's position——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Wait until I finish my statement. I am reminded of an order that was issued to one of the forest rangers in my section of the country. He was a lone man in charge of one of these forest reserves, which was about as large as the State of Delaware. One day he received a dispatch to cut a trail around the outside of his forest reserve and then go over it every day.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know anything about that——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It shows how absurd and how foolish the ideas of the Forestry Service sometimes are. Now this one man does nothing except draw his salary. It is a small item, but it ought to be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Florida National Forest, Florida, $6,180.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 23, after the figures "$6,180," insert the following: "*Provided*, That no charge shall be made for the grazing of cattle or sheep on any national forest reservation in the State of Florida."

Mr. LEVER. To that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, if, in a State like Florida, any possible injury could be done by the roaming of cattle over the reservations and grazing thereon. The gentleman understands the features of our country?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I would say that probably in his case the grazing of the lands in the forest reserve would not be detrimental to it, but it would be setting a precedent in this bill, which would rise and stare us in the face in every item of the bill and would result in breaking down the Forestry Service.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I am prompted to offer this amendment for this reason. In Florida we have no fences. The people turn the cattle out, and they roam as they may, and in order to keep them off the farms the farmers have to build the fences. Here is a forest reserve in my district with farms all around it. The people have been used for many years to allowing the cattle to roam through this country; but now if a cow gets over onto the reservation and bites a little wire grass, if there happens to be a watchman or other employee around the owner is called upon to pay a penalty, and in default he must be prosecuted.

One other question I wish to ask the gentleman. I am not very well acquainted with conservation. I believe it is the right thing if properly administered; but upon this reservation in my district they box the trees for turpentine purposes, and they cut trees down, some of them, and sell them to sawmill people. Does the gentleman think that is conservation, especially the boxing of the trees for turpentine?

Mr. LEVER. The theory now is that boxing the tree for turpentine does hurt it for lumber purposes. I take it that the Forestry Service only boxes or cuts trees that have fully matured.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. That is the theory. Now, one other question and I am through. In the light of the discussion and amendment coming under the present law, can a reservation be created, extended, or abolished by Executive order?

Mr. LEVER. That is my impression; yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Without legislation?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I appreciate the gentleman's position and his point of view, but I am constrained to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he has in his State the Appalachian forest reserve, concerning which the service sent a bulletin to the press not to be released until April 3, 1913—sent to all the leading newspapers in the United States—stating that the Forestry Service had just sold some timber in the Appalachian forests, and the material disbursed was $7 worth of logs bought by a Georgia farmer, and that it was a foretaste and indication that we are going to have the service pay in 10 or 12 years.

I predict that it will not be self-supporting for 30 or 40 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Kaibab National Forest, Ariz., $4,840.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a newspaper clipping in regard to this reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objecton?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Olympic National Forest, Washington, $25,650.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Olympic National Forest Reserve, for which $25,000 is required for operating expenses, is, in round numbers, once and a half as large as the State of Massachusetts. This is the reserve of which I spoke a few minutes ago, where one county has to spend $100,000 to help out the Forestry Service. This is the reserve where one county this last year—and that county larger than the State of Connecticut—received from the Forestry Service as its share of the 25 per cent returns the sum of $24.65; think of it, that sum in lieu of taxes for a territory as large as the State of Connecticut.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that in this particular forest reserve some gentlemen were building a hotel and health resort. They expended a good many thousand dollars building a road through that forest. My recollection is that the road cost over $100,000. It was of great benefit to the reserve. By accident they cut some timber on the Government land. When that was discovered the proprietor of the hotel—the man who was responsible and had at his own expense built the road—immediately had that timber measured, and sent a check to the Forest Service for the value. The Forest Service rejected the check and demanded that the hotel proprietor should pay the value of the timber after it was manufactured, instead of the stumpage value. They have been having trouble about it ever since. I do not hold the Forest Service responsible, of course, for all the acts of all of the men they employ. I know it is impossible to control them all, but I want to call this fact to the attention of the House to show one of the reasons why there is complaint from people in the West as to the way the Forest Service is administered. I will insert a newspaper article about this affair:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, June 13, 1913.]

PERSECUTION BY FOREST SERVICE TOLD BY EARLES—SUIT OF GOVERNMENT FOR TIMBER CUT OFF RESERVE IS ANALYZED—PAYMENT WAS OFFERED—FULL VALUE OF STUMPAGE TENDERED WHEN ERROR WAS FOUND; WORTH OF MILL PRODUCTS DEMANDED—IMPROVEMENTS DISCOURAGED AT SOL DUC.

"We have no fear of the outcome of the prosecution of the Government, which is really persecution directed against the business interests which, although handicapped by the Government, are attempting to develop the Northwest," said Michael Earles, president of the Sol Duc Hot Springs Co. and the Puget Sound Mills & Timber Co., regarding the suit of the Government for the recovery of damages for known trespass on the Olympic National Forest Reserve by the Sol Duc Hot Springs Co.

An amended complaint was filed in the Federal court yesterday by United States District Attorney Charles F. Riddell. The land in question is in the southwest corner of section 29, township 29; and the Government charges that timber to the value of $1,551.73 was cut and that it was worked into lumber and shingles to the value of $5,649.40. The Government asks judgment against the defendant company for the full amount of the value of the lumber products into which was cut the timber alleged to be on Government ground, or about $6,000.

PERSECUTION, SAYS EARLES.

Mr. Earles is bitter in his denunciation of the suit, and states that it is one of the most unfair pieces of persecution that has ever come to his notice. In speaking of the case yesterday, Mr. Earles said: "We own 320 acres at Sol Duc, and we have been anxious to have at least a part of it cleared. We built our mill there and at the time were under the belief that it was on our own ground. Agents of the Forest Service were on the ground many times during the construction of the mill and after it was in operation, and they at the time believed that we were building and working on our own ground. After we had cut about 500,000 feet of lumber a complaint was filed and local agents of the Forest Service ordered the land surveyed.

SEVENTY FEET ON RESERVE.

"It was then found that our mill was 70 feet on the Government reserve and that we had cut a great deal of the timber from the Government reserve. The next thing that we heard of the case was the filing of the suit. We have offered to settle the case by paying the Government $1,000, which would be a stumpage rate of $2 a thousand. This is more than timber is selling for on the stump on the Puget Sound coast at present, and the timber which we cut was 25 miles inland.

PENALIZED FOR BUILDING ROAD.

"Another example of persecution: Some time ago I built a 15-mile automobile road through the same section, and almost entirely through the Olympic reserve, at a cost of more than $100,000. This road is graded 30 feet wide in a mineral soil and is a natural firebreak. The Forest Service has the free use of this road at all times. When this road was under construction I was compelled to furnish a cash bond of $500 as a guaranty of good faith in burning brush and in other ways living up to regulations. When the road had been completed and my part in the arrangements had been fulfilled, I applied for the return of my cash bond of $500, but instead the Forest Service sent me a bill for $7, stating that the price of the timber which I had cut in the construction of this road was $507.

CAN'T TOUCH WATER POWER.

"That is a good example of the treatment that we have been receiving, but there are others. When we built the Sol Duc Hotel we first thought of making our electric light by water power. An investigation developed the fact that it would be impossible to use the water power which was going to waste all around us, and to-day, with water tumbling down the mountains to waste all around the Sol Duc Hotel, we are making our electric light in the old-fashioned way, with a battery of boilers."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that is the only case I have heard of in a good while where anybody was able to get even with a hotel man.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But they have not been able to get even with him yet.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, as one of those men I am afraid my friend from Illinois has not realized the high cost of hotel supplies. The profits in that business, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I can testify, are very small.

Mr. MANN. I never kick on any hotel bills I have to pay when I am traveling if I have the money. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina in reference to some of these items? This Olympic National Forest has for this year a little over $16,000. The bill carries for next year $25,000. The St. Joe National Forest, Idaho, has for this year something over $45,000, and this bill carries $34,000. There are items where there is an increase and some where there is a decrease. Generally what is the change in the situation which produces the difference in the estimated cost of operation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I call his attention to page 53 of the report, where that is explained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I tried to explain that in the report; but I will say that the testimony before the committee generally was to the effect that, in some of these forests, for instance, there was a contract for the sale of timber, which might be made this year, which was not made last year, and, of course, they would have to send in their forest cruisers and do the other work necessary in completing that sale of timber, and that expense would then be charged against that forest unit. That in a general way is the reason for these changes. In another forest, where there is a decrease, the contract for the sale of timber will have been completed by the time this appropriation becomes available, and hence the estimate for a smaller amount for the protection of the forest.

Mr. MANN. So far as the other forests are concerned, where there is no sale of timber, are the amounts in the bill substantially what were carried by the existing law?

Mr. LEVER. Substantially as carried by the existing law.

Mr. MANN. When these items were segregated, only a few years ago, we endeavored to and did fix certain amounts for

certain forests, but nobody was able to say then whether the amounts then fixed were the amounts that will be necessary. The Forest Service said they could not tell.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will notice there is a total decrease in these estimates of $7,000.

Mr. MANN. That is immaterial.

Mr. LEVER. That is small, of course, and immaterial.

Mr. MANN. Have they reached the point now where they can tell or do they know what is the normal cost of maintaining each of these forests?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; and that is shown by the fact that this bill, as far as the protection of the national forests goes, is practically what it was last year.

Mr. MANN. That is not necessarily shown by that fact, because under the provisions of this bill there is a chance to use any amount of money in any forest, practically.

Mr. LEVER. Fifteen per cent.

Mr. MANN. Of course the amounts carried in the bill are the same. Are these amounts actually expended in these forests, or about those amounts?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; substantially so; practically all of it expended. We felt that is the amount that should be charged against this service. Now, if we can finish this page of the bill, I promise the committee to rise.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rainier National Forest, Wash., $15,400.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice, according to the statement of the report, that there is an increase of $1,000 for the Mount Rainier reserve. On page 53 of the hearings I read:

Increase of $1,000, to provide additional scalers to handle an increased cut of approximately 5,000,000 board feet under approved sales.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this is an illustration of the policy that prevails throughout the whole service. The regular cost of scaling 5,000,000 feet of logs would be $250, if I am not mistaken; or, in other words, just four times as much as the customary charge. I notice that occurs in several other places.

I call attention to an editorial in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of December 13, 1913, entitled "The Chief Forester's Report," It is as follows:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, December 13, 1913.]

THE CHIEF FORESTER'S REPORT.

Mr. Henry S. Graves, Chief Forester of the United States and head of the Forestry Bureau of the Department of Agriculture, is certainly an optimist. His latest report, covering the fiscal year 1912–13, spreads a cheerful aspect over some very depressing figures. This is done by holding out "hope for the meat supply."

"The forage resources of the national forests," says the report, "contribute to the maintenance of more than 20,000,000 head of live stock." It further shows "sales of 2,000,000,000 feet of timber" out of a possible 6,000,000,000 feet, a cut, however, of only 500,000,000 feet, revenues of "slightly less than $2,500,000," and expenditures of "a little more than $4,600,000."

Analyzing the statement concerning forage, and granting that it is true, it is proper to remark that there are 40,000,000 acres of forests in western Washington, Oregon, and in Alaska that contribute nothing to the maintenance of any live stock whatever. The forage areas are in the dry or partially dry belts of the country where the timber resources are small compared with those areas which are without forage for live stock—the 40,000,000 acres mentioned above.

Taking up the figures, and making all allowance for the indefinite phraseology in the "little more than" and "slightly less than" qualifying clauses which characterize the Federal Forest Bureau reports, and three facts remain.

The service sold one-third of its own estimate of the crop on long-time sales, the bulk of them going to the large lumbering concerns. It cut but one-twelfth of what the bureau itself gives as the proper estimate of annual new growth. In other words, it took off the ground but 8 per cent of what the ground produced.

The year's administration of this estate—an area of national forests in the aggregate as large as all Germany—produced another deficit for the fiscal year of "a little more than" $2,100,000, a total deficit since 1908 of "about" $14,900,000.

What no service report has ever shown is a comparison between field and office expenditures, nor has there ever been an exact itemized statement of any kind printed. The financial operations of the service are placed before the country in a hazy, indefinite form which would never be tolerated coming from any private institution or any other Government bureau.

Like all previous reports, this one clouds the real issue as to whether or not forestry pays or ever will pay, by indulging in cheap buncombe about the "future of the meat supply."

To get down to dollars and cents, however, why do the national forests produce nothing but deficits?

I also call attention to two editorials from the Seattle Times that speak forcibly for themselves upon this question of forest conservation as practiced.

[From the Seattle Times, May 24, 1913.]

THE TRAGEDY OF CONSERVATION.

Seattle was treated to the tragic side of conservation the other day in Federal court when a homestead of 160 acres in Snohomish County was restored to the Federal reserve because the couple who settled on it and vainly fought for a title to their property had died while the case dragged its weary length through the courts.

Of the asininity of Pinchotism, of the unfeeling selfishness with which mad theorists plan to build up a Federal empire in the sovereign States of the West and in Alaska, of the deliberate dilatoriness of public servants in surveying lands in the so-called "conservation States"—of all these things Seattle long has had knowledge.

This little case—insignificant in itself, but important because of the principle involved—has introduced the tragic element and demonstrated the change that has come over Uncle Sam.

Once the friend of the homesteader and the settler, the old gentleman has become a niggard, seeking to hoard up useless wealth simply that it may not be enjoyed by others.

Who can measure the worry, the heart-burning anxiety, the depressing dread, and hopeless anticipation of defeat of this unfortunate couple?

Guilty of no crime, they were haled into court to defend the little tract of land upon which they had settled and which mad theorists had decreed should be part of a Federal reserve.

Such things as this drive people to desperation. Alien overlordship of this kind drove hundreds of thousands from Ireland to free America.

[From the Seattle Times, August 4, 1913.]

PINCHOTIAN THEORY IN UTAH.

Press "dope" from the Forestry Service of the Department of Agriculture contains the somewhat remarkable statement that "more persons make use of the national forests in Utah than in any other State."

The foregoing observation, with others like it, influences the Railway and Marine News to devote considerable space to the so-called forests of Utah.

It brings to light the interesting fact that outside of the Panguitch pine forests and some of the timbered section bordering the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and Kaibab Plateau there is probably no marketable timber obtainable in the whole State.

Every tie on every railroad was taken into the country by the railroad as it progressed, with the possible exception of some early contracts on the Union Pacific and the Rio Grande.

Probably nine-tenths of the forests have no resemblance to a forest. The creation of the reserves forced cattlemen and sheepmen to withdraw until they could get grazing permits, whence is drawn the picturesque yarn in the press "dope" of the Forestry publicity department. The Railway and Marine News says:

"When it is considered that vast sums have been expended by the Forestry Bureau to publish the wild theories of Gifford Pinchot, such foolish vaporings as the above, emanating from these high-priced publicists, are extremely laughable.

"Meanwhile, the timber merchants of outside places are supplying Utah with ties, telephone poles, mining timbers, and all construction timber, so that the limited areas preserved in that State can be used by future generations."

When it be remembered that the Panguitch pine forest is at least a hundred miles from the nearest railroad, and that in a radius of 50 miles there is not a population of 50,000 it will be seen that the publicity service of the Forestry Bureau has picked a shining mark for exploitation.

Utah is a splendid example of Pinchotian theory applied indiscriminately to the vast spaces of the West.

Its application there is no more ridiculous than in Washington, where rather more than one-third of the entire State is literally blanketed by forest reserves.

I also will insert in the RECORD two articles from the Railway and Marine News, of Seattle:

[From the Railway and Marine News, Seattle, February, 1914.]

FORESTRY BUREAU SEES LIGHT.

The Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, sends out a lengthy press letter covering the disposal of 1,000,000,000 feet of yellow pine from the Kaibab National Forest on the Utah-Arizona line. The press letter praises the Forestry Bureau and shows that in order to get this timber out it will be necessary to build a railroad approximately 200 miles long. For years such a railroad has been under discussion in Utah, and it will undoubtedly be built either from Marysvale, on the Rio Grande, or from Acoma or Modena, on the Salt Lake Route, and the possibility of its construction is a matter of deep interest to the intermountain country. However, it required a good deal of effrontery for the Forestry Bureau to take any credit in this connection, simply because the Kaibab Forest should never have been created. The absolute withdrawal of the limited and, in most cases, far-distant timber areas of the intermountain country have forced the people of that section to look to other markets for their lumber supplies during the last decade. If it had not been for the unjust withdrawal of these lands, a railroad would have been built years ago to the Kaibab Plateau for the purpose, primarily, of tapping a timber supply and incidentally to develop an agricultural area of southern Utah, which is badly in need of transportation. The Forestry Bureau, therefore, has deliberately held back for 10 years the industrial development of the entire south central part of the State of Utah by its wasteful conservation policy, and while it is a matter for congratulation that public opinion has forced it to open the Kaibab Forest, it deserves no encomiums of praise, but rather the severest arraignment possible for its wasteful policy in strangling that section of the country for the past decade.

[From the Railway and Marine News, August 1, 1913.]

UTAH'S THEORETICAL FORESTS.

"More persons make use of the national forests in Utah than in any other State. Nearly 27 per cent of all the permits for sheep and cattle grazing on the forests are taken out in this State. This does not mean, however, that Utah carries one-fourth of all the national-forest cattle and sheep; it happens that many small grazing interests make use of the forests there; and individual flocks and herds are larger elsewhere."

The above is a sample of the "press dope" that the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, puts out and which hundreds of unthinking papers publish in good faith. In this case the theoretical conservationist of Broad Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, or Broadway will read with rare zest, the fact that the wonderfully preserved forests of Utah are being put to such splendid use. They will have visions of majestic trees and hundreds of acres of fine forests in which the gentle-faced cow or the sad-faced sheep disport themselves in and about the trunks of these noble trees. But the average reader has never been in Utah. If he has, he will know that the Escalante Desert or the Salt Lake Desert or the great American Desert produce no foliage, while the highly cultivated chain of valleys, extending like a string of sausages from Cache to Washington County, produce everything from most luscious strawberries to the daintiest peach, but the pine, fir, and cedar are unknown.

In the high mountains of the Wasatch range and in the canyons leading thereto from the valleys, one will find quaking asp, cottonwood, poplar, and the small trees of the pine and spruce families which are native to Utah. A few 6-inch planks can be cut. But outside of the Panguitch pine forests, and some of the timbered section bordering on the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, and Kaibab Plateau, there is probably no marketable timber procurable in the whole State of Utah. Every tie on every railroad that was built to develop that interior State was taken into the country by the railroad as it progressed, with the possible exception of some contracts held by local citizens in the early days of the construction of the Union Pacific and Rio Grande, which antedated the era of preserving the trees for future generations.

In brief, probably nine-tenths of the national forests in the State of Utah have no resemblance to a forest, and when they were created in the past they served chiefly to withdraw grazing lands from cattle and sheep owners, and it is these cattle and sheep owners who have since procured permits to graze on the public land, which fact produces this picturesque story by the press agent of the Forestry Bureau in Washington. When it is considered that vast sums have been expended by the Forestry Bureau to publish the wild theories of Gifford Pinchot, such foolish vaporings as the above emanating from these high-priced publicists are extremely laughable. Meanwhile the timber merchants of outside places are supplying Utah with ties, telephone poles, mining timbers and all construction timber, so that the limited areas preserved in that State can be used by future generations.

P. S.—At the last writing, the Panguitch pine forest was 100 or more miles from the nearest railroad. In a radius of 50 miles there is not a population of 50,000 people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say I have several letters here, but I will only put in a portion of one received from a very intelligent man, a pioneer homesteader in western Washington, who writes the following:

We have not only been "experted" beyond the point of physical endurance, but we are literally being conserved out of existence. For 20 miles in every direction from my home I can locate nothing but abandoned homesteads and deserted cabins.

Brother JOHNSON, while we are slowly starving to death the work of conservation goes on. We had no Christmas, we had no New Years, and are getting old before our time because of no money and no way of getting employment to earn money. We have no hope. We have nothing to look forward to but the visit of the forest ranger.

Let us have a demonstration of practical conservation that will guarantee the use of natural and national resources to the end that we may live in the present and our families may have some promises of life in the future and we will try to be happy in the development of the gifts of nature and the creation of wealth on the shores of Puget Sound.

Mr. MANN. That is a confession of Democratic adversity, not of national conservation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A good bit of both, I think.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salmon National Forest, Idaho, $13,690.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679 and had come to no resolution thereon.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

### ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order may be set aside fixing Sunday, April 12, for exercises in relation to the acceptance of the statue of Zachariah Chandler, for the reason that it occurs on Easter Sunday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the order made this morning fixing Sunday, April 12, to make speeches about Senator Zachariah Chandler be set aside. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 436.

*Resolved*, That exercises appropriate for the reception and acceptance from the State of Michigan of the statue of Zachariah Chandler, erected in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, be made the special order for Sunday, April 19, 1914.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 751) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, submitting a report on preliminary examination of Holmes River, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 820); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting supplementary estimate of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1915, under the head of "Salaries, Office of the Secretary, Government actuary," salary $3,000 per annum instead of $2,250 per annum (H. Doc. No. 819); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14385) to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 362), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANTRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11625) to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 363), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12463) to authorize the withdrawal of lands on the Quinaielt Reservation, in the State of Washington, for lighthouse purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 364), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANTRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13415) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Shelbyville, Tenn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 365), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLANCY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14196) authorizing the Tuscarora Nation of New York Indians to lease or sell the limestone deposits upon their reservation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 366), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7025) to authorize the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. to change its line of railroad through the Chilocco Indian Reservation, State of Oklahoma, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 367), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 14430) to provide revenue and encourage the industries of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14431) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to include the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Regiments Kansas Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14432) to provide for the improvement of navigation on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 14433) to establish a fish-cultural station at some point in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 14434) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suit-

able site for a powder plant at or near the Borough of Brooklyn, in the State of New York, and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14435) to authorize the sale of certain public land within the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 14436) to regulate the conduct of trials in actions to recover damages for personal injuries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 14437) for the relief of persons suffering damages by the construction of the canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the Calaveras River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14438) for the relief of persons suffering damages by the construction of the canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the Calaveras River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14439) to provide for the erection of a public building at Quincy, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 14440) providing for the purchase of site and for public building at Guyton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 14441) to increase the limit of cost of site and public building at Red Bluff, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PROUTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 227, creating a commission to examine the relations between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POST: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio relative to proper Federal and State action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 14442) for the relief of Edward S. Carr; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 14443) granting an increase of pension to John R. Skidmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14444) for the relief of the heirs or estate of J. Howard Sheffer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 14445) granting a pension to Charles H. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 14446) granting an increase of pension to Harry Landau; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 14447) granting a pension to Emma S. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14448) granting an increase of pension to William Bay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14449) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Findly Morrow; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 14450) for the relief of Martin & Co., of Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 14451) granting a pension to Clarence Sass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 14452) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14453) granting an increase of pension to John W. Oakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14454) granting an increase of pension to L. C. Penninger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14455) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 14456) granting a pension to A. H. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14457) granting a pension to William Bogen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14458) granting a pension to John R. Callahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14459) granting a pension to Charles W. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14460) granting a pension to Charles H. Jennings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14461) granting an increase of pension to William J. Light; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14462) granting a pension to Pearl B. Scully; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14463) granting an increase of pension to S. N. Burdsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14464) granting a pension to James M. Dinwiddie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14465) granting an increase of pension to James Dougherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14466) granting a pension to Levi Essick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14467) granting an increase of pension to Moses Goldstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14468) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14469) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14470) granting a pension to Wilson S. Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14471) granting a pension to Martha A. Mouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14472) granting a pension to Alexander Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14473) granting an increase of pension to Vesta Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14474) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14475) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snoderly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14476) granting a pension to Jackson Weathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 14477) granting a pension to Spencer Le R. Burbank; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 14478) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Powell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14479) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sarah J. Montgomery, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14480) granting a pension to William Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14481) for the relief of George W. Peters; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 14482) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 14483) granting a pension to Amelia Kuhn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 14484) granting an honorable discharge to Eliphas W. Reed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 14485) granting an increase of pension to Mary K. Kalis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14486) granting an increase of pension to Sarah K. Lyberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 14487) granting an increase of pension to John W. Shawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 14488) granting a pension to Margaret Mars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14489) granting a pension to Anna Sorrels; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14490) for the relief of heirs of Samuel N. Pryor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of A. E. Birmingham and W. E. Sewell, of Bland, and sundry citizens of Union, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petitions of the Past Presidents' Association of Middlesex County, Mass., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of 15 citizens of Harrison, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 300 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of F. J. Schwab and 270 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Hickory Grove Sunday School and Church of the Brethren, of Pioneer, Ohio, against House bill

11312, relative to foreign exhibits at Panama-Pacific Exposition; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and churches of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of various banks of Kansas, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Agricultural Commission of Ohio in favor of the franking privilege for the State departments on agricultural bulletins; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the 330 members of the Granville (Ohio) Methodist Episcopal Church, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Eugene Snell Camp of Spanish War Veterans, of Coshocton, Ohio, in favor of the Spanish War veterans' widows' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of Illinois, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of McKees Rocks, Homestead, and Camden, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Petitions of Sam Johnson and 1,951 other citizens of Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 80 citizens of Lockland, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Petition of the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Vikings, favoring erection of a statue to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROWN of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of the first congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Federated Central Body of New York City, favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., protesting against the immigration bill in its present form; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against further extension of parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Pleasant Valley Wine Co., of Rheims, N. Y., and of sundry citizens of Hammonds Port, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of Henry Wolf and B. Goodman, of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Major Frank Kerk Camp, No. 53, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, known as the soldiers' and sailors' widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas Roulston, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of anticoupon bill, providing for 2-cent tax on coupons and stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, of St. Cloud, Minn., favoring passage of Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Northfield (Minn.) Ministerial Association, protesting against House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of 200 citizens of Everton, 75 citizens of Raymore, 85 citizens of Rich Hill, 28 citizens of Centerview, 100 citizens of Osceola, and 100 citizens of Sprague, all in the State of Missouri, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of J. H. Boughton, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the Barkley relief bill relative to flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of E. F. Shaw, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring Ransdell-Humphreys bill, relative to flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EAGLE: Affidavit of H. D. Martin in reference to claim of Martin & Co., of Houston, Tex., for refund of duty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, of New York, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of the Swedish Singing Society Svea of New York City, and the Scandinavian Hundred Men Society of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Captain John M. Pettingell Camp, No. 52, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring bill relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions adopted by the general court of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, providing for the retirement of all civil-service employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Petition of Methodist Sunday School at Martin, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of Paul North, of Cleveland, Ohio, relative to international fisheries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the General George A. Garretson Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring House bill 13044, relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Cleveland (Ohio) Humane Society, relative to shipment of young calves in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of sundry citizens of Vermont, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of citizens of Falls Creek, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation such as proposed by the so-called Hobson, Sheppard, and Works resolutions (H. J. Res. 168, S. J. Res. 88, and S. J. Res. 50), providing for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Marietta, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, against Government ownership of telephones and telegraphs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Protest of John Danielski, of Minto, N. Dak., and other citizens of North Dakota, against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the North Dakota Retail Lumbermen's Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of sundry employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, favoring passage of House bill 12740, relative to standardizing the wages of machinists; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Bartenders' Union, No. 36, of the twenty-third district of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Young Men's Bible Class and the First Baptist Bible School of Sharon, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against barring the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Battle Ground, Wash., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Tacoma Grocery Co., favoring anticoupon bill, placing 2-cent tax on coupons and trading stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Seattle (Wash.) Ministerial Association, protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry tailors of Hoquiam, Wash., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Hoquiam (Wash.) Commercial Club, protesting against repeal of the canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Scottdale, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12783, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the St. Louis (Mo.) Christian Advocate; the Baptist Courier Co., of Greenville, S. C.; Primitive Baptist, of Martin, Tenn.; and the Catholic Press Association, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against doubling postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Fenner R. Peckham, M. D., of Providence, R. I., relative to House bill 7775, Federal regulation of migratory fish; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Investors Financial Monitor, of New York, for investigation on subject of advisory letters and establishment of ranges of accumulation of securities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of F. F. Lanz, of New York County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against increase of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the General Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 38, Department of New York; the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98; the Kathryn Fellows Auxiliary, No. 28; and the David Wilson Camp, No. 59, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the mayor and council of Annapolis, Md., favoring building of a military post road from Washington to Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petitions of the German Beneficial Union, District Bohemia No. 90, and 1,561 other citizens of Maryland, praying that Congress do not pass House joint resolution 90, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Evansville Tool Works, Evansville Bookcase & Table Co., H. Lohse Co., Kolker Electric Co., J. F. Charley Auto Co., Knell & Wright, F. W. Harnishfeger Shoe Manufacturing Co., Paul & Ortmeyer Co., Horn Mercantile Co., and F. Landerberger Son, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Loomis Willson Co., of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the movement to change the administration of the tea law from the Treasury Department to the Agricultural Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHAN: Memorial of the New Britain (Conn.) Branch of the American Continental League, protesting against repeal of the canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of District No. 1, Grand Lodge Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., protesting against the immigration bill in its present form; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of various bankers of Chicago, Ill., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Watertown, S. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Herrick County, S. Dak., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Gettysburg (S. Dak.) Woman's Relief Corps, No. 15, protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of sundry citizens of St. Louis County, Minn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALMER. Petition of sundry citizens of Northampton County, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lafayette Post, No. 217, Grand Army of the Republic, of Easton, Pa., against any change in the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Susquehanna, Pa., favoring two-battleship program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mechanicsburg, Pa., favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring last Monday in October as Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, No. 406, of Bethlehem, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Memorial of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of W. M. Buck, of Essex County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POST: Petition of Ira Brookwalter and 26 other citizens of Springfield, Mass., favoring passage of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, favoring House bill 12740, relative to standardization of wages; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, against repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of the exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRINGER: Petition of sundry citizens of Bloomington, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Vikings, favoring erection of a monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petitions of sundry members of the Free Swedish Evangelical Church of Moline, Ill., and of the Methodist Protestant Church of La Harpe, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 13005, relative to protection of fisheries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Bedford, Mattapoisett, Acushnet, and Dartmouth, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against any law that will deprive the employees of the Post Office Department of any rest-day privi-

leges which they now enjoy; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Fred Waldek and 353 other citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petitions of sundry citizens of the old eighteenth congressional district of Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 12740, the machinists' wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the bartenders of the United States of America, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 200 citizens of New Franklin, 150 citizens of Bayard, and 350 citizens of Carrollton, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Court Gilson and 18 other citizens of Marysville, Ohio, against House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. George B. Wiltsie and 26 other citizens of Forest, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### WEDNESDAY, *March 11, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee conscious of our limitations and our weakness. If Thou didst not speak to us we would be willing to die as the beasts of the field. When Thou dost speak Thou dost stir within us great aspirations, noble and lofty aims, and ideals to fill out all the years and reach into the eternal. We pray that Thou wilt speak to us this day, and that under the inspiration of Thy call to our hearts and consciences and minds we may go forward to discharge the duties that pertain to life.

We seek from Thee a sphere in which we may make the investment of our influence, that we may bring happiness and blessing to those about us, and faithfully discharge all the duties of our sacred office as in Thy sight. We ask Thy blessing this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING (S. DOC. NO. 447).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an item of appropriation for inclusion in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for repairs and alterations on the old building of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 48. An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; and

S. 3742. An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York.

#### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to state that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] waited all day long yesterday with great patience to get an opportunity to bring up the District appropriation bill, of which he has charge. I will again yield my notice that I would address the Senate this morning after the close of the morning business on Senate bill 120 in order that the Senator from Maryland may proceed with and finish the appropriation bill. I shall then hope to take up Senate bill 120, and I give notice that I shall call it up tomorrow morning, if the appropriation bill has been disposed of.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McCUMBER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fargo and Forman, in the State of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Moorhead, Minn., and a memorial of Local Lodge No. 91, International Association of Machinists, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Ministerial Association of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present compensatory time privilege of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Olmsted County Farmers' Association, of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a different method of building good roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 91, International Association of Machinists, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Rice County, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Larned, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 1, Coopers' International Union, of Kansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wallace County, Gove County, Dickinson County, and Trego County, and of sundry citizens of Salina, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a term of the United States district court at Salina, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Missoula and Butte, in the State of Montana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Petersburg, Alliance, Troy, Winchester, East Palestine, Columbus, Findlay, Geneva, Youngstown, Cleveland, Clyde, and Chillicothe; of the congregations of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Akron, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Columbus, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Belfast, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of New Lexington, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 127, Bartenders' League, of Massillon, Ohio, and a memorial of Local Union No. 67, Toledo Cloak and Skirtmakers' Union, of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a memorial of the German American Alliance of Nebraska, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Omaha Grain Exchange, of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to pro-

vide for Federal supervision and inspection of grain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Scandinavian Grand Lodge of Connecticut, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Past Presidents' Association, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Middlesex County, Mass., and a memorial of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of New Bedford, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Bedford, Anderson, Gibson County, La Fayette, Dubois County, Howard County, Evansville, and Warrick County, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Council No. 16, Daughters of America, of Marion, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Fountain County, and Knox County, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worthington, Crotherville, Michigan City, and Oakland City, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Newcastle, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present compensatory time privilege of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BORAH. I present a petition signed by a large number of settlers and landowners within the Black Canyon irrigation district in Canyon County, Idaho. The petition is very short, and I ask that the body of it, omitting the names, may be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and the body thereof was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:*

We, the undersigned settlers and landowners within the Black Canyon irrigation district, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to provide some means whereby money may be available by the Reclamation Service in order that the said Reclamation Service may construct the irrigation system to water the lands within the Black Canyon irrigation district in Canyon County, Idaho.

That said district comprises about 90,000 acres of very fertile land, and that this land is arid in character and requires artificial application of water in order to become productive; that the most of said land has been settled for the last eight or nine years, and the greater number of the settlers have spent all their savings in constructing homes, digging wells, and making improvements on the land, expecting that water would be available within a short time, and are now almost destitute. The Reclamation Service informs us that it can not proceed to construct the works required to irrigate the lands on account of the lack of money in the reclamation fund, and petitioners pray Congress make the provision, as aforesaid.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of the Commercial Club, of Hoquiam, Wash., remonstrating against the repeal of the provision in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Seattle, Hoquiam, Renton, Olympia, Burlington, Spokane, Aberdeen, Bellingham, Tacoma, South Tacoma, Southbend, Roslyn, Port Angeles, Bremerton, and Walla Walla, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented petitions of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Burr Oak; of the congregations of the First Presbyterian Church of Hastings; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Howard City; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Buchanan; the First Baptist Church of Adrian; the United Brethren Church of Bates; and of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Adrian, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Hackett Corps, No. 60, Women's Relief Corps, of Bronson, Mich., remonstrating against any change being made in the American flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Holland Camp, No. 38, United Spanish War Veterans, of Holland, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors who served in the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WEEKS presented memorials of Local Union No. 77, Bartenders' Union, of Boston; of Local Union No. 113, Bartenders' Union, of Northampton; of the German-American Alliance, of Clinton; of Local Union No. 90, Bartenders' Union, of Lawrence; and of Local Union No. 95, Bartenders' Union, of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of New Bedford, Mass., and a memorial of the Past Presidents' Association, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Middlesex County, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present 178 individual memorials from citizens of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of Ashland Council, No. 143, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Ashland, Ky., and a petition of sundry citizens of Newport, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of 255 citizens of the first congressional district of Kentucky, and a memorial of sundry citizens of Kenton, Ky., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a few days ago there was printed in the RECORD at my request an address of some of the women of California on the subject of woman suffrage, and particularly intended to show what has been the effect of suffrage in that State. Since that time the whole subject has been very thoroughly discussed on the floor of the Senate.

In the meantime an investigation has been made by some of the women of England along the same line. The North American Review, in its last issue, contains a summary of the results, giving the questions that were sent out and their answers. I should like to have that statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE WORKING OF EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

The extraordinary uses to which the national platform of the dominant political party have been put of late call for more precise analysis and more extended consideration than can well be accorded in this number of the Review. In passing, however, while cheerfully heeding the call of consistency to indorse the Kansas farmers' opinion that "there is a mighty smart man in the White House," we can not but question the sagacity of the President's response to the advocates of equal suffrage who sought his aid and uncommon counsel. To hold seriously, in view of certain unauthorized proposals already made to Congress, that he could not properly urge legislation not yet subjected to "organic consideration,' seems altogether too much like shilly-shallying behind an unpetticoated platform.

Mr. UNDERWOOD defined the traditional Democratic position perfectly when he replied that all matters of the franchise were reserved to the States, and that, consequently, the suggestion of Federal action could not be entertained. Possibly Mr. Wilson felt that he could not well make his wholly natural and conclusive rejoinder while simultaneously he was demanding presidential primaries, but if so the circumstance is unfortunate in consideration of the fact that more than one-sixth of the electoral vote in 1916 will come from States where women vote.

But it is not the political aspect of this incident, nor, indeed, the incident itself in its broader phase, that now engrosses our attention; it is the working of equal suffrage in actual practice as ascertained by an impartial investigating committee composed of 12 distinguished English

ladies, headed by Adeline, Duchess of Bedford, and the Marchioness of Salisbury. These ladies obtained letters of introduction to a representative selection of prominent citizens of the States concerned—clergy and ministers of different denominations, lawyers, educationalists, publicists, business men, former holders of public office, and the like, and a few eminent women; to all of whom a list of questions was forwarded, accompanied by the following appeal:

"Several Englishwomen who are much interested in the question of the enfranchisement of women are desirous of knowing how it works in the States of America where it has been put into operation.

"They hold very different views on this subject, some being in favor of the change and some against it, but they all wish to know the result in these countries where it has been tried.

"They therefore beg that you will answer the questions on the inclosed paper, or as many of them as you can, and return it in the addressed envelope which is inclosed."

Sixty-three replies were received, and are summarized in the Nineteenth Century from the suffragist and antisuffragist points of view by the Hon. Robert Palmer and Mr. A. MacCallum Scott, M. P., respectively. A rough classification shows 46 favorable to equal suffrage, as against 8 neutral, 5 vaguely unfavorable, and only 4 definitely hostile. This Mr. Palmer pronounces "a very striking result," showing that the principle "is passing from the realm of controversy to that of universal approval among those who have seen it at work." Following is a consensus of the replies under the seven headings into which the questionnaire was divided:

"Q.1. Reasons for adoption.

"(a) Was it a party question?—A. Nowhere, except partially in California and Colorado.

"(b) Was there militancy?—A. None anywhere.

"(c) Where did the strength of the movement and opposition to it lie?—A. Strength mainly came from 'moral' influences and women's clubs; opposition from saloons and machine politicians.

"Q.2. Conditions.

"A. The qualifications are the same for men as for women; about 15 per cent fewer women are on the register, on an average; women are everywhere eligible to the legislature.

"Q.3. How is the vote exercised?

"(a) What percentage polls?—A. About 5 per cent fewer than men, on an average.

"(b) Have women formed new parties?—A. Nowhere.

"(c) Is the balance of existing parties altered?—A. No.

"(d) Do wives vote with their husbands?—About half say 'yes' and half 'no'; clearly individuals vary.

"(e) Has the female vote affected the character of candidates for offices?—Thirty-eight replies say 'yes,' often quoting instances; 13 say 'no.'

"Q.4. How has equal suffrage affected women's position?

"(a) Has it caused ill feeling between men and women?—Over 50 say 'no'; 2 say 'yes.'

"(b) Has it increased women's interest in politics?—Over 50 say 'yes'; about 6 doubt it.

"(c) Has it impaired their usefulness in the home?—Nearly 50 replies say 'no'; 8 say that in some cases it has. One picturesque answer perhaps hits the nail on the head in saying 'your flannel-mouthed suffragist is not a home-making woman at all.' But, after all, it is the agitation for suffrage which breeds the flannel-mouthed type; the grant quiets them.

"Q.5. Is there any agitation for its repeal?

"A. None.

"Q.6. What is your general impression of the change?

"A. This has already been summarized.

"Q.7. What legislation dealing with the following subjects has been passed since the women had the vote? Can the influence of the female vote be traced in any such legislation?

"(a) Conditions of female labor.

"(b) Protection of women and girls.

"(c) Temperance.

"(d) Education.

"(e) Sanitation and milk.

"(f) Industrial arbitration.

"(g) Widows' pensions.

"(h) Divorce."

Legislation on subjects a, b, and g is recorded in every suffrage State except Kansas, which had had no legislation since the grant, and "useful laws" have been passed in all of the States except Oregon and Arizona on subjects a, b, c, d, e, f, and g. The questionnaire selects the eight subjects on which it is thought women are most likely to use their votes. The replies from Washington and California, where three and two sessions, respectively, have been held since the grant of woman suffrage, show that the legislatures of both have already passed laws on seven out of those eight subjects in those sessions. On the "coincidence" theory the odds would be almost infinitely against such a thing happening, and when we find 21 answers from these two States affirming in unequivocal terms that these laws have been carried by means of the women's votes, no impartial mind can resist the conclusion that such is the truth. And in the still more extreme case of Oregon, where equal suffrage had been in force nine months, the only reply which deals with this part of the questionnaire enumerates laws of 1913 on subjects a, b, e, and g, and adds: "These were all due to the influence of women."

It may be further mentioned in this connection that on the only two of these eight topics on which reliable information covering all the States of the Union is to hand at the moment, namely, widows' pensions and the protection of girls by raising the age of consent to 18, the proportion of suffrage States which have legislated on these points is strikingly higher than that of nonsuffrage States. Thus 17 States altogether have widows' pension laws. Of these, 6 are suffrage States and enacted the laws since becoming so, and 11 are nonsuffrage. But the 6 are 6 out of 9 (2 of the remaining 3 having had equal suffrage less than a year), and the 11 are 11 out of 39. Similarly, of the 9 suffrage States, 7 have raised the age of consent to 18 since granting equal suffrage (an eighth having done so just before the grant), while of the nonsuffrage States the figures for 1911–12 (the latest available) show that then only 4 out of 39 had so raised it.

The eight neutral answers are perhaps the least instructive, as they come from those who either think it is too soon to judge or from those who have not observed any results from the change which justify a definite opinion. Not one of them mentions a single evil result, or fear of any, from the grant of equal suffrage.

The answers classed as vaguely unfavorable read like those of men who were opposed to woman suffrage and still bear it a lingering grudge, but can find no definite charge to lay against it. Most of them describe themselves as neutral. The worst they can find to say are the following: "Personally I do not believe in women voting, but I believe we can not help it." "Much freak legislation, possibly due to women's influence." "Nothing accomplished which could not have been done as well or better without suffrage." These are absolutely the three most unfavorable phrases in these answers, which can none of them allege any definite harm to have resulted from women's votes, while four of the five admit some definite good.

Of the four definitely antisuffragist replies, the following is a fair example:

"I should say * * * that women's suffrage has not affected the situation in legislation at all. It has added an increased responsibility, which responsibility has, I think, been well borne, and it has sharpened animosities and lengthened them. Plainly speaking, the granting of the suffrage is an increase of the ignorant vote. That it has not been so in Wyoming is due to the fact that * * * there is a very high intellectual average among our women. The experience of Wyoming is no guaranty of the effect of suffrage where conditions are different."

"And this," remarks Mr. Palmer, "is what on a rough classification was set down as one of the four hostile replies. On second perusal, its place seems to be rather (unconsciously) among the most favorable. For here an obviously 'unfriendly witness' coming from the Eastern States (where he had not seen equal suffrage at work), full of prejudice against it, tries to answer that it has been a failure, and is inadvertently betrayed into admitting that it is a success, but hastens to add that it might very likely be a failure somewhere else. The rest of the replies are uniformly favorable."

He concludes with these words:

"Is not the matter quite fairly stated thus? If the women of England use their votes in the same kind of way and on the same kind of subjects as the women of these nine American States are stated to be using them, then the grant of woman suffrage will surely be a notable gain to England's welfare. And is there any ground whatever for supposing that they will use them otherwise or less sensibly? Let us leave it at that."

Mr. MacCallum Scott's summary differs in no material point from Mr. Palmer's. Indeed, the most noteworthy feature of both reviews is the scrupulous impartiality of admitted partisans as to matters of fact. But each is "of the same opinion still." Mr. Scott sums up as follows:

"The conclusion to which I have come after reading through all the answers is that women through their votes have had some influence, quite different from the moral influence which they exercise without the vote, upon legislation. It is difficult to define this influence precisely. Frequent reference is made to the manner in which 'moral issues' appeal to women. I can not accept the view occasionally expressed that women have 'a somewhat higher moral standard' than men, but it is quite possible that, holding the same moral standard, they may give different effect to it in politics.

"I am impressed by several suggestions that women are much stricter and more ardent partisans than men; that they look to moral character in candidates rather than to ability; and that they have, in a greater degree than men, 'a tendency to regulate morals by law.' Men are on the whole more tolerant than women and inclined to allow a wider latitude of personal moral freedom so long as the rights of others are not interfered with. Women are, on the whole, more inclined to make their personal moral code a moral code imperative for others also and to apply coercion to secure conformity.

"Coercive legislation, depending as it does upon the physical arm of the law for its enforcement, if it is to be effective, must have behind it the physical strength of the country. If the majority of men should be against it, if its chief support comes from women who, while unable as individuals to exercise physical coercion, are yet able, through the ballot box, to evoke the physical arm of the law, then there is grave danger in extreme cases of a general conspiracy to evade the law. Authority, finding itself with a task beyond its power, will wink at the offenders. Law will fall into disrespect. There will gradually grow up a hypocritical feeling toward legislation. 'What does it matter what they pass? Let them pass anything they like, and if we find it inconvenient we will evade it.' If this became a general attitude, it would destroy that sense of responsibility and of respect for law which is the firmest foundation for stable government."

Suffragists will take slight exception to an argument whose sole basis is vague apprehension that the enactment of better laws will imbue men as a sex class with a spirit of law defiance. The plain logic of such reasoning is that it is not women, but men, who are unfitted to perform the duties of citizenship.

Taken as a whole, the result of the interesting inquiry constitutes a powerful backlog of evidence in favor of equal suffrage.

## PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. WORKS. I ask that a resolution of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, relating to Panama Canal tolls, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE
OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
*February 21, 1914.*

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast submit for your careful and favorable consideration the inclosed copy of a resolution, relative to Panama Canal tolls, adopted January 24, 1914.

Yours, very truly, C. W. BURKS, *Secretary.*

Resolution adopted by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast January 24, 1914.

Whereas on October 2, 1911, the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, at a meeting at which were present representatives of the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Oakland, Portland, Tacoma, Seattle, and Spokane, adopted the following preamble and resolutions by a unanimous vote:

"Whereas the building of the Panama Canal was undertaken by the people of the United States in pursuance of the great national policy, amongst other things of providing for the national defense, of opening up the shortest possible water route between the respective coasts of the United States and foreign countries, to provide, through natural methods and to prevent monopoly of transportation, means for transportation between the various sections of the Union at the lowest possible cost, to build up and expand our commerce with foreign nations and incidentally to encourage the upbuilding of a now decadent merchant marine: Be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this meeting that there should be no tolls charged through the canal to vessels coastwise flying the American flag;" and

Whereas Congress in due time passed a law for the regulation of the Panama Canal, which includes the provision exempting American ships engaged in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls for the passage of ships through said Panama Canal; and

Whereas a protest has been filed by the Government of Great Britain against this provision upon the ground of the provision of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which reads: "The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality"; and

Whereas for the reason that ships flying a foreign flag have not been and are not now permitted by law to engage in the coastwise trade, and are therefore not affected by any concession which the United States Government may desire to extend to American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, and such concession is not in contravention of the treaty; and

Whereas the river and harbors act of 1884, section 4, uses the following language:

"No tolls or operating charges whatever shall be levied upon or collected from any vessel, dredge, or other water craft for passing through any lock, canal, canalized river, or other work for the use and benefit of navigation now belonging to the United States or that may be hereafter acquired or constructed"; and

Whereas from the point of view of the membership of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast no tenable or reasonable ground can be found for the contention for the claim advanced by Great Britain: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast*, That we disclaim any intention or desire to avoid in the slightest degree any treaty obligation of the United States; that we claim for the people of the United States and for those of the Pacific coast as sensitive a regard for treaty obligations, or obligations of any other sort, as those held by the citizens of any other country, and particularly those of Great Britain, to whom we concede a high regard for all such obligations. Nevertheless, in a matter of such great importance as that under consideration, in which we feel that the interests of all the people of the Pacific coast are deeply involved, we can not concede to any foreign Government the right to interpret a matter which we regard as being one entirely within the powers of the American Government, namely, that of prescribing the terms upon which American vessels may do business through an American-constructed canal with other American ports, in which business the vessels of no foreign country can or has engaged; be it further

*Resolved*, That the President and Congress are hereby urged, with all proper courtesy and respect to the Government of Great Britain, to stand firmly upon the principle herein set forth, and to refuse to have stricken from our statute books, or from actual enforcement, the law exempting from tolls through the Panama Canal of American ships engaged in the coastwise trade; be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the president and secretary of this Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast to the President of the United States, to the several members of his Cabinet, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

THE ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF THE PACIFIC COAST.
ARTHUR W. KINNEY, *President*.
C. W. BURKE, *Secretary*.

## CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** Mr. President, I have here several telegrams that I have received in reference to the position I took on Monday upon the Mexican situation. I should like to have them read at the desk. I shall omit the personal portions of the telegrams.

**The VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection to reading the telegrams? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read them.

The telegrams were read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Ten good citizens who recently made a trip of 400 miles along the border, and hundreds of good citizens, will back your statements.

D. P. GAY.

[Telegram.]

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Your defense of our great President's Mexican policy expresses the sentiments of not only myself but thousands of other patriotic peace-loving citizens of this great Commonwealth.

WM. N. LOWRY.

[Telegram.]

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Your speech yesterday was to the point. Texans are with you.

J. T. YOUNG.

[Telegram.]

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Have just read your speech regarding the attitude of Texans generally as to intervention in Mexico. I wish to assure you that you have truthfully stated the feeling of the general public in Texas regarding the question.

E. B. YOUNG.

[Telegram.]

GREENVILLE, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

You have voiced the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the citizenship of Texas.

W. B. HAMILTON.
WM. PIERSON.
J. RILEY GREEN.
B. F. CORSBY.
GEO. B. HALL.
MORRIS HARRELL.
I. W. BRISCOE.
L. A. CLARK.
SAM D. STINSON.
A. E. EDWARDS.
C. E. CANTRELL.

[Telegram.]

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

I believe that your speech of yesterday correctly expressed the attitude of this community.

HENRY J. DANNENBAUM.

[Telegram.]

HILLSBORO, TEX., *March 10, 1914*.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

You are right on Mexican situation.

E. H. CRENSHAW.

## RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

**Mr. GRONNA.** Mr. President, I have here a letter which touches upon certain phases of the immigration bill that is now being considered by the Committee on Immigration, and which is a measure of very great importance to the country. I ask that the letter may be read.

**The VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The letter was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

CHICAGO, *March 9, 1914*.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is now pending in the United States Senate, for concurrence, a bill restricting immigration, known as the Burnett bill, recently passed by Congress. One of the clauses of the said bill requires the application of the literacy test to our immigrants as a condition precedent to landing. This clause is unfair, unjust, and unreasonable, and if adopted will work greater injury than good to this country.

My father came to this country in the early sixties. He came from Posen, that part of Poland taken by Germany. When he came here he did not know how to read or write. He worked on a farm, then in a factory, and later opened a little mercantile establishment which he conducted for 30 years. He learned not only how to write and read in his mother tongue but also the English language. He gave his children good education. He induced me to become a lawyer. I was admitted to the bar of my State, and through the courtesy of your late former colleague, Senator Cullom, I was admitted to practice in the United States Supreme Court.

Now, Senator, has this country lost anything in safety or dignity when it permitted him to land in the early sixties? Was it not rather a benefit to this country that he came, helped to develop and maintain it, and left posterity, who can still further aid this country in its development?

Senator, I am only one of the millions of sons of millions of immigrants who came to this country and who could neither read nor write, but who aided in the development of this country, and whose sons and daughters will carry on the work of their fathers still further.

You undoubtedly are apprised of the fact that certain Governments of Europe, either through deliberate neglect or design, cause and induce their subjects to remain illiterate. Shall these poor unfortunates find the gates of this country closed to them for the sins of their rulers? Will this country add to their already great sufferings by keeping them out of this land of liberty?

Will you say, Senator, that a healthy peasant, in whose veins flows pure blood, whose offspring is not tainted with any dreaded disease, and who is industrious and honest, though illiterate, is less desirable than a sickly, though educated, gentleman of the European centers? Would this country survive and be what it is to-day were the early settlers made of such sickly stock?

Senator, if you could come to Chicago I would show you in my office files of purchases of over $5,000,000 worth of real estate made by persons who signed their names by mark. I would take you to their homes. I assure you that never before have you seen a healthier lot of happy and contented, though poor, folks than they are. They are all law-abiding citizens. They are a little or no burden to the country. They pay their taxes promptly, and, if need be, Senator, they would shoulder the musket in the defense of the flag just as readily as a university professor. Is their presence a detriment to this country?

I therefore urgently request you to carefully consider the bill and vote so that the gates of this great land of liberty shall not be closed to the illiterate unfortunates.

Trusting, Senator, that you will vote against the bill, and thanking you for such step, I have the honor to remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

FRANK H. JANISZESKI.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

**Mr. SHIVELY**, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 322), accompanied by a bill (S. 4845) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the

bill being a substitute for the following pension bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 182. Lemuel White.
S. 186. Adaline Stoker.
S. 241. Robert A. Henderson.
S. 316. Katharina Britsch.
S. 329. Sarah L. Bentley.
S. 331. Elizabeth Fogg.
S. 332. Emily H. Bailey.
S. 336. Sarah McMunigal.
S. 353. Emma F. Dimmock.
S. 360. Jane E. Peck.
S. 366. Jefferson Conklin.
S. 399. Henry W. Bradley.
S. 401. James W. Smith.
S. 602. Charles Van Dusen.
S. 745. Joseph Hiler.
S. 765. David P. De Tar.
S. 867. Annie A. Voigt.
S. 945. Amanda M. Dixon.
S. 967. Andrew J. Merrill.
S. 976. Richard F. Jacks.
S. 1013. George W. Shreeve.
S. 1017. Alfred H. Fodrea.
S. 1025. Thomas Jared.
S. 1287. Samuel Waggoner.
S. 1331. Moses N. Jones.
S. 1583. Sarah W. Loud.
S. 1641. Addison C. Walker.
S. 1696. Joel Yeager.
S. 1699. George W. North.
S. 1828. Harriet J. Tuttle.
S. 1869. William H. Murch.
S. 1911. John B. Craig.
S. 1994. Almira J. Sterling.
S. 2004. Charlotte H. Ely.
S. 2270. Francis C. Sturtevant.
S. 2206. Ithamar Spurlin.
S. 2385. Susannah M. Smith.
S. 2483. John F. Spence.
S. 2486. James F. Brann.
S. 2521. Harriet A. Frasier.
S. 2525. Charlotte Lewis McMahon.
S. 2569. Nathan Long.
S. 2574. John J. Schneller.
S. 2628. Allison W. Pollard.
S. 2631. Abel Williams.
S. 2677. Daniel Igo.
S. 2678. Logan McD. Scott.
S. 2683. John B. Salsman.
S. 2820. Andrew Fifer.
S. 2826. Robert G. Sleater.
S. 3067. Tillman H. Snyder.
S. 3069. Catharine E. Brown.
S. 3150. Charles M. Sanderson.
S. 3151. Mary A. Forbes.
S. 3204. Wallace W. Chaffee.
S. 3279. Stephen M. Buckner.
S. 3290. Leonidas Folckemmer.
S. 3320. Alexander H. Farmer.
S. 3321. Augusta C. Bennett.
S. 3322. Alfaretta S. Bond.
S. 3325. Sarah L. Bushnell.
S. 3326. Sarah M. Chaffee.
S. 3336. Bridget O'Loughlin.
S. 3337. Caroline M. Smith.
S. 3338. Happy M. Smith.
S. 3340. Bertha H. Tiesler.
S. 3351. Timothy W. Reardon.
S. 3380. Joseph H. Truax.
S. 3381. Maria Roberson.
S. 3382. John Myer.
S. 3409. George L. Freeman.
S. 3410. Warren Rich.
S. 3411. Frederick R. Davis.
S. 3413. George W. Taylor.
S. 3414. William B. Houck.
S. 3426. Chandler Swift.
S. 3435. Albinia J. Pierce.
S. 3440. Jacob W. Smith.
S. 3446. Pleasant W. Logan.
S. 3478. James K. Brooks.
S. 3489. John F. Sacks.
S. 3523. Hiram Focht.
S. 3530. Charles Duggan.
S. 3535. Edward P. Champlin.
S. 3538. Henry H. Helphenstine.
S. 3569. William McKinzy.
S. 3581. Henry Snyder.
S. 3587. Abbie E. Fairbanks.
S. 3604. Simpson Newman.
S. 3612. William B. Warren.
S. 3634. William J. Keen.
S. 3635. William Green.
S. 3676. Junius T. Turner.
S. 3680. Henry J. Groves.
S. 3692. Edwin Snyder.
S. 3698. John M. Miller.
S. 3707. James M. Nelson.
S. 3718. Maria L. Johnson.
S. 3724. Mary A. Eisenhard.
S. 3751. William G. Simpson.
S. 3792. Edward McMillan.
S. 3794. Jacob W. Perkins, alias William West.
S. 3795. James R. Beaty.
S. 3806. Robert R. Polk.
S. 3807. Florence M. Craigie.
S. 3813. Amelia Peabody.
S. 3825. Delia D. Watson.
S. 3833. Eliza F. Withee.
S. 3860. Amelia Raschig.
S. 3949. Joseph Stall.
S. 3955. Burden H. Barrett.
S. 3963. George W. Carroll.
S. 3982. Hanah Meece.
S. 3983. Jobe Morris.
S. 3984. Henry C. Taylor.
S. 4036. Margaret T. Fuger.
S. 4038. Marshal B. Burk.
S. 4064. Asa J. Alexander.
S. 4065. Thomas A. Harvey.
S. 4067. Israel A. Gardner.
S. 4070. Sewell B. Harriman.
S. 4071. Helen E. Sturtevant.
S. 4089. Isaac P. Whitesides.
S. 4134. George W. Hayes.
S. 4170. Dudley L. Chase.
S. 4176. Lydia Richardson.
S. 4195. Elizabeth H. Smith.
S. 4202. Frederika L. M. Christman.
S. 4209. James W. Dunbar.
S. 4212. John B. Haley.
S. 4225. James A. Tyler.
S. 4266. Judson Kellogg.
S. 4268. Joseph Wilson Whittier.
S. 4292. Richard M. J. Miller.
S. 4339. Mary McGowan.
S. 4359. David Crandell.
S. 4376. Truman S. Bigelow.
S. 4378. Edwin H. Dana.
S. 4384. Henry Hahn.
S. 4386. John W. Shults.
S. 4402. Caroline Smith.
S. 4412. Michael Andrews, jr.
S. 4413. Franklin K. Prescott.
S. 4420. Jennie F. Wilson.
S. 4426. Martin Judy.
S. 4433. Charles H. Bailey.
S. 4439. John Walker.
S. 4440. Edwin R. Partridge.
S. 4445. Frank Boone.
S. 4475. Mary F. Helmer.
S. 4477. Benjamin A. Hey.
S. 4493. Torgus Haraldson.
S. 4516. John J. Evans.
S. 4518. John Campbell.
S. 4531. John E. Wheelock.
S. 4536. Elisha N. Mullinnix.
S. 4546. Williams P. McGuire.
S. 4564. James Allen Wood.
S. 4577. Sophia Armstrong.
S. 4580. Mary E. Fales.
S. 4589. Catharine Burroughs.
S. 4590. Sarah F. Johnson.
S. 4591. Lewis Estes.
S. 4600. Mary W. Kilgore.
S. 4605. Susanah S. Ramsey.
S. 4617. August Schnelle.
S. 4622. Daniel Prince.
S. 4659. Mary C. Grant.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1128) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 325) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2304) for the relief of Chris Kuppler, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 324) thereon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1703) for the relief of George P. Chandler, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 323) thereon.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 292), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and that said stenographer be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 4846) granting an increase of pension to William P. Clark (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

(By request.) A bill (S. 4847) for the relief of the heirs of Anderson Mayfield, deceased (with accompanying papers);

(By request.) A bill (S. 4848) for the relief of the heirs of Blueford D. Smith, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

(By request.) A bill (S. 4849) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Summerlin, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4850) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4851) granting an increase of pension to George F. Adamson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 4852) for the relief of Joe Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4853) for the relief of John J. Fisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4854) to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4855) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Colorado Cooperative Colony to permit second homesteads in certain cases, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1900; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4856) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Mullin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 4857) for the relief of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH:

(By request.) A bill (S. 4858) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel and set aside segregations of public lands under the Carey Act, and to regulate the same; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4859) granting a pension to Sarah E. Badley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4860) granting an increase of penson to John M. Broome; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4861) granting a pension to Caroline B. Sloan; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4862) for the relief of William E. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4863) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hutton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 4864) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the administration of justice in the Navy," to amend section 1624 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 4865) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 4866) granting an increase of pension to James K. Wesley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4867) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Rake (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4868) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Crawford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Confederate Veterans' Reunion to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in May, 1914; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DONATION OF FLAG TO WILLIAM B. CUSHING CAMP.

Mr. KENYON. I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a garrison flag, and when necessary to refurnish it, to William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans, of Maryland, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It will take no time at all, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read at length.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish one United States garrison flag to William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish to the William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans, Division of Maryland, and refurnish whenever he shall deem it necessary, one United States garrison flag, for the purpose of being displayed from one of the three flagstaffs on the Plaza in front of the Union Station, Washington, D. C.: *Provided*, That the raising and lowering of said flag shall be done without expense to the United States Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. The joint resolution has not been referred to a committee?

Mr. KENYON. It has not.

Mr. SMOOT. I think a joint resolution ought to be referred to the appropriate committee and reported from the committee the same as a bill.

Mr. KENYON. If that is usual, I assume it must be done, but I do not see any need of referring it to a committee. This is a matter about which no one will raise a question.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what I speak of. A joint resolution, like a bill, is always referred to the appropriate committee first, and then reported, and when the committee reports unanimous consent can then be asked for its immediate consideration.

Mr. KENYON. Of course the Senator is more familiar with the rules than I am. Is that a rule of the Senate, or merely a suggestion of the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I will not say that there is a rule on the subject.

Mr. KENYON. Then what is the use of referring it? Is there any objection?

Mr. CLAPP. It will merely take time to refer it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that the Senator from Iowa asked unanimous consent for present consideration. That disposes of any rule, if it is granted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will inquire whether there is an appropriation provided for in the joint resolution.

Mr. KENYON. There is none. There is not any expense involved to the Government except to furnish the flag. The Government has plenty of flags, I am informed, for this purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To whom is it proposed to furnish the flag?

Mr. KENYON. To Camp No. 30 of the Sons of Veterans, to be displayed on one of the flagpoles in front of the Union Station. There will be no expense to the Government in any way.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $40,000 for the erection of a gymnasium for the use of the pupils at the Indian school, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the merchantable timber on all unallotted lands within the Bad River Indian Reservation, Wis., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment providing that any officer of the United States Navy who served creditably during the Civil War and whose name is now borne on the list of retired officers of the Navy shall have the benefit of all laws in the same manner and to the same extent as though such officer had been retired for disability, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which were ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

CONVICT-MADE GOODS (S. DOC. NO. 446).

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have a copy of a hearing had before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in the second session of the Sixty-second Congress on the bill to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods. I ask that the hearing may be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 5th instant was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the resolution is to lie over without prejudice.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES. Is there not another resolution on the desk of the Vice President—Senate resolution 288—calling for information in reference to Panama Canal tolls?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington and which he requested should lie on the table.

Mr. JONES. I simply asked the other day that the resolution be passed over until the next day; that is all. I am now merely going to make the request that it be passed over until tomorrow, in view of the desire of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to take up the District appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution to which the Senator refers is on the Table Calendar.

Mr. JONES. I did not understand that it was to be placed on the Table Calendar. I thought the resolution was to be like other resolutions that go over from day to day, which are handed down by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no knowledge as to whether or not the RECORD is right, but the RECORD shows that the Senator from Washington requested that the resolution lie on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10523, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, before proceeding with the reading of the bill, I wish to make a short statement in regard to the work of your committee. We have endeavored, in reporting this bill, to make it fair and just; we have given four weeks of hearings to those who desired to be heard upon the different matters concerning the District of Columbia; we have endeavored to gather all the facts and to get all the information possible, I might say, regarding almost every item in the bill; and we believe we have the facts. We believe the bill has been thoroughly digested by your committee, and we believe also that the items contained therein represent the interests of the District of Columbia. We hope the bill will be acceptable to this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, in line 5, page 2, to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$6,000," so as to read:

Two commissioners, at $6,000 each.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the first two committee amendments to the bill be passed over without prejudice, to be recurred to after the other committee amendments have been considered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have not been able to examine this bill carefully, as I wish and expect to do before its final passage, but such examination as I have made discloses the fact that there is, generally speaking, a constant series of amendments proposed by the Senate committee which, almost without exception, increase the appropriations of the other House, already too large, in my judgment, and which aggregate an increase over the House bill of $1,709,105. The report of the committee also shows an increase in the aggregate amount of proposed appropriations over the law of 1914 of $1,753,017.49. A number of additional places also have been created—how many I have not yet estimated, but there are quite a number of them. Of course these involve salaries and are permanent in their character, for it may be stated almost as an axiom that an office once created is like Tennyson's Brook, "it goes on forever." It is easy enough, in other words, to create these extra positions, but it is extremely difficult to do away with them.

Mr. President, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate by interposing specific objections to each of these proposed amendments as they occur in the bill, and therefore I want, in a general way, as one Member of this body and as a Member of the majority, to record my protest against the constant tendency to increase appropriations in this body and to multiply the number of public officials.

The aggregate appropriations of the United States Government are appalling, and they are increasing by leaps and bounds. In fact, the tendency everywhere seems to be to make demands upon the Treasury of the United States, not only for public but for private purposes. The Treasury is regarded as a fountain of mercy, free to all, and reachable largely through the agency of the United States Senate. What the ultimate end of these conditions is to be no man can tell, but certain it is that the tendency grows by what it feeds upon. This condition has attracted public attention for a long time, and justly so; yet that public attention does not seem to have crystallized into an adverse public sentiment sufficiently strong to control or influence the action of the Congress of the United States in the direction of a sound economy.

At Baltimore year before last, Mr. President, the Democratic Party went on record against what it called "Republican extravagance." I want to read into the RECORD what we then said upon this subject:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Mr. President, this is a terrific arraignment of our political opponents as to their administration of the financial end of the Government. We not only accused them, we denounced them for a—

profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations * * * which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil.

That was either true, Mr. President, or it was false. If it was true, we certainly should not pay the Republican Party the compliment of servile imitation. If it was false, we should apologize to the Republican Party for this denunciation upon which we went to the people and asked for their votes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. But we are imitating that policy by increasing all appropriations; in other words, to use a slang expression, we are "seeing the Republican Party and going them one better." I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr SMOOT. Mr. President, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator in that connection that perhaps it would be well to state that the appropriations this year will be at least $100,000,000 more than the appropriations for any one year in the history of this country.

Mr. OVERMAN. How does the Senator know that when the appropriation bills have not been passed?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if after all the appropriation bills have been passed it turns out that I am mistaken, I would like him to call my attention and also the attention of the Senate to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will do so, and I think the Senator will need to make an apology then, because I do not think the appropriations will be anything like the amount he suggests.

Mr. THOMAS. If it should so turn out, I presume we will have to take refuge in Lord Clive's celebrated apology and "stand astonished at our own moderation."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that the Republican Party is ready now to accept an apology from the other side for this wrongful accusation.

Mr. THOMAS. So far as I am concerned, I am not yet ready to extend it, but I will be among the first to extend it if the tendency, which is now so manifest upon this side of the Chamber, shall materialize, as now seems probable.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single observation. I trust that no political controversy may arise in the Senate over the question of economy when we are considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill. It is a small bill at best, and it is an absolutely necessary bill. The committee has been very moderate in the increases they have attached to the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, that is the explanation, if not the apology, that is made for every increase in public expenditure—"it is only a little thing; let it go." Why, Mr. President, the accomplishments of men are made up of little things. A nickel is a little thing, and yet the accumulated nickels of the public constitute the revenues of our great public utility transportation concerns, meet their fixed charges, and pay their dividends.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is undoubtedly true, and some of us count our nickels very closely; but we have a statute, not created by the District of Columbia but by the Federal Government, whereby we have promised to pay to support this Capital of ours an equal amount to the amount contributed by the District. The people of the District of Columbia have been taxed and an amount of money has been raised, and as the bill stands to-day, with the increases made by the Senate committee, there is a balance of $670,000 which will revert to the treasury of the District of Columbia or to the Treasury of the United States. So it seems to me that we ought not to be parsimonious in making our appropriations to meet the amount raised by taxation from the citizens of this great Capital.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts amounts to anything—and I, of course, treat it with the utmost respect——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has said nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. I meant to have said "the Senator from New Hampshire."

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very much gratified to have the Senator make the mistake.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it is an honor to represent either of those great Commonwealths in this great body, consequently I do not think I should apologize to either Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, if the Senator——

Mr. THOMAS. I was simply going to say, if the Senator from Maryland will allow me, that if the logic of my distinguished friend from New Hampshire is cogent, then Congress must raise its appropriations for the District of Columbia under an existing statute as the assessments and levies are raised by the governing body of the District; in other words, the amount of our appropriations is determined, not so much by ourselves as by the action of the local authorities with reference to the local revenue. I do not think we can concede any such position. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator that there has been no extravagance manifested on the part of the committee; on the contrary, we have appropriated for the purposes of the District government less by $1,346,358 than was estimated by the commissioners.

Mr. KERN. Less than they asked for?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Less than they have asked for. We have also appropriated less than would be justified under the estimated revenues of the District for 1915 on the half-and-half basis by $670,435.59. I think, if the Senator will take the pains to look at the items one by one for which the appropriations have been made, he will not feel that he is justified in censuring the committee for making the appropriations they have made.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not disposed to measure the wisdom or the unwisdom of a congressional appropriation by the standard of the estimates made by those who want and demand and who will expend the moneys when they are appropriated. In saying that I am not reflecting, or, at least, I am not purposely reflecting, upon the good faith or the integrity of the officials of the District of Columbia.

I want to say, too, partly in reply to the suggestions of the Senator from New Hampshire, that my position is not aimed at this particular bill. I was unable on account of illness to be in attendance here when the Post Office appropriation bill was the subject of consideration. If I had been here, I would have said then what I am saying now, my purpose being, so far as I am individually concerned, to record a protest against what seems to me to be a disregard, if not a violation, of one of the planks of the Baltimore paltform upon which the Democratic Party came into power. We either meant what we said then or we did not. If we meant what we said, let us try to live up to it; if we did not, the sooner we acknowledge the fact and confess that the Democratic Party was engaged in a campaign of deception in so far as public expenditures are concerned, the better it will be for us and for the country. I know the temptations, the influences, the pressure that are brought to bear upon Members of both Houses of Congress by those who absolutely need appropriations, as well as upon the part of those who think they need them; and I know how difficult it is, in individual instances, to resist such suggestion as the Senator from New Hampshire has advanced. It appears everywhere along the line. It is the chronic argument, "This particular thing amounts to but little; it cuts no figure," so to speak, "one way or the other," and as a consequence it is allowed either in whole or in part and seldom rejected. It is not peculiar to this committee. It permeates the atmosphere of financial legislation everywhere.

Of course I recognize the fact that there are some increased appropriations that we must make. For example, there are a great many public buildings provided for, and a great many sites provided for. They may not have been wisely provided for, in the first instance, but the fact still remains that the amount of appropriation for them is inadequate to the end desired. As to matters of that kind, of course, increases are expected and desired, and should be given. I venture the prediction, however, that not a single great appropriation bill will come to this body but that it will be reported out, in all probability, with increased instead of decreased appropriations. That seems to be the history of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator in everything he has said. I think we are running wild on appropriations. The way to stop these increases is to sit in your seat and watch every item. If Senators would stay here and watch and discuss these increases, as they ought to do, while appropriation bills are being considered, instead of going to the cloakrooms, they would be doing great good.

Mr. THOMAS. I agree to that, also; and yet we know that there are many things which distract the attention of individual Members of this body. We can not all be here constantly. It is a good thing in theory, but it is almost impossible in practice. Of course I am one of those who try to be here as much as possible.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not criticizing the Senator. I said that on general principles.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully understand that, and I fully agree that there should be a greater attendance on both sides of the Chamber when appropriation bills are considered, whether they be great or whether they be small. I am not going to object to each individual item of increase, although I am against every one of them; but I simply wish now to record my protest once more against the inevitable and just consequences of disregard of our insistence to the people with reference to the subject of expenditures, with reference to the creation of useless positions, and with reference to the general subject of appropriations.

I desire to say before I take my seat, and I think it is no more than fair to say, that the Republican Party should not be

arraigned for profligate extravagance in the sense in which the people understand the expression, and possibly in the sense in which it was intended to be understood when that expression was incorporated into our platform. It is one of the usual practices, and a very commendable one, for the great political parties, as they alternate in power, to criticize and denounce vehemently their opponents' appropriations of the public funds. It is one of the good things in republican government, and, properly used, tends of course to economy and to a proper limitation of appropriations for governmental purposes.

The people of the United States, however, are very largely to blame for this condition. I am sorry to say there is not in the public mind the general desire and demand for the economical administration of public affairs that there should be, very largely because of the fact that each and every one seems anxious to secure something from the Public Treasury, irrespective of the fact that it can be replenished only by processes of taxation—by taking the money of the people, rich and poor, high and low, from them, ostensibly for public purposes.

I think, therefore, it would be better for us to take this bill as it came from the House and pass it without increasing one dollar of the amount appropriated. So far as the House is concerned, I believe it is just as subject to the reflections I am making as is this body, except in so far as the tendency of this body goes to increase appropriations.

Speaking specifically, I notice here one appropriation of $300,000 for a hospital which is something new. It is to be named after one of our most distinguished Members, a gentleman whom I have learned to respect and admire since I have been associated with him in this Chamber, and the use of whose name in connection with this hospital is a graceful and fitting recognition of his long and efficient service as a Member of this body. I wish to ask, however, independently of any question of sentiment, whether our revenues are such as to justify this very large added expenditure for the benefit of the District. In other words, do we need a $300,000 hospital at present, or can we get along without it, due consideration being had to the state of the Public Treasury?

I mention that item specifically because the chairman of the committee made direct reference to it yesterday at the time this bill took its place upon the calendar of unfinished business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me just a word?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Disclaiming responsibility for a few words that are in the amendment, and aside from the compliment that was paid me by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and especially by the distinguished chairman of the committee, and not caring whether they remain in the bill or not, I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that there is a condition existing in the municipal hospital of this city that would not be tolerated in any large city of the Republic of Mexico, to say nothing of the United States, for a single year. If the Senator from Colorado should visit that institution, which is located down on the banks of the Eastern Branch of the Anacostia River, he would be horrified, and would at once say, as the committee said when I invited them to go there with me, I having visited it several times before, that the Congress could not too soon remedy the existing condition. It is a reproach to civilization and common decency.

The reason a municipal hospital was not constructed years ago, as I argued should be done, was that it was urged that we should build a $3,000,000 hospital on this site instead of a $300,000 hospital. I resisted that contention; and when we came to the point where we could agree to have a moderate hospital, a comparatively small hospital, that would relieve the condition that existed in the so-called Washington Asylum Hospital, the committee wisely inserted this provision.

Mr. President, we can not afford in the interest of economy to forget the interests of humanity. I personally appeal to the Senator from Colorado, whose heart we know is always responsive to the demands of the poor and the suffering, to visit the present institution and see if he does not think the committee acted wisely in putting this item in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator how long the conditions have been such as he now describes?

Mr. GALLINGER. To my knowledge, for 25 years.

Mr. THOMAS. And during the past 25 years the Committees on the District of Columbia have not rectified this evil?

Mr. GALLINGER. There must come a time when an evil is corrected, and that time has now been reached. Constantly, year by year, the commissioners have recommended that something should be done, but we were confronted with a condition that had to be worked out. The contention was, on the part of certain gentlemen of influence, including the Board of Commissioners, that we should build a $3,000,000 hospital and destroy some of the other hospitals in the city, notably the Emergency Hospital and the Columbia Hospital, which have been doing splendid work. Those hospitals have now been taken care of, and the time has arrived when we can, by a moderate expenditure, relieve the deplorable condition that exists at the present time at the so-called municipal hospital which we now have.

As chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia for 12 years, and a member of that committee for 22 years, I have had this matter in mind, and have been greatly disturbed over it, and have hoped that the time would come during my service in this body when this most desirable work should be accomplished. I again say to the Senator from Colorado that if he will visit that institution he will be astounded at the conditions, and will agree with some of the rest of us that we ought not to practice economy at the expense of the poor people who are suffering for proper attention, proper care, and proper housing in that wretched institution, which no other municipality in this country would tolerate for a single instant if it could raise enough money to relieve the situation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I feel somewhat reluctant to visit the place, in view of what the Senator has said, because probably, as a result of my visit I might at least mentally censure the Senator himself for having permitted it to continue in that unfortunate condition during all the years he presided over this committee. I certainly should dislike to reach any such disagreeable conclusion.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Hampshire is quite willing to be censured for any neglect of duty in this regard. He has done a great deal of work for the District, and has always tried to act wisely. Of course, he was governed by the committees to which he belonged. It is a fact that there are a great many evils existing in the city of Washington to-day that ought to be corrected that will cost money, but they can not all be corrected in one year.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I admit that as to every enterprise of this kind my sentiments, my impulses, and, I trust, my humane instincts are quite as active as those of any other Member of this body. If it should be absolutely necessary to make an appropriation for the purpose of doing away with an intolerable condition, especially when that condition affects the diseased and the helpless, no man would be more swift to respond than myself. My experience is that inmates of public hospitals, generally speaking, are those who can not obtain admission into other hospitals, for instance, those which are conducted by the Sisters of Charity in the section of the country from which I hail. They are always better and more economically managed than the public institutions, however well they may be endowed. I am inclined to think that the institutions here have perhaps been affected by the same influences and the same conditions during all the long period of time they have existed.

I find, however, that there are other hospitals here, among which is the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, for which a new building is also provided by an amendment to this bill at an additional price of $50,000; that there is a Tuberculosis Hospital here, for which a total appropriation of something like $61,120, an increase of nearly $5,000 over the amount provided by the House, is carried in the bill.

I do not wish to be understood as making any factitious objection or any unreasonable objection or as constituting myself a mere obstructionist to any appropriation which is absolutely essential; but I realize the tendency and the direction of the Democratic majority. Unless we place some restriction upon our wholesale and indefinite appropriations—because some of these items are indefinite, as I may show hereafter—the people will very justly and very properly hold us to account, and our opponents will be able to draw a contrast between their own administration of public affairs and ours that will not in the slightest degree be favorable or flattering to us.

As one Member of this body, therefore, I do not propose quietly to permit these things to continue without recording my protest, even though I may be unable either to stop or to modify them.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me for a second?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Colorado suggested that the appropriation for the Tuberculosis Hospital was sixty-one odd thousand dollars. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. Sixty-one thousand dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; $61,120.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand. I call attention to it simply because we find there the usual increase.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is an increase of $5,120 over the amount in the House bill.

Mr. THOMAS. There is the difference between $56,000 and $61,120.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say to the Senator, if he will pardon me——

Mr. LODGE. I have the floor, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I merely wanted to say to the Senator that if he will visit that hospital he will find that it is managed in the most excellent way, and we feel, in comparison with other hospitals in the country, that it is managed as economically as any concerning which we have had information.

Mr. THOMAS. If it is managed in the most economical way, I should like to know why there is any necessity for increase.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because the number of patients has increased.

Mr. THOMAS. We are having increases in some cases because places are not properly managed and the others because they are.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will give the Senator the items. Three thousand dollars of it is for roads and sidewalks, and the other item is to furnish provision for the inmates, there being an increased number in the hospital.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during some years of service here I have observed that the speeches in favor of economy in public expenditures are usually made by the minority, although I have never noticed that the votes of the minority differed much from those of the majority when it came to increasing an appropriation in which the minority was interested. Therefore I quite understand the resolution in the Democratic platform in favor of economy, and I should not be disposed to say anything in regard to inconsistency if, when the Democratic Party found itself charged with the Government, it was discovered that it was easier to treat economy as an irresponsible minority than when responsible for the conduct of public affairs. That is all natural; it is human nature that when we are not responsible for making appropriations we should be very zealous for economy. But when we come to make the appropriations, while we should be just as zealous for economy, we find it is necessary for the proper conduct of the Government to make sufficient expenditures. I sympathize with the Senator from Colorado in his desire to live up to the pledges of that platform which is at times so sacred and again so disregarded. I understand his desire, but I should feel greater sympathy in this ardor for economy, which I observe in both Houses, if it did not always find its greatest explosion over the District of Columbia. There seems to be the most intense desire for the most rigid economy at the expense of these helpless people in the District, who have no votes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I trust the Senator will acquit me of the imputation of being particularly opposed to this bill. I had intended to say what I have said, as I before stated, when the Post Office appropriation bill was up for discussion; but I was detained from the Chamber by illness, and this is the first opportunity I have had to speak upon the subject. I assure the Senator there is nothing in what I have said that is intended to be peculiarly applicable to this one appropriation bill or to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. I noticed the Senator said that. My remarks were not directed especially to him. They were directed to the ardor for general economies which seems to become so violent when the District appropriation bill is up, particularly in the other House.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator's stricture is warranted, and I merely wished to set myself right in reference to it.

Mr. LODGE. I know the Senator said that he would, and I have no doubt that he will, criticize extravagance in every other bill, but the force of my remark I do not think is weakened as to the general readiness to be economical at the expense of the District.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with what the Senator says generally, but the taxpayers of the United States are interested to the tune of about $7,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. LODGE. I will come to that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the taxpayers ought to contribute their share to make this the greatest city on earth; and it will not do for the Senator to make the broad statement that this bill is made for people who have no votes, because the taxpayers of the country are interested in it.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say it was made for people who had no votes. I said that economy became particularly rampant when it dealt with people who have no votes.

One of the exceptions the Senator from Colorado himself made. He said there were certain things we must do. He mentioned public buildings. We must also make appropriations for rivers and harbors. Good roads are coming upon us. I think it will be noticed, if I may quote the old lines—

> 'Tis sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
> Bay deep-mouth'd welcome as we draw near home.

Some of the post-office buildings perhaps might wait and there would be no inhumanity to anybody, but it is said we must cut down the hospital for the District of Columbia and let post offices go over. In my judgment we are already making it general in both Houses to be very particular about the appropriations for the District, because the people here have no votes. If they had two Senators and two Representatives, you would not see that readiness which I have observed elsewhere to cut the appropriations, to undo the half-and-half act, to which this Government is as absolutely pledged as any Government can be to anything. It is a great pleasure to me to see that the Senate committee has unanimously set that proposition aside.

But, Mr. President, in a growing city it is absolutely necessary that there should be some increases from year to year. It can not possibly be avoided. I agree with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. He wants to make the expenditures here reasonable and proper, but we ought also to see to it that they do not sin against the wisest economy by holding back an increase which is made more necessary from year to year. This is the city of the Nation. I think we ought always to pay at least half of the expenses, and I think the amount we can save by cutting down expenditures here is, at the outside, not very large. It is well to bear in mind, if I may repeat, that it is an impossibility to prevent some slight increases of expenditures from year to year in a growing city as this is.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator permit another interruption?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to say what I intended to have said before taking my seat. I understand that the Government rent roll in the District of Columbia is enormous—something over $600,000. I believe with the Senator that true economy requires the erection of public buildings here to house the Government archives and the Government offices, and I would regard that not as extravagance but as real economy.

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly, it is real economy.

Mr. THOMAS. My remarks with reference to public buildings are as applicable to the District of Columbia as to any other section of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator was referring to post-office buildings. I did not realize that he had in mind the public building for the Government in the District of Columbia.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is correct. I intended to make this addition to what I said before taking my seat, and I thank the Senator for giving me the opportunity now.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not mean to detain the committee. I know they are anxious to go on with the bill. I only wanted to say this much and to express my firm belief that the committee of the Senate has made as small increases as were possible consistent with decent administration. I do not believe the members of the Committee on Appropriations are any more willing to be extravagant than any other Senators here, and before we condemn appropriations in this bill or any other as extravagant where increases have been made by the committee we ought, at least, to know all about the facts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word in connection with the contemplated appropriation for a hospital. I want to say to my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, that, differing from most of the States, including the little State from which I come, we have no institution in this great District for the feeble-minded. We have no inebriate asylum. We have no proper reformatory. All those were pressed upon the committee, but we did not feel like making appropriations this year for those much-needed institutions. The District of Columbia is infinitely worse off in those respects than are most of the other municipalities and the smaller States of the Union.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that I have noticed for a number of years since I have been on the Appropriations Committee that there has been a tendency on the part of the House to leave out certain appropriations that will be taken care of in the Senate. I do not think the Senate ought to be criticized too severely for many of the increases that have been made in appropriation bills, because I could call attention to many items of a char-

acter that have been counted as increases in this body that should primarily have been placed in the bill in the House of Representatives.

Mr. OVERMAN. Along that line I will ask the Senator, he also being a member of the committee, if he does not know the fact that at certain times absolutely necessary appropriations have been left out by the House knowing that the Senate would put them in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to tell tales out of school, but if I did want to do it I could say, what the Senator well knows, that there have been not hundreds of thousands of dollars, but millions of dollars that we have been compelled to put in appropriation bills when everyone knew they should have been put in the appropriation bills in the House of Representatives.

Mr. THOMAS rose.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply call that matter to the attention of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if his experience is to the effect or leads to the conclusion that this action on the part of the House is designed to compel the Senate to take the opprobrium, if any there be, of the increased appropriations?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I can not, nor do I want to, interpret the minds of the Members of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. But I say to the Senator that is the result, and it has been used in all parts of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand. It is one of the weaknesses of human nature to make somebody else take the blame. I have observed in the short time I have been here in public life that it is not corruption and dishonesty which lies at the bottom of congressional inaction or misaction, but it is political cowardice. We are afraid to do right because of the consequences.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to go into a discussion of the question of the hospital, but I want to plead to the Senator from Colorado that no point of order be made against that particular item. I should like to have the Senator go with me and visit that hospital to-day. I want to say that there is not a town in Colorado of a thousand people that would allow an institution to be crowded as are the inmates of that institution.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I can not understand why this intolerable condition has been permitted so long and why it is necessary for a Democratic administration to assume the burdens of the increased appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. I can say to the Senator that every year I have been on the Appropriations Committee we have provided some sort of a public institution for taking care of the poor and the blind, but we could not provide for all. We did have a makeshift there, and it has been getting worse every year since I have been on the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Yet the committee has not amended the conditions.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason is that we have had other items of the kind to take care of in the appropriation bill, and it was all we could do to get the House to agree to those items without going any further than we did.

Mr. THOMAS. Were those conditions worse than these?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in some cases yes, because we have had no institution whatever here to take care of certain unfortunate citizens in the District of Columbia and we had to provide for them. In those cases there had been no provision whatever made, and in this particular case there was at least a temporary provision made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is one change suggested by the Senate committee in the House bill to which I wish to call attention now, as the debate is becoming somewhat general, and I fear I may not be here when that part of the bill is reached. It is found on pages 24 and 25. The House provides for an assessment against adjacent property holders for street improvements, and the Senate committee strikes out that provision. I think, perhaps, the House bill goes a little too far with the assessment, and that it might well be modified so as to place the assessment of one-third against each of the adjacent property holders and one-third against the District.

I think property holders in the city of Washington ought to be treated just as they are treated in other cities, with, of course, the difference that this being the Capital, I believe the Government should liberally contribute toward making it a city worthy of our common country. But where improvements are made adjacent to property, the adjacent property holders receive the largest part of the benefit; and the result of the experience throughout the country, I think, has been that nearly every city in the United States assesses one-third of the improvements upon the streets to each of the adjacent property holders and one-third to the city treasury, upon the theory that the public at large receive one-third of the benefit and each of the adjacent property holders receives one-third of the benefit, and therefore an adjacent property holder should contribute directly toward an improvement which goes so largely to the improvement of his property. I think it is a mistake for the citizens of Washington to make an effort to free themselves in the matter of improvements from tax responsibilities that fall upon citizens of other cities of the United States.

I sympathize with their desire for liberal contribution from the National Government toward making this the most beautiful city in the land, but while that is being done they should be ready to pay taxes upon their property as citizens of other cities pay upon their property. You can go around the city and see improvements that are being made upon streets where the improvement is directly in the benefit of the property holders adjacent and yet the expense in the new additions falls upon the District treasury.

I think that the provision sent us by the House might perhaps well be modified to the extent of assessing the entire 40 feet half and half to the property owners. I think a part of it should come from the District treasury, as a part of the improvement goes to the general good of all the people of the District who drive over the streets, but a part of the improvement ought to be placed against the adjacent property holder upon the theory that he derives a benefit in excess of that which goes to the general public. It equalizes the distribution of these improvements. It also lessens the rush, the pull to get the improvements made in front of a particular property holder's property where a part of the cost goes to the adjacent property holder.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question? Does the Senator know any city where it is customary to charge the entire expense to the property holders?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I just suggested that I thought the entire charge was excessive.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. KERN. I can state to the Senator that in a large number of cities of the country the entire expense of street and sidewalk improvements is charged to the adjacent property owners under what is known as the front-foot rule. Not only that, but the cost of improving all street intersections is charged by assessment against property owners.

Mr. LODGE. In the city of Boston they charge for betterments on every new street, but the whole expense is not put on the abutting property. It is felt that those who get the benefits of passage through the street, the general public, ought to pay some portion of it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, I should like to make a suggestion as to this special matter. I wish to ask him whether he has taken into consideration the fact that the people who live on these narrow streets are poor people, and whether he has taken into consideration the further fact that those streets are not exclusively used by those people? Those streets are 40 feet wide. The custom of the past has been that these streets have been paid for on the half-and-half principle. In this case only streets 40 feet wide are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator from Maryland at once. Mr. President, the Senator's statement is not entirely correct. It requires a half-and-half assessment for a 40-foot wide street, and it requires the payment for a 20-foot street by the adjacent property holders.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes; but if the Senator will pardon me, the man who lives on the street only 40 feet wide has to pay it all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have heard this plea before; it is a specious plea; but it is not a sound plea. These improvements are largely made before the houses are sold; the improvements and the street construction precede the sale of the houses to the poor property owner, and they inure largely to the benefit of the real-estate owner who builds the houses and speculates in them.

Mr. GALLINGER. That may be true in the fashionable northwest, but if the Senator will go to the northeast and the southeast he will find there are miles of modest houses built on streets that have not been improved; and while the people living in the wealthy part of the city have had their streets paid for by the Government and the District of Columbia, it is proposed to put this burden upon the poor people in the other sections of the city.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment that I may ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from New Hampshire, who is very familiar with the question and knows so much about it, tell us has all the paving that has been done in the city of Washington been done at the expense of the United States Government or of the municipality?

Mr. GALLINGER. The abutting property owners paid one-half for the sidewalks, but the streets have been improved by the Government and the District of Columbia. When those streets have been opened there have been benefits assessed upon the abutting property owners, but when they have been paved or macadamized it has been done at public expense. That is the present system.

Mr. KENYON. I do not understand the Senator's statement that when the streets have been opened the expense of doing so has been assessed against the abutting property.

Mr. GALLINGER. When a new street is opened a certain percentage of the cost of doing so is assessed as benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is, the cost of paving, not the land to open the street.

Mr. GALLINGER. To open the street.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But really the adjacent property holders ought to give all the land to open the street, because they are the people who get the benefit of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. They do in a great many instances.

Mr. KENYON. It is true, is it not, that the cost of paving has been borne by the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that has been largely true in the past, and it is that objectionable system which the House bill seeks to change.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the present system; there is no question about that.

Mr. KENYON. I think it is objectionable.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What I wanted to say was that this last year the bill carried an appropriation for streets in the northeast. The Senator referred to other sections in the northeast. There were a number of streets that were paved at the Government expense—I went over them and looked at them—where the real benefit was to the adjacent property holder, and the benefit to the adjacent property holder was great; and I could but feel how unjust it was for the District as a whole to pay for those streets out of the treasury of the District when the benefit was practically all to the adjacent property holders and worth infinitely more to them than the cost of opening the street.

It is only because I have had the experience in the city where I live of paying for the development of the streets and the sidewalks, and for one-third charged against each adjacent property holder and one-third carried, I think, by the city at large, that I have felt that it was unjust to the treasury of the District to make these improvements in the interest of private property holders and not require them to contribute, as they contribute in other sections of the country, for benefits done their property by the improvements.

Mr. GALLINGER. What I meant to say, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, was that on all our great thoroughfares, our avenues, and our great streets the paving has been done out of the Treasury of the United States and the treasury of the District of Columbia. When you go into the suburbs—these rapidly developing suburbs—and into the northeast and southeast sections of the city, which have not grown as Washington expected they would, miles and miles of modest homes have been built for clerks and for the poorer people, and it is now proposed that this burden of paving the streets shall be imposed upon those people. It has not been imposed upon the people who live upon Connecticut Avenue, or Massachusetts Avenue, or New Hampshire Avenue, or Vermont Avenue, or any of the great avenues of the city; but at this late day it is proposed that this burden shall be transferred to the poor people who are building these little homes—they can not afford any better—and I think it is a great injustice. It may be that this matter can be compromised in some way, and that was the view the committee had in reporting to strike it out, so as to let it go into conference, there to be very carefully considered by wise men, to see if an adjustment could not be reached that would be fair. As it stands in the bill it is manifestly unfair.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. In the case of the repair of some of the streets here, say the Avenue of the Presidents, for instance, where the paving must be done over, who pays for that?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is done at public expense.

Mr. KENYON. At public expense?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is the rule.

Mr. KENYON. So that on streets where the homes of people of great wealth are located in this city, if the paving becomes destroyed and must be replaced, it is done at the public expense?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is.

Mr. KENYON. And at no expense to the property holders?

Mr. GALLINGER. None at all.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator think that a fair proposition?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not sure about that; I have not given it very careful consideration; but the man who occupies 25 feet front on a street may not use that street any more than does the man who lives 10 miles from that point.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But is not his property thereby increased in value?

Mr. GALLINGER. I doubt it very much. It is inconsequential.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it is increased in value, the owner of the property has to pay increased taxes and assessments upon it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have come to the Senate this morning against the advice of my physician because I felt a very great interest in this bill. I have waited here in the hope that I might have an opportunity to raise the point of order against the amendment that appears on pages 10, 11, and 12. The debate, however, is proceeding, and we are not taking up the amendments in order and discussing them, but we are roaming through the bill. I am apprehensive that I may not be able to remain until the amendment to which I refer is reached, and I should like to give notice that I want to reserve the point of order against it. I hope to be able to be heard against it if it is open to debate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I concur in the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that likely we had better proceed with the bill in order and discuss the amendments as they are reached, but the general debate was not precipitated by the committee; but members of the committee, of course, felt that they must make some defense of what they have done, so far as the bill is concerned.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me for just a moment——

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator was through. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I said that the abutting property owners pay one-half of the cost of the sidewalks. That is true; and, of course, they pay for the curbing; but the cost of paving, of asphalting, and macadamizing the streets is paid from the Public Treasury.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the debate seems to have taken on the character of a rambling discussion of the entire appropriation bill. I had risen at the time the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] rose to make an observation or two with reference to the very amendment to which he referred. I do not intend to go into any extended discussion of the proposition at the present time, but upon pages 10 and 11 of the bill appears an amendment which permits the Washington Gas Light Co. to acquire the stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. It is further provided that if any of the owners of the outstanding stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. do not sell at the price of $155 per share, proceedings can be had for the purpose of condemning that stock, not for the public benefit or for any public use but for the benefit of the Washington Gas Light Co.

Mr. President, I do not want to say anything that seems harsh about that provision or about the bill. I am so often accused of saying things with brutal frankness that I feel a special delicacy in discussing this matter lest I might impinge upon somebody's feelings. But this is the first time I have ever heard it solemnly proposed that the Government of the United States, under its power of eminent domain, could condemn the stock of a corporation not for its own benefit, not for the public benefit, but for the use of another private business corporation. This is the first time I have ever heard it hinted that the power of eminent domain can be employed to take private property from one citizen and turn it over to another citizen. The proposal is on its face absurd, unjust, and unconstitutional.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I took the same position in the committee. I have looked into the matter, and it strikes me that it is wholly unconstitutional; that the Government has no right to do what it is here proposed shall be done. Regardless of the policy of it, I inquire what right has the Government under its power of eminent domain to take the action proposed?

Mr. REED. I simply can not understand how it happens that the amendment is here in its present form. Of course, the Government has no such power. It can not condemn my house for the purpose of turning it over to Mr. Jones or to Mr. Smith; my house can only be condemned when it is to be de-

voted to a public use. The Government can not force one citizen to transfer his property to another citizen.

But, aside from that, even if the consolidation of these two companies were desirable, I would respectfully call the attention of the committee to the fact that when we fix a value of $155 per share, and do it by law, if the consolidation were to be effected and we were thereafter to undertake to regulate rates, the owners of the company could insist that they were entitled to a return upon $155, although the actual value of the stock might be much less. I simply view the proposition put forward in the amendment with astonishment. I am disposed to feel that there must be some kind of explanation which does not appear on the face of the amendment.

Besides that, I am opposed on principle to the consolidation of public-service corporations, certainly unless in the act of consolidation there be carefully written all of the provisions necessary to secure to the public fair and equitable treatment.

There is no greater graft—a term that is often used and often misused, but I use it advisedly—no greater graft has ever been systematically imposed upon the people of this country than the artificial-gas graft.

The gas plants of the great majority of the larger American cities are controlled by companies which are locally organized, and which apparently are local concerns, but an examination will disclose the fact that the United Gas Improvement Co. owns a majority of the stock and exercises complete domination and control over these supposedly local companies. It regularly and systematically loots the local companies or local stockholders by means of regulations and rules, which generaly prevent the payment of fair dividends to the local stockholders.

One of the favorite devices is to compel the local company to acquire all of its supplies through a purchasing agent appointed by the United Gas Improvement Co.; and this gentleman fixes prices which are sufficient to make great profits for the United Gas Improvement Co., while the local company is correspondingly "milked." Another favorite device employed to keep the local stockholder from ever obtaining any return is to make all of the additions, or a large part of the additions, to the plant out of the earnings of the plant, so that the local stockholders stand for years and years frequently without even the shadow of a chance of a dividend; but in the meantime the value of the property has been enormously enhanced. After the local stockholders realize they are never to receive any dividend returns, they, of course, are ready to sell at any price offered.

I do not claim to be an expert upon the cost of manufacturing illuminating gas, but such investigations as I have made lead me to the conclusion that in the city of Washington, located as it is close to the great coal supplies, gas can be manufactured and sold at a profit for from 50 to 60 cents a thousand feet.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will ask the Senator, if he will allow me, if that is not a matter entirely in the control of the Public Utilities Commission, and if they have not a right, upon investigation, to lower the prices in accordance with the prices at which gas can be furnished? I do not think the Senate is justified in fixing an arbitrary price, because we have no information on the subject; but, as I understand, the Utilities Commission was created for the sole purpose of making the companies, as they ought to be made, in my judgment, furnish gas at a price as low as possible, taking the stockholders into proper consideration. I ask the Senator if that is not the case—if the Public Utilities Commission are not in a position to make the companies furnish gas to the people here at a proper price?

Mr. REED. I can not answer the question "yes" or "no." An attempt has been made to confer power of that kind upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Whether or not the power has ever been tested in the courts I am not informed. This much I do know, however, that if Congress permits the consolidation of these two companies, a proposition which is utterly foreign to an appropriation bill, if we permit the consolidation to be made upon the basis of $155 for each share of stock of the Georgetown Co., that will become a recognized element of value which the Public Utilities Commission of the city must recognize when they come to fix rates.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KERN. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he has been able to get any information as to how it happened that this extraordinary gas-merger proposition found its way into an appropriation bill?

Mr. REED. I have not tried to find out. I have been astonished to see it. I have every confidence in the members of the committee and respect for them, but I do not understand what it is here for.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that in my judgment the reason the committee put in this item was that they thought they were benefiting the people. The two companies are not now competing companies. There is no competition between them.

Mr. KERN. If the Senator will allow me, does he not think it would have been very much better to have brought this in as an independent proposition, so that it could have been discussed on its merits and all the facts laid before the public, rather than to embody it in an appropriation bill, where it can not be discussed and voted on except in connection with other matters?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is being discussed now, and I presume it can be discussed; but I was going on to say that the reason the committee put it in was that the companies are not competing companies. The two companies—the Washington company and the Georgetown company—have specific territory in which they do business. The Georgetown company charge their gas consumers $1 per thousand cubic feet, and the Washington company charge their gas consumers 85 cents. There is no competition whatever. The committee thought that by merging the two companies the overhead charges and the various other charges would be less, and that the 25,000 inhabitants of Georgetown would have the benefit of 85-cent gas, or as much lower as the Public Utilities Commission might see fit to put the price.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri permit me to ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Has the substance of this proposed amendment been introduced by anybody, either in the House or in the Senate, as a separate bill?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It was put in as an amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It never has been introduced as a separate bill?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It originated before the Senate committee?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is my understanding, sir—that it originated as an amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I direct the attention of the Senator from Missouri to a feature of this matter which he may have discussed before I came in? To me this is rather a remarkable piece of legislation. It may be entirely justified.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will yield to me for just one second, as I understand, this measure was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] as an amendment to this appropriation bill, and it reached the Committee on Appropriations as an amendment referred to it by the Senate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As a proposed amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As a proposed amendment. It was brought up, in other words, in the regular way. We all understand, or at least I do, that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but it is so difficult to secure legislation that notwithstanding the rules we all know that a large proportion of the legislation enacted by Congress is enacted on appropriation bills. If it is not for the good of the public, if it is not for the benefit of the people, it can be easily eliminated. It ought not to stay here by the choice of anybody who thinks it is obnoxious to the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia. It is certainly subject to a point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask the Senator to yield to me that I may address an inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to inquire if a point of order against the provision under debate would be in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the bill is in charge of the Senator from Maryland, and that if he does not object, a point of order may be presented now.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought the paragraph had not yet been reached.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not yet been reached.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was waiting for an opportunity to make the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I hardly think that would be fair to the bill. I think it ought to be taken up by the various items, and if there is any objection to any matter here that would go out on a point of order, the point should be made at the time when it comes up.

So far as this matter is concerned, the committee put it in thinking it was in the interest of the people. If anybody feels differently and wants to take it out on a point of order, of course we have nothing to say. We believed the people were being benefited by this amendment, and we had no other reason whatever for putting it in. If it is not for the benefit of the people and they do not want it, that is the end of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED. I will yield to the Senator in order, Mr. President. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] had asked a question, and I had not concluded my answer to it. As soon as I can get around to the Senator from Mississippi I shall be glad to yield to him. I was not through with what I had to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will take but a moment. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Missouri, if he has not already considered it, one provision of this proposed amendment that seems to me most remarkable, and that is the provision which authorizes the Washington Gas Light Co., if it can not obtain these shares by purchase, to condemn them.

Mr. REED. I have already discussed that subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have never heard of one corporation being authorized to condemn the property of another corporation in order to engage in the same sort of business.

Mr. REED. I have already referred to that, but I am glad to have the opinion of the very eminent lawyer who has just spoken concurring in what I had said.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I rise simply to correct a statement that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] inadvertently made. I did offer an amendment relating to this matter, but not in the terms that are found in the bill. That amendment was laid aside and this amendment was subsequently submitted to the committee.

Just one word further, Mr. President. The committee had in view the belief that a merger of these companies would be greatly to the benefit of the public. Everybody, I think, concedes that. The committee perfectly understood, however, that the provision was subject to a point of order. The committee further expected that if the point of order was not made, the Senate would take up the amendment and perfect it.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Utah—and I am not a lawyer—that the provision to which they have called attention is probably not a proper one, but of course it can be put in different form. The price of the shares could be left to the Public Utilities Commission, and that would solve that problem. There are but a few shares—a couple of thousand shares—anyway, so that the burden that would be imposed upon the public because of the excessive valuation of those shares, if it is excessive, would not be very great.

What I wanted to say, however, was that the committee understood the provision was subject to a point of order. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] says he is going to make the point of order, and of course, so far as the provision remaining in the bill is concerned, that will end the matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is in error, I think, in stating that as there are but a few shares of stock outstanding, and that even if they were taken at an excessive value it would amount to but little to the public, for this reason: If we were now, by act of Congress, to fix the value of the outstanding stock, even if there be not to exceed 100 shares, that would immediately establish, or at least strongly tend to establish, the value of all of the stock of the company. The valuation thus determined would thereafter, in any proceeding brought to fix rates, become a basis for the rates. Besides, I insist that Congress has no more power to fix the price of a share of this stock and no more right to compel its transfer than we have to pass a law providing that the Senator from New Hampshire shall turn over his watch to me for $25 or any other sum.

I was interrupted in what I was saying in regard to one matter, upon which I want to conclude. I was saying that the United Gas Improvement Co. owns a controlling interest in nearly all of the great gas plants of this country, or at least in a very large number. The result is that a comparison of gas rates of the different cities of the country furnishes us but little information. The fact that a dollar is charged for gas in one town or a dollar and a quarter in another does not tend to show that gas is worth a dollar per thousand, because in nearly all of these towns the price of gas is controlled by the same parent or controlling company.

A few years ago proceedings were instituted to reduce the price of gas in New York City. The contention was made that the rates prescribed were confiscatory. The court, in passing upon that case, allowed at least to some extent franchise value, because, as I recall now—it is some years since I have read the case—it took as one of the elements of value of the whole property a valuation that had been fixed in some sort of proceedings many years ago as to a considerable part of the property, so that there was really an allowance for more than actual value. Nevertheless, in the city of New York the price of gas is fixed at 80 cents. Everybody knows that it costs much more to make and distribute gas in a city like New York than it does in a city like Washington.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me there?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator really mean to say that it costs more to distribute gas in a thickly populated city, like New York, than it does in this city of magnificent distances? Surely the Senator has not thought it out.

Mr. REED. I mean to say this, that the streets of New York underground are a complete network of wires, conduits, pipes, and sewers, and that to lay 100 feet of gas pipe in the city of New York probably costs more money than it would cost to lay a city block of it in the city of Washington.

The Senator smiles. I say that you can lay a gas pipe through the loose soil of a country district for probably one one-hundredth of the cost that is involved in laying it where you must cut through the expensive pavements of streets, and where you must lay your pipe with due regard for all the other conduits and pipes there are underground; and I affirm that it can be easily demonstrated, notwithstanding the larger population of the city of New York, notwithstanding the fact that it is more condensed, that it costs more to deliver a thousand cubic feet of gas in New York than it does in the city of Washington.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I did not intend to smile at anything the Senator said, and I do not think this is a question over which we can afford to indulge in levity; but it does seem to me extraordinary that the Senator should argue that it costs less to produce gas here than in a city like New York, where there are more gas meters in an area of a quarter mile than there are in this entire District, 7 or 8 miles square. It seems to me that is not a very substantial argument.

The fact is that the sale of gas in New York City in a small area, or in Boston or in Chicago, is enormous compared to what it is in the city of Washington. When the gas companies extend their mains out here 6 or 7 or 8 miles in the country, with only a few customers, it is manifest that it costs more than it does to supply gas to Broadway or Fifth Avenue or any of the great cities of Boston or Chicago. It seems so to me, at least.

Mr. REED. The Senator's view is a view that one would naturally entertain who is taking a mere casual glance at the situation; but I say to the Senator that investigations on these questions have been had, and plenty of them, and that you can lay a gas main in a small city and deliver gas there cheaper than you can in a great city, provided your small city is large enough to maintain a plant sufficiently large so that the ordinary economies can be worked out in the plant, and coal is near at hand and as cheap as in the large city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to woman.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside; and, without objection, House bill 10523 will be proceeded with.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I should like to finish this sentence, and then I will yield.

I have seen pipes and conduits in many instances that had to be put as much as 10 or 12 feet underground in order to escape interference with other pipes and conduits already laid. That, together with the higher cost of labor, with the long delays that come in putting in pipes and conduits in the thickly congested streets of cities, and a thousand other considerations, enter into the problem of cost. The fact is that the price charged in one city furnishes no substantial evidence of what gas can be furnished for in another city, because the companies in nearly all these cities are under a common control.

We had a gas war in my city once, and I saw the price of gas reduced to 50 cents a thousand and kept there for some years;

I saw my city lose that benefit by a consolidation of the two rival companies.

Now, it is said these two Washington companies do not compete, and therefore that they might as well be permitted to consolidate, and that by consolidating them we can give to the people of Georgetown cheaper gas. We all would like to see the people of Georgetown get cheaper gas, but in order to secure that blessing must we assist in the creation of an absolute gas monopoly? If the Washington company proposes to scrap the Georgetown company and itself furnish gas to Georgetown for 85 cents, then it is perfectly plain to me that the Georgetown company can do it now for 85 cents.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. REED. In a moment. We ought to be enacting legislation to reduce the price of gas instead of trying to increase the size of a monopoly. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Georgetown company tried the experiment a few years ago of reducing the price of gas to 85 cents, and lost so much money that everybody agreed that they could not afford to do it with the little plant they had.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not know who agreed to such a proposition. I do not know who the Senator includes in the term "we." But I undertake to say that whoever did agree to it did not go into the question of the cost of producing gas at all, because I know that gas can be made for less than 85 cents. I know that much about the proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I think this has reference to the question propounded by the Senator from New Hampshire, and that is in controversy. I wanted to give the Senator the cost of making gas during the year 1913 by the Washington Gas Co. I have the figures from the statistician of the Public Utilities Commission of this District. The average cost of producing 1,000 cubic feet of gas during the year 1913 was 47.26 cents. It struck me that on the question which was being discussed between the two Senators this has a direct bearing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is the cost of manufacturing, not including distribution.

Mr. NORRIS. This statistician says all expenses, including taxes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but not distribution.

Mr. NORRIS. I take it that includes distribution.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Missouri says that in any village gas can be produced more cheaply. I go to the little city in the State of Nebraska in which the Senator lives—McCook—where they charge gross $2, net $1.50 per thousand.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I have not made the claim that in a little city you could produce gas as cheaply as you could in a city like Washington.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the Senator from Missouri did.

Mr. NORRIS. But I have figures here, and I can produce them, as I expect to do in the discussion on the bill, which will show that the people of Washington from the year 1848 down to the present moment have paid an outrageously high price for gas, and that this company, the statistician tells me, has made gas during the last year at 47.26 cents per thousand cubic feet, and has been paying dividends up as high as 65 per cent; that it paid a dividend on its capital stock last year of 24 per cent, besides considerable of the indebtedness, and issued without any consideration whatever a great deal of stock.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is that Georgetown or Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the Washington company.

Mr. REED. So the Washington company makes those enormous dividends at 85 cents, but the Georgetown company can not sell, according to the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire, at less than a dollar without losing money, and yet their stock which it is proposed to condemn is put in here at 155.

Mr. NORRIS. That stock, I will say to the Senator from Missouri, is at the par value of $25. It is not $100 a share.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. I have not gone into those phases of the question. I was proceeding on "the light of nature and common account." I observe that a closer investigation brings a more startling result. A $25 share of stock is put in at $155 and the company is to be consolidated with another company in the public interest at $155, and yet it is asserted that the company can not possibly reduce its rate below $1 and the public can get no relief unless we permit this consolidation.

Mr. President, I hope this will be the last time a measure will be presented in this form to consolidate the public-service corporations of the city of Washington. I am in favor of the Government taking over these public utilities in the city of Washington, every one, and giving the people a service for what it costs. I have no fear of the evil of public ownership.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me? I made a mistake in the figures I gave. I said the capital stock was $25. I was thinking of the Georgetown company. That is $25.

Mr. REED. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. NORRIS. In my other remarks I was referring to the Washington Gas Co. The capital stock there is of a par value of only $20.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a good many years ago the cities of the United States secured their water from private companies. Those private companies were never as thoroughly consolidated as the gas companies are or as the telephone companies are. They were not interlocked and bound together so closely. Nevertheless there was some community of interest. The conditions grew to be so bad that a lot of extremists began to talk about the cities owning their own water-works plants. They were denounced as "anarchists," and "socialists," and "Populists," and every other kind of "ist"; but the movement started, and it has resulted in an immense reduction in the price of water to cities and an immense increase in the fire protection accorded the cities owning their own water-works plant.

The experience of my own city, where under a court decree we took over a plant at fully twice its actual value, furnishes a startling example. We increased the wages of the men; we reduced the price of water by 25 per cent; we practically doubled the size of the plant and paid for it out of the earnings. We made all those improvements and all those advancements from the earnings of the plant itself until a plant which cost us in round numbers $3,000,000 was actually earning interest upon over $12,000,000, and could have been sold for that sum.

There came a period in the rapid development and growth of that city when they could not quite keep up with the improvements out of the earnings, and some bonds were voted. But that plant can be sold to-day for three times the amount of money the people have in it. Besides, the price of water has been again reduced, so that we get our water for about 60 per cent of the prices formerly paid.

Mr. President, the experience of Kansas City is the experience of many American cities. The manufacture of gas is a simpler proposition than the securing of a supply of water, the purification of the water, and the distribution of it. There is no secret and no mystery any longer in the manufacture of gas.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. This controversy over the question of gas is by no means new. All through my part of the country it has been thrashed out for many years. Gas companies have been charging in many instances $2.50 and $2.25. I have here a volume that I have quoted a great many times. I am an advocate of municipal ownership of gas plants; and I say the only solution of this trouble will be the Government ownership of the gas plant of the city of Washington and in the District of Columbia. This was written some time ago. I read from Parsons's The City for the People:

> In 1885 the New York Senate investigated the gas companies in the city of New York and discovered that down to the year of the investigation the price to ordinary consumers had been for the most part $2.50 and $2.25 per thousand, and that more than half of such price was clear profit. In 1883 the average cost of gas to all the companies was 60 cents in the holder and $1 delivered to the burner, while the ordinary price was $2.25, and the receipts of all the companies averaged $2.16. In the year of the investigation the companies made a price of $1.75, and the following year it was reduced by State law to $1.25, which the companies were still charging in 1897, although 75 cents a thousand would then have yielded a good profit on the real investment, as was proved by the evidence brought out in another legislative investigation.
>
> In 1892 gas was being put in the holders in Boston at a cost of 33 cents per thousand; distribution cost 20 cents; allowing 7 cents for depreciation and 20 cents for interest on an allowance of $4 investment per thousand, which is more than fair, we find that 80 cents per thousand would yield an ample profit, yet the companies were charging $1.30 per thousand.
>
> In Chicago an excellent water gas—

And, by the way, the gas of cheapest manufacture to-day is water gas, costing practically nothing to manufacture. It is simply disintegrating the water, dripped or sprayed on a seething mass of brick or terra cotta, and the profit is enormous.

> In Chicago an excellent water gas is put into the holder at a cost of 20 cents per thousand—40 cents at the burner, including taxes, according to the statement of the two chief Chicago companies to the New York Stock Exchange in 1893.

This history can be repeated in almost every city in the country. The city of Alexandria, almost within the sound of our

voices, has for years maintained a municipal system of gas production and distribution as a benefit and a blessing to the community.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, he is talking about these things being new. I want to say that in Lynchburg, Alexandria, and several other cities in the old State of Virginia, long, long before the war they made and distributed their own gas.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And furnished and distributed their own water. There is nothing new about it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It will tend more to relieve municipalities and politics from corruption than any other one thing. The gas company and the water companies in my part of the world have been the dominating and controlling and corrupting influence in politics for the last 40 years. I want to stand sponsor for any effort that shall bring about the municipal ownership of these great benefits to the community.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the statement in regard to the cost of the various public utility products, if I may use that term, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] is in no respect an exaggeration. Many years ago an improved process for the manufacture of gas was discovered. It is a well-known fact that gas can be produced to-day for a small fraction of what it cost when it was made by the old process from coal. This Congress sits here and allows the Capital City of the Nation to be looted—for I think that is the proper term to be used—by its public utilities.

Let me give you an example. I am informed that an unlimited telephone service in a business house in the city of Washington costs one hundred and sixty-odd dollars a year. If I am incorrect, I wish some Senator would correct me. The population of Washington and the population of the two Kansas Cities that are divided only by the red lines of the map is approximately the same. You can get an unlimited telephone service in a business house in the city of Kansas City for $54 a year, and the service is better than it is in the city of Washington. How did we get this low price? By consolidating corporations? No. We had the old Bell telephone monopoly there. They charged us $98 a year for a service that was probably the worst telephone service in the whole world. We appealed time and again to the management of the company for a decent service, and we did not quarrel so much about rates as we did about service. There was at the time I speak of not to exceed 50 miles of metallic circuits in the town, although every country village had metallic circuits years before. The reason was that we were in the hands of the Bell telephone monopoly. We brought in a competing company, and we got the rates along with good service.

I had occasion to investigate that beneficent institution known as the Bell Telephone Co. I have often wondered why it is that the arm of the Government has not been stretched out after it.

The plan of organization is this: There is a parent company. The parent company proceeds to divide the territory of the whole United States into various districts. It then organizes a company in that district. In that company it takes 51 per cent of the stock to itself. It sells 49 per cent of the stock, and out of the stock that is sold it builds the local plant. Of course, the parent company, owning 51 per cent of the stock, controls the policies of the local company and takes down 51 per cent of its profits. Then the right is granted to that local company to organize other companies in the specified district upon the same terms between those companies and the local or head company as exist between the head company and the parent Bell company, so that in the end the Bell Telephone Co. owns a controlling interest in the companies that own a controlling interest in every one of the small companies. Thus it maintains its control throughout the whole of the United States.

And, Mr. President, in order to make sure that it will sufficiently loot and pluck these local companies it compels them to enter into contracts to pay royalties upon telephone instruments. We found upon investigation of that matter some years ago, when I had something to do with it, that the local companies were paying on the telephone receivers in Kansas City an annual tribute to the Bell Telephone Co. direct for the blessed privilege of using receivers and transmitters $2.50 per year, although you could buy a superior transmitter brand new for less than $2.50. The patents had long since expired.

Moreover, I state the fact that it is well known to those who have had occasion to observe, every time an independent company has sought to enter the field and give relief they have met with this sort of opposition, namely, the Bell Co., having the long-distance service, will refuse to unite their wires with the wires of the independent company or to transmit its messages, and when the independent companies get together and propose to unit their wires and give a long-distance service the Bell Co. will buy a link out of their lines, so that they can not give satisfactory long-distance telephone service.

Mr. President, this has gone on throughout the country for years. Right here in the city of Washington the people are being compelled to pay for business phones fully $3 where they ought to pay $1. If the Government of the United States were to take over this telephone plant and property, all patents of any real value having now expired, I have not the slightest doubt that every business man in the city of Washington would get an unlimited service for $50 a year. I am not afraid to have the Government try that experiment.

The time has come when we ought to set an example to the rest of the country through the government of the city of Washington. It ought to be a model city. It ought first to be a model city in its government. Every advantage of beneficent and wise and independent and just government should be conferred upon the people of Washington.

Then I am willing to go further. I am willing out of the public revenue paid by all the people of the country to liberally contribute to make this, the Capital of the greatest nation on earth, the most beautiful and splendid capital of the world.

I should like to see the Committee on the District of Columbia get busy with the proposition of solving these questions of public service. I would like to see that committee represent the people of Washington, who have no one to directly represent them. Let us give Washington gas, telephones, and electric light at cost.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] raised a point of order on this merger amendment, and I ask the Chair to rule upon the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. We have not yet reached the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Wisconsin was compelled to leave the Chamber. He had reserved the point of order, as I understood him, and he asked me to make the point of order at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It was asked whether the chairman of the District Committee is willing that the point of order should be made. I will say to the Senator that I am willing to have it made.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Wisconsin left the Chamber on the theory that the Senator from Maryland was not willing to take it up now. I believe the Senator from Maryland made a statement to that effect.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I say now that the Senator from Maryland is willing to take it up, and he asks the Senator from Iowa to make the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. In the meantime the Senator from Wisconsin has left the Chamber. I think he intended to come back by the time the amendment was reached in the bill.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that under the circumstances it would be well for him to wait until the Senator from Wisconsin returns. I will make the point of order when the amendment is properly reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor. Does he make the point of order now?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will make the point of order myself if no one else does.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gore | Martin, Va. | Shively |
| Brandegee | Gronna | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bristow | Hitchcock | Nelson | Smith, Md. |
| Bryan | Hughes | Norris | Smoot |
| Burton | James | O'Gorman | Stephenson |
| Catron | Johnson | Oliver | Sutherland |
| Chamberlain | Jones | Overman | Swanson |
| Chilton | Kenyon | Page | Thomas |
| Clapp | Kern | Perkins | Thompson |
| Clark, Wyo. | La Follette | Pomerene | Thornton |
| Dillingham | Lane | Ransdell | Tillman |
| du Pont | Lea, Tenn. | Reed | Warren |
| Fall | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Weeks |
| Fletcher | Lodge | Saulsbury | Williams |
| Gallinger | McCumber | Sheppard | |

Mr. KENYON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] is detained from the Chamber on account of a meeting of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and may not be here this afternoon.

Mr. REED. My colleague [Mr. STONE] is absent on account of sickness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is also absent on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if in order at this time, I wish to make the point of order against the amendment appearing on page 10, beginning in line 14, and ending on page 12, in line 21, that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill, and therefore out of order.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As chairman of the committee, I will say that that is agreeable.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I suggested a few moments ago, the Committee on the District of Columbia perfectly understood that this amendment was subject to a point of order. I had intended to make some observations on this subject, if it was discussed, but I will refrain from doing so, as I am very anxious to have the consideration of this bill pressed as rapidly as possible. Some statements have been made that are very inaccurate, but I will let time repair the mistakes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has asked that the first two amendments reported by the committee may go over, as the Chair understands.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I have asked that the first two committee amendments may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the reading of the bill begins, I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD a very brief table showing the price of gas in the various cities of the country, according to the well-known publication entitled "Brown's Directory of American Gas Companies."

Mr. REED. I have no objection to the request of the Senator, but, if the Senator can do so, I wish he would tell us how many of those companies whose names are contained in the table are controlled by the U. G. I.?

Mr. GALLINGER. I know nothing about the U. G. I. I am not acquainted with that individual.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the request of the Senator from New Hampshire will be granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

| City. | Population. | Price. | Candle-power. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Baltimore | 558,000 | $0.80 | 21 |
| Buffalo | 423,000 | 1.00 | 17.7 |
| Cleveland | 560,000 | .80 | 18 |
| Denver | 213,000 | .90 | 18 |
| Detroit | 465,000 | .75<br>.45 | |
| Indianapolis | 233,000 | .60 | 18 |
| Jersey City | 267,000 | 1.00 | |
| Los Angeles | 319,000 | .80 | 19.5 |
| Milwaukee | 373,000 | .50 | |
| Minneapolis | 301,000 | .85 | 18 |
| Newark, N. J | 347,000 | 1.00 | |
| New Orleans | 339,000 | 1.15<br>.75 | 22 |
| Pittsburgh | 533,000 | 1.00 | 20 |
| Providence | 224,000 | .90 | 19.5 |
| San Francisco | 416,000 | 1.50 | 22 |
| Seattle | 237,000 | 1.00 | 20 |
| Washington | 331,000 | .85 | 22.9 |
| Columbus | 181,000 | 1.00 | 17 |

NOTE.—The three cities where gas is furnished cheapest are Detroit, Milwaukee, and Indianapolis. In Detroit the Senet-Solway Co. manufacture coke and ammonia, and a portion of their surplus gas is sold at a low price to the gas company. In Milwaukee the Senet-Solway Co. also supplies their surplus gas to the gas company, thereby cheapening the price. Indianapolis formerly supplied the city with natural gas. When that failed they built coke ovens near the city. The old natural gas mains were allowed to remain in use, and the surplus gas from the coke ovens was furnished to the gas company at a low rate. In Washington the price of manufacturing gas is high, for the reason that only 10 per cent of the gas is made from coal, and for the remainder enormous quantities of oil are used, the estimate being that 12,000,000 gallons will be required, at the cost of $125,000, for the next year. The price of oil one year ago was 3.07 cents per gallon, while since last October it has been 4.15 cents.

Mr. KERN. I desire to ask with reference to the first amendment, which I understand is now under consideration——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has gone over temporarily at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. KERN. Very well; I was not aware of that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to say, in connection with what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has said, that I had an amendment prepared which I expected to offer to the committee amendment relating to the gas proposition, if it did not go out on a point of order. I shall offer one of the amendments which I had intended to propose to the committee amendment when it becomes in order after the committee amendments are disposed of, and I shall submit some remarks on the gas proposition at that time.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "one," to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,600"; and in line 11, after "$840," to strike out "one $720, one $900" and insert "two at $720 each"; so as to read:

Assistant secretaries to commissioners—one $1,600, one $1,200; clerks—one $1,600, one $1,500, one $1,400, two at $1,200 each, one (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) $1,200, one $840, two at $720 each; messengers—two at $600 each; stenographer and typewriter, $840; two drivers, at $600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "inspectors," to strike out "one $900, one $780," and insert "two at $900 each," so as to make the clause read:

Purchasing division: Purchasing officer, $3,000; deputy purchasing officer, $1,600; computer, $1,440; clerks—one $1,500, one $1,300, six at $1,200 each, three at $900 each, six at $720 each; inspector of fuel, $1,500; assistant inspector of fuel, $1,100; storekeeper, $1,000; messenger, $600; driver, $600; inspectors—two at $900 each; two laborers, at $600 each; two property-yard keepers, at $1,000 each; inspector of materials, $1,200; temporary labor, $150.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I move to disagree to the proposed amendment of the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment and will make the simple observation that here are two inspectors performing valuable work, one of whom is paid $900 and the other $780 per annum. They are doing exactly the same kind of work, and the committee felt that $900 in these days of high prices was not an excessive salary for an inspector. For that reason they equalized the salaries, giving each inspector $900. I do not believe the Senate will think that is an unwise increase.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that we are not giving what was asked. The commissioners asked that these salaries be made $1,000 each.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I understand, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] raised a question on that amendment——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The amendment was adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well; if it is agreed to, that settles it; but I understood the amendment was in controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the question was put the Chair ruled that the "ayes" appeared to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That was on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all right.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 3, line 3, before the words "at $1,200 each," to strike out "eleven" and insert "twelve," so as to read:

Building inspection division: Inspector of buildings, $3,000; assistant inspectors of buildings—principal $1,800, 12 at $1,200 each.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate disagree to the proposed amendment of the Senate committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator from Maryland will make an explanation of this amendment. I call his attention to the facts in the case.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a saving of $300 over what was estimated by the commissioners in the form in which we have placed the appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate committee increased the number of assistant inspectors of buildings at $1,200 each from 11 to 12, but the Senator will find that on line 5, in the same clause, we reduced the appropriation for temporary additional assistant inspectors from $3,000 to $1,500.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a transfer from the per diem to the regular roll; that is all.

Mr. THOMAS. Was the amendment adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "necessary," to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,500," so as to read:

Fire-escape inspector, $1,400; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$115,670" and insert "$125,710," so as to read:

In all, $125,710.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent for the clerks to be allowed to correct all totals in the bill. There will be some corrections to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and that order will be entered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee which has just been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 16, to insert:

Buildings for fish market: For constructing buildings for fish market on the water frontage of the Potomac River, lying south of Water Street, between Eleventh and Twelfth Streets SW., on the site designated as a municipal fish wharf and market in the District appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, approved March 4, 1913, $125,800.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that item was estimated for by the commissioners and hence is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think it is in order; but it seems to me that $125,800 is a large amount for a fish house.

Mr. THOMAS. If the amendment is in order, then I move that the Senate disagree to the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I was about to move to strike out $125,800 and insert $100,000. I made that motion in the committee, and I repeat it here. I think $100,000 is enough money to build a fish house on the river front, and to build a very handsome one.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, in regard to the amount of money necessary to build a fish market I will say that personally I know nothing about it whatever. It was represented to the committee that it was very important to have this building. A commission was appointed to investigate it. The matter was thoroughly investigated, and this was the amount of money that was reported to us as necessary to construct the building. I do not think any member of the committee knows whether or not the building can be constructed for less; but we have to depend upon somebody. This subject was put in the hands of experts, and, as I have said, the sum indicated was decided upon as necessary.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will suggest to the Senator that Col. Harding, the engineer commissioner, approves of it, and the municipal architect has prepared the plans and furnished the estimate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think this is a time when we ought to cut our cloth according to the proper measure. If it were a matter of constructing a building on some great avenue here, a different question might be involved. I have always voted for fine buildings on such thoroughfares in order to beautify the city, but this is merely a proposal to build a fish house on the banks of the river, and it does seem to me, although I am not an architect, that the municipal architect ought to cut the cost down to $100,000. That sum, it seems to me, ought to build a pretty nice fish house on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not simply a fish house, it is a fish market; and it is one of the most-needed improvements in the District of Columbia. It is curious to me that the same body which will throw $40,000,000 into Alaska to build railroads for 35,000 white people there should hesitate about spending $125,000 for a fish market in the Capital of the country for the benefit of the entire people of the Capital, especially now in times of the high cost of living, and all that sort of thing. While building a fish market, it is desirable that it be made somewhat ornamental and that it should not be simply a barn. I express the hope that this provision may remain in the bill and may receive the indorsement of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is quite true that I recorded my vote in favor of the Alaska bill as it passed this body, which made provision for a bond issue of $40,000,000 for the purpose of relieving a situation in one of the great dependencies of this country; a provision for an emergency which is absolutely exigent. But I voted against the conference committee report, which makes that appropriation a direct charge upon the Treasury. I am prepared to vote for adequate appropriations whenever and wherever they seem to me indispensable; but I do not think that it is necessary that the proposed fish market should be constructed here at this time. They have gotten along for many years without it. I think we ought to make these general appropriations as small as possible. If I am guilty of any inconsistency, I can only say that in that particular I have a great deal of good company in this Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would suggest that if the Senator would go down into that part of the city and look around and smell around a while he would be convinced of the fact that although we have gotten along with the present situation it is very advisable to cease getting along with it any further, on sanitary grounds as well as others.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, every objection that I make to these various appropriations seems to be followed by the suggestion from somebody that I ought to go around and look around and smell around. The Committees on the District of Columbia have been looking around and feeling around and smelling around for a good many years, with the result that they permitted these conditions to continue; but this bill contains a great many things that are here because of the fact that certain things will not bear looking around, feeling around, or smelling around.

Why should these various items be saddled at once upon this administration? If these intolerable conditions have existed, we are not responsible for them; and if they do exist, it seems to me that we can tolerate them at least long enough to enable us to understand and to realize what the amount of our revenue is going to be under our new policies. We do not know what amount of money we are going to have at the end of the fiscal year, except as we can estimate it, and very naturally these may be very substantially erroneous.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield in a moment. I was going to say that I think until by the actual operation of our new fiscal system we shall have ascertained what our revenues are to be we should not take these chances upon appropriations out of the general revenues, whether for building railroads in Alaska or for any other purpose. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to say to the Senator that every year we have provided more or less for improvements, of which this would be only one among others.

Mr. THOMAS. This is going to provide more instead of less.

Mr. WARREN. As a general thing, more of similar improvements have been contained in appropriation bills of the past than in this bill. From what I heard as I came into the Chamber this morning, when the Senator from Colorado was speaking, he seemed quite solicitous about the Democratic Party and its platform, and I honor him for it. I think that is the proper course for the Senator to take, to abide somewhere in the neighborhood of the provisions of that platform; but, Mr. President, some three years ago the House of Representatives passed from Republican control to Democratic control, and the same announcements were made as to economy and what should be cut out, and so forth; but after the appropriation bills had been prepared in the House and sent to us, we found that they exceeded those of the year before; and, of course, they were not less after they had passed through the Senate and through conference. Yet in the next election instead of holding the Democratic House responsible because it expended larger amounts than had been appropriated theretofore the people—the voters of the country—swept the Republicans entirely off the deck and elected a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in both branches.

I think the Senator is mistaken in thinking that this country wants to go wild on the economy side and leave these very necessary improvements uncared for because there is a change of administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator think——

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I have served on the Appropriations Committee under the administration of Mr. Cleveland and the Presidents since, up to the present time; and I have heard very often on this floor and elsewhere that a change of administration would affect the expenditures. But it does not do so, because the country is a growing country, and you can not put the child's foot in a wooden shoe and keep it there at the same size always unless you wish to make a Chinaman out of him and stop his future growth.

I have said here on this floor before—and I say again—that it does not matter who controls the Government for a term of years. You may cut down in one year, but you will have to make it up in the next. It is going to take a good deal of money. The Senator was in favor of the Alaskan improvement;

we were all in favor of the canal improvement; but all this costs money. The country is growing, and the total of the appropriation bills, therefore, is bound to grow.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am afraid the prophecy made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] this morning is going to prove true. The estimates alone this year are $28,000,000 more than they were last year, and this bill carries $1,700,000 more than the last appropriaton bill for the District of Columbia. So I think we ought to economize, and in this instance I think we can put up a building for $100,000 that will answer every purpose. I have seen public buildings erected in my State costing $125,000, and a county would build a courthouse right alongside the Government building for $60,000 and secure just as good looking a building. The architects, it seems to me, are very extravagant in making up their plans. I say let the architect cut his cloth according to the appropriation, and not make estimates which are so wild and extravagant. If we go on in this way we will finally swamp the Treasury. I am willing to let them have a fish house here, but at the same time I wish to cut down this large appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has called my attention to the fact that the Democratic House of Representatives elected in 1910 in its appropriations was more extravagant than its predecessor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not wish to be quoted in that way. I do not believe I said it in that way. If so, I want to correct myself.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not pretend to give the Senator's exact language.

Mr. WARREN. I said the total appropriations amounted to more; I did not say they were extravagant; I presume they were necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I will put it in that way; I do not wish to misrepresent the Senator. It seems to me, however, that that is a legitimate inference; I will not make it, however.

The Senator also said that these larger appropriations received the sanction of the Senate, notwithstanding which the country went Democratic and both Houses passed under the control of that party. The logic of that statement would lead us to the conclusion that the Democratic Party came into power at both ends of the Capitol because they increased appropriations after they obtained control of one House. That may be so; and it is possible that, if we continue these increased appropriations, it may result in continuing us here indefinitely in power; I do not know.

The great leader of the Republican Party on the floor of this body a few years ago said—and I do not think the statement can be successfully challenged—that a proper business administration of national affairs would result in an annual saving of $300,000,000. I believe it, and I believe to that extent our financial administration is extravagant and that it is a failure. I know of no way in which that can be corrected except by questioning these extravagant appropriations as they come, and in doing that I do not intend to reflect upon the integrity or upon the good faith of the committees having charge of these bills.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of extra appropriations. Is he satisfied that in the race for economy we shall accept as all right everything that we have had before and add nothing now? Would it not be as well, if you seek to economize, for the Senator to look into the annual and other expenditures that have been incurred heretofore and are continuing appropriations?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would.

Mr. WARREN. Here is a proposed expenditure that reflects upon the sanitary conditions of this city. The amendment under discussion is a remedial measure. It tends toward the production of healthful food, for, as we know, fish food is healthful. Certainly if there ever has been a time when it was necessary to nourish our fish industry it is now, when meat food is so high. This city would become more and more insanitary as this industry or trade grows larger if these remedial measures should not be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator believe the construction of this fish house would reduce the price of fish to the consumer in Washington? If he satisfies me on that point, it will go a long way toward securing my vote for this proposition.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that, whether it reduces the price of fish or not, it will improve the quality. If the Senator wants to make objection to these appropriations, it seems to me it is due the Senate that he should inform himself about the matters. If he is prepared to say that there is no need of this building, or that it can be built for less than this sum, let him demonstrate that.

Mr. THOMAS. I am simply prepared to say that the city has gotten along heretofore without these improvements, and I think the quality of the fish has been very fair; but I have not lived here as long as the Senator has.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have been to the fish wharves, and they are in very bad condition. In fact, they are a scandal. It is a disgrace that this part of the food supply of the city should have been furnished in any such place as it has been furnished.

Mr. THOMAS. I am satisfied, however, that the best way to cut down the aggregate is to make objections to the small increases in appropriations. If the Senate wants to increase these appropriations, if it is absolutely necessary, I am not going to make any factitious objections. I shall not stand in the way, alone, against the increases of appropriations on these great bills. I shall content myself by recording my protest.

This is but a small part of the numerous appropriations that are going to be made, with increases all along the line. I think a proper regard for the ultimate result, taken in connection with the fact, as I have stated, that our revenues are necessarily largely estimated on account of our change of fiscal policy, justifies the objections I am seeking to make.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the actual figures given in the estimates made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They call attention to the fact that this property was formerly claimed in private ownership, but that under a decision of the courts it came into the possession of the Government in 1903. Then it was leased for 10 years to private parties, and was taken by the Government last year, and has been operated by the District government for 12 months.

They say, in their estimates:

> By an item contained in the last District appropriation act this market was made a municipal market and was constituted the sole wharf for landing fish and oysters for sale in the District of Columbia and placed under the control of the commissioners for operation. It has been so operated since March 15, 1913, the date of the expiration of the lease, and the annual revenues, based on six months' operation, are estimated to be somewhat over $10,000 per annum. The buildings are not modern and the sanitary conditions are not what they should be. The present buildings should be torn down and replaced by a modern sanitary market, for which the above estimate is submitted.
>
> The details of the estimate are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Main building, 460 feet long, 40 feet wide, 1 story high, with 2 stories and attic in central portion | $98,406.40 |
| 2 packing houses, 64 by 22 by 18 feet | 7,704.80 |
| Boiler and refrigerating house, 20 by 48 by 24 feet | 4,608.00 |
| Boiler | 1,000.00 |
| Refrigerating and heating | 4,350.00 |
| Smokehouse and tank | 3,000.00 |
| Shed over fish wharf, 40 by 60 feet | 2,200.00 |
| Counters, etc., in fish houses | 2,400.00 |
| Scales | 1,100.00 |
| Plans and specifications and inspection | 1,000.00 |
| | 125,769.20 |

Mr. OVERMAN. Is the Senator reading from the House hearings?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am reading from the estimates made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, showing what is required and what each item will cost.

Mr. OVERMAN. I thought the Senator was speaking of the House hearings.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. So it seems to me the suggestions made, that the amount should be reduced, can not be very well sustained, in view of the fact that the items are all given here, and the amount required for each. It is simply a question whether we need this fish house, and whether we need a modern structure of this character, with conveniences for refrigeration, curing, and all the other things that attend a modern fish house. If we do, I do not see how we can get along with an appropriation of less than the one that is called for. It seems to me evident that we do need it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask some member of the committee—the chairman or the former chairman of the committee—in what manner this market is supposed to be operated. Is it operated directly by the Commissioners of the District, or are stations in it leased out under the control of the District for a revenue or license or fee? If so, what revenue would be likely to be had from it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that formerly the space was leased, and there was an income of $1,400 a year from it. A short time ago we put it under the control of the commissioners, and they have operated it, I think, for six months. It is now estimated by the commissioners that if this new structure is built they will receive an income of from $10,000 to $12,000 a year, a very large revenue, from this expenditure.

The chairman of the Board of Commissioners says the conditions there are horrible, and I know that from personal inspection. Our feeling was that if by replacing with a modern structure these dilapidated buildings and the horrible conditions there, we could get a revenue of from $10,000 to $12,000 a year from the property, we certainly would be justified in erecting there decent, clean, and sanitary buildings.

The proposition is to make this a wholesale and retail fish market of an approved type; and I feel sure that any Senator who will visit the place, as I visit it occasionally for the purpose of buying fish, will be satisfied that this ought to be done.

I notice the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] says we have made an increase in this respect. That is true. But we have reduced the appropriations carried by the bill $670,000 below the estimates; so that if the same percentage of decrease is made all through the bills that come here, I think the Senator will not have cause to complain. The Senator must remember also that this bill will have to run the gantlet of a conference committee, and beyond question it will be largely reduced, I regret to say, from what it is now.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is a point I have made in regard to the erection of these buildings—that these people always estimate from a million to ten million dollars more than we are going to give them, anyhow. Here they estimate $600,000 more than we have given them; and they ask for this building at $125,000, when I say that they can erect a building for $100,000 that will answer the purpose.

Look at this estimate. They propose to put up a building 460 feet long. I say they can put up a building 400 feet long for $100,000, instead of putting up a building 460 feet long for $125,000. The estimate which the Senator referred to is really an argument in favor of lowering this appropriation. The building is too long. It is too much of a building. Let us erect a building in keeping with a fish market and not a great extravagant building for $125,000.

Now, a point of order. I think the amendment I introduced before the motion of the Senator from Colorado to strike out is in order first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so considers.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I make no point about that. I am perfectly willing to have it so considered.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, it seems to me, with all due respect to this discussion, that the whole question is whether the unlimited sea-food supply of the waters of Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland can be availed of in the National Capital. There is no place in this country where the cost of food is higher than it is here in Washington, under the immediate supervision of the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives. It is a notorious fact that the cost of food supplies here in the District of Columbia is higher than it is elsewhere.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I made an inquiry a moment ago, and I will repeat it. I will ask the Senator from Maryland whether he contends that the construction of this fish market will reduce the price to the consumer in Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will render the fish more accessible, anyhow.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, that is the whole question involved in the proposed construction of this building. If it will not reduce the price of sea food to the people of this District, it is not worth while to build it.

Mr. THOMAS. I am unable to perceive how the construction of a building is going to influence the price of food.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I should think it might be argued that it would, because it will permit the use of improved refrigerating processes; and if you can keep your fish longer, and keep them in better shape, I should think they could reduce the price.

Mr. THOMAS. But we have all those conditions in the case of meat, and the price of meat is rising. We have all the modern refrigerating improvements, and still the price increases.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But I think the Senator will admit that in the case of a man who sells fish, the smaller the quantity he has to throw away, the better he can keep them, and the longer he can keep them the cheaper he can sell them.

Mr. THOMAS. Perhaps that would naturally follow, but our experience does not justify it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That I do not know anything about.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado further yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The question seems to be whether or not, under this municipal government, there shall be an effort made to apply refrigeration and cleanliness and storage and general good management from a municipal standpoint to this very vital and important question of reducing the price of food supplies.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if these facilities do not obtain now—refrigeration, for example?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. As far as I am advised, they are altogether in the hands of middlemen and people of that type. This seems to be the first step in the direction of refrigeration and storage under the control of the municipal authorities. For that reason, in view of this enormous supply of cheap and nutritious food available from these sea sources it is almost criminal that Congress has so long neglected to supply the demand that exists here with a reasonable competition from these unlimited sources of nutriment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think I am perfectly safe in saying that we have fish markets here, extensive, clean, with all modern facilities for the preservation of fish and keeping them in good condition, and have had them for some time; but I shall not prolong the discussion. It seems to me that the logical result of it all is, viewed from a Democratic standpoint, that where the Republicans make an increased appropriation it is profligacy and where we make one it is necessity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is, of course, eminently right about one thing. It is true in connection with all the improvements that ever were made in the world that the world got along somehow or other before they were made. We got along without the Declaration of Independence until after we made it, and we have gotten along without everything that has been done up to the time we did it. The question is whether we are going to continue to get along without this improvement. The question is not whether it has been bad enough in the past and the fault of the Republican Party, but whether we are going to stand responsible for continuing it in a condition bad enough.

The Senator has talked about economy. I believe in economy. I am an old-fashioned fellow, not only in my legislative capacity but in my individual capacity; so old-fashioned that I never contract a debt beyond about 30 days for household expenses. You can not cure extravagance, however, by continuing to waste at the bung while you are trying to save at the spigot. You might just as well try to increase your bank account by doing without socks while you wear a fur overcoat. Gentlemen who want to spend four-fifths of the entire income tax of the country for one year to build railroads in Alaska ought not to be cheeseparing about $125,000 for a fish market in the city of Washington, especially when you reflect that the people of the city of Washington put up one-half of the money, so that you are not spending even $125,000, but only one-half of it.

Upon the question of extravagance generally the Senator from Colorado is eminently right again. This Government is not only ridiculously extravagant; it is criminally extravagant.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator yield for a correction of a statement he has made with respect to my colleague, who is not here?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator made a statement as to his voting in favor of the Alaskan railroad bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not do anything of the kind. I made no statement at all about how he voted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understood the Senator to state that my colleague voted in favor of the Alaskan railroad bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said I could not understand how gentlemen constituting a body which has just voted away four-fifths of the amount of the income tax for one year for transportation facilities for the 35,000 white people up in Alaska should be cheeseparing about $125,000 for a fish market in the Capital of the Nation.

Mr. President, I think this country is not only ridiculously but criminally extravagant. The Senate of the United States cost a few years ago, and I suppose it still continues to cost, though I have not looked it up in late years, ten times as much per annum as the House of Lords, a body which is the very type of "effete old Europe," as we call her, with all of her extravagant ways. The House of Representatives spends several times as much as the House of Commons. These great extravagances seem to have gone on to a point that, in my mind, constitutes a criminality, and yet the American people seem to be so constituted that you can not appeal to them in behalf of economy.

Now, for heaven's sake, let us have economy; let us go to work and keep our party pledges; but let us stop up the bung, and not fool altogether with the spigot. Whenever gentlemen want to economize they come to economize upon the District of Columbia. I can tell you the main reason why $40,000,000 is put out in Alaska and $125,000 is strained at here. It is because a great political influence was behind the Alaskan project, a great section of this country with votes, while behind a fish market in the District of Columbia or anything else there is nobody with a single vote; no sort of politics at all except the sort of political influence that may be exercised by gentlemen who quadrennially come up to national conventions with contesting delegations, and I do not suppose that amounts to much.

There is some sense in beautifying the great capital of the country. There is some sense in making its conditions, and especially its market conditions, sanitary. There is a beauty and a majesty of sovereignty resting about the National Capital. We have not spent too much money in Washington; we have spent too little. There ought to be a great hall of records here, for example. We ought to cease renting all of the buildings that we are renting for departmental purposes. Beautiful pillared and columned buildings ought to be there to take their places.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment. If Senators want to economize, let them cast their eyes down toward the Pension Bureau; let them cast their eyes over the naval appropriations; let them come closer to the military appropriation bill; let them scan more particularly very many objectionable items which appear on river and harbor bills; let them scan with a little greater particularity very many still more objectionable items that appear upon public buildings bills—the expenditures that you and I are making for the purpose of retaining popularity in our districts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know whether or not the Senator was here this morning when I stated that I believed the Government should erect more public buildings here in the District of Columbia, and among other things a hall of records. I believe the Government is paying more rent here, perhaps 75 per cent more in each instance, than is charged to local tenants for the same space; and I quite agree that it would be the highest sort of economy for the Government to house all of its officials and all of its records here in buildings of its own.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is looking at what I am saying from a mistaken viewpoint. I am not debating with him. I am arguing this question. When I make these statements of my opinion, I am not criticizing him in any way, nor attempting to engage in a debate with him. I am visualizing the question itself.

When you come down to this proposition, I wish there were as good a basis behind most things we do as there is behind this. Here is a proposed expenditure of $125,000 in order to obtain a revenue of $12,000. Where did you ever get it for a public building in your district? It is nearly 10 per cent gross, probably 7½ to 8 per cent net. It is an investment, and such an investment as almost any property holder in the city of Washington would make.

I am glad the Senator from Colorado has sounded the tocsin upon one question. I do not believe in a nation being extravagant. I abhor waste, and I think a good deal of the trouble we are in now is not only the high cost of living, but the cost of high living. The individual American is wasteful and extravagant. The municipalities are so. The States are a little less so. The Federal Government is a little more so. There is no sort of business in the world that an American can go into without seeming to think it necessary to advertise himself by being wasteful and extravagant and ostentatious. It seems to be a national trait in our private life and in our public affairs. We love to do a thing because it is big and spectacular and expensive. We love to run in debt, individually and municipally and nationally. We ought to cut down expenses.

Somebody says this is a great and a rich Government. It is a great Government, but it is not a rich Government. Every Government that ever existed was, and every Government that now exists is, a pauper. It has not a dollar in the world that it does not get by putting its hands into somebody's pocket. It is a beggar, or else a robber, for every dollar it has. It is one or the other.

There never was such a thing as a rich Government. A Government is not a creator of wealth. It is not an owner of wealth. It is a mere gatherer-in and a distributor; and its money does not drop into the treasury like manna, the gift of God to the children of Israel. It is first taken out of somebody's pocket, and every dollar of it is subtracted from some other purpose.

There is not a dollar put into this Treasury and spent by this Government that is not subtracted from the comfort or the necessities of some individual, or else subtracted from public schooling or from church facilities or from road facilities or from some other useful purpose or economic facilities toward which that dollar might have been devoted in the States.

It is therefore our first duty as trustees for the people to use their money carefully and not wastefully. It is true, therefore, as in the case of any other trustee, that if we do use it extravagantly and wastefully we are using it dishonestly, because it is dishonest for a trustee to waste his fiduciary's money.

What is the spirit of the American Government here at this center? Are you and I and the Representatives at the other end of this Capitol engaged in the business of representing the people of the United States in saving money for them? No; you know we are not. What are we engaged in doing? Why, we are engaged generally in the business of trying to get out of the Treasury every dollar we can to put in our States or our districts. That is what is wrong with the American Government, and that is the reason why it is extravagant.

A member of the House of Commons does not feel that way about the English treasury, but our committee system and our representative system, where the man is always peculiarly a representative of a district, leads him to consider it a public duty to get out of the Treasury and get into his district every dollar that he can. Whose fault is it? Is it his? No; it is the fault of the people behind him, because they applaud him just in proportion as he gets money out of the Treasury and puts it in the district, and he knows that if he does not do it somebody will promise to do it and will be elected in his place.

We have to go to the root of this evil, if we have economy on the brain. We can not organize an economical government by objecting to necessary or advisable improvements anywhere, and least of all in this District, which is helpless and has no representative. It alone of all parts of the country has nobody paid and honored and admired because he gets money out of the Treasury and puts it at her service.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I voted with him on the Alaska appropriation. So the Senator can not charge me with voting $35,000,000 to build a railroad in Alaska, because I am simply trying to economize here. I wish to say that I have never failed to vote for appropriations that were plainly necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not said that the Senator from North Carolina voted extravagantly about anything or that he voted for the Alaska appropriation, either. The Senator misunderstood me if he thinks I said anything of the sort. I was comparing the two votes. I was not criticizing the Senator as voting against it or voting for it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think every Senator voted honestly on that question, and I was with the Senator on the proposition. I wish to say also that I have voted money to make this as far as possible one of the most beautiful cities in the country. I am in favor of voting everything that is necessary for the sanitation of the city as well as to beautify it. All I am trying to do is to economize as much as possible; and I think in making my motion to reduce the appropriation to $100,000 that that is a sufficient amount of money to put up a first-class fish market down on the Potomac River.

It is well to see the amounts that have been appropriated by Congress, say, in the District of Columbia appropriation acts

a few years back. The figures will show that the increase in this bill is much greater than in some of the other bills year after year. Of course as a city grows it has to have additional appropriations; but the appropriation for 1906 was $9,000,000 in round numbers; for 1907, $10,000,000; for 1908, $10,000,000; for 1909, $10,000,000; for 1910, $10,000,000; for 1911, $10,000,000; for 1912, $12,000,000; for 1913, $10,000,000; and for 1914, $11,000,000. This year the bill has gone about $2,000,000 above that of last year.

I am not criticizing the additions here, but I say there is too much money allowed for some of the public buildings. I think we spend too much money for public buildings, our court buildings and others, in the States. As to the estimate of the appropriation read here by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], I will repeat that a building 460 feet long is too much of a building for a city of this size. Therefore I insist on my amendment to fix the appropriation at $100,000 instead of $125,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in nearly everything he said in reference to appropriations for the District of Columbia. I am not one of those gentlemen who would take a delight in jumping on the District of Columbia. I rarely have taken a stand with reference to the District of Columbia appropriations, for the reason that I have never been a member of the District Committee of either branch of Congress, and I found myself unable to give time to the investigation necessary before a man should take a decided stand in reference to this city. The District of Columbia has been kicked around both branches of Congress, and gentlemen who vote for all sorts of extravagant appropriations square their consciences by attempting, always in good faith, to economize in the affairs of the District of Columbia.

But there is a necessity for economy, in my judgment, in every department of the Government. I think, perhaps, the enactment of the income-tax law, when its purpose and effect are understood, will have a deterrent effect upon some of the enthusiastic gentlemen who measure their right to come back to the Senate and the House by the sum total of the appropriations they have received for their respective States and districts. I propose, so far as I can see my way clear to do it, to vote against extravagant appropriations from all sources. I think that is the first duty of every Senator and of every Member of Congress, and particularly it is the first duty of Democratic Senators, because the Democratic Party is in control of the three branches of the Government, and I have it dinned into my ears by Democratic leaders and by men to whom the ordinary Democrats in the ranks look to furnish inspiration and leadership, that the prime and great evil of the tendency of the present times is extravagance in public affairs.

The only way to be economical is to be economical, and the only way to stop appropriations is to vote against them. Here is a proposition to expend $125,000 for a fish market along the wharves. I have examined both the House committee hearings and the Senate committee hearings and I can not find a line dealing with the subject. I do not say it is not in the hearings, but I failed to find it because of the fact that the hearings are not fully indexed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that it appears in the hearings before both the House committee and the Senate committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I have turned to the House hearings, and I spoke to a Member of the other branch about it, and he could not find it.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The Senator will find it on page 39.

Mr. HUGHES. Anyway I am informed that attempts were made to have this appropriation put in on the House side and that a subcommittee was appointed, or at least it was self-constituted, and an investigation was made, and it was decided not to put in the item.

I am more or less familiar with the conditions in that section of the city because I find it a very interesting locality. I like to see the boats lie at the wharves. Occasionally I pay a visit to that part of the city and talk with the men who bring up oysters and who ply to and fro between the oyster beds and the city of Washington. I have never, so far, discovered any necessity for an expensive fish market there. My observation has been that the traffic at that point consists almost entirely in the transportation and sale of oysters. There is a fish market in the general market, and nearly all the fish that come to the city of Washington come in by rail. Very little of the product comes up in those boats. Nearly all the boats ply between some point in Virginia near Norfolk——

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the next item in the bill is an amendment making an appropriation of $50,000 to reconstruct wharves at that point.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HUGHES. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did the Senator ever visit our present fish market when shad were coming in common use by the people of the District and see those boats loaded with them?

Mr. HUGHES. I did not happen to do so. I have not made any study or investigation of those conditions. I go occasionally to the wharves. The shad season does not last long. A great many shad come up the Potomac River and there may be a time during the year when a great many fish are taken from that river and handled at that point, but, as a general proposition, they are not handled like oysters.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is one other point. The Senator says fish come in by rail.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes. Fish do not come in voluntarily by rail. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it not a part of the Senator's creed that water transportation lessens the cost of bringing products to market?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; that is generally true.

Mr. GALLINGER. So if we had a fish market that would accommodate the fish consumed here they would come by water rather than by rail, would they not?

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator overlooks the fact that a high-class community like the city of Washington will pay the little charge that is necessary to get their fish fresh.

Mr. OVERMAN. The shad would not come by water entirely. Occasionally they come from North Carolina, but they would not come around the cape.

Mr. HUGHES. That is a different question. It may be a justification and a reason for the construction of this building that there are water facilities and steamboats plying between points where the fish are obtained and the points where they are brought for sale and consumption, but nothing like that appears here. It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is an item where we might very well start in and economize, not only for the sake of the General Treasury, but for the sake of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, one word more, and then I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. HUGHES. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is kind to me; he always is. Inasmuch as the commissioners have stated to Congress—to a committee, at least—that they can sell space in this market to the amount of $12,000 a year, does not the Senator think there must be a large traffic for this new fish market? Does not the Senator think that an investment of $100,000 or $120,000 which would produce $12,000 per annum is much better than we usually make?

Mr. HUGHES. As I said, I made an attempt to find out what the commissioners or what anybody had to say with reference to the merits of this proposition, but I was unable to find it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will find it in the House hearings, commencing on page 32 and extending over five or six pages.

Mr. HUGHES. I am going to examine it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will turn to page 33, he will see what the commissioners said on the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. It commences on page 32.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Commissioner Siddons said, at page 33:

> The very last report made to me by the market master indicates that we may reasonably expect to have an income of $12,000 from it during the first year that we have taken charge of it.

Mr. HUGHES. The point I make is that the commissioners' estimates of cost are seldom exaggerated. I am firmly convinced——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me just a word more, Commissioner Siddons says, on page 33 of the House hearings:

> Yes, sir; that has occurred to me, and there is something to be said in favor of that view. I can best answer it by saying that experience seems to reveal the fact that there is a great demand down there for space. We have a demand for the space and our income from the property has jumped from $1,400 per annum to what I conservatively estimate will be $12,000 per annum.

Mr. HUGHES. The commissioner is speaking of what place?

Mr. GALLINGER. The fish market.

Mr. HUGHES. The old fish market along the wharves?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. He says that they have received an income of $1,400 a year and that from this new fish market they have estimated an income of $12,000 a year.

Mr. HUGHES. I started to say that the commissioners' estimates of the cost of this fish market is, in all likelihood, for the actual construction and, in all probability, the estimate of the income does not exceed what will be actually received; but I believe it to be the situation now that nearly all the business that is done at the fish wharves is done by wholesalers and jobbers for hotels sending their buyers there to purchase oysters in great quantities and that there is very little real fish business done outside of the purchase and sale of oysters that is carried on there.

It is a very small fish market now; it can hardly be dignified with the name of market now; but it seems to answer all the requirements of the people of the District of Columbia. I never heard a man in the District of Columbia complain or criticize anybody because a more imposing fish market has not been built. I am informed by gentlemen who made the investigation, who are friendly enough to the proposition, if anything is to be said in its favor, that the fish are brought as cheaply here over the railroads and that the little additional cost is more than made up by the better condition in which the fish arrive by rail.

We are asked now to appropriate $125,000 at a time when everybody admits there is the greatest need for economy in the administration of public affairs. Imagine a community such as the majority of Senators reside in and the public interest that would be taken there over a proposed expenditure of $125,000. There would be a referendum and public meetings and debate without end. Yet this proposition is brought into this Chamber and everybody is supposed to graciously consent to it.

I think, Mr. President, there is no need for this additional public improvement; and surely in the interest of economy we can not expect men to support it who will vote against appropriations for improvements that are necessary. There are scores of public improvements which are necessary, but for which every Senator knows in his heart he can not conscientiously vote the money. Then are we going to vote money for public improvements that are admittedly not necessary?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If my colleague will allow me, I think he will agree that this little rent of $12,000 will pay a good deal better interest than many investments they make in the city of Paterson, N. J. I do not believe it is admitted that the improvement is not necessary. I believe there is a necessity for it there. I believe it is our bounden duty to do everything we can to facilitate transportation by water and to facilitate shipping. I believe, in regard to this fish market, the matter of $25,000 additional should be carefully considered before a reduction is made to $100,000. God knows I do not want to waste money, for I have been brought up too frugally all my life for that, having had to husband it; but I do believe in the construction of a great public improvement. The city of Paterson, N. J.; the city of Plainfield, N. J.; the city of Newark, N. J., would spend $100,000 and would not be narrow if after a reasonable investigation they felt that they would be justified in spending $125,000.

Mr. HUGHES. My colleague misunderstands me. I am trying to get the Senate to strike out the whole item. I will agree with the Senator if the item is to stay in. I do not propose to set myself up as a critic of the estimates of the commissioners. If upon sufficient investigation and statements satisfactory to me I were inclined to agree to the item I would not raise a question between $100,000 and $125,000, but I am against the proposition. I do not think it is necessary. I do not think it is fair to the people of the District of Columbia.

We have a magnificent market in the city now, and there is a fish market in connection with it. It never has been suggested in my hearing that there were any needed facilities that they did not have in that market or that there was any lack of facilities or lack of means for the proper handling of fish. But the District of Columbia is fated to have every sort of proposition thrust upon it where there is back of it the aid of a Senator or Representative.

If the Congress of the United States were appropriating the $125,000 out of the revenues of the United States Treasury for the purpose of putting up a model fish market as an example to the balance of the United States there would be some ground that might justify it, but the money which we appropriate must be paid by the people.

I am attempting to interpret the will and wish of the people of the District of Columbia as I would interpret the wish of the people of my home town. There is an agitation going on there now for a market and I am familiar with it. I am in favor of the project, but I do not believe there is any public sentiment in favor of this expenditure. I do not think there is sufficient need for it, and it is as plain and glaring an instance, in my judgment, of the carelessness with which Congress appropriates money as has come under my notice in a long time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say in regard to the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] that he himself admits that he never heard there was any effort on the part of the people of the District of Columbia, in the House or in the Senate, in behalf of this appropriation. Probably there are very few items in the bill that have been considered and urged more strongly than this one item, both in the House and in the Senate. As to the people of the District of Columbia not wanting it, to the contrary, every expression that we have is to the effect that they do want it and that they need it. There has been no objection on the part of anybody against the proposition, but, on the contrary, there has been great effort on the part of many to have this building constructed. The Senator himself admits that he had seen nothing in regard to it in the House and nothing in regard to it in the Senate, when there has been a very strong effort on the part of the District of Columbia Commissioners and others to secure the building.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I understood the subcommittee gave the question of the necessity for this fish market very careful consideration, and reached a conclusion that a fish market is very much needed here in the city of Washington. I accept their judgment with reference to the necessity of the fish market, although I thought that the amount recommended—$125,000—could very safely be reduced to $100,000.

I have always been told that fish food is much better, much more nutritious, than ordinary meats, and I think we ought to encourage the use of fish as much as possible, especially when we hear so much now about the high cost of living. If this would have a tendency to lead to the use of fish in the Potomac River more than at the present time, I think we would accomplish a great deal. While I am satisfied that the fish of the Potomac River are not so fine or so desirable or so nutritious as the fish on the Pacific coast, I believe that they come up to the general reputation, at least, of fish food.

I found a very interesting article this morning in the Washington Post showing the importance and the value of the Pacific coast salmon. I think it would have some bearing upon the necessity for this fish market and the importance of getting the people of Washington City to consume more fish than are found in the waters here. I ask to have it read by the Secretary for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 11, 1914.]

EAT SALMON TO SAVE—"GIVES STRENGTH AT LESS COST THAN MEAT," SAYS DR. SMITH—OFFERS FIGURES AS PROOF—FEDERAL COMMISSIONER OF FISHERIES DECLARES, ANENT LOW PRICE OF PRODUCT, THAT GOOD GRADES OF CANNED SALMON ARE RICHER IN BODY-BUILDING ELEMENTS THAN MEATS, AND COMPARES PRICES.

"To reduce the cost of living eat more salmon, especially of the cheaper grades, and less meat." This is the advice of Dr. Hugh M. Smith, Federal Commissioner of Fisheries, in a statement made yesterday enumerating the important factors in favor of salmon as an article of food as compared with meats. He asserted that not only is salmon cheaper than meats, but will keep indefinitely if the can is unopened, while meats spoil quickly in the home.

COMPARES WASHINGTON PRICES.

To prove his assertion that salmon is cheaper than meats, Dr. Smith compared the average retail prices of these products in Washington on February 10 last. One pound of canned red salmon of the best quality will cost about 16 cents, he said, while the same quantity of bone, muscle, blood, and brain building material and body fuel in other foods would cost as follows: Eggs, strictly fresh (at 34 cents per dozen), 36 cents; steak, sirloin (at 27½ cents per pound), 32 cents; mutton, leg (at 19 cents per pound), 32 cents; chicken, average (at 25 cents per pound), 21½ cents; ham, smoked (at 18½ cents per pound), 13½ cents; and pink salmon, canned (at 9 cents per can), 12½ cents.

"RICHER IN NUTRITION," HE SAYS.

"The best grades of canned salmon," said Dr. Smith, "are richer than meats in body-building materials and contain about the same amount of fats. Pink salmon, which is of a cheaper grade than red, is better than meats for making flesh and bone, but has less fat than the red salmon. Either is as digestible as the best sirloin steak, there is no waste, and nothing has to be thrown away except the can."

In 1913 there were canned on the Pacific coast the equivalent of 387,045,456 1-pound cans, valued at $38,563,891. This, it is stated, would supply about 4 pounds of salmon to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to ask some member of the committee what proportion of the fish sent to Washington are brought here by rail?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am unable, as far as I am concerned, to answer the Senator from Texas, but it is our opinion that if we have a good fish market here, a very much larger proportion will be brought by water than are now brought.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it proposed that it shall be a market for fish brought in by rail?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There will be facilities for keeping them there by refrigerating processes. If they were brought here by rail, those facilities could be utilized. I assume that a very much greater proportion of fish than now come to the market would come by water if they had better facilities than they have now. Not only that, but this is a good investment for the Government. It has been estimated that this property, costing $125,800, will produce a revenue to the Government of $12,000 a year, and give the people better fish, and I should think cheaper fish. For that reason they would be able to keep fish longer, and they would lose and waste less.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I have been reading these hearings, and it does not seem to me that there is anything in them that justifies the Senate in adding this item. Mr. Siddons, one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, while before the House committee, had this to say, on page 40 of the hearings:

May I, as suggested by this particular item, Mr. Chairman—

Which is the item under consideration—

recall a conversation we had with you? While we have endeavored to observe the caution you gave us not to introduce new legislation, at the same time we understood that we should put in here provisions calling for appropriations which we might hope to get through in a legislative measure, and, of course, we are not asking for this as legislation in an appropriation bill, but calling the matter to your attention in case the bill may go through.

And again I read from page 35 of the House hearings:

Mr. NEWMAN. I think it would. I think we ought to consider the entire matter as one proposition. I think what we ought to have is a system of municipal markets—

It is quite evident that these gentlemen are not at all agreed—

with one located as centrally as possible, instead of having these private markets. This fish market is not a municipal market; the only thing municipal about it is the title to the property. This third item you mention contemplates a municipally operated market.

In another part of the hearings one of the commissioners states that the expenditure of a much smaller sum is contemplated.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand from what the Senator has read that this item was not estimated for?

Mr. HUGHES. I will read it again.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is estimated for.

Mr. HUGHES. I will read it again. Mr. Siddons, the commissioner, said:

May I, as suggested by this particular item, Mr. Chairman, recall a conversation we had with you?

They had been talking this item over.

While we have endeavored to observe the caution you gave us not to introduce new legislation, at the same time we understood that we should put in here provisions calling for appropriations which we might hope to get through in a legislative measure; and, of course, we are not asking for this as legislation in an appropriation bill, but calling the matter to your attention in case the bill may go through.

They have a bill pending, I presume, for a system of municipal markets. In view of that statement of Mr. Siddons, and in view of the condition of the Treasury, if the House had just knocked the project out without rhyme or reason, we might insert it again in the bill and all vote for this new expenditure of $125,000. But in another part of the hearing we see where a much smaller sum was to be devoted to this purpose. However, somebody went to Boston, New York, and Norfolk, Va., and saw the fish markets there, and decided if they were going to build a fish market they would come back and build that sort of a market and ask for an appropriation of $125,000. Will any Senator for a moment compare the city of Washington in importance as a fish market with the city of Boston?

Mr. OVERMAN. They say in the hearing that they asked for a much smaller amount and then they went to Norfolk——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We are not acting on what they did in Norfolk. I care nothing about that. The committee is acting upon estimates made and given to us, and that estimate calls for $125,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand; from the hearings, it seems that they estimated first for a much smaller amount than $125,000; that then they went to Norfolk and other places, where they have fine buildings for the purpose, which cost $125,000, and then they estimated for $125,000. I want to know what was said about that, if the Senator recollects.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There was not anything said about it.

Mr. OVERMAN. It may have been in the House hearings.

Mr. HUGHES. It was in the House hearings.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have no idea what impelled the gentlemen who came before the committee to ask for $125,800. I do know that in their estimates there is also a separate item which makes up the amount of $125,800, which is the sum proposed to be given.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, in order to be absolutely accurate, I will read the statement from the House hearings in reference to it:

Mr. NEWMAN. Col. Harding, I think there were some rather complete estimates made, weren't there?

Col. HARDING. Yes. I should explain, Mr. Chairman, that when this item was first considered it was assumed that the building would cost somewhere around $100,000. Before the plans were drawn up a committee of our subordinates was appointed to visit Boston, New York, and Norfolk to look over the modern fish markets in those cities and make a study of the practices of handling fish, cleaning them, and disposing of the offal; and after their visit the plans were drawn by the municipal architect on the basis of providing similar facilities, with fireproof construction, to afford the space to cover existing needs and the probable growth.

That is the criticism I make against this item. The District of Columbia is going to be provided with an expensive fish market willy-nilly, whether it desires it or not, whether it wants to pay for it or not. The District of Columbia is not a fish center, and we would not be justified in providing an amount of money to construct such a big market as they have in Boston, which is one of the great fish ports of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does the Senator know how much that fish market cost?

Mr. HUGHES. It must have cost an immense sum; I have no especial knowledge in regard to it, and I do not know much about it; but I do say that such a fish market is not a necessity in Washington. The amount of fish to be handled at the fish wharves in Washington, outside of oysters, I am in a position to say, is infinitesimal; and, according to the hearings, the vast bulk of shipments which come to the fish wharves go to another market direct for distribution. The bulk of the business that is done at the fish wharves is wholesale business, and the expenditure of $125,000 is not going to confer any benefit upon the people who go there to purchase fish. As a matter of fact, very few people go to the wharves to purchase fish. I commend to Senators a visit to the wharves, and they will see there that the business is carried on practically between the fishermen and the hotels, the jobbers, and the wholesalers.

It may be that in course of time, and after proper study and consideration, it may be found necessary to make some alterations and to spend some money on the fish wharves, but I maintain that a case has not been made out before the Senate by the committee, and that $125,000 is too much money to appropriate lightly, in view of the condition of the revenues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 23, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$125,800" and inserting "$100,000."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I suppose that we are all very much in the same frame of mind as is the Senator from North Carolina. We want to get as cheaply as we can everything which the Government needs. I am sure there is not a member of the committee who is not as much in favor of economy and of practicing economy for the Government as is the Senator from North Carolina.

I am frank to say that I do not know what a fish market will cost; I know nothing about it. As I have heretofore said, a commission was appointed to investigate the matter, and it has estimated that $125,000 is necessary for this purpose. I assume that the Senator from North Carolina is not exactly in a position to determine how much a fish market would cost, and I think that probably we had better depend upon those who have made an estimate and have investigated the matter than upon any member of the committee. Therefore I hope the motion of the Senator from North Carolina will not prevail.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say, in reply to the Senator, that I think I guess pretty well when I assume that this work can be done for $25,000 less than the amount proposed to be appropriated, for the very engineers themselves say that the amount which they concluded to estimate for was for $100,000; but after they went to Boston, to New York, and to Norfolk and saw the fish markets there they concluded that they would increase it by $25,000, although, as I have stated, in the first instance they concluded that $100,000 would be sufficient. So I think I am a pretty good guesser.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I assume that in one case they guessed at it and in the other they came to the conclusion after they had obtained information.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; they just got a little more extravagant after seeing Boston and the other places.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to move to strike out the item, if that motion has not already been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not yet in order.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary status? What is the pending motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee have the right to have the paragraph perfected before any motion to strike out is entertained. The purpose which the Senator has in view will be accomplished, the Chair will say, by rejecting the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Jones | Norris | Smith, Mich. |
| Brandegee | Kenyon | Overman | Smith, S. C. |
| Bristow | Kern | Page | Smoot |
| Burton | Lane | Ransdell | Sutherland |
| Catron | Lea, Tenn. | Reed | Swanson |
| Chamberlain | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Thomas |
| Chilton | Lewis | Saulsbury | Thompson |
| Clapp | Lodge | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Gallinger | McCumber | Sheppard | Warren |
| Hitchcock | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. | Weeks |
| Hughes | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ga. | West |
| James | Nelsen | Smith, Md. | Williams |

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if this item is to go in the bill at all, I should be glad to have the amount cut down by $25,000, but I contend that it should not go in the bill at all. I have read from the hearings. In the course of the debate some Senator called attention to the fact that there would be an income of $12,000 if we erected the proposed new fish market. It seems to me that the $12,000 which has been referred to as the probable income of the new building has nothing to do with the new building at all; but it is the income which is received under present conditions. I read the testimony of the commissioners to that effect:

Mr. SIDDONS. Let me answer that question. Until the act referred to here was passed that space was leased by the District to a private individual, who paid $1,400 a year, and that was the total revenue derived from it by the District. Since the enactment of that law and since it has been taken hold of by the District government as a market our income has risen so that we may fairly consider that in the current year we shall receive from that source not less than $10,000. The very last report made to me by the market master indicates that we may reasonably expect to have an income of $12,000 from it during the first year that we have taken charge of it.

Mr. PAGE. From the present equipment and present buildings?

Mr. SIDDONS. Yes, sir; from the present equipment and present buildings, which are really shacks. That is all they are. We have done this with the limited amount at our disposal, but of course they ought not to continue there at all. Personally I have a great deal of confidence in the outcome of that project.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator if any statement differing from that of the Senator has been made to the Senate?

Mr. HUGHES. I understood a statement was made to the effect that when the proposed project was completed we would then receive an income of $12,000. That statement was made by a Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. If the fish wharves are rebuilt and the new fish market constructed, I want to say to the Senator that we will receive a great deal more than $12,000 per annum from it. We have received $12,000 under present conditions.

Mr. HUGHES. We receive $12,000 now from a source from which we formerly received $1,400.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. HUGHES. But the point I am making, if the Senator will permit me, is that this matter ought to be gone into fully and thoroughly. It was gone into fully and thoroughly before another committee, when it was decided that there was no pressing necessity for doing anything, and particularly no pressing necessity for doing anything hurriedly at this time. The situation is very satisfactory now. An income of $1,400 has been changed to an income of $12,000 with the present equipment and the present old shacks, and nobody is in a position to say that there will be any more business done if a great big market is constructed than is done now with the present equipment; nobody is in a position to say that the extension of the business will be so great that the receipts will exceed $12,000 over and above the expense of conducting it and also pay a fair rate of interest upon the amount of capital that will necessarily be put into the new construction.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is not altogether a question of interest upon the amount of capital. I agree with the Senator that, under present conditions, in spite of the shacks in which the business is carried on, in spite of the unclean and insanitary conditions that exist down there, with the wharf almost rotted out, there is a substantial showing of profit. There is a provision in the bill, as the Senator will remember, appropriating $50,000 to replace the present wharf, and I say that the present buildings should be removed because of their insanitary condition. The Senator no doubt has been down there and has witnessed the conditions under which business is done in the cramped quarters of the little shacks from which fish are distributed to the small dealers throughout this city. What is desired is to tear away all the present rotten wharves and buildings and have a new wharf there—a new wharf will have to be constructed in any event—and then erect a building there on a sanitary basis, according to the plans and specifications already drawn. From the rental of that new building there is not any question that we will get at least what we have been getting from private parties in the past, which is $12,000 a year; and the commissioners and all others interested in it have said that we will get more than $12,000 a year after the new market is constructed.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, my theory as to the manner in which this proposition ought to be handled is that the commissioners ought to be given a fair allowance for repairs and replacements, and the matter should be taken up and carried forward in a systematic, logical, and orderly manner. There ought to be a complete agreement of the two committees on it; the commissioners ought to go before the committees and give them such information as they have to enable the committees to act; but the work should not be entered into hurriedly and hastily by a committee of this body alone.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that it seems to me the only question to decide here is whether we want the present buildings down there to remain as they are and have that business carried on under the present insanitary conditions. If that is what the Senate wants, then eliminate this entire appropriation.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that the proposition as it stands before the Senate now is to provide a market somewhat on the scale and after the fashion of the fish markets in Boston, Norfolk, and New York. Nobody has contended that any such market is necessary here.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator from Utah is mistaken about the plans being drawn, because the testimony in the House, as read by the Senator from New Jersey, shows that it was first estimated that $100,000 would be enough, but after the District officials in charge of the matter went to Boston and saw the arrangements there they concluded they would increase the estimate to $125,000 in order that a fish market might be constructed at Washington something on the order of the fish market at Boston.

Mr. SMOOT. All I wish to say is that I inquired whether the estimate which had been made was for a particular building at a particular place, and I was assured that the estimate had been made and that the building would cost $125,800.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah if there is any system of inspection at this time provided at the fish market in Washington? I understood the Senator to say that the fish were handled in an uncleanly and insanitary manner. Is there any provision made for proper inspection or has there been any inspection in the past?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, there is nothing of that character provided in this bill. I will say to the Senator, nor would there be such a provision here.

Mr. LANE. Is there any inspection provided for?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there are inspection laws in the District of Columbia. I will say to the Senator that this market is the only place in the District for landing fish; it is the only place where the wholesaler distributes the fish. They are doing the best they can under the circumstances, and I believe that everything is perhaps as cleanly as possible under the conditions of the building. If the Senator will go there, he will see that the buildings are rotten, that they are ready to tumble down, and that the wharf is already gone. If it is not going to cost $125,000 to make this improvement, I am perfectly willing to vote for a less amount; but I believe that a new building for the fish market ought to be constructed.

Mr. LANE. I desire to ask another question for information. Is or is it not a fact that the fish market constructed there would increase the accommodation of the householders, or is it merely to be a market for the dealers? Will the people in the city of Washington go there and purchase their supply of fish or is it too far out of the way?

Mr. SMOOT. It is too far out of the way, although there may be some individual householders who will go there to purchase fish. I want to say to the Senator that the proprietors of the

little stores in all parts of the city go there when the fish arrive and secure supplies of fish, which they distribute from their stores; but it is true that there are some individual householders who go there and buy fish. The Senator or anyone else can buy fish at that market. It is really for both purposes.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I want to say, in reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], that there is absolutely no evidence to show, if we were going to establish a municipal fish market, that this would be the proper place at which to establish it. In fact, I am absolutely convinced that if we desire to establish a proper fish market in the District of Columbia we ought not to go to that place. It is simply a distributing point for such fish and oysters as come up the Potomac River; but the great bulk of the fish that come to the city to be distributed to the people of the city as individuals go to another market and will continue to go to another market. This provision will simply put an ornate municipal fish market where it is not needed or desired.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a misunderstanding in relation to the purpose for which this fish market is to be built. This fish market is to be built to receive fish as they come up the Potomac River, as the Senator says. It is not to be an ornate retail market.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have just read from the committee hearings that it is proposed to build a market on the model of the Boston market or the New York market or the Norfolk market, all of which are retail municipal markets, as I understand. I think the Senator and I do not disagree at all; I think we both want to get at the same object. I believe there ought to be a proper place for receiving and handling fish; the wharves ought to be repaired; the present buildings, to a greater or lesser extent, should be repaired, and proper facilities should be furnished for handling such fish as are brought there. There is not a great quantity of fish handled there. Oysters, of course, are handled there now, and I can not see how the facilities for handling oysters can be very well improved. They are brought up in the holds of vessels, which tie up at the wharves, and the oysters remain in the vessels until a purchaser carries them off in wholesale quantities. With the exception of the fact that the wharves are decayed, I can not see how the facilities for handling oysters can be very well improved.

Some of the Senators present seem to be of the opinion that this is to be a municipal fish market, or, at least, a retail fish market for the convenience of the people of the District of Columbia, although 90 per cent of the fish that are brought into the District of Columbia will, after passing through this market, go to another market for individual distribution.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite aware that 90 per cent will, and I believe that a larger quantity than 90 per cent to-day go to the consumer through other markets in this city.

I understand that this provision is for the purpose of building a fish market for the receipt of fish which come up the Potomac River and which from there are distributed to the merchants in the different parts of the city, who distribute them to their customers.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate only a very few moments. It was the duty of the committee to investigate this matter and report to the Senate its conclusions. This matter means nothing to the committee more than to other Senators. It did, however, become our duty to investigate it. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] has undertaken to investigate it during the discussion. He started in, as I understood him, by practically admitting that he knew nothing about it, and he has borne out that conclusion very fully during the discussion. I think he has justified the statement he started out with, that he did not even know that there had been a hearing, and knew absolutely nothing about the subject.

As I have said, it became our duty, Mr. President, to investigate this matter as well as we could and to report our conclusions to the Senate. Having done that, it is of no consequence to us any more than to any other Senator what disposition is made of it by the Senate. We have proceeded on the idea that the people of the city of Washington and the people who visit the city of Washington have a right to have their food supply furnished to them in a proper way under sanitary conditions.

The Senator talks about the estimate having been changed after a visit by the District officials to Norfolk, Boston, and New York. Well, Mr. President, I feel that the people of Norfolk have a right to as good a fish market as have any other people in the world; and if they have established a good fish market down there, and modern and approved methods have been adopted by them, I think the people of Washington did well when they sent down there to investigate the methods in use there; and if Norfolk has a modern and up-to-date market, as I believe it has, they will do well if they model a fish market here after the one in Norfolk. Nobody, however, has contended or suggested that we propose to have as large a fish market here as they have in Boston, but I think we ought to have as good a fish market here as they have in Boston—one with as good facilities for handling the fish in a sanitary, cleanly, and convenient way.

We have not gone about this matter in a careless or a reckless manner, as the Senator from New Jersey has charged. It has been carefully investigated by the Commissioners of the District; their experts have examined the conditions existing here and the methods and processes established in other cities, and after that examination and study they have made an estimate of the cost of constructing a proper fish market at this place. They report that the old building ought to be pulled down; that it is insanitary, unsatisfactory, and insufficient, and they recommend that it be removed. I think they are better judges of that than I am. I have been to the place, and I say that it is absolutely insufficient and not what it ought to be; but I am not going into the details, nor am I capable of doing so. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, however, have gone into the details, have made a laborious investigation of the subject, have reported the result of the investigation, and submitted the estimate. They report that the old buildings ought to be pulled down, as they are insanitary and untfit; that new buildings should be constructed; and they have estimated the cost of a new building at $125,800. I say that the city of Washington is entitled to just such a building as the commissioners have estimated for, and I think Congress ought to appropriate that amount of money to provide proper facilities here. I believe the people of Washington and those who come here are entitled to as good service as are the people of any other city in the world. The Treasury is not empty. Neither the Government of the United States nor the government of the District of Columbia is in an impoverished condition. We are able to furnish whatever is necessary; and, so far as I am concerned, I am in favor of furnishing the very best equipment for all the services and all the utilities that the people of Washington need.

I see no occasion for this great talk about economy. I want economy wherever an expenditure is unnecessary or wasteful; but I am prepared to vote for large appropriations to furnish the people the service they need and the service to which they are entitled. The people are not stickling about useless economy. All this talk about cutting down expenses is not easily absorbed by the public mind of America.

The American people want good service, and they are willing to pay for it. The people of Washington want good service, and the taxpayers are able to pay for it. The committee have reported their conclusions. They think a good fish market should be built, and a good wharf should be constructed. A fish market adequate to the necessities here will cost $125,000.

The people who want to receive their fish in an insanitary condition and an inconvenient manner may get along with this old building. It is their privilege to vote for it, and it is their privilege to enjoy the inadequate and insanitary service that is being furnished them now if they desire. It is nothing in the world to the committee. We only desire to report to the Senate our conclusions.

We believe the Senate ought to approve this amendment, and vote the $125,000 for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I call for a division. I do not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but I should like a division.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 7, line 23, "Buildings for fish market," it is proposed to strike out "$125,800," as recommended by the committee, and to insert in lieu thereof, "$100,000."

Mr. OVERMAN. I will state that I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and can not vote on this matter.

There were, on a division, ayes 14, noes 18.

Mr. THOMAS. No quorum has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No quorum has voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say, in explanation of my vote, that I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I have been informed that if present he would

vote as I would. Therefore I took the liberty of standing up and voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Hollis | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. |
| Bradley | Hughes | Nelson | Smith, Mich. |
| Brady | James | Norris | Smith, S. C. |
| Brandegee | Jones | Oliver | Smoot |
| Bristow | Kenyon | Overman | Sutherland |
| Burton | Kern | Page | Thomas |
| Catron | Lane | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | Lea, Tenn. | Ransdell | Tillman |
| Chilton | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Warren |
| Clapp | Lewis | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Dillingham | Lodge | Sheppard | West |
| Gallinger | McCumber | Smith, Ariz. | Williams |
| Hitchcock | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Works |

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on account of official business.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY.]

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] on account of sickness.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to state that the members of the subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee are in session under orders of the Senate, which accounts for their absence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. THOMAS. I call for the yeas and nays upon the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is unavoidably absent from the sessions of the Senate. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. If he were present he would vote "nay," and I would vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], who is absent from the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I am informed that if present he would vote "nay" upon this question. Making that announcement, I also vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair, announced a few moments ago, to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—17.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bristow | Jones | Shafroth | West |
| Gore | Kenyon | Sheppard | Works |
| Hitchcock | Kern | Smith, S. C. | |
| Hollis | Lane | Thompson | |
| Hughes | Norris | Tillman | |

NAYS—32.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Chilton | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bankhead | Dillingham | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. |
| Bradley | Gallinger | Nelson | Smith, Mich. |
| Brady | James | Oliver | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Lea, Tenn. | Page | Sutherland |
| Burton | Lee, Md. | Pomerene | Warren |
| Catron | Lodge | Ransdell | Weeks |
| Chamberlain | McCumber | Reed | Williams |

NOT VOTING—46.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | Fletcher | Owen | Smith, Ga. |
| Bryan | Goff | Penrose | Stephenson |
| Burleigh | Gronna | Perkins | Sterling |
| Clapp | Johnson | Pittman | Stone |
| Clark, Wyo. | La Follette | Poindexter | Swanson |
| Clarke, Ark. | Lewis | Robinson | Thomas |
| Colt | Lippitt | Root | Thornton |
| Crawford | McLean | Saulsbury | Townsend |
| Culberson | Myers | Sherman | Vardaman |
| Cummins | Newlands | Shields | Walsh |
| du Pont | O'Gorman | Shively | |
| Fall | Overman | Simmons | |

So Mr. OVERMAN's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer, and vote "yea."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I make the same announcement, and for the same reason withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as announced on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, make the same transfer as on the previous roll call, and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN. Making the same announcement of pairs, whereby the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] may stand paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last roll call as to the position of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], with whom I am paired, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 34, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—34.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Dillingham | Martin, Va. | Smith, Mich. |
| Bankhead | Gallinger | Martine, N. J. | Smoot |
| Bradley | James | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Brady | Jones | Oliver | Townsend |
| Brandegee | Lea, Tenn. | Page | Warren |
| Burton | Lee, Md. | Ransdell | West |
| Catron | Lewis | Robinson | Williams |
| Chamberlain | Lodge | Smith, Ariz. | |
| Chilton | McCumber | Smith, Md. | |

NAYS—16.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bristow | Kenyon | Reed | Thomas |
| Gore | Kern | Shafroth | Thompson |
| Hollis | Lane | Sheppard | Tillman |
| Hughes | Norris | Smith, S. C. | Works |

NOT VOTING—45.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | Fletcher | Owen | Smith, Ga. |
| Bryan | Goff | Penrose | Stephenson |
| Burleigh | Gronna | Perkins | Sterling |
| Clapp | Hitchcock | Pittman | Stone |
| Clark, Wyo. | Johnson | Poindexter | Swanson |
| Clarke, Ark. | La Follette | Pomerene | Thornton |
| Colt | Lippitt | Root | Vardaman |
| Crawford | McLean | Saulsbury | Walsh |
| Culberson | Myers | Sherman | Weeks |
| Cummins | Newlands | Shields | |
| du Pont | O'Gorman | Shively | |
| Fall | Overman | Simmons | |

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 7, after line 24, to insert:

Wharves for fish market: For reconstructing wharves at municipal fish wharf and market, including preparation of plans and specifications and personal services, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the engineer commissioner's office, on page 9, line 11, after the words "one $1,800," to strike out "three, at $1,500 each" and insert "one at $1,600, two at $1,500 each," and in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "$175,010" and insert "$175,110," so as to read:

Index clerk and typewriter, $900; clerks—1 $1,800, 1 at $1,600, 2 at $1,500 each, 2 at $1,400 each, 5 at $1,200 each, 2 at $1,000 each, 1 $900, 1 $840, 2 at $750 each, 1 $600; messengers—1 $600, 6 at $540 each; skilled laborers—1 $625, 2 at $600 each; janitor, $720; principal steam engineer, $1,800; 3 steam engineers, at $1,200 each; 3 assistant steam engineers, at $1,050 each; 6 oilers, at $600 each; 6 firemen, at $875 each; inspector, $1,400; storekeeper, $900; superintendent of stables, $1,500; blacksmith, $975; 2 watchmen, at $630 each; 2 drivers, at $630 each; in all, $175,110.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 5, to insert:

Employment of females: To carry out the provisions of the act approved February 24, 1914, entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," as follows: For 3 inspectors, 2 of whom shall be women, at the rate of $1,200 per annum, $3,600.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think according to the proper parliamentary procedure the amendment I desire to offer would be an amendment to the amendment suggested by the committee to perfect it. I therefore offer the amendment I send to the desk as an amendment to the amendment of the committee. I am not offering it in behalf of the committee, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand that by unanimous consent it was agreed that amendments of the committee should be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read, so that the Senate may see what it is.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 12, strike out "$3,600" and insert:

Also one stenographer or clerk at the rate of $500 per annum, and, further, the sum of $1,000 for contingent expenses, $5,500.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator from Iowa has there been an estimate for it?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the purpose of my amendment is to carry out the suggestion of the commissioners when they were before the committee respecting the 8-hour law in the District of Columbia, in relation to the employment of females. The law provides for three inspectors. The people who were instrumental in securing the passage of the law are anxious that it shall have a fair test and trial. There is no provision for any contingent fund to pay the expenses of the inspectors, and unless provision is made the result will be to cripple the 8-hour law in the District of Columbia. I do not like to suggest any increase in any way in the bill, but the people who are deeply interested in the law and in the welfare of women in the District of Columbia are anxious that there shall be a sufficient force and a sufficient contingent fund to carry it out, and not the mere naked proposition of inspectors provided by the law.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that the commissioners came before the committee in regard to this matter and it was discussed by the committee, and the committee came to the conclusion that for the present it would be better if we could get along with the three inspectors, and the commissioners tacitly agreed that they would undertake it and wait awhile longer. There is no estimate made for it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. It is true that under the law the inspectors are compelled to make inspections and keep records and make reports daily. There is no provision for office furniture, there is no provision for books, no provision for stationery, no provision for car fare, and there is no way in which the expenses of the inspectors can be covered.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that there is a contingent fund of $36,000 from which the necessary money can be drawn.

Mr. KENYON. That would cover stationery, but not the other items.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It will cover stationery and I presume such matters as they may want in addition. In addition to that, we thought that in the beginning probably the three inspectors would not be employed all the time, and one of them could remain in the office and the three could fill the bill. We understood that that was practically agreed to by the commissioners who were before us.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to take the item of car fare. The inspectors can not do their work without traveling over the city, and if they are constantly engaged in inspection the item of car fare will be a considerable one.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is already provided for. There is an appropriation in the bill of $5,000 for car tickets for employees.

Mr. KENYON. That will cover that item?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It will cover it.

Mr. KENYON. Take the item of furniture, office desks, and chairs. Is there any fund from which that can be drawn? I understand that there is none.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suppose they can be placed in one of the rooms in the Municipal Building, concerning which I should think there would be no difficulty whatever.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to give it as authentic, but I have been informed by the ladies who have been investigating this legislation that there is no fund available.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The committee took up those matters and went through with them thoroughly, and we felt that they were provided for and that the law would be carried out by these three inspectors.

Mr. KENYON. While I am in favor of the suggestions made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] for economy, I think if we can vote $125,000 for a fish market, we can vote a sufficient fund to give a fair test to the law limiting the hours of labor for women in the District of Columbia. It requires an appropriation of only $1,900 more. As the matter now stands, we have three inspectors, and there is no way for them to be provided with offices. There may be stationery. I see that one of the commissioners states that they can be provided with stationery; but there is no provision for typewriters, no provision for books, no provision as to how the accounts may be kept, no provision as to printing, or the other matters that will be covered by the contingent fund. If that is the case, the law is simply crippled in its operation and does not have a fair chance.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that, as far as the printing is concerned, there is a lump appropriation for the department, and the head of the department can take care of whatever printing is desired.

I also wish to say that one thing which led me to believe that the amendment as offered by the committee is sufficient was the statement made by Commissioner Newman in answer to the chairman of the subcommittee. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] said——

Mr. KENYON. Where is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMOOT. From page 45.

Senator SMITH of Maryland. Do you not think it would be better, Mr. Commissioner, in the beginning, to delegate one of these inspectors, at $1,200 a year, to act as clerk until you find out just what there is to be done?

Commissioner NEWMAN. To be perfectly frank, Senator, of course we do not know very much about it.

I thought if the commissioner appearing in behalf of this particular appropriation did not know very much about the necessities of the three inspectors provided for in the law it was not necessary for the committee to report any more than just simply what was asked for by the commissioners.

Mr. KENYON. But the commissioners did ask, I will say to the Senator from Utah, for a stenographer or clerk, and a contingent fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the commissioner says "to be perfectly frank, of course we do not know very much about it"; that is, whether it is necessary or not.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, there are a good many who do not know about the law and who want the law to be a failure. If the inspectors are not equipped with sufficient funds and a sufficient force to do this work, the law will be a failure, and that will be very satisfactory to a great many people.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say if the Senator refers to me——

Mr. KENYON. I have no reference to the Senator at all.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not true as far as I am concerned. I will say frankly if the chairman of the committee will accept it and let it go into conference we will find out more about it then; and, of course, it can be thrashed over in conference.

Mr. KENYON. Here is a law enacted for the District of Columbia that is in the nature of an experiment as to the hours of service for women. Grave questions are going to arise

with reference to its enforcement. The law provided for three inspectors, but it certainly contemplated that there should be some office force and some way in which they could carry out their work as the law prescribes they must do, namely, to make this inspection and to keep these records.

I will say that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who introduced the law and has fought for it, is not here to-day, and I have brought the matter up in his absence.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that he is not any more desirous of furnishing sufficient force and equipment for carrying out the law than I believe was the committee. The difference is that when we discussed the matter with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia they felt that it probably could be carried out with the force provided for in the law.

So far as I am individually concerned, and I think I can speak for the committee also, if this matter had been recommended by the commissioners we would have granted it, but there was no recommendation whatever for it. On the contrary, in talking the matter over they were of the opinion that the law could be carried out, especially in the start, with the three inspectors, one acting, probably, as a clerk, and they would find out what was necessary later on.

I personally have no objection whatever to a provision giving a clerk. So far as the money for stationery is concerned, that is already provided for in the deficiency bill. Thirty-six thousand dollars is provided for printing, stationery, and items of that character. So far as an office is concerned, an office can be found in the Municipal Building. I am willing to say that if the Senator from Iowa, respecting his judgment in the matter, feels that we should provide a clerk, as chairman of the subcommittee I have no objection to that being provided for.

Mr. KENYON. I perhaps should not have said what I did, but anyone reading the newspapers may observe that there is a well-defined purpose apparently to discredit the law already, and I am only insisting that the instrumentalities be furnished so that the law may have fair operation. Commissioner Newman said, on page 44 of the hearings:

> In addition to the $3,600 we want to recommend a clerk at $900 and a fund of $1,000 for contingent and miscellaneous expenses. We have conferred with some of the women who have been instrumental and interested in getting the bill through, and their opinion is, judging by the work of such inspectors in other places, that such an office will require a clerk to be in the office all the time to keep their records, and the estimate of $1,000 is for books of reference, equipment, etc., and temporary services.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator will find in another part of the report that the commissioners said they perhaps could do with what they have, but if the Senator desires to provide for a clerk I will not object to it.

Mr. KENYON. I will change my amendment, then, and divide it so as to apply only to the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$3,600" and add "one clerk or stenographer at the rate of $900 per annum, $4,500."

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator to make it read "stenographer and clerk," using "and" in place of "or."

Mr. KENYON. Yes; let it read "stenographer and clerk."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated as modified.

The SECRETARY. Strike out "$3,600" and insert "one stenographer and clerk, at the rate of $900 per annum, $4,500."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I should like to give notice that the bill will be called up immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 12, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 11, 1914.*

### ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

William P. Malburn, of Denver, Colo., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in place of John Skelton Williams, appointed Comptroller of the Currency.

### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Thomas W. Taubman, of Plankington, S. Dak., to be United States marshal, district of South Dakota, vice Seth Bullock, whose term has expired.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

#### CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Charles W. Fenton, Second Cavalry, to be major from March 8, 1914, vice Maj. James B. Hughes, First Cavalry, retired from active service March 7, 1914.

First Lieut. John E. Hemphill, Cavalry, unassigned, to be captain from March 8, 1914, vice Capt. Charles W. Fenton, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William L. Moose, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 8, 1914, vice First Lieut. Beauford R. Camp, Ninth Cavalry, retired from active service March 7, 1914.

Second Lieut. Charles D. Rogers, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 9, 1914, vice First Lieut. Douglas H. Jacobs, Twelfth Cavalry, detached from his proper command.

#### COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Second Lieut. Philip M. Ljungstedt, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 8, 1914, vice First Lieut. Wyatt O. Selkirk, resigned March 7, 1914.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1914.*

### ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Edward Minor Watson, Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii.

### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John L. Burnside to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Rome P. Donohoo to be register of the land office at Tucumcari, N. Mex.

Emmett Patton to be register of the land office at Roswell, N. Mex.

### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

S. P. Ascarate to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Felipe Sanchez y Baca to be receiver of public moneys at Tucumcari, N. Mex.

W. G. Cowan to be receiver of public moneys at Roswell, N. Mex.

### SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Lucius Dills to be surveyor general of New Mexico.

### POSTMASTERS.

#### CALIFORNIA.

Margaret Messick, Victorville.

#### ILLINOIS.

Henry Stahlle, Plano.
R. A. Thompson, Thompsonville.

#### IOWA.

Clarence E. Brooks, Brooklyn.
Issac Fouch, Monroe.
Lee S. Edwards, Dunlap.
L. H. Flood, Carson.
George H. Helscher, Keota.
H. F. A. Hilmer, New Hampton.
William H. Keough, Lehigh.
Elmer A. McIlree, West Union.
E. P. McManus, Keokuk.
Thomas A. Massie, Logan.
Martin C. Nelson, Spirit Lake.
John R. Strickland, Parkersburg.
Frank Thompson, Cambridge.

#### KENTUCKY.

Mary McR. Bruce, Stanford.
Harry H. Grobmyer, Carrollton.
Spalding Trafton, Henderson.
R. K. McCarney, Paris.

#### LOUISIANA.

J. M. Cook, Oakdale.

#### MICHIGAN.

John Brogan, Stockbridge.
John F. Hum, Grayling.

#### MINNESOTA.

Edward A. Buckley, East Grand Forks.

NEBRASKA.

Byron Busby, Wakefield.
John Canfield, Tekamah.
Patrick H. Green, Creighton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank Renning, Velva.
J. W. Stambaugh, Carrington.

NEW MEXICO.

Ervin E. Brunk, Dexter.
John M. Clark, Dawson.
Henry C. Roehl, Albuquerque.
Leopoldo Sanchez, Santa Rosa.

NEW YORK.

J. F. Lantry, Massena.

NEW JERSEY.

James A. Mahaney, Roebling.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Lula F. Bland, Pittsboro.
William C. Blanton, Forest City.
Samuel Y. Bryson, Hendersonville.
Luther B. Carr, Wallace.
John K. Cline, Lincolnton.
Hamilton Erwin, Morganton.
W. D. Templeton, Mooresville.
E. S. Yarbrough, Duke.
Vernon G. Pleasants, Rowland.

OKLAHOMA.

Mathias Schiefelbusch, Yale.

TENNESSEE.

M. B. Capps, Livingston.
I. S. Davidson, Petersburg.
W. H. Howard, Milan.

TEXAS.

B. M. Richardson, Athens.

WASHINGTON.

George B. Day, Walla Walla.
R. A. Turner, Ellensburg.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### WEDNESDAY, *March 11, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art infinite in the things wherein we are finite, help us to fix our thoughts on the things that are worthy, and bend every effort to their accomplishment, assured that Thou art with us to strengthen when we are weak, to enlighten when we are ignorant, to encourage when we falter, to make us courageous when we are timid. Thus may Thy sympathy inspire us, Thy hand lead us, and Thy love bring us on our way to victory in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The question of privilege which I desire to bring up has been heralded in the public press for the last week, and is a matter which contains an implication on the integrity and an imputation on the veracity of every Member of this House. One dispatch sent out recently, and which has been used in almost every newspaper in this country, uses the following language:

WASHINGTON, *March 9.*

Are there liars in the House of Representatives; and if so, who are they?

These are questions which have been brought to the fore by the latest developments in the controversy started by Charles Zueblin, formerly of the University of Chicago.

Prof. Zueblin said Speaker CLARK had counted only 23 of the 50 Members who, on a rising vote, demanded a roll call on the reference of the lobby report and resolutions to the Judiciary Committee. Speaker CLARK branded this assertion as a slander. Representatives MANN, MADDEN, MURDOCK, and others testified they saw no more than 23 Members rise.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, that statement is a reflection upon every Member of this House, and especially on the Speaker, whom I personally regard as one of the fairest officers who ever presided in a legislative body in America. [Applause.] And knowing that fact, and because I had some little part on the occasion in question myself, having made a point of order which was overruled, I felt it my right and duty to have the real facts in the case brought before the House of Representatives. I wrote to the National Voters' League in this city, which had given out the statement that 55 Members of this House had written that they voted in favor of the roll call, when the RECORD shows that the announced total was but 23. My letter was as follows:

MARCH 10, 1914.

Mr. LYNN HAINES,
*Executive Secretary the National Voters' League,*
*Woodward Building, City.*

DEAR SIR: I request that you furnish me, at your earliest convenience, a list of the names of the Members of the House of Representatives whom you have publicly stated advised you that they rose to favor the demand for a roll call on December 9, 1913, on the question of referring the Mulhall lobby reports to the Judiciary Committee. I desire also that you explain the purpose and method of your league in compiling this list. Thanking you in advance, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

M. CLYDE KELLY.

I received the following letter in reply:

THE NATIONAL VOTERS' LEAGUE,
829–831 WOODWARD BUILDING,
*Washington, D. C., March 11, 1914.*

Hon. M. CLYDE KELLY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of yesterday asking for the names of Members of the House who wrote to the National Voters' League stating that they joined in the demand for a roll call on the question of referring Mr. MACDONALD'S lobby resolutions to the Judiciary Committee, December 9, 1913. You wish to know also how the league secured this list of names. Please permit me to reply first to your second inquiry.

The National Voters' League is a permanent, nonpartisan organization, which seeks to give to the public accurate and timely information about Congress. In the course of its routine work an attempt was made to obtain an authentic list of the Members who had demanded the roll call in question, for the reason that the issues then under consideration were of vital importance. There were involved the integrity of the House itself and the whole question of the "invisible government" at Washington as disclosed in the Mulhall investigation. Yet in this, the very crisis of the controversy growing out of the Mulhall exposé, the House organization was evidently sidetracking these gravely important issues without either discussion or a roll call.

That is why an effort was made, in the only way open to us, to obtain a correct list of those Congressmen who had, by joining in the demand for a roll call, opposed the seemingly obvious "program" on that occasion. As one Member who joined in the demand for a roll call stated in his letter of reply:

"I think the resolutions were improperly referred to the Judiciary Committee, for I suspected that they would sleep the sleep of death there."

Below is quoted the league letter sent to all Members of the House. We expected that this letter would be answered with the same honesty with which the inquiry was made. Our only object was to be able to publish an accurate list of those who were in favor of a record vote.

In writing this letter I was careful so to phrase it as to preclude all possibility of a misunderstanding as to its purpose. By dating and describing the specific proceeding about which information was desired, it was made impossible for Members to confuse that proceeding with any other. I made it plain also that the names were wanted for publication.

The letter was as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Voters' League desires to secure for publication a list of those Members who joined in the demand for a roll call on the question of referring the lobby reports and Mr. MACDONALD'S resolutions to the Judiciary Committee when that issue came up in the House December 9.

"Will you aid us in this by answering these questions:

"1. Were you present in the House on that occasion?

"2. Did you rise and join in the demand for a roll call on the above-mentioned motion?

"We will appreciate an early answer.

"Very truly,

"_____ _____."

In response to this letter the National Voters' League has on file the statements of 47 Members of the House that on December 9, 1913, they rose and joined in the demand for the roll call in question. In addition to the 47, 8 Members were not certain, but the majority of these replied to the league's query in such a way as to imply that they also had supported the demand for the roll call. One Member telephoned to this office that he had voted for the roll call; 16 returned more or less evasive answers; 56, many of whom said they would have favored the roll call had they been present, replied that they were not in the House on that occasion. Two stated that they took no part in the proceedings because their names were involved in the Mulhall charges. Only 5 out of the 135 who replied stated that they were against the roll call.

The 47 who replied definitely that they joined in the demand for the roll call are as follows: Sydney Anderson, William A. Ashbrook, Silas R. Barton, Ellsworth R. Bathrick, Charles W. Bell, Stanley E. Bowdle, M. E. Burke, Philip P. Campbell, Ira C. Copley, Louis C. Cramton, Charles H. Dillon, Jeremiah Donovan, John J. Esch, John R. Farr, H. Robert Fowler, George E. Gorman, Courtney W. Hamlin, W. H. Hinebaugh, Willis J. Hulings, Albert Johnson, Edward Keating, M. Clyde Kelly, Thomas F. Konop, William L. La Follette, Fred E. Lewis, W. J. MacDonald, James Manahan, Andrew J. Montague, Victor Murdock, William F. Murray, George A. Neeley, John I. Nolan, P. D. Norton, Denis O'Leary, Percy E. Quin, John E. Raker, Arthur R. Rupley, Dorsey W. Shackleford, R. B. Stevens, Tom Stout, Howard Suther-

land, H. W. Temple, Charles M. Thomson, J. B. Thompson, Anderson H. Walters, Otis Wingo, and Roy O. Woodruff.

The eight Members who were in doubt, but the majority of whom replied to the league's query in such a way as to imply that they also demanded the roll call, are as follows: Robert Crosser, John J. Eagan, W. B. Green, E. L. Hamilton, Walter I. McCoy, N. J. Sinnott, Luther W. Mott, and John H. Small.

The Member who telephoned this office that he stood up to ask for the roll call is H. T. Helgesen.

Very truly,

LYNN HAINES.

Mr. Speaker, that is the exact status of the controversy which has been causing considerable comment in the press of the country. I maintain that it is not wholly a question of veracity on the part of the Members of the House, although that is involved. There is a deeper and more vital question than that. It touches the integrity of the processes of the House, and seems to indicate either that a number here, greater than the rules declare necessary to get a roll call, are not able to secure a roll call, or else Members are desirous of appearing in a different guise, when the light of publicity is turned upon them, than in a rising vote when they are not counted as a matter of public record.

There is the point at issue. It is a question as to the value and reliability of the proceedings of this House in expressing the public will, and I submit to you that that is worthy of the most serious attention of the Speaker and of the House of Representatives. Either we have a system where we can not secure a roll call when it is desired by a large number, or a system of misrepresentation, where Members do not vote in a rising vote as they would where their votes are a matter of public record. I contend that either situation is serious, and that a system which permits either must be changed. Here is a case where 33 Members were sufficient to secure a roll call and 55 Members declare that they voted for a roll call. I was present on that occasion, and I personally believe that the Speaker counted with exact accuracy, and that 23 Members voted on that occasion. [Applause.] But admitting that, it remains true that legislation may be killed or may be passed according to the manipulation of legislative machinery, whose cogs and wheels and pulleys can not be seen by the American people.

The particular matter at issue in this case concerns every man, woman, and child in America, because this was the lobby investigation. It was the investigation of charges which, if true, meant a combination on the part of dishonest "big business" and corrupt politics to rob the entire citizenship of the United States. It was far too important for the muzzle or whitewash brush, and yet we have had nothing in the way of definite action. I believe that this whole matter concerns most vitally the integrity of the House, and being firm in the belief that every Member should feel a direct and personal interest in it, I put these facts in the RECORD. I desire that they shall be known to every Member of the House and that the people of this Nation may have full knowledge of the dangers of secrecy in connection with the instrumentalities of legislation. The system which makes this situation under discussion possible is incompatible with and contradictory to the best elements and highest ideals of the Republic. It takes all actuality from our boasted government of the people, for the people, and by the people and leaves only a figure of speech. It gives foundation to the charges that there is an invisible government behind our visible government, and that it poisons the very springs of national integrity.

As sunlight is the best disinfectant and electric light the best policeman, so publicity of legislative processes is the best cure of such an evil as this. The people have the right to know the attitude of Representatives on every question, and the parliamentary machinery must be such that they can secure that knowledge from the public record, which will never show twice as many votes for a proposition as Members who voted for it.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3742) to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3742. An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York; and

S. 48. An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business is House bill 10785, to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor, and the House resolves itself automatically——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, before the House resolves itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, will not the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] make some effort to fix a time for closing general debate on the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be confined to one hour and a half.

The SPEAKER. How is it to be divided?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If there is anybody here who is in opposition to any feature of the bill, I shall be glad to hear from him.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in opposition to the second section of the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Maryland. I am in favor of the first section very heartily.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr Speaker, as the bill is now drawn, I shall desire either to support amendments to it or to offer amendments to it, because I think it invades the jurisdiction which belongs to the United States Public-Health Service, and I want to be heard on that phase of it.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] agree to take half of the hour and a half of time?

Mr. STAFFORD. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman ask for at least two hours.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Then I modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and desire to make it two hours instead of one hour and a half; one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Kentucky and the balance to be controlled by myself.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire one hour for myself. I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement unless I can have one hour of time on this question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] says he will object to any unanimous consent unless it provides an hour for him.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is the debate limited to the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. MANN. It is not to anyone who gets the floor.

Mr. SHERLEY. Can we get an agreement to limit the debate to the subject matter of the bill? I have no desire to unduly delay the matter. With its main purposes I am in accord.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have no desire to delay the matter, Mr. Speaker, but I do not often ask for time, and anything that I have got to say will be indirectly on the bill. I have got some things to say that are not directly connected with the bill.

Mr. MANN. Can not the gentleman get along with half an hour?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I can not. Unless I have more than half an hour I do not care to discuss the question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands that the Committee on Labor has a bill on the calendar preventing the importation of convict-made goods, which, if not called up to-day, will not be called up at all, because the committee will have occupied its second day.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If you take three hours, that will leave enough time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might get some more time under the five-minute rule; but it may be impossible to proceed unless there is a quorum.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate on this bill close in two hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I do not usually make remarks of this kind, but unless I get the time I ask for you will need a quorum here to confine it to two hours.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Very well.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Gentlemen do not want to be unfair, and they will be if they shut me out. The time taken up in getting a quorum would amount to as much as the time I want.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit a suggestion, it ought to be easy for the gentleman from Illinois to get his time on the second bill, and, as I understand, his remarks do not pertain especially to this bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have prepared my speech to a part of this bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that his remarks applied only indirectly to this bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Some of them apply directly to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that it will take three-quarters of an hour to call the roll. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] if three-quarters of an hour will not be satisfactory to him?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I shall get through with my remarks in three-quarters of an hour if I can, but I do not know that I can say all I want to say in that time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save time and get through, I will withdraw my motion and ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall object unless I can get an hour.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Very well. I renew the motion, Mr. Speaker, that all general debate close in two hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] moves that general debate on this bill close in two hours, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half——

Mr. MANN. That was not in the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that general debate on this bill be limited to two hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I move an amendment—that it be made four hours.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Make it three.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] moves as an amendment to the motion that the general debate on this bill be limited to three hours. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker. No; I do not want it if the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks for a division. Those in favor of the three-hour amendment will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-six gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed to the three-hour amendment will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Five gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this vote the ayes are 66 and the noes are 5, and the three-hour amendment is agreed to. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] in the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10735, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10735, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] desire recognition?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I do. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] if he is ready to employ his hour?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I have to make to-day may interest the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the other members of the Appropriations Committee.

While taking the floor in support of this important measure I can not refrain from making some reply to the erroneous statements made on the floor of this House by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and others on February 24. Their attitude at that time would indicate that they were under the impression that I was prompted to make the effort I did to secure an appropriation for the continuation of research work for industrial diseases and accidents by the Secretary of Labor or the heads of the bureaus of that department. In order that no one will be under a misapprehension, I wish to state that my effort in regard to that matter was actuated by my desire to have such work done without delay in an efficient and proper manner; but it seems that my effort drew an attack upon the Department of Labor and its bureaus, and the erroneous charges were made that they were operating in conflict with the law, or without authorization of law. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. FITZGERALD, of New York, said that we were favoring these amendments for narrow, selfish purposes, and also stated that my colleague, Mr. MANN, the leader of the other side of the House, was endeavoring to secure increased appropriations for political purposes, to which charge Mr. MANN offered no defense. I would say to the gentleman that if the Republicans will exercise their influence to secure bureaus of safety and provide money for investigations of industrial diseases and accidents they will be playing politics in an effective manner that will bring to them consideration and favor.

Of course the gentleman from New York arrogantly made this statement for the purpose of reflecting that I and others who were endeavoring to secure increased appropriations for these purposes were working in conflict with the best interest of the Democratic Party, as will be seen from his remarks February 24, as follows:

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I remarked earlier in the day, in the course of some remarks, that it would cost much more to conduct the Government under a Democratic administration if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] continued to deliver votes on that side of the House to aid some gentlemen on this side of the House who, regardless of the pledges that have been made by the Democratic Party, looking only in a narrow and selfish way at the things they were interested in, are endeavoring to override the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations in these matters. Later in the session a different song will be sung. I hope it will not be one that will disappoint the country and disappoint the party; but I do know that if we are to accept the statements of the heads of departments, regardless of their politics, as to their needs and the amount that should be expended in the conduct of every branch of the public service, then all promises of economy will be broken and the record that will be made by this House will not be to the credit, but will be to the everlasting damnation of the Democratic Party.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, aided by the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] indulged in a subtle and insidious argument, stating that the Secretary of Labor, the Labor Department, and its bureaus were operating in conflict with law, or acting without authorization of law. These gentlemen seem to take the position that they are the powers that be, and that those who dare to express opinions in conflict with theirs are objects of contempt and scorn.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], when I saw fit to exercise my right under the rules to object to an extension of his time, used the following words:

If the gentleman objects, he is going to have a little more trouble about getting his own time extended in the future. We have been more than indulgent with him. I am a member of the subcommittee, and have taken but little time on this bill.

Clearly taking the attitude that my privileges on the floor of this House were not equal to his, and that I was exercising a great deal of nerve in daring to interrupt him and in expressing opinions in conflict with those of these great dictators of the financial policies of this Congress.

I tried to be liberal with these gentlemen when I stated that, due to the fact that they were lawyers and never having had the experience that workingmen have had, they do not understand the terrible widespread results of these industrial accidents and diseases and the destruction that it brings to the life and health of humanity. I will again be liberal by saying that I believe that they can not appreciate how one feels that has had the wide experience that I have had as a workman and as one trying to uplift the conditions of the working people of our country. They probably have no way of knowing the number of lives that have been lost through preventable diseases and preventable accidents in the industries of our country. Much too little effort has been made by our National Government to secure remedies and preventives for these diseases and accidents.

For about 15 years of my life I worked at one of the most hazardous trades there is, namely, bridge and structural iron work. During this time I would estimate that 100 men were killed on the structures upon which I worked, a large percentage of which could have been prevented by the proper scaffolding and other safeguards. When a single man is killed, having no one dependent upon him, that usually ends the matter, excepting

the grief and sorrow of his friends; but when the victim is a married man with a family and others dependent upon him for their support it usually results not only in grief and sorrow but in destitution. As an example I have in mind one man in particular out of many others who lost their lives in Chicago. He was a fine big fellow, with a happy family of a wife and six children, and as is usual with the workingmen with families, he had little left of his earnings for their support. After he was killed it became necessary for the widow to work for a mere pittance in order that her children might have a bare, scant living. The children were forced to take positions in the factory and mill at an early age, thereby stunting them physically and depriving them of a proper education. If a married man with a family contracts a disease at his work, which could have been prevented, say, for instance, tuberculosis, he is usually unable to work for at least six months before he passes from this life. The expenses of the family are necessarily increased by his illness and what little might have been saved is soon consumed, and almost without exception the family is left destitute. Not only have they lost their loved one, but this means that the widow is often condemned to the washtub and the children to destitute poverty. According to the best information that I have there are about 15,000 widows and 45,000 children left in this condition annually, due to industrial accidents and diseases. I sincerely believe, therefore, that any man with human instincts, who really understands industrial conditions in regard to these matters, would not withhold his consent from an appropriation of $29,000 to continue research work to ascertain remedies for these conditions that will at least lessen the misery and suffering of the workers.

If these gentlemen had not stooped to the argument that the Labor Department and its bureaus had been violating the law, and that I, by asking for these additional appropriations, was thereby encouraging the violation of the law, and that these statements have made excellent material for the headlines of the newspapers of the country that serve the National Manufacturers' Association and other big business enemies of the labor people, I would not have mentioned this subject again. The Manufacturers' Association, whose influence has been directed against the rights and interests of any organization, Government bureau, or other institution that might tend to protect the interests of the workers, will grab at such statements as made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] as very good material to use against the Labor Department in its splendid efforts to secure better conditions in the industries of our country.

The gentleman from New York very craftily inferred that I was in accord with lawlessness when he made the following statement:

> I know, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois does not represent either the Department of Labor or organized labor or men who have the interest of organized labor at heart when he speaks in a slighting and trivial manner of the violation of the law by anybody. One of the things that has brought the labor movement in this country into contempt and under suspicion in the minds of a great many men has been a tendency to lawlessness upon the part of a few men, who took advantage of the power which they obtained in labor organizations.

In this regard I might say to the Congress, that there is nothing in the history of my life that would justify such a statement. While I do not care to take up the time of this committee, giving my history as a workman or as an official in the trade-union movement, I will say that those who know me and my record know that I was opposed to the vicious, dishonest, criminal element in the labor movement, and therefore the statement of the gentleman from New York, from which one might infer that I am in sympathy with violations of the law, is without foundation of fact. However, you now have it officially that I did not represent the labor organizations or the Labor Department in my effort to secure these increased appropriations, because it has so been stated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose word must not be doubted as being final.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We will see that the gentleman gets the time.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. After I get through with my speech I will gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the gentleman makes statements concerning myself he ought not to decline to yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The gentleman from New York made these statements with such force and influence that even the chairman of the Labor Committee was dazed for a time. However, he very ably defended the Committee on Labor from having anything to do with securing these amendments in the following words:

> Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I should not claim the attention of the committee now were it not for the declaration made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON]. I do not at this moment know how I shall vote on this amendment, because I must admit that the statements made by the committee in charge of the bill have produced grave doubts in my mind, and perhaps would have produced a state of certainty with regard to the amendment had it not been for the declaration of which I complain. * * * The fact is that the Committee on Labor, as such, has never had anything to do with these amendments, has never discussed them, has never had before it the subject of appropriations to the Department of Labor. I want to say, so far as I personally am concerned, although it may not be my portion to be charged with the particular responsibility on these matters, as the gentleman from Mississippi is now, that I give way to no man in this House in my purpose to enforce strictly administrative laws and to economize the resources of the people. And the Labor Department presents no exception to that rule, in my mind. If the Labor Department or a preceding bureau has violated the law and has expended money in a manner unwarranted by law, it, of course, can not ask for special privilege, and I am not here to defend it. But I am here, sir, to defend the Committee on Labor in this matter. The characterization it has received is absolutely unfounded and unjustified.

However, he failed to say one word in defense of the Secretary of Labor from the erroneous charges made against him. We have had an opportunity to associate with this man and to know him. He was one of the rank and file of the working people, who struggled up from poverty under extreme disadvantages. He has always had a high regard for law and order, and as a Member of this House established for himself an unquestionable record for honesty and integrity, and he was always loyal and attendant to his duties. As a member of the Cabinet he has conducted himself in a manner that commands the respect and confidence of all who know him, and to no man could the following words of Abraham Lincoln be more appropriately applied: "No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty."

Due to this misleading argument several other Members refused to vote for this appropriation for the continuation of research work into industrial diseases and accidents and put this House in the absurd position of refusing to appropriate $29,000 for these purposes, when just a few days before it appropriated $600,000 for investigations into the causes and prevention of hog cholera. Therefore this House goes on record as giving the animal greater consideration than it does the human beings who are at the mercy of industrial diseases and accidents that are destroying them by the thousands and tens of thousands. If the gentleman from New York thinks this is an enviable position to put the Democratic Party in, he will find that it would meet with the disapproval and protest of the American workingmen.

I want to state to this Congress that when the gentleman from New York or any other member of the Appropriations Committee, or any Member of this House, opposes appropriating necessary funds for the efficient operation of any Government department or bureau which is making investigations and gathering information which will be of inestimable value to the wageworkers he does not truly represent the Democratic Party, and when the Democratic Party is controlled by such influences it will cease to be a party of the people and will be unable to maintain the confidence and support of the American workmen. Such an attitude will not be sustained by the American voter, and it is a reflection upon the Democratic Party to say that such methods are in accordance with its policies or the fundamental principles of Democracy. This Democratic House has passed legislation for the protection of the working people that was denied them by the Republican Party for years and it deserves the credit and support of the wageworkers for what it has done; but its pledges are not all fulfilled, and it is our duty to carry out the letter and spirit of the promises we have made and enact legislation in accordance with the fundamental principles of Democracy, thereby giving labor greater freedom of opportunity and protection to human life.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not time. If I have time when I have finished my remarks, I will yield.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] seems to be another who was affected by the remarks of the gentleman from New York, that this department was operating in conflict with the law, and on February 27, with folded arms and uplifted face, with the expression of sanctification upon his brow, he made the following statement:

> I want to invite the attention of the committee to a statement made by the chairman of one of the great committees of this House the other day. If that statement had been made by some irresponsible person, I doubt if I would have called attention to it; but having been made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the great supply committee of the House, I feel that it is worthy of more than passing attention. Mr. FITZGERALD stated on the 24th of February as follows:
>
> "At that time a request was made by the Department of Labor to authorize the Secretary of Labor to purchase three automobiles—a seven-passenger touring car for himself, at $4,500; an electric runabout for the use of himself and others, for $2,500; and an automobile truck. The committee declined to include that authority in the bill, based upon the fact authority had never been given to any of the

departments to purchase automobiles for the Secretary or others connected with the department. In some way or other the information got noised abroad that such a request had been made, and innumerable Members of this House served notice upon the committee that they would not tolerate such a situation. The authority was not given, and yet it appears that during this session of Congress an automobile has been purchased for the personal use of the Secretary of Labor."

I would be ashamed of myself if I called the attention of this committee to the attempted raid upon the Treasury of $8,000 by a poor 70-year-old soldier out in Minnesota if I did not call their attention to the abstraction of $7,000 from the contingent fund of one of the departments of the Government in violation of the laws of this country by a Cabinet minister.

Thereby reiterating what the gentleman from New York had said, which will do the Democratic Party more harm and which will furnish the Republican Party with more campaign material than my colleague, Mr. MANN, the leader of the Republican side, has or can gather in the whole Congress.

When erroneous criticism of this character is made against one of the Cabinet officers it is an attack upon the administration, and the gentlemen who made these statements surely did not have the interests of the Democratic Party at heart when they took such a position.

This committee, whose chairman made an erroneous argument to keep the Department of Labor from getting an appropriation for research work of industrial diseases and accidents, gave their consent to the following appropriations for other departments:

| | |
|---|---|
| **NAVY DEPARTMENT.** | |
| Hydrographic Office, for contingent and miscellaneous expenses | $12,500.00 |
| Bureau of Navigation | 57,931.53 |
| Bureau of Ordnance | 12,345.60 |
| **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.** | |
| Geological Survey, for investigation of mineral resources in Alaska | 100,000.00 |
| **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.** | |
| An additional clerk | 400.00 |
| (But denies the Labor Department even an employee to run the elevator.) | |
| **UNITED STATES COURTS.** | |
| For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals | 60,000.00 |
| And a number of items under miscellaneous expenses amounting to | 61,292.76 |
| Bureau of Census | 2,500.00 |

I do not desire to complain of these items, but only mention them to show that other departments have been doing their business in a manner that when so done by the Department of Labor it is construed as being a violation of the law. These assumed watchdogs of the Treasury raised no objections to these appropriations being made to other departments.

In order that Members of this House shall not remain under the wrong impression in regard to the conduct of the Department of Labor, I desire to make the following statements of facts, which will show that the charges made by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Mississippi are without foundations of fact.

The various departments of the Government are equipped with the following conveyances:

State: 1 delivery truck, 2 carriages, 3 horses.
Treasury: 3 motor trucks, 5 carriage horses, 3 carriages.
War: 4 carriage horses, 4 carriages, 4 delivery-wagon horses, 4 delivery wagons.
Justice: 3 horses, 4 carriages, 2 delivery wagons, 2 horses.
Post Office: 1 electric truck, 4 carriage horses, 2 carriages.
Navy: 4 carriage horses, 4 carriages, 2 delivery wagons, 1 delivery horse.
Interior: 6 horses, 3 carriages, 4 motor trucks.
Agriculture: 5 carriage horses, 4 carriages, 4 draft horses, 1 motor truck.
Commerce: 4 draft horses, 5 carriage horse, 3 mail wagons, 2 trucks, 5 carriages, 1 motor truck (ordered).
Government Printing Office: 8 motor trucks, 2 automobiles (passenger).
Labor: 1 second-hand automobile and no limousines.

In addition to the equipment itemized above, many of the subordinate branches of the other departments have also been provided with motor or horse-drawn vehicles, but the one machine mentioned under the Department of Labor represents its entire equipment.

If anyone thinks it possible to conduct the business of one of the great executive departments of this Government without a vehicle or conveyance of some description, it is only because he has not taken the trouble to inform himself of the details and ramifications of this business. Nevertheless, during the first eight months of its existence, the Department of Labor was without either the service of any vehicle whatsoever or the means of procuring the same. In the latter part of October the Department of Commerce donated to it three old carriages and a team of aged horses, both of which had practically outlived their usefulness, and one of which broke down completely shortly thereafter. These vehicles were available for all character of official use. They conveyed the disbursing clerk and his assistants from place to place in the performance of their duties, were used for the transportation of large quantities of publications, and so forth, and served the Secretary in the fulfillment of such duties as devolved upon him by virtue of his official position, and which, were it not for his official position, he would not be called upon to perform.

The experience through which the Department of Labor went in the maintenance of horses and carriages served to convince it that one automobile would render better service and could be much more economically operated. The situation was brought to a head when one of the two horses became totally incapacitated, as the result of a general breakdown, and the other gave indications of shortly doing likewise. Veterinary bills were rapidly accumulating on behalf of the horse that was disabled, and a considerable expense was incurred in hiring another in its stead. The purchase of a new team would involve an outlay of some $600 or $700 and, in addition, the department would have been put to a monthly expense of upward of $100 for maintenance. It was then that the purchase of the automobile, which costs, not $7,000 but $1,600, was decided upon. It was procured only after the determination, based upon careful inquiry, had been reached that it could be maintained for about one-half what it would cost to continue the operation of horses and carriages.

Mr. FOWLER. And that automobile was swapped for.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes; that was traded for—a bargain.

The authority for the exchange of these horse-drawn vehicles and the purchase in their stead of an automobile is found in that portion of the act of March 4, 1913, appropriating contingent expenses for the Department of Commerce and Labor, which authorized "the purchase, exchange, and care of horses and vehicles," and the urgent deficiency bill of October 22, 1913, which carried an appropriation for the Department of Labor "to be available for the objects named in the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Commerce and Labor." Section 4 of the Revised Statutes declares:

> The word "vehicle" includes every description of carriage or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on land.

In harmony with that construction the Comptroller of the Treasury has twice ruled that if an administrative officer deems motor vehicles more efficient and economical than horses and carriages he is authorized, under an appropriation providing for the purchase of "horses and vehicles," to procure them.

So that it will be readily apparent to anyone who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts in this matter that the Department of Labor had not only ample legal authority for the purchase of the automobile in question, but that it was simply conforming to a policy which has long been pursued by other departments of the Government. Instead of being unjustly criticized for an alleged violation of law, where none has occurred, it should be commended for its action in the premises, which was dictated by a wholesome regard for conservation of the public funds and a desire to carry on its work in a businesslike way.

This bill as reported from the Committee on Labor places the proposed bureau of safety in the Department of Labor. On general principles there can be little doubt that this bureau, if it is to be established at all, should be established in that department. But in the light of the events of the last few days, one is compelled to harbor an unpleasant question. It is this: Is it the intention to create a bureau of safety, place it in the Department of Labor, and then cripple it and render it ineffective by the same tactics and methods which have been applied to the Department of Labor and its bureaus since the creation of that department?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, now in the Department of Labor, has for a number of years been doing some pioneer work in the very field which this bureau of safety is expected to occupy. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been crippled at every turn for want of appropriations. Not only that, but its appropriations have been hampered by restrictions which do not apply to other bureaus, and interpretations have been placed upon the language of even these meager appropriations which have not been applied to similar appropriations for other bureaus. It was stated on the floor of the House on February 24 that the Bureau of Labor Statistics had been violating the law in that it carried certain employees on a lump-sum pay roll, which lump sum, it was stated, had been appropriated exclusively for paying temporary assistants and experts and for paying the per diem and expenses of the field force employed by that bureau. The exact language of this section which appro-

priates this lump sum to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the current fiscal year is as follows:

For per diem, in lieu of subsistence, of special agents and employees while traveling on duty away from their homes and outside of the District of Columbia, at a rate not to exceed $3 per day, and for their transportation, and for employment of experts and temporary assistants, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding $8 per day, and for traveling expenses of officers and employees, and for the purchase of reports and materials for the reports and bulletins of the Bureau of Labor, and for subvention to "International Association for Labor Legislation," and necessary expenses connected with representation of the United States Government, $64,090.

The Appropriation Committee discovered that a number of permanent employees—19, I believe they say, in all—are carried upon this roll; that 8 of these are never assigned to field work. This alleged fact was made the basis of a violent attack upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the purpose of preventing that bureau from getting a reasonable deficiency appropriation. The inference, if not the direct statement, was that this alleged violation of the law, which, however, I will show was not a violation, had been inaugurated by those at present in charge of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. As a matter of fact, the practice complained of by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been going on in the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 23 years and has been going on in other bureaus of the Government ever since their establishment.

The statutory roll of the Bureau of Labor Statistics consists of the following: Commissioner, $5,000; chief statistician, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, $3,000; 4 statistical experts, at $2,000 each; clerks—5 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 12 of class 1, 9 at $1,000 each; 2 copyists; 2 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; special agents—4 at $1,800 each, 6 at $1,600 each, 8 at $1,400 each, 4 at $1,200 each; in all, $102,160, or 70 people. This is essentially the same number and the same salaries provided for in the bill reorganizing the present bureau, passed in 1888. There have been practically no increases in salaries or in force.

Now the language of the lump-sum appropriation does not specify that the people paid from that roll shall be field agents or employed in the field, and the carrying of the names of people employed in the office on that roll is neither a violation of the letter nor of the spirit of the lump-sum appropriation clause. There is no charge, and there can be no charge sustained, that the 19 people carried on that lump-sum roll to-day are supernumeraries or that they are being paid unreasonably large salaries. Ten per cent of the employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics resigned during the year 1913 to accept higher salaries elsewhere, and if there have been a few cases of transfer from the statutory roll to the lump-sum roll in order to hold the people needed it was made necessary by the niggardliness of Congress in holding the statutory roll to the exact level of 1888, regardless of the increase in salaries elsewhere and the growing demands of the bureau for higher grades of employees.

But what is this law which it is claimed has been violated? It was wedged into an appropriation bill in 1882 and is as follows:

That no civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger, mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall, after the 1st day of October next, be employed in any of the executive departments or subordinate bureaus or offices thereof at the seat of Government except only at such rates and in such numbers, respectively, as may be specifically appropriated for by Congress for such clerical and other personal services for each fiscal year; and no civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger, mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall hereafter be employed at the seat of Government in any executive department or subordinate bureau or office thereof or be paid from any appropriation made for contingent expenses or for any specific or general purpose unless such employment is authorized and payment therefor specifically provided in the law granting the appropriation, and then only for services actually rendered in connection with and for the purposes of the appropriation from which payment is made, and at the rate of compensation usual and proper for such services.

In 1912 an affirmation of this law of 1882 was again jammed into an appropriation bill, as follows:

That any person violating section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved August 5, 1882, shall be summarily removed from office, and may also, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year.

The thing to be objected to here is not so much these clauses that have been injected into appropriation bills as the fact that they are sprung now on the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make it appear that it has all of a sudden begun to violate the law, whereas the same condition exists in bureaus that have been created since the passage of that law and appropriated for in such a way that they could not possibly avoid doing what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is unwilling that the Bureau of Labor Statistics should do. For instance, the appropriation of the Bureau of Mines is entirely a lump sum. Under the law of 1882, reaffirmed in 1912, the Bureau of Mines could not employ anybody, as it has no statutory roll. The appropriation for the Bureau of Mines reads as follows:

For the general expenses of the Bureau of Mines, including the pay of the director and the necessary assistants, clerks, and other employees in the office at Washington, D. C., and in the field, and for every other expense requisite for and incident to the general work of the Bureau of Mines in Washington, D. C., and in the field, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $66,100.

For the investigation as to the causes of mine explosions, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry, $320,000.

For the analyzing and testing of the coals, lignites, ores, and other mineral fuel substances belonging to or for the use of the United States, including personal services in the Bureau of Mines at Washington, D. C., not in excess of the number and total compensation of those so employed during the fiscal year 1912, $135,000.

For inquiries and investigations into the mining and treatment of ores and other mineral substances, with special reference to safety and waste, $50,000: *Provided*, That no part thereof may be used for investigation in behalf of any private party, nor shall any part thereof be used for work authorized or required by law to be done by any other branch of the public service.

For one mine inspector for duty in Alaska, $3,000.

For per diem, subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, in lieu of subsistence, at a rate not exceeding $5 per day when absent on official business from his designated headquarters, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said inspector, including necessary sleeping-car fares, $3,500.

For technical and scientific books and publications and books of reference, $1,500.

For the purchase or lease of the necessary land, where and under such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, for the headquarters of five mine-rescue cars and for the construction of the necessary railway sidings on the same, $4,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept any suitable land or lands that may be donated for said purpose.

In all for the Bureau of Mines, $583,100 (p. 458, 62d Cong., 2d sess., C. 355, 1912). And this appropriation bill was passed in 1912, the very year in which the law of 1882, upon which is based this alleged criminality on the part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was reaffirmed. It may be said that the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines is not carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, and that, therefore, the restrictions do not apply. But that is precisely the point I want to make. You penalize practices in one bureau of the Government which you make a virtue of in others. You criticize a Labor Bureau for what you not only do not criticise the Bureau of Corporations and the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for doing, but you go further and make it impossible for the Bureau of Mines to do any other way than the way which you say is criminal when done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Moreover, the Bureau of Corporations, in addition to its statutory roll, has a lump-sum appropriation of $175,000, and the clause appropriating it is couched in the following language:

For compensation and per diem, to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, of special attorneys, special examiners, and special agents, for the purpose of carrying on the work of said bureau, as provided by the act approved February 14, 1903, entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," the per diem to be, subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Commerce and Labor may prescribe, in lieu of subsistence, at a rate not exceeding $4 per day to each of said special attorneys, special examiners, and special agents, and also of other officers and employees in the Bureau of Corporations while absent from their homes on duty outside of the District of Columbia, including necessary sleeping-car fares; in all, $175,000.

And again the Bureau of the Census has a lump-sum appropriation in addition to its statutory roll calling for $354,000 and couched in the following language:

For securing information for census reports, provided for by law, semimonthly reports of cotton production, and periodical reports of stocks of baled cotton in the United States, and of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton; per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of the same and of the detailed employees, whether employed in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records; the temporary rental of quarters outside of the District of Columbia; for supervising agents, and the employment by them of such temporary service as may be necessary in collecting the statistics required by law: *Provided*, That the compensation of not to exceed five special agents provided for in this paragraph may be fixed at an amount not to exceed $8 per day, $354,000.

In connection with the lump appropriation for the Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce, I want first to call attention to that bureau's statutory roll, which is as follows:

Commissioner of Corporations, $5,000; deputy commissioner, $3,500; chief clerk, $2,500; clerk to commissioner, $1,800; clerks—4 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 10 of class 1, 15 at $1,000 each; 15 copyists; messenger; assistant messenger; 3 messenger boys, at $480 each; in all, $78,300.

Then I want to call attention to a statement of promotions given out by the Bureau of Corporations and published in the Evening Star Wednesday, February 25, 1914. These promotions

must have been made from the lump roll, as certainly there is no provision for any special examiners at $3,480 a year in the statutory roll. The announcement of the Bureau of Corporations, as published, is as follows:

MOVE UP IN SERVICE—PROMOTIONS IN THE BUREAU OF CORPORATIONS ARE ANNOUNCED.

In the Bureau of Corporations the following promotions have been made:

Special examiners, Thomas M. Robertson to $3,480, Charles E. Edgerton to $2,580, Walter Y. Durand to $2,460, and David L. Wing to $2,340; Charles H. McDonald, special attorney, to $3,000; special agents, Harry C. McCarty, De Lorma A. Morrow, and Ernest S. Bradford to $2,400; T. A Carroll to $2,340; C. E. La Vigne to $2,100; E. O. Merchant, John M. Gries, Robert E. Belt, and William H. England to $2,040; Walter B. Wooden and Adrien F. Busick to $1,920; Clarence C. Farwell and William B. Horne to $1,860; Morton Q. Macdonald to $1,800; John W. Addison to $1,740; Leroy C. Floyd, Martin J. Dunsworth, Samuel S. Kalisher, Herbert L. Anderson, and John Knox Arnold to $1,680; James B. Peat to $1,620; Ishmael Burton and Waldemar R. Bendz to $1,500; Anderson H. Tackett to $1,440; Thomas A. Thibodeau, John F. Hauck, William W. Childs, and Walter P. Fickett to $1,380; Arthur E. Hyde and J. Paul Oren to $1,320; and Walter D. Waugh to $1,260; from clerk to special agent, Charles T. Windle to $1,620; William W. Bays to $1,320; Alvin R. Peterson to $1,200; clerks, Francis X. Patterson to $1,600; Otto E. Woerner to $1,400; Joseph W. Scheffer to $1,200; and Andrew N. Ross, Jason B. Caugin, and John S. Coombs to $1,000.

Now, there is not the slightest objection either to these promotions or these salaries in the Bureau of Corporations. Doubtless the promotions were all earned and the men were all qualified, but certainly these people paid from this miscellaneous lump-sum roll are not all experts. They are all permanent and by far the greater proportion of them are employed in the office in Washington all of the time. In other words, the Bureau of Corporations, the Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of the Census are doing precisely the same thing that, when done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is denounced upon this floor as being criminal or as being in violation of the law, and I would suggest that if the bureau of safety which as proposed by this bill is put in the Department of Labor for the purpose of being hamstrung, that maybe it had better be put in the Department of Commerce along with the Bureau of Corporations, or in the Department of the Interior along with the Bureau of Mines, where it will have some opportunity for development or some chance at least for a fair show.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has placed the same interpretation on the word "expert" that is commonly placed upon it in other bureaus; it has followed the common practice of governmental bureaus in its administration of the lump-sum roll. There is not a word in its appropriation law which limits the employment of experts as to time; the words "temporary assistants" do not apply to experts, nor does the term "expert" apply to a field force only. In short, I deny in toto that there is any violation of the intent or letter of this law.

In contrast with the Bureau of Corporations in the recent promotions just quoted, I want to place before the House the exact number of people carried on this miscellaneous expense roll in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. There is one at $2,760, as against the promotion to $3,480 made in the Bureau of Corporations on February 24—which, by the way, was the very day that the attack was made on the Bureau of Labor Statistics on this floor. To repeat, there is one at $2,760, one at $2,520, three at $2,280, six at $1,600, six at $1,400, two at $1,200. No very extravagant salaries these, and with the 19 people carried on this lump-sum roll the Bureau of Labor Statistics has in all but 89 employees, and pays the lowest salaries of any bureau in the Federal Government doing work of technical or scientific character, and does more work with fewer people than any other bureau in the Government, and does better work, and as a reward was refused money to print its reports and money to catch up with its arrearages in work, and for the reason, as some of us verily believe, that it has the misfortune to direct its activities along the lines of labor statistics. Whatever opinion may be held as to the good judgment exercised by those in control of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the past 25 years, the fact remains that the use made of its working fund was made necessary by the fact that Congress made no allowance for expansion in its statutory roll, and last year positively refused to do so. The remedy was to have given the Bureau of Labor Statistics the increase it asked for for the year 1914. Having refused to do that, to have given it something in the deficiency bill to enable it to get abreast of its work. This also was refused, and the question of the advisability of putting this Bureau of Safety under the Department of Labor resolves itself into this one query: Is it being put there for the purpose of chloroforming it along with all the other activities along the lines of interest to the laboring people?

With the suspicion, which it is impossible to escape, that the present Appropriation Committee of this House is laboring under a mental inability to be entirely fair to the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or anything that even squints toward labor, the question forces itself upon me whether or not that committee ought not to be instructed by the whole body of this House as to what it ought to do in labor matters; or, better still, whether the appropriations for the Department of Labor and its bureaus ought not to be considered by a separate committee, as is now being done in the case of the Agricultural Department, Navy Department, and others.

In making the effort I did to secure these increased appropriations for the Department of Labor and its bureaus so that they could efficiently do their work, I acted upon my own initiative, and if the gentlemen who so strongly opposed these needed appropriations are under the impression that I was prompted to do so because of the request of the Secretary of the Department of Labor or the head of any of the bureaus of that department, they are laboring under a misapprehension. Neither had I been asked to take this position by any organization of labor, but I was inspired to make the effort because I desire protection for the wage workers who are at the mercy of these destructive conditions in our industries. And if any gentlemen who may be actuated by a spirit of revenge desire to make an attack upon some one because of what I have said here to-day, let them direct their shafts at me, because I alone am responsible.

In his inaugural address President Wilson had the following to say regarding the preservation of the health and the protection of the wage workers:

Nor have we studied and perfected the means by which government may be put at the service of humanity in safeguarding the health of the Nation, the health of its men and its women and its children, as well as their rights in the struggle for existence. This is no sentimental duty. The firm basis of government is justice, not pity. These matters are of justice There can be no equality of opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politic, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they can not alter, control, or singly cope with. Society itself must see to it that it does not itself crush or weaken or damage its own constituent parts. The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves. Sanitary laws, pure-food laws, and laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency.

The American people applauded this statement, and the American Congress, if it is true to its promises, will provide ways and means to carry it out.

The Democratic House, under the great leadership of CHAMP CLARK, the Speaker, and OSCAR UNDERWOOD, the floor leader, will not only fulfill the pledges of the Democratic Party, but will respond to the needs of the American working people. The great Founder of Christianity proclaimed that He came "that the children of earth might have a more abundant life." Let us respond to our social and religious duty in part by enacting this legislation and seeing that sufficient money is appropriated for its efficient operation. [Applause.]

Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] if I have any time left.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I simply wished to ask the gentleman a pertinent question at one point in his statement when he said that I had charged certain things.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I read the official record.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman did not read any record which justified his statement at the time I wished to interrogate him.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. What was the statement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not recall it now. I will take the time to answer it after I have had the opportunity to read the gentleman's speech.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Now I will yield to my colleague [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. I simply wished to ask my colleague if it was his purpose to assert seriously on the floor of this House that the Committee on Appropriations of this House deliberately and willfully discriminated against the interests of labor in this country?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I stated the facts in regard to that. I do not know whether they have done it deliberately or not; but I will say, gentlemen, that this is not the first time. There was an agreement made last year by the Government, practically, to give the navy-yard employees an increase of wages, beginning the 1st of January. It was impossible to get this Committee on Appropriations to permit that money to be appropriated. That was practically violating an agreement. We have a condition on the Panama Canal now that, if it was not for the fact that it is labor and that labor can not be given proper consideration, you would hear from people who are howling this down. They would be unfolding the flag and waving it to the breeze in their splendid speeches if it was a matter concerning some vested right. The laboring men on the canal were

promised certain overtime and longevity pay by the agents of this Government, and this House has refused to appropriate the money. I say it is dishonest; that it is not complying with the agreement, no matter whether it is done in this House or where it may be done. This has been going on, mind you, since about 1909, under the Republican administration as well as under the present administration. I am going to keep battling for what I think is justice for labor. It does not matter to me whether labor supports me or not. I make no pretense of being the only representative of labor in this House.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I take it for granted that my colleague is sincere. I am satisfied he is.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have tried to be liberal in my statement concerning the Appropriations Committee. I have said that they did not understand these things. If they do understand them, then I say it is deliberate——

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say that the statement made by my colleague is an astounding and almost unbelievable statement, when he says that a committee of this House deliberately discriminates against the unfortunate of this country.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman, unless some one else desires to ask a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has the floor.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, before this session is ended, and when my work will permit me to take this speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] and analyze it, I shall take occasion to occupy the floor of the House sufficiently long to demonstrate how utterly worthless are the criticisms and statements made by him. His statement to-day is so full of misinformation, and he apparently is so innocent of what has been transpiring or what the real facts are, that I should not pay any attention whatever to his statements if it were not for the fact that many persons frequently credit everything they either hear or read. I shall not attempt to defend myself against any of the ridiculous and preposterous charges the gentleman from Illinois has attempted to bring against me. I shall put my record for the fearless discharge of my official duties in this House against that of the gentleman from Illinois, and I shall be willing to submit it not only to this House but to any constituency that he may select. I simply wish to add, Mr. Chairman, that every statement and every criticism that I made of the Department of Labor or of any other department of this Government during the conduct of the urgent deficiency bill in this House was thoroughly justified, and I do not retract in a single iota anything I said about them. [Applause.] More than that, I shall place in the RECORD the official statement and admissions of those in control of the various services criticized by me, and thus show that I was justified in what I said. If the gentleman from Illinois, or any other gentleman so disposed as he seems to be, imagines that he can frighten or coerce me from the proper discharge of my duty, he will ascertain in a very brief period that he is greatly mistaken.

I make this reply at this time so that no one may misunderstand that because I do not analyze and reply to the statements now that I have acquiesced in any of them. The gentleman's speech is full of misinformation, and perhaps he will regret when the full record is placed before the House that he was ever so foolhardy as to indulge in the remarks that he has submitted to the House. I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that has been allotted to me I can not undertake to make a speech; but as my name was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] in connection with the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel that I ought to make a brief statement. I have always endeavored, as far as I could, to be absolutely fair, absolutely just, absolutely honest, with all the departments. Nor do I believe that a Member of the House puts himself always in the best attitude before his fellows or of the country when he questions the motives that actuate the Members of this House, as the gentleman from Illinois has just done. Is it because he has misgivings in his own heart as to his own motives and so imagines that other people do wrong? I do not know. I attribute to him perfectly honest motives, but a mind full of misinformation, because in the consideration of these matters before the committee they were given a very patient hearing, and many of the items that were denied were not deficiencies, and these matters came before a deficiency committee. In a few days the legislative bill will be reported to the House, a bill which takes care of the Labor Department for the coming year. I do not believe that the gentleman from Illinois speaks for the Labor Department. I do not think he will advance rapidly the cause of that department by accusing his party Democrats of wrongdoing and in that character of speech. On the contrary, we will be fair with the Labor Department, and the people throughout the country, in spite of such speeches as the gentleman from Illinois has just made. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. This measure represents the most progressive thought of modern industrialism. Since the establishment of the factory system under which the individual had to look out for his own protection, there have grown up abuses in industrial life which weigh heavily on the men of labor.

Only in the last decade or two has there been an awakening to the needs of protection of labor by the employer. Representing a large industrial center, I am keenly interested in everything that tends to the protection of labor. In Milwaukee, noted for its iron and steel industry, and also for leather and all other kinds of industrial employment, long before there was placed on the statute book any workman's compensation act, the leading industries of that city took precautions to protect the welfare of their employees by the installation of labor-protecting devices.

The Milwaukee Harvester Works, which I have had the pleasure of visiting in conjunction with other large establishments, is a model in arrangement for the protection of laborers and artisans. Machinery which might jeopardize the health and security of the workman is equipped with safety devices to minimize the instances of accident. I could cite similar protective devices installed in our boot and shoe, glove, leather, machinery, and other establishments, both large and small. This protective system accounts for the small percentage of industrial accidents in our industries, and also for contentment among the workmen as to shop conditions.

The report of the Secretary of Labor shows that in the iron and steel industry greater advance has been made for the security and protection of employees than in any other branch of employment; that the risk in that industry has been reduced by reason of the installation of labor-protecting devices more than 67 per cent; and that the deaths have been reduced more than 30 per cent as the result of these improvements.

The first section of the bill, and there are only two sections, is substantially the creative thought of the brilliant leader of the minority, Mr. MANN, as embodied in the bill H. R. 7083, which he introduced as far back as July, 1913, with the exception only of having added a provision for the investigation of vocational diseases. We all favor that extension, and favor also the original provision for the study, investigation, and report as to labor-safety devices. This humanitarian movement to conserve the life and health and welfare of the laborer has been largely selfish on the part of the employer. They have seen that it was better for the morale of their establishments to provide them with up-to-date arrangements for their health and protection, than to leave undone those things that should have been done, and incur financial loss in reparation for injuries sustained; but we can not deprive them of the credit that they were also impelled in many instances by humanitarian purposes to conserve the lives and health of their own employees. Lately, by reason of the enactment of the workman compensation acts, which have taken away the defenses which have been recognized these many years under the common law of contributory negligence, fellow-servant liability, and the doctrine of assumed risk of the employment, reluctant employers have been driven to establish modern methods, which serve to protect the welfare and security of their employees. The insurable risk is lighter with improved self-protecting machinery, and insurance companies and also State legislatures require the proper safeguarding of exposed machinery.

The National Government by this provision is seeking to collate all this valuable information as to labor-safety devices in use in well-equipped plants and distribute it broadcast, so that it will have a value to the industries of the country generally.

But as to the next section, and it is the only other of the bill, which provides for a museum of sufficient size and capacity and with grounds annexed for these approved devices and for putting them in operation on exhibition, I respectfully contend that it is out of place in this bill. If any gentleman knows anything about these safety devices, like ventilating fans and other arrangements, they know that there would not be room enough on the Mall to provide a building for the exhibition of all these protective devices. And more than that,

Washington is not an industrial center; it is not intended to be, and we do not want it to be.

To have on display in operation, as this bill provides, these devices, without any limit as to cost and expenditure, would be but an idle waste of money that could much more readily be utilized in the dissemination throughout the country of the information that these labor experts will obtain, rather than by the erection of a large building which would rarely be utilized. I notice the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] rises in his place, and his doing so brings to my mind something to which he called attention the other day, and that is that there are thousands of models at the Patent Office that are never investigated, and this would be another instance of neglected inspection of exhibited devices. Another abuse that would arise would be this: The department would be obliged to play favorites in singling out and passing upon the several devices that would be tendered for display.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the gentleman know whether any of the foreign governments, especially those of great industrial nations, maintain museums such as is contemplated in the second section of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. The report of the Secretary of Labor is very vague upon that subject.

Mr. WILLIS. I have read that portion of the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. He states that it is understood there have been some such museums maintained at public expense, but his statement is not definite. I take it these museums may receive some support from the local government, but that the museum is primarily an industrial museum in connection with some industry or with various industries.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I regret to say that I can not. All of my time has been taken, and I will ask the gentleman from Ohio to pardon me.

I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take it that no one can be found who is not in thorough sympathy with the purposes that underlie this bill. Certainly it is difficult to conceive of anyone so hardened as not to feel sympathetic with any movement looking to alleviate the conditions of many of the industrial workers of the world. My purpose in speaking to-day, therefore, is not to advocate the need of this study, for I take it, as I have said, that on that there will be no division, but to bring to the attention of the committee the question of how most efficiently to carry on that study. Those of us who have had experience in legislative matters know that it is frequently difficult to prevent oneself from being misunderstood as to motives when one undertakes to criticize the methods adopted in a particular measure for carrying out some good purpose. But, as I shall vote for the bill, I am sure my criticisms will be considered as offered with the hope of perfecting the bill.

We have to-day one of the most efficient bureaus in the entire Government, a bureau with an ancient history, a history that it can well afford to be proud of, and because of which it has secured the respect of the entire country, and whatever it undertakes or whatever conclusions it reaches meet with practically general acceptation by the people of America, and that is the bureau now known as the Public Health Service, formerly the Marine-Hospital Service. That service is to-day engaged in the study of vocational diseases, and it is not only occupying that field in some respects fully, but it proposes to continue its energies not only along the lines heretofore followed, but to broaden out so as to embrace all vocational diseases and their causes. And it is because of that fact that I feel that we would make a mistake if we undertook to create a separate bureau to invade the field now properly occupied by the Public Health Service.

If you create a special corps to examine into the subject of vocational diseases, only one of two things must happen. Either that corps in its examination will of necessity not go fully into the subject, and therefore make a report that will not have the general acceptance that it should have in order to be of value, or it will go into the domain of general hygiene, that will carry it inevitably into the field that peculiarly belongs to that of the Public Health Service. In the study of vocational diseases you must consider not simply the questions that pertain to the industry under study, but you must consider general health conditions. For instance, in the consideration of fatigue and its effect upon the human system you must not only consider the fatigue that is induced by the labor at which the particular man studied is employed, but you must consider in connection with that the question of his food, how far the food that he is able to procure and does procure is such as to provide him with energy sufficient to offset the natural fatigue that comes from any and all labor. You have to consider questions of housing and of general sanitation. In other words, you have to consider not simply the conditions that surround a particular worker while at work at his trade, but you must consider the health of the community in which he lives and forms a part. It is perfectly apparent that for any special corps to enter into that field means to usurp the functions that belong to the Health Bureau. I have here, and I shall put it into the RECORD, because it is too long to now read, a statement prepared by the Public Health Service in connection with its hearings before the Committee on Appropriations as to its present activities. There seems to be an impression that they are not now engaged in the study of vocational diseases, but in point of fact, as I just stated, they have already done much along that line and are proposing to do much more. The Public Health Service not only looks after the health of all of the American seamen and gives to those who are sick free hospital attention, but it examines as to the physical healthfulness of all immigrants that come into the United States. It has made investigations of women and child labor in the United States. It has made investigations in regard to trachoma and the sanitary conditions of certain workers in the iron ranges in Minnesota. It has recently made an investigation as to the employees in the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., in Ohio, and it has made investigations of the mining industry and of the danger of and tendency to tuberculosis among such miners. It is now doing work in St. Louis along similar lines. In connection with the acts that we passed touching the manufacture of matches it is making a special investigation.

It made investigation of the rag industry in one State and made recommendations to the authorities for the control of the insanitary conditions there, and in doing that went into the subject of the method of the transmission of woolsorters' disease by means of biting flies. Inspection has been made of model factories with a view of obtaining information in respect to the methods of sanitation in such establishments. Laboratory experiments and tests have been made in regard to the use of poison and habit-forming drugs and the effect of fumes and the effect of fatigue upon workers; in point of fact, I could stand here, if I had the time, for an hour and enumerate various industries in this department which have pertained directly upon the subject of vocational diseases. Now, what I believe ought to be done——

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Briefly.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to be objecting to this bill on the ground that the passage of it would encroach upon the field of the Public Health Service work?

Mr. SHERLEY. Partially that is true. I am not opposing the bill, but I oppose the present form of it.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact the main purpose is to study safety appliances and devices rather than vocational diseases. I agree with the gentleman that it is not desirable to cripple the Health Service at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand the motive is not to cripple the Health Service at all, and I stated the motive of the bill was one with which I was in thorough accord, but unfortunately there is a great difference between motives of men and the results of men's actions. Many a man's action from a good motive causes unfortunately bad results. As the bill is drawn, in my judgment it is so broad it will authorize the creation in the Department of Labor of a medical corps for the study of vocational diseases, and to that extent it ought to be amended, and I was about to come, when the gentleman interrupted me with his inquiry, to that very point, What should be done is to strike out of the bill the language on page 2, line 2, "All phases of the subject of vocational diseases," and make it read in substance like this: "Also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases."

And then there should be an item inserted in the bill requiring the medical bureau to give to the department all proper aid in its study of vocational diseases, and I suggest an amendment in this form, after the word "time," in line 5, to insert:

It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service, in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes, to cooperate with such bureau upon the request of the Secretary of Labor.

Now, I make the language that way in order that it may clearly appear that the study of vocational diseases, as such, is the province of the Public Health Service, and is not to be the province of any corps created by this bill. The reason for it,

I desire to repeat, is that you can not have a proper study of a disease, as such, without considering not only the facts in connection with the particular industry but general questions of hygiene, questions that the Public Health Service are more peculiarly fitted successfully to go into than any corps that can now be created.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The amendment which the gentleman suggested was to come at the end of the sentence, line 5?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Does that involve any other change in the preceding language other than the change which the gentleman in charge of the bill will probably propose?

Mr. SHERLEY. It may, but it does not occur to me at the time. It seems to me if this was made to read—

It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and specific investigation and examination of labor safety plans and devices of all kinds and the needs therefor, general and specific, and also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases—

that would limit it to the field that properly belongs to it, and one that I want it to enter and fully occupy. Then by providing that the Public Health Service should cooperate with it, giving aid by means of its work in the study of vocational diseases as such, you would have covered the whole field.

Mr. MANN. I understand the amendment which the gentleman has read is almost the same amendment which I understand the gentleman from Maryland intended to offer?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that is true, but it is different in one particular. I understand the gentleman from Maryland was to propose an amendment after the end of the sentence in line 5, as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service to cooperate with such bureau upon the subject of vocational diseases upon the request of the Secretary of Labor.

Now, the reason I made my suggestion in this language:

It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes to cooperate with such bureau upon the request of the Secretary of Labor—

was to have it clearly appear, as I believe it ought to appear, that the study of vocational diseases as such is now within the field of the Public Health Service and should remain there, but to provide for a cooperation that would bring about a proper efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. The language of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] might leave it open at some subsequent time to be claimed that this bureau here to be created should go into the field that I think lies properly with the Public Health Service, and not with it. This is what I desired to bring to the attention of the committee. Unfortunately I shall not be able to print for the committee's perusal before a vote shall come upon this the statement that was made before the Committee on Appropriations, but I want to repeat that the Public Health Service is now actively in this field, that the appropriations it receives and asks for are very large, running considerably over $1,000,000 annually. And speaking for myself, and I have no doubt voicing the belief of all the members of that committee, it will be the desire of the Committee on Appropriations in providing funds for this new bureau to provide ample funds, and also to take care of all the proper activities of the health bureau, including the study of vocational diseases.

And in this connection I desire to say but one further word about the Committee on Appropriations. I have had the pleasure of serving on that committee for six or seven years. It is the duty, the high, sacred duty, of that committee to scrutinize with care all estimates that are submitted. If that committee does not by its zeal undertake to protect the Treasury against demands that should not be granted, there can be no hope of such protection anywhere else. And it is unfair to it and to the Members who perform as arduous, if not more arduous, service than membership upon other committees entails, to assume that in their attitude of scrutiny of estimates they are actuated by any other motive than that high and proper legislative one of protection of the Treasury of the Government that the burdens which the raising of the revenues of the Government place on the people may not be increased. [Applause.]

For myself, I deny any feeling of hostility toward any bureau of this Government. [Applause.]

Under the leave to extend my remarks I submit the following statement from the current hearings had by the Committee on Appropriations:

THE RELATION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE UNDER EXISTING LAWS TO OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES AND ITS FACILITIES TO INVESTIGATE SAME AND TO PROMOTE THE SANITATION OF INDUSTRIES.

Under existing laws the Public Health Service is charged, among other things, with the investigations of diseases of man. Section 1 of an act approved August 14, 1912, provides as follows:

"The Public Health Service may study and investigate the diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage and the pollution, directly or indirectly, of the navigable streams and lakes of the United States, and it may from time to time issue information in the form of publications for the use of the public."

Not only may the Public Health Service make investigations of diseases of man and distribute information in relation thereto, but it is charged with the collection of reports of the occurrence of vocational and infectious diseases, the control of communicable diseases in interstate traffic, and the care and protection of the health of American seamen.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HAS BEEN DEVELOPED INTO A NATIONAL HEALTH AGENCY IN CONFORMITY WITH LAWS ENACTED FROM TIME TO TIME BY CONGRESS.

Congress has established, developed, and maintained the Public Health Service as a national health agency by virtue of the following acts:

Act of July 16, 1798, creating a Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of January 25, 1799, first quarantine law.
Act of July 13, 1832, an act to enforce quarantine regulations.
Act of May 26, 1866, an act to enforce quarantine laws.
Act of June 29, 1870, to reorganize the Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of March 3, 1875, an act to promote economy and efficiency in the Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of April 29, 1878, an act to prevent the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases into the United States.
Act of March 3, 1879, an act to appropriate for the publication of the weekly public health reports.
Act of March 3, 1881, epidemic fund provided in sundry civil act. Continued from time to time since that date.
Act of September 6, 1888, epidemic fund may be used to suppress infection in interstate traffic.
Act of January 4, 1889, to regulate appointment in the Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of March 27, 1890, to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases from one State into another.
Act of March 3, 1891, medical examination of arriving aliens; shall be made by officers of the Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of February 15, 1893, granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of March 3, 1901, hygienic laboratory building provided in sundry civil appropriation act for investigations of "matters pertaining to the public health."
Act of July 1, 1902, to increase the efficiency and change the name of the Marine-Hospital Service to the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of July 1, 1902, an act to regulate the sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products in the District of Columbia and interstate traffic.
Act of March 3, 1905, to provide for the investigation of leprosy.
Act of June 19, 1906, to further protect the public health and make more erective the national quarantine.
Act of February 20, 1907, providing that the physical examinations of aliens be made by officers of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.
Act of August 14, 1912, to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

It is evident from the above laws that it was the manifest intention of Congress to create and develop a national health agency competent to investigate all unhygienic conditions reacting adversely upon the health of man, to disseminate the information acquired, and to formulate the necessary measures for control.

In accordance with these laws, the Public Health Bureau has been organized on broad lines and is eminently fitted to prosecute investigations of vocational diseases and sanitation of industries. Diffusion of this authority among several departments and bureaus of the Government would result in duplication of work, lack of coordination of effort, and useless expense.

PRESENT FACILITIES OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FOR INVESTIGATIONS OF VOCATIONAL DISEASES.

The Public Health Service now has 487 officers located at different points throughout the United States and in foreign countries. On account of the mobility of the corps, not only do these officers keep in touch with matters relating to the protection of health in communities in which they are located, but they may be concentrated and transferred to any point or points wherein insanitary conditions require investigations and control.

The movements of officers and the policy followed in respect to investigations are directed by the Public Health Bureau in Washington, which consists of six well-organized divisions so constituted that they can be readily enlarged without the necessity for developing new agencies for special investigations of particular hygienic subjects which would entail additional overhead expenses.

ACTIVITIES OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE IN RELATION TO VOCATIONAL DISEASES.

1. For many years the Public Health Service has treated and protected the health of American seamen, who constitute an important group of industrial workers.

2. It has examined mentally and physically millions of aliens, who form an increasing army of recruits to the industries. This latter duty is performed under law in cooperation with the Department of Labor.

3. The Public Health Service cooperated with the Bureau of Labor in an investigation of women and child labor in the United States.

4. In cooperation with other departments, three officers of the Public Health Service have investigated sanitary conditions in mines in Alabama, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

5. Another officer investigated the sanitary conditions on the Mesabi and Vermilion iron ranges in Minnesota with special reference to trachoma.

6. In like manner an investigation was recently made on behalf of the employees in the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., physical examinations being made of them, as well as their environment in the mills and homes being studied.

7. As a part of the investigations of the mining industry one officer spent almost a year in special studies of tuberculosis and miner's phthisis among metal miners.

8. In connection with his other duties, an officer of the service acted as medical director of the Anti-Tuberculosis Society at St. Louis, and directed studies of housing conditions of the industrial population of that city. He also occupied the chair of hygiene in the St. Louis University Medical School and taught industrial sanitation in this capacity.

9. In connection with their regular duties, other officers of the service have given or are now giving regular courses of lectures as professors in universities and medical schools on hygiene and industrial sanitation in Boston, Mass.; Baltimore, Md.; Mobile, Ala.; New Orleans, La.; and San Francisco, Cal; special emphasis being laid on housing and environment.

10. An investigation was made by an officer of the service of different systems of lighting, with special reference to their adaptability for places of employment, laboratory tests and systematic physical examinations of employees having been made.

11. Under an Executive order of February 28, 1906, sanitary inspections of Government buildings in Washington have been systematically carried on, and for the protection of other workers those suspected to be afflicted with disease are specially examined. In addition, the physical fitness of employees for certain duties has been the subject of special studies.

12. As a part of this work special researches have also been made of the effects of fumes of cyanide of potash in case-hardening processes, and special attention has been given to the injurious effects of certain pigments used in printing processes.

13. An extensive series of experiments has been made as to the presence of poisonous gases in certain railway tunnels and their injurious effects upon employees.

14. An investigation of the rag industry in one State was conducted and recommendations made to the authorities for the control of insanitary conditions. In addition, another officer of the service, while temporarily absent on other duty, demonstrated the method of transmission of wool sorter's disease (anthrax) by means of biting flies.

15. Inspections have been made of certain model factories with a view to issuing information in respect to the improvement of sanitation in other industrial establishments.

15a. In a publication just now out of press, namely, Public Health Bulletin No. 62, all the laws in regard to factory sanitation, with special reference to the prevention of communicable diseases, have been studied and analyzed.

16. Systematic studies have been carried on relative to the provisions of the several States for the control of the use of poisons and habit-forming drugs, and a detailed analysis of all State and territorial laws and regulations relating thereto has been issued in bulletin form.

17. A model law for the collection of morbidity reports has been drafted and recommended to the several States and Territories for adoption. Among the diseases the reporting of which is contemplated in this law are the following vocational diseases and injuries:

Arsenic poisoning, brass poisoning, carbon monoxide poisoning, lead poisoning, mercury poisoning, natural-gas poisoning, phosphorus poisoning, wood alcohol poisoning, naphtha poisoning, bisulphide of carbon poisoning, dinitrobenzine poisoning, caisson disease (compressed-air illness); any other disease or disability contracted as result of the nature of the person's employment.

18. Under authority of the act approved April 9, 1912, entitled "An act to provide for a tax upon white phosphorus matches, and for other purposes," the following regulations have been issued by the Secretary of the Treasury in respect to examinations of materials of which matches are made and the sanitary inspections of establishments in which they are manufactured:

"ART. 3. For the purposes of determining which manufacturers of matches are subject to the provisions of this act, every manufacturer of matches will be required to file with the collector of the district in which his factory is located a statement, under oath, setting forth the names of materials used in the matches produced by him and to furnish samples of the materials named and of the finished product to this office and to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for examination. This shall be done whenever deemed necessary by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and whenever a manufacturer may make a change in his process of manufacture.

"ART. 4. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall cause to be examined in the Hygienic Laboratory from time to time samples of matches bought upon the open market, to determine whether they contain poisonous white or yellow phosphorus, and he shall report the result of such examinations to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"ART. 5. If white or yellow phosphorus in any of its forms is used in the production of matches by the manufacturer, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall cause to be made a thorough examination of the factory and materials entering into the production of matches, and a physical examination of the persons employed in such establishment, and he shall report his findings in the matter to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"For the purpose of this investigation and examination any duly authorized officer of the Public Health Service shall have access to any match factory while in operation.

"ART. 6. Upon report of the findings of the Surgeon General, the collector of the district wherein the factory is located will be notified whether the manufacturer is exempt from the operations of the law, and, if not, the manufacturer will be required to register, file notice, bond, etc., as hereinafter provided.

"Section 2 provides:

"'That every manufacturer of white phosphorus matches shall register with the collector of internal revenue of the district his name or style, place of manufactory, and the place where such business is to be carried on; and a failure to register as herein provided and required shall subject such person to a penalty of not more than $500. Every manufacturer of white phosphorus matches shall file with the collector of internal revenue of the district in which his manufactory is located such notices, inventories, and bonds, shall keep such books and render such returns in relation to the business, shall put such signs and affix such number to his factory and conduct his business under such surveillance of officers and agents as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulation require. The bond required of such manufacturer shall be with sureties satisfactory to the collector of internal revenue and in the penal sum of not less than $1,000; and the sum of said bond may be increased from time to time and additional sureties required at the discretion of the collector, or under instructions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.'"

19. In accordance with the law and regulations cited, systematic examinations of a large number of samples have been made and new tests devised for these examinations.

20. Under the act of July 1, 1902, regulating the propagation and sale in interstate traffic of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, regular inspections are made of establishments where such products are made.

21. Particular attention has been paid to the sanitation of rural populations. It was an officer of the Public Health Service who demonstrated the presence of hookworm disease and its relation to industrial efficiency, and it was practically wholly on account of his efforts that the present widespread campaign for the eradication of this disease was undertaken. Likewise the insanitary conditions in rural communities giving rise to typhoid fever have been investigated by officers of the service, as a result of which extensive preventive measures have been put in operation and the incidence of the disease markedly reduced.

The control of insanitary conditions giving rise to the continuance of typhoid fever and malaria represents, in fact, what is classed as rural hygiene. This work affects favorably not only agricultural workers but all other persons who depend on their efforts for food and other agricultural products. It should be stated that the activities mentioned have not solely consisted in the issue of bulletins, but for the most part have consisted in active field work in cooperation with State and municipal health authorities and in general educational campaigns for the prevention of diseases and the betterment of insanitary conditions.

THE RELATION OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE TO GENERAL SANITATION.

In providing ways and means for the improvement of sanitation among industrial workers every insanitary condition must be inquired into. The investigator is thus quickly led from a relatively narrow zone of inquiry into the broad field of general sanitation. For instance, in studies of the high death rates from tuberculosis among workers in certain occupations inquiries as to fatigue, dust, etc., in factories must be supplemented by studies of public-health conditions in the home and in the community.

Investigations of industrial diseases, therefore, can not logically or practically be carried on independent of investigations of general sanitation. The field must be approached from a broad standpoint, and the officers performing the work must have both technical and general training in public-health matters and public-health administration.

INVESTIGATIONS OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE NOW IN PROGRESS.

In conformity with this principle a number of important investigations are now being made and others planned. These investigations are as follows:

1. A comprehensive investigation of the industries in relation to tuberculosis is being carried on in Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity at the present time under the direction of an officer of the service.

2. Field surveys are under way in a number of States to determine the extent of the migration of tuberculous persons from one section to another and its effects on employees of common carriers and the persons in communities to which they resort.

3. Investigations are being made of malaria in relation to its prevalence and its effects on the efficiency of individuals.

4. On request of the Indiana industrial commission, an investigation is being undertaken of the hygienic conditions of the employment of women and children in industries in the State.

5. Arrangements are being completed for a thorough inspection of the sanitation of the match industry in the United States.

6. On request of the National Council of Industrial Safety, two officers of the service are cooperating with a view to a sweeping investigation of insanitary conditions affecting different industries in the United States. One of these officers is also acting as sanitary adviser to the United States Commission on Industrial Relations.

7. Laboratory studies are being made as to the presence of deleterious substances in india-rubber manufactures.

8. In cooperation with the New York ventilation commission, an officer of the service, who is also a member of this commission, is making scientific investigations into the effects of temperature and humidity and circulation of air upon the human organism under working and resting conditions.

9. In connection with investigations of water supplies, extensive studies are being made of industrial wastes and their relation to the health of communities.

10. Intensive studies of rural hygiene are now being carried on in several communities, all factors, including housing, water supplies, etc., being given attention.

ADDITIONAL DUTIES IN RELATION TO INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE WHICH SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY UNDERTAKEN BY THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Several additional broad lines of investigation in relation to industrial hygiene should be undertaken by the Public Health Service and funds for that purpose provided. These are as follows:

1. Investigation of industries with a view to devising minimum standards of hygienic requirements.

2. Intensive studies of disease among industrial workers with a view to determining the underlying effect of industries upon public welfare.

3. Technical studies in service laboratories on lighting, heating, ventilation, and the effects of poisonous fumes and gases, fatigue, monotony, and the like on the average individual.

4. Collection of data in relation to the occurrence of occupational and other diseases and the causes giving rise to their continuance.

With additional personnel and funds the above lines of work can be continued or undertaken by the Public Health Service, and it is this agency which should be looked to for this work. There is urgent demand for such activities, as evidenced by bills now pending, but some of these bills would invest in other departments the authority which the Public Health Service already has been granted by Congress.

In so far as investigations of vocational diseases and making public the results are concerned, the necessary authority should continue to be lodged in the Public Health Service, because matters of industrial hygiene are not to be considered separately, and because this service is already organized to perform general sanitation.

In letters of February 2, 1914, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Labor in the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Senate the Secretary of the Treasury presented the views of the department on this subject, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
*United States House of Representatives.*

SIR: By direction of the Secretary I have the honor to invite attention to certain provisions contained in bill H. R. 10735, having for its object the creation of a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, and to state that these provisions, if enacted into law, would really be a duplication of existing legislation and would lead to the creation of a bureau which would, in effect, be another public health service under the Government, which would seem to be inadvisable from the standpoint of economy and efficiency.

The above-mentioned bill provides, among other things, for:

1. The study of vocational diseases and the dissemination of the results of such studies.

2. The gathering, compiling, publishing, and supplying of useful information concerning occupational diseases in the industries in the United States and elsewhere.

3. The erection of a museum in which shall be exhibited, among other things, approved devices for the lessening of dangerous conditions which may exist in industrial enterprises, and the method of lessening, preventing, and control of industrial diseases.

4. The establishment of a laboratory wherein may be examined and tested the relative efficiency of types of devices for the protection of machinery calculated to safeguard the employee or the general public from injury or industrial disease.

The above provisions in respect to the investigation and prevention of occupational diseases are very broad, and if enacted into law and vigorously enforced would lead naturally to the establishment of what in effect would amount to a public health service, a museum of hygiene, and a hygienic laboratory in the Department of Labor.

There is now in the Treasury Department a Public Health Service, which is specifically authorized by act of Congress approved August 14, 1912, to "study and investigate the diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage," and, furthermore, "from time to time issue information in the form of publications for the use of the public."

The extent to which the existing Public Health Service can study and investigate industrial diseases and correlated subjects is limited only by congressional appropriation and administrative policy. A number of field laboratories are now maintained for investigations of public-health matters, including the Hygienic Laboratory at Washington, which is recognized internationally as one of the great research institutions of the world.

Exhibits of hygienic devices have been prepared from time to time by the Public Health Service, and steps are now being taken to add materially to them for use at the Panama Pacific Exposition. They have been extensively drawn on for educational purposes in different parts of the country, and if collected in one place and added to would form the nucleus of a creditable museum of hygiene.

In addition the Public Health Service has a large corps of officers trained in the investigation and control of preventable diseases, and some of these officers are now engaged in special studies of industrial diseases, one also being assigned to exclusive duty with the United States Commission on Industrial Relations. The number of officers and special experts who may be engaged in this duty in the Public Health Service is limited only by the extent of appropriations, since the act of August 14, 1912, provides "that there may be employed in the Public Health Service such help as may be provided from time to time by Congress."

Any comprehensive plan for investigations of industrial diseases would necessarily involve studies of ventilation, temperature, humidity, cleanliness, and other conditions which influence the prevalence of preventable diseases generally. Such investigations would quickly lead into the broad field of general sanitation, since the prevention of industrial diseases is a part and is indisputably interwoven with the general public-health problem. To have the force attacking this great problem divided among several different departments and uncorrelated would cause administrative difficulties and duplication of work.

The loss in human health, in human life, and in economic resources which results every year in the United States from insanitary conditions in the home, the field, or the factory is enormous. Every effort should be made to check this loss, and it would appear that this can best be done, in so far as the Federal Government is concerned, by the development of an adequate homogeneous organization which shall render the fullest cooperation possible to the several departments in matters pertaining to public health.

In view of the above facts, I have to request that careful consideration be given to the matter, to the end that investigations of industrial diseases, compilation and dissemination of information concerning occupational diseases, and the establishment of a museum of hygiene, and the development of laboratory studies of vocational diseases shall continue to devolve on the Public Health Service.

It will be understood that these remarks do not relate to the provisions of the bill dealing with safety and safety devices.

Respectfully,

BYRON R. NEWTON,
*Assistant Secretary.*

In view of the foregoing statements, it is respectfully urged that the estimates for additional officers and funds be allowed, and that the development of this and other important phases of the work of the Public Health Service be continued.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and give way to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] for the time being.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in the right I suppose I enjoy now of recognition for an hour, I want to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS], and reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, the few remarks I desire to make I wish to say, frankly, do not pertain to this bill. I want to say to the membership of the House that as one of the committee to investigate the strike in Colorado we have just returned from there, and I hold in my hand a message which I think the Members of this House and the people of the country should have. The committee has not yet made a report, nor is it ready to make one, and I hope I shall not transgress the rules when I mention the fact that that committee has been there and found such condition of affairs as this telegram will reveal. It is as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *March 10, 1914.*

Hon. J. M. EVANS,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:*

Twenty-three militiamen, under orders of Adjt. Gen. John Chase, this morning demolished strikers' tent colony at Forbes, Colo. Men, women, and children made homeless in blinding snowstorm. Inhabitants of upper tent colony ordered by militia to leave their homes within 48 hours or be deported.

JOHN R. LAWSON,
*International Board Member, U. M. W. A.*
JOHN MCLENNAN,
*President District 15, U. M. W. A.*
E. L. DOYLE,
*Secretary-Treasurer District 15, U. M. W. A.*

I read this telegram for the purpose of getting it into the RECORD and before the country, with the hope that an enlightened public sentiment may stay the hand of strife and a ruthless militia in the State of Colorado, in order that further bloodshed in that unfortunate State may cease.

I thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two and one-half minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] 15 minutes.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Chairman, the subject of this bill, giving to the Labor Bureau the right of investigation in the line suggested, is one that should commend itself to everyone. To become statistical as regards the loss of life or limb from industrial or other accidents would mean but the pure waste of time. It is manifest that each of us in our everyday occupations observe or otherwise are acquainted with the misfortunes that are ordinarily the incident of everyday industrial work. We may just as well recognize that there is the necessity for that humbler class of occupations to be maintained and kept up in order that all may have the material and necessary enjoyment and comforts of life. We can not each occupy the same position, but in our different positions we relatively contribute to the success of our community and of all the people.

We must appreciate the progress that has been made in recent years, the advanced steps that have been taken. While government is fundamentally for the protection of people in their rights of property and person, we may have perhaps in the past considered too much the question of property and not sufficiently the question of the person. It is a pleasure to observe that those trite principles which in the past excluded and eliminated the right of recovery upon the part of the employee in the case of injury, or his family for compensation in the event of his death, while engaged in industrial work have been set aside. No longer is the old-time theory of risk in employment, negligence of coemployee, to be set up to preclude the right of recovery. The advanced thought of to-day has tended to make us realize that the individual is part of the great machinery of the industry, greater and more forcible and more important than the aid that comes from mechanical means. We have concluded that there should be a just return in time of accident to compensate for the losses sustained to the family in case of death to compensate it in the loss of the wage-earning member thereof. But there is no standard, there is no degree, there is no method of compensation that can restore to one the loss of a member of the family, or which can make one the valuable working force in the future that he was in the past after having been seriously injured in his occupation. There can be no compensation that can go into the home and bring back the light or pay sufficiently for the light that has gone out. There is no compensation that can restore the care of a father or the watchfulness of a mother or the ambition of a growing boy to return in part to his parents by his labor the kindness that they have bestowed upon him. Compensation is the best that the law and the machinery of the administration of the law will afford for the injury that has been visited upon a person.

We can not help but observe in the different States of our Union the care that has been taken with regard to the protection of property—insurance departments, banking departments are of long standing; to investigate them and consider whether deposit or indemnity companies seeking to safeguard deposits or to compensate people at times for loss of particular things are able to make good.

We have grown apace with that, and have considered the individual. We have established our health bureaus. We have established other bureaus that seek to eliminate where possible

those ills that are incident to human life; and while we are to-day measuring and valuing the property of great transportation companies, with the purpose and the object of seeing whether or not the investor is secure in the money that is put in, it is well for us to give thought and consideration to the circumstances and the conditions that surround the wage-earner and the laborer, and see whether he is safe in his employment, and see if we can not bring about a higher grade of security than he has had in the past and avoid as much as possible those risks which are ordinarily incident to the hazardous employment in which he is engaged.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that legislation of this character will be very beneficial. It is along the economic line, and it is on the line of prevention. In our day the employer is compelled and obligated to compensate, under the laws of various States, for the injury that befalls the employee. The employee should be guarded as well as possible, and to my mind, no matter what State regulations there may be, the establishment in a great bureau of our Federal Government of a department such as this will furnish the means by which the light will go out into many working quarters, and as the result of the education as to the management of machinery incident to the industries, there will be prevention of loss of life and of the loss of limb, and as well a prevention of disease. I care not to which department it is relegated or in what form it is established, but those two subjects are subjects on which the National Government should educate and enlighten the public and spread the information that can be gathered in connection therewith.

We go further in a measure like this than merely, as I stated, compensation. There is no greater work than to preserve the individual; no greater work than to realize the commonality of persons of all who engage in industry in this great country of ours; no greater work than to recognize the risks incident to employment. If those risks can be lessened, we contribute by that work to the relief of all the citizenship of our Republic. The hazardous occupation, the menial occupation, the dangerous occupation, whether from machinery or disease, is a necessary occupation, and if we can reach over and lessen the dangers it is not class good, but it is universal good. It is not directed solely for the benefit of particular people, but for the benefit of all. It is for the protection of the economic standard of the one who would employ labor, and it is, as well, the preservation of the laborer himself, who in his limitations may perhaps not be able to go much beyond complying with the divine mandate of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow.

But we will give to him, at least, security and aid and the means of avoiding danger, and we will seek to drive away from him disease and seek to preserve him for the best that is in him in his particular calling for the general good of our country and his special community. We will preserve him as well as a real man, as a helpful man, as a whole man, for the benefit of the family that is dependent on him for their necessities and maintenance. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating certain data from the hearings of the Public Health Service.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WATKINS). The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. How much time did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yielded back five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most humane measures that ever came before Congress. The powers of the Federal Government over the subject of safety to industrial workers is not very large. Most of the jurisdiction over industrial accidents and diseases is in the State governments, but to the full extent to which the Federal Government can exercise its power to save the life, limbs, and health of the American toiler it should be done.

I believe in all forms of conservation of national resources, but more especially I believe in the conservation of men. Men are the greatest national resource. Skilled, intelligent, and self-reliant workers are the greatest asset a nation can have. It is more important for our Government to protect this asset than all the other national resources combined. We educate our citizens at the public expense, we encourage them to learn useful trades to make themselves of value to themselves and to the community, we bring them to the point where they are a benefit and a blessing to their families and to all their fellow citizens, and then we allow them to be mangled and crippled at their work, their usefulness destroyed, their families left helpless and perhaps a charge upon the community. We interpose no barriers between them and the rapacity of greed or the brutality of indifference.

When a skilled young man of good character and honest ambition reaches a position of usefulness in his trade, no one can estimate in money his value to the State and to the community in which he lives. He may grow into the greatest blessing in the work he can do and the opportunities he can give his family. Many a young wife has filled her husband's dinner pail in the morning and kissed him good-by and sent him to his work a strong, active, useful man, and before night has found herself a widow, facing a darkening world with helpless little ones clinging to her skirts. Many a man has left home in the morning with high ambition in his heart, and bearing with him the skill and energy which is the hope of the Republic, and before night has found himself a mangled cripple doomed to drag himself through life a burden to those he hoped to help.

Dry statistics show that more men are killed and mangled every year in the industrial warfare than ever fell upon the bloodiest field of battle. How much of this is preventable? Let us find out, for every day we delay more workers are stricken down and more homes are desolated. Let us find out the causes and prevent all preventable dangers and industrial diseases. Each man's life is precious to him and to those who love him. Let us give him a chance and not put the fearful odds of the industrial combat and the fearful cost of industrial progress all on the worker and the worker's family.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the bill under discussion, to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, I believe will appeal to every Member of this body as a meritorious measure.

A HUMANE MEASURE.

The object of this legislation is to surround the industrial workers of this country with as many safeguards as possible. It is a conservation movement, to conserve the health and lives of 34,000,000 of industrial workers—men, women, and children who are toiling to produce enough for the rest of mankind to live on, and who are simply asking for a sufficient share of the products they produce to live and support their families.

The United States has not given this subject in the past the attention that its importance merited. In fact, it has not given it the attention that several European countries have, where the laboring man has practically no voice in the government.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS ENTITLED TO SOCIAL JUSTICE.

There is to-day, however, a nation-wide movement which recognizes that the industrial workers of this country are entitled to social justice, one phase of which significant expression means that they are entitled to be protected in life and limb and surrounded by the most healthful environment and safeguarded by every device that will make their employment as free from hazard as it possibly can be made.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT HAS FOUND EXPRESSION IN BENEFICENT STATE LAWS.

This public sentiment has found expression in various State laws. Within the last two years 21 States have placed on their statute books workmen's compensation laws; 27 States have eight-hour laws for public works, declaring that longer workdays tend to prevent the worker from acquiring the intelligence necessary to make him a useful citizen.

Thirty-one States have passed laws within the last two years affecting child labor, shortening the hours of labor, and requiring a higher minimum age, and prohibiting children from being employed at night work.

Many States have passed laws requiring one day of rest in seven and eight hours' work a day for women.

Eight States—California, Colorado, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and Utah—have followed the example of Massachusetts in passing minimum-wage laws.

Never in the history of this country have so many States adopted laws on any one subject within so short a time.

THE VOICE OF LABOR IS BEGINNING TO GET A HEARING.

At Detroit, Mich., the Ford Motor Co. began the new year by distributing $10,000,000 among its workmen. It is a profit-sharing company. Starting January, 1914, no man in the employment of the Ford Co. who is over 21 years of age will receive less than $5 per day. This means that the minimum wage for 90 per cent of the 21,000 employees of the Ford Co. will be $5 per day, whether he be floor sweeper, janitor, or mechanical helper. James Couzens, secretary and treasurer of this company, speaking for the seven Ford Co. stockholders, when

asked the motive that led them to divide one-half of their profits with their employees, says:

We believe that social justice begins at home. We want those who have helped us to produce this great institution and are helping to maintain it to share our prosperity. We want them to have present profits and future prospects. Thrift, good service, and sobriety will be encouraged and recognized. It is our hope to do still better by our employees in the future. We want them to be in reality partners in our enterprise. We don't agree with those employers who declare that the movement toward the bettering of society must be universal.

Henry Ford said:

We believe in making 20,000 men prosperous and contented rather than follow the plan of making a few slave drivers in our establishment multimillionaires.

If the exploiters of our great natural resources, such as coal, steel, oil, and copper, upon whom the moral obligation to share their exorbitant profits with their workmen was so much more obligatory, had divided their earnings with their workmen, what a great good they could have accomplished.

A copper-mining industry which, on an investment of $1,250,000, in 42 years has taken out $121,000,000, yet this same company treats its employees as serfs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Another practical demonstration of the nation-wide sentiment to improve the condition of labor was the passage of a law by the Sixty-second Congress creating the Department of Labor, and to-day the incumbent of that portfolio, William B. Wilson, is a demonstration that labor has in its ranks men who are capable of measuring up to the high duties demanded in such a position, and it is a tribute to our great institutions that a man beginning life as a boy working in the mines, getting his education in the college of experience, should be called as an advisor of the President of this Nation to fill a most important Cabinet position.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS PREVENTABLE.

It is claimed by high authority that over 50 per cent of the industrial accidents are preventable. According to Labor Bulletin No. 78, page 458, in the industries there are 35,000 accidental deaths and 2,000,000 injuries annually, which means a death every 16 minutes and a person injured every 16 seconds.

Contrary to the general understanding, only one-tenth of the fatalities and one-sixteenth of the injuries were railroad employees, the balance being persons engaged in other industries.

The continuous toll of shops and mills, mines, and railroads in maimed and dying exceeds each year the total blood cost of the Civil War. If these many accidents happened in one place at one time, humanity would be appalled and the combined intellect of the world would study causes and everything that the ingenuity of men could devise to prevent a repetition of its recurrence would be done.

Because these accidents are scattered they make a slight impression upon the general public, who look upon it as a necessary happening and incidental to the occupations in which the accident occurs.

GREAT ECONOMIC LOSS.

A large percentage of this army of injured workers have been unable to save anything from their wages for a rainy day and become a burden on their families or on charity.

It is estimated that from four hundred to five hundred millions of dollars are annually paid by public and private charities to support those injured in industrial accidents.

But the greater loss is the loss in manhood and womanhood, which is beyond computation.

The net annual economic gain of an average workman is estimated by insurance experts at $400 per annum. If a worker at the age of 30 years is killed by an accident, if he could have lived 25 years longer, his future economic value would have been about $10,000.

Any movement which will bring about even a small reduction of the accidents will be welcomed by employer and employee and the public at large.

WOULD REDUCE ACCIDENTS.

I believe if this bill becomes a law it will accomplish the purpose of its framers, and it will result in the installation of the latest and most approved labor safety devices in manufacturing establishments throughout the United States, and will materially lessen the number of industrial accidents; that by means of bulletins containing photographs and explanations it will be a great educational force in pointing out dangers and inculcating caution in employees and surrounding the laborer with a healthy environment.

WHAT AUTHORITIES ON THIS SUBJECT SAY.

Mr. Fred C. Schwedtman, an authority upon this subject, writes:

I am confident that half of the economic loss and half the suffering due to work accidents in the United States is preventable.

Mr. Young, of the Illinois Steel Co., which for a number of years has inaugurated a campaign for the safety of its employees, writes that the company's campaign has reduced the loss of time accidents at all its plants from 50 to 56⅔ per cent.

Mr. C. F. Close, of the committee of safety of the United States Steel Corporation, writes that his company's serious and fatal accidents in 1910 were 43.8 per cent less than in 1906, when their campaign for safety of their employees was commenced. These figures cover all operations and are based on the normal pay roll of 200,000 men.

These figures mean that over 2,300 men were saved from serious or fatal injuries who would have been injured under conditions existing in 1906 in one company and one industry.

The Chicago & North Western Railroad Co. a few years ago inaugurated an aggressive, systematic campaign to prevent industrial accidents. A committee on safety and sanitation was formed as a result. During the first 12 months ending December 31, 1911, as compared with the same period in the year 1910, there was a decrease in the number of accidents in the different departments averaging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The Pfister & Vogel Leather Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., inaugurated a similar campaign. Mr. John W. Maple, at the head of the safety committee of that company, writes as follows:

During the year 1912 our present system of accident prevention was in full swing. An average of the records in the preceding year show that 48 per cent of our total accidents were machine accidents, a reduction during this period of 50 per cent.

Mr. Maple further says:

Systematic inspection of the plants were made by our committee, and during the first year and a half of its work about 6,000 recommendations for guards, changes, alterations, repairs, etc., were recommended and put into effect. The committee took up the matter of safeguarding machinery, lighting, sanitation, and all matters relating to the welfare of the workmen.

The Chicago & North Western Railroad Co., among other precautions, are inaugurating a system of education, having meetings of their employees, and are placing "posters" or "reminders" in conspicuous places in their yards and shops. Some of these are as follows:

In 12 months 153 men were injured by stepping on nails projecting from boards and cleats taken from cars and thrown on the ground close to the track. Why not pile boards and cleats 6 feet from the rails and save injuries? If you do not do this you may be the next victim.

During the last 12 months 4 employees were killed and 113 injured by falling over obstructions left too near the rail. Why not pile all material 6 feet from the rail?

It is better to be careful than to be crippled.

I herewith give two tables showing the decrease in the number of people killed and injured while working for the North Western Railroad Co.:

We also show the following reduction in accidents for the year ending June 30, 1912, as compared with the year ending June 30, 1910, the latter year being the last year before the safety organization was started:

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| 17 fewer trainmen killed, a decrease of | 44.7 |
| 1,562 fewer trainmen injured, a decrease of | 47 |
| 9 fewer switchmen killed, a decrease of | 50 |
| 111 fewer switchmen injured, a decrease of | 17 |
| 3 fewer station men killed, a decrease of | 50 |
| 134 fewer station men injured a decrease of | 18.3 |
| 7 fewer trackmen killed, a decrease of | 25 |
| 700 fewer trackmen injured a decrease of | 40.1 |
| 2 fewer bridgemen killed, a decrease of | 66.6 |
| 87 fewer bridgemen injured, a decrease of | 27.7 |
| 1 fewer shop and roundhouse man killed, a decrease of | 25 |
| 190 fewer shop and roundhouse men injured, a decrease of | 15 |

But an increase of 1 car repairer killed in 1912; 31 car repairers injured in 1912; 1 unclassified employee killed in 1912; and 31 unclassified employees injured in 1912.

Mr. Richards, of the North Western Railway Co., furnishes the following statement:

Statement of things accomplished by the work of the safety committees during 12 months ending December 31, 1911, as compared with the same period in the year 1910.

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| 15 fewer trainmen killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 51.4 |
| 1,315 fewer trainmen injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 41.2 |
| 5 fewer switchmen killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 33.3 |
| 118 fewer switchmen injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 19.2 |
| 2 fewer station men killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 50 |
| 76 fewer station men injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 11.7 |
| 596 fewer trackmen injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 33.6 |
| 106 fewer bridge men injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 31.9 |
| 6 fewer car repairers killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 85.7 |
| 11 fewer car repairers injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 3.8 |
| 165 fewer shop and roundhouse men injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 12.8 |
| 1 fewer other employees killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 11.1 |
| 11 fewer passengers killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 61.9 |
| 23 fewer passengers injured in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 2.9 |
| 11 fewer other persons killed in 1911 than in 1910, a decrease of | 5.3 |

But unfortunately an increase of 9 trackmen killed in 1911; 2 bridge men killed in 1911; 8 other employees injured in 1911; and 22 other persons injured in 1911.

PROPER SUBJECT FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION.

I believe that the Federal Government should be the leader in the great humanitarian movement for the betterment of a large class of its citizens, a class upon whose sturdy shoulders the burdens of this Government rest in times of peace and a class that has always fought its battles in times of war.

The Federal Government, on labor legislation, is far behind many of our States. In the District of Columbia there is no workmen's compensation law, and many of the Government departments that employ a large number of employees are far behind some of our manufacturers in affording safe, sanitary, and healthy places for employees. I am glad to be able to say that we have an eight-hour law for women in the District of Columbia.

In matters of legislation take, for instance, the workmen's compensation acts which have been enacted by 21 States and which I hope this Congress will enact. Compare the humane principle of this law with the injustice of the common law and statutes that have been enacted.

All know how an injured employee is confronted in court, when he seeks to recover for his injuries, with those hard and ever present defenses: First, negligence of fellow servant; second, contributary negligence; third, assumption of risk.

The reports of the appellate courts in every State are filled with decisions reversing the judgment of juries and trial courts whose sympathies and sense of justice would not allow them to enforce the law on the subject of personal injury.

HUMANE PRINCIPLE OF THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS.

Workmen's compensation laws are simply the embodiment of the principle that the costs of industrial accidents shall be a charge upon the industry, to be placed in the cost of the product and not fall entirely upon the workmen. In other words, that the battered, smashed, and worn-out human machines should stand at least an even show with the battered, smashed, worn-out mechanical machines and should be a charge upon the cost of the product.

The enactment of the workmen's compensation law is a recognition that society and the State have at last awakened to the fact that injury and injustice to any part of our people must eventually carry its punishment and curse to the whole, and that for the well-being of the whole all must bear the burden so long placed upon the shoulders of those least able to bear it.

BENEFICENT EFFECT OF COMPENSATION LAW IN WISCONSIN.

A recent report of the chairman of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, Mr. Crownhart, states that only one man out of seven who was injured in industrial accidents in Wisconsin received any indemnity prior to the workmen's compensation law. In the last month in Wisconsin 96 per cent of all the accidents came under the workmen's compensation act, and they all received a fair indemnity without the intervention of courts or lawyers and without one cent expense to themselves and no friction with their employers. In the month of December just passed 686 claims were settled and fully disposed of and $42,550 paid in the State of Wisconsin under the compensation law. The Wisconsin workmen's compensation act at the end of its two year operation shows 6,894 claims settled and $594,532.04 paid on those claims. Nearly all the employers of labor are coming in under this law, and the chairman estimates that at least $700,000 annually will be received by injured employees, while in Wisconsin prior to the enactment of this law less than $200,000 was annually paid workmen through court decisions, and that amount only after half of it had been paid for expenses of litigation.

The work that the labor departments of the States can do is necessarily more local and limited than that of the Federal Government.

The work of standardizing labor protecting devices and investigating accidents and studying vocational diseases is peculiarly a function of the Federal Government, which can summon the most learned experts at its command to investigate every labor-safety device invented here or abroad; and when found valuable, the stamp of approval of this great Government upon it would mean its universal adoption.

Already moving-picture films are a medium of instruction along this line; some films have been sent to the 7,500 moving-picture theaters in the United States.

Museums, such as the one contemplated by this bill, have already been established in Berlin, Paris, Amsterdam, Zurich, Munich, and Budapest, Hungary.

The field of usefulness of a "Government bureau" in the study of labor safety plans and devices and occupational diseases would be wider and more extensive than anyone can now contemplate. The bill has the indorsement of the Secretary of Labor, the employers of labor, and organized labor, and I believe the necessity of such legislation will appeal to every Representative that gives it a thorough consideration. [Applause.]

I have prepared a brief on the law on the question of how far the Federal Government can go in compelling the use of labor safety devices, which is not involved in the bill, but which may be in future legislation along the line, but which is pertinent on legislation affecting the shipment of convict-made goods and other bills which will be before this House, which I submit as a part of my remarks.

LAW ON THE QUESTION OF HOW FAR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN COMPEL THE USE OF LABOR SAFETY DEVICES OUTSIDE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

It is a fundamental proposition that Congress has no general legislative powers and can legislate only within the powers granted by the Constitution.

"If the subject of regulation excludes transportation between points within a given State, a fortiori, does it exclude other transactions carried on wholly within the State, such as sale and manufacture?" Nor does it make any difference that such sale or manufacture is of an article intended for transportation to a point outside of the State. (Cook on Com. Clause, p. 48; Capital City Dairy Co. *v.* Ohio, 183 U. S., 238; Budd *v.* New York, 143 U. S., 517; Northern Securities Co. *v.* United States, 193 U. S., 197, 33; Kidd *v.* Pearson, 128 U. S., 1; United States *v.* Boyer, 85 Fed., 425 (slaughtering and packing); Hopkins *v.* United States, 171 U. S. (operating stockyards).)

A regulation, therefore, to be valid must be enacted under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The word "commerce" is not limited to buying and selling or to the interchange of commodities, but comprehends navigation and all intercourse. (Champion *v.* Ames, 188 U. S., 321; Gibbon *v.* Ogden, 9 Wheat., 1.)

Under the commerce clause a Federal statute is invalid unless its operation is expressly limited to commerce among the States, with foreign nations, and with Indian tribes. (United States *v.* Steffins, 100 U. S., 82; Employers' Liability Case, 207 U. S., 463; Trade-mark Case, 100 U. S., 82, 96.)

NO CONTROL OF LOCAL MATTERS OR INTRASTATE COMMERCE.

Congress can not enact regulations pertaining to matters purely local nor to matters of intrastate commerce. It has been argued that anyone who engages in interstate commerce thereby submits all his business concerns to the regulation of Congress. This view has been overruled, the court in Employers' Liability Cases, 207 United States, 463, saying:

To state the proposition is to refute it. It assumes that because one engages in interstate commerce, he thereby endows Congress with power not delegated to it by the Constitution; in other words, with the right to legislate concerning matters of purely State concern. It rests upon the conception that the Constitution destroyed that freedom of commerce which it was the purpose to preserve, since it treats the right to engage in interstate commerce as a privilege which can not be availed of except upon such conditions as Congress may prescribe, even although the conditions would be otherwise beyond the power of Congress. It is apparent that if the contention were well founded, it would extend the power of Congress to every conceivable subject however inherently local, would obliterate all the limitations of power imposed by the Constitution, and would destroy the authority of the State as to all conceivable matters which from the beginning have been, and must continue to be, under their control so long as the Constitution endures.

In Kidd *v.* Pearson (128 U. S., 1) the court said:

No distinction is more popular to the common mind, or more clearly expressed in economic and political literature, than that between manufacture and commerce. Manufacture is transformation—the fashioning of raw materials into a change of form for use. The functions of commerce are different. The buying and selling and the transportation incidental thereto constitute commerce, and the regulation of commerce in the constitutional sense embraces the regulation at least of such transportation. If it be held that the term includes the regulation of all such manufactures as are intended to be the subject of commercial transaction in the future, it is impossible to deny that it would also include all productive industries that contemplate the same thing. The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the States, with the power to regulate not only manufactures, but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining; in short, every branch of human industry. For is there one of them that does not contemplate, more or less clearly, an interstate or foreign market? Does not the wheat grower of the Northwest or the cotton planter of the South plant, cultivate, and harvest his crop with an eye on the prices at Liverpool, New York, and Chicago? The power being vested in Congress and denied the States, it would follow as an inevitable result that the duty would devolve on Congress to regulate all of these delicate, multiform, and vital interests—interests which in their nature are and must be local in all the details of their successful management.

In Veazie *v.* Moore (14 How., 574) the court said:

The phrase "to regulate commerce" can never be applied to transactions wholly internal, between citizens of the same community, or to a policy and laws whose ends and purposes and operations are restricted to the territory and soil and jurisdiction of such community. Nor can it be properly concluded that because the products of domestic enterprise in agriculture or manufactures, or in the arts, may ultimately become the subject of foreign commerce, that the control of the means or the encouragement by which enterprise is fostered and protected is legitimately within the import of the phrase "foreign commerce," or fairly implied in any investiture of the power to regulate such commerce. A pretension as far-reaching as this would extend to contracts between citizen and citizen of the same State, would control the pursuits of the planter, the grazier, the manufacturer, the

mechanic, the immense operations of the colliers and mines and furnaces of the country, for there is not one of these avocations the results of which may not become the subjects of foreign commerce, and be borne, either by turnpikes, canals, or railroads, from point to point within the several States toward an ultimate destination, like the one above mentioned.

In the Trade-Mark case (100 U. S., 82, 96) the court said:

When, therefore, Congress undertakes to enact a law which can only be valid as a regulation of commerce, it is reasonable to expect to find on the face of the law, or from its essential nature, that it is a regulation of commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with the Indian tribes. If not so limited, it is in excess of the power of Congress. If its main purpose be to establish a regulation applicable to all trade, to commerce at all points, especially if it be apparent that it is designed to govern the commerce wholly between citizens of the same State, it is obviously the exercise of a power not confided to Congress.

POWER TO PROHIBIT COMMERCE.

The power to prescribe the rules by which commerce is to be governed, vested in Congress, is complete in itself and acknowledges no limitations except those in the Constitution. Congress may employ such means as it chooses to accomplish those which are within its power. But the end to be accomplished must be within the enumerated powers granted by the Constitution.

The power to regulate involves the power to prohibit interstate commerce altogether. No authority can be found sustaining an arbitrary prohibition of any article or commodity from commerce. Under the guise of commercial regulation Congress can not legislate with respect to any matter not within its enumerated powers, nor to any matter within any power reserved by the States. Chief Justice Marshall said, in McCulloch v. Maryland (4 Wheat., 316):

Should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not intrusted to the Government, it would become the painful duty of this tribunal, should a case requiring such a decision come to it, to say that such an act was not the law of the land.

But the court has repeatedly held that Congress may prohibit commerce when articles of commerce are noxious or dangerous in themselves, when commerce endangers the health, safety, or morals of the people, or when such prohibition has for its purpose the facilitation, safety, or protection of commercial intercourse or any part thereof. (Cooke on Commerce, clause 70; commerce clause 37, American Law Review, 503; 7 Cys., 436; Gibbon v. Ogden, 9 Wheat., 1; Kiff v. Pearson, 128 U. S., 1; Veazie v. Moore, 14 How., 574; Champion v. Ames, 188 U. S., 321; Dooly v. U. S., 183 U. S., 171; Northern Securities Co. v. U. S., 193 U. S., 197, 335; McDermott v. Wisconsin, 228 U. S., 128. See article by Philander C. Knox, 17 Yale Law Journal, 135.)

In McDermott against Wisconsin the court said:

Congress has the right not only to pass laws which shall regulate legitimate commerce among the States and with foreign nations, but has full power to keep the channels of such commerce free from the transportation of illicit or harmful articles, to make such as are injurious to the public health outlaws of such commerce, and to bar them from the facilities and privileges thereof.

In Champion against Ames the court said:

* * * No clause in the Constitution could be cited which in any degree countenances the suggestion that the exercise of the power granted to regulate is limited, or that a citizen may have the right to carry from one State to another that which will do harm to his morals. In order to illustrate that regulation may properly assume the form of prohibition, the case of diseased cattle transported from one State to another was referred to, and also the Sherman Antitrust Act, also the Rahrer case with reference to interstate transportation of liquor.

Important consequences may flow from this decision. For example, it would seem to result that Congress may prohibit the transportation between States of goods manufactured in violation of the antitrust laws.

(Alfred Russel's comment on Lottery case, 37 Am. L. R., 503, 507.)

CONGRESSIONAL REGULATIONS WHICH ARE CONSTITUTIONAL.

1. Articles preventing conception (U. S. v. Popper, 98 Fed., 423).
2. Lottery tickets (Champion v. Ames, 188 U. S., 321).
3. Intoxicating liquors (In re Rahrer, 140 U. S., 545).
4. Telegraph and telephone (Western Union Telephone Co. v. Texas, 105 U. S., 460).
5. Warehouse and grain elevators (Mum. v. Ill., 94 U. S., 113).
6. Pollution of waters (Ausbro v. U. S., 159 U. S., 695).
7. Health inspection of personal property (Patapsco Guano Co. v. N. C. Bd. of Agr., 171 U. S., 345).
8. Quarantine laws (7 Cyc., 469; Train v. Boston Disinf. Co., 144 Mass., 423; St. Louis v. McCoy, 18 Mo., 238).
9. Oleomargarine (Schollenberger v. Penn., 171 U. S., 1).
10. Pure food (McDermott v. Wis., 228 U. S., 128).
11. Safety-appliance acts (Southern Ry. Co. v. U. S., 164 Fed., 343; Employers' liability cases, 207 U. S., 463).
12. Meat inspection.
13. Obscene literature.
14. False labeling.
15. Insect pests.
16. Opium.
17. Counterfeit coins.
18. New York statute requiring goods made by convict labor in another State to be labeled as such when exposed for sale in New York is repugnant to the interstate-commerce clause of the Federal Constitution (People v. Hawkins, 10 Misc. Rep., 65).

INSPECTION.

It seems that it is likewise within the power of Congress to provide for the inspection of articles that are subjects of interstate commerce in order to determine whether it may properly be prohibited.

(Cooke on Commerce Clause, p. 78, and cases and acts there cited.)

CONCLUSIONS.

In view of the foregoing it can be positively stated that any regulations as to safety devices and appliances must, if valid, be sustained under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Under that clause any regulation as to the manufacture of such machinery, as to intrastate commerce with respect thereto, or as to sale thereof after delivery in interstate commerce, except as such sale might be a part of interstate commerce, would be unconstitutional. It would also seem that properly guarded machinery is a proper subject of Federal legislation to the extent of barring such innocuous or harmful articles from the channels of commerce and also of requiring a previous inspection to determine whether such article is harmful.

No case or precedent can be found for the proposition that Congress may, for example, bar from the channels of interstate commerce the products of an improperly guarded machine, when the product is not noxious or harmful in itself. This would be true especially when such machine was not itself the subject of interstate commerce. This view seems to be supported by the employers' liability cases, Kidd v. Pearson, and other cases previously referred to. On this point see the able article of Philander C. Knox, in 17 Yale Law Journal, 135.

In conclusion, quoting the language from Philander C. Knox, 17 Yale Law Journal, 135:

For the purpose of promoting and protecting commerce Congress may close its channels to those who are injuriously effecting it, but for the purpose of enforcing its views of public policy in respect to matters not within the jurisdiction of Congress, it has no such power.

Congress may employ such means as it chooses to accomplish that which is within its power, but the end to be accomplished must be within the scope of its constitutional powers. The legislative discretion extends to the means and not to the ends to be accomplished by use of the means.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUCKER). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will you kindly inform me how much time has been consumed out of the hour at my command?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that a human being ought to have as much consideration as a piece of machinery, and that when he is damaged he ought to be given the same repairs as a piece of machinery would be given if it were damaged. As an employer of labor, it has always been my policy and the policy of those associated with me to treat the men as well as we knew how to treat them and to prevent every accident that it was possible to prevent by the introduction of machinery that would be likely to prevent accidents. When the State of Illinois enacted its compensation law, I think I was the first employer of labor that came under its provisions voluntarily.

The time has come when the people all over the country feel that men who are obliged to work at hazardous employments ought to be given every protection that the law can afford, and that where an accident happens the man injured or his family ought to be given such compensation as will enable them to live in comfort while he is disabled, and, in case of his death, that such an amount should be paid to the surviving members of the family as will enable them to live in a reasonable degree of comfort. It has come to pass that the business men of the country feel that the cost of protecting the life and limb of the men who toil should be figured as a part of the manufacturing cost of the commodity which they are engaged in making, and I feel that it is well to supplement what the States are doing by granting authority to the officials of the United States to

investigate and advise as to what life-saving appliances may best be adopted in the different employments throughout the country.

In so far as this bill does that I am heartily in sympathy with it and enthusiastic in favor of its enactment; but I can not bring myself to believe that section 2 of the bill ought to be enacted into law. This section provides that there shall be erected a museum of sufficient size and capacity, with grounds connected therewith, in and upon which shall be exhibited approved devices for the safeguarding of machinery and the protection of employes, and so forth.

This section of the bill does not indicate what the size of this museum shall be or what it shall cost. It proposes to enact a law without any well-defined idea on the part of anybody as to what we are going to do under the law. No hearings have been had on the question of the advisability of the establishment of such a museum. No investigation has been gone into as to what it will cost or what it will accomplish after it is established.

My own judgment is that such a museum would perhaps result in advertising, at the expense of the Government, the wares of people who have devices of various kinds for sale, and it does not look to me as if the Government of the United States ought to engage in the management of an exposition for the sale of commodities of any kind without expense to the men who have those commodities for sale. It is totally foreign to the subject of investigating and ascertaining what can be done to prevent vocational diseases and to make public the results of such investigations. It is totally foreign to the authority sought to be granted in the first section of the bill, which authorizes the Department of Labor to issue pamphlets apprising the business public and the people of the country what, in the judgment of the department, is best to be done to prevent accidents and disease. It seems to me that a museum such as is contemplated in the second section of this bill is not a thing that ought to be erected or conducted under the auspices of the Federal Government. I can not get away from the thought that if we engage in that line of endeavor we are simply placing the Government of the United States in the attitude of advertising somebody's goods without cost to the man who has them for sale. Whether that be true or not, it is true that we have made no investigation as to what this building will cost, either to erect or to maintain and operate, and it does not seem to me that the Congress of the United States ought to indulge in legislation on a question of this kind without having some intelligent conception of what it is going to lead to. If a man on the floor of this House wanted a post-office building erected in his district, he would at least come into the House with the information as to the revenue of the post office in the district, how manly people are to be accommodated as the result of the construction of the building, and what the building would cost to construct, and what it will cost to operate and maintain it. But here we have no such information. The chairman of the Committee on Labor, presenting this bill, says, in reply to a question, that no such investigation has been made.

It seems to me that there is no connection whatever between the authority sought to be granted in section 1 of the bill and the erection of a museum sought to be authorized under section 2 of the bill, and that if section 1 of the bill becomes the law of the land it will accomplish everything that is essential to have accomplished for the prevention of accidents and disease among the men who toil throughout the land, and that the erection of the museum will have no effect except to take money out of the Public Treasury without serving any good purpose. It can well be left out of the bill, in my judgment, without destroying the effect of the bill. On the other hand, I believe that the bill will be much better without it than with it, and when the question comes up for consideration under the five-minute rule I propose to offer to strike that section from the bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I propounded this inquiry a little while ago to another gentleman who had the floor, but was not able to get the information. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois can give it. Does the gentleman know whether the Governments of any other countries maintain museums such as the one proposed here?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know. It is said by some that they do. But our Government is in a totally different situation from the other Governments of the world. The central governments of all the other nations of the world have complete jurisdiction over those countries. In this country the States have complete governments in themselves and do the very things within the States that this bill proposes to do in the United States, and more, because the States themselves not only investigate but apply the remedy and require the payment of damages for injuries and death, while this bill can only authorize somebody to investigate and ascertain facts which may be disseminated for the information of the States, in order that the States may put that information into legislative form, and thus make more efficient the laws of the States than they are to-day. And while other nations may have museums, there can be no reason whatever why this Nation should have one. If we are to have museums, let the States avail themselves of the opportunity to establish them. I think this is a State function and ought to be under the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of safety appliances so far as we are able by law to provide them, and any experiments that go to show a better way to conserve life and limb in factories and mines and other places where men are employed ought to be carried on, and I think it is our duty to pass such legislation as will best carry out this good work. In the last 25 years the country has made great progress in this line of work, and many new inventions have been the means of saving the lives and limbs of workers. We are all glad to do what we can to bring about better conditions in the factories and in the mines. But there is one particular section of this bill which, from the first time I read it, has seemed to me to be objectionable. That is in reference to providing for a medical service in this bureau. With my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I have taken some pride in being able to broaden the scope and activities of the Public Health Service, because of all the departments certainly that which has to do with the conserving of the life and health of the individual is one of the greatest. So when this deparment was changed nearly two years ago so as to enable it to issue bulletins to go to the people for their benefit instead of scientific articles written only for the medical profession, we made a great stride forward. In this bill it is proposed to set up another investigating department of medicine that is to study the subject of vocational diseases. In the public health department which we have now established there are efficient workers who are able to go into any department, better equipped, better fitted in every way to do this work than by establishing a new department in some new bureau to be established.

We have seen in the Indian Department a lot of physicians who have no connection with the Public Health Service not able to cope with diseases that are affecting that class of our population until, in my judgment, all the activities in reference to health ought to be placed in the Public Health Service.

So I would like to see that part of the department placed in the Public Health Service, as it ought to be. To go ahead and create another one in this department is, I think, the wrong thing to do.

As to the museum that might be erected in connection with this department, that is another part of the bill that ought not, in my judgment, to be put into operation. We ought to pass this bill, making it purely a bill to look out for the safety and study the condition and methods of creating safety for those who work. I think if we were to do that and put it in operation we would find in the course of a few years that it would be of great advantage in preventing accidents to those who labor. I am heartily in favor of the bill with these parts stricken out, and thus let it go strictly as a measure to study the necessary means of safety for the protection of workmen.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity to present to Congress the reasons which have convinced me during the past three years that the American people should nationalize their railways.

In thus declaring outright for Government ownership of railroads, which, of course, would mean also the ownership of the telegraphs and telephones and the superseding of the express companies through the extension of the parcel post, I have not reached a hasty decision. Indeed, the facts in favor of Government ownership, developed by my investigations and my personal observation of Government-owned railroads in other countries, seemed overwhelming before I reached my present conclusion. I gave most careful consideration to every objection that has been urged against Government ownership.

It is my opinion that if this Congress should pass a law for the taking over at their actual physical value all the American railways, no one would be injured thereby, and that the American people would be saved billions for the future which otherwise would go to special-privilege corporations. Yet these corporations would not be hurt by such a law, because they would be paid the present value of their property. They would have no right to the speculative profits of the future.

The first objection urged against the nationalization of our railways is that it would create "an army of employees" who would dominate the politics of the country. None of the other 50 countries having government ownership of railroads has had that experience, so let us look into the facts and see if there is any ground to believe that we would be "dominated by an army of employees." We now have 100,000,000 people, and we have 500,000 Government employees, or 1 person in 200. If we nationalize the railways we will at once make civil servants of the 1,500,000 employees now working for the railroads. That would bring the total number of Government employees up to 2,000,000, or 2 persons in 100. The total number of telephone employees in the United States does not exceed 100,000, and the total number of telegraph and express company employees will not aggregate more than 100,000. So if we nationalize the railway, telephone, telegraph, and express companies and take all the employees of those concerns into the civil service, the then total of our employees will not exceed 2.2 persons in 100. Therefore the cry that an "army of employees" would dominate our politics is the merest bugaboo. We now have 300,000 postal employees. They vote independently; they are found in all parties. The same would be true if we should have railway, telegraph, and telephone employees. Besides there would be 97.8 persons in private life to only 2.2 persons on the Government pay roll, and any Congressman or Senator who favored the Government employees to the detriment of the private citizens would certainly be left at home at the next election.

The next principal objection to Government ownership of railways is that it is "socialistic." The world is not socialistic, yet 50 out of the 54 countries of the world have government ownership of railroads, the only four exceptions being the United States, Turkey, Spain, and Great Britain. Not all of the 50 countries owning and operating railroads own all of their lines, but they own and operate a substantial part thereof, and not a single one of those 50 countries has found government ownership and operation of railroads a failure. On the other hand, they have found it a great success, and not one of them would take a step backward toward private ownership.

The following table gives approximately the private and government mileage of the world by countries, excepting the United States, Turkey, Spain, and Great Britain:

| Countries. | Private mileage. | Government mileage. |
|---|---|---|
| Alsace-Lorraine | 17 | 1,079 |
| Argentina | 10,000 | 2,500 |
| Austria-Hungary | 6,931 | 19,694 |
| Baden | 134 | 1,053 |
| Bavaria | 605 | 3,772 |
| Belgium | 330 | 2,500 |
| Brazil | 6,265 | 4,939 |
| Brunswick | 119 | 274 |
| Bulgaria | 19,956 | 1,562 |
| Cape of Good Hope | 608 | 2,064 |
| Ceylon | | 579 |
| Chile | 1,453 | 2,201 |
| China | 2,870 | 470 |
| Colombia | 210 | 220 |
| Denmark | 855 | 1,131 |
| Dutch East Indies | 300 | 1,156 |
| Ecuador | 125 | 80 |
| Finland | 151 | 1,885 |
| France | | 24,849 |
| Germany | 1,248 | 31,000 |
| Greece | 700 | (1) |
| Guatemala | 400 | (1) |
| India | 3,973 | 25,321 |
| Indo-China (France) | | 1,430 |
| Italy | 1,240 | 8,520 |
| Japan | 489 | 4,399 |
| Mexico | 6,319 | 5,890 |
| Natal | | 776 |
| Netherlands | 822 | 985 |
| New South Wales | | 3,390 |
| New Zealand | 113 | 2,391 |
| Nicaragua | 20 | 160 |
| Norway | 219 | 1,329 |
| Orange River Colony | | 1,500 |
| Queensland | | 3,092 |
| Roumania | | 2,295 |
| Peru | 302 | 884 |
| Portugal | 952 | 531 |
| Russia | 11,450 | 27,691 |
| Servia | 14 | 360 |
| Siam | 25 | 350 |
| Africa (except as above) | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| South Australia | | 1,805 |
| Sweden | 5,072 | 2,559 |
| Switzerland | 582 | 1,524 |
| Tasmania | 168 | 462 |
| Venezuela | | 3,529 |
| Victoria | | 3,398 |
| West Australia | 695 | 1,568 |
| Total | 86,894 | 218,358 |

(1) Small.

The fact that 50 out of the 54 countries of the world have substantially adopted Government ownership and operation of railways as their national policy ought to be a complete refutation of the claim that it is socialistic.

I am opposed to socialism, tooth and nail. That is to say, I am opposed to Government interference where there is natural competition. I am opposed to "community ownership." Such ownership would deprive me of my choice and my initiative in seeking my home and my happiness.

But I do favor a "commonwealth," which word means the holding of certain powers and property in common for the benefit of all the people. I favor the adding of the transportation monopoly of America to the American commonwealth, just as the postal monopoly has already been made an asset of the commonwealth. That is not socialism. That would be but exercising a just and proper function of Government, a function which 50 out of the 54 countries of the world are already exercising. The people of this country of all political parties are progressive, but Congress does not, according to my view, respond to the country's desire for sweeping progressive laws. In dealing with the question of monopoly Congress has not as yet "scratched the bark on the outside of the tree." I am in favor of Congress going ahead with the strides of a giant in order that the American people shall come into their own now, and not 50 or 100 years from now.

The total wealth of the United States is at present approximately $120,000,000,000. The total capitalization of the American railways is $20,000,000,000, or one-sixth of our total wealth. If the railroads be nationalized, an act of Congress will direct the Government to take possession of the railroads on a given date, and the same act will necessarily provide that the stockholders shall be paid for their property at its actual physical value at the date taken over by the Government. In case of disagreement between any railway company and the Government commission having jurisdiction in the premises, a Federal court, with the aid of a jury, would hear the evidence and fix the fair value to be paid by the Government. That is perfectly constitutional. The public may always take private property for a public use upon making just compensation. No owner of railroad stock would be hurt. He would receive in cash the full value of his property.

But the cry is also made that "it would bankrupt the Government" to buy the railroads. Let us see about that. Suppose we had to pay for the railroads the full $20,000,000,000 which they are capitalized for. We could borrow that money at 3 per cent annual interest. And last year, 1913, according to the figures given the Interstate Commerce Commission by the railroads themselves, they made 5 per cent profit on their $20,000,000,000 capitalization. Therefore the Government would make a profit of 2 per cent per annum from the start, or a profit of $400,000,000 per year. That would be $4 per head profit per year to our people from our railroads, and would help some. But all this is upon the supposition that we would pay the railroads all they ask for their property, all they claim themselves it is worth, which, of course, we would not do.

The railroads of this country are capitalized for at least twice their actual value. That is quite generally conceded by all except the railroads themselves. Therefore when we take over the railroads at their actual cash value, to be ascertained by a proper commission, we shall probably not be required to pay more than $10,000,000,000 for them. As our annual interest charge on that sum at 3 per cent will be only $300,000,000, and as the net operating revenues are now $1,000,000,000 per annum, we shall make an annual profit from the start of approximately $700,000,000, or $7 per head of our population. That will be the saving on rail transportation alone. The saving to each individual who uses a telephone will be about half the amount he now pays. The saving on telegrams and express will be about the same as on telephones or a little more.

The gross revenues of the American railways for 1913, according to their own figures, amounted to $3,057,163,762.78. In other words, each individual in the United States contributes to the railways each year the sum of $30.57. That shows how closely the railroads come to the people. Each family of five contributes to the railroads each year the sum of $152.85. The most of this is paid indirectly in freights. The consumer does not pay the railroad direct, but the merchant does, and the consumer pays the merchant. Seventy per cent of the total revenues of the railroads is for freight.

The savings to the people that I have thus far shown are incontrovertible. They are based upon cold mathematical calculation. There are other savings to the people which would come from Government ownership, but which are not capable of being reduced to exact amounts at this time. For example, the railroads are now claiming operating expenses of $2,118,585,896.52 per year. This gigantic sum, which the railroads

deduct before they begin to count profits, amounts to $21 per head of our population. How much of it goes to actual legitimate expenses of the railroads there is no way of telling. But we do know that much of it goes to "educate the public" and to "create public sentiment" in favor of private ownership of railroads. All of this would be saved under honest, economical Government administration. Besides, the Government would not pay princely salaries to railroad presidents on account of their ability to foist on the public watered stock. At the same time conductors and other trainmen, shopmen, and mechanics would receive better pay and shorter hours.

To show that the railroads of this country are still engaged in wholesale bribery in order to mislead the people and maintain their hold on their present gigantic monopoly I will cite a few recent facts.

On page 609 of the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission of June 20, 1913, the commission says:

> It is worthy of remark that the general counsel of the New Haven Co. testified that, while the Legislature of Connecticut did finally vote unanimously in favor of the New Haven ownership of trolley lines, sentiment was at the outset the other way, and it was only after $100,000 had been expended in "molding" the opinion of the legislature that the final result was attained.

Another instance of the constant endeavor of the railroads to warp public opinion contrary to the truth is that which was recently brought to light in Harvard University. A recent investigation by the public-utilities commission of Massachusetts disclosed the fact that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad was secretly carrying on its pay roll Prof. Bruce Wyman, instructor in law at Harvard, paying him the sum of $833 per month, during which time Prof. Wyman lectured over the State on proposed legislation in which the railroad was interested. When the facts were made known, about three months ago, Prof. Wyman resigned. The same investigation by the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission disclosed that both W. A. Murphy, legislative reporter on the Boston Globe, and H. W. Kendall, legislative reporter for the Springfield Republican, were in the secret pay of the same railroad. These are only a few cases recently made public. We do not know how many more university instructors, editors, and writers are on the secret pay rolls of the railroad companies for the purpose of "molding public opinion."

A very able book was written in 1910 by Hon. Anthony Van Wagenen, of Sioux City, Iowa, favoring Government ownership of railroads. It was published by G. P. Putnam's Sons. Mr. Van Wagenen wrote me recently that within a year after his book was published the libraries of this country were flooded with anti-Government ownership books written by inspired pens.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman inform the committee if that is the same man who was recently removed from the office of district attorney for the northern district of Iowa by President Wilson?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Yes. Mr. Van Wagenen was last spring appointed United States district attorney for the northern district of Iowa by President Wilson. In December following he was asked to resign by Attorney General McReynolds on the ground of incompetency. Mr. Van Wagenen appealed to the President, and was removed by wire. I do not believe Mr. Van Wagenen was incompetent. I would vote for a resolution to-morrow to investigate the circumstances of his removal if I had the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I wrote to Mr. Van Wagenen and asked him for his version of the affair, and have his letters here, and if there is no objection I shall print them in the RECORD. I shall not insist on printing them if there is objection. Mr. Van Wagenen writes that he appealed from the decision of the Attorney General to the President, and that the President ignored his appeal and removed him by wire. This is the man who had contributed the best volume in favor of Government ownership of American railroads that was ever printed in this country.

Mr. Van Wagenen's letters follow:

SIOUX CITY, IOWA, *February 17, 1914.*

Hon. A. W. LAFFERTY, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have no way of telling for sure that the railroads were back of my removal. I have no doubt that they were. When I published my book they flooded the country with news items and pamphlets for nearly a year, all undertaking to show that Government ownership was a dismal failure in Europe. Attorney General McReynolds is against Government ownership, and, I think, was no doubt encouraged in his opposition by men like Judge Wade, Wilbur Marsh, W. W. Whitmer, and all of what we call the old-liners.

The Attorney General is either a reactionary or what I think is more likely, he is not sound enough a thinker to be a progressive. He, furthermore, attaches a little too much importance to what Bagbot in his essay on the English constitution refers to as the "dignified element of government." I think it was a general line-up in Iowa of all the reactionary influences. They seem to have the entire control of things in Iowa. No progressive, unless he has a little tendency to surrender, need waste his time while things remain as they are in Iowa now.

It is about 39 years that I have fought the straight progressive fight. I got knocked down many times by the reactionaries, but never thought anything of it. This matter looks entirely different and a little more serious to me.

Most respectfully, yours,

A. VAN WAGENEN.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA, *February 23, 1914.*

Hon. A. W. LAFFERTY,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 20th. I was appointed about the middle of April, I think the 17th, 1913, and removed on December 20. I doubt if the correspondence would show the real animus of the proceeding. I think that would largely lie in personal interviews. Here in Iowa I have been known for 35 years as an uncompromising progressive. When I was appointed to the bench 22 years ago by my friend Gov. Boise, every judge, so far as I know, rode upon railroad passes.

I was appointed on the 15th of April, 1892, and I was told by a railroad lawyer that I would not be offered a pass until the first of the following year, the regular time for distributing the same. That made no difference to me, so I said nothing. On about the 10th of June, I think, the railroads commenced to get a little nervous about it, and for some reason, whether prearranged or not, Col. Swan, a most estimable old man, attorney for the S. C. St. Paul & Omaha Railroad line, came into the little room occupied privately by the judges, and, in the presence of two of the judges handed me an envelope containing a pass, with a short note containing the compliments of Trusdale, general passenger agent for that line. I was in a position where I could say nothing. I knew that both of the judges carried passes on all of the roads, and so I took the pass and put it in my pocket and the colonel went immediately out of the room. I kept the pass about four or five days, then I returned it, assuring the officials that I did not have any particular object in doing so, except that I would feel a little better paying my own way. I assured them that the railroad would receive just as fair treatment, if not fairer, because I would thus place myself in an independent position. I sent it from a town about 75 miles from here, where I was visiting my old home. Two days later, when I came to Sioux City, there were two or three railroad officials here, all particularly good Democratic friends of mine, who urged upon me that such an unusual course would give the impression that I was a Populist and unreasonably opposed to railroads. They put up the usual story about how innocently they regarded the giving of passes, but I very firmly refused to accept transportation.

About that time my brother died at Cherokee, and the Illinois Central furnished a special engine and passenger car to take his remains from Cherokee to Rock Rapids, where the burial was to occur. I do not know whether his wife asked this favor, but I had nothing to do with it. I did not make any fuss about it, but it leaked out, and most everyone in this country knew that I was refusing to ride on passes.

For over 30 years the reactionary influence in the Democratic Party has always been against me for membership on the committee on resolutions in conventions or anything else I wanted.

When I took this position under President Wilson, of course I carried the same ideas as to my public duties. When the marshal told me to subpœna a man from Dubuque to Sioux City for the purpose of a visit, I had not the faintest idea that I would not be sustained in refusing. I would not have done differently if I had been confronted with removal at that minute. When the marshal told me that if I would not do this they would get my scalp I regarded it as ridiculous. The people of this State know that I have been uncompromising in matters of even the slightest graft, and I think every corporate interest has been for 35 years aware of the fact that I could not be reached in any manner. I am on the best of terms personally with all of these men, but during all these years I could always feel and know that they were terribly anxious to see me out of politics.

The principal trouble, as near as I can locate it, is over my prosecution of the Master Plumbers' Trust here in Sioux City. All plumbers' contracts here in Sioux City are assigned by the local trust on Monday evening. When a contract is assigned to a plumber, every other master plumber in Sioux City is under a solemn oath to bid at least 10 per cent more. To cut a long story short, I reported this and other similar outrageous conditions to the department. They wrote me that they were investigating the trusts in a national way and any prosecution that I might start here would frustrate their attempts to secure evidence. That part of the matter appeared to me to be reasonable, but there was a further statement that they were sending a special agent here to assist me. If I was to do nothing, I could see no necessity for sending an assistant here.

I suspected at once that they were so anxious to have me called off that this assistant was sent for that purpose. Three or four days later he came and tried to convince me that I would have to stop any prosecution here for about a year. He claimed that he had to go to Denver and investigate that national office, and he could not do that until June, 1914. After urging him, he finally said it was possible that he might get to Denver in November. This was on September 15. In the letter they sent me, and which had been unanswered pending the arrival of the assistant, they asked me to tell what, if any, reasons existed for immediate prosecution. After the assistant left my office, I immediately wrote the department, telling them that the three plumbing firms which were outside the trust were unable to fill contracts because they could not purchase goods. I had letters to this effect. In that letter I made use of the language that I thought that the weakness of these prosecutions was too much "dignified delay." I meant, of course, to refer to our experience during the last 20 years. Immediately the Attorney General sent for me. He called my attention to this letter. I explained to him that a reasonable view of that letter would not make it apply to his administration, because he had not been in long enough. That appeared to have perfectly satisfied him.

He then turned me over to Mr. Todd. When I went into Todd's room I had no idea of continuing the prosecution. The first thing Mr. Todd told me was that this special agent, Betjeman, who had explained to me that he could not go to Denver until next June, had been there three weeks. As he was in my office on September 15, and I was talking to Todd on the 17th of October, it disclosed to me, of course, that the

special agent had gone directly from my office to Denver, and I feel satisfied now that he came from Denver. I explained to Todd that my idea was that these dissolution suits were wholly ineffective and that prosecutions should be of acts in violation of the law of competition. I frankly told him that I had doubts of the efficiency of the Sherman law or either of its remedies. I called his attention to the fact that at the time we adopted our Sherman law, the overwhelming weight of authority on political economy was against Ricardo's idea of the effectiveness of competition as a natural law to regulate our industrial life. I told him that I thought that the Sherman law ought to be made effective at once or dropped. He was thoroughly convinced of the soundness of my views and insisted on my going ahead. I did not promise to do so, but I told him how I intended to proceed. I told him that I did not intend to make any investigation of the trust's offices at the State office at Des Moines or the local office at Sioux City, but I intended to go unexpectedly into their offices and take all their papers and records. I particularly explained to him that that would give the two secretaries immunity, but I thought it necessary to get the records.

On my way home I wrote the Attorney General from Chicago that I was feeling inclined to go ahead, and if there was any objection to my subpœnaing these two officers to let me know Monday. I heard nothing from him. On Tuesday I took out subpœnas, and that afternoon took every scrap of paper out of the local office of the trust and the following morning did the same at the State headquarters at Des Moines. I then got a telegram that I did not evidently understand the law and was giving immunity to the worst defendants. They ordered me to stop the proceedings until they sent a special attorney here. The special attorney, Mr. Gregg, came here, prolonged the hearing, but induced the grand jury to adjourn without making any report. They were told that they would be called back inside of two weeks, but they have not been called back yet. The Attorney General, in his tirade trying to justify my removal, stated that this prosecution would be pushed and had only been dropped because of my weakness in prosecution.

Now, here is where the shoe pinches. To follow up the theory which I had advocated for the enforcement of the law would have materially changed his program. I would not have done that except that Todd insisted on my doing so. The Attorney General, the last time he called me in, said that Todd denies this. I do not believe he does.

Just about that time he was making that deal with the Bell Telephone Co., by which they were getting complete immunity by simply transferring their Western Union stock. To have followed out the more efficient course that I was pursuing would have necessitated going after the Bell Telephone Co. (A. T. & T. Co.) not for a pantomime trivial dissolution, but for their many overt acts destructive of competition. Also for their robbery of the American people through the instrumentalities of their subsidiary companies. The Iowa company, for instance, can make a showing before the legislature that they are not making over 4 to 5 per cent on their investment. This is because they get only a trifle for long-distance tolls, State or interstate, and they pay immense royalties on expired patents and other tribute, which swells the dividends and augments the values of American Telegraph & Telephone stock.

You can have easily understood, I think, from this how necessary it was to get a man with these advanced ideas out of the department. Furthermore, there were several political schemes in Iowa, involving a lot of crooked machine politics, which were about to be pulled off, are now being put through, and with which they knew I would have no sympathy.

I was one of the first Wilson men in the country. I spent a lot of time and money trying to carry Iowa for him, and stumped the State of South Dakota for him at my own expense. The men who now control Iowa politics got their political positions by debauching the State with Wall Street money, which culminated in the celebrated Burlington convention. In my ward, a respectable residence district, they packed the caucus with over 200 illiterate foreigners, men who could not speak the English language. We carried the caucus, however, by defeating a resolution for a ballot, and these foreigners could not understand the English language and therefore could not vote viva voce. I don't think a dozen of them were naturalized citizens. There was not efficient management to handle the other caucuses and they carried the State against Wilson. Now these men, who are known to represent corporations and liquor interests, have absolute control in Iowa.

So far as the office is concerned I am not able to spend any money to fight it and do not want it, anyway. I am not familiar enough with the proceedings to know what could be accomplished by calling for the correspondence or an investigation. I demanded an investigation from the President and he never even replied. He can't send a sensible experienced lawyer here who will sustain the Attorney General in any respect. I practiced law here for 37 years, and Senators KENYON and CUMMINS, who have tried cases against me, I am sure will say that I am a fairly competent lawyer.

I know about every prominent lawyer in the State of Iowa, and I think you will get about the same opinion from every one of them. As I have not defended a criminal for 26 years I should think I might be perhaps a little weak in the prosecution if it were not for the fact that shortly before I was appointed I was hired by a county in central Nebraska to prosecute some bank robbers. There was with me on the case a local attorney, prominent and influential in the county and one of the best criminal lawyers of the State. Naturally you would expect him to take the lead in the prosecution, and he did for one day, and during the balance of the three weeks I took the lead in the prosecution.

Of course, it is barely possible that the real cause is that the Attorney General took a particular dislike to me. It is true that I am not cut out so I can "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee, that thrift may follow fawning," but I did nothing more than simply talk to him—possibly too much—as an equal. If I had been impressed with the idea that he was a sound statesman and knew more than I did, I would have undoubtedly been able to do a little better in this respect; but he uses so much profanity and gets so nervous and excited that I could not possibly stir up any enthusiasm as to his honesty or his intelligence.

In this I may have done him a great injustice, but I am willing to risk all I have in the affair by maintaining a profound belief that he is not my kind of a Democrat. I do not intend to keep quiet about it if things do not go right, and I know they will not. Whether anything could be accomplished by a method you mention I am not sufficiently informed to judge. I thank you, however, very deeply for your interest in the matter, and I hope we may meet some time and I may get better acquainted with you.

I trust I have not imposed upon your time by inflicting this long letter upon you.

Very truly, yours. A. VAN WAGENEN.

I think these letters show clearly that Mr. Van Wagenen has not been treated right. His whole life has been one of honest service to his fellow men. Suppose he is not the ablest lawyer in the country. Admit, for the sake of argument, that he ought not to have been appointed to the difficult position of United States district attorney on account of lack of experience in the trial of criminal cases. Still, I say the manner of his removal and degradation was cruel and ought not to go unnoticed by the American Congress.

From Mr. Van Wagenen's simple narration of the facts, which no one will doubt, it appears that he was jockeyed with by a special agent of the Department of Justice. It appears that he was lied to.

It appears that the American people are not getting home rule and just enforcement of the laws through local officials, but that local courts and local United States attorneys are being dominated absolutely from Washington through bureaucratic rule. It appears that local United States attorneys dare not enforce the laws this Congress has passed lest they incur the displeasure of Washington. It appears that local officers are communicated with through the medium of secret agents, having no regard for truth or facts, and that they are coerced in this disreputable manner. I say that the case of Anthony Van Wagenen and his removal for alleged incompetency is one that ought to be investigated by this Congress.

A few days ago a Member of this House pulled from his pocket in my presence and in the presence of a Senator of the United States an envelope containing an annual pass for 1914 over one of the railroads of this country and a check for a retainer of the Member as attorney for the company for the coming year. So it will be seen that while we have passed a law preventing free passes to Members of Congress the railroads still issue them to Members as part of the consideration for "services." I will give the name of the Member I have mentioned if anyone desires. In justice to him, however, I will state the he said he was going to return the pass and the check to the railroad company.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Certainly.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good thing to put a law on the statute books forbidding that kind of thing and making it a felony?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I certainly do. No Member of Congress has any right to draw pay as attorney for a railroad company.

Mr. MANN. Or anybody else, timberman or otherwise?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Yes; or anybody else, timberman or otherwise; and if any man can show where I have accepted a red penny since I have been a Member of this House I will resign before the sun goes down. I challenge anybody, especially the gentleman from Illinois, if he means me, to show any such thing.

We have no means of knowing, nor does the country have any means of knowing, how many Members of this House are now under the pay of railroads or affiliated special-privilege corporations. We have passed a law requiring that campaign contributions in aid of the election of Members of the House and Senate be made public, and we should now pass a law making it unlawful for any Member of this House or a Senator to accept compensation from any outside source, or at least a law requiring the Members and Senators to make annual reports to the Clerks of the House and Senate, under oath, giving an itemized public statement of all compensation received by them from sources other than their official salaries. I have a bill pending making it unlawful for any Member of Congress or Senator to accept any compensation for personal services from any source other than his salary and allowances from the Government and another bill which would require the statement I have mentioned to be made annually under oath by each Congressman and Senator, so long as it shall remain lawful for them to receive outside pay, so that the public may know what remuneration they are receiving, if any, in addition to their official salaries.

Another argument advanced against Government ownership is that rates are higher in those countries where Government ownership now obtains. That statement has been made all over this country, and it is absolutely false. Twice during the past year I have traveled through countries owning their own railroads in Europe, first last June and July and again during the three weeks' Christmas adjournment, and I find rates cheaper than in the United States, the time schedules faster, accidents

less, and service better, although the roads are much shorter, owing to the smallness of European countries, and might, therefore, be excused if they did charge higher rates.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee how the freight rates in Germany compare with the freight rates in the United States?

Mr. LAFFERTY. In Germany, where the Government owns and operates the railways, the freight rates are only about one-half what they are in England, where they are privately owned. If the German railroads were operating in the United States, where they would have the benefit of the "long haul," it is safe to say the rates would be not more than half what we are now paying. The rates in Germany now are much cheaper, on the average, than they are in the United States.

There are certain things which the Government can do better and cheaper than any private corporation can do them, and building and operating railroads is one of those things. Private capital will not invest in expensive and hazardous undertakings unless assured of immense profits.

The Government of the United States does now and for several years last past has owned the Panama Railroad Co., which operates also a line of ships. While that company is owned by the Government, it is operated on the same plan as a private railroad company, having a complete set of officers, a board of directors, and it has capital stock, all owned by the Government. Col. Goethals is president of the company. Its accounting system is the same as that of any private company. This company has from the start paid an annual dividend of over 6 per cent profit to the Government, and before declaring a dividend it charges off all depreciation, the same as any other company. The 1913 dividend of the Panama Railroad was 10.23 per cent. Yet it hauls cement from New York to Colon at $1.25 per ton. The water rate from Seattle or Portland to Alaska, a shorter distance, is from $12 to $20 per ton. This, perhaps, is an extreme illustration, but it emphasizes the advantage of Government over private ownership when it comes to the matter of common carriers, either on land or water.

Therefore I favor not only the nationalization of our railways, but I likewise favor the building and operation of ships by the Government. One line of these ships should ply between Alaska and the States. Others should carry our mails to foreign ports, at the same time carrying passengers and freight. We now pay $3,000,000 a year to foreign ships for carrying our mail. That sum would pay the interest on $100,000,000 of bonds with which to build ships of our own. And when built and put into commission the ships would pay for themselves. These ships could also be made auxiliary to our Navy. They could be so built as to be convertible into cruisers in time of war. We are now spending $20,000,000 a year for two battleships, each battleship costing $10,000,000, and they bring no returns whatever. There is no reason why we should not have a merchant marine composed of much cheaper ships, but at the same time suitable to augment our Navy in time of war. These auxiliary ships would not be a burden to the public but would actually pay their way, and, in addition, give a profit to the United States. I want to see the time come when citizens of America can go to any port in the world in an American ship, flying the American flag, and manned by American officers and an American crew.

By water we export annually $2,000,000,000 worth of merchandise, upon which we pay the ocean steamship trust freights estimated at an average of 10 per cent of the value of the goods transported, or $200,000,000. By water we import annually goods to the value of $1,500,000,000 and pay ocean freights thereon of approximately $150,000,000, making approximately $350,000,000 that we pay each year for transporting merchandise to and from the United States upon the high seas. This Congress could well afford to provide for the building of Government ships to be operated by our Government. A fleet of 200 great ocean liners would be a good beginning. We would get at least half the traffic to and from the United States with such a fleet, and our annual freight revenues alone would be, as has been seen, one-half of $350,000,00, or $175,000,000. The passenger and mail revenues would by themselves pay the operating expenses of our ships, leaving our cargo revenues net profit, less depreciation and repairs on the ships in commission. The depreciation and repairs annually on 200 ships of the value of $800,000,000 would not be over 10 per cent, or $80,000,000, leaving a clear profit from cargo revenues of $95,000,000 to be applied annually toward reduction of interest and principal of bonded indebtedness incurred in the building of a fleet of 200 ships at a cost of $4,000,000 each. The annual interest on the cost of the ships at 3 per cent would be $24,000,000. Subtracting this sum from the clear profit of $95,000,000 would leave the sum of $71,000,000 to be applied annually to the extinguishment of the bonded indebtedness of $800,000,000, so that in less than 12 years the fleet of 200 steamships would be paid for. An American merchant marine such as this, consisting of a fleet of 200 new ships, would be the proudest possession of any country in the world. Such a fleet would drive the shipping trust from the high seas and would be a godsend to the entire world. The United States is yet but a sleeping giant, lying stretched out from the Atlantic to the Pacific, embodying the strength of the richest country in the world. I predict that this giant is soon going to awaken to a full realization of his great powers and opportunities. And then these powers will be exercised for the benefit of humanity, liberty, and progress.

In the summer of 1911 I received many petitions from Portland, Oreg., asking Congress to provide for the mining of Alaska coal and to provide rail and water transportation therefor to the States. As a result, I introduced on December 4, 1911, House bill 14080, which was the first bill ever offered in the House of Representatives for the building of a Government railroad in Alaska. The bill also provided for the operation of a line of ships from Controller Bay to Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, and other Pacific coast cities, and for the mining of Alaska coal by the Government, and for its sale at cost to the people of the United States.

The people of the entire Pacific coast are very much gratified that Senate bill 48, introduced on April 7, 1913, by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has passed both the Senate and House and is soon to become a law. The bill appropriates $35,000,000 for the building or acquiring of not to exceed 1,000 miles of railroad in Alaska. I regret that the bill does not also provide for a line of Government ships from Alaska to the States, and I also regret that it does not provide for the mining of Alaska coal by the Government. I stand ready to work and vote both for the ships and for the Government mining of coal whenever opportunity may offer in the future. I shall offer separate bills for both of these purposes.

The argument is also made that the Government would not be as prompt and efficient in furnishing transportation service to the public as are private corporations. Experience shows the exact contrary. A few days ago I had a package of express and a parcel-post package of the same size sent me on the same day from Portland, Oreg. The parcel-post package arrived just four days ahead of the express package. The private corporations have so much checking against the supposed dishonesty of the sender and receiver of the package, as well as that of their own employees, that it takes as much time and expense to do this checking as it does to transport the package. The same is true of freight and of long-distance telephone and telegraph messages. I found personally that telegraph rates are less than half in Europe what they are in America, and the service much simpler and quicker and more satisfactory in every way.

The railroads have not failed to take advantage of conditions in the South to attempt to prejudice that section against Government ownership. The railroad interests would have the southern people believe that Government ownership and operation of railroads in the Southern States would interfere with present local police regulations prohibiting the intermingling of the white and colored races. That is the exact opposite of the truth. A single sentence in the law taking over the railroads, providing that they should be operated subject to all local police regulations of the States, would cover the case.

These few remarks give my views touching the subject of transportation by land and water. I regard it as a proper governmental function, and one which, when left to private corporations, results in exorbitant rates, unnecessary dangers to life and limb, and a strangulation of individual opportunity. If continued in office, I shall work and vote for Government ownership of transportation facilities whenever the opportunity offers itself.

The utter folly of hoping for results from attempted "regulation" ought to be shown by the fact that in 27 years the Interstate Commerce Commission has accomplished nothing in this regard. This commission has within the last few days announced a probable increase in freight rates, effective July 1, 1914, although the commission's own report for 1913, page 46, shows that the profits of the railroads are on the increase under existing rates. This report of the commission shows that the profits of the railroads for 1913 were nearly $100,000,000 greater than in 1912. What is the occasion for authorizing an increase

in rates under such circumstances? The following is the report of the commission for 1913:

*Summary of monthly reports of revenues and expenses of steam roads reporting total annual operating revenues in excess of $1,000,000.*

| Item. | Year ended June 30— | | Average per mile of road operated. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1913 | 1912 | 1913 | 1912 |
| Average number of miles of road operated | 221,748.58 | 219,666.45 | | |
| Operating revenues: | | | | |
| Freight | $2,134,533,675.86 | $1,902,742,853.03 | $9,626.14 | $8,661.96 |
| Passenger | 678,487,867.25 | 641,594,147.09 | 3,059.72 | 2,920.77 |
| Other transportation | 210,804,502.14 | 195,837,469.81 | 950.65 | 891.52 |
| Nontransportation | 33,287,717.53 | 28,789,383.52 | 150.11 | 131.06 |
| Total | 3,057,163,762.78 | 2,768,963,853.45 | 13,786.62 | 12,605.31 |
| Operating expenses: | | | | |
| Maintenance of way and structures | 407,171,756.34 | 351,583,429.82 | 1,836.19 | 1,600.53 |
| Maintenance of equipment | 501,671,011.01 | 439,997,245.83 | 2,262.34 | 2,003.02 |
| Traffic | 61,391,495.37 | 59,203,342.86 | 276.85 | 269.52 |
| Transportation | 1,074,943,310.41 | 994,986,281.09 | 4,847.58 | 4,529.53 |
| General | 73,408,323.39 | 69,190,051.24 | 331.04 | 314.98 |
| Total | 2,118,585,896.52 | 1,914,960,350.85 | 9,554.00 | 8,717.58 |
| Net operating revenue: | | | | |
| Rail operations | 938,577,865.23 | 854,003,502.60 | 4,232.62 | 3,887.73 |
| Outside operations | 1,379,130.21 | 475,163.99 | 6.22 | 2.16 |
| Total net operating revenue | 939,956,996.47 | 854,478,666.50 | 4,238.84 | 3,889.89 |
| Taxes | 124,356,024.17 | 116,419,026.43 | 560.80 | 529.98 |
| Operating income | 815,600,972.30 | 738,059,640.07 | 3,678.04 | 3,359.91 |

When first elected to Congress three years ago I did not favor Government ownership. I then favored "Government regulation." But I have investigated the matter carefully, found the facts set forth in these remarks, and have reached the conclusion that Government ownership is the only complete remedy.

A child born in America is certainly entitled to have an interest in something besides poorhouses and jails; but at the present time the Commonwealth includes but little more than these. The total wealth of this country, as before stated, is approximately $120,000,000,000. That sum is equal to $1,200 per head of our population. I do not say that each child should be born with that much property to its credit already earned. I think some premium should be placed upon the industry and good management of parents, who are under obligations to provide for their children. But I do say that each child born into this world should have an equal opportunity to earn his proportionate share of the world's wealth, and if one-sixth or one-fourth of it is already in the hands of corporate monopoly the child has no such chance. With Government ownership of railroads in America each child born in this country will find to its credit an interest in the National Commonwealth of a property value of $200. That common property would serve him all his life. It would aid him and help to give him an equal chance to earn his share of that portion of the national wealth which shall remain private property. It is merely a question as to whether the one-sixth of our national wealth represented by our railroads shall remain a permanent handicap to private effort or whether these railroads shall in addition to their great value as public carriers be made a strong arm of the Government to extend a helping hand to each one of our citizens who is engaged in private business. I am opposed to socialism. I am likewise opposed to monopoly. But I favor the happy medium where that portion of the property of the Nation which is monopolistic shall be placed to the credit of the Commonwealth and where the remainder shall be always subject to private ownership.

I certainly think that municipalities should own and operate their own public monopolies, such as street railways, gas, electric light, and waterworks, but the value of all of those when added to the value of the railroads, telephones, telegraphs, and Government-owned coal mines will not exceed one-fourth of the total national wealth, thus leaving three-fourths of the property of the United States permanently in private ownership as a reward to individual genius, industry, and frugality.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Eleven minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the 15 minutes yielded by the gentleman from Maryland to the gentleman from Illinois, I yield 7 minutes to him of the 11 that I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 22 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not use all the time allotted to me, although I think I may. I served in this House for a good many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which had to deal with questions of labor safety devices on the railroads. I think the first time I offered any distinctive proposition coming from myself on such subjects was to provide for a medal for those who saved lives on railroads similar to the medal authorized to be given to those who saved lives on the seas or from drowning. A few years ago I introduced, and it was passed, a resolution authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make investigation of devices to control the automatic stopping of railroad trains and block-signal devices, where those devices were presented without cost to the Government, and subsequently, following along the same line of thought, secured an extension of that authority to any safety devices which were applicable to railways.

The question of compensation for injury has been up—came up legislatively, really a good while after I became a Member of this House. We passed a law designed to permit railway employees to bring suits against railroads where the railroads did not equip their trains with the required safety devices. Then we passed a law providing for compensation to Government employees who were injured in certain hazardous employments. In the Panama Canal bill we went a little further and authorized the President to make regulations and a schedule under which compensation might be made for those who were injured in employment on the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co., there being no limitation in the law as to the amounts, while the existing law for compensation to Government employees in hazardous employment is one year's salary. The growth and tendency of the times has been, first, to endeavor to conserve the life and limb of the employee, and second, to put upon the business the cost of operation and production, including damages to life and limb. That would not be always applicable to a small employer who might be ruined or could have been ruined before the day of accident insurance; but the tendency is along both of these lines, and there is to-day no establishment, or very few, of large proportions where you can not find posted up all through it the sign "safety first." It is true that the employees do not always obey the rules that are laid down, because, like the rest of us, they have their human weaknesses.

I sometimes think that a little fad of mine, which is gardening, gives me the best opportunity that I obtain for reflection and determination of judgment. Last summer while the House was in session I took a little vacation and went home to the garden in June, and while working in the garden one day it occurred to me that there ought to be a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, and I have a companion bill which I hope some day will be reported. I sat down and drew the bill which I introduced, which is practically the first section of the bill now pending before the House, except as to the subject of vocational diseases. When I came back to Washington I introduced that bill and appeared before the Committee on Labor and made a short argument in favor of it.

It naturally and properly met with a good reception from that committee, and I desire to congratulate the Committee on Labor and thank them for what they have done with reference to the bill now pending. I took the matter up with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and with the Secretary of Labor. Mr. Bremner, our late colleague, whose loss we all deplore, and who obtained the love, the respect, and the confidence of those Members who came to know him as I did, had also been giving consideration to this subject, and he introduced a bill. I suspect that, not because I knew more but because I had more experience in drafting bills for Congress, the Secretary of Labor thought the bill that I had drawn was in more perfect language to accomplish the purpose than Mr. Bremner's bill, and the bill now before the House in the first section is practically the bill which I had drawn and the second section is a section taken out of the bill which Mr. Bremner had drawn. I think we ought to do more than merely gather and publish information in the way of written or printed publications. We are engaged now in what is called farm-demonstration work, and the Agricultural bill under consideration carries a total of nearly $800,000 for that purpose. The House some time ago

passed the Lever bill, which is now in conference and which will shortly cost several million dollars a year under the terms of the bill, and likely more than that, to go to the farmers with experts and show them how to do.

Now, it is not necessary in the United States Steel Co. for the Government to send an expert to show them about labor-saving devices, because they are amply able to pay and probably do pay larger salaries for that purpose than governmental salaries amount to. But all over the country are the smaller manufacturing establishments, factories of all kinds, where the employer will be glad to conserve the life, health, and limb of the employee. What is suitable in one building may not always be suitable in the same manner in another building. I would have grow up in this bureau some people who become experts in the way of devising methods of saving life and conserving the health of employees employed in manufacturing and in factories and have someone who can go into the establishment and show them even how, with a slight change and with little expense, perhaps something can be done which will make the employees safer, both in life and health.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Illinois apprehend there will be any conflict between the State inspector and the inspector appointed under a law of this character, or would they work together for the best interest of all?

Mr. MANN. The Government inspector, of course, could not go into any establishment except upon request. We have not the authority to send them there compulsorily. Take the Forest Service as an illustration. We now send expert foresters at the expense of the private owner to view a private forest and advise the owner of the forest. It does not cost the Government, but it is of great value to the owner of the forest. The same thing is done in various other lines of development of work in the country. Of course the gathering of statistics is to be desired, but it takes something more than the gathering of statistics to accomplish the purpose we wish to accomplish. The States, many of them, have very efficient and capable labor bureaus, but it is a duplication, and an unnecessary duplication, of work for each of the State bureaus to do the thing in the way of ascertaining the facts which can be done by a greater and more efficient bureau of the General Government; and that information, either statistical or in the fact, best can be furnished to the labor bureaus of the States. Of course the General Government can not invade the province of the State——

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does not the gentleman believe that such suggestions would be welcomed rather than resented?

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that at all; and welcomed not only by the State authorities but I think, in the main, welcomed by the people engaged in the business. When it comes to legislation, if it shall be developed that legislation is required, that will be for the State legislatures to act upon, because we will not have authority, and it will rest with the local people of the different States.

Mr. Chairman, with some apologies, but as an illustration of defects, I am going to say something half seriously and half facetiously. The great trouble with labor safety is to get the employees to obey the rules, and we have got to find methods by which they automatically obey the rules. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its report which was submitted to Congress on the 15th of December last, and bears that date, says, on page 67:

> The commission again is compelled to acknowledge the exceedingly large proportion of train accidents due to derelictions of duty on the part of employees. Fifty-six of the accidents investigated during the year, or nearly 75 per cent of the whole number, were directly caused by mistakes of employees, etc.

And the commission calls attention to the fact that people are prone not to obey orders or regulations because they think in that particular instance it is not necessary.

No man who crosses a street always exercises due care. He sometimes takes chances. I am somewhat amused by this report of the Interstate Commerce Commission about people not obeying the regulations, for the reason that they think it makes no difference, from the fact that ever since the Interstate Commerce Commission was created it has been violating a distinct law of Congress, because the commission does not think it makes any difference. Section 21 of the act to regulate commerce provides that "the commission shall, on or before the 1st day of December in each year, make a report which shall be transmitted to Congress." Now, of course, you and I can reason that it does not make any difference whether the commission reports on or before the 1st day of December, or on the 15th day of December, just as some railroad employee reasons that in a particular case it does not make any difference whether they send the brakeman or the flagman a certain distance behind, or whether they do this thing or that thing, it will not make any difference this time. The Interstate Commerce Commission, I think, never has made its report on or before the 1st day of December in any year. I think the reports are always dated the 15th of December. I know the last one is, because I have it in my hand.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, not only that body but other bodies fail to make their reports on time, and the result is our committee has to conduct hearings without the benefit of their reports.

Mr. MANN. I am not doing this for the purpose of criticizing that commission. As I said, I made it half facetiously. But I do it for the purpose of showing that the great majority of people when they come to deal with a rule, or a law, or a regulation think it is a very good law, or a rule, or a regulation for somebody else to obey, or perhaps they would obey it at some other time, but on this particular occasion it is not necessary.

Now, if we can install labor safety devices and methods which do not depend wholly upon the volition of the employee as to whether he obeys a rule or regulation, we will to that extent add to his safety. I think we can obtain these devices.

Now, this bill provides, as it reads, "for the study of vocational diseases in all of their phases by this bureau." The Public Health Service takes exception to that. A couple of years ago we passed a bill giving the Public Health Service authority to study practically the diseases of man in all of their relations. I told one of the public-health officers the other day that I thought he was a little hoggish on the subject. Having obtained a general authority which would authorize him to do almost anything, he was objecting to anyone having authority to do a part of the things he was authorized to do.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman remembers that several years ago a great pressure and sentiment in the country brought to reduce the number of what was called the health activities of the Government and consolidate them into one, so that the matter could receive better attention at less expense. I understand the gentleman did not have in the bill he drafted this provision for the duplication of the work of that investigation?

Mr. MANN. No. I thought it was covered to the extent it needed to be covered by the other language in the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does not the gentleman think it would be perfectly practicable to allow that part of the work to the Public Health Service which he and I have taken so much interest and pride in building up?

Mr. MANN. Well, I have not time to discuss that to any extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am sorry I interrupted the gentleman. I did not know that he was limited.

Mr. MANN. This is a practical question. I think it can be so arranged that it will be satisfactory to everybody. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert copy of the bill which I introduced last July and also report of the Committee on Labor on the pending bill, giving information obtained by me and the Department of Labor concerning the bill which I prepared.

A bill (H. R. 7083) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $4,500 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor safety plans and devices of all kinds, and the need therefor, generally and specially, and to make public the results of such investigation and examination from time to time. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor safety plans and devices in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

[House of Representatives, 63d Cong., 2d. sess., Rept. No. 167.]

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, from the Committee on Labor, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 10735:

The Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, submits the following report and recommends that the said bill do pass without amendment.

The bill is as follows:

"A bill to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor-safety plans and devices of all kinds, and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of all phases of the subject of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor-safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

"SEC. 2. That there shall be erected a museum of sufficient size and capacity, with grounds thereto annexed, in and upon which shall be exhibited approved devices for the safeguarding of machinery, the protection of employees from injury, the lessening of dangerous conditions which may exist in any industrial enterprise, and the methods of lessening, preventing, and controlling industrial diseases. All such appliances, devices, and arrangements may be exhibited at rest or in motion as may best serve the purposes of such exhibit. That in addition to the museum hereinbefore referred to and in connection therewith there shall be established a laboratory, wherein may be examined and tested the relative efficiency of types of guards or other devices for the protection of machinery calculated to safeguard the employee or the general public from injury or industrial disease."

On the 23d day of July, 1913, there was referred to the Committee on Labor the House bill No. 7083, introduced by Mr. MANN, of Illinois; and later, on the 17th day of October, 1913, there was also referred to the same committee H. R. 8948, introduced by Mr. Bremner, of New Jersey; both bills dealing with the subject of safety devices and proposing the establishment of a function in the Department of Labor promotive of their usage to diminish accidents. In the course of its investigation the committee was favored with the helpful counsel of the authors of both bills, and at length determined upon a composite measure comprising the principal features of each bill. The committee then instructed its chairman to reintroduce the measure as agreed upon in committee, and it is upon this bill which this favorable report is now made.

It seems unnecessary to add substantially to the views and data on the subject which have been submitted by the Secretary of Labor. One circumstance, however, may be stated briefly. Hitherto a measure such as this would have been surely amply supported by those considerations of humanity which look to saving the workers' lives or limbs. But within a very few years it is certain accident compensation laws will have been enacted by all the States entailing an economic charge of many millions of dollars annually upon the industries of the country to pay for the losses suffered by the victims of industrial accident. There will thus be supplied, if not the strongest, at least a very strong motive for the prevention of accidents by the employment of the most efficacious safety devices. And in the promotion of the general welfare it seems to be of the greatest humane and economical importance that ample and reliable information should be made accessible as to the latest and best devices for the prevention of accidents.

The report of the Secretary of Labor, which is exhaustive and highly informative, follows, together with a memorandum prepared by the Bureau of Statistics and a brief submitted by Congressman Bremner, all of which are referred to for a comparative discussion of the subject matter of the bill.

—

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, August 28, 1913.*

Hon. DAVID J. LEWIS, M. C.,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your communication inclosing copy of H. R. 7083, "A bill to create a bureau of labor safety," and asking for an expression of my views relative to the proposed measure. I have the honor to submit the following:

The bill (H. R. 7083) proposes to create in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety, with a commissioner at the head thereof, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $4,500 per annum. In addition to the commissioner "there shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by law." The function of the bureau shall be "to make general and special investigation and examination of labor safety plans and devices of all kinds, and to make public the results of such investigation and examination from time to time"; also "to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor safety plans and devices in the industries of the United States and elsewhere."

It seems to me that much useful work could be performed by a bureau such as is proposed.

The study of systems of accident compensation has for a long time been one of the lines of work carried on by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and numerous reports and bulletins have resulted. The study of accidents in various industries has for several years been carried on in a limited way, and in recent years the bureau has published several studies in this field, one in the cotton textile industry, a second in the metal trades, and a third and more elaborate study in the iron and steel industry. This latter study covered not only the collection of accident statistics and the study of causes of accidents, but also the study of methods of safeguarding and preventing the accidents. This volume should serve to indicate the usefulness of such studies, showing, as it does, the successful methods of safeguarding and accident prevention which are in use and which may readily be adopted in many other plants.

The following reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics relate wholly or in part to accidents and accident prevention:

Fourth Special Report: Compulsory insurance in Germany, 1898.
Twenty-third Annual Report: Workmen's insurance and benefit funds in the United States, 1908.
Twenty-fourth Annual Report: Workmen's insurance and compensation systems in Europe, 1909.
Bulletin No. 8: Railway relief departments, 1897.
Bulletin No. 17: Brotherhood relief and insurance of railway employees, 1898.
Bulletin No. 19: Mutual relief and benefit associations of the printing trade, 1898.
Bulletin No. 22: Benefit features of American trade-unions, 1899.
Bulletin No. 31: Present status of employers' liability in the United States, 1900.
Bulletin No. 32: Accidents to labor as regulated by law in the United States, 1901. British workmen's compensation act and its operation.
Bulletin No. 57: State cooperative accident insurance fund of Maryland, 1905.
Bulletin No. 58: New Russian workmen's compensation act, 1905.
Bulletin No. 64: Benefit features of British trade-unions, 1906.
Bulletin No. 70: British workmen's insurance acts, 1907.
Bulletin No. 74: Workmen's compensation acts of foreign countries, 1908.
Bulletin No. 78: Industrial accidents, 1908.
Bulletin No. 84: Accidents to railroad employees in New Jersey, 1888 to 1907. 1909. The Minnesota iron ranges (includes accidents to miners).
Bulletin No. 90: Fatal accidents in coal mining, 1910.
Recent action concerning accident compensation in the United States.
Foreign workmen's compensation acts.
Cost of industrial accident insurance.
Bulletin No. 92: Industrial accidents and loss of earning power, German experience.
Workmen's compensation insurance laws and bill of 1911. 1911.
Bulletin No. 96: Workmen's insurance code of July 19, 1911, of Germany, 1911.
Bulletin No. 101: Care of tuberculous wage earners in Germany, 1912.
Bulletin No. 102: British national insurance act, 1912.
Bulletin No. 103: Sickness and accident insurance law of Switzerland, 1912.
Bulletin No. 107: Law relating to insurance of salaried employees of Germany.
Strike at Bethlehem Steel Works, South Bethlehem, Pa. (printed as S. Doc. No. 521, 61st Cong., 2d sess.), 1910.
Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States (printed as S. Doc. No. 645, 61st Cong., 2d sess.), 1910–1912.
Vol. I. Cotton Textile Industry.
Vol. XI. Employment of Women in Metal Trades.
Vol. XIX. Labor Laws and Factory Conditions.
Report on Conditions of Employment in the Iron and Steel Industry in the United States (printed as S. Doc. No. 110, 62d Cong., 1st sess.), 1912.
Vol. IV. Accidents and Accident Prevention.

Numerous articles dealing with occupational diseases, some of which in European countries are classified as accidents, are not included in the above list.

The study of the subject is being continued in the iron and steel industry, and a similar study is also being made in plants engaged in machine building. In such work emphasis would naturally be placed more and more upon those safety devices and methods of safety work which are found to secure definite results in the prevention of accidents.

The work here referred to could profitably be expanded by taking up a larger number of industries, by completing and publishing the results of studies more rapidly, and by giving greater attention to the study of safety devices in detail. Great advances have been made within a very short time in the development of safety devices, both in this country and abroad, and the fullest information should be available in regard to these matters.

For many kinds of accidents devices will be found in successful use in some plants of the better class, and the experience there available will be ready at hand to show other employers and their workmen entirely practicable means of preventing many accidents and of gradually reducing the accident loss.

In the important European countries much attention has been given to accident prevention both by factory-inspection departments and also by associations of employers. In museums of safety devices the causes of accidents and the methods of accident prevention have been studied and illustrated, and are regarded as of the greatest practical use. A partial list of the European museums for safety is given herewith. It is understood that most of these are of an official character, but precise information is not available to show just which ones are official and which, if any, are supported by other than official agencies:

Paris, France: Musee de la Prevention des Accidents du Travail et d'Hygiene Industrielle. (Museum for the Prevention of Industrial Accidents and of Industrial Hygiene.)

Amsterdam, Holland: Museum van Voorwerken Ter Voorkoming van Ongelukken en Ziekten in Fabrieken en Werkplaatsen. (Museum for the Prevention of Industrial Accidents, and Disease in Factories and Work Places.)

Munich, Bavaria: Museum fur Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. (Museum of Welfare Work for Workingmen.)

Bremen, Germany: Burgerlicher Volksverein Soziales Museum. (Social Museum of the City People's Society.)

Amsterdam, Holland: Centraal Bureau voor Sociale Adviezen. (Central Bureau for Social Advice.)

Copenhagen, Denmark: Det Sociale Sekretariat og Bibliotek. (The Social Secretariat and Library.)

Zurich, Switzerland: Polytechnic Institute. (Polytechnic Institute.)

Charlottenburg, Germany: Gewerbehygienisches Museum. (Museum of Industrial Hygiene.)

Stockholm, Sweden: Centralforbundet for Socialt Arbete. (Central Union for Social Welfare Work.)

Frankfort on the Main, Germany: Institute fur Gewerbehygiene. (Institute of Industrial Hygiene.)

Many other countries have recognized the necessity of placing the promotion of safety and the use of safety devices under the control of some department of the Government.

Great Britain: There appears to be no such institution provided for by English law, though the centralization of power in that country makes it possible for a central supervision to be exercised through the inspectors of factories, etc., appointed by the secretary of state, whose annual reports are laid before Parliament, and who are charged with the enforcement throughout Great Britain of the factory-inspection laws. The special power conferred upon the secretary of state in this connection appears in section 79 of the factory and workshop act of 1901, which reads as follows:

"79. Where the secretary of state is satisfied that any manufacture, machinery, plant, process, or description of manual labor, used in factories or workshops, is dangerous or injurious to health or dangerous

to life and limb, either generally or in the case of women, children, or any other class of persons, he may certify that manufacture, machinery, plant, process, or description of manual labor to be dangerous; and thereupon the secretary of state may, subject to the provisions of this act, make such regulations as appear to be reasonably practicable, and to meet the necessity of the case."

Austria: By decree of January 6, 1899, the Emperor has sanctioned the creation of a commission for the prevention of accidents (Unfallverhutungskommission). The regulations governing this commission were published by the minister of commerce under date of May 13, 1900 (R. G. Bl. No. 86).

This commission consists of the central industrial inspector and not more than 20 nor less than 16 members, who are appointed for three years and are selected from experts on mechanics and hygiene, representatives of the workmen's accident insurance institutions, and employers as well as employees of establishments subject to accident insurance; there are also appointed 10 substitute members who must reside in Vienna. The commission is under the direction of the minister of commerce, who appoints its regular and substitute members, the former in conjunction with the ministers of the various departments interested in accident insurance. The ministers of commerce, public worship and instruction, interior, finance, railroads and agriculture may delegate to each meeting of the commission or one of its committee representatives who shall act in an advisory capacity. The minister of commerce is an addition authorized to call in special experts to these meetings, if he is requested to do so. The commission is authorized to form committees for the preliminary discussion of special topics. The commission convenes according to need on invitation of the minister of commerce.

The commission for the prevention of accidents is the advisory and consultory agency of the Government in all matters relating to the protection of life and health of workmen employed in establishments subject to accident insurance. The chief function of the commission is the rendering of opinions for the purpose of issuing general regulations or regulations for special industries relating to the safety of operation. It may also, of its own initiative, make proposals in relation to matters within its sphere of action.

Belgium: In Belgium there is an office known as the permanent deputation of the provincial council, which has local control over private industry, while the minister of agriculture, industry, and public works exercises authority with reference to enterprises established or operated by the State. Agents appointed by the minister of the interior have a supervisory power of inspection generally. The Government has authority to prescribe safety regulations and the adoption of devices suitable to the conditions in industrial and commercial establishments.

France: In France there is a body known as the consulting committee on arts and manufactures, which advises as to the general measures relating to the protection and health of employees either generally or with reference to certain occupations or methods of operation. Within certain spheres the committee on hygiene is called into consultation.

Germany: The workmen's insurance code of 1911 provides for accident associations with authority to issue the necessary regulations concerning the prevention of accidents in establishments of the members of such associations. These associations are very effective and go far in the direction of the establishment of safety museums as well as in encouraging remedial action in cases where employees have suffered from accident, providing artificial limbs, etc., and seeing that employment suitable for maimed persons is secured.

Italy: In Italy as in Germany the subject of the prevention of accidents is included in the accident insurance or compensation law of that country. The law authorizes the minister of agriculture, industry, and commerce, after consultation with the appropriate technical government council (mining, public works, railroads, etc.), to formulate regulations governing the particular industries, and requiring the adoption of suitable safety devices either generally or for special establishments. By consultation with the technical councils it is possible to secure expert advice appropriate to particular conditions.

Denmark: The minister of interior at the instance of the council of labor has power to issue specific regulations for safety in establishments covered by the factory act. This gives large initiative power in the matter of safety provisions.

Norway: The inspector of factories is given initiative power with reference to the provision of safety devices.

Spain: The compensation act of Spain provides specifically for the prevention of accidents through a technical commission consisting of one architect and three engineers. This commission was directed to furnish to the minister of interior a list of apparatus and measures for the prevention of accidents, and the Government was instructed after consulting with this commission to issue regulations for the introduction of measures and for the prevention of accidents and the protection of life, safety, and the health of the employees. It was also provided that the commission should establish a museum to preserve models of safety appliances and for testing new devices.

Our form of government would not permit of the establishment of a Federal bureau having police powers to regulate the use of safety devices, except in those classes of industry which come under Federal jurisdiction, such as interstate commerce. For years Congress has exercised jurisdiction in the regulation of safety devices to be used by interstate transportation companies. The greatest value which would accrue from the establishment of a Federal bureau of safety would be that it would act as a clearing house for all of the information available in the various States and in foreign countries. Performing this function, it would be of immense value, not only to the wage workers but to the country in general. I therefore have the honor to recommend that the bill be passed.

Sincerely, yours,

W. B. WILSON, *Secretary.*

---

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
*Washington, December 5, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. MANN: I am inclosing herewith the memorandum which you asked me to prepare, giving some information in regard to industrial accidents in the United States and foreign countries, and the means which foreign countries are using for the prevention of accidents.

I am, very truly, yours,

ROYAL MEEKER,
*Commissioner of Labor Statistics.*

MEMORANDUM IN REGARD TO INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the United States statistics do not exist from which the number of industrial accidents can be accurately determined, nor from which an estimate at all satisfactory can be computed.

Save for accidents in mines and in transportation we have in the United States few records to show the extent of the hazard of industry. In these two great industries and in the small amount of imperfect data which we have of other employments, we know enough to confirm the general impression that American industry pays an awful toll in death and suffering for the accidents of employment. That a considerable percentage of these accidents are preventable has often been shown.

In 1908 Frederick L. Hoffman, the well-known statistician, showed in Bulletin 78 of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics that the annual fatal accident rate of employees of coal mines in the United States for the 10-year period ending in 1906 was 3.10 per 1,000, as compared with 1.29 in Great Britain, 1.35 in Austria, 1.81 in France, and 2.13 in Prussia during the same period. A reduction of the rate in the United States from 3.10 to the level of Great Britain, 1.29, would, it was estimated, result in an annual saving of 915 lives. Since that date the situation has not changed for the better, for the American record of 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912 showed rates of 4, 3.92, 3.73, and 3.27, while the British rate has risen slightly to 1.36 per 1,000 in the 5-year period 1908 to 1912. Approximately 2,500 lives are annually lost by accidents in the coal mines of the United States.

Even higher than the rate among the coal-mine employees is that among employees of the metal mines. Thus, in the calendar year 1911 in the metal mines of the United States 695 men were killed, representing a rate of 4.19 per 1,000 men employed. The fatality rates due to accidents in metal mines in a number of foreign countries were as follows: Germany, 1.39; Great Britain, 1.64; Spain, 2.25; France, 3.16; Transvaal, 4.29.

The fatal accident rate in quarries in the United States is much lower than that in either coal or metal mines. In the calendar year 1911, 188 men were killed in quarry accidents, the death rate being 1.69 per 1,000 men employed. In Great Britain the death rate among quarry workmen was 1.08 per 1,000; in Germany, in 1911, 1.48 per 1,000.

Fully as striking is the excessive fatal accident rate among employees of American railways. Thus, the American rate for the 10-year period 1897 to 1906 was 2.50 per 1,000, against a rate of 0.98 per 1,000 among employees of German railways. In 1912, 3,635 American railway employees lost their lives in the accidents of their employment, and the American fatal accident rate was 3.02 per 1,000, while the British rate for the 5-year period 1908 to 1912 was 0.65 per 1,000 and the German rate for the 5-year period 1907 to 1911 was 1.13 per 1,000. Even these figures certainly understate the real situation among railway employees, for according to the American practice only accidents to persons resulting in immediate death or death within 24 hours from the time of the accident are regarded as fatally injured, while the foreign practice takes account of the outcome of the injury.

In other American industries records of industrial accidents, even approximately complete, are lacking, but it is generally accepted as true that in most industries, except where organized safety work has already been done, the accident rate is considerably in excess of accident rates in corresponding employments in European countries.

In the bulletin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics already referred to an attempt has been made to estimate the annual loss of life in American industry. Upon the basis of the census reports within the registration area of the United States it was estimated that for the entire country the actual number of fatal accidents annually was between 30,000 and 35,000, one-half of which were the immediate result of employment. The nonfatal accidents of industry are, of course, far more numerous than the fatalities, and while many are not serious in permanent effect, even the minor ones impose a heavy burden of suffering, and many of the more serious ones involve permanent disability and loss of earning power, with frequently absolute dependency. Corresponding with the estimate of fatal accidents above given, it was estimated that there were annually 2,000,000 nonfatal accidents in the country.

There may be question whether even this estimate is high enough adequately to represent the full number of accidents in the United States. If we accept such evidence as we have that the fatality rate in this country is higher than in European countries, then it must follow that any estimate of 15,000 to 17,500 fatal accidents is much too low. In Great Britain, according to the official statistics, the annual fatality rate for the five-year period 1908 to 1912 was 0.65, agreeing exactly with the rate for an earlier five-year period, 1904 to 1908. In German industries figures for the five-year period 1907 to 1911 show a rate of 0.71, and in Austria for the period 1906 to 1910 the rate was 0.63. If we may then assume as a moderate estimate of the fatality rate in this country 0.80 per 1,000, this upon the basis of 28,000,000 males 15 years of age and over occupied as wage earners, the number of deaths each year from industrial accidents appears to be 22,400. The number of nonfatal accidents is necessarily dependent upon the definition of such an accident, and the practice varies widely between the different countries. In Austria, where the available statistics of accidents are limited to those involving a disability of over three days, approximately 1 per cent of the total accidents are fatal. In Germany, because the figures for the minor accidents are less complete, the percentage of fatal accidents is higher. Without attempting to select a figure which shall express the proper relation between fatal and nonfatal accidents, it is probable that 2,000,000 is a conservative figure of the number of industrial accidents involving disability and some loss of time.

The possibility of substantial reductions in the accident rates and great saving in life and suffering by organized safety work is beyond question. In the iron and steel industry in the United States, where organized safety work has perhaps reached its best development, the Bureau of Labor Statistics found, in comparing the accident records of a group of plants in which safety work had been fully developed with a group in which such work had not been done, a rate of 167.1 per 1,000 300-day workers for the former group and 307.9 for the latter group, a reduction of 67.1 per cent, or of 2 accidents out of every 3. The greatest part of this accident reduction appeared in the accidents resulting in temporary disabilities, but a reduction of 21.5 per cent in the permanent disability rate and of 30.2 per cent in the fatal-accident rate indicated that the saving extended to accidents of practically every class.

There are many reasons for believing that what has been accomplished in the manufacturing plants of a single industry can be accom-

lished by similar methods in most other industries with a high accident rate. Such results have been brought about by careful study of the causes of accident, organization of systems of inspection, educational work, and the introduction of direct safety appliances. Even with the passage of well-considered laws calling for all reasonable safeguards, such laws can not come into general effect or produce the full measure of the results which should be expected without careful study of the conditions and causes of accident occurrence. Accurate statistics and the careful study which should accompany them can alone furnish a reasonable basis for improvement. The great possibilities of successful accident prevention have been clearly demonstrated in the experience of many industries abroad and in the case of some in this country. No more striking example of these possibilities is anywhere found than in the study of accidents and accident prevention in the iron and steel industry, published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics and refererd to above.

In most European countries which are industrially important industrial inspectors are charged with important duties with the view of securing the enforcement of the safety provisions of law and of advising and instructing employers in regard to the fencing and guarding of machinery and the use of safety appliances. The powers of industrial inspectors vary greatly in the different countries, but in the more important States they are called upon to give much attention to the study of accident prevention. Because they are charged with this duty, among others, thorough technical training is usually insisted upon as an essential qualification.

Museums of safety devices have been established in a number of European countries for the study and illustration of the causes of accidents and the methods of accident prevention, and are regarded as of great practical use. A partial list of the European museums of safety is given herewith. It is understood that most of these are of an official character, but precise information is not available to show just which ones are official and which, if any, are supported by other than official agencies. In addition to the museums here named, it is understood that a museum of safety appliances is to be established in London under the control of the Home Office.

Bremen, Germany: Burgerlicher Volksverein Soziales Museum. (Social Museum of the City People's Society.)

Charlottenburg: Gewerbehygienisches Museum. (Museum of Industrial Hygiene.)

Frankfort on the Main, Germany: Institute für Gewerbehygiene. (Institute of Industrial Hygiene.)

Nuremburg, Germany.

Munich, Bavaria: Museum für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseiturichtungen. (Museum of Welfare Work for Workingmen.)

Graz, Austria.

Paris, France: Musée de la Prevention des Accidents du Travail et d'Hygiène Industrielle. (Museum for the Prevention of Industrial Accidents and of Industrial Hygiene.)

Zurich, Switzerland: Polytechnic Institute. (Polytechnic Institute.)

Amsterdam, Holland: Museum van Voorwerken Ter Voorkoming van Ongelukken en Ziekten in Fabrieken en Workplaatsen. (Museum for the Prevention of Industrial Accidents and Disease in Factories and Workplaces.)

Amsterdam, Holland: Centraal Bureau voor Sociale Adviezen. (Central Bureau for Social Advice.)

Copenhagen, Denmark: Det Sociale Sekretariat Bibliotek. (The Social Secretariat and Library.)

Stockholm, Sweden: Centralförbundet for Socialt Arbete. (Central Union for Social Welfare Work.)

Barcelona, Spain.

Bucharest, Roumania.

Outside of the work which is done by factory inspectors, there are many unofficial organizations and agencies for the study of accidents and accident prevention. An international technical congress for industrial hygiene and the prevention of industrial accidents has been organized, and the first meeting was held in Milan in May of 1912. The congress was devoted to the many technical problems involved in the introduction of safety precautions for industrial workers. It was mainly initiated by the private associations for the prevention of industrial accidents which have existed for a number of years in France, Belgium, and Italy. Many of the large manufacturing firms in these countries are members of such associations and their factories are regularly inspected by technical inspectors, qualified to advise as to the precautionary measures for health and safety. The congress was held under the auspices of the Italian Government, and a large number of official delegates attended and took part in the proceedings. The special object of the congress, as explained by its president, was to bring together in an informal manner manufacturers and representatives of accident associations, insurance companies, factory inspectors, and sanitary experts for exchange of views in a friendly way, and thus secure some agreement as to introduction of reforms valuable both to the employer and the worker without attempting burdensome or premature industrial legislation.

Some particulars in regard to the accident situation and the means employed to protect the safety and health of workers in the individual countries are given in the pages which follow:

GREAT BRITAIN.

In Great Britain the question of frequency of accidents and the best methods of prevention have been given much study, extending over a long period. In 1911 this subject was the occasion of an elaborate report of a departmental committee, submitted after an investigation and study covering a period of more than two years.

In Great Britain, as in practically all other countries, the statistical information is not available to show the total number of accidents in industry. To only a limited extent are reports required for accidents resulting in short-term disabilities. The most satisfactory figures are those which are collected under the workmen's compensation act. These reports, covering seven great groups of industries, namely, factories, mines, quarries, railways, docks, construction work, and shipping, and including in 1912, 7,411,005 employees, 5,125,000 of whom were in factories, showed 424,406 cases of disablement and 5,046 deaths from accident. These reports, however, are far from complete for those accidents resulting in disabilities of less than two weeks. According to these figures the rate per 1,000 employees for all accidents was 57.3, and for fatal accidents 0.63, the rate for fatal accidents being the same as the average of the five-year period 1908 to 1912.

The fatal-accident rates for the five-year period 1908 to 1912 for Great Britain were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Seamen | 5.04 |
| Miners | 1.36 |
| Quarrymen | 1.06 |
| Railway employees | .65 |
| Nontextile factory employees | .22 |
| Textile employees | .07 |
| Average | .63 |

The prevention of accidents, except in so far as the matter is dealt with by specific provision of law, is in the hands of the chief inspector of factories, under the direction of the home secretary. The factory-inspection system in Great Britain is the oldest of its kind in any country, dating back to 1833. The number of inspectors, according to the chief inspector's report for 1912, is 205, not including mine inspectors.

In certain industries the home secretary has large powers of making regulations for factories or workshops, according to the circumstances of the case. The factory and workshop act of 1901, section 79, reads as follows:

"Where the secretary of state is satisfied that any manufacture, machinery, plant, process, or description of manual labor used in factories or workshops is dangerous or injurious to health or dangerous to life and limb, either generally or in the case of women, children, or any other class of persons, he may certify that manufacture, machinery, plant, process, or description of manual labor to be dangerous; and thereupon the secretary of state may, subject to the provisions of this act, make such regulations as appear to him to be reasonably practicable, and to meet the necessity of the case."

The departmental committee, in the report on accidents above referred to, reached the conclusion that the accident risk was higher than it need be and recommended a number of measures for improving the existing provisions for the prevention of accidents. The recommendations of the committee were that all possible steps must be taken to secure (1) that the employers shall cooperate with the inspectors, (2) that a knowledge of the risks of new machines and the best ways of fencing and guarding shall be diffused widely and quickly, and (3) that the best methods of fencing and guarding shall be enforced with speed and uniformity.

The committee also submitted certain proposals with the view of bringing about the desired reforms. These proposals called for conferences between inspectors and employers and employees; special reports by inspectors on industrial dangers; uniformity of requirements among inspectors; specification by the authority of dangerous parts of machines; guarding of machinery by makers; maintenance of guards; safety appliances other than fences and guards; methods of avoiding crowding of machinery; methods of remedying defective and slippery floors, stairs, etc.; proper lighting; regulation of the lifting and carrying of weights; regulation or prohibition of cleaning machinery in motion; the improvement of statistical information in regard to industrial accidents.

A number of the recommendations of this committee have already resulted in action. Among the most important of these has been the holding of conferences by the factory inspectors with the representatives of employers and workpeople for the purpose of discussing dangers and the best means of preventing accidents. In 1912 such conferences were held relating to cotton spinning, cotton weaving, worsted and woolen spinning, and to the iron foundry industry. In each case a substantial agreement was reached upon many important details, the agreement taking the form of detailed provisions in regard to the fencing and guarding of machinery and the regulation of working conditions.

GERMANY.

The accident situation in Germany will be fairly well shown by the published accident statistics. These have been given in quite full detail in the Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor, and for 1907 are summarized in Bulletin No. 92 of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The total number of accidents involving disability of more than three days in 1911 among the industrial workers insured under the German workmen's insurance system was approximately 484,000, or 58.4 per 1,000 full-time workers. It is fairly certain that these figures are not complete, as under the German insurance only those accidents resulting in disability of over 13 weeks or death are fully reported and classed as accidents, the shorter accident disabilities being compensated out of sick funds and being reported and treated as cases of sickness. For the industrial accident associations the fatal accident rate in the five-year period 1907 to 1911 was 0.71 per 1,000 full-time workers.

In Germany the study of the prevention of industrial accidents has for many years been one of the chief duties of the factory-inspection department. With the adoption of the compulsory-insurance system, under which the insurance associations are organized along industrial lines, additional measures were taken to reduce the number of accidents to the smallest number. Stringent rules were drawn up, applying to both employer and workmen, penalties were prescribed, and technical supervising inspectors devoted themselves to the work of instructing and advising the employer, as well as looking out for the enforcement of the rules. As the rate of insurance premium which is assessed against each employer is in a large measure dependent upon conditions in his particular establishment, as shown by his accident record and the report of the insurance inspectors, there is the strongest incentive for the employer to follow every rule and to follow every suggestion of the inspector.

On January 1, 1910, the number of technically trained inspectors employed by the accident insurance associations was 359, the 66 industrial associations having 321, while the 48 agricultural associations had 38. In 1909 the number of State factory inspectors was 543 and the number of mine inspectors 111, making a total of 654 factory inspectors. The number of employees in industry and in mining is approximately 11,250,000.

Five museums of safety for the study and illustration of safety appliances and methods of accident prevention exist in Germany. These are located at Bremen, Charlottenburg near Berlin, Frankfort on the Main, Munich, and Nuremberg.

AUSTRIA.

In Austria, with over 4,000,000 persons gainfully employed, about 3,000,000 are covered by the system of workmen's insurance. The statistics of accidents are probably not complete for the nonfatal accidents, because accidents resulting in disability of four weeks or less are compensated from the sickness insurance funds and classed along with cases of sickness. The official reports show a total of 128,094 accidents in 1907, or a rate of 63.4 per 1,000 full-time workers. Of these, 1,189 were fatalities, or a rate of 0.59 per 1,000 full-time workers.

In Austria, where the accident insurance associations are organized on a territorial rather than on an industry basis, as in Germany, the

work of inspection with a view to accident prevention is in the hands of the State factory inspectors. The accident insurance association may request the factory inspector to report on any factory, and as a result of the report may request the local authority to make rules.

The number of factory inspectors in Austria in 1910 was 126 and the number of mine inspectors 85. A museum of safety has been established at Graz.

By decree of January 6, 1899, the Emperor has sanctioned the creation of a commission for the prevention of accidents (Unfallverhütungskommission). The regulations governing this commission were published by the minister of commerce under date of May 13, 1900. (R. G. Bl. No. 86.)

This commission consists of the central industrial inspector and not more than 20 nor less than 16 members, who are appointed for three years and are selected from experts on mechanics and hygiene, representatives of the workmen's accident insurance institutions, and employers as well as employees of establishments subject to accident insurance; there are also appointed 10 substitute members who must reside in Vienna. The commission is under the direction of the minister of commerce, who appoints its regular and substitute members, the former in conjunction with the ministers of the various departments interested in accident insurance. The ministers of commerce, public worship and instruction, interior, finance, railroads, and agriculture may delegate to each meeting of the commission or one of its committees representatives who shall act in an advisory capacity. The minister of commerce is in addition authorized to call in special experts to these meetings, if he is requested to do so. The commission is authorized to form committees for the preliminary discussion of special topics. The commission convenes according to need on invitation of the minister of commerce.

The commission for the prevention of accidents is the advisory and consulting agency of the Government in all matters relating to the protection of life and health of workmen employed in establishments subject to accident insurance. The chief function of the commission is the rendering of opinions for the purpose of issuing general regulations or regulations for special industries relating to the safety of operation. It may also, of its own initiative, make proposals in relation to matters within its sphere of action.

FRANCE.

In France the prevention of accidents is chiefly in the hands of the factory inspectors, who enforce the law, which regulates many details of factory conditions. The law provides that factories and workshops must be kept in such a manner as to secure the safety of the workers. In every factory wheels, belts, cogwheels, and every other apparatus which may be the cause of danger must be separated from the workers in such a manner that they can not be approached except for the purposes of the work. Engines, machines, gearing, etc., must be installed and kept in the best possible condition for safety. This general provision of the law is supplemented by numerous decrees, framed in order to secure protection from some particular danger. The factory-inspection service in France was organized in 1874. In 1909 the factory inspectors numbered 139 and the mine inspectors 170. The number of persons employed in industry and in mining was approximately 7,000,000.

France also has a body known as the consulting committee on arts and manufactures, which advises regarding the general measures relating to the health and protection of employees, either generally or with reference to particular occupations or methods of operation. Within certain spheres the committee on hygiene is called in consultation.

BELGIUM.

In Belgium there is an office known as the permanent deputation of the provincial council which has local control over private industry, while the minister of agriculture, industry, and public works exercises authority with reference to enterprises established or operated by the State. Agents appointed by the minister of the interior have a supervisory power of inspection generally. The Government has authority to prescribe safety regulations and the adoption of devices suitable to the conditions in industrial and commercial establishments.

The Belgian factory inspection service was organized in 1889. In 1909 it included 45 factory inspectors and 98 inspectors of mines. The number of persons employed in industry and in mining is nearly one and one-half millions.

ITALY.

In Italy no general factory legislation was passed until 1898. In that year a law was enacted providing for the compulsory insurance of workpeople and empowering the Government to issue regulations for the prevention of accidents.

The law authorizes the minister of agriculture, industry, and commerce, after consultation with the appropriate technical Government council (mining, public works, railroads, etc.), to formulate regulations governing the particular industries and requiring the adoption of suitable safety devices either generally or for special establishments. By consultation with the technical councils it is possible to secure expert advice appropriate to particular conditions.

The inspection service, which was established in 1906, in 1909 employed 20 factory inspectors and 88 inspectors of mines. The persons employed in industry and in mining numbered approximately one and one-half million.

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY HON. ROBERT G. BREMNER, UPON THE SUBJECT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY.

The United States to-day occupies a curious position among industrial nations. Ambitious to be the first in point of output, we are sociologically the last in our methods of production. From the mechanical point of view we claim to lead, but the student of industrial economy is amazed to find that we practically ignore the modern science of conservation in its most important aspect. Trees, minerals, lands, water—these we admit (somewhat tardily) must be safeguarded from further waste. But the Government protection of these 34,000,000 men, women, and children, who constitute our industrial army, upon whose well-being rests the whole economic and social fabric of our Commonwealth—this is a phase of conservation practically ignored by our legislators and the public.

THE COST OF HUMAN WASTE.

One reason why the United States has not faced this question in the same practical spirit as other nations is the fact that we rely on immigration to make good our incredible waste of human material. Some figures, based on conservative estimates, help us to realize how serious an economic crime this policy has really proved.

It is estimated that out of 34,000,000 engaged in gainful occupations there are yearly some 38,000 deaths, 2,000,000 accidents (of which 500,000 are serious), and 3,000,000 cases of preventable industrial illness. While the killing of a man is usually only the beginning of the burden which society must assume (witness the 15,000 widows and 45,000 orphans which industry deprives annually of their natural supporters), let us rather accept the business view of the loss entailed by occupational deaths.

Death. The average economic value of a worker in this country (based on his usual earning capacity) is conservatively calculated at $2,900. We therefore squander, every 12 months, the equivalent of $110,200,000, and in addition burden private and public charity with the progressive financial and social consequences arising from the dependence of those left destitute or inadequately provided for.

Accident. Two million accidents, of which 500,000 are serious, entail an annual loss of probably $40,000,000 earnings.

Illness. On the German basis of calculation, the 3,000,000 cases of preventable industrial illness entail a cost of some $200,000,000. Who pays?

Broadly speaking, the United States ignores an annual wastage of normal earning capacity which, from three causes alone, exceeds $350,200,000.

In reality, society and industry itself share a far greater loss between them.

But there are other factors crippling our employers of labor and from these obvious causes of waste.

Only America ignores the fact that, for the producer, a man merely negatively well is inferior to a man in perfect health. Efficiency rests on a health basis. In fact, health is the original wealth.

Lowered vitality due to insanitary factory conditions; abnormal physical or mental overstrain due to speeding; depletion of reserve force; the long list of minor ailments ("feeling poorly, but able to work") reduce the value of the majority of employees fully 100 per cent.

Undue fatigue alone, plus resulting intemperance, costs industry close upon $1,000,000,000 a year. Such is the penalty industry must bear from "lack of taking thought."

THE REMEDY, BUREAU OF SAFETY.

"Eliminate waste" is the modern watchword of productive processes. Throwing aside the arguments of humanity and justice, other countries on a business basis have inaugurated campaigns for the elimination of industrial accident, disease, and lowered efficiency by the same scientific methods which they have brought to bear upon the technique of trade. Education is the key to occupational health and usefulness; the education of the public, the employer, and the worker in sanitary and safe methods.

MUSEUMS OF SAFETY.

In matters affecting the avocations of daily life, theoretical instruction is rarely efficient. "Seeing is believing" for the rank and file. Acting on that principle, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dresden, Frankfort on the Main, Gratz, Helsingfors, Munich, Odessa, Paris, St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Wurtzburg, and Zurich have erected museums of safety in which are exhibited, at rest or in motion, every type of dangerous machinery and its scientific guard; systems of exhaust ventilation for the control of dangerous dusts and fumes; types of respirators, masks, goggles, and special suits for dangerous work; devices to lessen excessive glare and heat; and, in brief, safety appliances for every type of mechanical or industrial processes.

These museums, which set a standard for the safety-bureau movement of each country, are also institutes for disseminating industrial knowledge. Lectures are given, literature is printed and circulated, photographs of their contents are published, and every employer or worker of the country is free to apply to them for impartial advice or help in problems affecting accident or disease prevention.

WHY NATIONAL?

Perhaps in no country is the demand for such a national and visible indorsement of the safety movement so needed as in the United States. Practically 50 governments through State departments of labor are attempting "interference" (so regarded) in industrial processes. Practically 50 different standards may exist, be enforced, or neglected, to the disadvantage of allied trades situated in different localities, yet producing goods under nearly identical conditions. The exhaust ventilation "blower" control of one State which may carry off by its excess pull the dusty product, across the border line is allowed to accumulate without criticism. The wire-mesh guards over wheels or belts in one factory, for example, may represent an outlay of thousands of dollars spent in good faith, yet a change of political administration of a local department may change the policy which a predecessor approved and call for new installations of a different type.

To merely cover danger points is but a detail of the question of scientific safeguarding. Some of the most dangerous machines are employed on piecework. A guard which cuts the employees' earning capacity in halves will be "thrown" in every instance. The stamping-machine guard, which calls for three extra motions on a level with the worker's head, is an example of inexpert precautions which defeat their object.

Moreover, there is a certain reverence for Federal experts, a recognition that they are somewhat removed from the field of local trade jealousies and rivalries, which is a powerful aid in obtaining recognition for the standards. They set in the protection of extra hazardous mechanisms. They do not suggest local "rake-offs" for the changes advocated in Federal reports, publications, and safety literature.

No one questions the need for small museums of safety in every large industrial center, but foreign experience proves that such branches spring from the deep roots of the national institute. The local boards of trade which will devote a room to charts, photographs, and models from the National Museum at Washington will in the future make possible a more scientific education of the employer than almost any State department of labor is qualified to give to-day.

Human conservation is an expert science, calling for the leadership of a few thoroughly trained authorities. From every viewpoint of efficiency our efforts should be concentrated on procuring, through national appropriation, what must otherwise be cramped and rendered limited by State curtailments.

Finally, the public advertisement, to use a crude phrase of a national museum. The fact that any worker or employer can appeal to it for instruction or advice, gives a guaranty of efficiency of administration and progressive methods which assures to the proposed bureau of safety, of which it is the demonstration, a timeliness otherwise prone to lapse into departmental delay. And while its primary object is to lessen human suffering its crusade for safe and sane manufacturing methods will be of inestimable practical advantage in standardizing such methods throughout our whole industrial system.

THE LABORATORY OF HYGIENE.

Valuable as has been the work of the foreign museum of safety, the Institutes of Industrial Hygiene in Vienna, Paris, and Milan are demonstrating yet wider fields for the student of human conservation.

The subtler dangers to the worker involved in exposure to dust and fume, to overstrain, overspeeding, nerve exhaustion, occupational intem-

perance, and the thousand signals to insanitary conditions, are here studied and their remedies weighed and approved. Milan devotes three large four-story buildings, equipped with the latest apparatus in laboratories, hospital wards, lecture rooms, and libraries, to the elimination of those diseases peculiar to employments. Twelve scientists cooperate with the director in the investigation of trade poisonings, such as those of lead, mercury, and arsenic. The toxin of fatigue, of muscular effort, and nerve depletion are proved by experiments upon living animals. Every trade process offering risk to health is investigated with a view to scientific alterations which shall protect the worker without undue hardship to the employer.

All the information acquired by the laboratory is free to those who seek its aid. And in this case, as in that of the museum, the fact that it is national makes it a force throughout the land.

No State department is to-day fitted to carry out, although each can help to promulgate, so extensive a program. Yet no one familiar with American needs would be content to advocate less than Italy offers to her workers.

Great as was her need, ours is imperatively greater. Above all, we need the authority which invests a Government investigation of trade conditions to free the minds of our industrial employers from the too common fear of local departments and their betrayal of secret processes and technical formulas. To a Federal investigator the average owner, who would gladly bar his door to the Department of Labor, throws open the book of his manufacturing experiences. A national clearing house for industrial welfare experiments will save years of effort and millions of dollars to those who are to-day ignorant of what has already been accomplished along those lines.

This is no untried experiment which is advocated by the Bremner bill. We shall but duplicate the experience of those countries which have already proved the value of an effort toward human conservation; an effort which is dictated both by financial wisdom and by the dictates of humanity and justice.

The first organization of this kind was founded by a great captain of industry, Engel Dulfus, of Mulhouse, in 1867, and since that time innumerable similar societies have sprung up. There exist also museums similar to the one which is the subject of this article. Among the principal of these may be cited that at Vienna (1890), at Amsterdam (1891), at Berlin (Charlottenburg, 1903). This last one has cost about 1,000,000 marks and possesses an annual budget of 40,000 marks. The new Parisian museum was founded by the "Association des industriels de France contre les accidents dutravail," established in 1883 by Emil Muller, and was organized entirely by private gifts.

Its purpose, inspired by philanthropy, is to indicate to the present patrons the precautions to be taken, the devices and the means to employ, for protecting their workmen against risks of all sorts—unhealthful atmosphere, dangers from machines and transmission devices, harmful dusts, high electric voltages, poisoning, etc.

In the hall situated at the other end of the museum we find a great assortment of hoisting devices, hoisting blocks, movable ladders, climbing harness for linemen, safety devices for roofers, various models of elevators, and protective stair cagings.

The climbing harness of Ravasse-Lullier is intended to prevent falls of linemen, carpenters, roofers, painters, ironworkers, etc.

While the most fastidious precaution, the most vigilant attention, and the most perfect industrial hygiene all act to reduce to a minimum the number and seriousness of accidents, they can not pretend completely to suppress them, since by definition the accident is unforeseen.

Although many interesting attempts to improve conditions and to promote more cordial relations between master and man have been made with fair success, the safeguarding of life and limb has not been perfected to any appreciable extent. Ask a manufacturer if his circular saws, punches, and presses are protected by safety devices, and usually he replies, "No," or if they are, "My men won't use them."

As Dr. Josiah Strong points out, economic considerations are wholly secondary. This is, first of all, a question of conscience. Needless slaughter is criminal slaughter.

"Industrial homicide is being committed every hour of the day, and the employer who does not provide all practicable means for safeguarding life and limb is particeps criminis.

"We are told that ancient Athens was forced every nine years to pay a tribute of 7 youths and 7 maidens to be devoured by the Cretan Minotaur, until Theseus slew the monster. We have here in the United States a monster named Indifference, to which we are making human sacrifice, not at the rate of 14 every 9 years but at the rate of a dozen a day, besides many scores who escape with their lives but are maimed or mangled.

"The establishment of a museum of security for America would mean the saving of thousands of lives, and, through the prevention of accidents, hundreds of thousands of workmen would be saved from disability, and thus from becoming a charge on their families or dependent on the State. Such a museum would also lessen liability for damage suits growing out of accidents." (William H. Tolman, director of the American Institute of Social Service, Century Magazine, May–October, 1906.)

John B. Andrews, in the Survey, that great and good publication, last month said:

"But in the United States we need an institution that will correlate the experience of our scattered little group of hygienists and enable more medical men to direct their attention to the problems of industrial hygiene. We need for the purpose a special laboratory and hospital to accelerate progress in the study of the causes and prevention of industrial diseases. With such an institution phosphorous poisoning would quickly disappear from our match industry as a matter of scientific sense. The long list of poisons affecting scores of different occupations would gradually be shortened. Conditions which lower vitality, lessen efficiency, and invite disease would quickly be improved, to the advantage of manufacturer and wage earner. The necessary research would be carried on by scientists of unquestioned ability and singleness of purpose, and in a manner which would enlist from all the heartiest cooperation.

"For the past two years the American Association for Labor Legislation has had an able commission of industrial hygiene, and last June called the first American Congress on Industrial Diseases. As an outgrowth of that congress a committee of experts has submitted to the President a memorial calling attention to the urgent need of a national investigation. The most valuable aid in such an inquiry would be an American clinic for the study and prevention of industrial diseases."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to address the House to-day on this subject, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the gentleman proceeds, I would like to yield the balance of my time—four minutes, I believe—to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the bill which I introduced and the report of the Labor Department on that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with this social-justice atmosphere that prevails in the House to-day. The primary functions of a government are the protection of the person and property of its people. The recognition of the rights of that great body of our people whose brain, brawn, and muscle keep the wheels of industry in motion, resulted in the recent establishment of the Department of Labor. I feel that that was wise, and that Congress should and will deal with the department generously, not only from a humanitarian standpoint, but for the general good of the whole people.

Our country is more and more becoming a manufacturing Nation. Hence the number of those employed in our factories, mills, and mines, and on the railways, is daily increasing. Their work is becoming more exacting, and we have for years been creating labor-saving devices. That, of course, was along economic lines. But we are becoming interested as a Nation in seeing that life-saving devices are created. The purpose of the bill under consideration is to stimulate the creation and use of safety devices and to prevent vocational diseases. No more worthy measure could be brought before this Congress. I am glad to see it so universally accepted.

I feel that the laborers of this country have not been receiving their just share of the increased wealth resulting from the numerous labor-saving devices. No doubt, with the spirit abroad which is manifest here to-day, in the near future they will come closer to receiving it than they have in the past. I trust that, in so far as legislation can assist in bringing about a fairer distribution of this increased wealth, it will be speedily enacted.

It is a pleasure to think that no partisan strife is here, and that the authors of the bill represent both sides of the House—the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the late Representative Bremner, of New Jersey—and that we have a composite bill here representing the best thought of its authors for the interests and welfare of the industrial workers of this country.

In the United States the question of the frequency of accidents and the best methods of prevention have been given but little study. It is true that nearly all, if not all, of the States have enacted laws in one form or another having for their object the prevention of accidents. The factory-inspection systems and the laws requiring that dangerous machinery be fenced and guarded are excellent measures; but these laws have not been adequate or uniform. Something more must be done. In countries that have given careful study to causes of accidents and the best methods of prevention, the annual fatal-accident rates have been reduced by two-thirds.

Royal Meeker, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, says:

> Save in mines and transportation we have in the United States few records to show the extent of the hazard of industry. In these two industries, and in the small amount of imperfect data which we have of other employments, we know enough to confirm the general impression that American industry pays an awful toll in death and suffering for the accidents of employment.

It has been proven that a large percentage of the accidents might have been prevented. The annual fatal accident rate of employees of coal mines in the United States for the 10-year period ending in 1906 was 3.10 per thousand, as compared to 1.29 in Great Britain, 1.35 in Austria, 1.81 in France, and 2.13 in Prussia during the same period.

Twenty-five hundred lives are annually lost by accident in the coal mines of the United States. A reduction of the rate in the United States to that of Great Britain would result in approximately saving 915 of the 2,500 lives. There has been no change for the better since 1906. During 1911 in the metal mines of

the United States 695 lives were lost, which was a rate of 4.19 per thousand men employed, as compared with 1.39 for Germany and 1.64 for Great Britain in the same industry.

Three thousand six hundred and fifty-three American railway employees in 1912 lost their lives in the accidents of their employment and the fatal accident rate was 3.02 per thousand, while the British rate for the five-year period from 1907 to 1912 was 0.65 per thousand, and the German rate for the same five years was 1.13 per thousand.

It has been estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that at least 18,000 persons annually lose their lives as the result of employment accidents. These figures that I have given refer only to the accidents resulting fatally and comprise only a very small proportion of the entire number of accidents. Many an accident which does not result in death carries with it great suffering, impairment of earning capacity, and frequently absolute dependence. It has been estimated that there are annually 2,000,000 accidents in this country which do not result in death. The foreign countries which I have referred to have all given much attention to accident prevention. They have established governmental agencies which carry on organized safety work, with the result that the number of fatal accidents in those countries is about one-third the number in the United States in similar occupations.

Of the governmental functions of protecting the person and property, the latter has, I fear, been paramount in the past. The bill under consideration emphasizes the importance of the protection of the person.

Our country has had a wonderful history. Its annals are those of progress. Among the chief characteristics of our progress have been the perfection of system and the attainment of speed. Labor and time saving devices have increased manyfold the capacity of the individual for producing results. Distant portions of the world have been brought into almost instantaneous communication by wire and wireless. The time consumed in journeying from one place to another has been reduced to a period that would have seemed incredible a few years ago. The acquisition of property and the attainment of speed are more and more giving way to the protection of the individual and the attainment of security.

The slogan once was "Speed at whatever cost." Now it is "Safety first." And where, Mr. Chairman, is a more fitting place for the establishment of the rule of "safety first" than in the centers of industry, where are found the workers who are performing every duty owed by them to society, and in addition thereto adding to the general fund of everything that enters into the growth and advancement of the country?

As a matter of simple economy, conservation is far superior to reparation. Prevention is better than cure. This principle has long been recognized and put into practice when applied to property. The bill under consideration applies this principle to the person. An article of property may be repaired so as to be as good as new. It may even be improved upon. But there is no reparation for the loss of an eye or a limb. Such a loss affects not only the person immediately injured, but directly affects his family and incidentally the whole community.

We may talk about the conservation of natural resources, and the policy of this Government in that direction should have been commenced long before it was. The greatest of all natural resources still remains and will always remain to be conserved. The life, health, and vitality of its people is the most important natural resource that this or any other country possesses.

I am in favor of this bill, because this is its object and purpose, and because I believe that its enactment will go a long way toward the accomplishment of its aims.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had about half a minute to yield back. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] desire to use that time?

Mr. STAFFORD. No.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield five minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Labor at the time these two bills came before the committee for consideration. I took the position at that time that there was room enough in all the world for all the people, and that consideration should be given by the Committee on Labor to both of these bills. I still adhere to my position taken at that time, and believe that the provisions of both should be retained.

I do not know which one of these Members first entertained the thought in his mind of the provisions of this bill, and we will never be able to determine that now. Death has closed the lips of one Member, who introduced one bill, and the law now closes the lips of the other Member who introduced the other bill. The main provisions of both are embraced in this bill, and there is room enough within these sections for credit for the living and honor for the dead.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point has been made here that the Public Health Department will object to the Bremner bill provision. That would be perfectly natural. That is what we should expect them to do. If they did not, they would be unlike other men. They would be abnormal human beings.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The objection made by the Public Health Service has nothing whatever to do with the Bremner bill.

Mr. GRAY. I understood the gentleman to say they were objecting to the provisions of section 2 of the bill. I said if that were true, it would be perfectly natural, because every department is jealous of the jurisdiction of every other department. The same is true in this House. Every committee is jealous of the jurisdiction of every other committee; and if the Public Health Department has not objected here at this late hour, I would expect that department to do so before we are through with this bill. If the reference was to section 1, I am glad to be corrected, but the same principle would apply.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the world was created for all the people and not for a special few. I believe that every human being born into the earth inherits a part of it, which he takes and holds by a natural and superior title, including the right to labor and live upon the earth and to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

There was a time when the laboring man was more independent in the enjoyment of this right to labor to live upon the earth than he has to-day.

There was a time when he could say to his employer: "If you do not wish my services, I will go back to the crossroads, to the village workshop, and I will make a plow, a wagon, or a carriage. I will employ myself and I will sell my product for my wages." But this condition of the laboring man has passed and gone. A great industrial revolution has brought a change and a new order of things in manufacture and production. The machinery has taken the place of the human hand and supplanted the plane, the saw, and the anvil. The laboring man has lost his individuality as a producing factor and he has become a dependent part of a great machine.

Under this industrial condition the laboring man can no longer master an independent trade or become proficient in even one single line. He must specialize within certain narrow limits to meet the requirements of production. He can perform only one process of many in the manufacture of a single article, and he can not do this with his hands alone but only while working upon a machine that is owned and controlled by another. He may make the spoke of a wheel or a hub or an axletree, but he can not complete a wagon or finish a product for sale upon the market. If he has learned to make the spoke of a wheel, he knows nothing of the machine or the process to mold the hub or to form the rim or to shape the axletree upon which the wheel will turn.

He has lost his power to employ himself and to live independent by the labor of his hands alone. He can only work when others choose to employ him and when they will consent for him to work upon their machines. When he asks for employment, the answer that comes back tells him whether or not he can labor to live upon the earth, and if the answer is no, he has nowhere to turn. The crossroads workshop is closed against him forever.

If this condition of the laboring man is not complete to-day, it is only a question of a brief period when it will have been fully consummated.

We can all calmly and deliberately philosophize as to what will become of the horse when the automobile has taken his place, but the problem is before us as to what will become of the

laboring man and his family when the automatic machine has taken the place of his labor if we can not make wages keep pace with production and in a ratio to meet the necessities of life.

The strike for a living wage under these new industrial conditions is answered by the lockout, and we are already at war over work and wages and the right to labor to live upon the earth.

But the right to labor to live upon the earth includes more than the right to work, more than the right to enjoy the full fruits of that labor. It includes, among other things, the right to labor under safe and sanitary conditions. Under these new conditions and our system of industry, under our relations of employer and employee and capital and labor, capital recognizes no obligation to employ labor nor to provide employment to men, nor to pay men for value produced, nor to provide safe or sanitary working conditions, except when the same will effect economy and the increase of profits.

But these new industrial conditions must be met; the dependency of labor must be compensated for; the duties and obligations of men must be made to conform to these changed relations by new legislation, assuring and safeguarding men in their inheritance of the earth and the fruits of their labor. Governments are the instrumentalities through which the people act collectively and are instituted to secure to themselves the enjoyment of their natural and inherent rights, and it is to this end and to meet these new and changed industrial conditions that the Department of Labor has been created and this bill is being enacted into law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] is recognized.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this measure, and believe that great good will come from the establishment of this bureau of labor safety in the prevention of accidents, in the lessening of occupational diseases, so serious in numerous trades and industries, and thus be the means of saving many lives. The men who toil in the coal and metal mines suffer a great loss in ill health without counting the awful cost in accidents and deaths that run annually into the thousands. Railroad accidents appall us. Notwithstanding our advanced position in the use of safety devices on railroads, the injury to body and loss of life are tremendous. Other industries have their sad burden of accidents and fatalities.

It is frequently stated, and statistics seem to make it true, that accidents are proportionately more numerous in American industries than in those of foreign countries. We want to know why this is so, and every effort should be made to discover the reason and apply the remedy to lessen accidents and the resulting injuries and deaths.

Jane Addams, the well-known social worker, in a recent statement says:

> Six hundred persons die each year in this country from preventable diseases and accidents, over many of which the Federal Government has large control.

In the great mining and industrial district which I have the honor to represent there has begun an active cooperative movement on the part of officials and employees to reduce the number of accidents. Indeed, all over the country there is evidence of an organized safety work that will surely lessen accidents and improve sanitary conditions. The passage of the measure now under consideration will prove an incentive to this movement, aside from the directly beneficial results that will follow from the Government's systematic activities in this great field of human welfare.

The purpose of this bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, will be to make general and special investigation and examination of safety plans and devices of all kinds and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of all phases of the subject of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere, and that there shall be erected a museum of sufficient size and capacity with grounds thereto annexed, in and upon which shall be exhibited approved devices for the safeguarding of machinery, the protection of employees from injury, the lessening of dangerous conditions which may exist in any industrial enterprise, and the methods of lessening, preventing, and controlling industrial diseases. All such appliances, devices, and arrangements may be exhibited at rest or in motion, as may best serve the purposes of such exhibit. That in addition to the museum hereinbefore referred to and in connection therewith there shall be established a laboratory, wherein may be examined and tested the relative efficiency of types of guards or other devices for the protection of machinery calculated to safeguard the employee or the general public from injury or industrial disease.

This practical interest in the health and safety of the worker in the mine, in the mill and the factory, on the railroad, and in industries in general, he who carries the burden of the race, is a most healthful sign. We can not exist, let alone advance, without his toilsome, dangerous labors, and it is with great pleasure and satisfaction that I take this opportunity to advocate and vote for a measure that will lessen his dangers and increase the healthful conditions surrounding his occupation and defer the sorrows and hardships of accidents and deaths from entering many homes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Just half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, since Mr. Bremner, who was vitally interested in this bill, is not here, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which he prepared, and which appears in the report of the Committee on Labor on this bill, be extended in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing the statement referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Following is the statement referred to:

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY HON. ROBERT G. BREMNER, UPON THE SUBJECT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY.

The United States to-day occupies a curious position among industrial nations. Ambitious to be the first in point of output, we are sociologically the last in our methods of production. From the mechanical point of view we claim to lead, but the student of industrial economy is amazed to find that we practically ignore the modern science of conservation in its most important aspect. Trees, minerals, lands, water—these we admit (somewhat tardily) must be safeguarded from further waste. But the Government protection of these 34,000,000 men, women, and children, who constitute our industrial army, upon whose well being rests the whole economic and social fabric of our Commonwealth—this is a phase of conservation practically ignored by our legislators and the public.

THE COST OF HUMAN WASTE.

One reason why the United States has not faced this question in the same practical spirit as other nations is the fact that we rely on immigration to make good our incredible waste of human material. Some figures, based on conservative estimates, help us to realize how serious an economic crime this policy has really proved.

It is estimated that out of 34,000,000 engaged in gainful occupations there are yearly some 38,000 deaths, 2,000,000 accidents (of which 500,000 are serious), and 3,000,000 cases of preventable industrial illness. While the killing of a man is usually only the beginning of the burden which society must assume (witness the 15,000 widows and 45,000 orphans which industry deprives annually of their natural supporters), let us rather accept the business view of the loss entailed by occupational deaths.

Death: The average economic value of a worker in this country (based on his usual earning capacity) is conservatively calculated at $2,000. We therefore squander, every 12 months, the equivalent of $110,200,000, and in addition burden private and public charity with the progressive, financial, and social consequences arising from the dependence of those left destitute or inadequately provided for.

Accident: Two million accidents, of which 500,000 are serious, entail an annual loss of probably $40,000,000 earnings.

Illness: On the German basis of calculation the 3,000,000 cases of preventable industrial illness entail a cost of some $200,000,000. Who pays?

Broadly speaking, the United States ignores an annual wastage of normal earning capacity which from three causes alone exceeds $350,200,000.

In reality, society and industry itself share a far greater loss between them.

But there are other factors crippling our employers of labor and from these obvious causes of waste.

Only America ignores the fact that, for the producer, a man merely negatively well is inferior to a man in perfect health. Efficiency rests on a health basis. In fact, health is the original wealth.

Lowered vitality due to insanitary factory conditions, abnormal physical or mental overstrain due to speeding, depletion of reserve force, the long list of minor ailments ("feeling poorly, but able to work") reduce the value of the majority of employees fully 100 per cent.

Undue fatigue alone, plus resulting intemperance, costs industry close upon $1,000,000,000 a year. Such is the penalty industry must bear from "lack of taking thought."

THE REMEDY, BUREAU OF SAFETY.

"Eliminate waste" is the modern watchword of productive processes. Throwing aside the arguments of humanity and justice, other countries on a business basis have inaugurated campaigns for the elimination of industrial accident, disease, and lowered efficiency by the same scientific methods which they have brought to bear upon the technique of trade.

Education is the key to occupational health and usefulness—the education of the public, the employer, and the worker in sanitary and safe methods.

MUSEUMS OF SAFETY.

In matters affecting the avocations of daily life, theoretical instruction is rarely efficient. "Seeing is believing" for the rank and file. Acting on that principle, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dresden, Frankfort on the Main, Gratz, Helsingfors, Munich, Odessa, Paris, St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Wurtzburg, and Zurich have erected museums of safety in which are exhibited, at rest or in motion, every type of dangerous machinery and its scientific guard; systems of exhaust ventilation for the control of dangerous dusts and fumes; types of respirators, masks, goggles, and special suits for dangerous work; devices to lessen excessive glare and heat; and, in brief, safety appliances for every type of mechanical or industrial processes.

These museums, which set a standard for the safety-bureau movement of each country, are also institutes for disseminating industrial knowledge. Lectures are given, literature is printed and circulated, photographs of their contents are published, and every employer or worker of the country is free to apply to them for impartial advice or help in problems affecting accident or disease prevention.

WHY NATIONAL?

Perhaps in no country is the demand for such a national and visible indorsement of the safety movement so needed as in the United States. Practically 50 governments through State departments of labor are attempting "interference" (so regarded) in industrial processes. Practically 50 different standards may exist, be enforced, or neglected, to the disadvantage of allied trades situated in different localities, yet producing goods under nearly identical conditions. The exhaust ventilation "blower" control of one State which may carry off by its excess pull the dusty product, across the border line is allowed to accumulate without criticism. The wire-mesh guards over wheels or belts in one factory, for example, may represent an outlay of thousands of dollars spent in good faith, yet a change of political administration of a local department may change the policy which a predecessor approved and call for new installations of a different type.

To merely cover danger points is but a detail of the question of scientific safeguarding. Some of the most dangerous machines are employed on piecework. A guard which cuts the employees' earning capacity in halves will be "thrown" in every instance. The stamping-machine guard, which calls for three extra motions on a level with the worker's head, is an example of inexpert precautions which defeat their object.

Moreover, there is a certain reverence for Federal experts, a recognition that they are somewhat removed from the field of local trade jealousies and rivalries, which is a powerful aid in obtaining recognition for the standards. They set in the protection of extra hazardous mechanisms. They do not suggest local "rake-offs" for the changes advocated in Federal reports, publications, and safety literature.

No one questions the need for small museums of safety in every large industrial center, but foreign experience proves that such branches spring from the deep roots of the national institute. The local boards of trade which will devote a room to charts, photographs, and models from the National Museum at Washington will in the future make possible a more scientific education of the employer than almost any State department of labor is qualified to give to-day.

Human conservation is an expert science, calling for the leadership of a few thoroughly trained authorities. From every viewpoint of efficiency our efforts should be concentrated on procuring, through national appropriation, what must otherwise be cramped and rendered limited by State curtailments.

Finally, the public advertisement, to use a crude phrase of a national museum. The fact that any worker or employer can appeal to it for instruction or advice gives a guaranty of efficiency of administration and progressive methods which assures to the proposed bureau of safety, of which it is the demonstration, a timeliness otherwise prone to lapse into departmental delay. And while its primary object is to lessen human suffering, its crusade for safe and sane manufacturing methods will be of inestimable practical advantage in standardizing such methods throughout our whole industrial system.

THE LABORATORY OF HYGIENE.

Valuable as has been the work of the foreign museum of safety, the Institutes of Industrial Hygiene in Vienna, Paris, and Milan are demonstrating yet wider fields for the student of human conservation.

The subtler dangers to the worker involved in exposure to dust and fume, to overstrain, overspeeding, nerve exhaustion, occupational intemperance, and the thousand signals to insanitary conditions are here studied and their remedies weighed and approved. Milan devotes three large four-story buildings, equipped with the latest apparatus in laboratories, hospital wards, lecture rooms, and libraries to the elimination of those diseases peculiar to employments. Twelve scientists cooperate with the director in the investigation of trade poisonings, such as those of lead, mercury, and arsenic. The toxin of fatigue, of muscular effort, and nerve depletion are proved by experiments upon living animals. Every trade process offering risk to health is investigated with a view to scientific alterations which shall protect the worker without undue hardship to the employer.

All the information acquired by the laboratory is free to those who seek its aid. And in this case, as in that of the museum, the fact that it is national makes it a force throughout the land.

No State department is to-day fitted to carry out, although each can help to promulgate, so extensive a program. Yet no one familiar with American needs would be content to advocate less than Italy offers to her workers.

Great as was her need, ours is imperatively greater. Above all, we need the authority which invests a Government investigation of trade conditions to free the minds of our industrial employers from the too common fear of local departments and their betrayal of secret processes and technical formulas. To a Federal investigator the average owner, who would gladly bar his door to the Department of Labor, throws open the book of his manufacturing experiences. A national clearing house for industrial welfare experiments will save years of effort and millions of dollars to those who are to-day ignorant of what has already been accomplished along those lines.

This is no untried experiment which is advocated by the Bremner bill. We shall but duplicate the experience of those countries which have already proved the value of an effort toward human conservation; an effort which is dictated both by financial wisdom and by the dictates of humanity and justice.

The first organization of this kind was founded by a great captain of industry, Engel Dulfus, of Mulhouse, in 1867, and since that time innumerable similar societies have sprung up. There exist also museums similar to the one which is the subject of this article. Among the principal of these may be cited that at Vienna (1890), at Amsterdam (1891), at Berlin (Charlottenburg, 1903). This last one has cost about 1,000,000 marks and possesses an annual budget of 40,000 marks. The new Parisian museum was founded by the "Association des industriels de France contre les accidents dutravail," established in 1883 by Emil Muller, and was organized entirely by private gifts.

Its purpose, inspired by philanthropy, is to indicate to the present patrons the precautions to be taken, the devices and the means to employ, for protecting their workmen against risks of all sorts—unhealthful atmosphere, dangers from machines and transmission devices, harmful dusts, high electric voltages, poisoning, etc.

In the hall situated at the other end of the museum we find a great assortment of hoisting devices, hoisting blocks, movable ladders, climbing harness for linemen, safety devices for roofers, various models of elevators, and protective stair cagings.

The climbing harness of Ravasse-Luilier is intended to prevent falls of linemen, carpenters, roofers, painters, ironworkers, etc.

While the most fastidious precaution, the most vigilant attention, and the most perfect industrial hygiene all act to reduce to a minimum the number and seriousness of accidents, they can not pretend completely to suppress them, since by definition the accident is unforeseen.

Although many interesting attempts to improve conditions and to promote more cordial relations between master and man have been made with fair success, the safeguarding of life and limb has not been perfected to any appreciable extent. Ask a manufacturer if his circular saws, punches, and presses are protected by safety devices, and usually he replies, "No," or if they are, "My men won't use them."

As Dr. Josiah Strong points out, economic considerations are wholly secondary. This is, first of all, a question of conscience. Needless slaughter is criminal slaughter.

"Industrial homicide is being committed every hour of the day, and the employer who does not provide all practicable means for safeguarding life and limb is particeps criminis.

"We are told that ancient Athens was forced every nine years to pay a tribute of 7 youths and 7 maidens to be devoured by the Cretan Minotaur, until Theseus slew the monster. We have here in the United States a monster named Indifference, to which we are making human sacrifice not at the rate of 14 every nine years, but at the rate of a dozen a day, besides many scores who escape with their lives but are maimed or mangled.

"The establishment of a museum of security for America would mean the saving of thousands of lives, and, through the prevention of accidents, hundreds of thousands of workmen would be saved from disability, and thus from becoming a charge on their families or dependent on the State. Such a museum would also lessen liability for damage suits growing out of accidents." (William H. Tolman, director of the American Institute of Social Service, Century Magazine, May–October, 1906.)

John B. Andrews, in the Survey, that great and good publication, last month said:

"But in the United States we need an institution that will correlate the experience of our scattered little group of hygienists and enable more medical men to direct their attention to the problems of industrial hygiene. We need for the purpose a special laboratory and hospital to accelerate progress in the study of the causes and prevention of industrial diseases. With such an institution, phosphorus poisoning would quickly disappear from our match industry as a matter of scientific sense. The long list of poisons affecting scores of different occupations would gradually be shortened. Conditions which lower vitality, lessen efficiency, and invite disease would quickly be improved, to the advantage of manufacturer and wage earner. The necessary research would be carried on by scientists of unquestioned ability and singleness of purpose, and in a manner which would enlist from all the heartiest cooperation.

"For the past two years the American Association for Labor Legislation has had an able commission of industrial hygiene, and last June called the first American Congress on Industrial Diseases. As an outgrowth of that congress a committee of experts has submitted to the President a memorial calling attention to the urgent need of a national investigation. The most valuable aid in such an inquiry would be an American clinic for the study and prevention of industrial diseases."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I think we can now proceed to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor safety plans and devices of all kinds, and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of all phases of the subject of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer two amendments which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask that they be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out after the words "study of" the words "all phases of the subject," and insert in lieu thereof the words "devices and methods for the prevention."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by adding to the words to be stricken out the words "vocational diseases."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If the gentleman will desist until both amendments are read, he will then see the completed scheme.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to add an amendment that will strike out the words "vocational diseases."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If the gentleman will suspend until both amendments are read, then he will see what we intend to do.

Mr. MADDEN. I suspend for a moment, at the request of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I ask the Clerk to read the second amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the House, the other one not being disposed of?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "time," at the end of the sentence, insert "it shall be the duty of the Public Health Service in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes to cooperate with such bureau upon request of the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, these two amendments, taken collectively, operate to bring the bill within the view expressed that there should be no conflict between the functions to be exercised by the Department of Labor and by the Bureau of Health; and the studies of vocational diseases will be made upon request of the Secretary of Labor by the Bureau of Health. Those two amendments are intended to make that thought effective in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid that the first amendment offered by the gentleman did not quite go as far as his statement goes, did it?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It confines the operations of the Secretary of Labor to methods of prevention of vocational diseases.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that if the gentleman from Maryland will have the Clerk read the language as proposed to be amended, it will perhaps clarify the meaning.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that will be done.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the Clerk begin with the word "and," in line 2, page 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

And also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service, in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes, to cooperate with such bureau upon the request of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the amendment. As I understand the purpose of this amendment, it is simply to correlate and coordinate the work of this proposed bureau with the work of the Bureau of Public Health. I see no objection to that amendment and am heartily in favor of it.

While I am on my feet I want to say with reference to this bill that it seems to me it is in entire harmony with the tendency, and the proper tendency, of the age in which we live to legislate along lines of humanitarianism and justice for man as man. As I have been sitting here, I have been thinking of some of the laws that have been passed in recent years that go directly to the benefit of the men who toil. Here are some of these laws, not all of them of course: The various safety-appliance laws, laws for the regulation of the hours of labor, the legislation to secure better sanitary conditions, the establishment of the Bureau of Mines, the establishment of the Children's Bureau, the establishment of the Department of Labor, and many other laws that have for their purpose direct benefit to the men who labor.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is an entirely appropriate kind of legislation. I am in hearty sympathy with it, and have supported all of it that has come before this House while I have been a Member, and I shall support this bill and all similar measures in the interest of the workingmen of this country.

Some question has been raised here as to the desirability of the second section of this bill. Personally I do not deem that section of as much importance as the first section of the bill; yet I see no valid objection to it and shall support it. My attention has been called to what has been accomplished in other countries by such a museum as is contemplated in this section. In the report which was alluded to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], our late colleague, Mr. Bremner, made reference to similar museums in Europe. As will be seen by referring to the report of the committee, reference is made to the fact that similar museums have been established in Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dresden, Frankfort on the Main, Gratz, Helsingfors, Munich, Odessa, Paris, St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Wurzburg, and Zurich; that in these museums various safety appliances have been collected together; and that from time to time instructive lectures are given there upon this line of work.

In his very able brief on this subject, our late colleague, Hon. Robert G. Bremner, says:

MUSEUMS OF SAFETY.

In matters affecting the avocations of daily life, theoretical instruction is rarely efficient. "Seeing is believing" for the rank and file. Acting on that principle, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dresden, Frankfort on the Main, Gratz, Helsingfors, Munich, Odessa, Paris, St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Wurzburg, and Zurich have erected museums of safety in which are exhibited, at rest or in motion, every type of dangerous machinery and its scientific guard; systems of exhaust ventilation for the control of dangerous dusts and fumes; types of respirators, masks, goggles, and special suits for dangerous work; devices to lessen excessive glare and heat; and, in brief, safety appliances for every type of mechanical or industrial processes.

These museums, which set a standard for the safety-bureau movement of each country, are also institutes for disseminating industrial knowledge. Lectures are given, literature is printed and circulated, photographs of their contents are published, and every employer or worker of the country is free to apply to them for impartial advice or help in problems affecting accidents or disease prevention.

* * * * * * *

No one questions the need for small museums of safety in every large industrial center, but foreign experience proves that such branches spring from the deep roots of the national institute. The local boards of trade, which will devote a room to charts, photographs, and models from the National Museum at Washington, will in the future make possible a more scientific education of the employer than almost any State department of labor is qualified to give to-day.

Human conservation is an expert science, calling for the leadership of a few thoroughly trained authorities. From every viewpoint of efficiency our efforts should be concentrated on procuring, through national appropriation, what must otherwise be cramped and rendered limited by State curtailments.

Finally, the public advertisement, to use a crude phrase, of a national museum. The fact that any worker or employer can appeal to it for instruction or advice gives a guaranty of efficiency of administration and progressive methods which assures to the proposed bureau of safety, of which it is the demonstration, a timeliness otherwise prone to lapse into departmental delay. And while its primary object is to lessen human suffering, its crusade for safe and sane manufacturing methods will be of inestimable practical advantage in standardizing such methods and throughout our whole industrial system.

These are good and sufficient reasons, which appeal to the minds and hearts of all of us.

Consequently it seems to me that that second section is wise legislation, though I deem the first section, prepared by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], of the most vital importance.

I have been struck by the statements made here in the report of the committee relative to the number of fatal accidents occurring in this country in the various industries. I have made a little computation, and, as I have figured it, according to the facts given here in the report of the committee, approximately 100 men per day are killed in the various industries of this country. It seems to me that those figures are astounding and staggering. Think of it. A hundred men a day are killed through accidents in the various great industries of this country. It seems to me that legislation which undertakes to reduce the number of those accidents is desirable and wise and statesmanlike legislation.

I call attention further to the rather discouraging presentation that is made here, comparing the rate of loss of life in this country with that in certain other countries. On page 6 of the report of the committee, attention is called to the fact that in the coal mines of this country for a certain period the average annual loss per 1,000 men was 3.1; in Great Britain it was only 1.29; in Austria, 1.35; in France, 1.81; and in Prussia, 2.13. In other words, we have the highest percentage of loss of life in the coal mines of this country to be found in any of the great coal-mining countries of the world.

Then, in the metal mines, it is stated that some 695 men were killed in the year for which the computation was made—at the rate of 4.19 per 1,000 men employed. The rate in the same industry in Germany was 1.39; in Great Britain, 1.64; in Spain, 2.25; in France, 3.16; and in the Transvaal, 4.20. That is the only one in which there was a greater percentage of loss than there was in this country.

These facts would indicate that in the United States the percentage of industrial accidents is much greater than in certain other great nations in similar industries. This is not as it should be; the American workingman is entitled to work under the most favorable conditions as to sanitation and safety, and it is the duty of the Congress to surround him by every possible statutory protection for health, life, and limb. Conservation should be applied not only to soils and water power and forests and minerals, but also to that most important of all resources, our boys and girls and men and women. This frightful waste,

economically indefensible, must stop; every sense of humanitarian feeling cries out for abatement of this shocking evil of loss of life and limb; let us protect our workingmen so far as in our power lies.

I am strongly in favor of this bill and hope it will be passed.

[Mr. WILLIS was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD].

Under the leave granted I desire to add a portion of the memorandum prepared by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. This memorandum contains some interesting and important facts, and is in part as follows:

In 1908 Frederick L. Hoffman, the well-known statistician, showed in Bulletin 78 of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics that the annual fatal-accident rate of employees in coal mines in the United States for the 10-year period ending in 1906 was 3.10 per 1,000, as compared with 1.29 in Great Britain, 1.35 in Austria, 1.81 in France, and 2.13 in Prussia during the same period. A reduction of the rate in the United States from 3.10 to the level of Great Britain, 1.29, would, it was estimated, result in an annual saving of 915 lives. Since that date the situation has not changed for the better, for the American record of 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912 showed rates of 4, 3.92, 3.73, and 3.27, while the British rate has risen slightly to 1.36 per 1,000 in the five-year period 1908 to 1912. Approximately 2,500 lives are annually lost by accidents in the coal mines of the United States.

Even higher than the rate among the coal-mine employees is that among employees of the metal mines. Thus in the calendar year 1911 in the metal mines of the United States 695 men were killed, representing a rate of 4.19 per 1,000 men employed. The fatality rates due to accidents in metal mines in a number of foreign countries were as follows: Germany, 1.39; Great Britain, 1.64; Spain, 2.25; France, 3.16; Transvaal, 4.29.

The fatal-accident rate in quarries in the United States is much lower than that in either coal or metal mines. In the calendar year 1911, 188 men were killed in quarry accidents, the death rate being 1.69 per 1,000 men employed. In Great Britain the death rate among quarry workmen was 1.08 per 1,000; in Germany in 1911, 1.48 per 1,000.

Fully as striking is the excessive fatal-accident rate among employees of American railways. Thus, the American rate for the 10-year period 1897 to 1906 was 2.50 per 1,000, against a rate of 0.98 per 1,000 among employees of German railways. In 1912, 3,635 American railway employees lost their lives in the accidents of their employment, and the American fatal-accident rate was 3.02 per 1,000, while the British rate for the 5-year period 1908 to 1912 was 0.65 per 1,000, and the German rate for the 5-year period 1907 to 1911 was 1.13 per 1,000. Even these figures certainly understate the real situation among railway employees, for according to the American practice only accidents to persons resulting in immediate death or death within 24 hours from the time of the accident are regarded as fatally injured, while the foreign practice takes account of the outcome of the injury.

In other American industries records of industrial accidents, even approximately complete, are lacking, but it is generally accepted as true that in most industries, except where organized safety work has already been done, the accident rate is considerably in excess of accident rates in corresponding employments in European countries.

In the bulletin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics already referred to an attempt has been made to estimate the annual loss of life in American industry. Upon the basis of the census reports within the registration area of the United States it was estimated that for the entire country the actual number of fatal accidents annually was between 30,000 and 35,000, one-half of which were the immediate result of employment. The nonfatal accidents of industry are, of course, far more numerous than the fatalities, and while many are not serious in permanent effect, even the minor ones impose a heavy burden of suffering, and many of the more serious ones involve permanent disability and loss of earning power, with frequently absolute dependency. Corresponding with the estimate of fatal accidents above given, it was estimated that there were annually 2,000,000 nonfatal accidents in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That there shall be erected a museum of sufficient size and capacity with grounds thereto annexed, in and upon which shall be exhibited approved devices for the safeguarding of machinery, the protection of employees from injury, the lessening of dangerous conditions which may exist in any industrial enterprise, and the methods of lessening, preventing, and controlling industrial diseases. All such appliances, devices, and arrangements may be exhibited at rest or in motion, as may best serve the purposes of such exhibit. That in addition to the museum hereinbefore referred to and in connection therewith there shall be established a laboratory, wherein may be examined and tested the relative efficiency of types of guards or other devices for the protection of machinery calculated to safeguard the employee or the general public from injury or industrial disease.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in reference to that motion I wish to be heard briefly. So far as we have information of the different countries of the world, the national institution for safeguarding life and limb is usually accompanied by museums, either of private or public establishments, where the proper information and device may be deposited, and to which those concerned may go for an exemplification of the devices themselves.

In the German Empire, for example, of which we have definite information, the museum exists, and is the subject of national ownership. The investment is something less than $300,000, and it is stated in the report of the Secretary of Labor, which I here insert, that over 26,000 visitors attend that museum in a year.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, March 10, 1914.*

Hon. DAVID J. LEWIS,
*Chairman Committee on Labor,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. LEWIS: In reference to the cost of construction and maintenance of the European museums of safety, in so far as such information might have a bearing on the Bureau of Labor safety bill, H. R. 10735, now pending, I would like to submit the following:

The foreign museum which most nearly compares with that proposed by section 2 of the bill H. R. 10735 is the German Imperial museum, known as the Permanent Workmen's Welfare Exhibition (Ständige Ausstellung für Arbeiterwohlfahrt), located in Charlottenburg, a suburb of Berlin.

An appropriation to purchase a building site and begin the erection of a building for this museum was passed in the budget of the Imperial department in 1900. The exhibition was opened June 18, 1903. The grounds, amounting to 1.85 acres, cost $113,764; but, of course, much of this area is ornamental and not actually used for building purposes. The buildings as they now stand cost $177,191, making a total cost for land and buildings of $290,955. They consist of an administration building, an exhibition hall, and a building connecting these two. The upper floor of the latter structure forms an auditorium with a seating capacity of 200 persons. This is used for lecture purposes. The exhibition hall has a ground floor space of 27,244 square feet, and is provided with a gallery having 13,057 square feet; both floors are available for exhibition purposes and give a combined floor space of 40,301 square feet.

The annual cost of administration is at present $9,520. The administrative force consists of a general director, a technical director (these two ex officio), three expert assistants, and four workmen, a total of nine.

The total number of visitors to the museum in 1911 was 26,253. The institution has a system of special day exhibits for persons interested in specific industries or trades; and these bodies of visitors notify the institution in advance and preparation is made to show for their benefit the most up-to-date safety devices along the line indicated. There were 418 of these previously announced group visitations in 1911, comprising 14,700 persons. The institution at Charlottenburg is maintained wholly at Imperial expense, and charges no fee to exhibitors or others.

The Institute for Industrial Hygiene at Frankfort is a private foundation supported by guaranteed subscriptions. Its cost of administration for 1912 was $10,961.

The Paris Museum for the Prevention of Industrial Accidents and of Industrial Hygiene is maintained by a combination of State aid and membership fees. An establishment employing 10 persons pays the minimum annual fee of $1.93; the maximum fee of $57 is paid by firms employing 1,000 or more persons. The State or city furnishes the institution rent free. The floor space so provided equals 7,744 square feet. The Industrial Employers' Association report shows that they contributed $772 per annum to the maintenance of this museum. Whether or not this, added to free rent, is the total cost of maintenance, I am not able to ascertain.

A similar museum maintained by the city of Barcelona, Spain, cost $975 for 1908, and the appropriation was increased to $1,448 for 1909.

You will note that these figures relate only to the museum feature of house bill 10735, i. e., to section 2 of that bill.

In addition to the above, I have attached hereto such statements of methods, regulations, etc., as it has been possible to bring together respecting the conduct of these museums of safety appliances in Germany, France, Italy, and Spain. Some of this material seems important as throwing light upon scope, purpose, and method, and you may desire to incorporate in the record some of these details.

I am, faithfully, yours,

ETHELBERT STEWART,
*Chief Statistician.*

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman, as chairman of the committee that reports this bill, willing to say to the House that he or his committee has given any investigation to the cost or utility of such an institution as this section proposes to establish?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Not as to the cost, but as to the utility, decidedly yes. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the museum would prove of the highest efficacy in the discharge of the functions to be developed by this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman prepared to say to the House what, in his judgment, such a museum will cost to construct and what will be the annual expense of maintenance?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The gentleman from Illinois knows that I would be the poorest judge of a subject of that sort, and I therefore make no attempt at an answer. But, with respect to it, we have agencies that have the confidence of this House as to their judgment and capacity. One of them is the Committee on Appropriations. It would have to pass favorably upon any appropriation or any scheme of construction that may be recommended for this purpose. Before the Committee on Appropriations can have to do with it, the subject matter must have been worked out by the Secretary of Labor and his associates with a view to the proper recommendations.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Maryland must know that if the law authorizes the construction of a building without any limitations on its cost, that the Committee on Appropriations will have nothing whatever to do except to appropriate

any sum of money that may be recommended by the department having jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I do not know that.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a fact.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I do not understand it to be a fact.

Mr. MADDEN. This leaves the cost of the enterprise unlimited.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The Appropriations Committee of the House is to pass upon it and they finally recommend the appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Appropriations has no power whatever to say what the limit of cost shall be. The legislative act authorizing the appropriation is the only means by which the cost can be limited.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think that position is surely subject to challenge.

Mr. MADDEN. I am willing it should be challenged, for I think it can not be successfully challenged.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Secretary of Labor could come here with a recommendation for a building costing a million dollars and that the Appropriation Committee would have to appropriate a million dollars?

Mr. MADDEN. I certainly do.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think that is information to the House as well as to myself. However that may be, the institution has been found essential by the nations of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks that his time be extended 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I will.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman spoke about the great museum established in Germany; does he know whether in that museum they have the actual devices for exhibition, or do they have simply models as they do in the Patent Office?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I can not answer that question. That is a point to be worked out. I suggest that the House primarily could not well resolve itself into such an agency as would work out such building matters in detail in advance. The House can settle the principle, namely, whether this function should have what has proved to be a necessary attendant abroad, a museum reasonably adapted for the exhibition of devices, and to which the people may go.

Let me recur to a statement made earlier in the discussion. The United States is in the sorest need of the most efficacious means of preventing accidents, because the accident ratios here run from two to five times as high as in other countries. Shall we be denied the agency that is found necessary, and freely granted, in other countries, where the casualty ratios are so much less than in the United States? I insist that this section is an essential feature of our duty to this subject, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the section will not prevail.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman spoke about the great national institution in Germany costing $300,000.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. A little less.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman any idea what it costs to maintain it?

Mr LEWIS of Maryland. A little less than $10,000 a year.

Mr. GOULDEN. Those are some of the figures that we all want.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it understood that the building provided for in this section shall be erected in the city of Washington?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. That is all left to future judgment and investigation.

Mr. McKENZIE. Of whom?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I presume the Secretary of Labor would be looked to for the recommendation.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the word "shall," in line 11, section 2, to be construed imperatively, or is it possible to construe it as "may"?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Imperatively, as imposing a duty on the Secretary of Labor to look into the matter of such museum and make proper recommendations to Congress for its construction.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the chairman if he does not think it would be wise to state where this building should be constructed?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I believe it would be very unwise. I am speaking for myself only.

[Mr. DECKER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this section mandatorily compels the Secretary of Labor to erect a museum of size and capacity, with adjoining grounds, sufficient to exhibit all kinds of labor-safety devices. Any person who has the barest acquaintance with labor-safety devices connected with railway transportation would know that it would require a building as large as the National Museum to house those devices alone. Any person acquainted with labor-safety devices connected with safeguarding the employees in the manufacture of steel would know that it would require a building larger than the National Museum, and any person acquainted in the slightest way with other industries of much magnitude would know that it would require a mastodonic building to house those devices. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who just preceded me, says he wants sufficient money efficiently and effectively used for this purpose. I tell him that the money so used would be wastefully expended and that the same sums could be effectively and efficiently used for the purposes stated in the first section not only as the gentleman states for the investigation of vocational diseases, but for the study, investigation, and report of labor-safety devices. That is the prime purpose of this bill, and, as explained by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the purpose is to have these experts go out into the field and investigate the well-equipped plants where these devices have been inaugurated and determine what are the best devices for the respective industries.

Would you rather have a million or two million dollars expended in the erection of some building on the Mall containing dead devices which will not be inspected by anyone, just like the models in our Patent Office that are now housed over here in the House Office Building, which no one inspects, or would you rather have that money expended on experts to carry that information broadcast over this country? Washington is not an industrial center. If it were a city like Chicago or Detroit or Philadelphia or the city which I represent in part, perhaps there might be some argument in that, but even then the very purpose of this measure is to give life to the information that is obtained by these experts of the bureau rather than to erect a building on the Mall or some other place to advertise some favorite device looking to labor safety.

It is all well and good for you to say that in some foreign countries there are some museums, but the report does not show that any of these museums are exclusively maintained by public support; in fact, the report shows that information is not definite in that particular; and I claim the conditions there are entirely different. The museums there are located in some industrial center, and it is likely that they are but an adjunct to the principal industries of the locality. The question before the House is, In what manner can the work be most effectively and efficiently done? I contend by sending these experts from the bureau out into the field disseminating the information among the small manufacturing establishments; by our experts inspecting model up-to-date establishments, like those in my State, and obtaining real evidence as to devices, and then disseminating it among the smaller plants rather than merely erecting a museum for some model that will convey no information to the manufacturing public at all and will be more a curiosity shop than a practical demonstrating plant. I hope the section will be stricken out.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the question of economy enters into this discussion and into the amendment to strike out the second section of this bill. It seems that economy is the order of the day whenever it comes to the conservation of human life, and especially before this House of Representatives. Some of the States of this Union have established industrial accident boards. They have also established bureaus of safety, and some of them have established safety museums. The United States Government has established a Bureau of Standards, as my colleague from Missouri states, and the reason for that is to give the States of this Union an opportunity to find out the results of the investigations that that bureau undertakes in reference to weights and measures and various other functions which they are called upon to perform according to law.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman says several of the States had already established these museums. I am very much interested to know which ones.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Well, I have in mind particularly the State of California; and I had a conversation last October with

one of the members of the industrial accident board out there and he took me in any showed me two rooms set apart for museum purposes, and told me all the space of the rooms had been taken by manufacturers of safety devices who offered to install at their own expense their own devices, provided the industrial accident board thought they were of sufficient value to be installed and entitled to consideration as safety devices.

Mr. WILLIS. Right there will the gentleman state whether these devices which were installed were actual devices or models?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. They were to be actual devices, either at rest or in operation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, the gentleman is getting to the point where there is some sense in the question. If the National Government is going to erect a building in which to have a museum, and give people opportunity to exhibit their wares at their own expense, that is another thing, but if the Government is going to run the museum at its own expense, for the exhibition of the wares of private individuals who have them on sale, and the Government is simply going to act as an advertising museum——

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I have only five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN (continuing). For the sale of commodities; if it is intended to do that, then this ought not to pass.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I will say, Mr. Chairman, it is up to the department, and especially it is the intent of this law to give the Secretary of Labor the right to say under what conditions these devices should be exhibited at rest or in motion. He also has the right to determine whether the device of a manufacturer is of value in the saving of life and prevention of accidents, and will not let devices go on exhibition unless they have merit.

Mr. MADDEN. This law does not do it.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Now, it seems unfortunate that whenever it comes to a proposition that is going to conserve human life and limb that the question of how much space this museum is going to take or the place in which the museum might be built also enters into it as a reason for not establishing it. Now, the committee gave this matter their consideration. First of all, we were under the impression the power to establish this museum is vested in the Secretary of Labor under section 1 of the original Mann bill. Mr. MANN, speaking before the committee, said that this first section was drawn and was in line with the law which created the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Several bureaus, including the Public Health Service.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Well, several bureaus; but the second section was added out of respect to our late colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Robert Bremner. We were under the impression that the power was lodged in the first section, but I believe that this museum will be of great value to the various inspectors and various officials of the different States of this Union interested in labor safety.

The officials of the different States of this Union, interested in labor safety, interested in conserving human life, would come to Washington as well as they could go to Chicago or some other place, and get the benefit of this exhibition of these various devices at rest and in motion.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can not they get the benefit of it in actual operation in some private plants to-day?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I believe if they had to go down to New England, to the plant of some manufacturer of a device down there, or to South Carolina, or to some other State to visit the manufacturer of some device, they would be put to an unnecessary expense. If we can spend millions of dollars for the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Standards, and other bureaus in connection with this Government, we ought to spend some money for the conservation of human life, and we ought to make it as convenient as possible for the States of this Union to get the information, and not have it in pamphlet form or by the use of stereopticon lectures, but by practical demonstrations of these devices in motion and at rest.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will fail. I believe the moral effect of this second section of the bill will be of great value to the Department of Labor in carrying out the terms of the law.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad, indeed, to see a bill of this character come before the House, giving the Members an opportunity to express themselves, both in word and in deed.

Mr. Chairman, Richard Arkwright invented the factory a few centuries ago. He was then a penny barber at Preston, England. It made him a peer of England. For a long time after the factory was established the employees were housed and fed in a building adjacent to the factory. Within a short time it developed that the employees became diseased when crowded close in lodging houses. Operators at first were so unmindful of sanitary conditions that the night shift took the beds of the day shift before the beds were made up. Epidemics in the course of time broke out in these lodging houses, which were so severe and devastating in their ravages that the Government of England was compelled to take charge of conditions and regulate them. Now, what happened in England in the inception of the factory has happened in every other country to a greater or less extent. Disease and death follow in the wake of the factory wherever it is established, caused by more than one reason. One of them is the insanitary conditions. Instead of the employees being stowed away in a building adjacent to the factory, they are housed in a number of small buildings surrounding the factory, and the sanitary conditions in many instances, as I have been informed, are exceedingly bad. This bill will give an opportunity for the purpose of making a more thorough investigation of these conditions, with a view of correcting these dangerous surroundings in labor quarters.

Mr. Chairman, another of the greatest evils which follow the greed to make money, the greed to get rich quick on the part of the men who control factories, quarries, mines, and business, is the inefficiency of the machinery and the surroundings with which the laborer has been confronted in the past. It is absolutely necessary in order to conserve the lives and limbs of these human agencies to see that a better condition surrounds them while they are employed. They are the great producing army of the world. Without them death stares every other occupation in the face. With them life, happiness, and prosperity may prevail everywhere. It is good for us who do not labor in these factories, in the mines, and in the fields that we conserve the lives of this great army of men who are annually bringing to us millions of wealth.

Mr. Chairman, this museum will be a most efficient agency, in my opinion. It ought to be located in Washington, where the Representatives of the congressional districts can go conveniently for the purpose of studying all of the collections that are placed in it, in order that they may properly look after the labor of their districts. No place in these broad States affords a better opportunity for getting this information to the people and the labor of this country than to establish this museum here in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that this bill may be passed as it now stands, and that it may be one of the means of giving to the Department of Labor the power which will make it a vitalizing, energetic, living force to shield and protect labor against the danger of diseases and death-trap conditions and elevate it to a respectability of other professions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, may I, please, have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, would it be possible to get an agreement as to the length of debate on this section?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I was going to ask that the vote on this section and all amendments thereto be taken at half past 4 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. That may not be long enough.

Mr. MADDEN. There may be some amendments offered if this section is not stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that the vote on the section and all amendments thereto be taken at the end of 20 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Reserving the right to object, I desire to say to the gentleman from Maryland that I would like three minutes myself.

Mr. MANN. How much time is required now?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Twenty minutes will cover it.

Mr. MANN. Let it go at 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that the vote may be taken on this section and all amendments thereto at the end of 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man on the floor of this House or anywhere else in my desire to do the thing that is best for the people of the country, whether they be working by the day, or the week, or by the month; and it matters not what kind of employment they may be engaged in. But I seriously doubt the wisdom of the criticism of men's motives every time they rise in their place here to try to conserve the Public Treasury in connection with the legislation that is here for consideration. If the question be one in which labor seems to be affected, some man rises in his place and objects to the motives that prompt men when they try to do the thing that ought to be done with all legislation, regardless of what branch of endeavor it may affect.

This second section of the bill proposes to erect and maintain a museum. It proposes to erect that museum without any limitation whatever upon its cost. It directs that a building shall be constructed and maintained, and then the proponents of the measure come before this body and say they have given no consideration whatever to the cost.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MADDEN. It will not be said, I hope, that because some one here wants to know what a thing costs he is antagonistic to the interests that are proposed to be protected or represented. We represent all the people of the United States, if I understand the Constitution, embracing those that are employed by the day and those that employ them. One man has equal rights with the other and ought to be given equal protection, and the taxpayers of the United States have rights here that Members of this House can not and ought not to ignore.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the gentleman say that if this bill passes in its present form the officer named therein would have authority to go ahead and make a contract for the erection of a building without further authority being given?

Mr. MADDEN. That is exactly what I say, and I challenge any man to successfully contradict that statement. He can let a contract for a million dollars, if he wants to, or $5,000,000, if he wants to, under the provisions of this bill; and he can then come before the appropriating committees of the House and require appropriations to be made to carry out the provisions of the contract.

It is not a wise business method that we are undertaking to pursue. I believe that every consideration ought to be given to the men who are sought to be benefited by this legislation; but in giving them that consideration I believe, too, that the men who pay the bills ought also to be considered, and that we ought to use that same wisdom that an ordinary business man is expected to use if he is going to conduct his business successfully.

This Government of ours is a great business institution, and all the people of the Nation are stockholders in that institution. Their rights ought to be conserved, whether it be on a question of finance or on a question of conserving the life and the health of the citizens of the Nation; and I, for one, propose here and now, and always while I am here, to exercise every right I have as a Member of this House to criticize any recommendation that comes before the House from any committee, whether it be the Committee on Labor or the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee, if I do not think the recommendation is wise and in accordance with the business policy that ought to be pursued by a wise business manager.

This section ought not to be adopted. It ought to be stricken from the bill; or, if not stricken from the bill, it ought to be so amended that we and all others interested may know just where the limit of cost is going to be placed, and not give to any man, no matter who he may be, the power to plunge the Government of the United States into unlimited indebtedness for the construction of this or any other kind of a building. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the objection has been made that there is no specific appropriation provided for in this bill to carry out the provisions of section 2. Probably it would have been better if there had been a fixed amount appropriated.

But I understand that there have been many investigations carried on and bureaus of information and research provided for the benefit of manufacturers and employers to promote trade, and are being carried on and provided for to-day, without any specific appropriation being named in advance, and I do not believe that trade or profits are more sacred than flesh and blood and human life.

But I believe that this defect can be remedied. I suggest to the chairman that he can amend this bill and provide a limit to the appropriation required. I am willing to go low enough in fixing such a limit.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I suggested.

Mr. GRAY. I am suggesting this, and I am glad to have the gentleman's cooperation. Please suggest it to the chairman. [Laughter.]

There should be no difficulty when all men are on the same side of a question, and I am glad there will not be any protest over this amendment.

I am willing to fix the limit far below the annual loss by reason of death and serious accident. This amount is given as $40,000,000. If this is true, we could appropriate one-half that amount and be more than justified. But I believe the committee would be satisfied with a limit of $500,000, or one-eightieth of the amount of the annual loss as measured in dollars and cents. But an annual loss in wages of $40,000,000 is the least item to be considered. Annually there is left 15,000 widows and 45,000 orphans to suffer from the loss of the breadwinner. Shame on the Congress that would hold profits above and of more concern than health and life and limb! [Applause.]

Mr. GORMAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORMAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to section 2 of this bill for the reason that, as I view it, it is impracticable and will accomplish no useful purpose.

It has been suggested here that if an appropriation were included, so that we would know the measure of expense that the Government would be put to, that might cure the defect in this section of the bill. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there ought to be a dollar expended to cure the so-called defect in section 2 of this bill. Suppose this section should be adopted. Where are you going to have the museum? And suppose you have the museum in a place that will be satisfactory to everybody. What good is it going to do if you enact any legislation that you can not enforce?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we now have enough legislation on the books if the courts will but enforce it. Some manufacturers of this country have found it more profitable to conduct the business in which they are engaged along lines that have resulted in this enormous loss of human life and this enormous injury to employees, rather than adopt safety devices, because of the inhuman policies that have been adopted in our courts.

Mr. Chairman, under the public policy now obtaining in our courts the man who seeks to recover damages because of an injury sustained by him in the line of his employment must first show that he was absolutely free from all negligence. The courts have long since abandoned the doctrine of comparative negligence that permitted a man injured in the line of his employment to measure his carelessness with the carelessness of his employer and allow a jury to fix the responsibility upon the one who was guilty of the greater negligence, and now, in most of the States, if not in all, if the defendant in a personal-injury suit can show that the employee was guilty of any negligence, however slight, that absolves the employer of all responsibility. The courts then proceeded to invent the doctrine of fellow servant, which imposes an almost intolerable burden upon the average plaintiff in a personal-injury suit against his employer. And, assuming this was not sufficient in all cases, the courts invented another barbarous doctrine which they call the "assumption of risk." This doctrine is based upon the theory that every man in seeking a job measures and takes into account the carelessness of his employer, the carelessness of his fellow workmen, and all the hazards of the employment in which he is about to engage.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what we need more than legislation is a higher regard for human rights in the courts of this country, rather than the regard which now obtains for the privileges of property. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if this bill is passed with section 2 included in it it will accomplish no useful purpose. It imposes a burden upon the Government that will do the employee and the employer absolutely no good. I am opposed to it because it seems to me we are wasting our time in enacting this kind of legislation; and if we just simply say to employers, "You must use those means for the safety of your employees that are generally regarded as appropriate for use in view of the state of the art in which you are engaged," and leave to the courts the enforcement of such a law, you will conserve the interests of the employer and the interests of the employee, and you will have done much to protect human life and limb. [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation because it invades a little of the twilight zone, establishes a little more authority for the Federal Government; because it reaches out into an area that has heretofore been left to the States and takes over a little more jurisdiction for the Federal Government. It has been suggested that the States maintain these different investigating bureaus and that they enact remedial legislation; but that proposition has been tried and it has been shown to be insufficient. The other day I looked into one of the statutes of one of the Atlantic Seaboard States, and this is how it provided for the safety of employees:

It shall be the duty of each corporation or other employer to place in one or more conspicuous places in each room of the factory in which any children under 14 years of age are employed, a notice or notices to the effect that said children are forbidden to clean any gears, cams, or pulleys, or to clean in dangerous proximity thereto, while the same are in motion by aid of steam, water, electricity, or other mechanical power; and no such employer, or its officers, superintendents, overseers, or agents shall knowingly or willfully permit or consent to such children so cleaning the said moving parts.

See the safety devices to protect the employer against any trouble. That babies are cleaning the gears and pulleys while in motion is nothing; not even will permitting or consenting to this be wrong, but the employer is safe till he is convicted of knowingly or willfully consenting. In such cases, mirable dictu, he is subject to a terrific penalty, amounting in the maximum to a $100 fine. Such an excruciating and inhuman punishment.

Of course, the law is a dead letter, except in so far as it promotes baby labor, to the shame and disgrace of the State legislature which enacted the statute in the year of grace and democratic progress, 1909.

That is the way that some of the States have been looking after the safety of employees. I am glad enough to see the Federal Congress take hold of the matter and reach out, even in this poor, weak way, to establish some uniform system from ocean to ocean; some means of recommending and giving information to the States, so as to create a public sentiment that will cause them not only to enforce the laws they have but to make better laws, and in the end will extend our own power and enable the Federal Government to do first-hand that which it ought to do in such cases.

We have recognized hogs as important enough to be considered by the Federal Government by appropriating money to fight hog cholera. We have considered horses and other live stock, and I am glad to help enact a statute that promotes the safety of laboring men and that will in the end lead to a uniform system all over this country. We have dragged the hogs and horses out of the twilight zone, and it is encouraging to see this effort that will result in starting something for some of the human beings that inhabit this country. But even here we hear the noise about "States' rights." The time has come for us to consider human rights.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I trust the gentleman will be kind enough to give us the name of the State to which he refers.

Mr. BRYAN. In all kindness, I will say it is not the gentleman's State.

Mr. GOULDEN. We have some excellent laws in our State.

Mr. BRYAN. It is not the great State of New York. It is a State farther south.

[Mr. CALDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] clearly is wrong in his interpretation of the second section of this bill when he says that under it contracts could be entered into for the construction of a building. The section grants no authority to anybody to enter into any sort of a contract for the erection of a building. Who would presume to claim the right under the language of this section to enter into contracts and advertise for bids? It merely says "there shall be erected a museum." There is no authorization to enter into contracts nor to do anything else.

The customary and only proper way to grant such authority is for the bill in express terms to authorize some person to enter into a contract for the construction of a building the cost of which shall not exceed a definite amount fixed by the bill. Subsequently from time to time Congress makes appropriations to meet the terms of the contract. But there is no authority to enter into a contract granted by the pending bill.

The fact, therefore, is that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois simply calls upon us to decide whether we are in favor of the establishment of such a museum ultimately.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I simply want to take advantage of the gentleman's courtesy to say that I hope to remove all doubt on that proposition by a committee amendment that will be offered if the motion of the gentleman from Illinois is voted down.

Mr. COOPER. Then, I have only to say further that a friend of mine told me a few years ago of a trip to Germany and of his visiting such a museum there, I think at Munich, where, with the utmost interest and with profit to himself, he examined the exhibit of safety appliances and other devices. He said it was a most instructive and useful exhibit to him, as it would be to any intelligent visitor. I am in favor of the establishment of such an institution as that in this country, and preferably in Washington, because it is the city best located for a building devoted to such purposes. More and more Washington is becoming the great convention city of this country. Every year thousands of men and women from all parts of the Nation gather here, and by means of such an exhibit could see demonstrated the usefulness of various appliances and devices for the saving of human beings from mutilation or death. The sum of $50,000 or more would be of little importance compared with the great benefits that such an institution would insure to the people of the United States.

One word more. I am glad to see the spirit evinced here—a spirit which is becoming more and more prevalent—of thinking of men as they ought to be thought of, not as property but as human beings. I recall that some years ago Gov. Dole, of Hawaii, in speaking of certain of the employers in those islands, said that they seemed to look upon men as mere machines and not as factors in the development of the State. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, by an arrangement between myself and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], who proposes to offer an amendment which I think will cover my objection to this section of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to strike it out.

Mr. MANN. Reserving a right to object, I hope the section will not be stricken out, for this reason: All of the authority conferred upon the Secretary under section 2 is conferred upon him under section 1. If section 2 should be stricken from the bill, the same authority will exist as though section 2 were included in the bill. Section 2 is a direct tribute to the late Mr. Bremner, a beloved Member of this House, and I do not think we ought to do anything but honor his memory in keeping section 2 in the bill. [Applause.]

[Mr. ADAIR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland, I renew my request to withdraw the motion to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to strike out the section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "disease," at the end of the section, insert:

"*Provided*, That before making any contracts or incurring any liability under this section the Secretary of Labor shall first submit estimates of the cost therefor to Congress and secure appropriations therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise for information. The Committee on Labor has another bill which it desires to consider. Will it be in order to take it up now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill favorably to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for two days, on account of attending the funeral of a friend.

To Mr. L'ENGLE, for three weeks, to attend to important business.

IMPORTATION OF GOODS, WARES, AND MERCHANDISE MADE BY CONVICT LABOR.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14330) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House resolves itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14330, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the House is apprised of the subject matter of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the object of this bill is to provide means for the effectual accomplishment as to the importation of foreign-made goods of what has long been the established policy and law of the country. Beginning as early as 1890 provisions were inserted in our tariff legislation prohibiting the importation of convict-made goods from abroad. The clause has been repeated in every tariff bill since that time, and in the present tariff law, known as the Underwood law, the clause will be found with a provision giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority to make regulations to carry out the provisions. The administrative authorities have reported that as a matter of fact in all the time that has elapsed, and with reference to all the commerce that has taken place between this country and the other countries of the world since 1890, not a single instance of discovery and condemnation of the prohibited articles of commerce has taken place. The bill now before the House, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] undertakes to provide means by which the importation of such goods can be discovered and prevented, and one of the means for that purpose looks to giving the right to private citizens in the United States to make protest to the collector of the port or to initiate proceedings in admiralty, having in view a challenge of the importer's right to import such goods, whereupon proper judicial and administrative agencies will be set in motion with the purpose of discouraging this trade, denounced by all conceptions of fair commerce.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. With pleasure.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to bring the bill to a vote to-night?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. That would be very desirable, if it is found practicable, but I have no judgment as to what the feelings of the House might be with reference to that. I might, perhaps, test the feelings of the committee, if the gentleman will excuse me, by asking unanimous consent to close general debate at 20 minutes to 6 o'clock and then proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not the gentleman's expectation to try to pass this bill to-night, is it?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I wanted to find the sense of the House with reference to the matter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might make the request to close general debate. I think if we got general debate closed to-night we would want to rise then.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important measure, and I know gentlemen on this side who wish to discuss it. I feel constrained to object for the time being, there having been only five minutes of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland withdraw his request?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think, perhaps, it will not be possible to close debate at this time. I withdraw the request and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY].

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, as has been said by the chairman of the Committee on Labor, this bill provides for the prohibition of the importation of convict-made goods. I will state as a matter of fact, so as to emphasize the importance of this measure, that we have in the United States something like 148,000 convicts who are employed in the prisons of this country in the manufacture of various articles of consumption. As against that, from the best information I can obtain, there are something like 2,400,000 convicts in European countries engaged in the manufacture of various articles which enter into the commerce of the world, and, under our present laws, are permitted to be brought into competition with the products of free labor. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] has said, since the tariff act of 1890 there has been a provision in the bill which prohibited, as was thought, the importation of convict-made goods. Upon investigation it has been discovered that there has never been a seizure of any convict-made goods, and the Treasury Department has been unable to enforce this provision of the law, which indicates that the law is deficient.

The tariff bills which have passed Congress since 1890 have contained almost the exact language which was employed in the bill of 1890, but the fact that we have been unable to prohibit the importation of convict-made goods emphasizes the necessity for the passage of my bill. The present tariff law contains a provision similar to the provision of the act of 1890. Inquiry was made of the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain whether or not the prohibition contained in the tariff law to which I have referred has been effective, and the Treasury Department replied that if it is the purpose of Congress to prohibit the importation into this country of goods partially made by convicts, as well as wholly made by convicts, it is necessary that the law be supplemented.

Upon investigation it is found that there are a great number of articles brought into this country made in whole or in part by convicts in the prisons of European countries. The manufacturers of this country are desirous that a law of this character be placed upon the statute books which can be enforced, and on the other hand the laboring people throughout the country are very much interested in seeing such a law passed, and the consumer is also anxious to have such a measure passed. Why this is true is very easily seen and understood. We have many instances in this country where certain manufacturers employ convicts at a wage ranging from 50 to 75 cents per day, and incident or in connection with this employment is included the use of building, heat, light, and water. The manufacturer who employs free labor is, as can be seen, placed at a decided disadvantage. The manufacturer who employs free labor for which he pays a living wage can not compete in the markets of our country with the manufacturer who employs convicts under the conditions I have described. This very often produces a tendency on the part of the manufacturer who employs free labor to reduce his wage scale, which explains the interest of labor in the passage of the bill; or very often the manufacturer who employs free labor and is compelled to compete for business under such unfair conditions is prompted to skimp and use shoddy materials in the manufacture of articles, and such manufactured articles are palmed off on the consuming public, and on this account the consumers of the country have a just cause for complaint.

It is estimated that the convicts in this country produce $34,000,000 worth of goods; and giving foreign convicts the same proportionate productive capacity, there being approximately 2,500,000, as against our 148,000, they will produce $560,000,000 worth of goods which enter into and demoralize our commerce and seriously affect the conditions of free labor, and imposes a hardship upon the consumer, as I have already stated. I am sure you can therefore very readily see that there should be no delay in the passage of this very wholesome legislation.

My bill does not only prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor, but it will impress upon the Treasury Department the need for enforcing the law in the first instance, as well as supplementing the means by which the law may be enforced.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HENSLEY. Certainly, I will yield.

Mr. SISSON. I presume that a majority of the Members of the House will be in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but I want to call the gentleman's attention, if he has given the matter study, and I am sure he has, because I notice he introduced the bill. On page 5, section 8, there is a provision as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, whenever goods, wares, and merchandise have been delivered to him pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this act, to dispose of the same by donation to the American National Red Cross.

What is the purpose of that?

Mr. HENSLEY. The purpose, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, is to empower the Treasury Department whenever it seizes goods that are brought in here in violation of this law to donate them to some national charitable organization such as the American National Red Cross Society or organization of like character for use.

Mr. SISSON. Now, let us see. You take these goods and confiscate the goods by law.

Mr. HENSLEY. Instead of destroying them under the present law.

Mr. SISSON. Wait a moment. The right of the Federal Government or the right of the State government or any sovereign, when certain laws have been violated, to confiscate goods has always been the right of the sovereign to confiscate, but does the right of the sovereign go so far that in addition to confiscating the goods for public use, and that is why they are confiscated, you then can take that particular character of goods confiscated, irrespective of delivery, and give them to a private individual or private institution or to an eleemosynary institution of any kind? Has the gentleman considered that phase of the bill?

Mr. HENSLEY. I have not made any investigation of that particular feature of the bill, but in my judgment there can be no question that the right or power vested in the sovereign to confiscate carries with it the right of disposition.

Mr. SISSON. Let us speak of the policy of it then. Ought it to be the policy of the Government, through the Secretary of the Treasury, to select a particular institution or a charitable organization; the gentleman preferably said here the Red Cross, but you mention any other national charitable organization——

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISSON. To take the goods so confiscated and donate those goods irrespective of value to some institution or charitable organization of some kind?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will ask the gentleman if that is not preferable to a destruction of the property?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think so. I think the gentleman's bill ought to provide that where goods have been confiscated under penalty—and it must be under a penalty for violating the law—the man must be given some sort of a hearing. You can not take private property even of a foreigner under the Constitution without giving him a hearing. It must be confiscated in accordance with the law, and he would have to have a hearing. If you confiscate his goods for a violation of the law, it is in the nature of a penalty——

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes; to be sure.

Mr. SISSON. Can you take the proceeds of the confiscated goods or the goods themselves and donate them under the Federal Constitution and say that you are going to give them to the Red Cross? We have a fine upon such goods, and such fines, when recovered, should go into the Treasury, and then can we say that we are going to give them to the Red Cross?

Mr. HENSLEY. It is not a fine, as I understand it.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be perfectly proper, and is it not customary in enforcing laws of this character, to cover the forfeited goods into the Treasury?

Mr. SISSON. Of course.

Mr. BORLAND. Can not you make any disposition you choose——

Mr. SISSON. I do not believe it is good public policy.

Mr. BORLAND. Ah!

Mr. SISSON. I doubt extremely the right, and I certainly doubt it is the moral right, of the Federal Government to take property in the nature of a fine and——

Mr. BORLAND. Now, let me call the gentleman's attention to this——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this: Suppose the goods are of a nature that the destruction of them would be a real loss. Suppose they are shoes?

Mr. SISSON. I am not discussing that phase of the question. That, of course, might subject property to be destroyed that ought to be used.

Mr. BORLAND. We will assume they are not; but nevertheless they come under the discussion of this, and to destroy them would be to destroy some property that would be of value to somebody. Suppose we have some convict-made shoes; would it not be proper for the Government, instead of converting them to its own use, to put them in the ordinary channels of trade? Would not that be proper?

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman loses sight of the fact that the amount of goods that would come in in this way would be very small. But the question is whether the Secretary of the Treasury should be permitted to select particular institutions to which he would distribute these goods. Why not have the goods sold and the money covered into the Treasury?

Mr. BORLAND. Because, as the gentleman will readily see, they would go right into commerce.

Mr. SISSON. I understand. De minimis non curat lex. There will be such a small amount of these goods that the effect on trade would be infinitesimal. I am discussing the policy of the Federal Government vesting the Secretary of the Treasury with the right to select an institution to which he would distribute these goods.

Mr. HENSLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to be opposed to a policy of seizing these goods and donating them to some institution where they would be properly used as against the destruction of them?

Mr. SISSON. I would infinitely rather, so far as I am concerned, as a policy of the Government, to have them destroyed than to have the Secretary of the Treasury invested with the right to select institutions to which he would donate these goods.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. The gentleman asks whether any precedent could be cited for the State or Federal Government in such an instance.

Mr. SISSON. The Federal Government. The States, of course, occupy entirely different lines.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I was going to say that I know that in the State of California when fish and game are seized for violation of the fish and game laws, after the case is tried in the court, the fish and game commission turn them over to the various eleemosynary and charitable institutions, such as orphan asylums, and so forth, instead of destroying them.

Mr. SISSON. I want to suggest simply this: Suppose I am Secretary of the Treasury—and I am a human being like the balance of folks—and there are a number of institutions I might select—Episcopalian institutions, Roman Catholic institutions, and institutions of various kinds—and I would have to select the ones to which I would donate these goods. I believe the tendency would be in the wrong direction, and would get up all sorts of controversies as to which institution was entitled to the donation.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman will discover from the reading of the bill that this says the "Red Cross or other national charitable institutions," and the Secretary of the Treasury will determine that matter when application is presented.

Mr. SISSON. The "Red Cross or other national institutions" is a very broad term. Now, what is a national institution? Is it one that is chartered by the Federal Government?

Mr. HENSLEY. Now, I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] that I have only a few moments in which to discuss this, and it is pretty evident that we are not going to reach a vote on the bill to-day.

Mr. SISSON. Then, for that reason——

Mr. HENSLEY. I would like if the gentleman would give a little serious thought to the question and then give us the benefit of his views upon the subject. I can not conceive of the gentleman taking the stand he has announced here.

Mr. SISSON. What is the meaning of "national institutions"? Are they ones which are chartered by the Federal Government?

Mr. HENSLEY. The Red Cross, or some other charitable institution. We can make no mistake when goods are donated to charitable institutions which need them. After passage of this bill there will be very little to confiscate.

Mr. SISSON. You may say that they will make no mistake, but——

Mr. HENSLEY. The devastating floods over in Ohio last year and in other parts of the country, when the Red Cross went there to render service to those people who were afflicted by that condition, I think would be an instance in point.

Mr. SISSON. The point I have in mind is this: That if we confiscate these goods they become the property of the Federal Government. Why should you take that forfeiture any more than you would take the forfeiture of cash or any more than

the money that comes into the Treasury from any other source and donate it to any institution?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me a suggestion in that connection?

Mr. HENSLEY. Certainly; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] will think of this a moment, I think he will agree with me that if this becomes a law there would be very little to give to anybody.

Mr. SISSON. That is what I think. Therefore the sale of the goods and the covering of the proceeds into the Treasury would not amount to much. And, by the way, the Treasury has few friends. I used to think the Treasury had friends, but I have changed my mind about it now.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It would be difficult for the committee to draw a bill in such a way that someone could not say, "Why did you not draw it in another way?" The gentleman remembers the story of the man who had a little donkey——

Mr. SISSON. To my mind there is a serious precedent involved here in the disposition of this property.

Mr. HENSLEY. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Mississippi that the bill as originally drafted did not contain this provision. A bill similar to this was introduced in the Senate some time ago by Senator STONE, of Missouri, and it provided for the destruction of property, as the law now provides for it, and the committee to which this bill was referred, consisting of Senator REED, of Missouri, Senator LA FOLLETTE, Senator CUMMINS, and others, insisted that it be changed so as to enable the Treasury Department to donate the goods confiscated to such institutions as are named herein. This absolutely conforms to the suggestion of the Senators composing the committee of the Senate to which the bill was referred.

Mr. SISSON. That does not strengthen the question in my own mind—simply because some Senator happens to have done something that is not right, in my judgment.

Mr. HENSLEY. Let me read to the gentleman from the hearing had before the Committee on Labor in the House. Mr. HAWLEY, a member of the Committee on Labor, asked this question in commenting upon the bill reported by the Senate:

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to ask you this question: The bill as reported by the Senate says the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and empowered to deliver these goods to the American Red Cross Society or any other national charitable association?

Mr. HAWES. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWLEY. Which is a very proper disposition of them. But do you think that under the language that is mandatory that they be so delivered if he knew them to be manufactured in infected prisons, where contagious diseases were epidemic at the time, or where the convicts were afflicted with tuberculosis? Has he any discretion to destroy any goods he knows to be infected or improper to be distributed among our people?

That matter was carefully gone into, I will suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. That position is perfectly sound, but I do not believe that it is sound to vest in the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion of taking these fines. It must be that it is in the nature of a fine and in the nature of a forfeiture, and they are dealt with just alike. The title to it, of course, immediately vests in the Federal Government. Otherwise it could not dispose of it or give it away. I am not in favor of any provision or any departure whereby the Federal Government becomes a collecting agency and turns over its forfeitures and fines or any taxes, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury or any other official. Every gift of property ought to be a specific gift by Congress, and there should be no general authority. However small this may be, it is the beginning, I say, of a new departure, and already we have a bureaucracy in this country.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] that being a question of policy largely—speaking for myself, and I think for other Members of the House—we would, of course, be glad to hear from the gentleman; but that question has been gone into very carefully by the committee heretofore, and it seems to me that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] has very pertinently suggested——

Mr. SISSON. I agree with Judge SHACKLEFORD that the amount would be very small——

Mr. HENSLEY (continuing). He has very pertinently suggested that the amount to be given to anybody will be very small under this bill when it becomes a law.

Now, I was about to say, when I was interrupted by the gentleman from Mississippi, that this supplements the means by which the prohibition can be enforced. It gives the parties affected, be it a manufacturers' association or a company or a labor union, the right to go into court and seize the property; and there the question of whether or not the goods have been made by convict labor can be determined by judicial proceedings. If the goods are discovered to have been made by convicts in other countries, they can be seized and disposed of under the provisions of this law.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is no sort of question about the need of a law of this kind. We have been laboring under the opinion and belief that we had a law for this purpose and that it was being enforced; that the tariff law, which contained the language such as I have gone over, was sufficient; and it was only after an investigation of the subject that we found that the law has never been enforced. The Treasury Department, for some reason or other, has been unable to make this law what it was intended by Congress to be. It is certainly demanded not only by the laboring people of the country, but it is insisted upon by the manufacturers of the whole country, and consumers as well. There is a different proposition, as you all understand, submitted, of course, in the passage of a law of this kind from that which obtained in the passage of the law which had for its purpose the regulation of interstate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable talk on the floor of the House within the last few days in regard to the effect of the new tariff law on imports. I read from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Thursday, March 5, 1914:

United States tariff booms exports from British Columbia—Trade almost doubled with revision of the American schedules—Shingles greatest gain—Lumber, wood pulp, fish, ore, and bullion leading articles imported by Uncle Sam.

Those are the headlines. This is the article:

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, *March 4*.

Since the new United States tariff went into effect last autumn the exports from British Columbia have doubled, according to announcement made this morning by Robert E. Mansfield, United States consul general at Vancouver.

To cope with the extra export business which has resulted from the elimination and reductions in the duties on British Columbia commodities it has been found necessary for the local consular branch to acquire additional office accommodation.

The increase in the business relations between this Province and the United States was reflected in the comparative statement published early in January, showing the amount of exports up to December 31.

Later returns show that the exports have been practically doubled during the period that the new tariff revisions have been operative.

The greatest gains are noted in the figures for shipments of shingles, lumber of different classes, wood pulp, fish, ore, and bullion. It is the general opinion among those in touch with the lumber situation that the placing of shingles on the free list has imparted a big stimulus to the industry in British Columbia.

Large quantities of fish are being shipped almost daily from Vancouver, the exports showing a big increase since the adoption of the new tariffs.

I may say that that is in accordance with the report made by the experts who were sent out by the Department of Commerce to investigate the shingle industry. They reported that since the new tariff law went into effect more shingles had been imported into this country than ever before in the same length of time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the question presented here is, Shall goods made in foreign prisons be imported into this country and come in competition with free American labor? The whole judgment of the American people says, No. It is shocking to think that foreign convict labor can be employed upon the manufacture of goods which are sent over to this country to compete with goods made by free American wage earners. Our American wage earners are men who maintain a self-respecting standard of living. They are taxpayers and rent payers; often home owners. They must educate their children, support their families, and discharge the duties of citizenship. This class of labor should not be debased by competition with foreign prison labor. Congress has just passed a law to prevent the shipment of prison-made goods in interstate commerce in this country, so that no State can dump its convict-made goods upon another State. Now, we ought to pass this law keeping out all foreign convict-made goods. I am strongly for it. The man who is honest and respectable is entitled to some show. He has a hard struggle and he is entitled to great credit; certainly he is entitled to an equal chance.

Sometimes I think our sympathy for the criminal or for the down and out may lead us to overlook the rights of the self-respecting man who is not down and out, but who is doing his duty and meeting his responsibilities like a man. The good citizen who supports his Government and does not break its laws should be given the first consideration.

This is a good law. It has teeth in it. It says that the convict-made goods shall be seized and destroyed if an attempt is made to import them. That is the way to make the law effective. Make it cost the foreigner something to try to ship prison-made goods in here. We have had a law on the statute books ever since the McKinley Tariff Act prohibiting the entry of prison-made goods from abroad, but it was a mere campaign dodge. It did not mean anything, and could not be enforced. Foreign convict goods have been coming in here under all the high-tariff laws. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you can not arrest the foreigner who owns the goods, and you can not prove guilty knowledge on the man who receives them in this country. The only effective way to stop the evil is the way this Hensley bill provides—seize the goods and destroy them. That will stop it. The foreigner can not stand that drain on his pocketbook. He will quit sending the goods in.

The provisions of the tariff law which have been carried ever since the McKinley Act provide that no goods shall be admitted to entry in this country that are the product in whole or in part of prison labor; but there being no penalty clause and no seizure clause, the only penalty is that the goods if they are known to be prison-made goods can be turned back at the port of entry, and the importer is at no other loss or expense than the transportation and the attempt to enter.

In order to stop the entry of prison-made goods something more effective is necessary, because it develops that under that provision of the tariff bill, which has been in force now more than 20 years, no seizures of goods have been made, and there is no report from the Treasury Department of any goods having been excluded on that particular ground. Manifestly they have no way of reaching a result.

Mr. BALTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BALTZ. I understand that the Treasury Department can not enforce that law, for the reason that if the goods are partly made by prison labor, but finished by free labor, they can not be excluded.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; they give that as one reason, that if the goods come from a shop where they are finished by free labor the department has no way of knowing that a prior part of the process of manufacturing was done by prison labor, and therefore they have no right to exercise arbitrary jurisdiction and exclude them. But under this bill the necessary legal provision has been provided by the Labor Committee that framed this bill. When the goods are here any American citizen or organization interested in the matter can, upon showing made to the collector of internal revenue, have the goods turned over for seizure here under the ordinary procedure relating to the seizure of goods in the enforcement of the revenue laws.

Then it becomes a question of fact, and the burden of proof is on the man who claims to own the goods. The proceeding being one in rem, any man who claims to own the goods will have his day in court and he will find it necessary to come forward and prove that the goods are not prison-made goods. If, on the trial of that question, it is determined that the goods are, in whole or in part, the product of prison labor—on which question, of course, any citizen or organization making the claim that they are will have an equal chance to be heard—the goods are condemned. I undertake to say that under that procedure very few prison-made goods will come into this country. It will be enforced, because back of it is the sentiment not only of the manufacturers but also of organized labor of America. They will probably see that sufficient test cases are made where goods can be traced to European prisons, and the goods will not simply be turned back at the port of entry but they will be seized, and the loss will fall on the importer.

The bill provides the usual penalty clause, but for the enforcement of that guilty knowledge is necessary. We can not arrest the man in Europe and punish him, and therefore this criminal clause can only fall on the importer in this country, and then only when guilty knowledge on his part is produced. So no injustice can be done to him. It must be proved that what he did was done knowingly and fraudulently, and the burden of proof is on the Government to show that the man under arrest is guilty. As to the goods themselves, however, the man must be able to prove the genesis and construction of his own goods. Therefore I say that the law has teeth in it. It has behind it the necessary material to make it effective, and the committee has done a great deal of careful work.

Now, the question arises, When these goods are admitted and forfeited to the Government, what shall be done with them? If they are sold and the proceeds turned into the Federal Treasury, the goods will enter again into commerce, the very purpose which it is intended to prevent. If goods are destroyed, if they be harmless, like twine or shoes or some goods not infected with disease, and coming from a place not infected with disease, there is a loss of valuable property that might do some one some good. They are goods of some value. It is provided therefore that instead of being destroyed they shall be turned over to some charitable organization; and I know of no charitable organization in this country better qualified to accept them than the Red Cross. The Red Cross has done a wonderful amount of work in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys in the distribution of supplies furnished by the Federal Government to the innocent sufferers from those terrible floods.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Is it not a fact that the Red Cross is recognized in the treaties of the different nations in regard to war as a privileged order and entitled to certain special conditions in the progress and prosecution of war?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; the Red Cross performs a work that is subgovernmental in character. It not only takes care of noncombatants who suffer by war and distributes to them the necessary relief, but under the American amendment to the Red Cross treaty it takes care of the sufferers from great national calamities and disasters where large numbers of people, by a national calamity are thrown into want and into a helpless condition, as was the case in the Ohio Valley, and in Galveston, in San Francisco, and in many other similar disasters where the Government has felt itself under obligations to come to the immediate relief.

This suggestion did not come from the committee of this House or on this side of the aisle; it came from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], a Republican member of the committee. I quote from the hearings:

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to ask you this question: The bill as reported by the Senate says the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and empowered to deliver these goods to the American Red Cross Society or any other national charitable association?

Mr. HAWES. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWLEY. Which is a very proper disposition of them.

I agree with him about that. I agree with my friend from Mississippi that the number of goods coming in here would be negligible, but what goods do get in, instead of being wantonly destroyed, as they would be under the older and ruder rules of law, if they are ordinary standard goods that can be used under any circumstances, should be turned over to a national organization, such as the Red Cross. I think this bill ought to pass. This is a measure in the interest of free, honest, self-respecting, high-grade American labor, and I am proud to vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 23 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the gentleman from Mississippi begins, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how long he intends to run? It is now half past 5.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. After hearing the gentleman from Mississippi it may be well to make some agreement in regard to Wednesday next. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that after the committee adjourns to-day, when we take up the subject on next Calendar Wednesday——

Mr. STAFFORD. I suggest to the gentleman that that request can be granted only in the House.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi 10 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall consume 10 minutes. I do not think it is necessary for anybody to undertake to defend the Red Cross Society; it needs no defense at my hands. Everybody understands it is doing a great and noble work. I am willing that it shall prosper; I am willing that it shall thrive; but if you are going to leave these goods to be donated rather than to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, it ought to be fixed so that he would not have to make a selection between the rival organizations, not only as between charitable, but as between those of a religious nature, each feeling that it was entitled to the goods and entitled to recognition. I would not like to be the Secretary of the Treasury under those conditions. We ought to avoid the very appearance of evil. We ought not to put the Secretary of the Treasury in the position where sometimes the most delicate question would have to be solved by him. I believe I have a right to appeal to the good common sense of the Members of this House. There never has been a time, and I hope the time never will come, when there ever will be any sort of a religious test or religious discussion on the floor of this House, and I am unwilling that the Federal Government, even in the small matter of a small number of goods that might possibly come in,

even if this bill were passed, should ever find itself face to face with the time when it shall be called upon to select between charitable institutions that may be dominated by religious institutions or one that may be dominated by people who belong to various denominations throughout the country. I believe that the very moment you begin to give charity in that way out of the Federal Treasury you are likely to get into trouble in the future.

If you are going to give these goods away, you had better say that they shall be given, always and outright, to the Red Cross; you had better fix it and not leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. If the Federal Government ever gets title to this property, it must get title to it by virtue of a forfeiture. It is in the nature of a fine; it is in the nature of money that may be collected from a criminal because of the violation of law; and according to all of the laws of the States it goes into the State treasury, and if it is a county violation it goes into the treasury of the county, or, if a municipal violation, into the treasury of the municipality. When a violation of law requires the Federal Government to forfeit goods, the money obtained from those goods ought to go into the Federal Treasury. If they are to be sold, they will be a very negligible feature and will cut very little figure in the trade of the country. If you are going to deflect money from the Federal Treasury, small amounts of money in this way, you could then deflect large amounts of money. The answer may be that Congress can always control that. That ought to be true, but those of us who have served a few years here know the wickedness of precedent. An innocent precedent set to-day will rise up and confront you in the future, and when we champion something like it in the future we search the books to find the precedents where Congress has done that thing before.

I am unwilling that this precedent shall be set, and I may say to my friend from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] that I believe labor has suffered more from precedent in the courts than from any other one thing. The fellow-servant doctrine was all right when men used to employ labor and only a few men were employed and a man could look face to face the man who was employed and responsibilities were about the same, it was perhaps true that the fellow-servant doctrine worked no injury; but now, under the great corporate institutions and the great private institutions, men who organize their business place one man as superintendent or foreman, who himself is an employee, but who at the same time is a master of the men who work under him, and yet the courts, by virtue of the old precedent, have applied the fellow-servant doctrine to all of the great modern institutions of business throughout the country, notwithstanding the reason for the rule had long since disappeared. Conditions became such under this old rule that the legislative bodies had to change the rule by statute. In some States the courts modified the rule, as they did first in Georgia, that the fellow-servant doctrine should be abolished and the doctrine of comparative negligence established in its stead.

So it is with precedent in all other lines. It is difficult to get away from precedents. A law is nothing more or less than a rule of action, that which controls men's conduct, and when we violate the rule we are punished for it. So in making this precedent to-day, innocent though it may be in the beginning, it may rise up in the future to haunt us. It is so easy to pursue the proper way now, and that is to say that these goods shall be treated when they are sold by the Secretary of the Treasury as any other fines. They may be used in the Federal prisons, if they are suitable for the clothing of Federal prisoners.

Mr. IGOE. Would it not meet the gentleman's objection to stop with the donation to the American National Red Cross and leave out the other words?

Mr. SISSON. I do not like that at all, but I would rather have that fixed so that the institution to get the benefit of the goods is named, and not leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury and compel him to decide as between churches as to who should have the money or clothing or to what hospital the goods should go, if they happen to be drugs.

If it is clothing, then various other institutions would be clamoring for it, and you could not blame the institutions; you could not blame the people who are at the head of these eleemosynary or charitable institutions for trying to get every particle of help they could get to help the inmates of those institutions over which they have charge. Now, in regard to the suggestion that this clause, "or other national charitable organizations," be stricken out, made by my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. The Red Cross is in one sense of the word almost a public institution, because it is only in case of war and great calamities and great epidemics this institution is called upon, and it performs a great work, and therefore if we take this phrase out it would be infinitely better to fix upon one institution like the Red Cross rather than vest the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion to dispose of the goods to those who might need them in accordance with his views. Now, I have no objection to the bill. In the first place, the purpose of the bill is all right.

There is one thing I want to call the attention of the committee to which struck me as being a little strange. I do not know whether it occurred to the committee, and I may be a little hypercritical, but I notice the provision which says:

By convict, pauper, or prison labor, etc.

The term "convict" is used, and then "pauper or prison labor."

Mr. HENSLEY. I will say to the gentleman the word "pauper"——

Mr. SISSON. I understand the word "pauper" is defined over here in another section; but it struck me when I first read the bill that a man may be a pauper and yet be guilty of absolutely no crime. He may be a pauper by virtue of some act of Providence, and a pauper may be a perfectly honorable man, and, therefore, if I had been drawing the bill I should have used the language which is contained in section 9, where it says—

Those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at the public expense, in whole or in part.

Giving a definition and interpretation of the use of the word "pauper," because a pauper, in the general acceptation of the word, is a man without means, and, in the legal acceptation of the word, he is a man who has been declared a pauper by the proper authorities of the State; he may be hunting labor and be an honorable man; and I believe I would rather have the definition between convict and prison labor—have the section read as follows: "By convict, prison labor, or"—

Those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at the public expense, in whole or in part.

That absolutely clears the bill, so far as I know, of any objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HENSLEY. The word "pauper" does not fall within the purview of section 9.

Mr. SISSON. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. HENSLEY. A pauper, as the gentleman defines it, does not fall within the purview of section 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I understand the definition you give over here of pauper is for the purpose of specifying the class of paupers who would be covered by your bill, but why not use the language covering the persons you desire to cover rather than to use the word "pauper," because the people who are poor may be the most honorable people in the world and should not be classed with prison or convict labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if there is no further desire for discussion this evening, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 14330 and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent for a re-reference of the bill H. R. 14438, introduced by me yesterday, which, through error, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It should be referred to the Committee on Claims. It is a bill for the relief of persons suffering damages by the construction of a canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the Calaveras River.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that reference will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to see if it is possible now to agree upon debate for Wednesday next, when the consideration of this subject is to be resumed, and I ask unanimous consent of the House that one hour be then devoted to general discussion and that after that the bill be taken up under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that on next Calendar Wednesday general debate on H. R. 14330 be limited to one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I assume it will be equally agreeable to the gentleman if he makes it conditional that one-half of the time be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. One-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. One half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The request is that on next Wednesday the general debate on the bill H. R. 14330, the pending bill, be limited to one hour.

Mr. SISSON. On general debate?

The SPEAKER. General debate. One half to be controlled by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, March 12, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Peter Daniel *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 821); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation increasing the salary of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States from $3,600 to $4,500 per annum (H. Doc. No. 822); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13870) to provide for the erection, furnishing, and equipping of a building in the city of Washington, D. C., for the Department of Justice, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 368), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11747) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction of a public building in Memphis, Tenn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 369), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14491) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clearfield, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 14492) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification for cotton; to provide for the application, enforcement, and use of such standards in transactions in interstate and foreign commerce; to prevent deception therein; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14493) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 14494) to amend the interstate commerce act, giving and granting unto the Interstate Commerce Commission power and authority to fix and determine rates, charges, and compensation to be allowed a controlled common carrier by the controlling common carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14495) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the trustees of Rhine Center Cemetery, in the town of Rhine, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin, two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces, with their carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. L'ENGLE: A bill (H. R. 14496) to equalize freight rates over transportation lines engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14497) denying admission to the mails as second-class mail matter to certain newspapers and periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 14498) authorizing the Northern Arapahoe Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14499) for the erection of a public building at Lumberton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 14500) providing for the exchange of lands or the making of additional entries in connection with lands entered on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 14501) to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 14502) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial paper, to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 23, 1913; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Resolution (H. Res. 435) authorizing the Committee on Printing to inquire into the sale and terms of the publication known as the "Messages and Papers of the Presidents"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolution (H. Res. 437) to provide for the consideration of H. R. 14385; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the Hamill bill to pension civil-service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the Hamill bill to pension civil-service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVIS: A bill (H. R. 14503) granting a pension to Leonard D. McCutcheon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14504) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quinlan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: A bill (H. R. 14505) granting an increase of pension to James D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14506) granting an increase of pension to Levi North; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROCKSON: A bill (H. R. 14507) granting a pension to Harriet C. Martindale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 14508) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Slatten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 14509) for the relief of Philander P. Coats; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14510) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph H. Pugh, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14511) granting a pension to Wilhimene Linder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 14512) granting a pension to Nancy Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14513) granting a pension to Mary T. Kington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14514) granting an increase of pension to James Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14515) granting an increase of pension to Ira A. Goodridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 14516) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 14517) granting a pension to Emma B. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 14518) granting an increase of pension to Gardner H. Deremer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 14519) for the relief of William J. Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14520) for the relief of the heirs at law of Samuel G. Curtis and Elizabeth G. Curtis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14521) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Bauer Candee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14522) granting an increase of pension to William Galvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14523) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14524) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Keeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14525) granting an increase of pension to Eva H. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 14526) granting an increase of pension to Ann Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14527) for the relief of Samuel M. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14528) for the relief of Cyrus H. Abbott and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 14529) for the relief of the Ursuline Convent; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 14530) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stroup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 14531) granting an increase of pension to William O. Strickland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 14532) granting an increase of pension to Lewis P. Clingman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 14533) granting an increase of pension to Alphonzo O. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14534) granting an increase of pension to James Gagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14535) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14536) granting an increase of pension to Susan Wigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14537) granting an increase of pension to Danford Wyllys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14538) granting an increase of pension to James I. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 14539) granting a pension to Walter H. Sober; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 14540) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14541) granting an increase of pension to John Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 14542) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 14543) granting a pension to Louis Settles; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Protests from 32 citizens of Washington, Franklin County, Mo., against national prohibition amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Freeport and Pittsburgh, Pa., against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), protests of 26 citizens of Hermann, Gasconade County, Mo., against the national prohibition amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR: Petitions of the Bethel Brethren Church and the Evangelical Church, both of Berne, Ind., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 515 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Sandy Valley Grange, No. 1764, of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, in favor of the Bathrick bill (H. R. 11897), relative to farm loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the Presbyterian Brotherhood, of Wooster, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the United Brethren Sunday School, of Strasburg, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of Samuel Thornton, of Cambria County, Pa., favoring free press and free speech and against suppression of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William Jacobs, jr., of Cambria County, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennington, N. J., favoring House bill 8947, relative to free mail delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of 1,300 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of sundry citizens of Gloucester City, Camden County; Westville, Gloucester County; and the Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the ex-president of the Ohio Fish and Game Commission, relative to fisheries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Major Frank Keck Camp, No. 53, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of John Bates Clark, of Columbia University, New York, favoring repeal of exemption clause of Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Thomas Roulston, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Underwood anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., favoring bill relative to flood control on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of Olympia (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring bill for improvement of Willapa Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions signed by 265 citizens of Dodge County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, and all similar prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 21 citizens of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for the passage of House bill 4981, a bill for the labeling, marking, and tagging of all fabrics and leather goods, and providing for the fumigation of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALDER: Petitions of John J. Hickey and other citizens of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX: Petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Bedford, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, favoring investigation of Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Michigan Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, against changing the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 30 residents of Manteca, Cal., in regard to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Spanish War veterans, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York, favoring machinists' wage bill (H. R. 12740); to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS: Memorial of the Minnesota State Dairyman's Association, protesting against passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Petition of J. M. Felkner and 35 other citizens of Hudson, N. Mex., and vicinity, in favor of the so-called Murray stock-exchange bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Theodore A. Miller Camp, No. 5, of the Provisional Division of New Mexico, United Spanish-American War Veterans, of Roswell, N. Mex., praying for the passage of legislation to pension the widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection (H. R. 13044); to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Lost River Lodge, No. 605, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Trainmen, of Tucumcari, N. Mex., relative to overtime pay for employees on Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Central and Fort Bayard, N. Mex., favoring House bill 9596, relative to reclassification of clerks of the mobile Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the G. K. Warren Woman's Relief Corps, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., against changing the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Hardwood Manufacturers Association of the United States, favoring Randell-Humphrey's bill relative to flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring House bill 7374, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, against literacy test in Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of various bankers of Iowa, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Richmond, Ky., relative to right of negroes to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William J. Woods, of New York, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union, of the District of Columbia, favoring House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of S. W. Fairchild, of New York, favoring the Hughes-Bacon bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., against increase of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of a committee representing ex-Union commissioned officers of National Military Home, favoring early passage of bill relative to National Military Home; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Horace White and Samuel T. Dalton, of New York, favoring repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the ex-Union Volunteer Officers' Association, favoring the volunteer officers' retired list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of the Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Local No. 36, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of various voters of the eleventh and twelfth congressional districts of Missouri, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the Grand Army Post of Washington, Iowa, against House bill 6581, relative to pensioning Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of sundry citizens of Covington, Ky., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of Adolph Lantering, of Hoboken, N. J., relative to a bill for placing a tax on coupons, prize tickets, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of various members of the Hebron Lutheran Church, of Blairsville, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of Evansville Ice & Storage Co., Busch Remedy Co., Scheips Shoe Co., Bedford & Nugent, Stolz Schmitt Furniture Co., John Vogel & Sons, Bernardin Bottle Cap Co., Evansville Floral Co., Geupel Bros., and Benighof-Nolan Co., all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of John P. Graff, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. F. Heyman, of the Lake Erie Fishermen, for legislation permitting the use of trap nets; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Scandinavian Grand Lodge of Connecticut, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacDONALD: Petition of the People's State Bank, of Munising, Mich., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. O'Connell Corps, No. 236, Women's Relief Corps, Iron Mountain, Mich., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Oscarii Sick Benefit and Aid Society, of Skandia, Mich., favoring bill appropriating for erection of a statue to Capt. John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petitions of William E. Edmond and other citizens of Kings County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, of the District of Columbia, favoring House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of sundry citizens of Mount Morris, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Jefferson County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring House bill 11897, relative to farm loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast, protesting against repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the San Francisco (Cal.) Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 13723, the anti-coupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of A. Simon, of Flushing, N. Y., and the Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Protective Association of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the New York State Drainage Association, favoring passage of House bill 8180 relative to flood control, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the District Grand Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Springfield, Mass., protesting against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Bartenders' Union, No. 421, of Newport, R. I., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various members of Division 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., protesting against repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of H. B. Townsend, of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of House bill 12471, relative to adjusting major portion of naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Rear Admiral Charles M. Thomas Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Rhode Island, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Memorial of the New York State Drainage Association, favoring the passage of House bill 8180, for flood protection, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of the Major Frank Kerk Camp, No. 53, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, and of the memorial and executive committee of the Boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-ninth congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-ninth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of E. E. Morris and other citizens of Monmouth County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, protesting against House bill 12928, to amend the postal and civil-service laws; to the Committtee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, against repeal of the exemption clause of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Waiters' Union, Local No. 17, of California, and sundry citizens of California, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany House bill 14314, relative to a pension for R. Ray Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 14278, relative to a pension for Edwin T. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland (by request): Petitions of various members of the Pleasant Hill Grange, of Arcadia, Md., and the Mount Airy (Md.) Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petitions of C. E. Gross and other citizens of Baltimore, Md., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of 1,683 citizens of Kentucky, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of 14 citizens of Otis, 16 citizens of Plainfield, 25 citizens of Holyoke, 300 citizens of Westfield, 40 citizens of Shelburne, and 100 citizens of Shelburne Falls, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, protesting against the literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Bartenders' Union, Local No. 81, of Holyoke, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of Messrs. Caldwell & Wilson, Norwich, Ohio, and 65 others, favoring legislation to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petitions of 100 citizens of Dickey, 100 citizens of Guelph, and 300 citizens of Jamestown, all in the State of North Dakota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 12, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, loving Father, we desire, as we come to the tasks of this day out of the region of quiet and peace, one sacred, self-revealing moment in Thy presence to give to us the spiritual equipment for great service. We would not handle lightly the interests of so many millions of Thy children. We need the blessing of God to enable us to address ourselves to the tasks of this day that are so near to Thy heart and that mean so much to all the people. Grant, we pray, that at this moment we may carry the divine inspiration and guidance that we may faithfully and well discharge the duties that Thou dost require at our hands.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from Arthur Simmons, president of the American Foreign Labor Exclusion League, with reference to the immigration bill, which will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN LABOR EXCLUSION LEAGUE,
UNITED STATES AND CANADA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
*Houston, Tex., March 8, 1914.*

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
*President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: May I call your kind attention to immigration bill now under consideration in the Senate?

No doubt 95 per cent of our American people desire a new immigration law. We use the term "undesirable immigration." We mean undesirable conditions rather than undesirable people. In one of our large cities the city police reported 108 (women) prostitutes in one house. Out of the 108 prostitutes, 101 were foreigners. In this we see an undesirable condition. Simple way out, we must consider, first, the foreigners here; second, those desiring to come to America.

Our present law on contract foreign labor—a fine of $1,000 each—too small; entirely too small. Should be $10,000 each. Add to this, criminal alien $10,000 each; also add for each prostitute alien $10,000 fine for any person, firm, company, partnership, or corporation who are directly or indirectly concerned in the importation of or directly or indirectly concerned in the employment of foreigners and aliens of contract labor or criminals or prostitutes in the United States.

SLAVE LABOR.

One very serious mistake has been made in the history of the Nation's development, and every precaution should be taken to prevent history repeating itself. At one time our forefathers seemed to have thought that the only way to secure an adequate supply of labor was importation of slaves. Their importation brought results and consequences little dreamed of. Possibly the demand for labor to grow cotton was solved thereby for a time, and the cotton industry was rendered more profitable, but every dollar proved blood money one hundredfold. For, after all, it is our institutions and ideals and their successful perpetuation that make us economically, industrially, and commercially great.

Will you do me the kindness to refer this to Committee on Immigration? Also print in RECORD.

Very truly, yours,

ARTHUR SIMMONS,
*President American Foreign Labor Exclusion League.*

Mr. SWANSON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Virginia in reference to the construction and maintenance of post or rural free delivery routes in the several States. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution in reference to the construction and maintenance of post or rural free delivery roads in the several States.

Whereas there is much agitation over and interest manifested in the construction, maintenance, and improvement of the public roads and highways of the several States of this Union; and

Whereas monetary aid from the Federal Government would greatly further the construction, maintenance, and improvement of the post or rural free delivery roads, which are in the main traveled highways of the several States; and

Whereas the United States Government is now using over 1,000,000 miles of public roads through this country in carrying its mail over them, either through its star route contractors or its rural delivery carriers, without contributing to the States or communities one cent of compensation; and

Whereas the United States Government has appropriated little, if anything, for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of the post or rural free delivery roads of the several States of the Union; and

Whereas Senator CLAUDE A. SWANSON on July 7, 1911, introduced in the United States Senate a bill, No. 2935, to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes, through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States through which such post roads and rural free delivery routes may be established, which bill seeks to secure an appropriation of $20,000,000 annually for aid to the several States of the Union in the construction, maintenance, and improvement of the post or rural free delivery roads of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Virginia (the House concurring)*, That the several Members of Congress and the United States Senators representing this Commonwealth in the National Congress now assembled in Washington, D. C., be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to secure the passage of Senator SWANSON'S bill, or a bill which has for its object of securing of an appropriation from Congress for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of the post or rural free delivery roads of the several States of this Nation; and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress and the United States Senate.

Agreed to by the senate January 27, 1914.

O. V. HAUGER,
*Clerk of the Senate.*

Agreed to by the house of delegates February 24, 1914.

JNO. W. WILLIAMS,
*Clerk House of Delegates.*

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Harper County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of 361 citizens of Tyler, 200 citizens of Waco, 125 citizens of Luling, and 250 citizens of San Angelo, all in the State of Texas, and a petition of 5,500 citizens of the city of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RANSDELL presented memorials of 656 citizens of New Orleans; of Local Union No. 496, Journeymen Barbers' Union, of New Orleans; and of Local Union No. 79, International Association of Marbleworkers, of New Orleans, all in the State of Louisiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of West Baton Rouge Parish, La., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for Government control of the levees of the Mississippi River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a number of petitions from various church organizations in North Dakota asking that an amendment to the Constitution for national prohibition be enacted. I ask that one of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD and that all be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and one ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution suggested for adoption by churches, young people's societies, clubs, and other organizations, and for public meetings generally. Woman's Christian Temperance Union speakers are urgently requested to secure from all meetings which they address the adoption of this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we heartily indorse the movement for national constitutional prohibition embodied in the joint resolution introduced in the United States Congress by Congressman RICHMOND PEARSON HOBSON, proposing an amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, importation, exportation, or transportation for sale of beverages or foods containing alcohol."

(Signature of president or chairman.)

(To be sent, when signed, to National W. C. T. U. headquarters, Evanston, Ill.)

Adopted by Jamestown Presbyterian Church, representing 729 people, December 24, 1913.

H. B. ALLEN.

Adopted by Christian Endeavor Society of same church, representing 70 plus.

A. J. BARTRAM,
*Vice President, Jamestown, N. Dak.*

Mr. GRONNA. I present a resolution from Bad Lands Lodge, No. 639, Railway Employees, of Dickinson, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of what is known as the Sutherland bill. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on April 22, 1908, there was enacted by Congress a law known as the Federal employers' liability law, under which the railway employees of America are for the first time in the history of the United States securing an approach to an equitable compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; and

Whereas there is pending in Congress a compensation bill known as the Sutherland bill, S. 595, which, if enacted, will supersede or annul the Federal liability law: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, By the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, No. 639, in regular meeting assembled at Dickinson, N. Dak., that we are unalterably opposed to the passing of any Federal compensation law that does not contain an optional clause that will leave undisturbed our rights in the Federal liability law; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to each Member of Congress of North Dakota, and to the United States Senators of this State, that this resolution may be laid before the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States and the respective committees thereof, and a copy be spread on the minutes of this meeting.

Adopted this 2d day of March, 1914.

JENS P. JOHNSON,
*Recording Secretary.*

Attest:

C. W. FOSTER,
*President.*

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Palermo, N. Dak., remonstrating against any change being made in the law regulating the parcel post, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Retail Lumbermen's Association, favoring the adoption of 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hettinger, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 170 citizens of Fargo, 350 citizens of Grand Forks, 52 citizens of Forman, and 21 citizens of Hillsboro, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Russell, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Topeka, Seneca, and Miltonvale, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pleasanton, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit gambling in futures on stock exchanges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry ministers of the Gospel, residents of Garden City, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present compensatory time provided for postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WORKS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against any repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. STERLING presented a memorial of Thomas Elsom Post, No. 54, Department of South Dakota, Grand Army of the Republic, and of Women's Relief Corps No. 42, of Northville, S. Dak., remonstrating against any change being made in the American flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Thomas Elsom Post, No. 54, Department of South Dakota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Northville, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the monthly payment of pensions, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Claremont, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxi-

cating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of the congregations of the Hildreth Baptist Church, of Columbus; the Calvary Presbyterian Church, of Canton; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Manchester; and the Broad Street Church of Christ, of Columbus; of sundry citizens of Toledo, Cleveland, Lakewood, Dayton, Columbus, Upper Sandusky, Steubenville, Akron, Manchester, Linden Heights, Ironton, East Liverpool, Van Buren, and Athens, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Toledo, Lima, and Coshocton, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hamilton, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Little Hocking, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Evansville, Perry County, Spencer County, Knox County, and Posey County; of the South Side Improvement Association, of Richmond; of the Richmond Militaer Verein; and of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 54, of Evansville, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Mennonite Church of Berne, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Davenport, Delmar, Clinton, Iowa City, and Grinnell, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lyons, Muscatine, Davenport, Dubuque, and Des Moines; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 60, of Keokuk; and of Local Union No. 527, Bartenders' League, of Dubuque, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented a memorial of the Emmet Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the repeal of that provision in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Covington, and Vincennes, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dekalb County, Jasper County, and Laporte County, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of Bridesburg Council, No. 135, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bridesburg; of Washington Camp, No. 180, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Mountain Top; of Washington Camp, No. 401, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia; of Washington Camp, No. 586, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Olanta; of Black Knight Commandery, No. 100, Ancient and Illustrious Order Knights of Malta, of Easton; of Washington Camp, No. 182, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Herndon; and of West Scranton Council, No. 497, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Federation of Young People's Societies of Allegheny County; of the congregations of the Hebron Lutheran Church, of Blairsville; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Shickshinny; and the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilkes-Barre, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Belsano, York, and Wilkes-Barre; of Local Union No. 260, Bartenders' League, of Braddock; of the Central Labor Union of Erie; and of Local Union No. 108, Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union of York, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THORNTON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., and a memorial of Local Union No. 738, Bartenders' League, of Baton Rouge, La., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Eau Claire, Tomah, Appleton, Fond du Lac, Bangor, Oshkosh, Milwaukee, and Menasha, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Council of Grain Exchanges, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate dealing in farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New London, Grand Rapids, Danbury, Oxford, and Neenah, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wausau, Wis., praying that an appropriation be made annually for the construction of two new battleships, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Milton, Wis., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of John McDermott Post, No. 101, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, and of the Women's Relief Corps of John McDermott Post, No. 101, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Scandinavian Grand Lodge of Connecticut, Independent Order of Good Templars, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wallingford and Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gardner and Hubbardston, and of the congregation of the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church of Lowell, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Bartenders' Local Union No. 84, of Taunton, and of sundry citizens of Taunton, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Keystone Club, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Richmond, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of sundry citizens of Moorhead and Glyndon, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1566, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and a petition of Eldbridge Center Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Eldbridge, Mich., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of the South Side Methodist Protestant Mission; of the United Brethren Church; of the First Baptist Church; and of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Methodist Protestant Church, all of Adrian, in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Michael P. Smith, of Jackson, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Bethel Council No 10, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bethel, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Local Branch, Connecticut Federation of Labor, of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED. For my colleague [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Chamber on account of illness, I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Missouri, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Claims.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
STATE OF MISSOURI,
*City of Jefferson, March 10, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Herewith I inclose you certified copy of the resolution passed by the house of representatives in reference to the adjustment of claims of citizens for services rendered and supplies furnished during the Civil War.

Trusting the same will have, as I know it will, your every consideration, I am,

Very truly, yours,

ELLIOTT W. MAJOR,
*Governor.*

Whereas the State of Missouri, in order to adjust the claim of its citizens for services rendered and supplies furnished in aid of the National Government during the Civil War, did, in 1874, appoint commissioners to adjust such claims; and

Whereas said commissioners, after due hearing, did so adjust such claims and accept and receive from the claimants their vouchers and other proof, issuing in exchange therefor certificates, and did thereupon deposit with the United States Treasury Department, in Washington, all of said vouchers and proof, where they now remain; and

Whereas such vouchers and proof have never been examined or reported thereon by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives of the State in Congress assembled be requested to urge the passage of such legislation in Congress as will cause the examination of said vouchers and proof and the determination of the validity and justice of said claims, and the amount due thereon, and to whom due.

I, Omar D. Gray, chief clerk of the house of representatives, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced into the house of representatives February 17, 1913, by Representative Towson, of Shelby County, and which was read and adopted.

OMAR D. GRAY,
*Chief Clerk.*

Attest:

NETTIE AUSTIN,
*Secretary to Chief Clerk.*

Mr. REED (for Mr. STONE) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Weston, Kansas City, Joplin, De Soto, St. Louis, and Edgerton, and of Local Union No. 343, Bartenders' League, of De Soto, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Carthage, Clinton, St. Louis, and Utica, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Paris, St. Louis, Joplin, and Cape Girardeau, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Common Council, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for Government control of telegraph and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Political Equality League, of Springfield, Mo., praying for adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to grant the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Post Office Clerks' Association, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to post-office employees incapacitated in line of duty, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 57, International Association of Machinists, of Moberly, Mo., praying for an investigation of the Illinois Central Railroad and the Harriman lines' strike, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the board of directors of the Bank of Sparta, of Sparta, Mo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the income-tax law to provide a method of information at the source, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for Federal inspection of grain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented petitions of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of St. Louis; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fornfelt; and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation to pay longevity or overtime pay earned by Panama Canal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented petitions of the Board of Trade, the Association of Credit Men, and the Implement Vehicle & Hardware Co., all of Kansas City, in the State of Missouri, praying that an appropriation be made for the prevention and control of floods, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Poplar Bluff, Mo., praying that an annual appropriation be made for the construction of two new battleships, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a memorial of the Council of Grain Exchanges, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate dealing in farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Business Men's League, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of legislative reference and bill drafting, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bland, Linn Creek, and Arrow Rock, and of Business Men's League of Carthage, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the roads of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Lumbermen's Club of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for a continuance of the Commerce Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Doniphan, Mo., praying that an appropriation be

made for a survey of the Current River, Mo., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the Hannibal Club, of Hannibal, Mo., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of homes for representatives of the United States in foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented a petition of the house of delegates of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers, and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. STONE) presented petitions of the Missouri Bankers' Association, of Sedalia; of the United Commercial Travelers, of Carthage; of the Boosters' Club, of Sedalia; and of the Shoe Manufacturers and Jobbers' Association of St. Louis, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submit two telegrams in reference to the Mexican situation, which I ask to have read at the desk.

There being no objection, the telegrams were read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

ROCKPORT, TEX., *March 11, 1914.*

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Fully nine-tenths of the people of Texas approve the policy of the Wilson administration with Mexico without qualification. Most of the few who want intervention by the United States are influenced by desire for office or for pecuniary considerations or for prospective pensions.

JNO. H. TRAYLOR.

[Telegram.]

TYLER, TEX., *March 11, 1914.*

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Everyone here is with you.

HAMPSON GARY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I observe in the first telegram read that certain men in Texas are charged with desiring pensions. They want a war with Mexico, so that they can get wounded, I suppose. I think that is a most extraordinary statement.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. KERN. I present two telegrams relating to the bill for the Federal inspection of grain, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *February 24, 1914.*

Senator JOHN W. KERN,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Understand McCumber's bill for Federal inspection of grain likely to come up any day. The grain trade of this State is opposed to Federal inspection. We are working with Department of Agriculture for standardization of grades and Federal supervision of inspection, thus giving relief sought by MCCUMBER and avoiding dual and cumbersome inspection and delays in transportation. We hope the matter can be worked out in orderly, intelligent manner in connection with Department of Agriculture under proper supervision.

INDIANA GRAIN DEALERS' ASSOCIATION.

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *February 24, 1914.*

Hon. JOHN W. KERN,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We are informed McCumber Senate bill 120, Federal inspection of grain, likely come to a vote soon in Senate. The Indianapolis Board of Trade is pledged to adopt grain standards as promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, and is in favor and is now asking the Secretary of Agriculture to assist in passing a law creating a bureau in that department to supervise the inspection of grain in all markets in some such manner as national banks and railway transit bureaus are supervised. We are opposed to Federal inspection, because it would create a cumbersome and expensive system of dual inspection of State and interstate grain.

WILLIAM H. HOWARD, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WORKS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 122) authorizing the State of California to select public lands in lieu of certain lands granted to it in Imperial County, Cal., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 327) thereon.

Mr. RANSDELL, from the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, to which was referred the bill (S. 2616) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 328) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of Bolognesi, Hartfield & Co., to report it adversely, and I submit a report (No. 330) thereon. I ask that the bill may be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4449) for the relief of Frank Austin and others, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 329) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3800) making an appropriation for aids to navigation in Alaska, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 331) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 531) to set apart certain lands in the State of Oregon as a public park, to be known as the Saddle Mountain National Park, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 332) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4938) providing for the issuance of patents to transferees of town lots purchased from the United States at public sale in certain cases, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 333) thereon.

CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST RESERVE.

Mr. BRADY. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 1739) to reserve certain lands and incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve, and I submit a report (No. 326) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following-described lands, to wit, the east half of section 23 and all of sections 26 and 35, township 11 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian; also sections 1 and 2, east half of section 10, sections 11 to 14, inclusive, east half of section 15, east half of section 22, sections 23 to 26, inclusive, east half of section 27, and sections 31 to 36, inclusive, township 12 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian; also sections 1 to 5, inclusive, north half of section 10, north half of section 11, and north half of section 12, township 13 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian, be, and the same are hereby, reserved and withdrawn from entry and made a part of and included in the Caribou National Forest Reserve.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, to which I presume this bill was referred, to make an explanation of it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The bill was not referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. THOMAS. What committee reports the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I can say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], as I introduced the bill and am somewhat familiar with it, that it has for its purpose the inclusion in the national forests of some Government lands in the immediate vicinity of a city of our State. It is for the purpose of protecting the watershed of the city.

Mr. LANE. What is the name of the city to which the Senator from Idaho refers?

Mr. BORAH. Montpelier.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator from Idaho state how many acres are included in this reservation—I mean under the act proposing to increase the reservation, if there is an increase?

Mr. BORAH. About 3,000 acres, I believe; but the Senator from Colorado must understand that this is solely for the purpose of protecting the watershed of the city of Montpelier. It is a matter which has been very thoroughly investigated, and I would not be the author of a bill here to include lands in a forest reserve for any other purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator think it would be better to convey the land to the city for that purpose, rather than to include it in the forest reserve?

Mr. BORAH. That, in my judgment, would be an impossibility. I do not think we could put through such a bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator reporting the bill if there has been a report on it from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BRADY. There has been. The favorable report on the bill is unanimous from the committee, and there is also a report from the Agricultural Department from the Assistant Secretary, B. T. Galloway.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to object to the bill, because I think in principle it is right. I think that where a watershed needs protection the land ought to be deeded outright to the city; and I think such a bill can be passed in this body and in the other House, for such a bill has been passed; but I do believe that this bill ought to have been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, because it is a proposition to take public lands and put them into a forest reserve.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill going to the Committee on Public Lands. There is no need of delaying this matter any longer.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not asking that the bill go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BORAH. Then I trust the Senator will not suggest that the bill should have gone there.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not understand what the Senator from Idaho said.

Mr. BORAH. This bill has been delayed for the last year, and there is no need for delaying it any longer. It ought either to be defeated or to be passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know to what the Senator from Idaho has reference. I simply said that I was not going to object to the passage of the bill; but I did say, and I repeat it, that the bill originally ought to have gone to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GRONNA. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the committee considered this bill and considered the report made by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Galloway. Inasmuch as the bill simply proposes to include certain land within a forest reserve, which is under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department, we thought that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had jurisdiction. Therefore I believe it had full authority to consider and report on the measure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether this bill has been petitioned for or has been introduced at the request of the city council of the city?

Mr. BORAH. It has been petitioned for by the mayor and citizens and indorsed by the council. The question has been agitated there for the last year and a half or two years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the bill.

Mr. BRADY. There is no question but that the passage of this bill will be of material benefit to the citizens of Montpelier in the protection of their water supply.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I feel that the citizens of a State ought to have control of these matters, and if they ask for such a measure it seems to me it ought to be granted them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will not oppose this bill, for the reason that both Senators from Idaho ask for its passage; but I do not want, by not opposing it, to be considered as acquiescing in the proposition that because a forest reserve is under the control of the Agricultural Department, therefore the Committee on Public Lands should not consider, pass upon, and report upon bills of this character.

It is quite true that the Forestry Service is within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, but it never ought to have been there; and it would be a good piece of business, irrespective of the fact that the public lands should be under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department as to the Forestry Service as well as to other matters, if some such legislation could be effected at this session of Congress that would transfer the Forestry Service to the Interior Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, before the word "half," it is proposed to strike out "east" and insert "west."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### LAND IN PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4172) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 335) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It has passed the Senate, and has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Public Lands. It is intended to remove a cloud on the title of property in Pensacola, which has been in adverse possession of private owners for over 20 years. I should like to have the matter disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent remising, releasing, and quitclaiming forever all right, title, claim, and interest of the United States of America in and to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, in the county of Escambia and the State of Florida, to such person or persons, firms or corporations, as shall make proof that he himself, or he and his grantor or grantors, has had continuous possession thereof under claim of ownership during the last 20 years next before the passage of this act. Such patent, however, shall be subject to any public easement or other adverse right suffered or granted by the patentee or his grantors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, in the State of Florida."

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 4173) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 334) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, this bill is precisely of the same nature as the bill just passed, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent remising, releasing, and quitclaiming forever all right, title, claim, and interest of the United States of America in and to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, in the county of Escambia and the State of Florida, to such person or persons, firms or corporations, as shall make proof that he himself, or he and his grantor or grantors, has had continuous possession thereof under claim of ownership during the last 20 years next before the passage of this act. Such patent, however, shall be subject to any public easement or other adverse right suffered or granted by the patentee or his grantors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla."

### THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND NATIONAL QUARANTINE.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate resolution 282, which authorizes the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine to hold hearings on Senate bill 4573, to encourage rural sanitation, with special reference to the prevention and suppression of malaria and typhoid fever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine be, and it is hereby, authorized to send for papers and persons, administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the consideration of S. 4573, to encourage rural sanitation, with special reference to the prevention and suppression of malaria and typhoid fever; to have its hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, has this resolution been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. RANSDELL. It has been referred to that committee and was reported by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the 6th instant.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, to what bill reference is made in the resolution? I do not remember it from the number.

Mr. RANSDELL. Senate bill 4573 is a bill to promote rural sanitation, with special reference to the prevention of typhoid fever and malaria. It is the bill on which several hearings were held some days ago.

Mr. WORKS. I understood the hearings on that subject had been practically closed.

Mr. RANSDELL. The hearings have been closed, but they have not as yet been published. We proceeded to hold the hearings really without authority.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the law the committee has the right to have published 1,000 copies of the hearings; but I suppose what the Senator desires to arrive at is an authorization to pay for the reporting of the hearings?

Mr. RANSDELL. That is exactly what I desire.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all the resolution includes?

Mr. RANSDELL. That is included in the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONVICT-MADE GOODS.

Mr. HUGHES. I move that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1933) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That course is entirely agreeable to the committee. I understand that a similar bill is before another committee and that it was unnecessary really to send this bill to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what committee does the Senator from New Jersey desire to have the bill referred?

Mr. HUGHES. I ask that it may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 4869) granting an increase of pension to Camwells P. Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4870) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 4871) to increase the limit of cost of site and public building at Red Bluff, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THORNTON:

A bill (S. 4872) to prohibit the taking or catching of commercial sponges in the Gulf of Mexico or the Straits of Florida; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. BRYAN:

A bill (S. 4873) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Charles Morgan, sr., deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4874) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to prepare and establish a single uniform classification of freight, with its rate schedule, and to prescribe rules for the ascertainment and apportionment of freight operating expenses; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 4875) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to exchange rights of way in connection with lands pertaining to the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 4876) to amend section 41 of the national-bank act, being renumbered as section 5144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4877) granting an increase of pension to Egbert Dart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4878) granting an increase of pension to Moses A. Sisco (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 4879) to increase the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4880) authorizing Ponca City, Okla., and the board of education of said city to convey certain lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4881) to create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the University of the United States.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) authorizing the printing of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) authorizing the printing of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JONES (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res 126) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,500 for the erection of a gymnasium and manual training building and equipment at the Indian school at Mount Pleasant, Mich., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 298) as follows:

Whereas there was published in the morning papers what purported to be a London cable to the New York American, giving an account of the annual dinner of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, in London, in which Hon. Walter Hines Page, the American ambassador to Great Britain, is reported to have said, "The Monroe doctrine simply meant this: That the United States would prefer that no European Governments should gain more land in the New World"; and

Whereas it is further stated that, amid laughter, Mr. Page declared that he would not say that the United States had constructed the Panama Canal for Great Britain, but that it had added greatly to the pleasure of building that great work to know that the British would profit most by its use: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be requested to procure and furnish to the Senate, without delay, a copy of the speech made by the American ambassador, and particularly that part thereof giving his definition of the Monroe doctrine, and that portion thereof in which he is alleged to have stated amid great laughter that the British would profit most by the use of the Panama Canal, and that he call upon the American ambassador to furnish forthwith for the use of the Senate the evidence upon which that portion of his speech was based wherein he is alleged to have said that it added greatly to the pleasure of the people of the United States in the building of the Panama Canal to know that the British would profit most by its use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

SOIL SURVEY OF YORKTOWN AREA, VIRGINIA.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 294), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That 1,300 copies of the Soil Survey of the Yorktown Area, Virginia, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

CLAIM OF HALL-GARRISON & CO.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 295), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the United States be, and hereby is, directed to immediately transmit to the Senate all documents on file in his office or in or under his possession relating to the claim of Hall-Garrison & Co. against the Republic of Nicaragua.

DISCONTINUANCE OF STAR ROUTES.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General be directed to furnish to the Senate detailed information as to how many and what star routes have been discontinued during the present fiscal year; what curtailment has been made in the service; and what, if any, discontinuance or curtailment has been determined upon for the ensuing fiscal year.

LUCY B. KASSON.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 297), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Lucy B. Kasson, widow of H. A. Kasson, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, the said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee and that said stenographer be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PAINT CREEK DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 300), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of the report (No. 321) of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on the investigation of the conditions in the Paint Creek coal fields of West Virginia.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 301), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That Senate Document No. 603, Sixty-first Congress, the code of the people's rule; Senate Document No. 624, Sixty-first Congress, representative government; Senate Document No. 556, Sixty-second Congress, initiative and referendum; Senate Document No. 302, Sixty-second Congress, initiative, referendum, and recall; Senate Document No. 521, Sixtieth Congress, memorial of State Referendum League of Maine, concerning initiative and referendum; Senate Document No. 529, Sixtieth Congress, supplemental memorial of Initiative and Referendum League of America, relative to national initiative and referendum; and Senate Document No. 516, Sixtieth Congress, memorial of Initiative and Referendum League of America, relative to a national initiative and referendum, be printed for the use of the Senate.

ADDRESSES BEFORE THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS.

Mr. FLETCHER. At the fourth annual convention of the Southern Commercial Congress, at Nashville, a number of addresses were delivered at a session which was arranged as a memorial to the late Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, formerly in charge of the farmers' cooperative demonstration work in the Department of Agriculture. In view of the achievements of Dr. Knapp, the great public interest in his work, and the great benefits derived from it, I desire to have those addresses printed as a public document, and I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have a brief but very carefully prepared statement by Mr. N. C. Richards, of North Yakima, Wash., a gentleman with whom I am very well acquainted, setting out reasons why cooperative organizations composed solely of growers of agricultural and horticultural products which are not formed for profit should be exempt from legislation looking to the control of combinations in restraint of trade. I ask that the statement may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I understand will have jurisdiction over legislation of that character.

There being no objection, the paper was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the live issues of the day is the reduction of the high cost of living, and it is the avowed policy of the present administration to endeavor to reduce the cost of the necessities of life to the consuming masses. To this end the tariff bill recently passed removed or greatly reduced the tariff on all agricultural products.

An element that enters into the present high prices which consumers of food products are paying therefor and is much more responsible for such high prices than the tariff is the cost of distribution. Our producers are only getting on an average 43 per cent of the price which the ultimate consumer pays. Of the remaining 57 per cent, about 5 per cent pays the cost of transportation; the balance is consumed in middlemen's profits and waste in distribution.

The elimination of a part of the expense of distribution of our agricultural products is one of the great problems that confronts us, and its solution is worthy of our best efforts. As has been demonstrated in some of the European countries, one of the most potent factors in accomplishing this result is the bringing together of the producers into cooperative organizations for marketing and distributing farm products. As yet little progress has been made in this direction in this country. It has, however, been demonstrated, both in the United States and abroad, that if the growers can be united in associations so that their products can be marketed in quantity through a common selling and distributing agency a part of the middlemen's profits and of the expense of distribution can be eliminated. Thus better prices can be obtained for the producer and also lower the cost to the consumer.

The movement for the organization of cooperative associations among our farmers is growing. Especially is this true of those engaged in fruit raising. The prosperity of those sections of our country devoted to horticulture seems to be absolutely dependent upon the ability of the growers to develop marketing organizations which will deliver them from the tribute exacted by the commission men. Associations have been formed among the growers of both citrus and deciduous fruits. Many of these associations have no capital stock, and all of them are cooperative nonprofit organizations, composed solely of growers. They are in no sense corporations in restraint of trade, and are not organized to enable anyone to corner any product or article in order to make a profit out of it. Their expenses are paid by a uniform percentage charged on the produce handled. If this amounts to more than the actual cost, the surplus is returned to the growers. These organizations have two fundamental objects—first, to obtain for the producer of agricultural or horticultural products a fair living price for what he grows and avoid having it all taken from him by middlemen; second, to get these products into the hands of the consuming masses at prices which they can afford to pay and thus increase consumption and enlarge the demand. The producers' organizations are always ready to sell at what their produce is fairly worth in the market.

Naturally, the commission men and dealers who have fattened and grown rich at the expense of the farmers are antagonistic to these organizations and use every available means to prevent their growth and to alienate their members. These men will be very quick to seize upon anything which they might use to disrupt the farmers' associations. If any law for the regulation of trusts is so framed that it can be construed to include these associations or furnish a pretext for attack upon them, it will be readily seized upon and used to deter farmers from organizing and to destroy the organizations formed by them for mutual protection.

In framing legislation for the control of combinations in restraint of trade it should be made clear that such legislation is not intended to reach or affect cooperative organizations composed solely of growers of agricultural or horticultural products which are not formed for profit and whose control is always retained in the hands of the farmers. It would not seem that there can be any legitimate objection to this, as it is for the benefit of everyone except the men who have heretofore profited by the helplessness of our agricultural classes, owing to their lack of organization. The laborer, the capitalist, the professional man, the manufacturer, and all our great mass of consumers will be benefited, as the ultimate result of the success of such organizations will be to reduce the price to the consumer.

Many of the European Governments have taken the lead in promoting and fostering cooperation among their agriculturists, with the result that they have not only greatly improved the condition of the tillers of the soil but have materially added to the general prosperity of all their people.

Any bill passed for the regulation of combinations in restraint of trade should contain an exception in favor of farmers' cooperative organizations, about as follows:

"The provisions of this act shall not apply to or be construed to include cooperative associations or organizations which are not formed for profit and in which only producers of agricultural or horticultural products can become members or stockholders."

Mr. JONES. I have been informed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that a bill relating to the subject matter of the paper is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. That being the case, I should like to have the paper referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I had supposed that the proposed legislation was before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that change of reference will be made.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask to have read the editorial which I send to the desk with reference to the suffrage question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the News, Indianapolis, Ind., March 7, 1914.]

A DIFFICULT SITUATION.

Senator ASHURST, of Arizona, is fairly entitled to the sympathy of the public. The distinguished statesman has been working hard to get a vote of the Senate—and a favorable one—on the woman-suffrage amendment. Yet yesterday he received a telegram from Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, one of the suffrage leaders, in which she said: "If you allow the suffrage amendment to go to vote now, I shall consider you to be false to our interests and shall not hesitate to make that fact known in important places." We do not know what the poor man is to do. Doubtless he does not know himself. Mrs. Belmont represents the Congressional Union, which is said to have "unlimited financial resources."

On the other hand, Mrs. Medill McCormick, of the National American Woman Suffrage Association—to which the Congressional Union does not belong—asks for a vote on the amendment. "The national board," Mrs. McCormick says, "is standing firmly by the Woman Suffrage Committee of the Senate in its effort to secure this vote." Mrs. Belmont, we are assured, "holds no office in the National American Woman Suffrage Association and can not speak for its 400,000 members." As Mr. Dooley says, "There ye are."

Quite as interesting is Mrs. Belmont's characterization of the Woman Suffrage Association. That, as we have seen, desires an immediate vote, and Mrs. McCormick is urging it. Yet Mrs. Belmont, of the Congressional Union, says to Senator ASHURST:

"Those who have asked you to push amendment to vote are not genuinely interested in its immediate success. They are progressives and are using you. Beware of their advice. We expect you to represent us—not them."

The charge is that the Woman Suffrage Association does not want the "immediate success" of the amendment, but that it is playing politics in the interest of the Progressive Party. The embattled ladies have certainly made things very unpleasant for Senator ASHURST. He can not admit the claim of one of them to represent the movement without discrediting the other, and that is something that no gentleman would care to do. So we say that the Senator is entitled to the sympathy of the public.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KERN. I desire to call up the resolution I submitted a few days ago, and of which I gave notice, proposing an amendment to Rule XXV of the Senate, with a view to its reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 293) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That so much of Rule XXV of the Senate as relates to the membership of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard be amended to read as follows:

"A Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators.

"A Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, to consist of 9 Senators."

Mr. KERN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 9, 1914:

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property.

On March 12, 1914:

S. 48. An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 10735. An act to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

COAST GUARD.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 2337. It is a bill to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service. In making the request I wish to say that this bill has passed the Senate twice in substantially this form, and that it now comes here with the unanimous report of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator if there is any need for the immediate consideration of the bill. We have an appropriation bill here that we want to get rid of before 2 o'clock, if possible.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that the consideration of this bill will take but a very few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the bill has not been read, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is just laying the bill before the Senate. It will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 3, line 2, after the word "division," to insert "one from each service to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury," and in line 7, after the word "guard," to strike out "abolishing such clerical positions as may not be needed," so as to read:

There shall be in the administrative service of the coast guard two chiefs of division, one from each service to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with annual salary of $3,000 each, together with such clerical and technical positions and the incumbents therein as it may be necessary to transfer from the two existing organizations to the coast guard. There may be such other clerical and technical assistance as may from time to time be authorized by Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 4, line 6, after the word "allowance," to strike out "for the present offices and their incumbents" and insert "in the present Life-Saving Service and the present Revenue-Cutter Service," and on line 10, after the word "successors," to insert "This shall include all laws and regulations which now give to the enlisted men of the existing Revenue-Cutter Service increased pay of $1 per month for each three years' service, allowances for uniforms, and all other allowances or gratuities due to enlisted men, which are hereby made applicable to the enlisted men of the coast guard, who were formerly surfmen in the Life-Saving Service," so as to make the paragraph read:

SEC. 3. That all existing laws affecting pay and allowance in the present Life-Saving Service and the present Revenue-Cutter Service shall apply to the corresponding positions in the coast guard and the officers and men transferred thereto and their successors. This shall include all laws and regulations which now give to the enlisted men of the existing Revenue-Cutter Service increased pay of $1 per month for each three years' service, allowances for uniforms, and all other allowances or gratuities due to enlisted men, which are hereby made applicable to the enlisted men of the coast guard who were formerly surfmen in the Life-Saving Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 4, line 17, after the word "sections," to insert "three"; in line 18, after the word "seven," to insert "eight"; in line 24, after the word "be," to strike out "placed on waiting orders" and insert "retired from active service"; and on page 5, line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "pay and allowance" and insert "duty pay, salary and increase," so as to read:

The provisions of sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the act of April 12, 1902, providing for the retirement of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, are hereby extended to include commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the coast guard. A commissioned officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man who has served 30 years may, upon suitable application, be retired from active service and receive 75 per cent of the duty pay, salary and increase of his grade or rating.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 6, line 7, after the word "keeper," to insert: "*Provided*, That the district superintendents shall be the chief officers and first in authority in their respective districts"; in line 10, before the words "the organization," to strike out "As soon as" and insert "When"; and in the same line, after the word "guard," to strike out "is completed" and insert "shall have been perfected," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That hereafter whenever a vacancy occurs in the grade of keeper of a life-saving station or house of refuge it shall be filled by promotion and appointment from the grade of surfman, and whenever a vacancy shall occur in the grade of district superintendent the vacancy shall be filled by promotion and appointment from the grade of keeper: *Provided*, That the district superintendents shall be the chief officers and first in authority in their respective districts.

When the organization of the coast guard shall have been perfected the President is authorized to retire the general superintendent on 75 per cent of his present salary, and no further appointment shall be made to such office. At the same time the office of assistant general superintendent shall be abolished.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, to strike out all of section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That this act shall become effective on the first day of the fourth month next following the date of its passage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 25, after the word "Sec.," to strike out "7" and insert "6."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 5th instant was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the resolution is to lie over without prejudice until called up by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the resolution be still further laid over. The bill, as I understand, is now before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I am quite willing that it shall have all needful time for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator any objection to the resolution going to the calendar or to the table?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think not. I can bring up the resolution at any time. I do not care to have it called up every day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the Table Calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10523, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, beginning on page 14, line 13.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Free Public Library, including Takoma Park Branch, on page 15, line 3, before the word "janitors," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 5, after the word "engineer," to strike out "$1,080" and insert "$1,200"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "$46,640" and insert "$46,740" so as to read:

Ten pages, at $360 each; three janitors, at $480 each, one of whom shall act as night watchman; janitor of Takoma Park Branch, $360; engineer, $1,200; fireman, $720; workman, $600; library guard, $720; two cloakroom attendants, at $360 each; six charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $46,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to insert:

For purchase and installation of 80-horsepower auxiliary boiler, $2,500.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire from the chairman of the committee what exigency exists for that additional appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that it was represented to us that the boiler they now have is very old, about 11 years old, and it is liable to get out of order at any time. Even if it were in order, it is thought by the committee that there ought to be an auxiliary boiler to take the place of the other when it is out of use. We investigated the matter thoroughly, and we believe this boiler is absolutely necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 16, line 5, after the words "In all," to strike out "$21,000" and insert "$23,500," so as to read:

In all, $23,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 17, line 11, before the word "herein," to strike out "one additional motor vehicle" and insert "two additional motor vehicles," so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance, care, and repair of automobiles, motor cycles, and motor trucks, acquired for the government of the District of Columbia, that are not otherwise herein provided for, including such personal services in connection therewith not otherwise herein authorized, as the commissioners shall in writing specially order, and for the purchase of two additional motor vehicles herein specified; namely,

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it appears from this bill that 11 automobiles are now provided for the use of the District and its officials, and the House has provided one additional motor vehicle. This amendment is designed to provide still another. I should like to inquire whether there is any need for this extra automobile? It would seem to me that with 13 automobiles for the use of the officials of the District we are providing for them very liberally at public expense.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that the number "13" probably does not cut any figure in this appropriation. The object is that each member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have an automobile. We feel, after investigation, that it is necessary for each of them to have one. Two of them have automobiles already; and this is to give the third man equal facilities with the other two.

Mr. THOMAS. I quite agree that there should not be any discrimination between the commissioners; but why should any of them have automobiles?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. One of them has had an automobile all along. They believe that in order to attend to the business of the District it is absolutely necessary they should have automobiles. They go all over the District to look after the business of the District.

Mr. THOMAS. Upon the theory that at least one of them should be at headquarters all the time, I should think there would be enough automobiles to go around, the other two being engaged in the use of them. I object to the amendment, and hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Does this involve an expenditure for the employment of a chauffeur?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, of course. The automobile will not run itself.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to know about it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I assume it will.

Mr. THOMAS. How much is the appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is included in the item further on. I do not remember what it is.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator know what character of automobile it is proposed to get?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It will cost $2,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will suggest that each one of the civilian commissioners now has a horse and carriage, and those will be dispensed with. The House bill provides one automobile for the two civilian commissioners. They could not well do their work under that arrangement. They have to go all over the District almost every day to look at the streets, the proposed improvements, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator a question: If the commissioners as a body had one machine for that purpose, would they not be able to do all the visiting of the streets they wanted to, but would they not have to dispense with the use of it for private purposes?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course there is a provision in every appropriation bill denying them the right to use these vehicles for other than official business. Whether they do that or not, I can not say. I am afraid in the past that was done to some extent.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the rule is honored more in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think likely so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then is not the proper thing for us to do, instead of increasing this number to cut it down, and give the commissioners one machine to use for official purposes and nothing else?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I said, a provision in the bill requires that they shall use these vehicles only for official purposes. All the committee knew about this matter was the statement made by the commissioners, the chairman of the commission saying:

I have found since I have been commissioner that it has been absolutely impossible for me to get over the District of Columbia as we ought and find out what the District government is doing and how it is doing, and to observe the conditions that need attention. Each civilian commissioner is supplied with a horse and vehicle, but it is impossible to cover the District with a horse and vehicle. It simply can not be done.

This is a large municipality, 7 or 8 miles square, and improvements are going on constantly. I think we ought to supply the commissioners with whatever transportation they actually need.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In regard to the chauffeur, the matter about which the Senator from Colorado inquired, I will say that there would be very little difference between the expense of the chauffeur and what it costs to keep the horse and keep up the vehicle.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that on page 18, line 18, the word "six" is stricken out by the committee and the word "three" substituted therefor. I will read the proviso:

That all motor vehicles and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the government of the District of Columbia shall be of uniform color and have painted conspicuously thereon, in letters not less than 3 inches high and markedly contrasting in color with the body color of the motor vehicle, the words "District of Columbia."

I should like to inquire why this sign is diminished in size by 50 per cent, unless it be to enable the gentlemen to use these machines for private and pleasure purposes. The sign will be much less conspicuous if the letters are only 3 inches high.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There was no such intention on the part of the committee. If the Senator prefers to have the letters 6 inches high, we have no objection to their being made 6 inches high.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me obvious that this is a case of economy. It costs less to paint a 3-inch letter than it does to paint a 6-inch letter.

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to say that if it is designed for that purpose, perhaps it is an evidence of economy; but, Mr. President, the proviso just preceding the one I read is to the effect that—

No automobile shall be acquired hereunder, by purchase or exchange, at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding $2,000 for one seating more than two persons or $1,000 for one seating not more than two persons.

We know that a good automobile seating two persons can be obtained for very much less than that sum. It seems to provide for the most expensive sort of vehicle for these gentlemen. We are not only going to give them one machine, but the best

machine one can buy. It appears to me that this is a matter which ought to receive serious consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a question of economy whether a lower-priced machine is cheaper in the end than a higher-priced one. That is a question which I am not able to determine. I take it for granted that more people think that a good machine at a fair price is cheaper than a common machine at a low price. In my own personal use, in considering the question of economy, I would think that a good machine is cheaper than a common machine, and I do not see why the representatives of the Government should not be able to exercise their judgment in buying what is probably the cheapest in the end. Of course it costs less money in the beginning, but in the end a more expensive machine is cheaper than one at a lower price.

Mr. THOMAS. I quite agree that in many instances the highest-priced article is the most economic, but I have a little knowledge upon this subject. I believe that a machine seating more than two persons can be acquired for very much less than $2,000, a first-class machine, and one seating not more than two persons I know can be acquired for $500. My objection goes not so much to the cost as to the two additional motor vehicles which I do not think ought to be provided for.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill just what the provision means. In line 15, page 17, the committee propose to strike out 12 machines and insert 13 machines. Does that mean that they have 12?

Mr. THOMAS. They already have 11.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Twelve were provided by the House and now we are making the number 13.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The House gave 12 and we provided for an additional one, so that each commissioner should have a machine. That is the whole matter in a nutshell.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask further, is it supposed that the three commissioners are going to be out of their offices separately all the time, and that therefore each one needs a machine all the time to attend to his official duties out of his office?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we accepted the representations of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They reported to us that these machines are actually necessary to properly conduct their business, and they made the impression upon us that their statement is true. Therefore we reported the provision for an additional machine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, while we are upon this subject I want to say a few words about the automobile business generally. I do not believe in the Government of the United States giving public officials, except in very exceptional cases, passenger automobiles. These exceptional cases are where very exceptional duties are to be performed. If they are not paid sufficient salaries, we had better pay them sufficiently and be done with it, and then let them hire their own autos when deemed needful by them. If they do not have to pay out of their own pockets, they will think them needed when not.

I see no peculiar reason why a Commissioner of the District of Columbia should not have one if the chiefs of departments and other people are to have them. But I do not believe the Government of the United States ought to give an automobile to any of them, the Speaker of the House, or a member of the Cabinet, or anybody else. I do not see any greater reason why they should be given to them than why they should be given to Senators or Representatives or Supreme Court judges. Some Senators imagine that they can not attend to their business without automobiles, but they buy the automobiles and attend to their business in them. As to myself, being a good deal of a democrat, I find that I can get along with the street cars about as well as any automobile, somewhat more rapidly, in fact, as a rule, if you count the time that it takes to get the auto from the garage and at your service.

Here are 13 automobiles for the service of the District of Columbia, paid for in part by a good many rather poor people in the District, some of them costing $2,000 and some of them costing $1,000, "then there are some"—18 more. While we are talking about economy I do not know of anything better to begin economy on than automobiles. They are used very largely by the officials, who have them for social purposes. We all know that. They are perhaps more largely used for social than for official business. They are put at the behest of guests and other people by the officials as well as used for themselves and for their families.

Now, if it be true that there be an official who absolutely needs an automobile in order to attend to his business, and that he must have it, and that he is paid such a small salary that he can not have it, and therefore must without it neglect his business, we ought to increase the salary sufficiently to give interest upon the automobile and make allowance for the wear and tear of the vehicle until it is worn out, and then force him to perform his duty, even if he has to buy an automobile or hire a taxicab from time to time to do it. In this very bill we are increasing the salaries of the commissioners, I believe, by a thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It has not been done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know it has not been done, but the bill proposes to do it. It has been passed over; but it will be done, and it ought to be done. Their salaries ought to be increased. I am in favor of paying every man a fair wage for a fair day's or month's or year's work, considering the character of the work and the character and preparation necessary to fit the man for the work before he undertook the duty. I am in favor of erring rather upon the side of liberality than of being skinflinty about it; but I do not believe in the theory that so many people have, or seem to have—Senators have it, too—that the minute a man gets an office you must somehow furnish him, together with the salary of the office, as perquisites everything necessary for him to have to attend to the duties of the office. Some people go so far as to think we ought to furnish them with something outside of plain water to drink, if they prefer other sorts of water, or typewriters, as well as the secretaries to run them. Some have thought we ought to furnish free baths and bath attendants. They go so far as to think we ought to furnish them with whatever is needed in attendance to their public duties.

They take the office; they take the office willingly; generally they are anxious to have it; and it does not follow that everything which is incidental to one's attention to public duty should be paid for by the public, even down to transportation from and to the office. The salary is intended to cover all that.

Pro forma, at any rate, and as a beginning, I am going to move to strike out all of the language of the bill beginning with line 5, on page 17, and ending with and including the language in line 20, page 18. That will carry with it the entire appropriation for the maintenance and purchase of passenger automobiles for the District of Columbia. Then, when we increase the salaries of the commissioners $1,000 additional—if that is not thought sufficient, an amendment may be moved to make it more—we will pay them sufficient to enable them to purchase automobiles and to give them a sinking fund, and the wear and tear upon them, and interest upon the investment.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, if the Senator will permit me, there are only three commissioners, and it was a question as to the officials who have in the performance of their duties to traverse this District constantly, such as the building inspectors, the health inspectors, would the Senator deprive those officials, without increasing their salaries, of means of transportation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I undoubtedly would. The street car service of Washington is splendid, and there is no reason why merely because a man is an official he should disdain the common chariot of the common people. I ride in it here, and so does the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We find it amply sufficient. There is hardly a part of Washington that is not reached by a street car if you walk three or four or five squares at the end of the trip—at the getting-off place.

Mr. GALLINGER. But these officials——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will answer further that it is the abuse of the thing. It grows and waxes by what it feeds on, to wit, itself; and the more of them you furnish the more of them you are going to have to furnish. Every petty official will tell you, if you leave it to him, that he needs an automobile in his business.

Now, there might be some exceptions in the fire and police and health departments, and perhaps some of the more delicate inspectorships, where celerity of movement is absolutely necessary at times; but these can be provided for in a more deliberate manner later, after consideration by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the way, I may say that the abuse anent automobiles in the District of Columbia is nothing compared to what it is in some of these departments.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator if his motion prevails, it would strike out the motor trucks and everything of that character which are included in it.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to call attention to that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is conceded now that it is cheaper to use motor trucks and vehicles of that kind than it is to use horses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are 13 of these automobiles.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But the motion would include all of the motors pertaining to the service of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's motion would strike out motor trucks. They could not carry building material, electrical materials, and things for the parks on the street cars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to strike out motor trucks.

Mr. LODGE. That is included in the Senator's motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to modify my amendment so as to strike out all of the language I have designated, except the language in lines 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, on page 17. Those lines seem to include all of the motor trucks. I want to change my amendment by moving to strike out, beginning on line 13, page 17, instead of line 5, down to and including line 20, on page 18, except lines 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, on page 17.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that the order was that committee amendments should first be considered. The Senator, I think, ought to take a little time to digest this matter, because the very provision the Senator proposes to strike out involves the care and maintenance of motor trucks. I would suggest that the Senator withhold his amendment until the committee amendment is disposed of and later on offer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire is a good one. I had momentarily lost sight of the unanimous-consent agreement to consider committee amendments first. We could not consider this even if I wanted to now. I give notice that I shall make the motion in proper form later.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, in the interest of the motion of the Senator from Mississippi, we will first beat the committee amendment which undertakes to enlarge the number to 13.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we are going to have 11, I would as soon have 13. The principle is what I am after.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator does not understand me. What I mean is that we ought not now to add this one, but take the first step to beat it, and as soon as we have the opportunity let him present his amendment. I hope his amendment will be adopted. I shall vote for the amendment suggested by the Senator from Mississippi to strike out the 12 that the House provided for.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The contingency suggested by the Senator can be met by passing over the matters relating to automobiles.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We can pass it over and later take it up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Frankly, as far as I am concerned, if we are to have 11 I would just as soon vote for 13. It is the principle involved of furnishing public officials with automobiles that I am striking at, not the number. If you are going to furnish one you ought to furnish all of them, I reckon, to be consistent.

Mr. SMOOT. While the Senator from Mississippi is considering this question, I should like to have him take into consideration the horse transportation to be dispensed with. If we strike this out we have to make some kind of an arrangement to take care of what they have to-day in the way of horse transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the Senator a question there. Have we any horse transportation except for wagons to carry stuff? Are there carriages for these people?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That ought to be stricken out. We ought not to furnish any carriages and horses to any of them for their own transportation.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me answer the Senator. The horse transportation that can be dispensed with, as given by the commissioners, is as follows: 10 drivers, 28 horses, and 18 vehicles.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are those horse trucks?

Mr. SMOOT. It simply says vehicles. I can say, however, that for the assistant to the engineer commissioner there are 2 drivers, 2 horses, and 4 vehicles; for the engineer of highways there are 1 driver, 1 horse, and 1 vehicle; for the superintendent of streets, 1 driver, 1 horse, and 1 vehicle. In the sewer department there are 2 drivers, 8 horses, and 4 vehicles. In the water department there are 4 drivers, 16 horses, and 8 vehicles.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask some member of the committee how many of those vehicles are carriages for the transportation of the officials themselves. I want to strike out the provision for them. If any of them are express wagons or truck wagons for the transportation of materials, I do not want to strike that out.

Mr. SMOOT. In the water department, of course, we know what those vehicles are. We see in all parts of the city drivers and men going from one end of the city to the other in light wagons.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are they, as a matter of fact, for the transportation of materials or for the use of the officials?

Mr. SMOOT. Both. I have seen vehicles with material for the repair of water mains, and I have seen employees of the department in the same vehicles going to make repairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no objection to somebody riding in it when it is used for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah that we go a little further in our efforts to stop joy riding and get rid of the vehicles not used for the public service, but for personal pleasure. If the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi should reach some that are necessary for the public service, there will be an opportunity for the conferees when they investigate it to take care of those that are actually required for the public service. I understand the Senator from Mississippi is reaching after those that are used largely for pleasure, and I so cordially agree with him that I hope he will press his motion to amend and that I may have an opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, in regard to this matter we all recognize that this is a day of progress and that in many particulars business can be facilitated by using automobiles rather than horses. The committee in considering the matter took into consideration the number of men who would be employed and the amount of work that could be done by a motor rather than by horses, and in taking a broad view of the whole situation we felt that the work of the District could be conducted as economically and better with motors than with horses. There are many horses that can be dispensed with, and there will be fewer men employed under this arrangement than otherwise.

I would say to the Senator from Georgia, if he feels that these vehicles are being used for personal purposes it would be better, rather than obstruct the business of the District of Columbia, to put a penalty upon their use and thus prevent the use of a vehicle by anybody who might feel disposed to ride in it for personal comfort. We felt that they should have this various equipment for the purpose of conducting the business properly. If there is any fear on the part of any Senator that the vehicles will be used for purposes other than official business, then put a penalty upon such use to prevent it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now the proposition is to give each one of the commissioners an automobile for official purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that these vehicles are used, not only by the commissioners themselves but by people in their employment when the business requires their use.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But there are already a number of others, and the proposition is that each commissioner shall have an automobile for official purposes. It is utterly impossible that three automobiles should be required for the official work of the three commissioners. One would certainly do all the work that they could possibly do requiring the use of an automobile.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the persons who are going to use these automobiles. It is under the head of contingent and miscellaneous expenses, on page 17:

> Automobiles for the offices of the civilian commissioners and the engineer commissioner, including the building-inspection and street-cleaning divisions, surveyor's office, and electrical department.

If the Senator will only stop and think, he will see that it is impossible for the employees in the street-cleaning division to run around on the street cars. It is impossible for the building inspectors to do the same. It is impossible for the water department or the sewer department, or the officers of the District government, called on at any time of day to go to any part of the city, to be without some kind of transportation. This does not mean that they are simply for the commissioners, and I call the Senator's attention to the fact that what we are furnishing them to-day here is 10 drivers, 28 horses, and 18 vehicles. The committee think, and so do the commissioners, that it will save money to the Government of the United States to provide the automobiles instead of these vehicles, just the same as we have done for the Government Printing Office and just the same as we have done for many of the other departments of the Government. If the reports can be relied upon and the statements made to the committee are true, there is not any question that it is cheaper to run the automobiles than it has been in the past to maintain stables, horses, wagons,

drivers, and attendants upon the horses and wagons after the day's work is over. Mr. President, it is for that purpose that this provision is made.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And it will save the cost of the keep of the horses, which is very expensive.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I included that in what I stated. I will say to the Senator that I will take the Government Printing Office as an illustration. The Government Printing Office had stables to maintain, with three or four men there in the nighttime and in the daytime, and they had wagons galore, hauling paper from the depot to the Government Printing Office. They maintained those stables there; and they were not only a nuisance, but they were a constant menace to the Government Printing Office on account of the danger from fire. If the reports are to be relied upon, since the Government has purchased the few motor trucks and automobiles they now use for the carrying of employees from one department to the other, the expense has been decreased rather than increased.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not want my position to be misunderstood. I am emphatically in favor of the substitution of motor trucks for horse vehicles for the transportation of material and for the doing of everything that they can properly do in that way in the Post Office Department, in the Government Printing Office service, and elsewhere. The committee of which I have the honor to be chairman has substituted for horse vehicles in the service of the Senate here, for the delivery of the mail and various other things, motor trucks instead. That is all right; it is all right, because it affords better service and cheaper service; but that is not what I am striking at at all; that is not what I intend to try to accomplish. What I want is to strike at the carriages and the buggies and the automobiles used ostensibly for official purposes by public officials for the transportation of themselves. It seems to me the two things are as unlike as daylight and darkness.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am in full accord with his position. Let me tell the Senator now——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word more.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] said that we could provide that these automobiles be used only for official purposes. We have done that, but it does not do any good.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Is there any penalty attached to the violation of that regulation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; there is no penalty.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, put in a penalty if you think they are going to use them for "joy riding" and for purposes of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You would have to be going around indicting Cabinet officers on the ground that they had done such a thing. I do not think that is practicable. I do not think we would do that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think we ought to assume that these people are going to violate the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not assuming it. There is not a man here who does not know that there are automobiles furnished to public officials for official purposes which are used for other purposes. We all know that. I do not know that that is the case in this particular instance, but we all know that it is done at times.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will suggest to the chairman of the committee that it occurs to me that there is already a penalty in the bill in the form of a provision that there shall be letters painted on the carriage of a different color from the carriage itself. If any official wants to ride in a carriage of that kind for social purposes, he must be rather indifferent to the dignity of the thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How would you or I, if we saw him on the streets, know whether he was going for official, social, personal, or any other purpose?

Mr. GALLINGER. My suggestion was that I did not think any self-respecting official would go for a social purpose in a carriage of that kind with letters painted on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand that this lettering business goes through the entire service. I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire for information, whether the requirement, which is in the bill, for the uniform coloring of the vehicles and painting conspicuously thereon the letters——

Mr. GALLINGER. The letters are to be of a different color, I will suggest to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does that requirement go through the entire automobile service of the Government departments, or is it confined to those included in this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it does apply to the entire Government service by provisions in other bills, that there shall be such lettering.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word. The provision for the transportation of the District officials is more required for business purposes and for the advantage of the conduct of the city business than for any other reason. The officials are all obliged, from the commissioners down through every grade, and in all departments, to constantly travel back and forth here within the city. Take the electrical department, as an illustration. There comes a break in the wires here and there, which must be attended to, and attended to at once. They have to take their tools, and efficient workmen must immediately go to the point where the trouble has occurred. The water department has a break in a pipe, and it is of enormous importance to get there at once to repair it. It is the same with the sewerage system. If there is any justification for furnishing such transportation, in my judgment, it is abundantly justified in the case of these District officials.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator from Indiana will wait a moment before interrupting me.

We give to the Cabinet officers, and I think properly so, horses and carriages to transport them from their homes to their respective offices. Those officers are not obliged to go about the city; they are not obliged by the call of duty to run hither and yon over the whole surface of this District in the public service, and nothing else. We give this transportation to the Public Printer; we give it to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; we give it to other officials; and now it is proposed to take it away from the one class of men who are obliged to be on the move constantly in all parts of the city. It seems to me it is poor economy to take this means of transportation from these city departments. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] calls my attention to the fact that it is a question of time. These officials in this way save half the time they would otherwise lose on the street cars, and it seems to me that this provision is good economy for the District.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. I ask the Senator if the electrical department and the water department are not already provided for?

Mr. LODGE. No; they are all included here.

Mr. KERN. There is no proposition here to abolish or dispose of the automobiles already on hand.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Mr. President——

Mr. KERN. They are already provided with as many automobiles as they need.

Mr. LODGE. The bill includes automobiles for the building-inspection and street-cleaning divisions, the surveyor's office, and the electrical department. Then, of motor cycles, one is provided for the plumbing division, four for the street-cleaning department, and three for the electrical department. Of motor trucks, one is provided for the municipal architect's office, one for the electrical department, and one for the parking commission.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me for a moment, I think I can answer that question, as I heard the commissioners testify on that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Tennessee proceeds, I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the street-cleaning department and the electrical department, to which he refers, are not included in my motion.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator very properly left out motor trucks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say that if I thought this reform would end here I would not be willing to make this distinction; but, I think, if we begin it here we will carry it clear through all the executive departments.

Mr. LODGE. The point I wanted to make was, that if there are any officers of the Government who really require automobiles, not merely for their own official purposes, but for the benefit of the public service as time-saving arrangements, it is the officers who are charged with the conduct of the affairs of the District of Columbia. We provide liberally for automobiles for all the executive departments, for officials whose public

business only requires them to travel to and fro between their houses and their offices; they are not obliged to superintend street repairs or to look after broken water pipes or anything of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that connection, I should like to ask the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], however, first asked me to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he does not think that we ought to put an end to that very thing of giving automobiles to men just to get to their offices and to go home from them?

Mr. LODGE. I think it has been carried pretty far.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. With the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts, the amendment on page 17 will merely increase the number of automobiles, so that each commissioner may have one. At this time the commissioners have different duties to perform and different departments to supervise. It is merely in the interest of an orderly and businesslike conduct of their offices to provide each of them with an automobile, and it is not an extravagance.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] I will say that the commissioners are obliged to be at the same time on different branches of departmental work, and it is poor economy to pay men the salaries which the commissioners receive and make them lose time by waiting for one automobile to return from a previous trip or to travel on street cars or horse-driven carriages.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The automobile will cost nearly as much as the salary of a commissioner, will it not?

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. No; not at all, because the automobile will last longer than one year.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Tennessee. I entirely agree with what he says as to the need of the additional automobile. The automobiles provided for are not extravagant ones. The Senator from Colorado said that $2,000 would purchase the highest type of automobile. Why, Mr. President, the high-power cars, such as the Pierce-Arrow, the Packard, and the Peerless, cost from seven to eight thousand dollars each; they range all the way from that down. A thousand dollar car is not an expensive car, although the cheap car is the dearest car you can buy. A good car will outlast three cheap ones, as a rule.

But apart from that, Mr. President, it seems to me, in the interest of the efficient conduct of the District business, the saving of time to enable the commissioners to properly attend to the municipal business, to get rid largely of all the paraphernalia of horses and carriages, which they now maintain, and to simplify the whole service, we should give them a proper equipment of automobiles. I do not believe they will be used enough by the commissioners for social purposes to rob the United States to a very great extent.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I fear we are laboring under a misapprehension as to this matter. I understand now the proposition is to purchase 13 new automobiles. That information is given to me by the Senator from Utah——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Oh, no.

Mr. KERN. I asked the Senator from Utah the question whether or not the fire department, the engineer department, and the water department are not now furnished with automobiles, and the Senator assured me they are not, and that the purpose is to buy 13 new automobiles.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, if I give him that impression, of course I want to correct it. To-day there are 11 automobiles, which have already been purchased, for the purposes about which I spoke to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. They have already been purchased under a former appropriation?

Mr. SMOOT. They have been purchased under a former appropriation, and the amendment of the Senate committee is to increase the number of automobiles allowed by the House, which is 12——

Mr. KERN. Thirteen.

Mr. SMOOT. No; under the House bill twelve were allowed, but the Senate committee has increased it by one, making it thirteen provided for in the bill.

Mr. KERN. The increase is to provide an automobile for each of the three commissioners?

Mr. SMOOT. It will provide one for each of the three commissioners.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The proposition is now to give each of the commissioners one automobile.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Which we think is all right.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the automobile now authorized for the commissioners is for the engineer commissioner, and it is now proposed to authorize one for each of the civilian commissioners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KERN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Asburst | Hughes | Norris | Smoot |
| Brady | James | Owen | Stephenson |
| Brandegee | Johnson | Page | Sterling |
| Bryan | Kenyon | Perkins | Sutherland |
| Burton | Kern | Pittman | Thomas |
| Chamberlain | Lane | Poindexter | Thompson |
| Chilton | Lea, Tenn. | Ransdell | Thornton |
| Clapp | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Tillman |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lodge | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Dillingham | McCumber | Sheppard | Warren |
| Fletcher | McLean | Smith, Ariz. | Williams |
| Gallinger | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Works |
| Gronna | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. | |
| Hitchcock | Myers | Smith, S. C. | |

Mr. CHILTON. I am requested to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] are necessarily detained from the Senate upon business of the Senate in connection with the lobby investigating committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to say that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] on important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, there has been some controversy here about the number of automobiles already owned and in use by the city. I refer, not to motors or trucks, but to passenger cars.

I find, on page 562 of the House hearings, that there are 31 passenger cars already owned and in operation by the various departments of the city government. There is 1 passenger car in the building department, 1 in the engineer commissioner's department, 4 in the fire department, 1 in the surveyor's office, 6 in the police department, 3 in the electrical department, 5 in the street-cleaning department, 3 in the surface division of the engineer office, 4 in the sewer department, and 3 in the water department, making a total of 31 passenger cars already owned and in operation by the District government.

In addition to that, there are 19 trucks or delivery vehicles, and there are 21 motor cycles. There are 12 more passenger cars estimated for the fiscal year 1915; but the total number of passenger cars, trucks, and motor cycles now owned by the city is 71, of which 31 are passenger cars.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this amendment that it provides one additional car, and that is for one of the District commissioners, the other two District commissioners being already furnished with cars. We felt, upon investigation, and as a result of the hearings we had, that it was absolutely necessary for each one to have a car.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] speaks of the total number of cars now owned by the city. I will say that every corporation of any size furnishes itself with these cars. They believe it is good policy. The Capital Traction Co. of this city has 8 cars for its own service; the Washington Railway & Electric Co. has 7; there is a total of 15 cars that those companies feel they should have in order to conduct their business properly.

We feel that this additional car is necessary, and we hope the Senate will back us up in our opinion.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to what particular department these automobiles are to be assigned, or is only one being asked for?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. One additional car, for the use of one of the District Commissioners. The House has already granted one. This will make three altogether. We feel that each one of the commissioners should have a car, and, feeling that way, we have put in this amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Maryland whether these cars are used exclusively on official business or whether they are used for private purposes?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As the Senator will notice, the bill requires that there shall be placed on the vehicles, in letters 3 inches high, and markedly contrasting in color with the body color of the motor vehicles, the words "District of Columbia"; and the bill also requires that they shall be used for official purposes only.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will turn to page 18 of the bill, he will find this provision:

All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the government of the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, and shall be under the direction and control of the commissioners.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If that is a fact, and if these vehicles are not to be used for private or individual purposes, why is it necessary to have so many? Why can not the District of Columbia have a certain number of vehicles not assigned to any particular department, but located at the District Building, to be used by any public official who has public reasons for using them?

My impression is that as a result of allotting these vehicles to different departments, if the officials do not use them for their private business there must be a large part of the time when they are idle, because the officials can not be constantly traveling. Any large corporation which had reason to provide automobiles for the use of its officials would not assign one automobile to one department and another to another department, but would keep them available at headquarters, to be used by any official at any time.

I think this practice of subdividing the use of the vehicles is a mistake; and from what I have seen here in Washington I am very suspicious that these vehicles which are purchased for public use are being constantly used by the officials for private purposes when they are absolutely under their own control.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that that is not a matter that the committee went into. The arrangement had already been made. When the matter came before us, however, from the reports we had we felt that each member of the Board of Commissioners should have a car, under the arrangement as it now exists. I am not discussing the propriety of what the Senator has just referred to; but there is no question that they have different and entirely separate departments to attend to, and at times they all have to be out attending to their respective matters. We feel, therefore, that it is in the interest of the Government, in order to facilitate the transaction of business, that each commissioner should have one.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in favor of giving the commissioners plenty of facilities for attending to their duties promptly, and I think it is a matter of economy. I believe, however, that the vehicles should be painted some distinctive color, so that they could be known wherever they were. This matter of merely lettering them with small letters does not answer the purpose, and I presume a great deal of use is made of them in "joy riding." They go so fast when they are on those excursions that you do not have time to distinguish the letters; and they should be painted some distinctive color, so that they can be recognized. Otherwise, I am in favor of giving the commissioners plenty of facilities to perform their duties.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator having charge of the bill illustrates the necessity of providing these automobiles for the District officials by giving us some statistics on the number of automobiles that are in use by private corporations. He gives, as an illustration, the number of automobiles that are used by the Capital Traction Co. and the number of automobiles that are in use by the Washington Railway & Electric Co. Those are the two street car companies doing business in the District of Columbia. It seems to me they do not illustrate the proposition, and are of no force as an argument.

These street car companies are themselves engaged in the transportation business. They make their money by transporting on street cars people who are hanging onto straps. They know from their own experience that it is at least not enjoyable, and sometimes not safe, and certainly never good for the health, to ride in their own conveyances, and therefore, as a matter of self-protection, they have to resort to automobiles.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I take it for granted that these motor cars are not maintained for the purpose of having the officials ride in them. I take it for granted that they are used in the conduct of their business. If street railway people feel that it is incumbent and necessary and better for the promotion of their business to have motor cars to look after their interests, in my judgment it is only an illustration of the fact, if they are conducting their business properly, that it is not an exceptional thing for the city of Washington to have motor cars for the conduct of its business.

Mr. NORRIS. I am inclined to commend the street car companies for thus protecting the lives and the comfort of their officials when they have to ride around on official business. We all know from experience that if they had to resort to the methods that the people have to adopt who give their money to them so that they can buy automobiles they would be, at least, carrying their hands in slings a good share of the time.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what kind of a motor vehicle this additional one is that the committee proposes to authorize the commissioners to purchase?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a vehicle to cost not to exceed $2,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. But is it a truck or an automobile?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a passenger vehicle.

Mr. BRISTOW. Who is to use it?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. One of the District Commissioners.

Mr. BRISTOW. How many have they now?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They have two, and this is to furnish one to the third commissioner, each having different departments to look after.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why is it not designated in the bill as an automobile for the commissioner? That is a very deceptive way to put in automobiles—"motor vehicles." They might be trucks, they might be motor cycles, or they might be almost anything.

I think it is scandalous, as I have said before, to buy automobiles, for which the public is expected to pay, for these officials about Washington to use. Some of us have difficulty in keeping out of the way and preventing ourselves from being maimed and killed by public vehicles, automobiles, that are ridden about in by officials, not on official business but on pleasure trips as a rule.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Mr. President, on page 14, line 5, the bill reads:

Automobiles for the offices of the civilian commissioners and the engineer commissioner.

There is no attempt, as I understand, to deceive.

Mr. BRISTOW. I thought we were on page 17.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Perhaps I have a different print from that which the Senator has.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is on page 17 in the regular print.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is page 17 here.

Mr. BRISTOW. On page 17 it says:

Two additional motor vehicles.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Yes. The language I refer to is on line 13, page 17:

Automobiles for the offices of the civilian commissioners and the engineer commissioner.

Mr. BRISTOW. But the amendment we are on now is just above that, is it not?—

Two additional motor vehicles.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Yes; and it specifies what they are:

Namely, automobiles for the offices of the civilian commissioners and the engineer commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one word for the information of the Senate.

I realize that I have not the knowledge concerning the exact service of these vehicles that would enable me to draw up an amendment so as to save those that ought to be saved and do away with those that ought to be done away with; so I give notice that at the proper time I am going to offer an amendment to refer back to the District of Columbia Committee all of the bill beginning on line 5, page 17, and going down to and including line 20, page 18, with instructions to so amend the same as to strike out all appropriations for maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles, except for the fire department and the police department and the emergency health service. I think nobody else of Washington officialdom needs them.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement of my proposed amendment, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS moves to recommit to the District of Columbia Committee all of the bill beginning on line 5, page 17, down to and including line 20, page 18, with instructions so to amend the same as to strike out all appropriations for maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles, except for the fire department and the police department and the emergency health service.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have been inclined to be liberal in the matter of making appropriations for the District of Columbia. I think, however,

the people of Washington City do not appreciate the liberality that has been displayed on the part of Congress in their behalf.

Ever since I have been in the Senate there has been constant and continuous complaint of Congress for failing to make the appropriations that the people here seem to think they are entitled to have. I have grown a little bit tired of that sort of thing. I begin to feel that it might be a good thing for us to turn over the government of the District of Columbia to the people who are complaining of us and allow them to run it for a while and have the Government simply pay taxes upon the property it owns within the District; but they would not be satisfied with that. They are protesting against any movement of that kind. It is apparently a very difficult thing to satisfy them in the matter of furnishing them money. They do not represent the people of the Nation, whose Capital this is, but their own selfish interests.

Of course, the whole country is interested in the city of Washington. It is the Capital of the Nation. It does not belong alone to the people who live in Washington. We are all interested in making it a great city, a beautiful city, and one of which all of us may be proud. If, however, a Senator conscientiously votes against any particular appropriation or votes in favor of reducing it, he is at once attacked by the people of Washington and by the newspapers as being an unreasonable economist.

That occurred only yesterday, when there was a question about the appropriation for a fish market, where there was a difference of $25,000 involved. The committee proposed to appropriate $125,000 for the purpose. It seemed to me and to others that $100,000 was ample to supply that need, but you notice in the newspapers this morning that complaint is made of that, and the Senators who voted against the higher appropriation are criticized for having voted against it. This attitude of the District toward Members of Congress is calculated to arouse resentment and lose them what they so much want in their own interest.

With respect to the particular matter that is before the Senate, if the use of another automobile is reasonably necessary to do the business of the District in a proper way, then I think this appropriation should be made. I do not know whether it is necessary or not. I am willing to take the judgment of the members of the committee who have dealt with this matter and made the necessary investigation. I do not think we ought to be penurious about these matters, but I do not understand why there should be this constant antagonism on the part of the people of the city of Washington with the Congress of the United States, who are endeavoring, I think, to treat them very liberally.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection I merely wish to say a word. I am perfectly willing that it shall be laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is all.

Mr. SMOOT. But for that purpose only. At the first opportunity, of course, the joint resolution will be pressed for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of House bill 10523, the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Without objection, that will be done. The Chair hears none. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the question of automobiles used in the Government service in Washington is a big one. I have no doubt that a great many abuses have crept in. I have no doubt there are many automobiles in use that ought not to be. I have no doubt that some of them are being used for unofficial purposes, for objectionable purposes, and there is, no doubt, great room for reformation in this service.

But I desire to say to the Senate that the automobiles that are used, whether wisely put in service or not, were put in the service by the Congress of the United States. They are not brought into use by this appropriation bill. There are now in the service of the District of Columbia, not including the departmental service, 31 passenger vehicles. Those 31 passenger vehicles were put into use by Congress from time to time. It was not done at one time, but a gradual increase of the service has been going on for years until we now have, as I said, 31 passenger automobiles in the service of the District of Columbia. It may be that the question ought to be overhauled, but the committee did not feel that it was incumbent upon it to go into an investigation of the automobile service of the District of Columbia which had been authorized by the laws of Congress.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether these automobiles have been provided for in the past from time to time in the manner that this is proposed to be done? Has it all been done in appropriation bills?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Undoubtedly; but they were purchased under acts of Congress; they were provided for by Congress.

Mr. WORKS. I was not seeking to criticize that mode of providing for them. I was only asking for information.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not mean to say that all of them were originally authorized in appropriation bills; I have not any knowledge as to that; but I do mean to say that they were purchased under acts of Congress and provided for the service of the government of the District of Columbia by acts of Congress, not by this bill. They were purchased and paid for by the Government and put into the service of the Government by the authority of Congress.

So, when the Committee on Appropriations took up the work of appropriating for the District service in the pending bill, it was incumbent upon it to appropriate for the automobiles which had been provided for and put into the service of the Government by acts of Congress.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. The bill, however, not only proposes to maintain those automobiles, but it proposes to buy additional machines.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am coming to that. To narrow the question which the Senate now has before it, these 31 automobiles, I will say, were put into the service by the authority of Congress. The committee, of course, has appropriated in one place or another for them, but not at this place. This particular section provides for only 13 automobiles, 11 of which are already in the service. The House added one additional automobile, and the Senate committee added still another, making two additional automobiles provided for now in the bill.

So the question was not before the committee, and the committee did not consider that it was a part of its function at this time to undertake an investigation of abuses in the automobile service in the city of Washington, either in the District government or in the departments, if such abuses exist. Very likely there are abuses which creep in. We are all prone to err, and in the public service particularly there will be encroachments from time to time, and things that ought not to be will creep in. We shall have to be always vigilant and careful to keep down abuses as far as possible. It may be that some of these machines ought to be eliminated, and I think that is most likely, but so far as the matter now before the Senate is concerned it is within a very narrow compass.

There is a proposition here to add two automobiles to the service in the District of Columbia. All we are dealing with, all the committee undertook to deal with, all it has presented to the Senate for its consideration is that the House added one automobile and the Senate committee added still another, making two additional automobiles now proposed in this appropriation bill. Whether we have acted wisely in giving the additional automobile is for the Senate to determine. It was presented to us in this way: The District Commissioners appeared before us and asked for these additional automobiles. They say they can not efficiently and satisfactorily discharge the duties assigned to them unless they have them. It seems to me reasonable and proper if there are automobiles that ought to be eliminated to let them be eliminated, but I do not think that the District Commissioners can discharge their duties efficiently unless each one of them is provided with an automobile. It is a very wide area that they have to travel over and that they have to inspect and govern.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator, if he will——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. How did the commissioners or the authorities of the District of Columbia get along for the hundred years in which the government of the District of Columbia was conducted before automobiles came into use?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not state the number of years, but I remind the Senator that I have heard there was a time when our forefathers went to mill with a sack of corn and put the corn in one end of the sack and a rock in the other to balance it. Instead of dividing the corn, they put the corn in one end and a rock in the other end. I have never heard it contended that we were wrong when we changed that usage. I do not think that we can stand still. I think we must use those facilities that are necessary for the dispatch of business in the stage of civilization in which we find ourselves.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will pardon me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. They may have put the stone in one end and the corn in the other end in Virginia, but in the region where I was raised we divided the corn into two parts and left the rock out. I think in the old days probably just as good men were developed under those conditions as in the days of the automobile. The idea that these commissioners can not do the work without an automobile, I think, is ridiculous. They could do it if they wanted; but it is a convenient and luxurious thing to have, provided the public pays for it and provides somebody to run it for them. I see that this very bill contains the following clause:

including such personal services in connection therewith, not otherwise herein authorized, as the commissioners shall in writing specially order.

That is, if the commissioners want a chauffeur or some other assistant they can order them; and, of course, they go on the pay roll as their body servants.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rose simply to say that it rather surprises me to have the Senator from Kansas refer to 100 years ago. I recall the fact that I have read that Dolly Madison dried the household clothing in the East Room of the White House. That would not be done to-day. We have progressed, and progressed very rapidly, and we are continuing to progress. These officials now have horses and carriages. It is believed to be a matter of economy to give them automobiles. They are high-cost officials, and they will get to their places in half the time and save two or three dollars a day if they are busily engaged in inspection work, and pay for the automobiles in a little while. I think we are wasting a great deal of time this morning on an absolutely inconsequential matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think, Mr. President, that a great deal of time has been wasted because of the impression that it was in order now to take up the entire question of abuses in the automobile service. I am surprised that the progressive Senator from Kansas should want to deprive the District government of those modern appliances which have come into use, and which facilitate business so much. I realize, of course, that at the time when our ancestors put a rock in one end of the sack to balance the corn the State of Kansas had not been born. It came into existence in modern times, and I thought it was abreast of modern ideas. I was very much amazed to hear the Senator say that he thinks the District Commissioners can get along without automobile service.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator was dilating upon the importance of the commissioners having automobiles in order that they might properly attend to their duties. The inference was that before automobiles were used the duties were not properly attended to. I thought it was a reflection upon the distinguished and able men who have served in that office previously, I think, with credit to themselves and to the Government.

Now, so far as progress is considered, I am in favor of all reasonable progress, but I observe we are making the greatest progress in the spending of the people's money for luxurious appurtenances to public officials. It takes three or four hundred thousand dollars to build an ordinary office building here in Washington to house a few hundred Government clerks. It would be more progressive to buy out some of the office buildings that we are maintaining now by renting rooms from the parties who constructed them. We could buy three or four of them for what one Government building will cost and put more people in them than are in the entire Government buildings now that we spent probably $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 for. If we had a little common sense in the matter of Government expenditures, in my opinion it would be better progress than the progress the Senator is discussing.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, we can not undertake in this bill to go into the construction of public buildings or the rental of buildings. I think we had better keep ourselves down to the question whether we shall buy one additional automobile in order that each Commissioner of the District may have that facility for the dispatch of his business. The commissioners have a very wide field of labor. They have the health service of the District; they have the street improvements of the District; they have the electric lines of the District, the street car service, and the telephone service. I will not undertake to enumerate all the services, but the duties of the District Commissioners are exceedingly comprehensive and exacting. I myself do not believe that they can attend to those duties promptly and efficiently and faithfully unless they have facilities to get from place to place to look after their various duties.

Mr. LANE. I wish to ask the Senator if each one of the commissioners makes use of a separate automobile and has an individual driver while he is attending to these numerous duties, and if there will be any possibility of getting the commissioners to double up and ride in couples?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that these automobiles are not used exclusively by the commissioners themselves. They are used under their orders as well as by themselves for the District service. They send their assistants in the automobiles. They are not used for their own purposes only, but for the purposes of their subordinates and assistants.

Mr. LANE. I would then inquire if the largest use and the greatest mileage is not made after dark?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, it is very easy to impute evil to people.

Mr. LANE. I am asking the question. I do not know.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am not in the detective service here.

Mr. LANE. I was wondering if there was any way of striping them like a yellow jacket or painting them with phosphorescent paint, so that we could tell these automobiles after dark?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are striped sufficiently to be identified. The bill requires appropriate lettering to be put upon them for that purpose. Whether they are put to an improper purpose I am not advised. If the Senator knows of any improper use made of these automobiles, I think he ought to make the charge. I do not think it is very fair treatment to these officials to be merely theorizing that they may perhaps be violating the law and violating their oath of office. I know of no improper use made of them. Very likely there are some abuses, but I do not know anything about them.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do.

Mr. LANE. I do not think the commissioners themselves make any improper use. I do not think that they indulge even in joy riding. I have not so great confidence, however, in the chauffeurs. It seemed to me that we might get the commissioners to double up and ride together.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think it is an excessive allowance when we allow to each commissioner for his own official use and for the agencies under him a single automobile. I do not think it would be economy, as a rule, for the two commissioners to go out at one time. They generally have to go separately, each in his own sphere of work. They came before us and insisted that each one of them needed an automobile for his use and to be used under his orders in the execution of public duties. I believe their claim to be correct and just, and I think they ought to have this additional automobile.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask a question simply for information. I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia if the Public Printer, the Commissioner of Pensions, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are each furnished an auto and driver under the existing law, and also under pending appropriation bills?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would not like to undertake to answer as to each of those officers. I have no doubt there is a very large number of automobiles in the Government service. There are 35 in the service of the District of Columbia, and that may be too many.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from North Dakota will remember that those would not be provided for in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are not provided in this bill, and therefore I do not undertake to answer.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from North Dakota will pardon me in this connection, I understand that the commissioners had horses and carriages before, and so have many of their assistants. As I read the bill, we now provide for doing away with horses and carriages and these automobiles will simply take the place heretofore filled by horses and carriages.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is provided for by the bill in order to have a more economical and a more expeditious service. I believe the Government will be the gainer by giving an automobile to each commissioner. I remember on one occasion making some investigation into the use of horses and I found that one of the commissioners had three horses and two coachmen.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator refers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Not the present commissioners, but a former commissioner of the District of Columbia. That was discovered and it was corrected, but one commissioner did have three horses. When we substitute automobiles, giving one to each commissioner and putting out of commission the horses and carriages and coachmen they now have, I believe there will be a more expeditious and a more economic service. I think it is fair and reasonable and just. It is in accordance with modern usages and in accordance with efficiency of business service. The committee so believing have made this report, and it is for the Senate to decide. All we have done is to give one more automobile in order that each of the commissioners may have an automobile under his control.

Mr. McCUMBER. My mind was not fixed so much upon the question of the automobiles for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as to understand the law governing the supply of autos for these other officers. It could not be done in this bill, but I should like to ask the Senator a single question. In the case of the Commissioner of the Land Office, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Commissioner of Pensions, the Public Printer, all their work is wholly inside, and there is practically nothing outside, while the Senator from Virginia himself not only performs all his labors here but he must go down to the departments several times a week, and rush back again in order to be present at the opening of the session of the Senate each day. Can the Senator give any reason why the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, taking that one officer, for instance, should be furnished a carriage and a driver or an auto and a chauffeur any more than any other Government employee, any more, than a Senator or Representative, who must do a great deal more outside work, who must run around a great deal and visit a department a great many times more than any of the officials I have named?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will answer the Senator from North Dakota, and then I will yield to the Senator from Colorado. No doubt there are abuses of that sort. I started out with the statement that the committee in this bill have had no occasion and were under no duty to take up that big question. I have no doubt Congress has been too generous, and has given too many automobiles and chauffeurs to Government officials. I have no doubt it is a good field for investigation and for reform, but this committee is not answering to the Senate on that question now. We are simply answering as to our recommendation to add one more automobile, so as to give each of the District Commissioners an automobile to be used exclusively in the Government service and to be substituted for the horse service which the commissioner now has.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator, right there, allow me to correct a matter?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Yes; if the Senator from Colorado will excuse me——

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota I do not think the commissioners he has mentioned have automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. That was exactly what I wanted to state.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me, one can not always tell because a man uses an automobile whether it is a Government automobile or his own; but the appropriation act will show.

Mr. McCUMBER. Right there may I suggest to the Senator that I referred either to automobiles or carriages?

Mr. WARREN. It is the same in either case. I include both.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will just say here that the Commissioner of Pensions does not have a carriage.

Mr. WARREN. If he does, it is probably from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. McCUMBER. Every one of them has.

Mr. WARREN. There are so many for the Interior Department. I may be mistaken, but I know of no place where they are provided for the head of a bureau.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I appeal to Senators to investigate that question at some other time. Now let us narrow this question down and let us determine whether each commissioner of the District shall have an automobile.

Mr. WARREN. I want to state the reason why there is a difference in the case of the commissioners referred to. Their duties are at their home office mainly, and they can go to their department by street car lines. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are supposed to visit every portion of the District where there are cars and where there are not. The area of this city is broadening, of course, and it has broadened a great deal of late years. They really have about the transportation they had 25 years ago when the city was nearly half as large. The difference is very great between the duties of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who have both office and outside work to do, and those who have been mentioned, such as the Commissioner of the Land Office, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Now I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. If it be true that the various officials mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota are supplied at public expense with these conveyances, I think it should be done away with.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will excuse me, I beg him not to go into a long general discussion of the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going into it. I think the Senator from North Dakota is mistaken, but, of course, if he says such is the case, I accept his statement. I have been accompanied by a number of officials in the street cars when going to and from the Capitol for a long time. My impression is, therefore, that the Senator is mistaken in his assumption that the heads of bureaus and divisions under the Cabinet officers are given conveyances.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I am not dealing now with that proposition. I am dealing simply with the proposition to give each of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an automobile. The committee of which I am chairman having investigated that matter and having reached the conclusion that it ought to be provided, we have reported it to the Senate for its acceptance or rejection. That is the sole question that we have submitted to the consideration of the Senate to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not hear the last remarks of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. Did I understand the Senator from Colorado to say that the officials which I have mentioned are not furnished with either autos or carriages?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I did not. If the Senator asserts it as a fact, I accept his statement, but I based my statement upon the fact that I have frequently accompanied these gentlemen in public conveyances to and from their offices.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a fact that they have them, but under what provision of law it is done I have no knowledge. I do not know whether it is by direct appropriation or whether it is paid out of the contingent fund; but such has been the case and probably is the case at the present time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think I can explain the seeming discrepancy between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no discrepancy, because I accepted the Senator's statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is, because this matter was up in the House of Representatives some 10 years ago, when I was a Member. I had the honor of bringing it up at that time. It developed that public vehicles paid for by the Government were being used by the families of public officials and were being used for private purposes; that the wives were going to market in the vehicles; that they were making their calls in the vehicles; and the men who were acting as their chauffeurs were on the pay rolls as messengers. I have no doubt that vice, to some extent, is continued to the present time, and while the very officials for whom the vehicles were purchased are using the

street cars, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] states, the families of those officials are using the vehicles for personal and private purposes.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he does not think the wives of Senators and others do more traveling than the officers themselves and are more in need of the conveyance in making their calls?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think probably there is something in the suggestion made by the Senator from California. The fact is that this is a great vice. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would treat it as a whole. One of the serious evils is that nobody knows how many of these vehicles are purchased nor how many of them are employed. I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations owes it to the Senate to lay before the Senate in some systematic and simple manner the total number of vehicles, whether automobiles or carriages, that are employed supposedly in the public service here.

Mr. GALLINGER. I feel sure that I am not mistaken in the recollection that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] less than two years ago offered a resolution calling for this information. It was transmitted to the Senate, and I apprehend it can be found in the document room to-day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It may be; but when Senators rise here——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will add just one suggestion. There is no question about a long list of officials using carriages at the Government expense. The Public Printer certainly does or did, the Commissioner of Pensions certainly does or did, not long ago. I have been spattered with mud by Assistant Secretaries more than once with spanking horses and carriages. There is no doubt about it, I think, and I have always thought it was an evil, but it can not be remedied in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would ask the Senator from New Hampshire how he can remedy the evil unless he begins it in some bill and then continues it in every other bill as rapidly as the bills come before us?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a pertinent question. I will say in reply that I have sent to my committee room and have failed to find the assignments that are made to the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I think each one of them has more than 25 different duties to perform in the District. I have failed to find the document, and so I can not at this moment present it, as I had intended doing, but will insert it later.

If there is any class of officials in the District of Columbia who are entitled to modern means of transportation, it is the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They are underpaid to-day, and their duties are so large, so numerous, and so onerous that they ought to be given first consideration.

Whether or not other officials ought to have automobiles I am not prepared to say to-day. I think it is a matter that might well be taken up in a comprehensive, systematic way, so that some proper solution of it may be found.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it is that for which I am speaking; but the chairman of the committee rather resented the idea that when the committee recommended this particular automobile for this particular official, Senators should rise and protest against the extravagance in the purchase of automobiles and the employment of chauffeurs for officials.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Nebraska that he is mistaken if he thinks I have done that. I had no such intention. I merely said that it was a matter which we did not investigate and upon which we were not prepared to give any information, and referring especially to this case I remarked that we had made no investigation of that kind, and we knew nothing about it. There may be wrongs going on and there may be discrepancies, which are not in accordance with the laws and not in accordance with the appropriations, which we did not take into consideration; but I had no idea of resenting anything that the Senator from Nebraska may have said with regard to the matter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the point I was endeavoring to make some moments ago, and what I want to repeat here, is this: It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, when it recommends an additional automobile and realizes that every year the demand is increasing for automobiles, it ought to prepare some comprehensive plan by which the public service can be cared for in an economical way. It certainly is not good business to buy an automobile, turn it over to a single official, and to buy another automobile and turn it over to another official, and another one, until we have 31 automobiles employed in the local government. There must be some more economical means by which necessary transportation can be afforded to these men. Each of these officials can not spend all of his time in an automobile. It ought to be possible to have a limited number of automobiles at the disposal of the occupants of the District Building, and to permit the officials to use them when necessary on the public service. If you assign one automobile to each official, then whenever an official is engaged in his office the automobile is idle, which must be a large part of the time, and the chauffeur is idle, which must be a large part of the time. If the service must be rendered, why can not the Committee on Appropriations provide in some comprehensive way for a limited number of automobiles for the use of the officers employed in the District Building without assigning to each one a separate automobile?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will excuse me for interrupting him, I will say that I am not prepared to concede his suggestion, that it is incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee to undertake to investigate the automobile abuse in the Federal Government. That would be putting on the committee a duty that perhaps would require months, if they did nothing else. If this abuse is to be investigated, there ought to be a resolution passed by the Senate to that effect, and a special committee ought to be appointed.

The Senator must bear in mind that if some abuses have crept in through the Appropriations Committee it is only a very small part of them. There are other committees which handle these matters. Take, for instance, the Army and Navy. I think, if there be abuses, there are perhaps more of them in those departments than in the departments of the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Naval Affairs handles the naval bill, the Military Committee handles the Army bill, the Indian Affairs Committee handles the Indian appropriation bill, and so on throughout. I do not conceive that it is a part of the duty of the Appropriations Committee, of its own motion, without any initiation of the subject by the action of the Senate, to undertake a reform of that sort. I think it would be almost impossible for the Appropriations Committee, with the time at its disposal and with the duties that are imposed upon it, to undertake to investigate an abuse of that character. I have no doubt there is an abuse, and that it ought to be investigated. I am very willing to do my part of it, and shall endeavor to be more careful in the future in investigating automobile appropriations that come through my committee, but I do not feel that the committee are called upon to investigate the whole subject; it would not be possible for them to do justice to it.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. What the Senator says is very true, but has any explanation been made of the necessity for this additional automobile? As I understand, the other House investigated this matter very thoroughly. Is this one of the cases where an appropriation was refused by the House because it was understood that it would be certain to be put in by the Senate?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The House did give consideration to it. Each one of the commissioners asked for an automobile; the engineer commissioner already had an automobile, but the two civilian commissioners did not have automobiles. The House gave one additional automobile. The commissioners then appeared before the Senate committee and stated that they could not get along with one additional automobile; that each commissioner needed an automobile to discharge his duties efficiently. In view of the large field of labor which is intrusted to them and the explanations they made, we felt that their request was reasonable, and we added one automobile, so as to give to each civilian commissioner what the engineer commissioner already had.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Senator from Virginia given any consideration to the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], which I regard as a very valuable one—that of having one, two, or three automobiles for the common use of all the commissioners? As the Senator from Nebraska has said, in the nature of things the commissioners must spend a great deal of time in their offices, and they could arrange their business in various parts of the city so that they would not conflict. If that suggestion has not already been given consideration by the committee, it seems to me that it should receive consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That suggestion received consideration by the committee; but I call attention to the fact that

these automobiles are not used exclusively by the commissioners, but are used by other people in the employ of the commissioners in the execution of the work of the District government. The commissioners say they can not get along efficiently with fewer than three automobiles. I repeat, they themselves do not use them exclusively, but they assign them to a very large number of other people; and they say, considering the amount of field labor, the large number of services which they must investigate and consider, and the large number of agencies that they must use in assisting them in the discharge of their duties, it is necessary that this additional automobile should be provided. The committee may be mistaken; it is for the Senate to say. I am perfectly willing for all of the automobiles to be taken from the commissioners if it is the judgment of the majority of the Senate that they do not need them. We thought they needed them—that each commissioner should have one automobile—and we have reported that conclusion to the Senate. We gave the matter the best investigation we were able, which was chiefly hearing the commissioners themselves and considering the scope of the service they were required to render. I believe the Senate will make no mistake in giving each one of the commissioners an automobile.

I think that the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska that this subject should be investigated is eminently proper, and I hope it will be done; but I do not think it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to take upon itself that labor, and I do not think the Committee on Appropriations would have the time and the opportunity to do justice to the matter if it should undertake it. The duties of the committee are very large, and we find it very difficult to discharge the duties that are specifically assigned to us; but a reformation of that sort in the Government service at Washington ought to be undertaken by a special committee, created under a resolution of the Senate, it seems to me. I will do the best I can in investigating the subject as matters move along, but I can not promise that it is possible for me to give a proper and thorough investigation and to afford a remedy by reporting measures to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are taken, I ask permission at this point in the discussion to insert a little statement showing the assignment of the duties of the several Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF OFFICES AND DUTIES TO THE COMMISSIONERS, AS COMMITTEES, AS ESTABLISHED JANUARY 24, 1910, AND AMENDED JANUARY 24, 1911.

PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD, OLIVER P. NEWMAN.

All unassigned matters.
Anatomical board.
Assessments.
Assessor.
Assistant assessors.
Asylum and jail, Washington.
Auction matters.
Auditor.
Bathing beach.
Charities.
Child labor.
Children's Guardians, Board of.
Claims against District of Columbia.
Coal furnished for use of district government.
Collector of taxes.
Columbia Hospital, appointment of trustees.
Corporation counsel.
Dental examiners.
Disbursing officer.
Dog tags.
Druggists to the poor.
Excise board.
Historical tablets.
Insurance, superintendence of.
Library, free public.
Licenses for general business.
Liquor licenses.
Medical examiners, boards of.
Medical supervisors, board of.
Municipal lodging house.
National Training School for Boys, ex officio trustee of.
Paupers, transportation and care of.
Pharmacy, board of.
Physicians to the poor.
Playgrounds.
Purchasing officer.
Public library.
Public schools.
Reformatory.
Rock Creek Park, board of control, president.
Taxes.
Veterinary medicine, board of examiners.
Washington Asylum and Jail.
Workhouse.

COMMISSIONER FREDERICK L. SIDDONS.

Coal for private use, weighing of.
Columbia Hospital, ex officio trustee of.
Coroner.
Drainage of lots.
Employment agencies.
Fire department.
Fish wharf.
Flour, inspection of.
Food, inspection of.
Garfield Hospital, isolating wards.
Hacks and hack stands.
Harbor master.
Hay scales.
Health office.
Insane.
Lumber, inspection of.
Markets.
Morgue.
Nurses' examining board.
Police department.
Pound.
Providence Hospital, isolating wards.
Superintendent of weights, measures, and markets (act of Mar. 3, 1911).
Smoke abatement.
Surgeon, police and fire departments.
Vehicles on streets, movement of.
Veterinary surgeon.
Wood, inspection of.

COMMISSIONER CHESTER HARDING, LIEUTENANT COLONEL, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Ashes, removal of (Jan. 24, 1911).
Asphalts and cements.
Automobile board.
Boilers, inspection of.
Bridges.
Building sites, purchase of.
Buildings, dangerous, removal of.
Buildings, insanitary, condemnation of.
Buildings, inspector of.
Conduits.
Contracts.
District Building.
Electrical department.
Elevators.
Engineer department.
Fire escapes.
Garbage, removal of (Jan. 24, 1911).
Gas and meters, inspection of.
Highway extension.
Lighting of streets.
Municipal architect.
Night soil, removal of (Jan. 24, 1911).
Parking.
Pavements.
Permit clerk.
Plumbing.
Railroads.
Refuse, removal of (Jan. 24, 1911).
River front.
Roads.
Rock Creek Park, board of control, secretary.
Sewers.
Sidewalks.
Stables, engineer department.
Steam engineers, board of examiners.
Street and alley cleaning (Jan. 24, 1911).
Street railways.
Streets.
Subdivisions.
Surveyor.
Trees.
Water department.
Wells.
Wharves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and therefore refrain from voting.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. JONES was called). The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has been called from the Senate on official business.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when the name of Mr. SIMMONS was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent on account of illness. I will ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. He is absent, and I do not know how he would vote if present. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], which I transfer to my colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. WARREN. I have a pair with that Senator; but I transfer that pair, so that the Senator from Florida may stand paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Not knowing how he would cast his vote upon this particular question, if present, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who is absent on account of illness. I do not know how the Senator from Texas would vote on this amendment, if present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I am advised, however, that, if present, he would vote as I have voted, and therefore I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], which I will transfer to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is absent on account of illness, and that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is absent on official business and has a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—33.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Fall | Owen | Swanson |
| Bradley | Gallinger | Page | Thornton |
| Brady | Lea, Tenn. | Perkins | Townsend |
| Brandegee | Lodge | Ransdell | Walsh |
| Bryan | McLean | Shields | Warren |
| Burton | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| Catron | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. | |
| Chilton | Myers | Smoot | |
| Dillingham | Overman | Stephenson | |

NAYS—19.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bristow | Kenyon | Poindexter | Smith, S. C. |
| Gore | Kern | Reed | Thomas |
| Hitchcock | Lane | Robinson | Tillman |
| Hughes | Nelson | Sheppard | Weeks |
| James | Norris | Smith, Ga. | |

NOT VOTING—43.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | du Pont | McCumber | Shively |
| Borah | Fletcher | Newlands | Simmons |
| Burleigh | Goff | O'Gorman | Smith, Mich. |
| Chamberlain | Gronna | Oliver | Sterling |
| Clapp | Hollis | Penrose | Stone |
| Clark, Wyo. | Johnson | Pittman | Sutherland |
| Clarke, Ark. | Jones | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Colt | La Follette | Root | Vardaman |
| Crawford | Lee, Md. | Saulsbury | West |
| Culberson | Lewis | Shafroth | Williams |
| Cummins | Lippitt | Sherman | |

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 17, line 16, before the words "in all," to strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen," and in the same line, after the word "including," to strike out "one" and insert "two," so as to make the clause read:

Automobiles for the offices of the civilian commissioners and the engineer commissioner, including the building-inspection and street-cleaning divisions, surveyor's office, and electrical department, 13 in all, including 2 to be purchased hereunder for the service of the civilian commissioners.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "$9,150" and insert "$15,634"; and in line 18, before the word "inches," to strike out "six" and insert "three," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for motor vehicles, $15,634. All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the government of the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, and shall be under the direction and control of the commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the joint or interchangeable use of any of the same by officials and employees of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no automobile shall be acquired hereunder, by purchase or exchange, at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding $2,000 for one seating more than two persons or $1,000 for one seating not more than two persons: *Provided further*, That all motor vehicles and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the government of the District of Columbia shall be of uniform color and have painted conspicuously thereon, in letters not less than 3 inches high and markedly contrasting in color with the body color of the motor vehicle, the words:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 21, to strike out the headline "City service" and to insert "District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 18, after the word "sewers," to strike out "chief inspector," and insert "assistant superintendent," so as to make the clause read:

Telephones connected with the system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. may be maintained in the residences of the superintendent of the water department, superintendent of sewers, assistant superintendent of the street cleaning division, secretary of the Board of Charities, health officer, chief engineer of the fire department, and superintendent of police, under appropriations contained in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 23, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized, in their discretion, to furnish necessary transportation in connection with strictly official business of the Government of the District of Columbia by the purchase of car tickets from appropriations contained in this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures herein authorized shall be so apportioned as not to exceed a total of $5,000 for the fiscal year 1915: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not include the appropriations herein made for the fire and police departments.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment appropriates a sum not in excess of $5,000 for the purchase of car tickets. On page 63, line 22, there is a similar appropriation of $5,000 "for purchase of car tickets for strictly official use"; and on page 66, line 16, there is another amendment providing $650 "for purchase of car tickets for strictly official use," making a total appropriation for that purpose of $10,650. I will be obliged to the chairman of the committee for information in regard to the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that in the past car tickets have been furnished out of appropriations for the District, but under a decision by the Comptroller of the Treasury it is now necessary that there should be a specific appropriation. I read from a letter on this subject addressed to the committee by the commissioners:

In a decision dated July 29, 1913, on the question of the use of car tickets, the Comptroller of the Treasury of the United States said: "In the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 758, 776, and 782), specific provisions have been made for purchase of car tickets for the Treasury Department, Departments of the Interior and Justice, thus showing that when Congress intends car tickets to be furnished for local travel it makes specific provision therefor."

So it will be seen that the comptroller claims that there must be a specific provision made for the purchase of car tickets for the police and other departments of the District government. As I have said, this is not a new thing at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not want to object to a reasonable appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator will notice the car tickets are not to be used for any other purpose whatever except strictly official business.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I asked one of the commissioners whether the tickets would be allowed to be used for the transportation of officers from their homes to their places of business and from their places of business to their homes, and the commissioner said "No."

Mr. THOMAS. I am aware of that; I think the committee have safeguarded that provision so far as they can, unless, perhaps, some provision should be made whereby the tickets should have a certain color or designation; but the sum of $10,650 will purchase 255,600 car tickets, and it seems to me that that is a very large number of passages to be secured for this purpose. The Senator from Utah has called my attention to the fact that something less than $5,000 has been expended hitherto for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, for this particular department, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Then it was not the total expenditure for that item?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; for this particular department.

Mr. THOMAS. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that Commissioner Siddons, when this item was up for consideration, said:

The reason for that item is, briefly, as follows: After the enactment of the public-utilities law the then utilities commission ruled that by virtue of its provisions the practice which had theretofore prevailed of permitting policemen and firemen to ride free on the street cars of the District could no longer be permitted, and an order carried out that view of the law. So the free transportation of these officers was refused. The embarrassment and, I think, distress on the part of the police officers and firemen that followed led to an effort on the part of

the commissioners to secure an opinion from the Comptroller of the Treasury whether or not under the existing contingent appropriations car tickets could be provided to police officers and firemen when engaged upon official missions about the District. The opinion of the comptroller was adverse. He said that under the existing law the commissioners could not do that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I desire to say to the Senator from Colorado that, according to the records of the District, the expenditures previously for this purpose have been about $5,000 annually.

Mr. THOMAS. For this department?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. For this department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether the chartered privileges of the street railway companies are such that we could require them to furnish this transportation to the District as compensation in part for the privilege they enjoy of using the streets? I do not believe in the street car companies furnishing free transportation as a gift to city employees, but I do think, as a part of the obligations imposed upon them for the privilege of using the streets, it is eminently proper that they should be required to furnish certain transportation to the municipality or to the local government—the District Commissioners in the present instance—as a part of the compensation which they should pay to the District for the franchises given to them. If the charters of these companies are in such shape that that could be done, it seems to me the proper thing for us to do would be to require the street car companies to furnish a certain amount of transportation to the District Commissioners, to be by the District Commissioners used for public purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we investigated that matter, considering that probably it would be one way to get rid of making this appropriation. The law, as we understand, does not compel the street car companies to furnish such transportation now. We might go to them and ask it as a privilege, but the commissioners thought that that would not be a wise thing to do, because possibly it would put those who might ride on those tickets under some obligation to the companies, and it was not deemed wise to allow policemen to ride upon tickets procured in that way. There is no law now to authorize such a proceeding, but possibly there could be a law passed compelling the street car companies to do as the Senator from Georgia suggests they might be made to do. The Senator may be right, and on account of the privileges which they enjoy from the District of Columbia it might be right to take such action, but there is no way under which we can proceed at this time except by a specific appropriation, and the committee thought it wise to make this appropriation to meet the exigency of the situation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is proper to add that the street car companies are quite willing to transport the policemen and firemen free of cost, as they have been doing, but they are inhibited from doing so by the public-utilities bill and the decision of the comptroller.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I suggest that we might put on this bill a provision requiring that a certain amount of transportation shall be furnished to the District Commissioners.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would be rather in contravention of the position we have taken against free transportation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would not be free transportation at all. It would be a price of the franchise. It would be a part of the tax fixed upon them incident to the franchise they receive. They would make no presents to policemen. They would be required by law to furnish the District Commissioners a certain amount of transportation, which they would furnish as a part of their franchise tax. It would belong to the commissioners and would be distributed by the commissioners as the property of the District to the servants employed by the commissioners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 20, after line 24, to insert:

For repair of the morgue building, $3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 24, to insert:

For the purchase of new apparatus in the office of the inspector of asphalts and cements, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Improvements and repairs," on page 24, after line 5, to strike out:

That hereafter whenever, under appropriations made by Congress, the roadway of any street, avenue, or road in the District of Columbia is improved by laying a new pavement thereon or by resurfacing an existing pavement from curb to curb or from gutter to gutter, where no curb exists, where the material used is sheet asphalt, asphalt block, asphaltic or bituminous macadam, concrete, or other fixed roadway pavement, such proportion of the total cost of the work, including all the expenses of the assessment, to be made as hereinafter prescribed, shall be charged against and become a lien upon the abutting property, and assessments therefor shall be levied pro rata according to the linear frontage of said property on the street, avenue, or road, or portion thereof upon the roadway of which said new pavement is laid or the existing roadway of which is resurfaced: *Provided, however*, That there shall be excepted from such assessment the cost of paving or resurfacing the roadway space included within the intersections of streets, avenues, and roads, as said intersections are included within building lines projected, and also the cost of paving the space within such roadways for which street railway companies are responsible under their charters or under law on streets, avenues, or roads where such railways have been or shall be constructed.

The assessments herein provided for shall be levied and paid for in the following manner, namely: Where the width of the roadway actually to be paved is 40 feet or less between the curbs, or between the gutters, where no curbs exist, after deducting the amount required to be paved by the street railway companies, the total cost of the work, including the expenses of assessments, shall be assessed against the abutting property owners, one-half to each side; where the width of the street thus to be paved, after deducting the amount required to be paved by the street railway companies, shall exceed 40 feet, the cost of construction as herein provided for shall be levied and paid for as follows: The cost of constructing 20 feet on each side of said street shall be assessed against the abutting property owner, and the cost of paving the remaining portion of said street, including the cost of intersections, shall be paid for by the government of the District of Columbia out of funds available for that purpose.

Assessments levied under the provisions hereof shall be payable and collectible in the same manner and under the same penalty for nonpayment as is provided for assessments for improving sidewalks and alleys in the District of Columbia, as now provided by law: *Provided*, That the cost of publication of the notice of such assessment upon the failure to obtain personal service upon the owner of the property to be assessed therein provided for and of the services of such notices shall be paid out of the appropriation for the work, and such assessments, when collected, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund available for similar public work.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think this is one of the most objectionable amendments that has been presented by the committee. I am not prepared to approve the provision of the bill just as it comes to us from the House. I think it is rather extreme to charge all of the improvements to the property holders; but I do think a fair proportion of the street improvements should be charged to the adjacent property holders.

I notice in the RECORD this morning that, in speaking of certain improvements made under the bill passed by the last Congress, I was quoted as referring to those improvements as having been made in the northeastern section. I said, or, at least, I meant to say, the northwestern section. I was seeking to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I rode around and looked at a number of those improvements carried in the last bill, just to see how much they were public improvements and how much they were private improvements; and I found a number of them that seemed to me useless, except for the benefit they did to the property immediately adjacent to the improvements.

Improvements of that character are proper. They ought to be made. They give a chance for the city to grow. Where, however, the property holder receives preeminently the benefit of the street improvement, it is not fair that the charge should fall upon the entire city; and in the case of the District, where the property holder receives preeminently the benefit of the improvement, it is not fair that the District treasury should carry the entire improvement. The natural consequence of such a line of action is that the man who has the influence gets the street improved and the man who has not does not.

The only fair way to conduct these improvements, it seems to me, is that which has grown up as the result of the experience of most of the cities of the country. If we could, as a substitute for what the House has sent us, provide a plan by which the District Commissioners might improve streets upon the petition of two-thirds of the property holders in a particular locality, charging to the District that portion of the improvement which applied to the cross streets and charging to the District one-third of the entire improvement, and in the narrower streets, of 40 feet, charging one-third to the adjacent property holders on each side, I believe we would find that petitions would come in from neglected portions of the city—from the east and northeast sections—and that many of those people would find it practicable to have streets improved that now are neglected.

My own observation has been, where I live, that a petition is required from the owners of two-thirds of the frontage on a certain area of a street to authorize the city council to have the street improved, asphalted, or paved in the way designated.

Then the city pays a third and the adjacent property holders each a third. This would be especially fair on narrow streets where there are no street cars.

If the present action of the committee prevails and the matter goes back to conference, at least I hope there may come out of the conference an agreement by which, instead of the extreme form in which this matter is left by the action of the House, a plan may be substituted under which petitions can be presented to the commissioners by the property holders, and where they are ready to pay two-thirds of the expense the District shall pay one-third and the District shall also pay for the crossings.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has presented a view of the case that I confess impresses me. The Senator will understand that the committee struck out this provision in the House bill not because of entire hostility to the proposition, but for the purpose of putting it in conference and seeing if an agreement could not be reached that would be satisfactory to all parties.

In connection with what the Senator has said, and for the purpose of clearing up a misapprehension that is in the minds of some Senators I will say that my attention has been called to the fact that great improvements are going on where there are not any houses in the district, and yet the streets are beautifully asphalted. I was referred, for instance, to the extension of Massachusetts Avenue. That is all done by the owners of the property. The same is true of these beautiful suburban subdivisions like Edgewood. The owners of the property make those improvements with a view of selling the property, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They pay it all?

Mr. GALLINGER. They pay it all; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not having a provision by which legislation authorizes the improvement, they go to the expense of doing it all?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do. The suggestion I made yesterday—and one which still impresses itself upon my mind—was as to the possible hardship which would be imposed upon the poorer classes unless we work out this problem very carefully. I suggested that on these beautiful streets and avenues the Government has made the improvements and the property owners have not paid a copper; while in the northeast and southeast, where they need improvements tremendously, and where we have not appropriated heretofore sufficient money to give them what I think they are entitled to, where the clerks and people of moderate means are building little homes, the provision as it comes from the House would impose upon those poor people the burden of paying all of the cost.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Except for the fact, if the Senator will allow a suggestion, that they are not getting anything now.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are not now; no. It is possible that the Senator's suggestion about a petition would remedy that evil.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the committee in conference could agree upon a plan by which a certain proportion of the property holders might petition for the improvement, and thereupon two-thirds of it would be assessed to the adjacent property holders and one-third to the District, it would conform to what I think is now the generally accepted plan in the majority of the cities of the United States, and I am sure it works well where I live.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 26, line 26, before the word "feet" to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty," so as to make the clause read:

Repaving with asphalt the granite roadway of P Street NW., between Rock Creek and Twenty-eighth Street, 40 feet wide, $11,500.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, in relation to that item, whether it is merely for laying the asphaltum or whether it includes the grading?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is for repaving.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 27, to insert:

For constructing a suitable viaduct and bridge to carry Benning Road over the tracks of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to be available until expended, $110,000. And the commissioners are hereby authorized to make the necessary expenditures for the construction of said viaduct and bridge and approaches under the like conditions prescribed for the expenditure of the appropriation for a subway and bridge at Cedar Street, contained in the act of May 18, 1910, making appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1911: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing said viaduct and bridge within the limits of the rights of way of said Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. shall be borne and paid, half by said railroad companies in proportion to the widths of their respective rights of way, and half by the United States and the District of Columbia, as provided in section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1903; and said sums shall be paid by said companies to the Treasurer of the United States, one half to the credit of the District of Columbia and the other half to the credit of the United States; and the same shall be valid and subsisting liens against the franchise and property of said Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., respectively, and shall be a legal indebtedness of said companies in favor of the District of Columbia, jointly for its use and the use of the United States as aforesaid; and the said lien or liens may be enforced in the name of the District of Columbia by bill in equity brought by the commissioners of said District in the Supreme Court of said District, or by any other lawful proceedings against the said Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., or said Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., or both; and any relocation in the line or change in the grade of the tracks of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. necessary to permit the completion in accordance with approved plans of the viaduct and bridge and approaches herein provided for shall be made by and at the cost of said railway company; and in the event of said railway company failing or refusing to do such work the same shall be done by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the cost to be paid from the appropriation for said bridge and viaduct and collected from said street railway company in the manner provided for in section 5 of "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878, and paid into the Treasury, one-half to the credit of the United States and one-half to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 11, to insert:

Payment for ground and damages on account of condemnation proceedings: To pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings in square No. 2838, in the city of Washington, $4,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 2, after "$1,800," to insert "and hereafter said street between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets shall become a part of Irving Street, and be known and designated upon the plats and maps of the District of Columbia as Irving Street," so as to make the clause read:

Northeast: Fort Place, Seventeenth Street to Eighteenth Street, grade and improve, $1,800, and hereafter said street between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets shall become a part of Irving Street, and be known and designated upon the plats and maps of the District of Columbia as Irving Street.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to insert:

Northeast: Minnesota Avenue, Benning Road to Forty-second Street, grade and improve, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 12, to insert:

Northwest: Connecticut Avenue, Tilden Street to Pierce Mill Road, grade and improve, $5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 14, to insert:

Northwest: Avenue of the Presidents, Montague Street to the Military Road, $26,952.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 16, to insert:

Northwest: Park Road, Fourteenth Street to Sherman Avenue, grade and improve, $10,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 18, to insert:

Southeast: Highview Place, Nichols Avenue to Brothers Place, grade and improve, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 20, to insert:

Southeast: Fifth Street, Alabama Avenue to Savannah Street, and Savannah Street, Fourth Street to Randle Place, grade and improve, $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 23, to insert:

Southeast: Waclark Place, Nichols Avenue to Raleigh Street, grade and improve, $800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 32, to insert:

Northeast: Hunt Place, Deane Avenue, and Grant Street, from Minnesota Avenue to Division Avenue, grade and improve, $14,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 3, to insert:

Northeast: Streets in Burrville, Division Avenue to District line, grade, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 5, to insert:

Southeast: Fourth Street, Nichols Avenue to Savannah Street, grade and improve, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 7, to insert:

Southeast: Sixth Street, Alabama Avenue to Savannah Street, grade and improve, $1,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 9, to insert:

Southeast: Randle Place, Alabama Avenue to Savannah Street, grade and improve, $1,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 11, to insert:

Northeast: Twenty-fifth Street, Hamlin Street to Irving Street, grade and improve, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 13, to insert:

Northeast: Twenty-fourth Street, Irving Street to Hamlin Street, grade and improve, $3,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 15, to insert:

Northeast: Otis Street, Twelfth Street to Fourteenth Street, grade $4,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 17, to insert:

Northwest: Eleventh Street, Columbia Road to Park Road, grade and improve, $6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 19, to insert:

Northeast: Lawrence Street, Sixteenth Street to Eighteenth Street, grade and improve, $3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 21, to insert:

Northwest: Harrison Street, Belt Road to Wisconsin Avenue, grade and improve, $5,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after the line 23, to insert:

Northwest: Forty-first Street, from Ingomar Street to Harrison Street, grade and improve, $800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 33, to insert:

Northwest: Audubon Street, Albemarle Street to Broad Branch Road, grade, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 2, to insert:

Northeast: Kearney Street, Fourteenth Street to Eighteenth Street, grade and improve, $5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "$85,500" and insert "$210,452," so as to read:

In all, $210,452.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 5, to strike out:

Hereafter the street designated as the Avenue of the Presidents shall be known and designated as "Sixteenth Street" in accordance with the original plans of the city of Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I was going to say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], I understand, wishes to say something about this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the early days our forefathers laid out the plan of the city of Washington. They made it so that all the streets running north and south were numbered, and all the streets running east and west were lettered, and the diagonal highways were called "avenues of the States."

Our forefathers were a logical, sensible, consistent sort of people, and they laid down a logical and sensible and consistent plan of a city. It is true that since then the letters of the alphabet have given out—such has been the growth of the Federal city—and the new and suburban streets running east and west have had to have their names supplemented; but numbers never will give out, and there is no necessity for changing the names of the north-and-south streets.

Sixteenth Street NW. was so called because it was *the* sixteenth street of the city of Washington west of North Capitol Street. It was just half way between Fifteenth and Seventeenth Streets, and it received, in the forum of common sense, the name of Sixteenth Street. A year ago, I believe, by way of a rider upon the appropriation bill, this time-honored name, whereby the sponsors in baptism of Sixteenth Street had made it a member of the Washington municipality, was changed to "Avenue of the Presidents." This change was partially dictated by the desire of property owners upon the street, who thought that calling it an "avenue" would appreciate the value of the property there, or, rather, the price of property, not its value, and partially by an identical desire on the part of influential real estate dealers in lots there.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether he can state a better reason for it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I think I can state another and an equally compelling reason.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the Senator can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going to do it in a few minutes.

One of the reasons, I repeat, that led to the change was that certain property owners on Sixteenth Street and certain real estate dealers dealing in property on Sixteenth Street thought they could thereby appreciate the price of their holdings. I understand there really are in existence people of certain types, notably conspicuous among the nouveaux riches, who decline to own a home on anything that is not called an "avenue" or a "boulevard" or something of that sort, and I have been told that some "so-called folks" of that ilk had really declined to buy property upon Sixteenth Street because it was not called a boulevard or an avenue. Then, in addition to this influence, there was another, and that was the influence of society, spelled with a "s-a-s" and a "s-i-e" and a "t-y."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator whether he bought his home on this celebrated street before or after the change of the name?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I bought mine before the change, and I did not belong to the class who absolutely required to be situated and located upon an avenue in order to be happy or feel respectable. Well, "sassiety" wanted it—a certain sort of "sassiety"—so as to put it on a visiting card, you understand, "Mr. John Smith, No. So-and-so Avenue of the Presidents." It is just one of those illustrations of ridiculous snobbery that might have been delightfully satirized by Molière in a manner after that of Les Precieuses Ridicules.

Now, a good, plain Mississippian comes up here and wants to see me. I live on Sixteenth Street. The only property I own in Washington is my home there. When he knows that I live on Sixteenth Street he knows that when he gets off the Fourteenth Street car he has two squares to walk west, but when he hears that I live upon the Avenue of the Presidents he not only does not know where I live, but nobody out there can tell him, because the people in that vicinity as yet positively refuse to call it the Avenue of the Presidents.

I have received a mass of letters since the name was changed, and only two of them were ever directed to me at the Avenue of the Presidents, and they were invitations to dinners. The folks out home do not know it. The folks in the neighborhood do not know it under its masquerade name. If you get off at Fourteenth Street and ask the first passerby who lives there which way you shall take to get to the Avenue of the Presidents, the chances are he will tell you that he does not know.

It is a peculiar sort of thing. The people who brought about the change just wanted to call it an avenue; they did not care much what.

For a while they suggested "Executive Avenue," but that looked as if the inhabitants and residents upon it might be executed. [Laughter.] Then they wanted to call it the "Avenue of the Allies," because it ran from Jackson Square, where the monuments to our allies, Rochambeau, and von Steuben, and Lafayette, and Kosciusko, and the balance of them, including Andy Jackson, I suppose, are; but just so they got it called an avenue they did not much care what avenue it was called. I am astonished that they did not call it a boulevard while they were about it, because there is no boulevard in Washington, and they might have called it just simply "The Boulevard."

It indicates a sort of a snobbish respect and reverence for official position and titles that is absent even from London and St. Petersburg. In London, so far as I know, there is no "Avenue of the King." In St. Petersburg, as far as I have yet learned, there is no "Avenue of the Tsars." Even in Berlin, where the Kaiser not only reigns but rules, while there is an "Avenue Unter den Linden," showing the reverence of humanity for beautiful trees, there is no "Avenue of the Kaisers." It remained for Washington to originate an "Avenue of the Presidents," named after all of them, good, bad, and indifferent, from George Washington down to Theodore Roosevelt and the rest, inclusive. [Laughter.]

I live on the street, and I do not want to be known as living on the "Avenue of the Presidents." Somebody down in Mississippi might think I bought the house after the street was

so named. If it had been so named beforehand, I would have hesitated, because I would not have brought upon my visiting friends the confusion of trying to locate me after they got here.

Now, the House of Representatives, seeing the utterly too great ambitiousness of this appellation, introduced into this bill a clause which we have just reached, restoring to Sixteenth Street its time-honored name and giving it permission to cease masquerading under the denomination of the Avenue of the Presidents. In doing it the House did a very sensible and a very wise thing.

Knowing the members of the District of Columbia Committee as I did, I thought it would only be necessary to mention the fact to one of them and that they would imitate the House example. But the Senate committee has an amendment upon this bill striking out the House provision. The House provision is:

Hereafter the street designated as the Avenue of the Presidents shall be known and designated as "Sixteenth Street," in accordance with the original plans of the city of Washington.

The Senate committee strikes out that House provision from the bill, so that the question presents itself now over the Senate committee amendment. I hope that the Senate committee amendment will be voted down and that those of us who love high thinking and plain living may be permitted to think as highly as we can and live as plainly as we know how on Sixteenth Street and not upon the Avenue of the Presidents.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but other business has kept me away from the meetings, as much as I should like to have attended them. I heartily agree with everything the Senator from Mississippi has said, and I would not take the floor now for what few words I am going to say except to explain to that committee that it is usually not my habit to go away from the recommendations made by the committee of which I am a member without first giving notice to the committee that I shall take such a position on the floor of the Senate.

This name seems to me to be the extreme of all snobbishness. If we have the Avenue of the Presidents, I will insist that we shall have an Avenue of the Vice Presidents. I shall insist that we shall change old Seventeenth Street into an Avenue of the Cabinet, and go through with all that ridiculous——

Mr. WILLIAMS. An Avenue of Senators, by all means.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; Avenue of Senators; and when they name that avenue away out in the country somewhere I hope I may be able to buy a home on it. But as to the idea of designating old Sixteenth Street the Avenue of the Presidents, I can do no more than to express the sentiment which was better expressed by the Senator from Mississippi and declare it to be a snobbishness with which I have no patience.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, beginning after the word "Washington," in line 9, page 33. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

*Provided*, That the alley running parallel with the said avenue north of Massachusetts Avenue and between said avenue and Seventeenth Street shall hereafter be known and designated as the Alley of the Vice Presidents.

[Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that for the sake of brevity he might amend by striking out the word "Presidents" and let it go that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is always difficult to argue a matter of taste, because when you declare your reasons for liking or disliking something as a matter of taste it is very apt to seem as if you were reflecting upon those who take an opposite view. It seems to me that good reason as well as good taste dictate a return to the name of Sixteenth Street.

Washington is one of those capitals which is the creation of government like St. Petersburg, and in a less degree Madrid and Berlin. Therefore they took here a number of farms, open country, and upon it they laid out a city. They adopted a simple system of naming. I do not think, myself, as an abstract proposition that letters and numbers are particularly inspiring names for streets. I think they indicate some poverty of invention, but they are at least simple, sensible, and convenient. They have stood for many years. They serve every purpose. By making this change we adopt what seems to me—and I say it with all deference to those who differ from me—is a pompous, ostentatious, affected name. It is not in consonance with the general naming of the Capital. It is not in consonance with the language in which it is stated. "Avenue of the Presidents" is not an English idiom. It belongs to another language. It is very appropriate in Paris to say "Street of the Peace," but it would be absurd to do it in English. If we are going to use that name we should say "Peace Street." That gives it a still further air of affectation, to my mind. I suppose everyone here recalls the familiar ballad of Thackeray, in which he indulges in a little humor at the French method of naming streets:

A street there is in Paris famous,
For which no rhyme our language yields,
Rue Neuve des Petits Champs its name is—
The New Street of the Little Fields.

And even when Thackeray translated it, he did not make a literal translation. He had to say "New Street" instead of "Street New of the Little Fields."

Here we take and contort English in order to reach a name which I do not think adds to the dignity of the city at all. It seems to me it is far more dignified to keep the simple and very serviceable and convenient nomenclature for our streets that we always had. I was very sorry when I saw the change made, and I sincerely hope that the committee amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I approach the discussion of this matter with a good deal of trepidation. I was notified in advance that the Senate was to be treated to the rarest kind of wit in discussing the name of this highway, and it is a matter of gratification that Senators who always indulge in gaiety when they have an opportunity have given us a sample of real wit in this discussion.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] came to Washington he bought a home on Massachusetts Avenue, and we are all glad that he is living on that beautiful avenue and enjoying his beautiful home. There are some people in Washington and some people who will come to Washington in the future who have very clear notions that our street nomenclature is not of the best, and that numbering streets First, Second, Third, Fourth—and we had until recent years a Four-and-a-half Street—is an awkward way of designating our streets. It is true that it is a convenient way to find people, and I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Mississippi, for the first time in his life, has established a home where he can not be found. But he would be laboring under the same handicap if he lived on New Hampshire Avenue, or Vermont Avenue, or Massachusetts Avenue, or Rhode Island Avenue, or any of the other great avenues that George Washington placed in a swamp when he thought the city was going to travel in another direction, and his followers have been disappointed to find that New England has all the beautiful avenues of the city of Washington.

George Washington put the avenues down here in the northeast and southeast, and when a distinguished southern Senator started out two or three years ago to find the avenue that was named after his State, one of the original thirteen States, he found it was paved with cobblestones and ran directly through the navy yard. He came to me, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in great trouble, asking that we would find some other avenue to name after his State. The result was that we found one which runs in a straight line and is known as Georgia Avenue.

Mr. President, about this Sixteenth Street, and I hold no brief in behalf of the people living on that street, I think the Senator from Mississippi inadvertently has done some of them an injustice. I do not think they are snobs. I do not think that they had any snobbery in their minds when they felt it would be a good idea to give some other name to that street than Sixteenth Street. Over 90 per cent of the property owners on that street signed a petition for a change of name. The first suggestion was, I believe, that it should be Executive Avenue, and various other names were suggested. Among others, the late lamented Justice Brown, who lived on the street, suggested White House Road, taking a name that is common in England; that is, the "road" part of it. Other names were suggested by various persons. The matter drifted along until last year.

However, to go back a little way, I will say that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of their own volition, some years ago named the part of Sixteenth Street running north of the old boundary line—that is, from Florida Avenue—the Avenue of the Presidents. They put the name on the street lamps. The citizens on that street adapted themselves to the change and were apparently happy. But some influences were set at work and the next board of commissioners changed it back to Sixteenth Street. So the change last year was not the first change that happened to that important thoroughfare.

Various objections have been made to the present name. We have heard some of them humorously suggested this afternoon. While perhaps I am somewhat devoid of the scintillating humor that certain other Senators are in the habit of treating us to, I think I could make one or two suggestions that perhaps would

entertain the occupants of the galleries as much as those already made; but I will not venture on that course.

I made a suggestion some years ago about that street, and were it not for the difficulty of pronouncing the French name I would have had it called L'Enfant Avenue, in honor of the man who did so much toward laying out this beautiful city and who in his wisdom, suggested, perhaps, to him by George Washington himself, made these magnificent avenues which run obliquely from the Capitol, like spokes in a wheel.

But Congress changed the name of this street last year, and various objections have been made to the change in this debate and elsewhere. One of the objections that has been urged more often than any other is that it is too long a name. It contains 21 letters, while the avenue that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts lives on has 19 letters, while New Hampshire Avenue has 18 letters, Pennsylvania Avenue has the same number, and Connecticut Avenue has 17 letters. So the length of the name does not seem to be very important. The number of the words might well, I think, be objected to.

It has also been objected that no President ever lived on that avenue. Suppose no President ever did live on the avenue, every President the country has ever had, including the one that New Hampshire contributed, has looked up that avenue from the porch of the White House a great many times, no doubt; and I am not quite sure but that in view of that fact it is a rather happy appellation.

It is further insisted that the street runs on straight lines, while it was intended that the avenues should run diagonally, like the spokes of a wheel. That was doubtless the intention of the men who laid out the city of Washington, but I do not apprehend that it ever entered the minds of those men that other avenues might not be added that did not run like the spokes of a wheel.

Let us see what we have done. We have Georgia Avenue, we have Oregon Avenue, we have Denison Avenue, we have Dumbarton Avenue, we have Wisconsin Avenue, we have Sherman Avenue, we have Wyoming Avenue, we have South Avenue, and we have other avenues in the city of Washington that run on straight lines. So the argument that we have departed from the plan laid out by those wise men in the early days of the Republic does not hold good.

Mr. President, Sixteenth Street is one of the most magnificent thoroughfares in all the world, and it is destined, in my judgment, to be in the next 25 years the grandest street in all the world. It is a most beautiful thoroughfare, wide, lined by elegant residences, extending out into the country almost to the District line now, and destined, as I believe, to be extended through the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania to the historic battle field of Gettysburg. It was in that view, no doubt, that some people thought it would be a good idea to change the name from a street to that of an avenue.

I am not going to argue that the change of name was wisely made, or that the present name should remain unchanged, but I do, Mr. President, suggest in all sincerity that that great thoroughfare may well be called an avenue rather than remain as a numbered street.

It is undeniable, Mr. President, that the change of the name of Sixteenth Street to that of "Avenue of the Presidents" has given a splendid impetus to the development of that great thoroughfare. Beautiful houses and other magnificent structures have been erected. The Russian embassy, the French embassy, the Spanish embassy, the Brazilian embassy, the Bolivian legation, and the Venezuelan legation are located on that avenue at the present time, and I understand it is not a wild dream to believe that other embassies will find their homes on that avenue.

The name has been changed on the street lamps. Property has been assessed under the new name, unimproved property has been acquired for building purposes, and many other things have been done because of the fact that it is no longer a numbered street.

Mr. President, I have no greater interest in this matter than any other Senator. Personally, it is immaterial to me what name the highway bears, because I do not own a foot of land on that avenue or in any other part of the District of Columbia. So if it is thought desirable to change the name of that street back to Sixteenth Street it will not affect me.

Mr. President, I think I understand how the change was made in another body. It did not get much consideration. But if the Senate in its calm moments and forgetting the influence that wit and oratory always play in a discussion of a matter of this kind, concludes to make the change, no fault can be found.

What I have hoped for, Mr. President, is that this matter might go to conference, and it was for that purpose, and that purpose alone, that the committee struck out the provision the House inserted in the bill. I believe if it goes to conference a compromise will be reached and that there will be gratification on the part of the good people living on that beautiful thoroughfare as well as the people in general at the result which will be attained.

I should not stand here or elsewhere in stubborn advocacy of the present name of that avenue, but I do insist, Mr. President, that in view of what is going on along that great highway, what has been accomplished already, and what will be accomplished in the near future, the people living on that thoroughfare are entitled to more serious consideration than they have been given to-day. They are among our best and most patriotic citizens, among our most generous citizens. They stand for what is best in the District of Columbia, and they have a right, as they have done by a petition of 90 per cent of the property owners, to ask Congress to change the name from a street to that of an avenue.

Mr. President, that is all I will say about the matter except to repeat that I trust the Senate will not be carried off its feet by the humorous suggestions that have been made to-day, and that they will permit this matter, as the committee would wish them to do, to go to conference with a view to an agreement that I think very likely would be satisfactory to all the Members of both Houses of Congress.

But if that is not done no Senator will be more content than I will be to have the old name restored, because I do not expect to own a mansion on Sixteenth Street or a home, however modest, on any other street or avenue in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] "hopes that the Senate will not be carried off its feet" by what he pleases to call humor. There is absolutely nothing humorous at all in restoring to Sixteenth Street its original name. It is a plain and simple, comprehensible name. There was something quite humorous in giving it the name of "Avenue of the Presidents," and perhaps that accounts for its getting the name; maybe it was a joke.

Mr. President, the Senator referred to the manner in which the House changed the name back to what it originally was. He said it received "little consideration" there. I want to say that when it was originally changed in this body from Sixteenth Street to the Avenue of the Presidents it was done by a rider upon an appropriation bill, without notice to a single Senator in this body who lived upon Sixteenth Street. As far as I was concerned, I did not know of it for several days after the new name was blazoned on the street lamps.

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion was made by a Senator living on Sixteenth Street.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Then he had notice of it, of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. And a considerable property owner on the street.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I admit that he had notice of his own motion, but I did not have any notice of it. I did not know it until as I told you and then found it in the RECORD two or three days afterwards.

In the next place, I deny that the people on Sixteenth Street wanted the change. Of course, a great many people signed the petition, but we know how people sign petitions. Nor did I a moment ago say that "the people living on Sixteenth Street were snobs," as the Senator seemed to quote me as saying. I live there myself, and a great many of my dearest friends and neighbors are there; but I did say it seemed to me the motive behind this change was twofold—a desire to appreciate the price of the street property and, secondly, a sort of innocent snobbery. Not all of them, nor a tenth of them, were actuated by the mere society fad idea, but some of them were, undoubtedly.

I do not want any compromise. I do not want it to go to conference for the purpose of compromising and, it may be, bringing it out as the "Avenue of the Senators," or the "Sergeants at Arms," or something else. I want it restored to its rightful name. I want the plan of the city maintained, as far as it can be. If we named a street Oregon Avenue, it was perhaps a street running east and west after the letters for such streets had given out. We have had to resort to names for east-and-west streets when we exhausted the letters of the alphabet.

Not only that, but the plan of the city had another delightful and significant thing about it. This is the Government of the United States. It is the only Government in the world that is plural in number. The consequence was that the avenues were named after the States. There are States yet that have no avenues named for them, and if it is going to be called an avenue at all, it seems to me it would have been well to have kept up the original idea.

Mr. President, a majority of the people who wanted this wanted it for the plain pocketbook purpose of increasing the price of the property on Sixteenth Street—amongst others, real estate dealers interested in that proposition.

I live on Sixteenth Street. The only property I own in Washington is on Sixteenth Street. I tell you the price of the property there is too high already, and Congress ought not to do anything to make the price of property out there any higher. I can sell mine to-day for more than I gave for it. I bought it when it was Sixteenth Street, and the price that was given for it was given as property on Sixteenth Street.

It is true that there are people of a certain class who will buy a lot upon a highway called an avenue and will not buy a lot upon a highway called a street. I am not desirous to increase the number of such silly people in my immediate neighborhood. As to the embassies that have been built out there, they would have been built anyhow. They went to Sixteenth Street because it is the greatest residence highway in this town. Continued due northward it would strike Gettysburg.

By the way, if you were going to change the name at all, it ought to be called "the Gettysburg Road."

Mr. GALLINGER. I would say to the Senator that that suggestion has been made by other people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I said if you were going to change it, but I do not want to change it at all. I want the Sixteenth Street of Washington called Sixteenth Street. That is its right name, and I do not want a great long name given to it of any description. I do not want the simple plan of the city destroyed, nor do I want this parade of humor continued which was begun when they started out masquerading it under the appellation of "Avenue of the Presidents."

The Senator very truthfully says it is one of the grandest streets in the world. It is broad, splendidly paved, with large, deep yardways between the beautiful sidewalks and the houses. It is very well improved for the most part and is destined to be improved very much more. Its avenue of shade trees, double in places, is a thing of beauty and a joy to the eye. Values out there are appreciating all the time, appreciating too rapidly and too much. It is not the best thing for a city to have the prices of lots in eligible parts of it so high that men of modest means can not buy them at all. So even if those people were right about the change of name appreciating values, I for one am not selfish enough to want that done, so far as what I own is concerned, and it ought not to be done by the aid of Congress. If it takes place in the natural course of development, all right. Then I shall welcome it. But I want no law to accelerate the appreciation.

The Senator says that Massachusetts Avenue has more letters in it than Avenue of the Presidents.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not quite as many.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But when people come to write it they do not write it Massachusetts Avenue. They write it "Mass." with a period, and when they come to write Connecticut Avenue it is "Conn." with a period. So I suppose while this would be written Ave. of Presidents, or something of that sort, or to abbreviate it still further "Ave. of Pres.," which suggests some thoughts into which I shall not go.

I imagine that the real reason which guided the House in restoring the old and right name was that the House had a recurrence of plain, ordinary, simple, common sense, and the common sense of the situation was to let the Sixteenth Street NW. alone, and let it continue to be called for what it was—Sixteenth Street NW. This was its baptismal name. Its sponsors in municipal baptism were very great men. Then the historical associations of Sixteenth Street are such that I should hate to see the historical continuity destroyed.

It reminds me of the time when Amos Cummings, whom I loved very much, came to me over in the other House and said he wanted to change the name of the Congressional Library and to call it the "National Library." I said, "Amos, I could imagine that coming from a Philistine, but not from you. The whole history of this great library is mixed up with its name. It started out with a few books for the use of Congressmen. It was literally the 'Congressional Library'; and you come along and want to change its name and just run a plow of revolution across the line of historical continuity. I do not want it done." And Amos dropped it. So if there were no other reason except that, I do not want to destroy the historical continuity of things on Sixteenth Street by having its name changed.

Some very great men in Washington have lived on Sixteenth Street in former days, and their names are connected with it and the name. I do not want the man who comes here seeking to have pointed out to him where they lived told that their homes and habitations, so far as they have any on earth now—they being dead—are to be found upon a street by a different name.

In all due seriousness, Mr. President—it is hard to argue seriously the name of a street—but with all due seriousness I hope that the Senate will vote down the Senate committee amendment, and that the name of Sixteenth Street may be restored. I think, so far as I have been able to learn, while I will not say a majority of the people there are in favor of the restoration I do know that a great number of them are, and a majority of those whom I have met are.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I concur with the views expressed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It does not occur to me that a name gives dignity to a street; I do think that the street gives dignity to the name; and it is immaterial whether you call it Sixteenth Street or whether you call it the Avenue of the Presidents. It will not change the character or the importance of the street. So far as the fine buildings upon the street are concerned, if my recollection serves me aright the improvements had all been made or had been projected before there was a thought of the change of name, and they went to Sixteenth Street and not to the Avenue of the Presidents. Sixteenth Street is a great, broad, fine street, and those improvements were bound to be made there, whatever name should be applied to it.

I know that I and many others, while we did not feel that it was a matter of very great importance, were really sorry when we ascertained that the name had been changed. It was not changed with due deliberation, whatever may be said to the contrary now.

Mr. President, I think we all know the reason why it was changed. It was not that the street would be any more dignified or any more beautiful or any more useful, but it was because there was a sort of a fad that the name "Avenue of the Presidents" sounded a little more harmonious perhaps to the listening ear than did "Sixteenth Street." I hope, with the Senator from Mississippi, that the House provision will be concurred in; and I hope that the matter will not go to conference, for the reason stated by the Senator from Mississippi, that if it does it may be very well taken that the wish and the will of the Senate is that it shall remain "Avenue of the Presidents."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, while I have the greatest possible confidence in the Senate conferees on the District appropriation bill, it seems to me that this is a question with which the Senate itself is capable of dealing. The Senate knows whether it wishes the old name or the new. I am rather surprised at statements that have been made that the people feel so about having it called an avenue. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] referred to my house being on Massachusetts Avenue. I should not have cared sixpence whether it was an avenue or a street. In the old city in which I was born pretty much everything is called a street; I have never lived in anything but a street there. If Massachusetts Avenue had been called "Massachusetts Street," it would have been just as attractive to me as "Massachusetts Avenue"; but if it had been called the "Avenue of the Massachusetts," I think I should have revolted. [Laughter.]

Besides, the name "Massachusetts" is an American name, an Indian name, relating to the name of an Indian tribe. The names of all the States have a meaning, and they have a peculiar significance and appropriateness here in this Capital. "Avenue of the Presidents" goes against the grain with me, because it is an unnatural way to entitle a street in the American Capital; and it is done with a French idiom.

I sincerely hope that we shall vote upon the question here, and retain the House provision.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if I had greater hope than I have of the committee amendment being agreed to—I still hope it will be, but I am somewhat solicitous about it—I would perhaps feel like expressing regret that anything has occurred in the renaming of Sixteenth Street to lead the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to think that we are aping foreign manners, for I feel sure there is no such purpose in it. We have a President Street in New York City. I do not know but that they ought to get rid of that name. All the avenues of New York City run on straight lines. The Senator from Massachusetts alludes to the city in which he was born. I presume that was Boston. They have there a Commonwealth Avenue, a Huntington Avenue, a Massachusetts Avenue, and a Columbus Avenue. When I mentioned "Commonwealth Avenue" the Senator said, sotto voce, that that was the only one. I have enumerated others and could add to the list. These avenues all run in straight lines out into the country, and are magnificent thoroughfares. I do not imagine the people of Boston would

want to name one of those avenues "Sixteenth Street," or any other kind of a street.

There is a dignity to the name "avenue." I do not like the name "boulevard"; I think that is too Frenchy; but "avenue" is an American word. I confess that if I were rich enough to buy a home in Washington, I should endeavor to get it on one of the great avenues of this city. I might not succeed in doing so, but I should endeavor to do so. I do not wonder that people coming here to make their homes and to invest their money turn their eyes toward the avenues of the city with a feeling that they prefer them to the streets. I am glad a great many of those people are building their beautiful homes on the avenue named after the little State which I in part represent, and I know that they have a pride in it. I am willing that they should gratify that pride; it does not do anybody any harm, and perhaps it does some people good.

Mr. President, it would be idle to continue the discussion, but I felt constrained to say a few words on the subject, because I thought it a matter of some consequence to the city of Washington. I have abundant faith to believe that the committee of conference would deal with this subject very wisely and reach a wise conclusion, but if it is the judgment of the Senate that the name of Sixteenth Street should be restored, let it be done. After we have done that, we ought to turn our attention to some other avenues the courses of which are violative of the plan that was laid down by Washington and L'Enfant and Ellicott, and rename those avenues as streets. We would be consistent if we did that. However, the matter is before the Senate, and I hope it will come to a speedy vote, for the reason, as I said yesterday, that I am extremely anxious as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to see this bill make as rapid progress as possible.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a resident of Washington for the past two years or more, I am interested in this subject. First, I wish to say that I believe that there is a good deal in a name. I have laid out a great many streets and a great many avenues, and whenever the opportunity came, I am frank and free to say that I tried to dignify those thoroughfares with the name of "avenue."

It seems to me, accepting the argument of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that if the change of name has increased the value of the property on that avenue, it has been of infinite benefit to the District of Columbia. I believe the dignified name "Avenue of the Presidents" has conduced to the value of the property, but aside from that personal view of it, it seems to me it is eminently fitting that the name should be the "Avenue of the Presidents," approaching the White House as that avenue does. Having been changed—it is on your lamp posts, it is in many of your titles, and it is generally accepted now—pray Heaven, what particular reason can there be at this time for subverting this and coming back to the name "Sixteenth Street"? Naturally, that name would have a peculiar appeal for me, because I was born on Sixteenth Street in the city of New York, but I believe that the public have accepted the present name. I do not believe there is any general rebellion against the name "Avenue of the Presidents," and I believe that it adds to the dignity and character of the city. I trust that the motion to change this name will not prevail. I have not one dollar's worth of interest in this city, nor any interest other than the general interest as a sojourner here and a lover of the Capital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the question is put I wish to call attention to one matter that I intended to state, and it will take but a word.

The proposition to change the name of Sixteenth Street to "Avenue of the Presidents" was originally offered in the Senate when there was a reasonably full attendance—I recall the circumstance very well—and it was agreed to without dissent. It went to conference, and the House conferees immediately agreed to it. So the House in its present attitude assumes a position different from that assumed by the conferees on the part of the House when the name was changed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question. I myself do not know, but I inquire of the Senator if he remembers whether or not an intimation came from the House to the effect that if the Senate would put in the amendment changing the name the House conferees would agree?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees, and I will say to the Senator that I never heard of any such intimation.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah was one of the conferees, I will ask him if this matter had ever come before the House so that there could be a vote on it as a distinct and separate proposition?

Mr. SMOOT. No; there was not a direct vote upon it, but it came before the House on the question of the House concurring in the amendments proposed by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. They agreed to the amendment changing the name of Sixteenth Street because they had to agree to it with the rest of the conference report; but the provision was never voted upon by the House in any way, either as an original proposition or on a question to concur in it as a separate amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is perfectly true, Mr. President; but the Senator from New Hampshire has well stated the position of the conferees of the House. I remember that just as soon as we reached the amendment of the Senate changing the name of Sixteenth Street, Mr. Burleson, who was then the senior member of the conferees on the part of the House, immediately stated, "the House recedes"; and the amendment of the Senate became a part of the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am not interested at all in the legislative processes by which this high-sounding name became attached to this very beautiful street. The only practical question before us now is whether the Senate prefers the name Sixteenth Street to the present name. I hate to pronounce the name now attached to the lamp-posts on that magnificent thoroughfare. Some Senators seem to think that name, having been painted upon the glass lamp-posts, is given a quality of fixity and endurance, if not of antiquity, that should make any modern vandal hesitate to desecrate it. I do not feel in that way. I confess that the first time I saw that name emblazoned on a lamp-post, if I had had a stone within reach I think I would have thrown it at the lamp-post in my revulsion at the horror that had been perpetrated upon an otherwise respectable and handsome-looking street. I still find it difficult to restrain my disgust at the motive which operated to put the name there, and I admit the continuing irritation it causes me to be compelled to observe it. I think the change in name was actuated by some sort of a "hifalutin" idea, if not of snobbery, at least of a pursuit of a delusion of grandeur.

The Presidents have had nothing whatever to do with that street, any more than with any other street. It is a good, wide street, such as Fourteenth Street and other streets.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is wider.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It may be wider, but it is parallel with all the other numbered streets. If the geometrical plan upon which the city is laid out is that the numbered streets should be at right angles to the lettered streets and the avenues should be superimposed upon that rectangular plan, running diagonally, I think there is some merit in preserving the nomenclature of the streets as they were laid out; but, be that as it may, this importation of an idiom or the aping of a foreign method of plastering a lot of words on to one street when a brief designation is all that is necessary is repugnant to me, and I think it ought to be repugnant to the idea of simplicity and good taste and lack of ostentation and splurge which ought to be characteristic of a democratic form of government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. It has been suggested to me that perhaps the real reason why the name of this street was changed was because of the revulsion of public sentiment from the old principle of 16 to 1. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If there has been a revulsion, I am with the revulsion, and I hope it will be permanent. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. There is where the Senator and I differ.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know the Senator still adheres to his shattered idols, theoretically at least. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. That is one among other reasons why I shall vote with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If that is one, I have sixteen why I shall also vote with the Senator from Mississippi. That is all there is to it, Mr. President. It is simply a matter of how this would strike a man of simple taste who wanted to rely upon the appearance of the street itself for its dignity, and not upon the name that was painted upon the lamp-posts or printed upon the visiting cards of the residents. While I admit that some attention ought to be paid to the people who reside upon a street and to their desire for a name, I do not think that ought to be a controlling reason.

I can see no propriety whatever in calling this street the "Avenue of the Presidents." You might just as well call it the avenue of anything else. I do not see why all the Presidents of this country, including those who are now departed and reposing in peace, should be held responsible for this

thing. They made good records in their lives, and now that they have gone to their eternal repose, why they should have this name foisted upon the street with which they had nothing to do I do not see. It appears to me that if "Sixteenth Street" was a good enough name for that thoroughfare for 100 years it is good enough now, and I do not approve the motive which I think operated to change it, and so I shall vote to restore it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am interested to observe that the flow of wit continues, and I am gratified that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who doubtless looks out on beautiful Connecticut Avenue day by day and thanks heaven that his State has been so honored, has added his interesting contribution to this discussion.

As I said before, Mr. President, I have no personal interest in this matter; but I do think that Senators ought not to suggest that there was an evil motive animating the change of name. I have some little knowledge about that matter—I will not impose it upon the Senate—but I think the motive was just as pure and just as worthy as any motive could be.

If the Senator from Connecticut, arm in arm with the Senator from Mississippi, will go up Pennsylvania Avenue, he will find a street running north and south called John Marshall Place. Its name was changed from a numbered street at the instance of a Senator whom we all honored and with whom we joined with great alacrity in making that change because he wanted to honor the name of a great jurist. I did not think then that the name was particularly applicable to that little street; but it is there and it is a departure from the plan of the city which has been so earnestly urged should be retained.

Mr. President, forgetting the witticisms, overlooking the suggestion that interested motives had something to do with the change of name, I have no doubt that the Senate will act conscientiously. I do not think Senators ought to argue that if this amendment prevails and this matter goes to conference the present name will be continued. I will venture to suggest that this is almost the first time in my recollection where a committee, acting deliberately, has asked that a matter, not of such great importance that it should startle the Senate, be allowed to go to conference for the adjustment of differences, has had its request denied; but if it should be denied, I shall find no fault, however much I may regret it.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, all that I care to say on this question is that ever since Sixteenth Street lost its ancient and rightful name I have been hoping for an opportunity to be able to vote to restore it, and I am very thankful that the opportunity has now come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 33, after line 15, to insert:

To carry out the provisions contained in the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, which authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, there is hereby appropriated, payable entirely from the revenues of the District of Columbia, such sum as is necessary for said purpose during the fiscal year to end June 30, 1915.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the Secretary in reading that amendment, there is no fixed amount of appropriation for the purpose indicated. It seems to be a question of indefinite amount. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill to give me some further information concerning it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that it is impossible to fix an amount, because it is not known what amount will be realized from condemnation proceedings. It is always put in this form, so that whatever may be necessary may be used. If the Senator would like to hear it read, I have here an explanation of the whole matter.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not trouble the Senator to read it; but, if he will allow me, I will be glad to read it myself.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 34, line 8, after the word "material," to strike out "and maintenance of motor vehicle for use of engineer commissioner and his assistants," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs—Streets, avenues, and alleys: For current work of repairs of streets, avenues, and alleys, including resurfacing and repairs to asphalt pavements with the same or other not inferior material, and this appropriation shall be available for repairing pavements of street railways when necessary; the amounts thus expended shall be collected from such railroad companies as provided by section 5 of "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878, and shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for the fiscal year in which they are collected, $339,185.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 17, to insert:

Repave with asphalt the roadway of Seventh Street NW., from New York Avenue to Q Street, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

For surfacing with asphalt the roadways of approach on both sides of the Highway Bridge, $30,000, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to do this work with their portable asphalt plant if, in the judgment of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, such work can be economically performed by the use of said plant.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill why in the provisions for the improvement of streets all through the bill there is at all times specified an asphaltum pavement? No other type of pavement apparently is considered. It seems to me such provisions restrict the choice of the commissioners. Asphaltum makes a fairly good pavement—not the best kind of a pavement, but as good perhaps as most others. It has the disadvantage of being slippery in wet weather, when horses fall and sometimes are seriously hurt. Is there no choice as to the kind of paving which may be used? Is this city tied down to one particular type of pavement, without any opportunity whatever to secure any other? If that be true, they are at the mercy of a company or a trust which controls the entire market, as I understand, of that article. It seems to me the city should have the choice of selecting any form of pavement which would give satisfaction on a fair test.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that I am not exactly prepared to answer his question. I can only say that this city, as a general proposition, is paved with asphalt, and they have machinery here for the purpose of repairing asphalt pavements. I am unable to tell the Senator just why that has been done.

Mr. LANE. That is what attracted my attention to these items—the continuation of a policy which seems to be already in existence, confining the city officials to that particular kind of pavement.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that so far as Washington is concerned it seems to be the accepted pavement here, and has been accepted by the commissioners as the best. That is all I can say by way of explanation.

Mr. LANE. It is not a better pavement than others. It has the disadvantage of being a pavement which, on any slope, if there is any grade, is a very cruel one on horses. It is a pavement upon which an automobile, such as the one we bought a while ago for the commissioner, will skid, and he may break his blessed neck if the chauffeur turns a corner quickly. It has that disadvantage. The supply of the material, as I understand, is in the hands of a trust, and the price which the city pays is an arbitrary one, not open to any competition whatever.

If that is true, and I think it is—it has been proven to be true in other cities—a grievous injustice is done the city in that respect, and a remedy for it should be provided. The commissioners should be allowed the liberty of selecting what, in their opinion, is an equally good pavement. There are many of them. In fact, there are several which are not only as good but are superior. It will not cost the city any more, and if you bring in competition you will get your paving done more cheaply. There are other pavements on which horses do not fall and split open the skin over their knees. All of you have seen on a slippery day the pitiful spectacle of poor beasts slipping and falling on these pavements, and straining every nerve in their bodies to keep upon their feet.

I think that ought to be considered. I do not know just what to do. If there is any way of offering an amendment to cure this, I shall do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this matter has been thrashed over a good many times. It is not in the hands of a trust, for the reason that in the bill we have put upon asphaltum pavement a specific price which the commissioners can not exceed.

Mr. LANE. I noticed that.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a very low price. It is conceded on all hands that the price is very low.

Mr. LANE. One dollar and eighty cents for resurfacing with asphalt, the Senator says, is a low price?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think it is $1.80. I have forgotten just what it is. However that may be, we have investigated this matter. Others have come here and I have championed their cause, but when we came to consider the matter it was always found that their pavements were more expensive than the asphaltum and for that reason they have not been used. We have a concern in New England that I should like to help, which I think makes a superior pavement, but it is a very much more costly pavement. It is not so slippery.

Mr. LANE. The bitulithic and other pavements have nearly always underbid this pavement in our city. In the case of asphalt pavement, under the provisions of this bill you can lay anything you want; you can put it in half an inch thick, and it is an asphaltum pavement; but it is not worth the money you pay for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course this pavement is laid under the direction of the engineer commissioner, and every detail is looked after. The pavements are unquestionably placed as they ought to be and of the requisite thickness.

Mr. LANE. Here is a provision which states that not more than $1.80 per square yard shall be paid, but it does not state the thickness of the pavement. Now, you can pay that price for any pavement. I think it is as wide open a specification for street laying as I have ever seen in my life. I do not know any city engineer who would accept such a provision as that or attempt to do business under it or lay a street pavement under it. Still, you may get good work here, and you may get your work done economically and cheaply; but if you do, you ought to be grateful to God and your good luck. You do not do it by tying yourself down to anything specific.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 36, after line 18, to insert:

For alteration of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River, so as to provide for a draw span therein, to be located and constructed in accordance with plans to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to be immediately available, $60,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether this amendment is intended to provide for a new draw span to take the place of one now existing, or whether it is to provide a draw span where none now exists?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that there is no draw in that bridge. There is another bridge, which I believe the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. owns, in which we can not compel them to make a draw until we put in one here.

Mr. THOMAS. Will they make the draw, or can they be compelled to do it, in case this is provided?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it necessary for navigation?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is what is reported to us—that it is necessary for navigation and for the improvement of the Anacostia Flats.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Sewers," on page 37, line 9, after the word "sewers," to strike out "$161,600" and insert "$200,000," so as to read:

For suburban sewers, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Streets," on page 38, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$20" and insert "$25"; in line 11, after the word "bicycles," to insert "purchase of uniforms, not to exceed $3,000"; and, in line 12, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$269,900" and insert "$273,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Dust prevention, cleaning, and snow removal: For dust prevention, sweeping, and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, under the immediate direction of the commissioners, and for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters in the discretion of the commissioners, including services and purchase and maintenance of equipment, rent of storage rooms; maintenance and repairs of stables, hire, purchase, and maintenance of horses; hire, purchase, maintenance, and repair of wagons, harness, and other equipment, allowance to inspectors and foremen for maintenance of horses and vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed $25 per month for each inspector or foreman; purchase, maintenance, and repair of bicycles; purchase of uniforms, not to exceed $3,000, and necessary incidental expenses, $273,000, and the commissioners shall so apportion this appropriation as to prevent a deficiency therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 21, to insert:

For the purposes of investigating and reporting upon the collection and disposal of garbage and other city waste originating in the District of Columbia, including the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of disposal plants, the necessary accessories, and the employment of personal services and such other incidental expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 10, to insert:

Bathing beach: Superintendent, $600; watchman, $480; temporary services, supplies, and maintenance, $500 to be immediately available, $2,250; for repairs to buildings, pools, and upkeep of grounds, $1,500, to be immediately available; in all, $4,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 18, to insert:

On and after August 1, 1914, fees received for the use of public scales shall be paid to the collector of taxes and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriated trust-fund account, "Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia," and the commissioners of the said District are empowered to use so much as may be necessary of said fees for the payment of compensation, to be fixed by the said commissioners, of the weighmasters authorized by the act approved March 19, 1906, entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the public hay scales," and the said commissioners are hereby authorized to appoint and pay such weighmasters. Any balance of said fees remaining at the close of each fiscal year shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 14, after the word "facilities," to insert "wading pools," and in line 19, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$12,490," so as to make the clause read:

Playgrounds: For maintenance, equipment, supplies, tools, construction of toilet facilities, wading pools, fencing, grading and repairs, including labor and materials, and necessary incidental and contingent expenses for all playgrounds, including not to exceed $100 for rent of storage houses, under the direction and supervision of the commissioners, $12,490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 8, to insert:

For construction of swimming pools, shower baths and equipment, purchase and installation of toilets, lockers, and screens, including necessary personal services, for the Rosedale and Howard Playgrounds, to be made immediately available, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 13, to insert:

For supplies, repairs, and necessary expenses of operating swimming pools, and purchase of bathing suits, to be made immediately available, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 16, to insert:

Two guards or swimming teachers for four months at $60 per month each, to be made immediately available, $480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 19, after the word "playgrounds," to strike out "$31,295, which sum shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia" and insert "$43,265," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for playgrounds, $43,265.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "electrical department," on page 42, line 14, after the word "repairman," to strike out "$960" and insert "$1,200"; and in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "$47,695" and insert "$47,935," so as to make the clause read:

Electrical engineer, $2,500; assistant electrical engineer, $2,000; four electrical inspectors, at $1,200 each; inspector, $1,000; electrician, $1,200; two draftsmen, at $1,000 each; three telegraph operators, at $1,000 each; four inspectors, at $900 each; expert repairman, $1,200; three repairmen, at $900 each; telephone operators—three at $720 each, four at $540 each, one $450; electrical inspectors—one $2,000, one $1,800, one $1,350; cable splicer, $1,200; assistant cable splicer, $620; clerks—one $1,400, one $1,200, two at $1,125 each, one $1,050, one $750; assistant repairmen—one $620, two at $540 each; laborers—one $630, two at $540 each, one $460, two at $400 each; storekeeper, $875; in all, $47,935.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Washington Aqueduct," on page 44, after line 16, to insert:

For ordinary repairs, grading, opening ditches, and other maintenance of Conduit Road, $3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 9, after the words "McMillan Park Reservoir," to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuation of parking grounds around McMillan Park Reservoir, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 24, after the word "hand" to insert "the work to be done by the present force of men engaged on the Washington Aqueduct when their services can be spared from other work," so as to make the clause read:

For erection of a house for the assistant to the overseer at Great Falls, Md., including purchase of necessary materials not now on hand, the work to be done by the present force of men engaged on the Washington Aqueduct when their services can be spared from other work, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rock Creek Park," on page 46, after line 10, to insert:

For the removal of dead and down timber from the woods and streams of Rock Creek Park, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Schools," on page 46, line 17, after the word "principals" to strike out "and supervisor of manual training, fifteen" and insert "supervisor of manual training, and director of primary instruction, sixteen"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$53,700" and insert "$55,900," so as to make the clause read:

Officers: Superintendent, $6,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at $3,000 each; director of intermediate instruction, 13 supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, and director of primary instruction, 16 in all, at a minimum salary of $2,200 each; secretary, $2,000; clerks—1 $1,400, 2 at $1,000 each, 1 to carry out the provisions of the child-labor law, $900; 2 stenographers, at $840 each; messenger, $720; in all, $55,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 23, to insert:

The director of primary instruction now in the service of the schools, or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at a basic salary of $2,200, and shall be entitled to an increase of $100 per year for five years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, before the word "teachers," to strike out "one thousand seven hundred and sixty-nine" and insert "one thousand seven hundred and sixty-eight," so as to make the clause read:

Teachers: For 1,768 teachers, to be assigned as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 9, to strike out:

Director of primary instruction, at a minimum salary of $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 14, to insert:

Hereafter the directors of domestic science, domestic art, and kindergartens shall receive a salary of $1,500 per annum, with an increase of $100 per annum for five years: *Provided further*, That for the year ending June 30, 1915, each of said directors shall receive the salary next above his present salary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "teachers," to strike out "$1,377,050" and insert "$1,375,250," so as to read:

In all for teachers, $1,375,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, there is an item here in regard to the high school, to which I wish to offer an amendment before we pass on it. I have offered it, in fact.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We have not come to it yet.

Mr. LANE. Very well; I simply wanted to call attention to it.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 22, after the date "1912," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$462,935," so as to make the clause read:

Longevity pay: Longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, principals of normal, high, and manual training high schools, principals of grade manual training schools, heads of departments, director and assistant director of primary instruction, directors and assistant directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, and kindergartens, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 26, 1908, May 18, 1910, and June 26, 1912, $462,935.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 4, after the word "janitors," to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

Janitors and care of buildings and grounds: Superintendent of janitors, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 10, after the word "engineer," to strike out "$900" and insert "$1,000," and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,100," so as to make the clause read:

J. Ormond Wilson Normal School and Ross School: Engineer, $1,000; janitor, $600; laborers—one $420, 3 at $360 each; in all, $3,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 26, after the words "In all," to strike out "$123,390" and insert "$123,790," so as to read:

In all, $123,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 16, to insert:

For 5 graduate nurses, 1 of whom shall be colored, who shall act as public-school nurses, at $900 each, $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 6, after the word "same," to strike out "$115,000" and insert "$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds and for repairing and renewing heating, plumbing, and ventilating apparatus, and installation of sanitary drinking fountains in buildings not supplied with same, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 23, after "$1,500," to strike out "4 kindergartens, $1,350; 1 sewing school, $150; in all, $4,000," and insert "5 kindergartens, $1,700; 1 sewing school, $150; 1 cooking school, $300; 1 manual-training shop, $300; in all, $4,950," so as to make the clause read:

For furniture, including clocks, pianos, and window shades for additions to buildings for kindergartens, and also tools and furnishings for manual-training, cooking, and sewing schools, as follows: One four-room addition to the Congress Heights School, $1,000; 1 six-room addition to the Birney School, $1,500; 5 kindergartens, $1,700; 1 sewing school, $150; 1 cooking school, $300; 1 manual-training shop, $300; in all, $4,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 8, before the word "superintendent," to insert "each the superintendent of schools and," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs of same, stationery, printing, ice, purchase and repair of equipment for high-school cadets, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including an allowance of $300 for livery of horse or garage for each the superintendent of schools and superintendent of janitors, and including not exceeding $1,000 for books, books of reference, and periodicals, $47,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 8, after the word "apparatus," to insert "and technical books," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of apparatus and technical books, and extending the equipment and for maintenance of the physics departments in the Business, Central, Eastern, Western, and M Street High Schools, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 12, after the word "materials," to insert "and technical books," and in line 17, after the word "same," to strike out "$2,100" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of fixtures, apparatus, specimens, and materials and technical books for laboratories of the departments of chemistry and biology in the Central, Eastern, Western, Business, and M Street High Schools, J. Ormond Wilson Normal School, and Normal School No. 2, and installation of same, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 18, to insert:

Hereafter the taxes levied by the government of the District of Columbia and paid for the year next preceding the time of levying tutelage charges by nonresident pupils or the parents of nonresident pupils shall be accepted as a credit or part credit, as the case may be, on said tutelage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 23, to insert:

Hereafter all pupils whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District of Columbia shall be admitted and taught free of charge in the schools of said District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the paragraph on page 58, lines 3 to 8, inclusive, as follows:

Buildings and grounds: Toward the construction of the new Central High School on the site purchased for that purpose and toward grading and other work necessary to prepare the site, grading of an athletic field, construction of retaining walls, and construction of an athletic stadium, $450,000.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, there is the item to which I wished to call attention. I do not know whether this is the proper time to offer an amendment or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has invariably ruled that the committee amendments are first to be passed on, and then the bill is open for amendment by Senators.

Mr. LANE. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 59, to insert:

For the purchase of a site for a new Eastern High School, to be located east of Tenth Street east and north of D Street south, $150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 3, to insert:

For a four-room addition to the John F. Cook School, $33,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 5, to insert:

For an 8-room addition to the Powell School, $66,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 7, to insert:

For a site for a new school building in the sixth division, north of G Street and east of Tenth Street, $45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 16, to strike out:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be paid to any person employed under or in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia, who shall solicit or receive, or permit to be solicited or received, on any public-school premises any subscription or donation of money or other thing of value from pupils enrolled in such public schools for presentation of testimonials or for any purposes other than for the promotion of school athletics, school gardens, and commencement exercises of high schools.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it seems to me that is a very meritorious provision, and I should like to inquire why it was stricken out by the consent of the committee. It prohibits, under pain of loss of salary, the solicitation on any public-school premises of any subscription or donation of money or other thing of value, from pupils enrolled in the public schools, for presentation of testimonials or for any purposes other than for the promotion of school athletics, school gardens, and commencement exercises of high schools. I think that is a very salutary provision, on the face of it. I am open to conviction, however, if I am wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland rose.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me, several delegations of students came before the committee, and they all testified that if this provision was left in the bill it would curtail a great many student activities, such as the publication of different magazines and papers by the students, and we thought it inadvisable to do that. There seemed to be no abuse or excess in the matter of these subscriptions, and the students in the schools seemed to be unanimous in desiring to have the provision stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say further that the superintendent of schools of the District of Columbia wanted it out. He had no objection to the practice, and said it had not been abused in any way.

Mr. THOMAS. The point is not that the practice has been abused but that it is susceptible of abuse, and if it is permitted it is bound in time to lead to abuses through established custom. Therefore I do not think the paragraph should be stricken out. Whether the students desire it or whether the principals are willing to accede to it or not, I do not believe any person receiving a salary out of the revenues of the United States should be permitted to solicit or to receive, on any public-school premises, any subscription or donation from any of the students for any purpose whatever.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the fact that the school officers have absolute control of the matter without any legislation, and they will regulate it satisfactorily.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but in these days the absence of a positive requirement is very apt to be made an excuse for indulgence in things which are in themselves momentarily popular. The best way is to put a prohibition upon them, and then the evil can not become so great as to amount to an abuse.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 60, to strike out:

No greater amount of floor or room space shall be occupied in the Franklin School Building for office purposes of the Board of Education or of the superintendent of education than was so used January 1, 1913; and the remainder of said building shall, until otherwise provided, be devoted solely to the actual work of teaching.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 1, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$12,250," so as to make the clause read:

Columbia Institution for the Deaf: For expenses attending the instruction of deaf and dumb persons admitted to the Columbia Institution for the Deaf from the District of Columbia, under section 4864 of the Revised Statutes, and as provided for in the act approved March 1, 1901, and under a contract to be entered into with the said institution by the commissioners, $12,250, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 8, before the word "blind," to strike out "indigent," so as to make the clause read:

For instruction of blind children of the District of Columbia, in Maryland or some other State, under a contract to be entered into by the commissioners, $7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Metropolitan police," in the item of appropriation for salaries of major and superintendent and members of the police force, on page 62, line 12, after the word "each," to strike out "18 drivers, at $7[illegible] each," and insert "20 drivers, at $900 each"; in line 14, before the word "police," to strike out "three" and insert "five"; and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "$907,161.53" and insert "$913,341.53," so as to read:

Sixty-four lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on bicycles, at $50 each; 20 drivers, at $900 each; 5 police matrons, at $900 each, to possess police power of arrest; in all, $913,341.53.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 24, after the word "grounds," to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$7,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to police stations and grounds, $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 21, to insert:

For purchase of car tickets for strictly official use, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 2, after the words "in the," to strike out "third precinct station house modern locking devices, $4,520" and insert "second, third, seventh, and ninth precinct station houses eight modern locking devices, $18,080," so as to make the clause read:

For the reconstruction of cell corridors and the making, erecting, and placing therein in the second, third, seventh, and ninth precinct station houses eight modern locking devices, $18,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 8, after the words "In all," to strike out "$50,620" and insert "$70,080," so as to read:

In all, $70,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 18, before the word "each," to strike out "$900" and insert "$1,000"; and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "$13,640" and insert "$13,840," so as to make the clause read:

House of detention: To enable the commissioners to provide transportation, including purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, and a suitable place for the reception, transportation, and detention of children under 17 years of age and, in the discretion of the commissioners, of girls and women over 17 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise, including two clerks, at $1,000 each; four drivers, at $600 each; hostler, $600; six guards, at $600 each; three matrons, at $600 each, to possess police powers of arrest; miscellaneous expenses, including rent, forage, fuel, gas, horseshoeing, ice, laundry, meals, horses, wagons and harness and repairs to same, and other necessary expenses, $3,440; in all, $13,840, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Fire department," on page 66, after line 15, to insert:

For purchase of car tickets for strictly official use, $650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 17, after the words "In all," to strike out "$127,550" and insert "$128,200," so as to read:

In all, $128,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 20, after the word "company," to strike out "Tenley" and insert "Tenleytown," so as to make the clause read:

Permanent improvements: For house, site, furniture, and furnishings for an engine company to relieve No. 20 Engine Company, Tenleytown, D. C., including the cost of necessary instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, $40,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 23, to insert:

For new house, furniture, and furnishings for No. 1 Engine Company, K Street, between Sixteenth and Seventeenth Streets NW., including cost of necessary instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, $33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 3, to insert:

For house, site, furniture, and furnishings for Truck Company No. 1 of the fire department of the District of Columbia, including cost of necessary instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, $55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 13, after the words "In all," to strike out "$65,700" and insert "$153,700," so as to read:

In all, $153,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, my attention is attracted to the words "Sixteenth Street," in line 25, page 66, and it reminds me to suggest that the words "Avenue of the Presidents" are found in two or three places in the bill. The Secretary, I think, should be instructed to change those words to "Sixteenth Street" without formal action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 67, after line 13, to strike out:

The commissioners are authorized and directed to transfer the officers and men and all apparatus, horses, and supplies connected with the fire station and fire-engine house at Randle Highlands to the first additional fire station that may be established, or to any other fire station in the District of Columbia, and in their discretion they may at any time discontinue the maintenance of said fire station and fire-engine house.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 70, after line 6, to insert:

Bacteriological laboratory: For the purchase and installation of new apparatus, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 8, to insert:

For the replacement of apparatus and supplies, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 9, to insert:

For maintaining and keeping in good order, and for the purchase of reference books and scientific periodicals, $300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 11, to insert:

In all, $3,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 12, to insert:

Chemical laboratory: For the equipment and maintenance of the chemical laboratory and the purchase of reference books and scientific journals, as follows:

For the purchase and installation of new apparatus and equipment, $1,920;

For the replacement of apparatus and equipment, $755;

For maintaining and keeping chemical laboratory in good order and the purchase of chemicals, filter paper, absorbent cotton, gauze, etc., reference books and journals, $500;

In all, $3,175.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 10, to insert:

For the completion of the pound and stable, including necessary equipment and paving, $2,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts," subhead "Juvenile court," on page 73, line 3, after the word "officer," to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,500"; in line 5, after the word "chief," to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; in the same line, after "$2,000," to strike out "one $1,200" and insert "two at $1,200 each"; in line 6, after the word "each," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 7, after the word "bailiff," to strike out "$700" and insert "$900"; and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$14,600" and insert "$17,800," so as to make the clause read:

Juvenile court: Judge, $3,000; clerk, $2,000; deputy clerk, who is authorized to act as clerk in the absence of that officer, $1,500; stenographer and typewriter for judge's work and to aid in keeping records in clerk's office, $900; probation officers—chief $2,000, two at $1,200 each, three at $1,000 each; clerk for probation office, $900; bailiff, $900; janitor, $600; in all, $17,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 9, after the word "jurors," to strike out "$1,300" and insert "$900," so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous: For compensation of jurors, $900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for juvenile court, on page 73, line 11, to strike out "For rent, $240" and insert: "For rent, $2,400, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the selection of new quarters shall be made by the judge of the juvenile court subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Mr. THOMAS. There is an increase of 1,000 per cent in the item—from $240 to $2,400. I should like to have it explained.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state to the Senator from Colorado that the present rental was merely nominal, because the building is on ground belonging to the Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the building is to be torn down and a new Hall of Records erected on it. So the court must necessarily move.

Mr. THOMAS. It is necessary to get quarters somewhere else?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Quarters elsewhere must be rented for the court.

Mr. THOMAS. Was it determined to abandon the present structure and rent other quarters between the time the bill came from the House and the time it was reported by the committee?

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. If the Senator will permit me, the Secretary of the Treasury has rented the building to the juvenile court at a nominal rental, and after the bill passed the House Judge Latimer received notice that he would be dispossessed and the building torn down. So it has become necessary to provide for the rental of other quarters, and the lowest estimate which could be placed on such rental was $2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 16, after the word "equipments," to insert "cost of moving," and in line 17, after the word "grounds," to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

For furniture, fixtures, and equipments, cost of moving, and repairs to the courthouse and grounds, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 23, after the words "provided for," to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, ice, gas, and laundry work, stationery, printing, law books, books of reference, periodicals, typewriter and repairs thereto, binding and rebinding, preservation of records, mops, brooms, and buckets, removal of ashes and refuse, telephone service, traveling expenses, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 24, after the words "in all," in the total of the miscellaneous items for the juvenile court, to strike out "$3,240" and insert "$7,300," so as to read:

In all, $7,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 7, after the word "fireman," to strike out "$480" and insert "$600," and in line 9, after the words "In all," to strike out "$30,060" and insert "$30,180," so as to make the clause read:

Police court: Two judges, at $3,600 each; clerk, $2,200, deputy clerks—one $1,600, one $1,500, two at $1,200 each, one who shall be a stenographer and typewriter $900; deputy financial clerk, $1,500; seven bailiffs, at $900 each; deputy marshal, $1,000; janitor, $600; engineer, $900; assistant engineer, $720; fireman, $600; two assistant janitors, at $300 each; matron, $600; three charmen, at $360 each; telephone operator, $480; in all, $30,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 3, before the word "janitor," to insert "messenger, $600," and, in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$17,600" and insert "$18,200," so as to make the clause read:

Municipal court: Five judges, at $2,500 each; clerk, $1,500; three assistant clerks, at $1,000 each; messenger, $600; janitor, $600; in all, $18,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 9, after the word "court," to strike out "$19,850" and insert "$20,450," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for the municipal court, $20,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts and prisons," on page 76, line 12, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert "for expenses of shipping remains of deceased convicts to their homes in the United States," so as to make the clause read:

Support of convicts: For support, maintenance, and transportation of convicts transferred from the District of Columbia; for expenses of shipping remains of deceased convicts to their homes in the United States; for expenses incurred in identifying and pursuing escaped convicts and for rewards for their recapture; to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, $70,000.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire whether it has heretofore been the practice to ship the remains of deceased convicts to their homes in the United States or whether a new policy is going to be entered upon under this provision of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am unable to say whether that is the case or not, but it does seem to me that it should be the policy.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me to be a most extraordinary provision that after convicts die the United States Treasury is to be put to the expense of shipping their remains to their homes in the United States. Generally speaking, if I am correctly informed, their remains are sent to various medical schools and colleges of the United States for scientific purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state to the Senator that there is no increase whatever in the appropriation because of this item.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand; but the next time the bill comes in there will be a special appropriation for that specific purpose. I think it ought to be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," on page 78, line 10, after "$3,500," to insert "assistant secretary and stenographer, $1,400"; in line 12, before the word "messenger," to strike out "stenographer, $1,200," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "$18,060" and insert "$18,260," so as to make the clause read:

Board of Charities: Secretary, $3,500; assistant secretary and stenographer, $1,400; clerk, $1,200; messenger, $600; inspectors—one $1,200, three at $1,000 each, two at $900 each, two at $840 each; drivers—one $780, three at $720 each; hostler, $540; traveling expenses, including attendance on conventions, $400; in all, $18,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 79, line 18, after the word "items," to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$38,000," so as to make the clause read:

For provisions, fuel, forage, harness and vehicles and repairs to same, gas, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, and other necessary items, $38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 79, after line 21, to insert:

For hospital furnishings, including sterilizers and accessories for operating room, and microscope for laboratory, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, after line 16, to insert:

For installing laundry plant in jail, including dry box, washing machine, and other appurtenances, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 25, after the word "Jail," to strike out "$122,825" and insert "$129,325," so as to read:

In all, under Washington Asylum and Jail, $129,325.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 6, before the word "teachers," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 8, after the word "engineer," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; in line 9, after the words "assistant engineer," to strike out "$480" and insert "$600"; and in line 10, after the words "in all," to strike out "$11,040" and insert "$11,880," so as to make the clause read:

National Training School for Girls: Superintendent, $1,200; treasurer, matron, and four teachers, at $600 each; overseer, $720; parole officer, $600; seven teachers of industries, at $480 each; engineer, $720; assistant engineer, $600; night watchman, $480; two laborers, at $300 each; in all, $11,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 6, after the word "Girls," to strike out "$24,540" and insert "$25,380," so as to read:

In all, for National Training School for Girls, $25,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical charities," on page 83, line 11, after the word "Charities," to strike out "$34,000" and insert "$36,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Freedmen's Hospital by the Board of Charities, $36,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for the Columbia Hospital for Women, on page 83, after line 16, to insert:

For new washer in laundry, $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 21, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$14,000" and insert "$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with Children's Hospital by the Board of Charities, not to exceed $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 4, to insert:

Toward the construction of a new building for the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, to be erected on the site purchased and owned by said hospital, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 17, after the words "Board of Charities," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care and treatment of indigent patients under a contract to be made with Georgetown University Hospital by the Board of Charities, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 20, after the words "Board of Charities," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read.

For care and treatment of indigent patients under a contract to be made with George Washington University Hospital by the Board of Charities, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 1, before the word "each," to strike out "$180" and insert "$240"; and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$18,120"; so as to make the clause read:

Tuberculosis Hospital: Superintendent, $1,800; resident physician, $480; pharmacist and clerk, superintendent of nurses, and engineer, at $720 each; pathologist, $300; matron, dietician, chief cook, assistant engineer, laundryman, and seven graduate nurses, at $600 each; assistant cooks—one $360, two at $240 each; assistant engineer, $480; elevator conductor, $300; three laundresses, at $240 each; farmer, laborer, night watchman, three orderlies, and assistant laundryman, at $360 each; two ward maids, at $180 each; four servants, at $240 each; in all, $18,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tuberculosis Hospital," on page 85, line 11, after the word "items," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$32,000," so as to make the clause read:

For provisions, fuel, forage, harness, and vehicles and repairs to same, gas, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, books and periodicals not to exceed $50, temporary services not to exceed $1,000, and other necessary items, $32,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 13, after the word "grounds," to insert "including roads and sidewalks"; and in line 14, after the word "sidewalks," to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$5,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, including roads and sidewalks, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 16, after the words "Tuberculosis Hospital," to strike out "$56,000" and insert "$61,120," so as to read:

In all, for Tuberculosis Hospital, $61,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 16, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications, necessary grading of site, and for the erection of hospital buildings, including power house and domestic-service building, for municipal purposes, to be located and erected on the site now owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, and hereafter to be known as Gallinger Hospital, with authority to contract for the completion of said buildings at a total cost not to exceed $300,000, which amount is hereby appropriated and made immediately available

Mr. THOMAS. The Senate has devoted itself for a number of hours now continuously to the consideration of the bill, and in view of the fact that I desire to say something upon this amendment at the bottom of page 85, I would suggest that the business of the Senate be laid aside for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 8 minutes spent in executive business the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12, 1914.*

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Ralph P. Quarles, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, vice Antonio Perry, term expired.

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Wade Warren Thayer, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Ernest A. Mott-Smith, resigned.

MARSHAL OF THE DISTRICT OF THE CANAL ZONE.

William Howard May, of Culebra, Canal Zone, to be marshal of the district of the Canal Zone.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Fred C. Pabst, of Galveston, Tex., to be collector of customs for the district of Galveston, in place of Francis L. Lee, whose term of office will expire by limitation March 31, 1914.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12, 1914.*

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

William P. Malburn to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

POSTMASTERS.

MAINE.

Edgar M. Frisbee, Kittery Point.
Patrick F. Welch, Calais.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James M. Hurley, Marlboro.

MISSOURI.

William Arterburn, Carrollton.
Hugh J. Bowen, South St. Joseph.
B. C. Drummond, Lexington.
Edgar J. Greisinger, Unionville.
Benjamin F. Hackney, Carthage.
William H. Hambaugh, Craig.
W. A. Kirkpatrick, Joplin.
Alfred T. Lacey, Fredericktown.
Dudley A. Reid, Gilman City.
James E. Sater, Monett.
John K. Scott, Golden City.
James Todd, Maryville.
Charles L. Wilson, Sarcoxie.

NEW YORK.

Claud M. Armitage, Candor.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Kathleen Kelly, Agricultural College.
Myrtle Nelson, Bowman.

OHIO.

Richard D. Brown, Pataskala.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

J. W. Applegate, Edgemont.
E. W. Babb, Wakonda.
F. B. Boyle, Corsica.
Albert P. Monell, Stickney.
Matthew F. Ryan, Mobridge.
Lloyd L. Truesdell, Burke.

UTAH.

Isadore Lessing, Beaver.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### THURSDAY, *March 12, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Take us, O God our Father, into Thy nearer presence and make us willing factors in the furtherance of the great eternal plan which Thou hast ordained; that the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth may be hastened; that contentions, strife, wars, and all ungodliness cease and men live together as brothers, each for all and all for each, under the divine leadership of Thy son Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPRINT OF SPEECH OF HON. SIMEON D. FESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the very excellent speech delivered by the Hon. SIMEON D. FESS, on the 12th day of February, on the life of Abraham Lincoln made a public House document.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent that the oration delivered by Mr. FESS, of Ohio, on Abraham Lincoln on the 12th day of February be printed as a House document. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has consulted the Joint Committee on Printing?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not. It is a matter that would be of no expense of any consequence, and I think the document is so valuable and so full of interest and valuable information that the people of the country would like to have it, and the people of Illinois especially, the State from which I come.

Mr. BORLAND. I am inclined to think the gentleman is entirely right about that; but it seems to me the Joint Committee on Printing should pass upon this matter first.

Mr. MADDEN. It has not been the custom, and it ought not to be the custom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] objects.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I wish to announce to the House that immediately after final action on the Agricultural appropriation bill and the river and harbor bill the Committee on Rules will present a special rule to the House for the consideration of the Sims free-tolls bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman is making his announcement, may I ask him when the rule is to come in for the consideration of the Flood bill, to carry out the provisions of the fisheries treaty?

Mr. HENRY. We would like to bring that in, if it will take only a short time, and provide for only two hours' discussion. We would like to wedge that in between the two in some way.

Mr. MANN. That was not in the gentleman's announcement.

Mr. HENRY. I know; but that is the desire of the committee.

Mr. MANN. It is not coming in before the Agricultural appropriation bill is disposed of?

Mr. HENRY. No; I have no desire to do that.

The SPEAKER. The announcement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is that at the conclusion of the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill and the river and harbor bill he will call up his resolution in regard to the Panama Canal tolls bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, pertinent to that announcement, I wish to say that so many people are interested in that question that I suppose it might just as well be understood that it will be impossible to reach it before the latter part of next week under that announcement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has figured on that matter, and if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] gets through with his Agricultural appropriation bill on Saturday, it seems to me that the earliest date that this tolls rule could be reached would be a week from to-day or a week from to-morrow. The river and harbor bill sometimes takes one day, and sometimes two, but the Chair has never known it to take more than two.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will take a little longer this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND] spoke to me just now, and I ask unanimous consent that he be granted two more days in which to file the report containing the minority views.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman ask that the minority be granted two more days. Somebody else on the minority might wish to file a report.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be granted two additional days beyond what has already been granted in which to file their report. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now that the matter is before the House, I want to say that I understand that there will be in connection with the consideration of the river and harbor bill something in the way of general debate that has not been customary heretofore.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors informed the Speaker that he thought there would be four hours of debate on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think there will be six hours' debate.

The SPEAKER. Then the rule on this tolls bill can not be reached until next Friday.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] if he can give the House any idea as to how much general debate the rule he will bring in will provide for?

Mr. HENRY. Fifteen hours' general debate.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think that is enough to cover so important a question as this?

Mr. HENRY. It seems that ought to be abundant time.

Mr. MADDEN. For that reason, I want to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Rules that we ought to have the most liberal amount of debate possible for the committee to accede to.

Mr. HENRY. It seems to me that is very liberal. Some gentlemen wanted 8 hours, and others 10 hours, and others 12 hours, and finally we concluded that 15 hours would be abundant.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it should be 20 hours.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me say to the gentleman that I have had more demands for time to speak on this subject than any other subject that has come up in this Congress. The desire seems to be general on the part of individuals to debate it.

Mr. HENRY. There is no desire to be harsh in the terms of the rule. Probably they would be liberal in regard to time for discussing the rule.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned I would be very willing that there should be the utmost liberty of debate. I wrote 15 hours into the rule because I took that suggestion from some one on the other side.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman first suggested to me 15 hours for the minority. I did not know then how great the demand would be, but I will state that since that time at least 7 hours have been asked for on that side of the House, to say nothing of the Republican and Progressive Members.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not want to restrict the debate at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] a question.

Mr. HENRY. I yield to my colleague [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask when we can have the complete report of the committee on this very important question.

Mr. HENRY. The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been printed several days.

Mr. ADAMSON. Our report is already in print.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I refer to the views of the minority.

The SPEAKER. Leave has just been granted to the minority for two days' additional time in which to file their views.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is the information I desired to get.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] if the Committee on Rules have decided on 15 hours or if that is merely suggested?

Mr. HENRY. They have decided on 15 hours and have authorized the reporting of the resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will it not be possible to extend that time?

Mr. HENRY. When we get the rule up for consideration we will talk it over again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is manifest that this matter can be arranged, if at all, when the rule is reached, and as we are only consuming time now I demand the regular order.

### EDUCATION.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a very short joint resolution, consisting of one page, passed by both houses of the California Legislature, recommending to Congress that a department of education be established in Washington.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, is that to go in the back of the RECORD or in the body of the proceedings?

The SPEAKER. It will go in the back of the RECORD, if the Public Printer knows his business.

Mr. BORLAND. I should like to suggest to my colleague that if that is a petition for the establishment of a department of education, it ought to go into the basket with other petitions and does not need to be printed as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. CHURCH. It is a joint resolution passed by both houses of the California Legislature.

Mr. BORLAND. It can be introduced by the gentleman as a petition. It amounts to a petition.

Mr. CHURCH. It is a memorial to Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. It ought to be presented as a petition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It ought to be referred to the proper committee. It will not get to any committee if it is simply printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. I object.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FALCONER, for one week, on account of the death of Mrs. Falconer's father.

### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement I think we are to return to page 29 the first thing this morning.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. To take up the Chugach Forest.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Page 29, line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. When this bill was last under consideration it was agreed that on the next day the bill was considered the committee should return to page 29, line 24. The Clerk will report the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chugach National Forest, Alaska, $16,320.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I had rather you would wait 10 minutes. Then I think we can get an agreement.

Mr. LEVER. All right. I withdraw the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the reason that no one has ever yet been able to explain why this reserve was created or what purpose it serves. I call the attention of the committee to a map of this reserve. The reserve is located in southeastern Alaska, and it contains about 11,000,000 acres, as much as three or four of the New England States combined. If the committee will look at this map they will discover that the only things conserved by this reservation are glaciers. It contains more glaciers than any other area of its size in North America. I may say that on 90 per cent of the entire reserve there is not a tree. I was talking this morning with a gentleman who has resided in that reserve for at least 20 years, and he told me that there was not a merchantable saw log on the entire reserve.

A short time ago the Senate committee had before it the Forester and one of his assistants, and they made an attempt to tell why this forest reserve was created. I want to read a few extracts from the hearing to show the character of this reserve and the use that it serves.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman inform us when and by whom this forest reserve was created?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not recall the exact time, but it was created when Mr. Gifford Pinchot was the Forester, during the administration of President Roosevelt. First, I read from page 250 of the hearings as to the character of this forest reserve. This statement was read to the Forester and to his assistant, and he was asked whether it was correct. Before the American Mining Congress at Chicago, October 24, 1911, Mr. George E. Baldwin gave this description of that forest:

> One of Alaska's needs is the immediate abolition of forest reserves. The recent and present governors of the Territory have in their reports condemned them. I wish to speak for a moment upon the Chugach Reserve, in which I live. This reserve covers thousands of square miles along the southern coast, more than 90 per cent of which is utterly destitute of timber, being barren slopes, glaciers, and mountains above timber line. Less than 10 per cent is covered with a scattering growth of spruce, hemlock, and cottonwood of inferior quality, practically all mature and supermature. Not a foot of this timber will ever be exported. In fact, a large part of the lumber used within

the limits of this reserve is shipped from Puget Sound. It is only useful for local needs, and should be used by our people without undue restriction.

The gentleman to whom I was talking this morning, who lives on the western end of the reserve, the only place where they have any timber, told me he did not believe there was a tree standing that was over 30 years old in that portion of the reserve on the Kenai Peninsula.

The trees grow on the surface of the ground and as soon as they reach any height the wind blows them over. He assures me that there are hundreds and thousands of acres of small timber overturned by storms that is, of course, of no value whatever. There are 150 fish traps along the shores of the reserve. They use timber 20 inches at the butt and 6 inches at the small end for piles, and they can not find timber suitable even for that purpose, and practically all the piles for fish traps are brought from Puget Sound.

Now, I will read further:

Forest reserves are supposed to be created to provide timber for future generations, to attract rainfalls, to regulate stream flow, to prevent forest fires, and provide Government revenue. Let us take up these propositions in turn.

First. What is the use of preserving timber that is falling down and rotting of old age for future generations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 10 minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he can finish in that time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think I can get through. I want to say that I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee. I know he has been very patient; but this is an important proposition, and especially so in view of the fact that we have appropriated money to build a railroad in Alaska. I want to show by the evidence of the forester himself that the only purpose of this reserve is to protect the title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington that his time be extended 10 minutes?

Mr. LEVER. I do not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think this item ought to be stricken out. I think I am not making any very rash guess in saying that it will be stricken out in the Senate, because a committee of the Senate had the forester before it and tried for two hours to find out what was the purpose of this reservation and failed. Now I read further:

Second. As to rainfall, the area embraced within the limits of this forest reserve receives a rainfall of from 70 to 120 inches per annum. As over 90 per cent of this reserve is destitute of timber and the treeless Aleutian Islands to the west of us receive more rains than we do, the idea that the cutting of the timber needed by our people will have an effect upon rainfall is utterly absurd.

Third. As to stream flow, our streams largely have their sources in the everlasting glaciers, and would flow bank full for centuries without a drop of precipitation.

Fourth. As to forest fires, there never has been a forest fire in this reserve, and never will be—soaked with rain in summer and covered with snow all winter.

Fifth. As to Government revenue, it has cost the Government two dollars for every one it has collected so far, besides imposing a cost of thousands of dollars upon our citizens in obtaining permits.

We defy the Forest Service to show one single benefit it has conferred upon the people living in this reserve, upon the people who will live in it in the future, or upon the people of the United States generally.

Now I want to read further from the hearings as to the character of this reservation. I read from page 343 of the hearings, and I am reading from the statement of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], who was before the committee:

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As the representative of Alaska, I say to the committee that the people in those forest reservations in Alaska have long since learned that it is a question of years to secure any result in the way of action on applications for homesteads, with the probability that they will be refused; it has resulted in keeping many people away from these great forest reservations, and has practically depopulated that part of the country, except in the towns. And as to this particular reservation, the Chugach Forest Reservation, I want to say to this committee and to Mr. Greeley, as the representative of the forestry reserve, that it is a shame that such a reservation should be maintained there. It is a fraud upon the people and a fraud upon the forestry reservation, for there is not anything there that is worthy the forestry reservation maintaining it as a forest reservation, and it lowers the Forest Service in the opinion of the people, who really favor proper forest conservation.

I read again, from page 460 of the hearings, where Mr. WICKERSHAM makes a further statement and says:

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I want to call your attention to the fact, Mr. Graves, before this committee, that in the opinion of the people who are best acquainted with this Chugach Forest Reserve, that it has no timber on it of any commercial or other value except for local use, and has very little of that on it, and that very largely on the western side, along Cooks Inlet, where the slight timber area there covers large areas of valuable coal lands; that the most of this Chugach Forest Reserve is covered with immense glaciers, the greatest glaciers in the world; that it is very largely very high mountains covered with perpetual snows; that the mountains are very steep, running right down to the sea; that there is no necessity at all for its being perpetuated as a forest reserve; that it hurts the purpose of those who wish to conserve resources of this kind; and that it is a fraud upon you and upon the service, and upon the people of the country, and tends only to discourage development in this particular region.

Now I want to read you what the assistant forester says about it himself, and I read from page 336 of these hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Then, how have you conserved anything by handling it for them?

Mr. GREELEY. I do not know that we have conserved anything to date, except the title.

The CHAIRMAN. And, as a matter of fact, you have lost the Government money so far, have you not?

Mr. GREELEY. The title to the land has been kept clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The title to the land was not in danger anyway, under the law.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; it is in danger. Men might settle on some of it as homesteads.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I know; but we can protect against that. Now, as a matter of fact, have you not caused the Government an expense without doing anything so far, other than would naturally happen if you never had been there, so far as conservation is concerned?

Then, further on, the chairman asked this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see if you can answer this question; if you can not, say you can not answer it; I say, so far you have done nothing toward conservation. I say, so far, mind you, not what may happen a thousand years from now, but so far you have done nothing toward conservation that would not have naturally happened if you had not been there.

Mr. GREELEY. We have preserved the title to the land.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. Is that your answer?

Mr. GREELEY. That is my answer.

The sole purpose of this reservation, so far as Mr. Greeley or Mr. Graves were able to show, was to preserve the title and keep the people from settling there.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman indicate the date of the hearings that he is reading from?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It says on the back of this document, "May 12, 1913."

Mr. MANN. Who was the chairman?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Senator PITTMAN.

Now, I want to show you, according to their own statement, that the question of fire protection is not involved. I read from page 338, where Senator JONES asked this question:

Senator JONES. The only public interest, I gather from your testimony, that has been subserved up there has been to hold the title in the Government thus far?

Mr. GREELEY. I think that is the main thing. There is a small fire danger in that forest, but it does not amount to much.

Senator JONES. That amounts to nothing. That was not the purpose of it, to protect from fires, was it?

Mr. GREELEY. No, sir.

Now, if there was no purpose to protect from fires, what is the purpose of that reservation? I challenge any man to answer that question. After the Senate committee had had the forester before them and he was cross-examined by Senators WALSH, JONES, and PITTMAN for two hours in an attempt to find out the purpose of this reserve, they gave it up in disgust. The forester's statement is the most striking illustration of the saying that the English language can be used to conceal thought that I have ever seen.

The other day I had the expense of conducting this reservation given me, and I saw what the receipts were, but I have not been able to find it. I know it is small compared with the amount expended. This is not only a useless expense, but it ought to be abolished, because they interfere with every settler that wants to go into that part of the country.

I was talking with a gentleman this morning who has resided in the Territory for 20 years, and he stated to me that last year there were five or six settlers came up into the western part of this reserve desiring to take up homesteads, and that they tried all summer to find a forester and failed. The only purpose of the reservation to keep settlers out did not fail of its purpose in this instance.

He told me this morning that he knew of 15 or 20 families that contemplated going in this summer if the reservation could be abolished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask for five minutes more, and then I will quit.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee what value the land is, whether it has any mineral deposits which was the reason for the withdrawal of the land from public entry?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know how valuable in minerals the lands are, but mineral lands can not be taken up for homesteads.

Mr. STAFFORD. I mean, are there any mineral deposits upon the land?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I presume there is coal in that portion of the country, certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware that the Committee on the Public Lands has reported a bill to safeguard the interests of the Government so far as mining claims are concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman not think it would be well before we withdraw our control over this tract to wait the passage of that or some similar bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman advocate creating forest reserves to control the title to mineral lands?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it justifiable to withdraw public land if there are valuable mineral rights not adequately protected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman advocate withdrawing public land under fraud and pretense of creating a forest reserve?

Mr. STAFFORD. But it was not withdrawn under fraud and pretense. There was some timber there, and perhaps it was withdrawn for the purpose of protecting the mining rights of the public.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If it was withdrawn for the purpose of protecting the titles to mineral lands, then it was withdrawn under fraud and pretense and sham, and a fraud was perpetrated on the public. What right has any forester or any President of the United States to withdraw land under pretense of protecting the forest if in reality it is to protect the title to mineral lands?

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can not yield any further, as I have not the time. There are in this portion of the country that I was speaking about some agricultural land. If I had more time I could read from the hearings and show where they admit that a homesteader has no title on this forest reserve. He has to go to the forester to get it. The only purpose of this reserve has been to hold back the development of that country, and now, as we are going to have a railroad constructed there, what excuse is there for its continuance? We have a bill reported here now to open up those coal lands. What excuse is there for keeping a number of men and paying them $22,000 a year to simply annoy settlers?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that if he knows the land laws he knows that under the homestead laws no one can take up land that is designated as mineral land, not even take up land in that vicinity.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can not yield any further. Just one other statement. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the only timbered land there is in this entire reserve is around the city of Seward, and that is especially taken out of the reserve, as is indicated on the map. The only timbered land there is on the Kenai Peninsula is outside of the reserve. There is no timber in that entire area, and it appears that where some was by mistake placed in the reserve that when it was discovered it was eliminated.

Mr. GOULDEN. Are there any farming lands at all within this reservation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. And they could be homesteaded and cultivated and made productive?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Whorf told me there were five or six homesteaders who came in there last year, and who tried all summer to get a forester to go with them so that they could locate that land, but they never found him. He was down here at Ketchikan, the headquarters of this reserve, a thousand miles away from Cook Inlet.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman inform us who is getting all of this $22,000, and what it is for?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It goes entirely to pay these five or six foresters, who spend their vacations up there. They do not perform any service under heaven. The only thing they do is to annoy people who try to settle in that country. The fact is that one of the great purposes in creating it was in order to add 11,000,000 acres to the forest reserve, so that in making up the estimates for the appropriations they could count in the 11,000,000 acres and get that much more money to spend in the forest reserves in the United States.

Mr. GOULDEN. When was it created?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. LEVER. July 4, 1907.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

[By unanimous consent Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of the committee for any extensive statement as to the impropriety of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The amendment is to strike out the sums that are now being used for the protection of this national forest in Alaska. The facts submitted to me by the Forest Service on yesterday in writing do not agree with the statement of the gentleman from Washington. In a memorandum from the Forest Service, which I hold in my hand, this statement is made:

> Assistant Foresters James B. Adams and Earle H. Clapp were sent to Alaska last summer to make a special examination of the lands within the Chugach National Forest. Their estimates indicate that there is a stand of approximately 8,000,000,000 feet.

So that there are 8,000,000,000 feet of timber——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the statement of the Forester is correct, how does it happen that in the hearings before the gentleman's committee Forester Graves himself estimates that it will be 25 years before he can sell enough timber off that to pay expenses?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman was reading from the testimony of Mr. Graves?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes. Before the gentleman's committee he estimated that it would be 25 years before he could sell enough timber off that to pay expenses.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I take it in that connection there would be many of these forest units that probably never will be self-sustaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is not this one?

Mr. LEVER. That may be true. I do not recall the testimony. The fact, nevertheless, is that the testimony of these foresters who were sent to this reserve in Alaska, as shown by the memorandum which I hold in my hand, is to the effect that in these forests there are 8,000,000,000 feet of hemlock and spruce timber; and it seems to me that it is a sufficient asset for us to protect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how many acres of land the 8,000,000,000 feet are on?

Mr. LEVER. I do. There are included in this forest about 11,000,000 acres of land, and 5,000,000 of it is regarded as timberlands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And how many feet?

Mr. LEVER. With 8,000,000,000 feet of spruce and hemlock, board measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a thousand and a half——

Mr. FORDNEY. Fifteen hundred feet to the acre would not be worth going after.

Mr. LEVER. Well, with the vanishing supply of our timber, I think it is very well to protect it against some individual who wants to go and gobble it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us get it perfectly clear. It is spruce and hemlock?

Mr. LEVER. Spruce and hemlock is my recollection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And they can care for it at the same expense and in the same proportion as in some of the heavily timbered reserves of the States of Washington and Oregon, at the same rate per acre. I would like to get that in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that can go in the RECORD, I have no objection to it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield, in order to set myself right?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to be understood as objecting to forest reserves; but I say if there are but 8,000,000,000 feet of lumber on that much land, it is but 1,500 feet per acre, whereas in the South—in the State of the gentleman—he would not be warranted in going on 40 acres of land for 60,000 feet of timber. It is not worth the cost of building the roads to get to the timber.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will undoubtedly see this distinction, however: That the demand for lumber on account of

the lack of the timber supply makes this timber much more valuable than it would be in South Carolina.

Mr. FORDNEY. It certainly would, and cost more money to get it.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. This forest was set aside, as I have learned, for the purpose of protecting that timber for the use of the settlers in Alaska. More than that, it develops that there are extensive copper and coal deposits around Prince William Sound and the rich copper prospects along the Copper River Railroad can be most easily supplied with native-grown timber from the forests. Now, I suspect that the effort to eliminate this forest from the control of the Government might be based on the desire of somebody to get their fingers into these copper and coal mines which are now protected under this reserve.

In addition to that, I desire to say to the committee that the Forestry Service has already recommended the elimination of practically one-half of this forest because of the fact it has no timberlands, but the Secretary of the Interior, anticipating that the Alaska railroad bill would become a law, recommended the Forest Service to take no action in that regard until Congress had determined upon its policy in reference to the Alaskan road.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In one minute. Now, then, since Congress has determined to build a railroad in Alaska the Forest Service believes, as does the Secretary of the Interior, that this large body of land, which will very likely become the right of way over which the railroad is to be built, should be maintained in the possession of the United States until the location of the railroad has been fixed, and for that reason, if for no other reason, this reserve should be retained and its protection provided for by sufficient appropriations. Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to ask the gentleman, What is the character of this timber? What is it good for?

Mr. LEVER. It is spruce and hemlock.

Mr. BOOHER. But what is it good for?

Mr. LEVER. It has special value as wood pulp.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, is it not a fact it is not worth anything for building purposes, and do not the hearings show it?

Mr. LEVER. I do not remember the hearings, and I will say to my friend from Missouri I am not an encyclopedia and can not remember all I have heard; but the statement from this memorandum from which I have been reading is to the effect that that timber is spruce and hemlock and it is bound to become very valuable as the development of the country goes on, and particularly valuable for wood-pulp purposes. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. BOOHER. Before the vote is taken I would like to get about five minutes. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Before the gentleman does that, I wish to say this, further: That the showing made by the Forestry Service as presented in these memoranda is sufficient to justify the continuance of this appropriation, certainly until we have located the line for the Alaskan railroad.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. Have you any evidence showing the present condition of this timber, whether it is fully grown and developed, is going to fall down and rot, or whether it is simply young, thriving, growing timber that in 25 years or longer will be more valuable than it is to-day?

Mr. LEVER. I have no testimony as to that fact, but I think it is true that it is young timber.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment striking out the paragraph for this forest reserve in Alaska. I am in favor of it for the reason that it is a useless expenditure of money to continue it. My recollection of the hearings on this subject is that some gentleman who was before the committee, by the name of Steele, a man who was thoroughly posted on the conditions up there, stated to the committee that the timber was absolutely worthless for building purposes; that there was none of it of that character; and if any gentleman has the hearings here I would be glad to turn to it.

Mr. LEVER. That testimony was not taken before the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. BOOHER. I think it was; that is my recollection.

Mr. LEVER. I have no recollection of any such testimony.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have the testimony taken before the Senate committee in May, 1913.

Mr. LEVER. But not before the Committee on Agriculture of the House, I am sure.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, here is the testimony, taken before the Senate committee on May 12, 1913, of a gentleman by the name of Steele:

> Senator JONES. In other words, this timber is not suitable for building purposes?
>
> Mr. STEELE. I would not give you 5 cents a thousand for it for building purposes. Our experience, Senator, was this: We first put up a little powder house at Prince William Sound, constructed of boards, doubling the boards, leaving cracks about 4 inches in width between the first tier of boards, then battening these cracks with 12-inch boards, and whenever we would get a driving rainstorm the rain would go right through those boards.

Mr. LEVER. In order that the record may be straight, let met put in the RECORD in connection with that this statement furnished me on January 1, 1914, by the Forestry Bureau:

> The fisheries, the mining industry, the railroads so far built, and all ordinary building are largely dependent upon native material, for practically all the demands of which it is as well suited as imported timbers.

Mr. BOOHER. That is true of other forests in Alaska, but not true of the Chugach Forest.

Mr. LEVER. Who is Mr. Steele?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. He is a very reputable gentleman who lives in Alaska, and is connected with the building of railroads.

Mr. LEVER. With railroads?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, the gentleman says "railroads," and he is sitting down, while evidently thinking a man who represents railroads is not to be believed. I want to say to the gentleman that I talked with two men who live in this reserve, one of whom has lived there for 20 years, Mr. Wharf, and Mr. Donald McKenzie. And Mr. Wharf told me that in the 150 fish traps up there very little of this timber was used for the piling; that they sent to Puget Sound for it. Mr. McKenzie told me they tried to use this timber for railroad ties, but they had to abandon it, inasmuch as it was absolutely unfit for that purpose.

Mr. LEVER. What is the interest of these gentlemen in this proposition?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The interest of Mr. Wharf, who lives up there, is that he would like to have some of these men who went up there last year trying to get homesteads, get them without consulting the Forester.

Mr. LEVER. Is it not more likely that he would like to have some of those copper and coal lands?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is not true, because he is one of the men out of a great many thousand who has got a coal claim.

Mr. LEVER. I never saw a man who had so much property that he did not want to acquire more.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Did the gentleman ever see a man so honest he would tell the truth?

Mr. LEVER. Lots of them, and I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is one of those men.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am telling what one of these gentlemen said this morning about the character of this timber.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am much interested in the dialogue between the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Washington, but they have taken most of my time. [Laughter.]

It does not make much difference who the gentleman is, whether his name is Wharf, or McKenzie, or what business he is interested in, this forest reservation ought to be abandoned. There are thousands of sections of good land in this reserve that can be homesteaded. We are building a railroad in Alaska for the purpose of inducing people to go up there, and you have got the best lands—that they would strike first in going to Alaska—in a forest reserve, where they can not get an acre of it. It has been stated that the timber is absolutely worthless as building timber, and it ought to be cleared off of the ground. It is said it will make wood pulp. There was not anybody in the Senate hearings who testified it would make wood pulp. But suppose it would, is it not better to open it to settlement? You can not get people to settle in Alaska when you have the best part of it fenced up in a forest reserve. According to the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina, there is on an average about one tree to the acre. There are thousands of acres that have not a tree of any kind on them. I hope the motion to strike this item from the bill will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to warn the members of this committee not to take too seriously the grievances expressed here on the floor by these distinguished

colleagues of mine, who take an entirely different view on some of the very fundamentals of this conservation proposition from what the people of the State of Washington take.

Now, to begin with, it may be true that the limits of these reserves are subject to some kind of revision; there may be some merit to that contention. But when you come to take up here on the floor of this House a proposition of this kind, to throw out the appropriation which provides means of keeping up a forest reservation, and thus by a collateral attack throw out the whole machinery and put out of commission the whole reserve and wreck the whole plan, then the proposition becomes absolutely ridiculous, it seems to me.

This particular reservation was made by order of Theodore Roosevelt, and whether or not that order met with the approval of some of the gentlemen from Washington, nevertheless the fact remains that by that order the coal deposits of Alaska were saved to the people of this country, and I am glad that that reservation was made. I am glad that the order was given. I am glad that that coal was preserved.

We had a great deal of debate here over the Alaska railroad bill, and we accomplished what I believe to be the greatest piece of progressive legislation that has been enacted by this Congress when we enacted the Alaskan railroad bill. But if it had not been for that order reserving those coal fields, I am quite sure that all will admit that President Wilson would not have deemed it necessary to have included in his message a request that a railroad be built up there.

But I must hasten along. The gentlemen from Washington in the past have endeavored to have timberlands and other lands eliminated from the forest reserves, and it has always been the story that the settlers needed it; that the settlers needed the opportunity to build up the country. But in actual practice where lands have been eliminated, within a very short while they have gone into the possession of men in large blocks for speculation and to be used as a means of extorting toll from generations yet to come.

There was a great hullabaloo raised over the reservation of land in Clallam County, in my State. It was stated that it was absolutely necessary for the development of that territory to eliminate a lot of those lands. But after getting those reports, and after fighting for a long period of time, the senior Senator from my State [Mr. JONES] aiding and writing letters, and other Representatives joining with him and writing letters about the necessity of getting this land out quickly, in the interest of agriculture in Clallam County, on the claim that agriculture was jeopardized because of that reserve, finally they got the land out—something like 700,000 acres—and behold, inside of a few months—in fact, the next day after the necessary act was passed here—the big timber interests and organizations controlling large bodies of land were on the ground; and I have here a list of settlers. Among them is the Milwaukee Land Co., leading with 80,630 acres; James D. Lacey & Co., with 48,370 acres, together with a lot of others; and in 10 years' time only 600 acres have been cultivated out of a total of 700,000 acres; 523,720 acres had passed into the hands of large companies owning great bodies of land.

Now, I am glad that this Chugach Reserve has been made. And I want to say that the people out in the great Northwest indorse Theodore Roosevelt; and they indorse Gifford Pinchot in the work that he did. They indorse that conservation movement, and they are glad that work was done.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I do not think I can. My time is about out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman spoke about Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wish the gentleman would explain in connection with his statement the action of Mr. Gifford Pinchot in that transaction, where the Northern Pacific Railroad got 240,000 acres of valuable land and the Santa Fe got 1,200,000 acres of valuable land in exchange for worthless land. I would like to know about that.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman that lieu-land legislation was put on the statute books by the gentlemen who cooperated with my colleague, and this land was taken out through these lieu-land propositions; but Gifford Pinchot stopped that sort of thing.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I asked the gentleman to explain that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] be given five minutes more. This is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Gifford Pinchot, in his efforts against the operations of timber looters and speculators under the lieu-land provisions that had been put into laws by the men who took the same position on this floor as my colleague now takes, interfered with those things and stopped them. I have shown here, in the remarks I made during the special session, facts and figures by which that fact can be easily demonstrated, and I say Gifford Pinchot is not responsible for the taking of that property away from the people out there.

It is true that forest reserves were first created by order of Grover Cleveland, and then by order of President Roosevelt and others; and then by cute legislation, offered on the floor here by Members, by striking out a line here and inserting a line there, they fixed it so that these lieu-land selections could be made, and so that the Government could be divested of this property, and it took active, energetic work to stop it. They said that the Government had taken in land belonging to the railroads, and that it was necessary to get the forest-reserve land in a compact body, and that it was necessary to have the railroads which had land in forest reserves give up that land and take land on the outside; and they fixed it so that they got land on the outside without consideration of the value or location and without other safeguards which ought to have been put in, and which would have been put in if the legislation had received full consideration. By that kind of legislation they robbed the public domain.

When Gifford Pinchot and the Forestry Bureau came on the scene they attacked that line of work and interfered with it and stopped it, and they are the ones who are entitled to the credit for stopping it. Those Members of Congress from the Northwest who heretofore represented that country and failed to take up the matter in the way that they ought to have taken it up found it easy enough to come here and, by amendments like this, wipe out reserves and wipe out the improvements that had been made.

We do not want to turn Alaska over to the speculators and give them carte blanche as to these public lands, and so I urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be defeated, and that we continue in the course that we have been pursuing, unless we take up the matter regularly and, upon full consideration by the department and after full discussion here, make such corrections here as may be necessary in the administration of our Forest Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for minutes in which to reply to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to reply just briefly to some of the statements made by my colleague [Mr. BRYAN], and I want the committee to hear this statement.

The elimination of the lands from forest reserves, to which my colleague refers, I have heard about a great many times. It was probably a mistake, and ought never to have been done. But I call the attention of the House to these facts, and if my colleague now or hereafter can explain them I would be glad to have him do it.

Mr. Gifford Pinchot made a protest against this elimination which he has mentioned, and Mr. Pinchot was right when he protested against that elimination, as the results have shown since. But at that time Mr. Gifford Pinchot was connected with the Government. He was connected with it after that until he went out under President Taft's administration. Now, after this elimination of which the gentleman speaks, and while Mr. Gifford Pinchot was still connected with the Government service——

Mr. BRYAN. With the Government service, not the Forest Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. While he was connected with the Government service, when he was the man upon whom the President was depending for advice and information in regard to the creation of these forest reserves, the Santa Fe Railroad received 1,200,000 acres of the best land upon all the public domain in exchange for a like number of acres of land that contained no timber and was utterly worthless, and was estimated by the railroad company at from 15 to 18 cents an acre. Why did not Mr. Gifford Pinchot protest against that exchange? He was in the service. I challenge my colleague or

any other man to show where Mr. Pinchot ever protested against that steal. That is what my colleague called it. It was not what he put in the RECORD, but that is what he said. It was the greatest and most outrageous looting of the public domain in our history.

Mr. BRYAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not just at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Gifford Pinchot could see a settler in my portion of the country if he cut a tree. Mr. Gifford Pinchot could see a man in Alaska if he cut a fishing pole; but he could not see the Santa Fe Railroad getting 1,200,000 acres at one time.

Afterwards a bill was brought in here to repeal the lieu-land law. During the time when that law was pending over in the Senate one of the forest reserves in Montana was extended to include 240,000 acres, or a new reserve was created containing that amount of practically treeless land belonging to the Northern Pacific Railroad. Mr. Gifford Pinchot was then forester. The Northern Pacific Railroad went out into my country, and for that 240,000 acres of practically worthless land they got 240,000 acres of heavily timbered land, trading it acre for acre. Where was Gifford Pinchot? Why did he not protest against that trade? He favored that exchange. Talk about looting the public domain. These gentlemen who howl about conservation come in here and protest about "looting the public domain," but Mr. Gifford Pinchot and the men associated with him let the railroads of this country take 2,000,000 acres of land for practically nothing without a word of protest. Why did they keep silent? Why did not Mr. Pinchot protest like he did when that elimination was made out in my State? His protest then was right; but if Mr. Gifford Pinchot has ever protested against the seizure of these public lands by the railroads, let him say so. Let him point where he has protested against the specific cases to which I have referred. I do not want to do him any injustice, but every time that any man speaks on the floor of this House in behalf of the interests of the West or about the looting of the public domain by these railroads some one arises and talks about these great "conservationists." I am getting a little weary of this "holier than thou" attitude. Let them clean their own skirts first. Mr. Pinchot is now a candidate for United States Senator over in Pennsylvania. Let him explain these transactions with the Santa Fe Railroad. Let him explain the transactions with the Santa Barbara Water Co., that got 63,000 acres of the public domain for land that they themselves estimated at 25 cents an acre. Mr. Gifford Pinchot wrote a letter indorsing that transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to strike out the paragraph in line 24, page 29.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 3 and the noes are 41, and the amendment is rejected. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did the Chairman report the ayes as 3?

The CHAIRMAN. Ayes, 3.

Mr. BRYAN. I understood that the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORDNEY; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE——

Mr. MANN. Well, but, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRYAN. I saw five men standing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. The gentleman knows he is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order, but the Chair——

Mr. MANN. What is the purpose of the gentleman in naming Members in this way?

Mr. COOPER. Is it out of order in this House or in the Committee of the Whole when a Member thinks there has been a mistake in the count for him to call attention to it? When four Members are standing, if the Chairman announces the vote as 3, is it out of order to call attention to it?

Mr. BRYAN. These four gentlemen ought to be proud to have their names given.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair will not hold it out of order to make this inquiry. Technically it may be out of order, but the Chair will not hold it out of order. The present occupant of the chair may have been mistaken as to how many were standing in the affirmative. The Chair thought that one, at least, of those standing was an employee of the House.

Mr. COOPER. There were four besides him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may have been mistaken as to the exact number, but it can not affect the result. The Chair intended to be entirely fair about the matter. He took one of those, at least, standing to be an employee of the House, and thinks he was correct about it.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to say this——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Under what rule are we now proceeding?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. We are reading the bill under the five-minute rule, and the regular order is the reading of the bill. The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I am not going to call anybody's name.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman in order in proceeding now, in view of the ruling of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has made no ruling. This has been going on by unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to make a statement.

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Washington is evidently fighting from the Washington viewpoint the senatorial battle in Pennsylvania. He is inclined to bring a candidate over from his State——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I again demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. MOORE. I thought he would in due course of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of saying that I was one of the Members who stood up just now and voted in the hope that the appropriation for the Chugach Range would be stricken out. I do this for the purpose of putting it into the RECORD, so that no man who may be a senatorial candidate from my State of Washington shall later on go rushing around and declaring that I missed a chance to go on record as to where I stand on the expenditure of money for this particular Chugach Range.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For a question.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman's colleague a candidate for Senator in his State or the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not going to look around among the Members of the House to pick out pinfeather candidates for Senators. I do not know to whom my friend from Pennsylvania refers.

Mr. MOORE. There are candidates coming from out west, or New York, or somewhere, who are running in Pennsylvania, and there are candidates running for Senator in Washington. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. By inference I might refer to both, but I do not want to use up my time in that way. I have too much to do to look after the interests of my great district, which is three times as large as the State of Massachusetts, with its three large forest reserves, every one of which we are willing should be maintained, but we do contend that if money is to be spent for upkeep and for the employment of rangers, enough should be spent so that more constructive work shall be done. In the Chugach Range in Alaska I have no more interest than any man in the Northwest. I do not want it to appear by inference that I am in favor of striking down any part of the timber in that reserve. I hope every bit of it will be kept for the people of the United States, but I do not think it is necessary to have forest-reserve men and clerks go there to preserve the timber that nobody can want now; rangers to arrest occasionally a settler or a prospector who picks up a sled load of wood to build a fire.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Awhile ago when my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, was speaking, I endeavored to ask him a question, but his time was so brief that he did not have an opportunity to yield to me, but said that he would yield to me later, but his time expired.

Here is what I wanted to call to his attention in connection with the remarks he was making. This lieu-land law was

repealed in 1905 in part on the recommendation of Gifford Pinchot, who was not made forester until 1905. Now, this elimination that the gentleman complains of was made prior to that date, and Mr. Pinchot could not be held responsible for the elimination made prior to the time he had any responsibility or jurisdiction in the department.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What I tried to say, and I think I did say, was that Mr. Pinchot was connected with the Government during all the time of these transactions, and he saw that elimination out in our State and protested against it. Why did not he protest against the others?

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman admits that it was none of Mr. Pinchot's duty or responsibility to protest?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. BRYAN. He says a short time before, or a number of years before, he did all he could to prevent the looting of the particular district that my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, represents by these Standard Oil syndicates that were there; he did all he could and tried to save it. He was turned down absolutely by the authority of the congressional delegation from Washington urging Executive action. Then later on they did some more of this kind of work, and Mr. Pinchot did not protest. Now he says why did not Mr. Pinchot keep up the good work? He says Mr. Pinchot was doing mighty good work when he tried to stop the then Washington delegation.

The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], then a Member of Congress, was earnestly urging that elimination; and the gentleman from Washington now says that Mr. Pinchot did right when he protested against it. It is a fact that Mr. Pinchot was turned down at the earnest recommendation of Senator JONES. They were in direct opposition. He says Mr. Pinchot was right, and commends him, and now he complains because he did not keep up the good work, although he was not responsible, although it was not his official duty, although it was not assigned to him by any law to interfere with these eliminations.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. No. I will yield in a few minutes. I have yielded to the gentleman once, and I do not want to appear discourteous. Mr. Pinchot, as soon as he became forester, as soon as he got hold of the matter, stopped this lieu-land exchange, interfered and stopped the whole procedure, over the protest of men from the Northwest who ought to have been there protecting the public lands. Now he wants to condemn him because for a period of time he was not volunteering his services and protesting. I do not doubt he did protest all he could against those lieu-land reserves, even though it is not recorded, but it was not within his authority or power. He got fired by President Taft in the Ballinger controversy later on because of his activity, because he tried to do something. The Republican President put him out of office because of his earnestness to save these resources for the people; and I want to say that the last man in the State of Washington on whom you can score and make good a criticism, so far as conservation of the public domain is concerned, is Gifford Pinchot. You can not make good out there on criticizing him or Theodore Roosevelt either. Theodore Roosevelt carried the State by 50,000 above Taft——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting washing of linen on that side of the House, but I trust the gentlemen will soon conclude it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I only want one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear the situation so far as my colleague is concerned. He made one statement, I think unintentionally, and I think he will correct it when it is called to his attention, wherein he said the lieu-land law repeal was opposed by the Members from the Northwest. He is mistaken about that, at least so far as the delegation from the State of Washington is concerned, because we not only worked for it, but voted for it.

Mr. BRYAN. Did the gentleman ever introduce a bill directed toward a repeal of the lieu-land law?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not that I know of.

Mr. BRYAN. Or any other man from the State of Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; we passed such a law.

Mr. BRYAN. But never introduced it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know how it could become a law without somebody introducing it.

Mr. BRYAN. It was put through by Theodore Roosevelt with the big stick.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is not correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is not correct. Mr. Chairman, I thought I would give the gentleman an opportunity to correct a misstatement, but if he prefers to leave it in that way in the RECORD I have no objection. What I want to say is this: The gentleman still apparently does not understand my statement, and here is what I want him to explain. When Mr. Gifford Pinchot was Forester—remember he was the Forester—there was an extension of a forest reserve or reserves, or new reserves created, in Montana, and 240,000 acres of practically treeless land included that belonged to the Northern Pacific Railroad.

For this land of little value the Northern Pacific obtained 240,000 acres of heavily timbered land in exchange, and that Gifford Pinchot favored that transaction.

Mr. BRYAN. When was that?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know the exact date.

Mr. BRYAN. Was the gentleman in Congress at that time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Did the gentleman from Washington, seeing that loot, protest?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman from Washington did not know that the looting was going on, but a Member of this House went to Gifford Pinchot and protested, and Gifford Pinchot said he proposed to favor it any way, and the fact that the railroad was getting some of it would not turn him from what he considered the proper policy.

Mr. BRYAN. Did my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, protest?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why, the gentleman just said he did not know anything about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am not in the habit of protesting against something about which I know nothing.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of making an explanation. I misunderstood the situation a little while ago as it was presented by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN]. He introduced the subject of a United States Senatorship as it seemed to affect the forest reservations in Alaska. I was inadvertently in a position to be counted——

Mr. MADDEN. Is there a United States Senatorship to be given away in Alaska?

Mr. MOORE. That is a part of the explanation I want to make.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean that he was counted as a United States Senator?

Mr. MOORE. Not yet. [Laughter.] My present understanding of this mixed situation is this, that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] was advocating the distinguished ex-forester of the United States, Mr. Gifford Pinchot, for United States Senator in the State of Washington, and that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] was advocating the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] as a possible candidate for United States Senator in the State of Pennsylvania. That is how I came to get mixed up in this matter, and, having gone to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to speak to him about it, I was counted as one of the three—and I hope they will now be immortal—who stood up against an unwarranted expenditure of the public money for the purpose of maintaining gentlemen on vacation trips somewhere up in Alaska to look after a treeless forest that evidently was put on the map some time ago. But I now understand where the trouble lies. I am in error in believing that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is a candidate for United States Senator in the State of Pennsylvania, and I am in error in understanding that the gentleman who is so popular, at least in the State of Washington—Mr. Gifford Pinchot—is a candidate for Senator in that State or in Alaska.

Mr. BRYAN. But the gentleman would be right if he were to say that he could be elected out there.

Mr. MOORE. If I ever was right, I certainly would not be in the class of the gentleman from Washington, because the gentleman from Washington is so universally the other way that his interruption at this time gives point to his position. [Laughter.] But I find my error was in this, that instead of believing, as I thought, that Gifford Pinchot was a candidate for United States Senator in the State of Washington, the fact is that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is the candidate for Senator in that State, and that Mr. Gifford Pinchot, who is so popular there, and whose record was brought

into question a moment or two ago by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], is actually a candidate for Senator in the State of Pennsylvania. I think it is important that the House of Representatives, that hears so much about Mr. Pinchot, should know that he has finally come into the State of Pennsylvania to become a candidate for Senator there.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently to my colleague for five minutes, and will he please tell me now who will be the candidate for Senator of the United States, Mr. BRYAN or Mr. Pinchot?

Mr. MOORE. I do not know. I have just been advised that Mr. Pinchot has become a candidate for the Senate in the State of Pennsylvania. That is useful and important information, if true.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] by telling him whom the Republicans ought to elect as Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, and that is, Mr. J. HAMPTON MOORE, of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Well, I hesitate to admit that, of course. Mr. Chairman, I believe I still have some part of my time left to further elucidate this question; but I will use it to say to my distinguished friend from the great Democratic organization of New York that never on any occasion or in any adversity has he failed me. I thank him for the nomination, but will not accept at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that some of the gentlemen from the Northwest coast have at last discovered the uselessness for forest purposes of a large part of the Chugach Forest Reserve. I have a very lively recollection of a few remarks I made with regard to that famous reserve, that does not contain many trees, at the time it was largely extended. The Agriculture bill, I recall, was brought into the House. There was a large increase for the forest reserves. At that time the expenditures on the reserves were not segregated, as they are now, but were lumped together, and a large increase was accounted for, apologized for, and excused on the ground that some 20,000,000 of acres had been added to the reserves, necessitating the expenditure of a few thousand more dollars. The interesting fact I discovered on investigation was that while the increase in the area in reserves was mostly in Alaska, yet the money that was being asked for on account of the increased acreage was to be used within the continental boundaries of the United States and outside of Alaska.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to indicate what year that was?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I do not recall. I think the gentleman remembers it. We had a stirring time over it I recollect.

Mr. LEVER. I recall the time.

Mr. MONDELL. My good friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I remember, thought I was overemphatic in some of the statements I made in regard to the matter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was right, as usual.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the fact; I accept the statement; I was right, as usual. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. As right as usual.

Mr. MONDELL. The fact remains that this reserve was increased by millions of acres, and that increased area was and is and will be almost entirely unforested and valueless for any purpose within the purview or contemplation of the forest reserve law.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. That when this great extension was made, it was made as an excuse for largely increased expenditures thousands of miles away in other reserves.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman able to tell the committee what the purpose of establishing a treeless forest reserve is?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I assume generally——

Mr. MOORE. Is it not to take care of a number of employees in the service?

Mr. MONDELL. I have opinions about it. What I want to emphasize is that the great additions to this reserve was of land without trees, and it was made the excuse of expenditures elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Would it not be valuable for experimental purposes?

Mr. MONDELL. Possibly for the purpose of experimenting as to how far that sort of thing could be done without protest.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sopris National Forest, Colo., $6,230.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he is able to inform the committee how many acres there are in forest reserves altogether, and how many of those acres are treeless?

Mr. LEVER. There are 168,000,000 acres. Just what percentage are treeless I am unable to state to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman able to state approximately if there is any considerable area which is treeless?

Mr. LEVER. There is a considerable treeless area that is included in the national forests.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it approximate anything like 30 per cent of the total acreage?

Mr. LEVER. It would be a mere guess upon my part to make any statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state for the information of the committee what good purpose is served by having a treeless forest reserve? The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was not able to state that.

Mr. LEVER. My own opinion of it would be that the land would be very valuable for grazing purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it advisable specifically to establish grazing areas and call it a forest reserve?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I do not think that is the case. Is the gentleman aware of any?

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking the gentleman from South Carolina for information on this subject, and I can say, with all the discussion I have heard on the floor of this House on this subject, I have never been able to get an intelligent conception of a forest reserve upon which there are no trees.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois understands that the House of Representatives is not responsible for these reserves. They have been set aside by Executive order from time to time, and it is the duty of Congress, of course, to appropriate for their protection. Now, just what per cent of these forest reserves is not timbered I do not have that information right at hand, but it would be very easy for me to get it, and if the gentleman desires it I will get it and put it in the RECORD.

The information is as follows:

The treeless lands within the national forests are comprised of the mountain tops above timber line, which include about 8 per cent of the entire area, the lands within the timber belt which are covered with brush or undergrowth of value for watershed protection about 11 per cent, and the burned-over areas and open parks and slopes about 9 per cent. This makes a total of 28 per cent of the area of the national forests which is at present treeless and is being held either for the purpose of reforestation or watershed protection.

Mr. MADDEN. I should be very glad to have it as a matter of information. I think the public ought to have such information, and I am quite sure that most of the people out my way who live adjacent to the forests would like to know why any part of the public domain is set aside as a forest reserve where there are no trees.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. HAWLEY. As members of the committee we have asked the Forestry Service on several occasions the number of acres that were nonforested within the forest area, within the exterior limits, and we have been told that no survey has yet been made of sufficient detail to determine the number of acres. They know it as to a few forests, but not as to all of them.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. HAWLEY. We have been insisting that information be furnished at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the Committee on Agriculture think that it would be one of the important functions of the committee to ascertain this and bring in some definite recommendation, so that we may reach an intelligent conclusion upon which we may be able to base proper legislation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill now under consideration provides an appropriation of $185,000 to do that very thing—to classify the agricultural lands within the national forests and eliminate them as rapidly as possible?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if, after looking it all over carefully, he does not think it is unfortunate that in asking these trite questions regarding what comprises somewhere near one-half of all the territory of the 11 great Western States he has to ask the members of this very important Agricultural Committee, which, if it attends to the great agricultural problems of the United States, has all and more than it can do? Does he realize that more than one-fourth—nearly one-third—of the agricultural appropriation is for the Forest Service—$5,700,000 out of about $19,000,000? I want to ask him if he had ever stopped for a moment to consider that in Arizona, I think it is, 92 per cent of that territory is conserved or held by

the Government in some form or other, leaving only 8 per cent of it for two Senators and a Congressman, a governor, and a whole line of State officials to look after?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will have to revise that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, then, how much of that State is conserved and why?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not really on the floor for the purpose of criticizing anybody. I am simply asking for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to suggest to the Committee on Agriculture that it would be wise for that committee to make some systematic effort to get such information upon this subject as will give an intelligent conception of what the situation is to the Members of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that I do not believe there is a committee in this House which has made a more diligent effort to get information about all subjects connected with the bill which is reported to the House now than the Committee on Agriculture. It is almost impossible to anticipate in a bill that contains a thousand different items, as this bill does, every question that may be asked on the floor of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply want to say, in reply to the gentleman from South Carolina, that I agree with him that there is no committee in the House more diligent, more patriotic, more painstaking, more up-to-date, than this Committee on Agriculture, and the only thing I know of which they have overlooked is this very important question of not being able to ascertain the number of millions of acres there are in the forest reserves that ought to be in agriculture.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon will be heard in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. The total area in the national forests is 187,487,976 acres. When the national forests were established they were established by exterior boundaries, describing them usually by the township surveys. Great areas were included in them, because many of them were created within a very brief period. Many large areas were included in that that ought not to have been included, because, as stated, many of the forests were created quickly. There are, for instance, two kinds of land that have no trees on them that are included in the forest reserves. The first is the agricultural land. This land may have a small growth of timber or timber in spots on it. Those we have been endeavoring to have segregated, because there is a great demand for homes on the public domain, and the committee has appropriated from time to time moneys for that purpose, and this bill carries $185,000 for the purpose of selecting and segregating the agricultural lands.

The other class of lands are lands that are treeless, having been burned over, or are rocky, or with thin soil, and for which there is now no demand for homestead purposes. We have not made any special attempt to have any examination made of these latter, because, with the pressing problems upon us, no great good would come from such an examination at this time, and if they are valueless areas they may just as well be in the forest reserve as anywhere else, but we are urging the early elimination of lands capable of and valuable for agriculture.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. They have been carrying in this bill for a number of years appropriations for forestry purposes, for which $185,000 is carried this year. How long are they going to carry this appropriation without finishing this work?

Mr. LEVER. We have been carrying this appropriation for this purpose but one year. Last year was the first year that appropriation was carried in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Have you any estimate from the department as to about how long you will carry it?

Mr. HAWLEY. It will take some time to eradicate the cattle tick. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. They made a statement before the committee that they are hopeful to classify all these agricultural lands in the course of three years with the continuation of this amount of money.

Mr. GARNER. That is a very indefinite statement as to being able to complete this work within a few years.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to my friend from Texas that the Forest Service can not be entirely accurate as to how much of this land is agricultural until it has made the classifications which we are providing for in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. I should imagine there is a good deal of difference between——

Mr. HAWLEY. Is this being taken out of my time?

Mr. GARNER. There must be a difference between being able to survey a forest reserve in order to ascertain the agricultural land in it and eradicating the tick. You could appropriate enough money now in this bill at this time to do that entire survey work.

Mr. MANN. You would not have the force to do it.

Mr. GARNER. It seems to me it would be advisable to do so instead of running along for an indefinite number of years. If it is desirable to segregate this agricultural land, why not do it in one year?

Mr. MANN. Why not survey all the lands in the United States in one month and thus dispose of the subject?

Mr. GARNER. It would not be so difficult to do it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, we have been at it for a hundred years and have not done it yet.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture as to the length of time this item has been carried in the bill. I was misled as to that by the fact that for some years the Forest Service has been eliminating lands. But it does not matter whether it was carried in a specific item or in a lump fund; that practice has prevailed for a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I would like to have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon will proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], about appropriating enough money to make these surveys at once, whether the Forest Service is able at this time to find men who are sufficiently expert in agricultural land to go all through these forest areas and determine upon their character, I am not able to say, but I agree with him that the appropriation ought to be large enough to enable the Forest Service to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. In a moment. I think if it is found that in the next succeeding appropriation they are able to do that they ought to push the work as rapidly as possible, so that those reserves will contain only lands that are properly the subject of forest purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to ask the gentleman from Oregon if he did not think it would be a good idea to have a committee of this House appointed, consisting of Members not interested in forest-reserve territory, to investigate just exactly what the situation is with respect to forest reserves and make a report based not on interest in the situation but on the facts? In that way, it seems to me, we would get at the facts and be able to give to the public such information as it is entitled to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I would like to have another minute, if I can have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon will proceed for one minute more.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] about a committee of the House, that is a matter to which I have never given any consideration. So far as I know the Members from the Western States and in their attitude toward the Forest Service, they have been insisting upon one thing especially regarding the areas of the forests, and that is that the agricultural areas within the forests should be listed and opened at the earliest possible date, because there is a vast influx of settlers in the western country seeking homes, and when they can not find homesteads within our borders they leave and go up into Canada. We can ill afford to lose them, because every man who goes out with his family takes out about a thousand dollars, and we lose a family of from three to five people. I think that no commission that could be created by this House, distinguished as it might be, would have more interest and more patriotic concern than the Members from the States in which the forests are located, so far as I know them.

Mr. MADDEN. I know they are unbiased.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to detain the committee, but this question of nontimbered lands in the forest reserves is a very interesting one and of great importance to the people in the regions where the reserves are located.

It is true that there is a large amount of nontimbered land in the forest reserves, and where it is the sort of nontimbered land that is in the Chugach Reserve in Alaska it ought to be eliminated, because no good is served by retaining it in reserve and harm is done. On the other hand, there is a very considerable amount of nontimbered lands within the exterior boundaries of many of the reserves that is there properly.

Let me illustrate by taking the case of the Bighorn Forest Reserve in my State. The Bighorn Mountains are a great mountain mass, approximately 50 to 60 miles in length and about 30 miles in width, rising from the plains on either side and forming a great elevated rolling plateau, pierced in the center by the uplift of the main peaks of the range. The slopes of the valleys, particularly on the north side, are timbered. The south sides of the slopes ordinarily are not. Some of the open areas are timbered; more of them untimbered. A considerable portion of the land is above the timber line. Practically none of the land is fit for ordinary agricultural purposes; its elevation is too great. A considerable amount of it is good for grazing, but the untimbered areas in that reserve are practically all mountain areas. The untimbered areas are so scattered and dispersed among the timbered areas that it would be practically impossible to eliminate them. To do so would mean the creation of a dozen reserves where we have one, and no good purpose would be served; for while we should not put grazing lands in forest reserves for the purpose of having them in reserves, no harm is done if a certain amount of mountain grazing land is in a reserve, and the effect of the reserve and its protection, we hope, will ultimately be to extend somewhat the forested areas on these mountain slopes and sides and tops.

The complaint with regard to agricultural lands in forest reserves in times past came, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] has just suggested, arose from the hurry and carelessness with which the exterior boundaries of the reserves were established years ago. Much of that has been remedied. There are still some areas that ought to be excluded from the reserves. I think there are not many such in my State. We have not much to complain of in that regard. But on the Pacific slope they have another condition—land within the reserves that is actually timbered, and heavily timbered, but that would be valuable for agricultural purposes if the timber were cut and the land cleared. And there the question is, Should the settler be allowed to have the valuable timber and the land, or should the timber be cut and sold and then the settler be allowed to obtain the land? Or, taking everything into consideration, should the land be retained as timber-bearing land? It is not an easy problem, and it is a problem that has a great many sides.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman laboring under the impression that the Forest Service has sold any timber in our State? I hope not.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman has criticized the Forest Service for not selling timber in his State. I do not know how extensive those sales are. But I imagine that one reason why they have not sold more is because there is so much timber in the gentleman's State that you could not sell it all at once, and it would not be a good thing to do it if you could. In my State the Forest Service is selling about all the timber there is a demand for. I think they are rather stiff in their prices—too high in some cases—but if they sold much more we would not have any long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stanislaus National Forest, Cal., $16,601.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On the last day when this bill was under consideration the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was talking about the creation of certain forest reserves after the law prohibiting their further creation by Executive order was passed, and a moment ago the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] was speaking of the rapidity with which these forest reserves have been created. I have here a list of the creation of some of these forest reserves, and I find that on February 6, 1907, there were four reserves created, that on the 1st day of March, 1907, there were 12 created, and that on March 2, 1907, there were 20 forest reserves created. I call attention to the fact that these creations were just before the law went into effect upon the subject. The law prohibiting the creation of new forest reserves in certain States, contained in the agricultural bill approved March 4, 1907, at 9.43 o'clock a. m., is in the following language:

*Provided*, That hereafter no forest reserve shall be created, nor shall any additions be made to ones heretofore created within the limits of the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, Colorado, or Wyoming, except by act of Congress.

It was just before the act became effective that all the reserves which I have mentioned were created. They totaled about 12,000,000 acres, as I remember.

Mr. Chairman, I ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a memorandum showing the number of the reserves and the dates of their creation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The memorandum referred to is as follows:

1. January 15, 1907.—Caribou Forest in Idaho and Wyoming; new.
2. January 25, 1907.—Cascade, Oreg.; addition.
3. February 2, 1907.—Ouray, Colo.; new.
4. February 6, 1907.—Monticello, Utah; new.
5. February 6, 1907.—Stony Creek, Cal.; new.
6. February 6, 1907.—Big Burros, N. Mex.; new.
7. February 6, 1907.—Glenwood, Utah; new.
8. February 14, 1907.—San Jacinto, Cal.; addition.
9. February 15, 1907.—Little Belt, Mont.; readjustment of boundaries.
10. March 1, 1907.—Toiyabe, Nev.; new.
11. March 1, 1907.—Wenaha, Oreg. and Wash.; addition.
12. March 1, 1907.—Siskiyou, Oreg.; addition.
13. March 1, 1907.—Big Hole, Mont. and Idaho; addition.
14. March 1, 1907.—Uncompahgre, Colo.; addition.
15. March 1, 1907.—Big Belt, Mont.; addition.
16. March 1, 1907.—Imnaha, Oreg.; addition.
17. March 1, 1907.—Park Range, Colo.; addition.
18. March 1, 1907.—Holy Cross, Colo.; addition.
19. March 1, 1907.—Bear Lodge, Wyo.; new.
20. March 1, 1907.—Colville, Wash.; new.
21. March 1, 1907.—Las Animas, Colo. and N. Mex.; new.
22. March 2, 1907.—Little Rockies, Mont.; new.
23. March 2, 1907.—Yellowstone, Wyo. and Idaho; addition.
24. March 2, 1907.—Port Neuf, Idaho; new.
25. March 2, 1907.—Palouse, Idaho; new.
26. March 2, 1907.—Weiser, Idaho; addition.
27. March 2, 1907.—Cabinet, Mont. and Idaho; new.
28. March 2, 1907.—Mount Rainier, Wash.; addition.
29. March 2, 1907.—Washington, Wash.; addition.
30. March 2, 1907.—Ashland, Oreg.; addition.
31. March 2, 1907.—Coquille, Oreg.; new.
32. March 2, 1907.—Cascade, Oreg.; addition.
33. March 2, 1907.—Umpqua, Oreg.; new.
34. March 2, 1907.—Blue Mountains, Oreg.; enlarged.
35. March 2, 1907.—Medicine Bow, Wyo.; enlarged.
36. March 2, 1907.—Lewis and Clark, Mont.; addition.
37. March 2, 1907.—Otter, Mont.; new.
38. March 2, 1907.—Olympic, Wash.; addition.
39. March 2, 1907.—Montezuma, Colo.; addition.
40. March 2, 1907.—San Juan, Colo.; addition.
41. March 2, 1907.—Priest River, Idaho; addition.
42. March 2, 1907.—Tillamook, Oreg.; new.

The names of many of these forests have since been changed. I have given the names as they occur in the original proclamations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to state that there had been no sales of timber on any of the reserves in the State of Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There have been some sales. Off those 12,000,000 acres they sell enough to keep one mill running a few months in the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I misunderstood the gentleman. I thought he made the bald statement that there had been no sales.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. At the rate they have been cutting their timber it would take 35,000 years to cut over the reserve once in the State of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the hearings show that they have only got on all the forest reserves about half a billion feet, they still expect to cut an average of 6,000,000 feet, which will be, of course, a material increase, and will undoubtedly enter into competitive conditions in the lumber trade.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They are always expecting. They told us 10 years ago they were going to sell enough timber to pay expenses. If you will look into the hearings you

will see that they always consult the great timber owners as to the price they shall fix——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not want to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will discover that one reason why the expectations of the Forest Service are not realized in the amount of timber sales is because they always consult other great timber owners as to the price at which the timber shall be sold, and they always fix it at a price a little higher than the private timber owners get.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give us the basis of that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is in the hearings. If they were private individuals, the Attorney General would prosecute them for making a combination to keep up the price of lumber. In your own hearings on this bill the representative of the Forest Service testified that they always asked about as much or a little more than timber sells for on private holdings.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says "your own hearings." I hope the gentleman will not ascribe the hearings to me, because I am not a member of that committee. I think the statement should be made by some gentleman who is a member of the committee.

Mr. MANN. In view of the Underwood tariff law and the great increase in the production of lumber products in British Columbia and the closing of mills in Washington, why does the gentleman now desire to have the Forest Service sell the timber when there is no demand for it from the mills out there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes. The gentleman is the only man I know of who can answer it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The reason why I would like to have the Forest Service sell some timber is that a little over one-fourth of my State is in forest reserves, and they have been paying us the magnificent return of $14,400 a year; whereas, according to the statement made by our Commissioner of Public Lands, if the timber on the forest reserves was taxed at the same rate as private timber, in my State it would pay between $5,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year. We would like to get some returns, in view of the fact that we were promised by Mr. Gifford Pinchot that we were going to get in my State an amount equal to what the State lost in taxes, if it had the right to tax this timber.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has given a very lucid answer to my question. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] that the Forest Service is not selling more timber because it consults with Mr. Weyerhaeuser and other timber barons, I think it is time that the statement should go into the RECORD that there is a statute which requires that when timber is sold by the Forestry Service to an amount exceeding $100 it must be sold on competitive bids, after 30 days' notice in the newspapers of the country. That is the law, and the gentleman ought to know that, and he ought not to put statements into the RECORD unless he is satisfied as to his facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that in the hearings before his committee the other day a representative of the Forest Service said they always sold their timber for as much or a little bit more than the private timber owners? Is not that statement in the hearings?

Mr. LEVER. That may be; but why not? Why should they give the timber away? The Forestry Service is handling a piece of property that belongs to the people of the United States. Why should the Forest Service give it away? Why should the Forest Service sell the timber that belongs to the people of the United States to the people in the Western States cheaper than they can get it anywhere else?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why should the Forest Service combine with those who hold timber outside to fix the price?

Mr. LEVER. I have just read to the gentleman and called his attention to the fact that timber is sold on competitive bids under the statute of this Congress.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not a fact that the forester said it sold for about as much as private timber, but there was nothing whatever said anywhere in the hearings that they had consulted with anybody as to what the price would be; but it was sold in accordance with the statute, after due publication, and no consultation with Mr. Weyerhaeuser or anybody else?

Mr. LEVER. If there is any testimony in the hearings before the committee to that effect, I have not found it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in this connection, in the balance

Mr. LEVER. I want to say in this connection, in the balance of the time that I have, that we have spent one hour and three-quarters this morning discussing matters that took place in 1907—discussing Gifford Pinchot pro and con. In that time there has been one amendment offered, an amendment to strike out a national forest in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Just one moment. I think it is rather strange that these critics of the Forest Service should select the one forest in Alaska upon which to offer an amendment to strike out, leaving their own forests untouched, with no amendments to strike them out. If the forest policy of the United States is not a good thing, I ask you gentlemen—you critics—to offer your substantive propositions—your amendments to this bill. If the Forest Service is not a good thing for the United States, offer your amendments to strike out these appropriations one by one, and I will put you on record here; and if your people agree with you, they will send you back; and if not, they will send some one else who will agree with this policy. I ask you not to consume the time of the House or of the country in delaying the passage of this great Agriculture appropriation bill with talk alone, but give me your propositions and let us do business and you will find the Committee on Agriculture standing for every item in this bill ready to defend it, and, if possible, ready to see that their position is sustained by the Committee of the Whole. There has been but one proposition offered to the House this morning, and that is to strike out the Alaska item, and yet you have spent an hour and three-quarters talking about things that happened before some of us were born.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I am not losing my patience, but I do hope gentlemen will let us read along a little while.

The Clerk read as follows:

Toiyabe National Forest, Nev., $9,770.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very anxious to make it appear here now in opposition to the statement of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee that some of us who desire to have the Forest Service looked into carefully by the people of the United States do not want to strike out the Forest Service or to strike it down. As I understood the one amendment offered—and I am anxious to make my position clear—it was not an amendment to do away with the Chugach Reserve, but was an amendment to avoid spending unnecessary money there. The chairman has asked us what we can do in a constructive way. My contention is that this child—the Forest Service—has become so large that it is about to eat up the department to which it belongs. We take a day every week or so here to consider matters pertaining to the District of Columbia, 69 square miles and yet when the opportunity arises to discuss these enormous reserves and tracts, we are asked to hurry along. I can not stand here representing the people of the State of Washington and try to get more money for the real development of these great reserves, for a point of order would be made.

Mr. LEVER. It would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I know it. I would not get anywhere in this great but very expensive year of Democratic economy. It is hopeless for me to try to secure three times the expenditure in each reserve, so that we might have some roads cut through, so that we could go through that country; and so far as I am concerned, in the second district of Washington, I want to say that we are not trying to get back a single stick of timber. We have trouble enough of our own with the timber that is privately owned.

The Clerk read as follows:

Washington National Forest, Wash., $13,130.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that here is one more reserve in the State of Washington just exactly like the three reserves in my district, and to ask how many Members of Congress are there who suspect for a moment that under a provision in this bill which authorizes the building of telephone lines in forest reserves, the Forest Service agents can go into the Olympic Forest Reservation and spend several thousand dollars to put up a line 23 miles long directly in competition with a farmers' line, erected by each farmer himself contributing thereto? Is not that a waste of the Government money? Is there any need of putting

two telephone lines along the same trail where only a few people live?

Mr. COX. Could the Forest Service have made any connection with the farmers' telephone line or got communication in any way with them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes, certainly. Here is a little line 23 miles long, running from two little bits of towns, not connected with any trunk line, and the farmers who put up their money and agreed to contribute $6 a year for service and upkeep ask only that the Government shall pay the price of two telephone instruments, or $12 a year.

Mr. COX. Could the Forest Service have rented any of these boxes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course. But the Forest Service said, You give us free use of telephones or we will put up our own lines, and they not only did put up their own lines, but they went into court and sued these poor farmers, living 20 miles from a settlement of any consequence, for the cost of an eighth of a mile of telephone poles that are not worth as much out there as a few toothpicks are in this Chamber. That is what I call extravagance in the Forest Service. Yes, and worse.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman put in the RECORD how much that Government telephone line will cost?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. COX. Approximately how much is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I should imagine $6,000 or $8,000. It costs money in that country to build roads or telephones and to open the country. These people who went in there were originally 80 miles from a settlement, and they hauled their supplies in over rough trails and have waited almost a generation for relief to come.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I ask for information. If the Forestry Service had wanted a connection with the farmers' line, would the farmers have allowed them to connect on reasonable terms?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; the farmers, after many weeks of effort and organization, met and put up their own money and their labor and built 23 miles of telephone line in this forest reserve. One-eighth of a mile of that line ran on the actual reserve itself. This other part was an elimination.

Mr. GOULDEN. And the forest reserve people could have used the line on reasonable terms?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; one-eighth of a mile of the telephone line was actually on the public reserve, as I say, which was a road originally on public lands before there was any forest conservation—a county road, if you please. The first step after the Government got into the quarrel was for the Government to order down the private telephone line which crossed the one-eighth mile of forest reserve originally a public road. The line itself does not get anywhere. The forest rangers got into a quarrel with the people and did not propose to pay $12 for two instruments, or $24 for four instruments, I forget which it was, but they were willing to put up a rival line, reaching from nowhere to nowhere, for the benefit of nobody.

Now, in dispensing the forest money received for sales and for grazing, 25 per cent goes back to the county in proportion to what its area is in the reserve. I have told you that 25 per cent of that amount in one great, big county in my district was about $25 last year. On top of the 25 per cent there is 10 per cent that is floating money. The 10 per cent of that floating money is to be used in the further extension of roads, trails, and other things. It became necessary, after the farmers were so angry and upset over the telephone extension, to placate them. The farmers had already petitioned for that celebrated, so-called "big bottom country" to be opened, and thereupon some rangers or agents of the multitude of people who travel around at the Government expense proposed that some of the 10 per cent money, about $2,000, should be used to build a good road along there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That brought about a situation so that for a time the farmers were divided as to whether they would like to have a little bit of the "big bottom" land thrown open for more people to come in or sit down and get this $2,000 for building the roads.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I take it, from the gentleman's argument, that he thinks this expenditure in these items is too large—that it is extravagant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not a bit of it.

Mr. LEVER. I want the gentleman from Washington to give me warning, so that I can get my cohorts in here, if he is going to offer an amendment to strike out these appropriations or cut them down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the contrary, I would move to add three times the amount to the appropriation for every forest reserve in the United States. How can we get along with these trifling appropriations in a district where the forest reserve itself is bigger than a whole State? How can we build roads to travel over to get anywhere? We get no taxes; we do not want the timber. My heavens, we do not want it! The gentleman does not know what it means to have 35 or 40 per cent of a State set aside and be at the mercy of this service. I have dozens and dozens and dozens of letters from men writing me, giving the names of rangers, inspectors, and others who come, one after another, over and over again, looked the lands over, quarreling and reporting as to whether it is timberland or agricultural land; and then come more agents making a geological inspection, with counter reports back and forth, back and forth, until the agents and investigators alone use up, I do believe, actually more of the Government's money than the land will be worth in the next 200 years. I think I know what I am talking about, because I live right on the edge of one of these big forest reserves.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prescott National Forest, Ariz., $4,780.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say that I will gladly offer an amendment to strike out the appropriation for any reserve in our State, with the single exception of the sum sufficient to protect the forests from fire if the chairman will tell me what that amounts to. We would be far better off if all the other items were taken out.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to say that the gentleman is rather fortunate in waiting until we get through with nearly all the Washington items.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, there is one here now, if the gentleman will tell me what the fire protection amounts to.

Mr. LEVER. I will let the gentleman make his motion, and I will take my own course.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman has criticized us because we have not made objection to items as they came along, instead of the Alaskan one. I will tell you why. We did not know much about the rest, but I did know about the one in Alaska. The gentleman can not give us any information about them, neither can any man on the committee.

Mr. LEVER. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Give us the amount of nontimbered land there is in these forest reserves.

Mr. LEVER. I have told the gentleman repeatedly that the Forest Service itself did not know the amount. I told him also that we appropriated $185,000 in this bill to find out, and we began the work only last year. Where was the gentleman and his party when it was in power on this proposition?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to say to the gentleman that it does not lie in his mouth to criticize anybody because they do not object. The Forestry Service does not know anything about it. The reason I did not object to these items is because I was willing to let it go, because I did not know anything about it myself. I objected to the one in Alaska, because the creation of it served no useful purpose.

Mr. LEVER. It was not very convincing.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; and it would be a waste of time as to these other items. But I challenge the gentleman from South Carolina to stand up before the House and the country and give one good reason why this Chugach Reserve should be retained.

The Forest Service ought to protect the forest reserves from fire. I hardly think gentlemen ought to criticize me. I did not object to many other items. If I had known that he would consider it a favor I would have objected to one after another. If the gentleman will tell me how much appropriation is needed to protect the particular forest now under consideration from fire, I will move to reduce it to that amount.

Mr. LEVER. I accept the gentleman's challenge and will give him the information he desires, except I tried to make him understand, and I think everybody else in the House understands except the gentleman, that I did not know and the Forest Service does not itself know the exact percentage of nontimbered land within the national forests. Now, the gentleman wants to

know something about this particular forest. Here is the information.

WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST.

Area and location. The Wenatchee National Forest is situated in Chelan and Kittitas Counties in central Washington. The gross area is 1,157,000 acres, of which 652,354 acres are publicly owned.

Topography: The topography is extremely rough and rugged, and the mountains (Cascades) are cut by countless streams, forming an important tributary system to the Columbia River to the east. Some bench land occurs along the streams.

Stand: The total stand of timber amounts to 3,715,000,000 board feet. Only a small amount is accessible. Douglas fir and western hemlock are the principal trees. Other trees of importance are yellow pine, western red cedars, and firs.

Purposes: The Wenatchee Forest protects the heads of streams the waters of which are used for irrigation in the Kittitas and Yakima Valleys, famous for their fruit. The danger from fire is great, and it is absolutely necessary that these watersheds be protected, not only on account of the value of the water for irrigation, but also because of the value of the timber embraced within the area.

Does the gentleman want any more information?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have no doubt that is the amount necessary for fire protection and——

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not move to strike it out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Because the gentleman says it is necessary for fire protection.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is mistaken when he says the gentleman from South Carolina did not know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered. My friend from South Carolina could not furnish the desired information; perhaps I can. I would like to inform gentlemen that they expended $141.86 last year fighting fires——

Mr. LEVER. How much?

Mr. STAFFORD. One hundred and forty-one dollars and eighty-six cents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Can the gentleman give me the number of million feet of board timber in the Wenatchee Reserve in the State of Washington compared with the number of feet in the Chugach Range, and then we will compare the expenditures of $9,300 with $16,330?

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman of the committee did not furnish the information to the committee requested by your colleague, and I desired to supplement that and furnish it.

My purpose in rising was to direct the attention of the chairman to the fact that last year there was carried in this item the sum of $11,330, and there was expended, according to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, $21,347. In glancing over the other items in this bill I find the department has not been limited to the appropriations carried in last year's appropriations act, but in many instances they are double the amount. I am acquainted with the fact that under the 15-cent limit arrangement the department has that authority, but if it has that authority I would like to inquire what is the basis for the estimates of the department when they are free to increase it at will.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will if the gentleman is going to furnish information.

Mr. HAWLEY. The reason why some of the items of expenditure appear larger than the authorization of the preceding year was that some of the forests were changed in their boundaries, lands were transferred from one forest to another, and so some were increased in size, and there appears charged to that forest under its name the amount really expended under its present boundaries, which should be taken into consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. That may be the explanation of the department, Mr. Chairman, but when we consider all these items, we find expenditures in excess and, in some instances, twice the amount, so that is no explanation to this House as to the others; and accordingly I would like to have from the chairman, if he can furnish any explanation as to the basis of the department in furnishing these estimates when they expend usually twice the amount appropriated in the upkeep of the different forest reserves.

Mr. LEVER. I would think that the department bases the estimates upon its general knowledge of the situation and what is necessary for the protection each of these forest units needs and put in what should be used or is likely to be used during the fiscal year for which the estimates are being made. That is the explanation I gave to the gentleman from Illinois day before yesterday. It may be that the Forest Service knows that in a certain forest unit a contract for timber is going to be made, and it will necessitate, of course, the sending in of forest cruisers to mark the timber and make selection, and the like of that.

And knowing that fact in advance, of course they can estimate in advance in the neighborhood of what the expenditure will be.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee must have given consideration to the need of continuing that interchangeable appropriation of 15 per cent of the total expense for use in any one item.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform this committee as to his committee's opinion whether there is any urgent need for the department having such an omnibus discretion as does away with any limitation on the expenditures for these respective forest reserves?

Mr. LEVER. I would think that is an important provision for the Forestry Service. For instance, 15 per cent of $2000 here in one of these items would be a very small amount of money.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the 15 per cent is not limited to the specific appropriation, but it is 15 per cent of the total of two or three millions of dollars that may be expended on any one project.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has an entirely different impression from that which the committee has, then.

Mr. STAFFORD. I read the provision, and I think it bears that construction.

Mr. LEVER. That is not the construction the department places on it, nor the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad to hear that. Then it is 15 per cent of the specific appropriation made?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order to make an observation.

If all the appropriations for the various forest reserves are as properly and honestly made as this one, the committee and the Forestry Bureau are to be complimented. I happen to be familiar with this well-watered and finely timbered reservation. It lies along the Columbia, the Wenatchee, and the Chewawa Rivers in the State of Washington, is the watershed of that great fruit country which lies along the Wenatchee and Columbia Rivers, from which thousands of tons of splendid fruit are shipped each year, and where irrigation is necessary. Therefore I am heartily in favor of this particular item, and wish to say to you that it is an honest, well-thought-out, and deserved appropriation. The home of the big apple, the luscious cherry, the juicy pear is in the Wenatchee Valley, beginning at the flourishing city of Leavenworth and extending eastward for 50 miles. The waters from this famous reservation are required to irrigate these rich producing fruit lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] yield the balance of his time to me?

Mr. GOULDEN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to say to the chairman, in view of the query I propounded to him when he stated it was the practice of the department that this 15 per cent allowance is limited to the specific appropriation, that in every instance, I might say, in the expenditures for these respective forest reserves the amount expended by the department was in excess of the 15 per cent, and the bill itself says 15 per cent of the total appropriation may be utilized.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is reading from the expenditures for 1913.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will take any one item the gentleman sees fit to take, and I will show to him the expenditure is away in excess of the specific appropriation. The authorization of 15 per cent on this great total means millions and millions of dollars, which means no limitation whatsoever on the discretion of the Forestry Service in the expenditure of that 15 per cent.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is calculating upon the amount carried in this appropriation bill as one basis, and making his calculation upon the basis of expenditures for 1913.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take, for instance, the one I just referred to; last year's appropriation for the Wenatchee Forest Reserve was $11,330. There was expended $21,347 on that forest reserve, or more than 80 per cent in excess of the specific appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. That was expended the year before. You are not reading the expenditures for the fiscal year 1914, but you are reading the expenditures for the fiscal year 1913.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will get the appropriation act of the year previous, and I think my statement will be confirmed also by that.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman may be correct, but I do not think he is.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it were not for the fact that in all of these items the expenditures are nearly double the amount of the appropriation, I would not be so positive in my assertion.

Mr. LEVER. I would be glad to have the gentleman look that up.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Before the pro forma amendment is withdrawn I wish to say that I object to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GOULDEN. In order to accommodate my friend from Washington, who has given us so much valuable information this morning, I will not withdraw the pro forma amendment now, but yield the balance of my time to him.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank my friend from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Here we have an appropriation of $9,330 for the Wenatchee National Forest, and my colleague from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] says that if the chairman of this committee would tell him how much of that appropriation is to be used for fire protection he will then move to strike out all the rest of the appropriation, so that there can be nothing done in the forest reserve except such as is coincident with the protection from fire, and that all of the other work is to be laid down.

Now, I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that if my colleague were to succeed in putting through an amendment of that kind, and thus wreck the work of the Government in the next fiscal year in that magnificent forest reserve, I doubt very much if my colleague, notwithstanding his geniality, good nature, and all that sort of thing, would be permitted to stay over night in Wenatchee if he were to drop off there after having put through here that particular amendment.

I want to read here a letter with reference to the administration of that forest, a letter that was written on October 21, 1912, to the National Conservation Association. It is as follows:

FERN DELL ORCHARD,
*Lakeside, Wash., October 21, 1912.*

NATIONAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of the 5th instant, asking me for honest opinions to certain charges against the national forests and the actual effects upon myself and neighbors of these reserves as now handled. I have no hesitation in telling all I know of any subject that pertains to the public welfare. I will answer the questions as they come by number.

First. The national forest is a blessing to the people within its borders because it affords, provides, and guarantees a supply of fuel, timber, and pasture or range for every resident. It affords us the best fire protection known.

Right now I want to call to the attention of the Members here, as a diversion, that the vast areas of timber in my State, tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres of land, that have passed into private hands out there and are held in private control, do not worry or cause any particular annoyance to these gentlemen. We do not have any rights, public rights, out there in Washington over the areas that have been passed over to the Weyerhaeusers and the railroads. The only rights the public has out there are in these forest reserves. Now I read further:

It prevents the forest cover from being destroyed, thus conserving our springs and water supply, and also keeps our steep hill and mountain sides from erosion. The Forest Service has given us roads, trails, and telephones. It is a detriment only to lawless exploitation.

Second. There is not a natural resource within this (Chelan) forest that is not offered for use and is being used as fast as people can make use of them. Logs for lumber, timbers, electric-light and telephone poles, wood, pasture for great bands of sheep, everything that can be used, is used. Only it is now looked after and the resources are sold, not stolen.

Third. This forest has been dug over two or three times and is being gone over all the time.

Fourth. I have never heard of a mining claim being held up in this reserve, although there are some that should be.

Fifth. Timber, fuel, pasture, is given to the poor man free. The big man, big sheep man, steamboat man, sawmill man, etc., pay for their privileges. Giving the lie direct to that charge.

Sixth. At the risk of being tiresome, I must tell you of our situation here. Lake Chelan is nearly 60 miles long. It is one of the most beautiful pieces of water in the world. The climate is such that you can take a blanket and go camping and sleep on the ground for months. No rain nor dew. Thousands avail themselves of this opportunity every summer. Any man, be he ever so poor, can take his wife and kids in a rowboat and spend as long as he has the time along the shores; but the only camping places, owing to the precipitous shores, are at the mouths of the various creeks that empty into the lake. A few people have raised a big howl because they were not allowed to homestead these places. See? A dozen of these homesteads would sew up the whole thing. These places, all together, would not make a garden, but they would sell to some millionaire, and the few men would practically own the lake. We hope these places will be held for the thousands who need them. Aside from this, homesteads are being taken all the time where there is any agricultural land, and the benefit of the doubt is generally given to the applicant.

Seventh. All the forest officers and men that I have come in contact with have been courteous, polite gentlemen. I have eaten and drank with them, and I have fought fire with them, when for 6 days we put in about 16 hours a day, without very much food or water either. Their work is hard and many times dangerous and their pay is insufficient.

Eighth. I have not met the eastern theorists. The men on the Chelan Forest, from supervisor down, are men raised in this country and have worked up from the bottom in the service here. They know their business, and there are no more sober, honest, and reliable business men in this country. Ask the banks or any business house in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask only two minutes, Mr. Chairman, and I also ask that I may insert the rest of the letter that I do not read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. I read further:

Ninth. The sheep range is the land way back and up that no settler could use. We have all the range we can use at our doors. All our logs for lumber have been sold to a local mill here. There are no other buyers. Wood is sold to the steamboats, given to the settlers, up to a certain amount.

You may get the idea from this letter that my warm espousal of the Forest Service is because I have profited in some way from the handling of same. I will say my home here was homesteaded long before this was a reserve. I have never even received a cord of wood. I have plenty on my own land, but my neighbors have had favors. We all know and appreciate the advantages of being in the reserve, and we don't want any State handling of it. Much better it would go back as open Government land than to let the State have any hand in it.

I am sure this is the opinion of the great majority of the people in this country, especially of those who live in the reserve. Hoping you will be able to head off any adverse legislation and that the good work will go steadily on, and if I can be of any use you will call on me, I am,

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD F. GAINES.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a slight difference of opinion among the Members of the House representing the State of Washington. The gentleman from Washington, Mr. HUMPHREY, thinks that the appropriation for the Forest Service ought to be reduced because the administration is too expensive. The gentleman from Washington, Mr. JOHNSON, thinks the appropriations ought to be increased threefold; but it is some pleasure to know that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. BRYAN, is thoroughly satisfied with all that has been done and all that is being done, and with the appropriation.

It is a pleasure to know that some one in Washington or these other States where they have large forest reserves does not have a kick. The fact is, there has been a good deal of criticism of the Forest Service on the floor of the House. The forest reserves are of comparatively recent origin. Complaint has been made that no one knows just how many acres have trees on and how many acres do not have trees on. Yet I dare say that until the end of time that will not be known, because what was true yesterday will not be true to-morrow of those reserves. There is constant addition to the timbered area through the growth of new forests, and loss of untimbered area through its being taken out of the forested area and turned over as homesteads, and other disposition as public lands.

We have not learned all there is to know about the management of forests, but the people of the West, in the locality of these forests, have not yet fully appreciated the fact that the people of the United States believe that those lands belong to the people of the United States, and that if settlers go onto those lands and obtain them, in the main free, because they think they are of value, they must take them upon the conditions which the Government prescribes, and one of those conditions now is that they shall not be permitted to seize the valuable timber on the lands and the valuable forests belonging to the whole people for the exploitation of individuals or corporations.

That policy is thoroughly settled as the policy of our people to-day, in my opinion. While we may make mistakes as we go along, and while we may learn more and more about what forests should be retained, about how timber should be disposed of, we propose to maintain as the right of the people these reserves of our country, and we do not propose to turn them over for private exploitation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that debate on this paragraph is exhausted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I desire to proceed for five minutes, in order to furnish the chairman of the committee with the information he requested a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman requested the information as to the difference in appropriations and the amount expended in the fiscal year 1913 I have obtained the appropriation act of 1913, and I will call his attention to the appropriations under that act for the Wenatchee Reservation, in the State of Washington, and the two following ones, and compare the amounts with the amounts expended.

For the year 1913 there was appropriated $8,183 for the Wenatchee; there was expended $21,306. For the White River National Forest, Colo., there was appropriated $12,112, and there was expended $20,429. For the Whitman National Forest, in Oregon, there was appropriated $16,489, and there was expended $32,845.

It goes without saying that these amounts are far in excess of the 15 per cent of the individual items. The authorization as carried in this bill permits the department to spend not to exceed 15 per cent of the general expenses of the Forest Service in any branch of the administration of the Forest Service. The total amount carried in this appropriation act for the Forest Service is $3,500,000, in round numbers. That authorizes the Chief of the Bureau of Forestry to spend $475,000 on any one item without any restriction whatsoever. The reason why I am directing this query to the gentleman is because of the abuse which was made of a similar interchangeable appropriation, not in the Agricultural Department, but in the Post Office Department, by the noted Machen and Beavers. It was the abuses which were committed by those post-office officials some 12 years ago that caused the Post Office Committee that met following those disclosures to eliminate from the appropriation bill a similar interchangeable provision—which up to that date had been allowed to the Division of Salaries and Allowances—to appropriate 5 per cent of the total appropriation for various items to be used indiscriminately in other items.

We found that there could be no limitation whatsoever on the disposition of the public funds. I think we have had a pointed illustration of the abuse in the instance cited by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], where a ranger was authorized to expend thousands of dollars upon his own ipse dixit for the establishment of a public telephone line when there was a private telephone line in existence that would have given the necessary service, just because of some feigned objection that this forester may have had to the use of the farmer's private line. I think it is a subject that should be brought to the attention of the chairman of the committee. It can not be corrected at the present time. He stated that he and the members of the committee were under the impression that the 15 per cent was limited to one specific item: I call attention to the fact, so that when the committee meets next year they will take it into consideration and will consider whether it is not advisable to take this item that may be subject to abuse, and in the history of other departments has been the subject of the gravest kind of abuses, and correct it.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that the impression of the committee is that this can not be transferred in the manner which the gentleman suggests, and that that opinion is confirmed by the testimony of the Assistant Secretary, Dr. Galloway, before the committee, that transfers are limited to 15 per cent of the item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have a law which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend 15 per cent of the amount appropriated under general expenses, which is $5,500,000, and which amounts in this bill to $750,000; and here are these special instances that I have called to the attention of the committee, where the increase amounts to 80 and in some instances to 100 per cent of the amount appropriated for a particular purpose.

Mr. LEVER. That language may be involved, and it may be well to correct it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] regarding the apparent increases in the items above the amount appropriated, I should like to call the attention of the committee to this situation of the accounting: There is appropriated in the bill a certain amount of money for the payment of supervisors, rangers, and guards and other employees, for other expenses immediately connected with the forests. That is the item to which the gentleman has referred, in the appropriation law of 1912; but in the bookkeeping, in order to render a fair account of all the costs with which any particular forest is to be charged, there is added to that specific appropriation for the forest the proportionate amount of the overhead charge, of the division of the national domain into which it falls. There are six divisions or districts into which the forests are divided, and a proportionate part of the overhead charge in each division is added to the particular amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HAWLEY. Just a moment. Then the proportionate part of the overhead charge of the Washington end of the administration is added. In addition to that, while the language of the act may be broad, yet I asked Assistant Secretary Galloway specifically on that point, and he said he never transferred to any item more than 15 per cent of that particular item. That 15 per cent additional goes into this amount. Then there are certain items that are included in the appropriation for the Forest Service, regarding the special services, the study of trees, dendrological study, silviculture, the growing of trees, making surveys, roads and improvements, and other items. Those are accounted for. All the work done on the forests under those items is counted up and accounted for in the report to which the gentleman refers, to show what that particular forest costs the Government, so that every item of cost that that forest must be charged with is accounted for in this appropriation from all sources. The report from which the gentleman has read does not profess to be a report of the expenditures simply for the men who care for the forest, but it is a statement of all the items with which that particular forest ought to be legitimately charged.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman uphold the chairman of the committee in the statement that the 15 per cent is applied to the individual item, and not to the total?

Mr. HAWLEY. I asked Assistant Secretary Galloway if certain items could not be increased over 15 per cent from any large item in the bill, and he said no, that it could only be added to by 15 per cent of the particular item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to correct the gentleman when he says this appropriation is limited merely to salaries.

Mr. HAWLEY. I never said salaries.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to say salaries. I wish to call attention to the phraseology—

For salaries and field and station expenses, including the maintenance of nurseries, collecting seed, and planting necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the national forests named below.

Mr. HAWLEY. That language and the preceding paragraph precedes these appropriations, and is the general enacting clause not only for these individual items but for all the items of silviculture, dendrological studies, extermination of insect pests, making roads, surveys, and every other business that the Forest Service carries on.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I have before me the segregated, itemized expenditure for this Wenatchee Forest Reserve. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, we appropriated a total amount of $8,183. The statutory expenditure for salaries on that forest reserve alone was $11,417, or far in excess of the 15 per cent; and as you run across the page, following the various segregated items, you will find that the total of expenditures is away in excess of the 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. While I do not wish to criticize, and it would be far from me to criticize the good faith of the Assistant Secretary, I still believe that the figures and returns of the Secretary of Agriculture showing the itemized expenditures contradict that statement and contradict the exposition made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. I think it would require further investigation before the gentleman can wipe away the figures which show that double the amount has been expended in many instances.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am talking in the time of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriation for the item was $8,000; and how much was the expenditure?

Mr. STAFFORD. Eighteen thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, that is more than 15 per cent.

Mr. HAWLEY. It does not show that that particular explanation is incorrect. Let me go over the matter again. There was authorized for expenditure in each of the forest reserves a certain amount of money. When they came to report on each reserve, in order to make a fair report, of what a given forest has cost the Government, they must charge it with not only the work of the rangers, but a proportional part of the administration in Washington, the administration in the district in which it is, for roads, surveys, improvements, and other expenses, and then, possibly, the 15 per cent must go into that.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the appropriation of $8,000 was simply to pay the rangers?

Mr. HAWLEY. To pay for the rangers and the administration of the forest.

Mr. MADDEN. On the ground?

Mr. HAWLEY. On the ground.

Mr. MADDEN. And all the other general expenses?

Mr. HAWLEY. There is added to this all the items and all the amounts that ought to be charged to it, not only in the field and the items I have mentioned, but for experts that go to the forest to study the extermination of pests, and the other expenses already enumerated.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. MADDEN. If there was $8,000 appropriated for a particular forest, assuming that the $8,000 was to cover the management, what does the management consist of?

Mr. HAWLEY. The $8,000 was to cover the cost of caring for the forests on the ground. Then, there are other appropriations to take care of, like fire protection, and so forth.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does it say so in the appropriation bill?

Mr. HAWLEY. I am talking about the practice of the department.

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriation bill, then, does not tell the truth.

Mr. HAWLEY. The appropriation bill tells the truth, for that is what they get. They can not pay out any money unless the appropriation bill authorizes it, because it has to pass through the hands of the Auditor of the Treasury Department.

Mr. MADDEN. Can I make another suggestion which the committee may take advantage of in making up appropriations for a given forest? That is, that they ought to segregate the items, so much for the management on the ground, so much for overhead charges, everything incidental to the management that might figure during the year.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will turn to page 26, at the bottom of the page he will find that from there down to line 20, on page 28, all the purposes that he has mentioned are set forth in general terms, and then follows the items for specific work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Are there any items there for spreading wire netting over an acre of ground to keep the birds and squirrels from eating up the seeds?

Mr. HAWLEY. There is a provision in the bill for forest nurseries.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item in the bill for the appropriation for the different forest reserves is very explicit and it covers all expenses on each of the reservations except overhead expenses, but you may send into a forest an expert whose salary is carried by some other appropriation. The item reads:

For salaries and field and station expenses, including the maintenance of nurseries, collecting seed, and planting necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the national forests named below.

I do not recall just how the item of expenditure is made up to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred, but certainly, if it is made up correctly, it should show the items of expenditure out of this specific appropriation. If they want to guess what the overhead charges are, and it is purely a matter of guess, they can put it in a separate item. If they claim that somebody has gone into the forest under some other item of appropriation, that ought to be specified in the report. We have, for instance, an item of $400,000 for the construction of trails and roads in the forests. Of course, a portion of that may have been expended in this forest; but, if so, the item of expenditure should show whether it comes out of another appropriation and is a special item, or whether it is for the administration of the forest itself.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The statement in the book of expenditures of the department under this item of expenditure shows the ordinary current expenses of timber sale, trespass, grass, fire trespass, water power, and the like of that; fire and other emergency expenditures, permanent improvements, such as roads, telephones, and silviculture, a technical name for the study of forest trees.

Mr. MANN. If they have bunched all those items together in one, they might as well have thrown the thing into the wastebasket, as far as furnishing information is concerned.

Mr. LEVER. Each item that I have read is a separate item, covering a separate amount.

Mr. MANN. How much of that appropriation and expenditure is for the items covered for maintenance of the forest itself on the ground?

Mr. LEVER. Let me read:

Ordinary current expenses, $18,000.

Mr. MANN. What was the appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation was not set out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Eight thousand one hundred and eighty-three dollars.

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation was $8,180.

Mr. MANN. There can be no question among us arithmeticians that $18,000 is more than 15 per cent above $8,000.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; but, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] explained——

Mr. MANN. But he did not explain, and that is the trouble.

Mr. LEVER. That could be accounted for, I think, in the overhead charges in the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. But that is not a part of the overhead charges. In the first place, there can not be more than 100 per cent of the expenditures in the field for overhead charges. That would be to plead guilty to gross negligence and extravagance. You can not make the overhead charges for those forests more than 100 per cent of the appropriation expended in the field.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman is not contending that I made any such statement?

Mr. MANN. I am not contending anything about what the gentleman's statement was.

Mr. HAWLEY. That included all improvements and other matters.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] states that the administrative expenses, including the expenses of the forest, were $18,000. That does not include the other special items, which are certainly more than $8,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. But that includes a proportionate part of the statutory roll.

Mr. LEVER. That is what I was trying to bring out.

Mr. MANN. It includes no part of the statutory roll except overhead charges.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The item of appropriation is for salaries and field and station expenses, including the whole thing for the forest itself. There is no other statutory roll that is charged to that forest.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whitman National Forest, Oreg., $16,790.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to conclude my remarks in

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I conclude my remarks in regard to the general management of the Forest Service by saying I thoroughly indorse all that was said a few moments ago by that careful, cautious, far-sighted Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. We people away out West know that conservation is here and here to stay, and that being the case we do want it looked into and taken care of, with full regard to both sides of the question. That is all there is to the problem. I am not talking of the past, but of the present. It does no good to talk of what happened seven or more years ago.

But I submit here is a proposition in bureaucracy. Here is a bureau which is, I feel sure, too big to be handled under a department. That must be apparent. Here is one branch of the Government service which we all expect will pay the people back for every dollar expended, and pay back in millions of dollars, and I ask once more, if this is the case, is it not apparent to the Members that it is a big and terrific task to impose all of the work in connection with this bureau on the Agriculture Committee? One thing more in respect to the charges made here on the floor this very day—and perhaps I was a little confused as to who was running for Senator in the State of Washington and who in the State of Pennsylvania—but what I do want to say in reply to the queries as to why more has not been said in previous Congresses about conservation and the care of the forests. I will tell you why. Except my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, where is the Congressman who

has dared to get up and talk about the Forest Service when he knows he will be promptly jumped upon and accused of representing the timber owners?

In this Olympic Forest Reserve there are 15,000 people living, and I believe I am the first man who has come from down in the heart of that country who has dared to talk in an effort to tell the representatives of the people of the United States something about what is happening. It makes very little difference to me whether I am attacked for it or not. I will tell you that the list of names of poor people who have been mistreated out in these forest reserves in my district is as long as the list of dead at Gettysburg, and it is time that somebody with nerve enough got up to say something about it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman spoke of what we expected to get back from this forest-reserve operation. Can the gentleman give us information as to what we are getting now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You are not getting anything now; but let us be fair about that. All of this timber belongs to all of the people. Some of the agricultural land should go back to the settlers; but here on the next page there is an item proposing an appropriation for segregation and classification of lands, $100,000. If you want to know how far that will go out in that heavy western country, where the undergrowth is 2 feet thick, step over into the Indian Service and ask what it costs to classify the lands in the Quiniault Indian Reservation for allotment, and you will find that $100,000 will rattle around like 10 cents in a big tin washboiler. It is a mere drop in the bucket and nothing more.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman misunderstood the purport of my question. I was not taking exception to his remarks but was trying to get information as to whether we were getting anything back out of this large expenditure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; you are not; but you will in the course of fifty or a hundred years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, $100,000 is a lot of money. Who gets it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps the map makers. Who knows? Perhaps it will be divided around among a lot of people who are so classified that I can not recall the divisions; but never mind, they will be working along all the time.

Mr. COX. And doing nothing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Classifying some lands in a slow way, and after classification is made, we will say, of 25,000 acres, then the geological board will eliminate some of them, and some other board will eliminate some more, and they will make some more maps, and the 25,000 acres will be reduced to 5,000 acres, and then it will be proposed to have a race, a lottery, or something else for hundreds of land-hungry people to rush in and grab the little piece that is left, at expense to themselves and to the Government out of all proportion to what the agricultural lands are really worth.

Mr. COX. Then that $100,000 will probably provide for about 5,000 acres of land?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I did not make that statement. But I will say this: Conservation is a big baby to be taken care of, and not only along this line, but along many others, the country is marching on toward Federal control—actually Federal usurpation, in great measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington asked and obtained leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. I want to make a further statement, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois, in reference to this forest in Washington, as to the way in which expenditures are made and to give some reason for the expenditures being larger than the appropriation. I hold in my hand a statement of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, and if the gentlemen will turn to page 29, fourth line from the bottom, they will see that for this Wenatchee Forest there is an expenditure of $11,417.49 in the way of statutory salaries and $3,598 from the lump fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the lump sum, may I inquire?

Mr. LEVER. Under the general expense item of the Forest Service.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. That is a specific item.

Mr. LEVER. A specific item, known as the lump fund.

Mr. MANN. It is an item of appropriation for the forest.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. This contains $327.23 for transportation; $554 for meals and lodging; $1,347 for wages; $84 for subsistence supplies and $1,494 for materials and equipment; $310 for freight, express, and drayage; $33.59 for advertising; $91.91 for telephone and telegraph; $42.75 for miscellaneous supplies and services and $300 for rent; $2.30 for furnishing heat, light, and so forth; fuel, no charge at all; $250 for forage, stock feed——

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is reading one line above the right line.

Mr. LEVER. Well, that brings out the thought.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say that all other than the statutory amount for salaries is paid out of the segregated items carried in the appropriation act?

Mr. LEVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say that all the items other than the first, for salaries, which is paid out of the statutory amount, were paid out of the appropriations for the segregated items of the Forest Reserve Service?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will just call the attention of the gentleman to this fact. I also examined this before the gentleman replied. I am acquainted with the figures of the total amount which the gentleman says is $21,347. The amount of the statutory salaries is $11,417, the amount as given by the gentleman, leaving a balance of $9,930. The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1913 for this reserve is $8,183. Fifteen per cent is $1,200, which makes the amount $9,380, $600 in excess of the 15 per cent allowance, so the gentleman will have to make some further allowance, though I will say frankly to the gentleman that his explanation to the committee has informed me of something of which I was not advised when I first took the floor, that as to this total expenditure for this forest reserve there is included an aliquot portion of the departmental expenses. In that connection I wish to say out of the total appropriation of $21,347 charged up to one item—one reserve—there is an expenditure of more than one-half for departmental expenses here at Washington, or $11,417, and that is the case as to other reserves, going right down the line.

Mr. LEVER. No; not necessarily in Washington.

Mr. HAWLEY. Rangers' salaries are charged in.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seems to me a very large amount that should be specifically accounted for.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will; but before the gentleman from Illinois starts let me say further I have had the clerk of the committee call up the Forest Service and make inquiry about this 15 per cent clause, and they say that it relates to the item and not to the total appropriation, and this difference about which we have been speaking is accounted by this explanation I have tried to give.

Mr. MANN. Now the only service which can be rendered on the statutory rolls are supervisors and rangers, clerks, draftsmen, carpenters, machinists, messengers, and charwomen. I suppose they do not have any charwomen at these forest reserves. I should hope not. I do not believe they have messengers out there.

Mr. LEVER. But I understand, however, that they do not have——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. I do not object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Now, I do not believe they have supervisors or deputy supervisors, or rangers or deputy rangers——

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But it seems like a very large sum of money to pay the supervisors and rangers, more than the entire cost of the appropriation for the forest reserve itself.

Mr. LEVER. I confess to the gentleman it does look large to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that of this statutory roll, $1,570,000 was spent outside of Washington, as the Book of Estimates shows.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I called attention to that the other day.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. LEVER. I say very frankly to the gentleman that it does look like a disproportionate amount of overhead charges.

Mr. MANN. I would not call them overhead charges.

Mr. LEVER. Statutory charges, then.

Mr. MANN. I would not call them overhead charges, and say that it is the salary of the rangers and supervisors. They are in the field.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, the gentleman must understand that this is rather a large forest and very likely to take a good-sized force to administer it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wyoming National Forest, Wyo., $7,170.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, so that I may call the attention of

the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], whom I know to be a very good Treasury watchdog and a good observer also, to the fact that I hope he will never find it necessary to go out into the far western States and endeavor to take up a homestead on a piece of eliminated land that has been taken out of the forest reserve at considerable expense, with agents here and there, and then find himself trying to hold that piece of land, and, as a poor western farmer, witness a battle between the forest ranger of the Agricultural Department and a special examiner of the Land Office, one supported by the Department of the Interior and the other by the Department of Agriculture, and then let him decipher, if he can, after one year, what the mess of correspondence means, and he will see that the price has been spent more than a couple of times over and what chance he has.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is undoubtedly right; but he need not worry, as he is not going to catch me in that kind of a trap.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We need the gentleman out there for a citizen. We need gentlemen with backbone.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman that we do not need them in Seattle, as we have plenty of men with backbone and nerve out there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; as was evidenced by the recent election out there in Seattle.

Mr. BRYAN. And I guess that you celebrated the victory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will, my friend, together with Seattle's greatest majority.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington how much it costs to supervise and segregate land put to agricultural uses?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Often much more than it is worth. In an upland, where the land is rough and hard, I would not advise anyone to go on it for a living.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman give an idea of what it costs? I hear him criticizing the department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not say, but I think about $20.

Mr. MADDEN. An acre?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the regular charge for the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do you mean in the Department of the Interior or in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MADDEN. I mean the lands for settlement that are owned by the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think $10 an acre.

Mr. MADDEN. If the Government gets only $10, and it costs the Government $20, how much does the Government pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is not different from a good many other expensive Government operations. We are coming rapidly, I am afraid, to a form of Federal usurpation, where the Government will have to do it all for this citizen, that citizen, big and little.

Mr. MOORE. What will it do for us in Pennsylvania, where we pay for our own forest reserves?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Government now has the mountain tops, I take it, in Pennsylvania. Our people out in the State of Washington, where we get as low as $25 per county in lieu of taxes, for as much as half the area of a county, while you have got your mountain tops laid by and paid for in cash by a generous Government. What is more, the 5 per cent you get in lieu of taxes this bill is going to give you 10 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not seem to be satisfied with the Forestry Service out in his own State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course we are not satisfied.

Mr. MOORE. And that is due to certain conditions of which the gentleman does not approve?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Would the gentleman like to see that applied to Pennsylvania, a State in which we have a million acres paid for by ourselves? Would the gentleman from Washington load on the State of Pennsylvania what he does not want?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If you will take care of my good conservationist friend Pinchot and keep him so busy attending to public duties that he can not fill up the libraries and the magazines with dream-book conservation, you will do the rest of the country a favor. Some day you may cry out that your State has been pot shotted by Pinchot.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman leaves me in doubt whether I am listening to an eloquent speech in the House of Congress or to the reading of a lurid magazine article on conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. I wanted to ask the gentleman who has just taken his seat whether the candidate for Senator in Pennsylvania is the gentleman from Washington or the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not go into the politics of the Eastern States, but I will say this: Let me tell you this in regard to conservation——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to interfere, but I am going to make a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I wish the gentleman would reserve it. The gentleman is always generous in matters of this kind.

Mr. MANN. We are not making progress on this bill by the discussion of politics in Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Additional national forests created or to be created under section 11 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stats., 963), and lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted for the purposes of said act, $77,590.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I understand this is for the Appalachian forests—the care of them?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It does not cover any land that has already been acquired. Has not some land been acquired?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE], who is a member of the commission, to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I will be very glad to answer that question. In the year 1912 the commission acquired 287,698 acres. In the year 1913 the commission acquired 713,415 acres, and I think by the end of the present fiscal year something like 250,000 acres will be added to that amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Government has not title to that amount yet?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. No.

Mr. COX. What States will that be in?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. In Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

Mr. COX. Does it represent the virgin forests?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Yes; largely.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to call attention to the fact that when what is called the Weeks bill was being debated here in the House we were solemnly informed from time to time that the land purchased under that act would not cost more than 50 cents an acre——

Mr. MADDEN. And that much of it would be given.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and that much of it would be given to us. I find from the report of the National Forest Preservation Commission, on page 2, that it costs us $5.07 an acre.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does the gentleman mean that it costs that much to maintain?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No. The purchase price of it was that. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to an item that is even more interesting than that. I find, in looking at the detailed statement of the expenses of purchasing this land, that it cost 22 cents out of every dollar to purchase lands that everybody wants to sell us, lands that everybody is anxious and willing that we should take. This merely illustrates the extravagant and incompetent methods of the Forest Service again. It takes 22 cents out of every dollar to pay the expenses of investigating the lands we are about to purchase.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman ought to be fair enough to make it plain in the RECORD that the Forest Service does not buy a foot of this land.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know it does not, but I am holding right here in my hand a statement of the salaries paid for examining this land. The Forest Service employees received the most of it, and it amounted to $100,710. They are the ones that contract these expenses. They send men out to examine this land, and it costs as much as the land is worth for them to make the examination.

I call attention to a further fact showing the incompetence and extravagance of this Forestry Bureau.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have appropriated about $4,000,000 for additions to the forest areas and have expended $100,710 in doing it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hold in my hand the report of the Secretary of War, and if he is correct in the statement made here, in the year 1913 $884,309.95 was expended, and of that sum $723,999.75 was for land; the rest of it was for expenses. If my figures are correct, that is 22 per cent. I may have made a miscalculation, but I do not think I have.

Let me give you some other illustrations of how incompetent this Forest Service is. I find that we have public lands to the amount of 700,000,000 acres under the control of the General Land Office. They can administer those 700,000,000 acres, take care of it, make their surveys, look after the settlers, and everything connected with it, and it costs $2,356,000 a year to do it. The Forest Service, on the other hand, looks after 163,000,000 acres, and it costs $5,500,000 to do it. That is the difference between the two bureaus.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. The gentleman understands that in purchasing these lands in the beginning there are extraordinary expenses. For instance, the geological people have to go on it and make a full report. Then the forestry people, the experts, go on and count the timber, and then the title has to be looked into.

Mr. MANN. And then the survey must be made.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. The survey is made, and a great deal of legal talent must be employed in procuring title. Of course the expenses are greater at first than they are later.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But, unfortunately for that comparison, I am using the last figures. I am quoting the figures of 1913.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. HAWLEY. I want to say a word, as a member of the commission, in regard to the purchase of these lands. Great bodies of land are offered to us from time to time, but in making up the areas that are easy and economical of administration we must add to those that are offered, so that the bodies will lie together as compactly as possible.

Of course, the men who offer the lands—all the lands in the East here that we are buying are in private ownership—desire to get as large a price for their land as they can, and they make representations that they think, I suppose, are fair as to the value of their land. If we took the lands on the basis of the valuation at which they are offered to us, the total amount expended for the lands purchased or authorized to be purchased would be very largely in excess of the amounts we actually pay.

Under the provisions of the Weeks law, as soon as any area is offered or the commission has decided upon areas in which it will make purchases, and upon the character of the land that we desire to purchase, the Forest Service officials are authorized and instructed to go down there and examine the land and ascertain just the kind and character of timber there is on it, the value of the soil, and the different values of timber on cove and slope and ridge.

So that when they come back to us with their report we have a detailed report of everything on those areas above 8 inches in diameter, breast high, estimated at its commercial value, and a general summary of the value of timber on the land below 8 inches in diameter, the minerals and all the other values that may be in the land, including the value of the soil. As a member of the commission I would not buy land for the Government unless I had information, as adequate and competent as possible, as to what the land was worth; and while, as the gentleman from Washington says, it does cost something to make these surveys of the character of the land, counting the trees and making the geological survey, to determine whether under the law it is suitable for purchase, and then to make surveys of the exterior boundaries of the land and to ascertain prices paid in the several localities, yet I believe it is a proper and necessary expenditure. We do not buy the land on surface surveys, but on horizontal surveys, such as it is the practice to make on western lands. The amount per acre that it has cost the Government to make these surveys has, in my judgment, been saved many times over, in comparison with what we would have had to pay for the land if we had taken it at the valuation of the parties offering it or at the valuation of somebody we might have appointed as a purchasing agent.

Mr. MANN. Or on the acreage they have given.

Mr. HAWLEY. In some cases the acreage has been reduced thousands of acres—10 per cent, as I recall it, in one instance—so that this is a necessary and valuable expenditure, and I think the cost per acre, taking into consideration the amount of work done and the information collected, is not excessive; and if anything, I would insist upon its being more thorough than less thorough.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is familiar with timber lands in our country, where it is much more difficult to examine the land than it is in the part of the country where the land under consideration is located. I will ask the gentleman if he thinks it would be a reasonable expenditure for a private party who contemplated purchasing land to expend as much as 22 per cent in the examination of the property? Under the circumstances I suppose it is probably all right in this case, and no more than it ought to be, but does not the system make it extravagant? My first impression is that it is absurd to talk about expending 22 cents out of every dollar for the purpose of examining to know whether we want to purchase or not.

Mr. HAWLEY. I take it for granted that the gentleman has stated the computation correctly; but if the gentleman has examined some of these southern areas, as I have, he will find a great difference in looking over land here and in the West. In the West the timber stands comparatively even over a large area. Here we have cut-over areas, areas which have been partly cut, areas in which certain trees, like the poplar or tulip, have been cut out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certain varieties?

Mr. HAWLEY. Where certain varieties are cut out, and where certain varieties of very large trees, apparently good timber, have no commercial value in the territory where they are located. There are many questions involved in the examination of land here that would not be involved in the examination of land out in the western country.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the selection, classification, and segregation of lands within the boundaries of national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the homestead laws applicable to the national forests, $100,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I did not know but some gentleman would move to strike out this item, in view of the fact that one gentleman stated awhile ago that it cost about $25,000 to survey 2,000 acres of land. If it really costs $25,000, in the matted undergrowth of Washington, to open 2,000 acres of land to homestead settlement, it seems to me that that is rather an extravagant expenditure, and I think any gentleman who believes that ought to move to strike out this item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I move to strike out the item.

Mr. LEVER. I was anticipating that the motion would be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to say just one word in reply to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] about the expense of examination of land in our State. I have never had any personal experience, but I was talking the other day with a man connected with the Indian Service, and he was talking about making an examination of the land out on an Indian reservation in the district of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington]. It is not a very large Indian reservation, but he told me it would take two years to examine the timber.

I wish once more to refer to the transaction where the Northern Pacific Railroad, for 240,000 acres of practically worthless land, land without valuable timber on it, was permitted to select an equal number of acres of the finest timberland then owned by the Government. This is the exchange that was made when Mr. Gifford Pinchot was chief forester. I refer to it again to call the attention of the committee to a very interesting letter I received upon the subject.

This letter reads as follows:

POLSON, MONT., June 5, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I was very much interested in reading your resolution calling for investigation of the Forest Service, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 29th ultimo.

I am familiar with the lands in the Lewis and Clark and Flathead National Forest Reserve. I have been over considerable of the most

tains within the 50-mile limit of Northern Pacific lands, and personally know that the land in the Swan Range and Main Range of the Rocky Mountains in Flathead and Missoula Counties is absolutely worthless, with the exception of the Swan River Valley, which contains very good merchantable timber, but is only a very small territory compared with the vast area of mountainous lands which are not worth 10 cents per acre; and in lieu of this worthless land the Northern Pacific Railroad was permitted by the Forestry Department to select the very best yellow-pine lands in western Flathead County, which at that time embraced all of now Lincoln County as far west as the Idaho line, and north to the Canadian boundary line, a territory almost as large as some of the Eastern States.

I have been over considerable of this area, and have estimated the timber, while in the employ of the Julius Neils Co., one of the large lumber companies of the Northwest. I find a large portion of this vast territory that contains on an average of 10,000,000 feet to the section, and extending for miles and miles, where you can drive over with a buggy, there being no underbrush—only fine, large pine trees—and the land is gently rolling and is agricultural in character when the timber is removed. I find, further, that pretty soon after this land was selected by the said company and approved by the department, a very large tract was sold to the Big Blackfoot Lumber Co., whose headquarters is at Bonner, Mont., in Missoula County; and when the said transfer was made the deed was recorded in Kalispell, Mont., and the clerk's and recorder's fees amounted to over $2,000. A very large portion of this land is yet owned by said railroad company, and I can furnish proof satisfactory to satisfy any impartial committee that this land did not cost the railroad company to exceed 25 cents per acre, as the land they held in the national forest was not worth that amount; and now the lands selected in lieu thereof are worth on an average of $30 per acre. I am willing to appear before the congressional committee and furnish all the information necessary to establish the facts as I have outlined them here in this letter; at Kalispell I can get a copy of the records or list of Northern Pacific lieu lands and can furnish also an approximate estimate of the timber on these lands.

I know positively that the valuable timber now held in the Lewis and Clark and the Flathead Forest Reserves is held in the interest of the big lumber companies. In the year 1907 I made a trip up the Swan River Valley in the National Forest Reserve with the manager of the Julius Neils Co., who were at that time investigating the timber in this particular territory with the object of purchasing same. We examined the river, with reference to driving logs, and estimated the cost of logging the country; and since that date I have observed that, under the rulings of the Forestry Department, no one person or corporation of small capital can purchase timber from the National Forest Reserve, and that it has been absolutely reserved and intended to be sold to the large lumber companies.

Very respectfully,

FRANK C. BAILEY,
*United States Commissioner, Polson, Mont.*

Mr. BRYAN. As I understand it, the paragraph to be stricken out is the one providing $100,000 for the selection, classification, and segregation of lands within the boundaries of national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the homestead laws applicable to the national forests.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. I am opposed to striking out that paragraph. For my part, I am perfectly willing to eliminate from forest reserves land that ought to be eliminated. I am perfectly willing to vote money to be used for the purpose of segregating real agricultural lands, but what I oppose is this wholesale elimination without a survey, without careful study, and without proper computation, that results in the timber barons and in land speculators getting large tracts of land to hold and use for speculation, and for purposes of that kind. I am surprised at any gentleman who comes, as my colleague does, from a State that has a number of forest reserves should object to money being appropriated to be used in this careful, scientific way for ascertaining what land is necessary to be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will yield to me for an interruption, I desire to say that if this is stricken out, it is my purpose to offer an amendment making the sum at least $300,000, so that some business can be done along the very lines my colleague has suggested, and which I heartily indorse.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is really acting on a well-laid plan, then I must insist that there is something wrong with his planner. If he really made the motion without understanding it, or without intending to do what the motion would do, then, of course, I would be glad to eliminate my remarks and let him withdraw his amendment; but for him to move to strike out a paragraph providing $100,000, because by some kind of circumlocution and jiu jitsu he proposes later on to move to insert another paragraph in its place, containing an appropriation three times as large, is a method of parliamentary procedure and legislative legerdemain that I can not comprehend. I am opposed to the amendment, and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if it is not too late, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and modify it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to be permitted to withdraw his amendment and modify it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. By striking out "$100,000" and making the sum "$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. By striking out the figures "$100,000" and inserting "$300,000."

Mr. BRYAN. I hope there will be no objection to that.

Mr. LEVER. I object.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to ask if the gentleman is required to have unanimous consent in order to withdraw his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks he is. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and Mr. LEVER demanded a division.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to waste time in this way I will make the point of no quorum. If time is going to be wasted in this way, you will keep a quorum here for the rest of the time this bill is under consideration.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Washington can not frighten the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not interpose in that way when the House is dividing. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and be counted.

The committee divided; and there were 2 ayes and 52 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members present, a quorum, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fighting and preventing forest fires and for other unforeseen emergencies, $150,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to obtain some information concerning a proposition that may have been submitted to the committee as to the appropriation of $100,000 to be expended in various States in cooperation with the States in the suppression of forest fires. On February 5 last I received a letter from the Wisconsin State forester, Mr. Griffith, requesting me to favor an appropriation of $100,000 for that cooperative purpose. The item under consideration does not extend to those projects, I understand.

Mr. LEVER. We carry a separate item for that. The gentleman will find on page 66 that the committee allowed the Secretary's estimate of $100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I replied to the State forester that I was not in favor of imposing on the National Government burdens that should be borne by the State, but I see the committee took a different view, and believes in appropriating money purely for State purposes. When the item is reached in the bill I shall have something to say on that project. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, $165,640: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may procure such seed, cones, and nursery stock by open purchase, without advertisements for proposals, whenever in his discretion such method is most economical and in the public interest and when the cost thereof will not exceed $500.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call attention to the fact that, according to the statement of the Forester, it cost $11 for every acre they have planted, but only one acre out of two survive, so it costs $22 for every acre planted. They invest $22, and 50 years hence they get an acre of land that is worth, the way they have been administering the national forests, 16½ cents. After waiting for 50 years they get an acre of land they cut a cent's worth of timber from a year. If the $22 had been invested at 6 per cent, it would amount to about $98. If there was ever a farce and an extravagance for which there is no justification, then this so-called seeding and planting of forests is one. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the amount—how many acres have been planted within the 15 or 20 years that the service has been trying it?

Mr. LEVER. I will read to the gentleman from page 28 of the Forester's report:

The reforestation work covered 29,446.02 acres, of which 23,777.73 acres were sown and 5,668.29 acres planted, at average costs per acre of $4.04 and $11.14, respectively. The total expenditures during the year for seed, nursery stock, equipment, and labor were $159,300.13. Douglas fir was used on over 10,000 acres, western yellow and western white pine on over 7,000 acres each, and lodgepole pine on over 2,000 acres, making over 92 per cent of the entire area; on the remainder a large number of other species were planted in small quantities. The work was distributed among the different States, as follows:

And then follows a list of the States which I presume the gentleman does not want.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The purpose I had in mind was to find out whether the cost had been reduced since 1912, when the Forester gave it as $11.05 an acre. He further states that one-half of it only survives—only 1 acre out of 2 lives. So it costs $22.10 to plant these trees, and then you have to wait on an average, I suppose, 50 years before you can make any return, and if they cut it at the same rate they do now it will return the magnificent sum of 6 per cent on a valuation of 16½ cents per acre.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask either one of the gentlemen to which expenditure he refers, the planting of trees or the reseeding?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It costs $11.05 for planting, and the seeding is considerably less.

Mr. MANN. Does either gentleman know whether they take the raw ground to plant the trees, or do they prepare the ground?

Mr. LEVER. They sow the seed frequently.

Mr. MANN. Sowing the seed would not cost 25 cents an acre. The planting of an acre of young fir trees would not cost over $1.25 or $2 possibly an acre. The planting of a small tree is a simple operation. You push down your foot and pull it out and the tree is planted. I have planted thousands of them.

The Clerk read as follows:

For other miscellaneous forest investigations, and for collating, digesting, recording, illustrating, and distributing the results of the experiments and investigations herein provided for, $40,160.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose only of calling attention to the difference in the administration by the State of Washington and the Government of their forests in our State. Mr. Gifford Pinchot, in an article in Pearson's Magazine of May 19, 1913, states that the State of Washington up to the time of which he writes had received from forest service $115,205. Of course, like they always do, he tells us that some time we are going to get an amount equal to our loss of taxes. I called the attention of the House to the fact some time ago that if we were to tax timber in the forest reserves in our State at the same rate we tax private timber we would get between five and seven million dollars. The State of Washington has about 2,000,000 acres of timberland and the Government has 12,000,000 acres of timberland in our State. I am not especially complimenting the conduct of the State forest service, but out of the 2,000,000 acres there are about 666,000 in the national reserves that the State is permitted to use. Yet the State has already accumulated a fund of $12,000,000 from that part of the 2,000,000 acres it has been permitted to handle. The Forest Bureau, which has 12,000,000 acres, makes $14,500 a year. That is the difference between the two.

If the forests in my State were properly administered they would pay the entire expenses of the Forest Service, great as it is to-day, amounting to something over $5,500,000, and at the same time pay into the National Treasury from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 a year. I cited the illustration of British Columbia, where their forests make net the sum of $3,000,000 a year. The people of the State of Washington are asked to be very thankful because the Forest Service can take one-third of our State and keep it out of taxation and sell timber off it at the rate of 1 cent an acre, because they so run it that they would cut over it once in 35,000 years, if they continue at their present rate, and because we receive the munificent sum from it of $14,500 a year. That is what we get for all this vast amount of land that is taken out of taxation.

Mr. PAYNE. What does the gentleman mean by taking it out of taxation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I mean it is not taxed.

Mr. PAYNE. Does not the gentleman know it belongs to the United States Government, and why should it be taxed?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I suppose the gentleman knows I am saying what the tax would be if taxed the same as private holdings. Why is not that timber worth as much to the Government, if properly controlled, as to anyone else?

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman talks about mismanagement that is one thing, but he always winds up with the statement that it is not taxed for the benefit of his State.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Because the Forest Service, as well as Mr. Pinchot in his article referred to, has repeatedly promised that if we will just be patient the 25 per cent we get from the sale of the timber on the forest reserves will take the place of what the tax would be if we were given control of the reserves.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know what Mr. Pinchot has to say about that. He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In other words, I am making this point, that if the State of Washington could control that timberland, or if private parties controlled it, it would be worth, without in any way decreasing the original amount, cutting only the natural increase, between $5,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year.

Mr. PAYNE. And in spite of that the gentleman voted to build a railroad in Alaska to be run at Government expense.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is to be within a forest reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has made this statement repeatedly. He made practically the same statement in a magazine article, published in American Industries:

Their records in the State of Washington demonstrate that during the last 10 years they took $75,000,000 and gave in exchange $115,000.

The gentleman has asserted that if the timberland in the forest reserves were taxed in our State, our State would get the munificent sum of $75,000,000, whereas we have gotten only $115,000 from the Forest Service. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars a year that we would get in the State of Washington for taxes, if the timber were only in private hands, if only the big timber barons owned that land instead of Uncle Sam. I have here the record of the meeting of the Tax Commission of the State of Washington in 1912. The State taxes for general purposes under the whole tax levy amounted to $5,819,449. That was apportioned among the several counties of the State. The taxes on the railroads, on the timberlands, on the farm lands, on the banks, on the buildings, on the street railways, on the live stock, on the merchandise in the stores, on the mills, on the factories, on the mines, on the newspapers, on the steamboats, on all the franchises, and on all the property of the State of Washington combined amounted to only $5,819,447, and yet my colleague repeats, and has repeated it twice on the floor to-day, and has published it in this magazine article some months ago, that if this timber had been in private hands—in other words, if the Weyerhaeusers owned it, or the Polsons owned it, or if the big timber mills down there at Aberdeen, in the district of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON], only owned it—we would get $7,500,000 a year extra. But the figures show that the combined taxes levied by the State tax commission for all purposes for 1912 was less than $6,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. I will.

Mr. MANN. All the taxes raised in the State of Washington for public purposes are less than six millions, as stated by the gentleman?

Mr. BRYAN. I am speaking of State taxes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not include county taxes?

Mr. BRYAN. I am not talking about county taxes, but I am willing to comment on county taxes.

Mr. MANN. That takes away all the gentleman's argument.

Mr. BRYAN. It does not take away the gentleman's argument at all, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. MANN. It just occurred to me that it did; that is all.

Mr. BRYAN. I can clear the occurrence from the mind of the gentleman from Illinois, if he will allow me a moment. The sum of $6,000,000 exceeds the entire State tax, and is considerably less than this $7,500,000 referred to by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]; but in this $6,000,000 are included innumerable other things besides this timber.

Timberland is only a small fraction of the assets of the State, the taxable assets, so that the statement that $7,500,000 would have been derived from that timber is absolutely absurd and can not be figured out by any system of mathematics or the reasoning of any intelligent man. My time has about expired, and I ask unanimous consent to set forth this data more definitely in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRYAN. In the closing paragraph of the article by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington is the following:

Yes; they are helping the schools. Their record in the State of Washington demonstrates it, for there, during the last 10 years, they took $75,900,000 and gave in exchange $115,000. Great is conservation, as it has been practiced by the Forest Service!

We will just lop off the $900,000, almost a million you will note, in order to be magnanimous with the gentleman.

According to the fourth biennial report of the State board of tax commissioners for the period ending September 30, 1912, the entire assessed value of all property in the State of Washington subject to taxation was $1,005,086,251. The total assessed value

of all the privately owned timber in the State was at the same time $89,375,888, or about 9 per cent of the entire assessment.

It will be seen from the following excerpt from the official proceedings of the State tax commission of Washington that the total State taxes assessed for all purposes in the State in 1912 was $5,819,449:

On motion, the State tax for general purposes, amounting to $1,230,256; for State school purposes, amounting to $1,909,664; for military fund, amounting to $110,559; for permanent highway fund, amounting to $1,005,086; for public highway fund, amounting to $502,543; for University of Washington, amounting to $477,416; for Washington State College, amounting to $326,653; for Cheney State Normal School, amounting to $90,458; for the Bellingham State Normal School, amounting to $90,458; for the Ellensburg Normal School, amounting to $70,356, making a total of $5,819,449, was levied and apportioned among the several counties of the State as indicated by schedule E of this report.

If the timberland assessment is 9 per cent of the total of the entire assessed values of the State, then the timberland would pay 9 per cent of this $5,819,449, or $525,750.49. In other words, the State of Washington collects from all its timberlands under private ownership an annual tax of a half million dollars. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] says the State of Washington would collect $7,500,000 from the forest-reserve areas annually if these reserves could only get into private hands.

The statement is absurd beyond all consideration even if only one year be considered. He says the people of Washington would collect fifteen times as much from the timber that is not in private ownership as from that in private ownership, but the gentleman to compound the absurdity and wild inaccuracy of his figures says the State has suffered this loss of $7,500,000 each year for 10 years, making a grand total loss of $75,000,000. In 1905, just seven years earlier, the total assessed value of all taxable property in the State of Washington was $328,542,525, which is $676,543,726 less than in 1912. Those who know are aware that in those good old days, when the Puget Mill Co. had such supreme power over the officers who collect the taxes, that timber was very much underassessed. Anyone with ordinary intelligence can see how absurd the statement of my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington is. Ten years ago I feel safe in saying that the State did not collect $2,000,000 per year from taxes from all sources. Yet the gentleman says we lost $7,500,000 per year just because this timber was held by Uncle Sam.

In the article referred to my colleague says:

If this land thus included in the national forests was taxed by the State of Washington the same as private timber holdings, it would give to that State annually $7,593,500. What does the Forest Service give us in return for this amount, $14,400 per year?

My colleagues would do well to ponder a little on the words of their leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The good old days are gone, and gone forever. Uncle Sam has been generous to the few lucky men who were cunning enough, lucky enough, or shrewd enough to get the timber in such tremendously large quantities into their own private hands in the West. The two gentlemen from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. HUMPHREY] have practically stood alone here to-day in their assaults upon the "dreaming" Pinchot. Not another man on the floor of this House, except the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], has lent any encouragement to their assaults on the Pinchot brand of conservation. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, these timber resources belong to the people and the time of their exploitation has passed.

These Government forests are a part of the Federal system of public ownership. We are going to own the coal in Alaska and the railroad in Alaska, and we are going to do some more things in this Republic that will startle this fast vanishing race of politicians. "You can not fool all the people all the time," and you had as well give up the game. How long will a man last in this day and time who stands up before the people and proposes that the public give away valuable timber reserves so the property will become subject to taxation? That kind of nonsense will not go any longer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 15 per cent of the total of all sums appropriated under "General expenses, Forest Service," may be used in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as provided above under general expenses for Forest Service for all expenses necessary for the general administration of the Forest Service

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I did not think it was necessary to reply to my colleague, but he evidently misunderstood my statement. His statement and mine are not inconsistent. I took the figures given me by the commissioner of public lands for our State, or, rather, took them from his report. Using these as a basis of calculation, the tax on 12,000,000 acres of timberland at the same rate would amount to the sum mentioned, $7,500,000. That is not inconsistent with the statement made by my distinguished colleague. He gives the taxes for State purposes only. He takes his figures, I fear, from the Forest Magazine. I read them, and they are not correct, as used in the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter all moneys received as contributions toward cooperative work in forest investigations, or the protection and improvement of the national forests, shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the payment of the expenses of said investigations, protection, or improvements by the Forest Service, and for refunds to the contributors of amounts heretofore or hereafter paid in by them in excess of their share of the cost of said investigations, protection, or improvements.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede that it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, when necessary for the purpose of increasing the public benefits or public use of the national forests, rent or lease to responsible persons or corporations, for periods of not to exceed 20 years, suitable spaces or portions of ground for the construction of summer residences, hotels, stores, or any structures needed for recreation or convenience.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will conclude not to make the point of order for this reason: On the forest reserves there are very many places of scenic beauty that hundreds of people desire to visit and spend their summer outings upon. For instance we have one in my own State which I will use as an illustration out of many that might be named. Out in Josephine County, Oreg., there are what are called the Oregon Caves. They are in the midst of a great forest and many people desire to visit them. They are probably 30 miles from the nearest accessible point. There is a company that desires to build a summer hotel up there, and many people desire to erect summer residences that they may go up in the forest for the purpose of enjoying the scenery and the healthful atmosphere of the forest. They can not do that unless they have accommodations. This company will, under the regulations of the Forest Service, for instance, build a road in there which will be of use to the Forest Service in the administration of the forest, and they will construct such buildings as are necessary to accommodate the people. Persons will build inexpensive summer cottages. There will be put up, for instance, for the benefit of the community a little summer store at which they can buy flour and various things of that kind which they need. At all times it will be under the control of the Forest Service; no damage can come to the forest; in fact this amendment went into the bill on the special recommendation of the Forest Service; the roads will aid in their general improvement and management, it being the national policy, I take it, to make the forest not only contribute to the general welfare from the standpoint of national development, but to the good and pleasure of the people.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall whether we enacted legislation similar to this for the national parks or some specific national park?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Yellowstone.

Mr. MANN. I know we had such a proposition up here.

Mr. HAWLEY. It has been done for several national parks.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was an item in the appropriation bill last year which applies only to the land under the control of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANN. I understand it would not apply to this, but I am asking whether this is the same thing that was done in reference to a national park.

Mr. HAWLEY. The same thing in practically the same language, but whether in exactly the same language or not I can not say.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman permit? The same practice is carried with reference to the forest reserve in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a very bad practice to pass this legislation in an appropriation bill, and I therefore make the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation and not in order on the bill.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair thinks it is correct. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a clipping or two that I have here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain matter which he has indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the preparation for market, the handling, grading, packing, freezing, drying, storing, and transportation of poultry and eggs, and for experimental shipments of poultry and eggs within the United States, $50,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether this work, in reference to eggs, is now being carried on under some other appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the testimony before the committee is to the effect that this work heretofore has been carried on under the pure food and drugs act. It is not new work by any means, but we wanted to take it from that general expense language and put it here in the bill, where it could be seen.

Mr. MANN. Fifty thousand dollars looks like a very large appropriation to commence work that is not very well developed yet. I do not know what they intend to do. I noticed the other day there came into one of the Pacific coast ports 3,500,000 eggs from China, under the Underwood tariff law—eggs that ought to have been produced in the United States. Is it to investigate so as to aid them in bringing eggs in from abroad?

Mr. LEVER. No; I think not. I think the investigation is in aid of the poultry raiser and consumer in this country.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, they need no aid in China, because the statement is made in the public press that they have had the eggs over there for 80 years. All we need to learn is that secret.

Mr. LEVER. This is really not an increase, but only an apparent increase, being a transfer of the $50,000 from the lump-sum appropriation of the food and drugs act. There is no increase in the amount of work to be done.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Department of Agriculture has expended $50,000 out of the appropriation for the enforcement of the pure-food law for "investigating the preparation for market and the handling, and so forth, of eggs"? If so, it seems to me like a gross abuse of an appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee is to that effect.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether there is any way that we can frame language by which we can control the department, but certainly no ordinary minded individual would have supposed that in an appropriation to enforce the pure-food law we would have $50,000 of it expended for the purpose of ascertaining how to handle eggs.

Mr. LEVER. I confess very frankly to the gentleman from Illinois and to the committee that I did not know until the statement was made before the committee that that money was being expended in that way.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what is meant by experimental shipments of poultry and eggs in the United States; what are those experimental shipments?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] that the department is undertaking to make a study of the marketing condition of eggs. For instance, to find some way of preventing breakage, to find some way of getting the eggs to the market in the best condition from the farm; also they are making investigations into the proposition of dried eggs, and things of that kind. There is a number of lines of investigation that the department is making.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Then you consider the producing of eggs by a farmer is a Federal question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. They seem to think so, at least. And this not only covers eggs, but poultry.

Mr. MANN. Under this item, of course, they go into the whole storage proposition. Is it the intention of the department to go into the question of cold storage as to eggs, and incidentally everything else, under this item?

Mr. LEVER. I think not.

Mr. MANN. Well, that would not be straining nearly as far from the interpretation of the language as it would be to go into this enforcement of the pure-food law.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I think I can reconcile the gentleman from Illinois to this expenditure of money. I want to assure him it has a great effect, especially on the solution of the high cost of living in the United States. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], who has the matter of the parcel post entirely in charge for the whole House, and who I regret is not here, says that if we get so that we can pack eggs and other things of that kind, the farmers can trade directly with the ultimate consumer, and that the parcel post is going to solve the question of the high cost of living to the ultimate consumer. Now, under the instruction of the Department of Agriculture, or in some other way, but I think it was very likely from the original brightness and alertness of some of my constituents, I saw in a local paper that some farmers living out some 15 miles from my home city have learned how to pack eggs so that they can be sent by parcel post without arriving at destination in a scrambled condition, and that they send them fresh to their customers in the city every day. Of course, gathering them in at that time, they are really able and honestly to certify that the eggs are freshly laid.

They are a strictly fresh article, and they contribute that much toward reducing the high cost of living, because, being a strictly fresh article, these farmers not only insist but they have the right to insist, and succeed in insisting, upon receiving the highest market price for these eggs, and they get 3 cents a dozen extra for having produced fresh eggs on the market. That helps Mr. LEWIS out in his problem of solving the high cost of living by making possible direct dealing between the farmers and the consumers; and the farmers have the right to this. Why not? Why should they not get the highest market price for their eggs—the highest price they can get?

It is in the interest of agriculture and it is in the interest of the farmers of the country that this appropriation should be continued. I hope it will be.

Then we can go a little farther and see by what process in China, 80 years ago, they were able to pack away eggs in cold storage and produce them now, probably having in view the provisions of the Underwood tariff bill, whereby they can bring them in free and ship them to St. Louis at 10 cents a dozen and sell them to the unsuspecting public there at 20 cents a dozen, thus reducing the high cost of living, if they can furnish any eggs that are fit to eat. [Laughter.]

It is all in the interest, first, to help the ultimate consumer, and to help the farmer in selling his eggs to the ultimate consumer. I hope my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will make no further objection to this item. [Laughter.] I yield to the gentleman from Illinois the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to come in before anybody else, but——

Mr. SIMS. I want to bear testimony, Mr. Chairman, that I am now getting all the eggs I can use from Virginia by parcel post. They come absolutely fresh, and not one is broken. The producer is selling direct to the consumer right in this town.

Mr. MOORE. Where are they shipped from?

Mr. SIMS. I do not remember the place, but it is only a short distance from Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman remember the price?

Mr. SIMS. I pay 35 cents a dozen. I pay the bill at the end of the month.

Mr. MOORE. That is the usual market price, or a little better, is it not?

Mr. SIMS. I really do not know.

Mr. MOORE. Then it has no effect on the cost of living at all, except to increase it?

Mr. SIMS. It has this effect: These eggs are absolutely fresh, and they all come in perfect condition. I do not think that place is more than 75 miles away.

Mr. MOORE. The farmer gets a good price, and the gentleman pays a high price.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PAYNE. I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] testifies now that he gets fresh eggs shipped in by parcel post. The gentleman on my left a moment ago stated that some time ago he had eggs, as he understood it, shipped clear from the Northwest to Washington, in good order on arriving here.

Thereupon we proceed to make an appropriation of $50,000 to learn how to ship eggs. I had supposed it was done by parcel post. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]

tells us we are spending $50,000 during the current year for this purpose and that we expended, I suppose, $50,000 last year for that purpose. So far as I have been able to learn, the substance of the knowledge acquired by the department could be stated in this clipping, giving the precautions that should be used by egg handlers. This is from a newspaper clipping—a newspaper of high standing.

Among the precautions suggested by Dr. Pennington were the discarding of used cases, more care in handling the eggs, more care in sieving, more careful bracing and buffing in the cars. The careless freight handler, who tosses egg cases about, is responsible for a good deal of the loss, according to Dr. Pennington.

That is a very valuable bulletin. Next I suppose we will be told that the man who throws eggs on a stone floor will damage the eggs unless they are frozen. [Laughter.] Perhaps they will advise that all eggs be frozen when we send them to market, so that they can not be broken.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the next thing they will do will be to raise the question as to whether the hen, when she is cackling, is laying or lying. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I quit after that. [Renewed laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, $15,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to learn from the gentleman from South Carolina just how this $15,000 is expended and where.

Mr. LEVER. This is entirely new language and the beginning of an entirely new line of work in the Bureau of Chemistry. There have been no expenditures under this head heretofore.

Mr. MOORE. The department has not undertaken this line of investigation before?

Mr. LEVER. That is the testimony had before the committee.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to make an inquiry I was unable to by reason of the colloquy on the previous item—a question as to the storing of eggs, and so forth. Will the gentleman from South Carolina tell me where that expenditure is made? Have we experimental stations elsewhere than in Washington?

Mr. LEVER. No. That expenditure, as I gathered from the witnesses who appeared before the committee, is largely in the way of salaries for the scientific investigators and traveling expenses.

Mr. MOORE. Are there many of them?

Mr. LEVER. No; very few.

Mr. MOORE. Who is in charge?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Pennington, a lady chemist, who is regarded as one of the great chemists of the world.

Mr. MOORE. Her work carries her to the different points throughout the country to conduct these investigations?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WILLIS. Can the gentleman state whether the investigation that the department has already made has gone to the matter of the utilization of the waste in the canning of fish? I ask that question because in another committee that matter has come up.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I know, and so far as the witnesses have testified before the committee, this is the first time the Department of Agriculture has undertaken this line of work. No work has been done in that line heretofore, but they are now asking funds with which to do it.

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly the department has been doing work along this line for a number of years, has it not?

Mr. LEVER. No; their statement before the committee is to the effect that this is new language and new work in the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] very appropriately suggests to me that it is probable that this work is a duplicate of work that has already been undertaken and done in the Bureau of Fisheries. Is that a fact?

Mr. LEVER. We inquired into that situation, and our information is that this will not duplicate any of the work that is being done by the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. WILLIS. Has not this bureau been cooperating with the Bureau of Fisheries? I think I read somewhere in the hearings that the Bureau of Fisheries had loaned the Bureau of Chemistry one of its vessels.

Mr. LEVER. That was not in the fish work, but in the oyster work. If you will notice the next item, for the investigation of oyster handling and the like of that, it is with reference to that, not with reference to fish. As I understand it, there has been no cooperation between the Bureau of Chemistry and the Bureau of Fisheries except in the oyster work.

Mr. WILLIS. So far as the gentleman knows, then, there has been no investigation along the lines that I have suggested?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. WILLIS. We found out in another committee that there was undoubtedly a tremendous waste in the canning business, that fish that were good for food were being used for other purposes.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly that is true, and we ought to encourage our people to eat more fish, and they will do it when they learn not to be afraid of them.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the packing, handling, storing, and shipping of oysters and other shell fish in the United States and the waters bordering on the United States, $5,000.

Mr. MOORE. Is this a new item?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then you are entering the oyster field, also, for the first time?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. We want to do with oysters the same character of work as with fish. I will say to the gentleman that the testimony before the committee is to the effect that the Bureau of Chemistry during the past year have been cooperating with the Public Health Service in this oyster work. They estimated for a very much larger sum than the committee allowed. We looked into the situation very carefully, and the committee became afraid that there might be a duplication of work, and hence we revised the language of the item itself and cut the appropriation down to $5,000, confining it to the packing, handling, storing, and shipping.

Mr. MOORE. Evidently the word "planting" has been left out for some reason.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then you are not going into the culture of oysters at all?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MOORE. But you confine the work wholly to the packing, handling, storing, and shipping of oysters?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The other question might involve the rights of some of the States where controversies have already arisen, and which are still pending, as for instance, in Maryland.

Mr. LEVER. That is the reason we cut out that part of it. We looked into the matter very thoroughly.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, $10,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of reverting to the paragraph in reference to oysters. At whose suggestion was that investigation proposed? Was it the Department of Health?

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman mean this item in the bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. For investigating the packing, handling, storing, and shipping of oysters.

Mr. LEVER. This language was estimated for by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It has nothing to do with the planting or cultivation of oysters?

Mr. LEVER. Nothing whatever. The committee were very careful to keep that out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the food and drugs act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, and rent outside of the District of Columbia, $644,301; and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may employ and designate scientific experts to make investigations and act as boards or committees to report to him upon questions arising in the enforcement of said act of June 30, 1906.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that part of the paragraph including the word "and" in line 14, down to and including all of line 19, on page 43.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a point of order against the language indicated.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I doubt very seriously if that language is obnoxious to the rule as being new legislation. I will say to my friend from Illinois that the purpose of setting out this language is to make it show absolutely on its face that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to appoint these scientific boards, for instance, such as the Remsen Board. You will remember that several years ago quite a controversy arose here in the House as to whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture had the power under the pure-food act to appoint the Remsen Board.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman think he ought to have that power?

Mr. LEVER. I contended at that time that he ought not to have that power, but the House overruled me. That was before the gentleman from Minnesota became a Member. The Attorney General has held that the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to appoint such a board as would be provided for in this language. I made a point of order against it on the floor of the House on the occasion to which I refer, and the Chair held that the Secretary of Agriculture had the right to make this appointment. So that, speaking now to the Chair, I am satisfied in my own mind that this is not new legislation at all, but is a setting out of what is now existing law, just as these other items in this bill have been set out.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to say that the provision to which I make the point of order is the enactment of permanent law in an appropriation bill. If the Secretary has the power now, there is no necessity for reenacting the authority which he is thought to have.

Mr. LEVER. That may be, but that would not affect the judgment of the Chair. The chairman is not called upon to pass on the necessity, but whether it is existing law.

Mr. MADDEN. I maintain that this is a change of existing law and attempting to enact a permanent law on an appropriation bill, which is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the question which was raised in the House with reference to the Remsen Board did not arise in this matter at all. It was claimed by gentlemen at the time that under the pure-food law no such board could be appointed. But an appropriation was made for the enforcement of the pure-food law. It was not for Congress to determine how that money should be expended. It was for the administrative officers, and the administrative officers, under the opinion of the Attorney General, held that under the pure-food law as written they could make the appointment of certain gentlemen to assist them in the administration of the law and advise them. That is not the proposition here. Here is a proposition to add to the pure-food law, to provide permanent law that hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may employ and designate scientific experts to make investigations and act as boards or committees to report to him upon questions arising in the enforcement of said act of June 30, 1906. That is distinctive new legislation. As to what they may do under the appropriation when made is for their determination under existing law. But under the rule it is not in order to provide new legislation authorizing directly the appointment of boards, however desirable it may be to do that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I think the section is clearly subject to a point of order. According to the section, there is no limit to what the Secretary of Agriculture might do. He might appoint scientific experts, make investigations, have boards unlimited. It seems to me that it is clearly new legislation and ought to be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is new legislation, and will sustain the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to make an inquiry concerning the language on page 42, lines 23 and 24, which I did not hear the Clerk read, or I would have made the inquiry then. The item reads:

> For the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, $10,000.

That has never been carried before. I would like to inquire what is the intention of the department as to the use of this money. How is it to be used?

Mr. LEVER. The statement before the committee was about like this; I put it pretty fully in the report:

> Biological investigations (p. 42, line 23): This is a new item and involves an increase of $10,000. The department asked for $20,000, but the committee reduced it to the amount named, believing that as this was new work $10,000 would be sufficient to begin the investigations. Under this item laboratory experiments and research will be conducted to determine the biological effects of foods and drugs and substances used in their manufacture. Studies will be made of the relative food value of various substances for the purpose of determining what constitutes a pure food. These involve metabolism experiments for the purpose of studying the deleterious action of substances which are or may be used in food products and the biological study of the value and composition of foods and related research problems.

Mr. MANN. I understand—I catch on quite quickly—that this is a revival of the poison squad.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. That is what the language says so far.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so.

Mr. MANN. What is the biological investigation of food and drug products if it is not the investigation of their effect on the health of people?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Alsberg, before the committee, says this:

> Dr. ALSBERG. That, again, is an item which provides chiefly for investigations which have been set aside from the appropriation for the enforcement of the food and drugs act; that is to say, it is a new item, but represents the continuation of work which has been done to some extent under the food and drugs act.
>
> Mr. HAWLEY. That, in a measure, is a segregation of the larger appropriation?
>
> Dr. ALSBERG. Yes. It contemplates, in addition, some new work. The object of making all these segregations here is to give to Congress fuller information than it has had heretofore. Some years ago all these last four appropriations would have been paid for out of the fund for the enforcement of the food and drugs act. Dr. Pennington's appropriation was paid last year out of that fund, for instance. Now, this work of biological investigation of food and drug products is partly a continuation of the old work and in part new work. The Bureau of Chemistry, in the enforcement of the food and drugs act, is constantly confronted with new problems. I might use lard and lard substitutes as an illustration. That happens to be a large and important product. It so happens that the people of the United States want the fat they use for cooking purposes in solid or nearly solid form. They do not like to use oils for that purpose, and many tropical oils are unfit for food purposes. An invention has been made which enables one by chemical means to convert an oil into a hard fat, so that the product is, chemically and in every other respect, so far as we can find, the same as a natural fat. It is not a substitute.

Now, they want to find out why this is so.

Mr. MANN. Those of us who have been here for a number of years remember the fight over the poison squad. While my friend from South Carolina was denouncing the poison squad, Dr. Wiley and I were defending it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. Dr. Wiley never had a better friend on the floor of the House than I was, and I defended him.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think the gentleman was against the poison squad. A whole lot of other gentlemen in the House were, though I will take it back as to the gentleman from South Carolina, because I do not remember definitely; however, I think that whole side of the House, without exception, was against Dr. Wiley and the poison squad. Now it comes in again, identically the same thing, under a little different language. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] read a part of his report and then read some other language from the testimony. I am going to read a little more of his report:

> Studies will be made of the relative food value of various substances for the purpose of determining what constitutes a pure food. These involve metabolism experiments for the purpose of studying the deleterious action of substances which are or may be used in food products and the biological study of the value and composition of foods and related research problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Wiley was carrying on experiments for the purpose of determining the effect upon the human system of putting various preservatives in packed, canned, and preserved foods of different kinds. People charged him with favoring one kind of preservative over another, although as a matter of fact he did not believe in the use of artificial preservatives in these foods, and the people employed in producing the food using the preservatives made a very lovely contest and secured favorable action from Congress upon the subject. I am glad to know now that the new Secretary of Agriculture proposes to endeavor to ascertain what effect it has on the human system to eat, say, tomato catsup day after day, perhaps, with a certain preservative in it, or to eat various other food products, either canned or packed or dried or otherwise preserved, containing a preservative. It was the theory of Dr. Wiley, in which I never wholly partook, that any artificial preservative in food which was not assimilated by the body—and these preservatives are not assimilated by the body—required an extra exertion on the part of the body to get rid of them, either on the part of the kidneys or the liver, that that was an extra tax on the system over and above the ordinary tax which the system should bear, and that in the course of time it would have a tremendous effect upon many people. We struck it out years ago, with the aid of that side of the House, and now, under the leadership of my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], to whom I am always proud to take off my hat, we have reinserted the poison squad once more.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Will the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] say whether there is anything in the present food and drug act, of which our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the author, which will prevent the indiscriminate sale of what are known as bichloride of mercury tablets?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say frankly that I know of nothing in this food and drug act to prevent that if the tablets are properly branded.

Mr. MOORE. Having the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina, I invoke that of the gentleman from Illinois, who is the author of many wholesome laws that are now in operation, to the subject of many communications—I know many of them have come to me—with regard to what appears to be an absence of national law restraining the use of these tablets, which are shipped from State to State and sold in certain drug stores, and which in many cases result in the death of those who take them by mistake or design.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the governor of his State vetoed a bill to restrict the use of bichloride of mercury tablets, because he said they were a household necessity.

Mr. MOORE. That may be, but that does not remedy a situation that is becoming national and that results in the loss of human lives by mistake. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who may regard this as a humorous matter—though I am quite sure that he does not—will recall the widely reported case of the young man in Georgia who recently fought for his life, with every newspaper in the country commenting upon his resignation and fortitude and upon the great distress of the young wife who prayed for his recovery. There have been many other similarly pathetic cases. Within the last year, I am told, the records show that upward of 100 deaths have resulted from the use of these tablets taken by accident or for suicidal purposes. Evidently, there is no sufficient special label or warning attached to the packages or bottles containing them, and through a mistaken idea that they are for headaches or for the purpose of relieving pain they are sometimes innocently swallowed, with generally fatal results.

Now, if we are to spend $644,000 for the purpose of enforcing the pure food and drug act, and if a large proportion of that money is to go into salaries of experts and scientists, and in particular if some of it is to be spent for scientific commissions to make investigations with regard to food supplies and the purity of drugs, it seems to me that no better purpose could be served than by telling the Secretary of Agriculture through his competent agents to study this question and see if we can not find a remedy for what is apparently a very great evil.

Mr. LEVER. The matter to which the gentleman refers I have no doubt, and I believe, is a very important matter, and I think he will agree with me that there is no authority in the pure-food law under which we could make appropriations to carry on that line of investigation. The Public Health Service is doing a great work, and I see the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], whose committee handles that service.

Mr. MOORE. I take it that the gentleman from Illinois, who drafted this law and for whom it is named, may have had this thought in mind at one time, or may have it in his mind now, to try to guard against this evil.

Mr. LEVER. It certainly has not been construed by the officials of the department to give them this authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I see no harm in calling the attention of the Department of Agriculture to the fact that we are expending a large amount of money and that some of it might be applied for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything about this subject. Probably I would not; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in a moment of temporary aberration of mind, referred to me as considering this subject from a humorous standpoint.

Mr. MOORE. I rather think the gentleman did. He smiled—which is unusual for him—at the very height of my argument.

Mr. MANN. I smiled at the ignorance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania; that is all. I could not help it.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is usually serious, but he smiles occasionally.

Mr. MANN. I took up this subject last fall, when we were in session and I was not able to persuade a quorum to come here—took it up myself, took it up with the national wholesale and retail drug trade, took it up with the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture, and with the Public Health Service, and with the manufacturers of those drugs. I have done a good deal of work upon the subject, and not being as ready as some other gentlemen, have not yet been able to find a solution of an unsolvable problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. The result of the inquiry I have just made has been to draw from the gentleman the very illuminating information that he has been alive to the necessities of this situation, and that the attention of the Department of Agriculture has been called to it. Is it not worth something to the world at large to know that?

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. MOORE. I think it will be if the gentleman's mind works right.

Mr. MANN. Well, my mind is not like the gentleman's from Pennsylvania—there is no need to put an "if" about it. It works right.

Mr. MOORE. It is always conceded that the gentleman's mind works right.

Mr. MANN. I concede it.

Mr. MOORE. And he is always right and we are always wrong, as the gentleman always is.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry to have the gentleman say I am always wrong.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I will take that back.

The Clerk read as follows:

And hereafter every food and drug inspector of the United States Department of Agriculture is, in connection with his duties as such food and drug inspector, hereby authorized to administer or to take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, and such oath, affirmation, or affidavit administered, sworn, affirmed, taken, had, or done, by or before such inspector, shall be valid and of like force and effect to all intents and purposes as if administered, sworn, affirmed, taken, had, or done by or before any other person within the United States duly authorized and competent thereto.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph is subject to the point of order. I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SOILS.

Salaries, Bureau of Soils: One soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 executive assistant, $2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 4 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,260; 8 clerks, class 1; 5 clerks, at $1,000 each; 3 clerks, at $900 each; 1 soil cartographer, $1,800; 1 soil bibliographer or draftsman, $1,400; 1 photographer, $1,200; 5 draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 1 clerk-draftsman, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $1,000; 1 messenger, $840; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 2 laborers, at $600 each; 1 laborer, $300; 1 charwoman or laborer, $480; in all, $59,420.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what exact work the Bureau of Soils is doing that requires an additional appropriation for help?

Mr. LEVER. On the statutory roll, you mean? There is no increase in this item at all. There is an apparent increase, but that is an increase from transfers from the lump sum.

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriation last year was $53,620 and this year $59,420.

Mr. LEVER. There is an apparent increase of about $5,000, but that is represented here in transfer from the lump sum.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina tell the committee what the Bureau of Soils does?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman had done me the distinguished honor to have read my report upon the subject, it would not have been necessary for him to have asked me that question.

Mr. MADDEN. I know very well the gentleman writes very lucidly——

Mr. LEVER. Much more so than he speaks.

Mr. MADDEN. And writes with a great deal of force on everything upon which he writes, and he always speaks much more forcibly than he writes, but what I would like to have him tell us is just exactly what this bureau does.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has not yet replied to my question.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Bureau of Soils is engaged in the very important fundamental work of classifying the different soils of the United States, studying soil fertility, going into a number of different lines of investigational work which it has been doing heretofore, and which the committee thinks is important, among them, studying the sources of different fertilizers.

Let me call attention to one result of the work. They have discovered, on the Pacific coast, kelp beds, from which we can

manufacture sufficient potash to last this country for a hundred years, I presume. That is a line of work that was put into the agricultural appropriation bill some few years ago, and it has resulted, we think, in bringing to the attention of the country in a commercial way, and to commercial interests and industry, propositions that are going to mean a great deal to this country, and particularly to the farmers. And there are other lines of work that I will be glad to take up item by item when we come to them.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the committee what the total appropriation of the Bureau of Soils is? I have not gone over the figures.

Mr. LEVER. Three hundred and fifty-nine thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. And $59,000 of that is for office expenses?

Mr. LEVER. Salaries, and the like of that; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. So that about 20 per cent of the whole expense is for office expenses?

Mr. LEVER. I presume there is a great deal more than that which goes in the way of salaries, but the gentleman understands the Department of Agriculture is not like many other departments in that respect, and that practically all the expenses of the department are in the way of salaries in the employment of experts, scientists, and the like of that.

Mr. MADDEN. This is all for salaries in the department here?

Mr. LEVER. The bulk of it. The laboratory, the scientific, and the research work of this bureau is done in the laboratories in the city of Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought they were used to find out what the soils were useful for.

Mr. LEVER. A certain amount of this appropriation is for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Only about 20 per cent of it.

Mr. LEVER. For instance, we are spending $169,000 for investigation of soils in cooperation with other branches in the Department of Agriculture. That is field work, pure and simple.

Mr. MADDEN. That is 50 per cent, then, of the total expenditure. Now, it looks to me as if 50 per cent of the total appropriation is a very large part of the appropriation to be expended for that branch of the work that does not produce any results.

Mr. LEVER. That $169,000 to which I refer is for field work; that is, the investigation and mapping of the soil.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. And, of course, there are other lines of field work also, which are segregated in the bill. I presume I can get it in the Book of Expenditures and show just what is expended in Washington. But even conceding it is a large fund, I do not think the bureau is subject to criticism on that account, for, as I said a moment ago, necessarily a large amount of the appropriations made for the Agricultural Department in scientific research work must be expended in Washington, where its laboratories are located and its experiments being made. I think the gentleman will concede that that follows necessarily.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not going to object to the appropriation, but I thought it well enough to call attention to what I believe to be an extravagance at the office end of the work.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think it is, however. I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, $36,500: *Provided*, That of the amount hereby appropriated, the sum of not exceeding $5,000 may be used for the erection of a small laboratory building on the experimental farm of the Department of Agriculture at Arlington, Va., for the purpose of studying fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by electrical methods, plans and specifications for the building to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and all work done under his supervision.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso to this paragraph of the bill, and wish to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he believes that the erection of this building is a necessity for the proper conduct of the work?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that several Members of Congress who have given very careful study to this proposition of extracting nitrogen from the air appeared before the committee and urged very strongly upon the committee a large appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to make that study. Members of the committee got into communication with the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture, and especially the gentleman who will be in charge of that line of work, and he told us very frankly that he thought it was a line of investigation that should be pursued, and he could do the work, he felt satisfied, if he had a small laboratory at Arlington that would not cost to exceed $5,000. The gentleman understands, of course, that nitrogen is one of the three essential ingredients of what we call a complete commercial fertilizer and is the most expensive one of the three. We are doing a great deal of work down in my country in getting nitrogen into the soil by the use of leguminous plants, and we are succeeding very well in that direction, but any process by which the nitrogen supply may be increased or its cost reduced must be of great importance to the agricultural interests of the country.

Mr. MADDEN. You can get that by putting in clover and alfalfa and that sort of thing?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. Of course the air is filled with nitrogen, and if we could find some process by which we could extract it in a commercial way it would mean a great deal to this country.

I will say very frankly that the committee thought that while this might be in an ordinary sense a waste of money, at the same time the subject was so big and the results, if we succeeded in getting favorable results, would be so good that it would be a good investment to make an effort in that direction. The language, in my judgment, is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman in reality think it would be possible, after the experiments were made, to convey the nitrogen to the ground without some process of cultivation, such as the raising of clover or alfalfa or some such product as that, which would carry the nitrogen into the soil by opening up the pores of the soil?

Mr. LEVER. Every commercial fertilizer—and we use a great deal of it in the South—bears its proportion of nitrogen, and it goes into the soil as a plant food.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, any conclusions that would be obtained as the result of this study would not enable any person to convey the nitrogen into the ground without the use of some fertilizer or without the use of some leguminous plants?

Mr. LEVER. That may be. Of course, I do not know how they would convey it to the soil. I presume they would do it in the ordinary way, as it is done now, by the mixture of potash and phosphoric acid.

Mr. MADDEN. What good would it do after you got it?

Mr. LEVER. I take it that if the department can devise a plan by which you can extract nitrogen from the air so successfully that it can be put on a commercial basis, private individuals will go into the manufacture of it and make the cost of fertilizers very much cheaper by cheapening the process.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if there is any water power or anything of that kind over at Arlington?

Mr. LEVER. I am not positive of that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I always understood that the extraction of nitrogen from the air was a proposition involving a large amount of power—power more than anything else. I can not see what possible opportunity there would be for investigations of this character out at Arlington.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that I have not given very special study to the proposition of extracting nitrogen from the air, but the department itself asked for only $5,000 for this work, and I presume that they have asked for a sufficient amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. This is a proposition that has advanced largely in Norway, where they have great water power and where it can be used at small expense. It is a proposition thus far involving the use of power, and therefore I can not understand how any experiments of any value can be carried on out at Arlington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I think I shall make a point of order on this item, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. I think the experiments are valuable, but they are not going to be conducted at the right place.

Mr. MADDEN. I will not make it, then.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will renew the point of order for the sake of getting some information. I would like to inquire whether it is essential to have this experimentation conducted at Arlington, and whether it could not be more favorably carried on in the department here at Washington?

Mr. LEVER. No. Their statement was that they would rather have the work carried on at Arlington.

Mr. STAFFORD. They might wish to have it carried on in the pleasant surroundings of the landscape over in Arlington; but is it practicable to have these experiments made in the department here, where they have laboratories, instead of having a separate building erected on the Arlington estate?

Mr. LEVER. The department informed me that they had absolutely no room in the department to carry on this work. They

want to erect for it a fireproof building in Arlington. They have no room here.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has not answered my question yet as to whether this work could be done as practicably here in the laboratory in Washington as over in the landscape gardens at Arlington.

Mr. LEVER. I said that the testimony of these gentlemen who will do the work is to the effect that it can not be done here. That is all I know about it. I will say that I think another reason why they want to go to Arlington is that they have an electrical plant there that they can use in connection with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can appreciate the reason if they have a plant there that they can utilize in this experimentation. The important fact advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] that this service could be carried on in Norway and in Sweden, where the electric power can be produced cheaply because of the superabundance of water power, does not to my mind make it impracticable to make the experimentation here, where there is some electrical power, and if the gentleman says there is such power over on the Arlington estate I have no objection to the item.

Mr. LEVER. I recall that that is one of the reasons; and my clerk, whose memory is good, also recalls it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I renew the point of order. I do not know whether the gentleman will bowl me over as easily as he has the other gentlemen or not. As I understand, there is no question about the ability to obtain nitrogen from the air in fixed form for use commercially.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. MANN. And that is being done in a number of places.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And that is done where they can obtain practically unlimited water power for the purpose of generating electrical power.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; cheap power.

Mr. MANN. Now, it being known that you can do this, and the question being the obtaining of the power, what is the use of locating a plant out here at Arlington, where you can not find out anything about the cost, the cost being practically the only question in controversy?

Mr. LEVER. That is a very important question, and I will answer the gentleman as nearly as my recollection will permit me to answer him. Dr. Cameron made the statement before the committee, as I recall it, that just a few days before appearing before the committee he had examined a number of patents filed in the Patent Office for extracting nitrogen from the air by different processes, and I think he said there were more than a hundred of them; but he said that most of these processes are patented already, and that is true of the situation in Norway. He said they were secret processes that they could not get hold of. Now, Dr. Cameron—who, I think, is one of the ablest chemists in the Department of Agriculture—has no doubt that if he is given this appropriation and this little laboratory he can find a process by which nitrogen can be extracted from the air and put upon the market in a commercial way.

Mr. MANN. If he has persuaded the Committee on Agriculture of that fact, he has done remarkably well. If he could persuade me that he could do this with $5,000, I would beg, borrow, or steal the money in some way and put it into his hands and have a patent worth millions and millions of dollars. I think he is a little bit overoptimistic on the subject.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, in justice to Dr. Cameron, who is one of the most modest men I have ever seen, that Dr. Cameron did not come before the committee on his own initiative, nor did the Department of Agriculture estimate for this item. It is inserted in the bill on the initiative of the committee itself.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt it might be advisable to have this work carried on somewhere. We have a number of dams in various places, in connection with irrigation plants of the Government and otherwise, where we have water power; but to start in and make experiments on something concerning which the requisite is cheap water power at a place where there is no water power at all reminds me of experimenting with an irrigation plant on top of Pikes Peak.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even at a small laboratory, such as is proposed in this item, would it not be possible for the experimenter to determine the amount of electric power necessary to produce the nitrogen that is so very valuable as a fertilizer, and thus determine the cost?

Mr. MANN. That would not help them out any at all. For instance, the manufacture of ground wood pulp and print paper requires cheap water power, and in almost every place where it is manufactured cheap water power is used for that purpose. We are carrying on experiments in reference to the use of different woods for the manufacture of pulp, but we do not think for a moment that we can determine the value of our experiments in the laboratory in Wisconsin without testing them further in the practical mill, where we must ascertain the facts from actual operation, which could not be done here.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, we can ascertain from the experimentations in the laboratory at Madison whether certain kinds of wood are utilizable for pulp. That is the purpose of the laboratory.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we know that certain kinds of wood can be used. The question is how to utilize them. No one has been able to determine that question practically yet, so that they can be utilized commercially. I am not complaining of that work. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of soils, in cooperation with other branches of the Department of Agriculture, other departments of the Government, State agricultural experiment stations, and other State institutions, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, $169,800.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I think there is some new phraseology in this paragraph that needs some explanation. I would like to know whether it means a new departure or whether they are conducting the same activities and want an authorization.

Mr. LEVER. The department submitted estimates, and in submitting estimates submitted this language, with the statement that it did so for the purpose of more clearly setting out in the bill the character of the work being done under the item. There is no departure in policy whatever, nor is there any new authority added in the item. It is in legal effect completely the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether as to this $169,000 how much is spent in cooperation with State institutions?

Mr. LEVER. The Department of Agriculture under the present management is trying hard and sincerely to establish cooperative relationship with the agricultural colleges in the States. This is shown in the department's attitude toward the Lever agricultural extension bill, and it is shown in a number of recent arrangements. Practically every agricultural college now is cooperating with the Department of Agriculture in carrying on the Federal work in that State. In my own State the Federal official in charge of the department's work, the farm demonstration work, is located at the agricultural college, occupying one of the professors' houses. He is in fact a part of the faculty, living on the ground. Of course, he does his work separately. It is the hope of the department, as it is of each member of the committee, that closer and closer cooperative arrangements can be made in conducting the work of the Department of Agriculture with the States and the agricultural colleges.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the case the gentleman instances, is he performing the work for the Agricultural Department, work that should be performed by the State agricultural institutions, and are there other instances where the National Government is paying for services that should be performed by the State? I know that the tendency is to relieve the State.

Mr. LEVER. The character of the work being done by the man to whom I refer is farm demonstration work, with which the gentleman from Wisconsin is familiar, as he is with the farm management work in the North. It is a system of getting the information from the Agricultural Department out to the farmer by the farm demonstration method. I do not think it is the work of the State or that the State ought to be called upon to do it entirely, but I do think the States under the Lever extension bill ought to be called upon to do their share. I do not hesitate to say that I believe the time is coming when the States will cooperate in all work of a large public character, such as is this demonstration work. I believe it will make for efficiency and economy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Am I to understand that there is no instance where the National Government is performing work which the State ought to perform, and thereby relieving the State from the burden?

Mr. LEVER. Not as far as I know.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say to my knowledge the students of the State agricultural college of my State are making these

soil surveys under Government supervision. I know that is the case with the Cornell students.

Mr. LEVER. That is under some cooperative arrangement with the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. PLATT. I want to ask the gentleman whether there is any provision in the bill for reprinting of soil surveys that are out of print?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. PLATT. How can that be done?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation for the printing of those surveys is carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill—an item, I think, of $300,000.

Mr. PLATT. Is there no way to get a reprint under this bill?

Mr. LEVER. No; not under this language, nor in this bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. LEVER. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman knows that I am in sympathy with making liberal appropriations for the Bureau of Soils, but it seems to me that there are two or three matters that ought to be explained. Is not there a duplication in these items as compared with items on the preceding page; for instance, "For soil-fertility investigations." "Properties and composition of soil humus," and "The transformation and formation of soil humus by soil organisms," and so forth? It seems to me that you have the same thing provided for in three or four different places.

Mr. LEVER. No; although I am not surprised that the gentleman should get that idea from the language; but, as a matter of fact, there is no duplication whatever in this Bureau of Soil's work. The item under consideration is for field work and the other is mainly for laboratory and research work.

Mr. WILLIS. It is not work done by the same body of men?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire, before I withdraw the point of order, as to how long the gentleman plans to run to-night?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will let us read through the statutory roll of the Bureau of Entomology, I will be very glad to rise.

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Entomology: For the promotion of economic entomology; for investigating the history and the habits of insects injurious and beneficial to agriculture, horticulture, arboriculture, and the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, and ascertaining the best means of destroying those found to be injurious; for collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such investigations; for salaries and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, freight, express charges, official traveling expenses, office fixtures, supplies, apparatus, telegraph and telephone service, gas, and electric current, in connection with the following investigations.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman be willing to have his motion pending, so that the committee can now rise?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from South Carolina if he intends to proceed with the bill to-morrow?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to make an arrangement with the gentleman in charge of pensions by which we might go on with this bill, but I have not been able to do so as yet. I understand, however, that even if the pension bill is taken up, it will not take over a couple of hours.

Mr. LANGLEY. It will not take that long, unless there is some opposition.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], whom I see in the Chamber.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there will be a special rule on the fisheries treaties brought in to-morrow, and that the Committee on Rules will ask to have the floor. If so, the Pension Committee will have to give way.

Mr. LEVER. If the special rule, however, is not brought in, how long does the gentleman think it would take to complete the pension bill?

Mr. SHERWOOD. There are 208 names, and if there is no filibuster we ought to get through in an hour.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Committee on Pensions will also have a bill, I understand.

Mr. SHERWOOD. So far as I am concerned individually, I am willing to give way to the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. That being the case, the committee will go on with the bill to-morrow. The gentleman from Ohio says that he is willing to give way to-morrow to the Agricultural bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I would like to offer to the next line.

Mr. STAFFORD. That can be considered to-morrow.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein a tabulated report showing the work of the department on farm-demonstration work in Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it in the nature of a speech that the gentleman desires to insert?

Mr. JACOWAY. No; they are tables showing the progress of this work. There will be an introductory statement on my part, which the gentleman might construe to be a speech.

Mr. STAFFORD. How voluminous is the data which the gentleman wishes to insert?

Mr. JACOWAY. It is not very voluminous.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the same purpose be accomplished if the gentleman asked to have it published as a public document? I do not believe there would be any objection to that. The gentleman would have those documents under his control.

Mr. JACOWAY. I would rather have it published in the RECORD in the usual form.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to its going into the RECORD. I have no objection to its being published as a public document.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] desires to offer an amendment and have it pending.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I will offer that to-morrow.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know how voluminous the gentleman's remarks are, and if they could not be published as a public document? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, this is part of the debate that I have been participating in during the day.

Mr. JACOWAY. Oh, very well.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4247. An act to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy by the appointment of six vice admirals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4096. An act to amend the act authorizing the National Academy of Sciences to receive and hold trust funds for the promotion of science and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPRINT OF SPEECH MADE BY HON. SIMEON D. FESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN (H. DOC. NO. 823).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to publish as a House document the very excellent speech delivered on the subject of Abraham Lincoln by Representative FESS, of Ohio, on the 12th of February last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks to publish as a House document a speech made by Representative FESS, of Ohio, on the 12th of February on Abraham Lincoln. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] a moment ago in the Committee of the Whole asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in reference to certain matters, and objection was made. I

hope the gentleman who objected to the request will withdraw it, and I will make no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am not inclined to make this a case of barter, but the gentleman from Illinois asked to have this matter printed as a document, and I stated to the gentleman from Arkansas——

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman ask to have it printed as a House document?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Then I have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I said to the gentleman from Arkansas I had no objection to having his matter printed as a document.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course everybody was delighted with the speech of Mr. FESS which was delivered in the House here, but that is already printed in the RECORD. What is the advantage now of printing it as a public document? It is frankable, and what is to be gained by that action?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a patriotic address with Mr. GOULDEN'S remarks at the time, who was present when the speech was delivered by President Lincoln on the battle field of Gettysburg, and I think it is one of the most comprehensive statements of the case that has ever been made; and I think it ought to be published as a public document.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not for the life of me see what is to be gained by printing the matter as a public document when it is already frankable. The Senate does that because they do not insert in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman feels it keenly, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BOYS' CORN CLUBS.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Speaker, there are 75 counties in the State of Arkansas. In the year 1913 boys' corn club work was carried on in all but 5 of these counties. Two thousand three hundred and fifty-nine boys and at least one girl cultivated an acre of corn under departmental instruction and guidance and in accordance with departmental methods. They averaged 45 bushels of corn per acre. The average cost was 36½ cents per bushel. True, these were select acres, but it is important to consider that this average yield is more than double the average yield under existing methods of cultivation as generally practiced. Wesley Pledger, in my home county, and who lives at Belleville, Ark., raised 94 bushels of corn on 1 acre of ground and took first prize of $100.

EIGHTEEN WHO LED.

I give here the names and addresses of the Arkansas boys, and there is one girl in the list, who made over 100 bushels of corn on an acre of Arkansas land in the year 1913.

These 18 members grew 1,930 bushels of corn on 18 acres, with an average yield per acre of 107 bushels at an average cost per bushel of 16 cents:

| Name. | Address. | Number bushels. | Cost. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cents. |
| Louis Epstein | Luna Landing | 100 | 10 |
| Floyd Peters | Okolona | 100 | 48 |
| Edwin Moore | Hot Springs | 155.25 | 16½ |
| Jean Garner | Paragould | 102.5 | 20 |
| Harold Logers | do | 102.33 | 27½ |
| Clyde Halbrook | Franklin | 106 | 18 |
| Orde Phillips | Wyman | 102.75 | 16 |
| Allen M. Rush | Melbourne | 112 | 13 |
| Charley Benson | Shannon | 100 | 33 |
| Russell Benson | do | 108 | 15 |
| Willie Deaver | Brockett | 106 | 10 |
| Fred Going | Pocahontas | 100 | 9 |
| Miss Delphine Moore | Wyman | 104.4 | 11 |
| Elbie Moore | do | 101 | 11 |
| Donald Jones | Greenland | 102 | 14½ |
| Jno S. Reed | Johnson | 104.75 | 24 |
| Grover Choate | El Paso | 116.36 | 23 |
| W. D. Sego | Griffithville | 110 | 16 |

This kind of work carried out in all the corn fields of Arkansas would have added over $40,000,000 to the corn crop of Arkansas in the year 1913.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes, sir; gladly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was this production of corn during the year when there was considerable drought?

Mr. JACOWAY. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, I will say I think the year was a normal one and the conditions about the same as those of the average year.

Mr. MURDOCK. This was the year 1913?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes.

COTTON CLUBS.

Cotton is one of the great crops of Arkansas. We raise nearly 1,000,000 bales of this kingly crop. We not only produce standard middling but grow large quantities of long staple, which brings from 24 to 30 cents per pound in the spinning markets of the world. This crop is grown on about two and one-quarter million acres. [Applause.]

But look at what cotton-club work shows. In 1913, 800 boys each grew according to modern agricultural methods an acre of cotton each in 50 counties of the State. Their average yield was 1,081 pounds of seed cotton. This is double the average for the State. These acres averaged a net profit of $25.10 per acre.

Had all the cotton lands of Arkansas done as well the increase in the crop would have netted the State $40,000,000 in a single year. [Applause.]

CANNING CLUBS.

Arkansas girls have not only shown that they can grow corn equal to the boys, but an Arkansas girl holds the record for canning club work for the 12 Southern States. This young lady is Miss Fay Parker, of Beebe, Ark., who made a net profit of $152.83 on one-tenth of an acre garden. This is at the rate of $1,528.30 per acre for good gardening in Arkansas as conducted by Arkansas horticulturists if they keep up with the intelligent pace set by one of Arkansas's fair daughters. [Applause.]

ARKANSAS'S GROWTH.

Statistics show that during the last 30 years Arkansas has made a greater growth than any other State in the Union. In 1880 the value of the factory products in this State was $6,850,000. In 1913 the value of factory products was $80,000,000, an increase of 1,400 per cent. The value of farm products in 1880 was $43,796,000, and in 1913 it was $168,375,000, an increase of 300 per cent. Our forests yielded in 1880 only $2,990,000, and in 1913 they brought us $54,008,000, an increase of nearly 1,700 per cent. Our mines yielded the pitiful sum of $65,000 in 1880, and in the year 1913 they brought $5,600,000. This was an increase of 8,400 per cent.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF CLUB WORK IN ARKANSAS FOR 1913.

CORN CLUBS.

The corn-club work has been conducted in 70 counties this year, with a total enrollment of 2,359 boys. The average yield per acre of the boys reporting this year is 45 bushels. The average cost per bushel is 36½ cents. This average yield of 45 bushels per acre is more than double the average yield of the State made under the old methods of cultivation. Below are the names and addresses of members who made 100 bushels and over per acre with the cost per bushel:

COTTON CLUBS.

The cotton clubs have been conducted in about 50 counties in the State with a total enrollment of 800. The average yield per acre of seed cotton of the boys reporting is 1,081 pounds. This is double the average of the State made under the ordinary method of cultivation. The average net profit per acre of the boys reporting, $25.10.

CANNING CLUBS.

The canning-club work for girls has been conducted in 13 counties, with a total enrollment in round numbers of about 800. The girls reporting have grown over one-quarter million pounds of tomatoes on their gardens. They have not only grown tomatoes on their gardens, but have grown a number of other vegetables. The total value of all products sold from the one-tenth-acre gardens amount to over $14,000. The average cost of production per one-tenth acre is $10.24, with an average net profit per one-tenth acre of $35.07. Arkansas has the honor of having a girl who holds the record of having made the greatest net profit of any girl in the 12 Southern States in which the club work has been conducted, according to information received from the Department of Agriculture at Washington. The girl is Miss Fay Parker, of Beebe, who made a net profit of $152.83 on one-tenth of an acre. The canning-club work is becoming more popular every day, as well as the corn and cotton clubs. In two years the local aid for conducting the canning-club work, which is put up by quorum courts and by private subscription, has grown from nothing to over $5,000, and there are counties now wanting the work, but will have to be denied this year, because of insufficient funds from the Government.

IS THE WORK WORTH WHILE?

The question has been asked me if the work is really worth while, and what there is to it? A few figures will, I think, show the merits of the work. Approximately there are 2,475,000 acres of corn in Arkansas in 1913. The average yield per acre of the State is about 20 bushels. The corn-club boys have made an average of 45 bushels per acre, a gain, therefore, of 25 bushels per acre. Two million four hundred and seventy-five thousand acres, at a gain of 25 bushels per acre, give a total gain of 61,875,000 bushels of corn, which, at 70 cents per bushel—and this is reasonably low—would give an increase in dollars and cents in the corn production in Arkansas for 1913 of $43,312,500, had every acre of corn in Arkansas been worked under demonstration methods.

There have been approximately 2,400,000 acres of cotton grown in Arkansas in 1913. The average yield per acre in the State is about 370 pounds of seed cotton. The boys have averaged 1,081 pounds of seed cotton per acre. There has therefore been a gain, in round num-

bers, of 500 pounds per acre; 2,400,000 acres with a gain of 500 pounds per acre would give a total gain of lint cotton of 400,000,000 pounds, which, at 10 cents per pound, and this is reasonably low, would give a gain in dollars and cents of $40,000,000 had every acre in cotton in Arkansas been grown under demonstration-club methods. Arkansas therefore would have been over $80,000,000 to the good had every acre of corn and cotton been grown under demonstration-club methods. I leave it for the reader to say whether the demonstration-club work is worth while.

There will be two new features of the club work the coming year—poultry clubs for the girls and the pig clubs for the boys. Poultry clubs were conducted to some extent in two counties last year. They will be made a regular feature of the girls' work the coming year and prospects are that they will be very popular.

The pig clubs for the boys are to be conducted in conjunction with the corn clubs. We hope to teach the boys that there is no better way of marketing their corn than through good hogs. We also hope to teach them that, aside from being a good means for marketing their corn, that one of the best ways for building up the soil is through the growing of more and better live stock.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, FARMERS' COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION WORK.

[Extracts from annual report, 1913.]

The Arkansas State office of the farmers' cooperative demonstration work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, has just finished compiling its annual report to the department of the results accomplished in Arkansas for the year 1913. The facts set out in this report show that a wonderful progress has been made in the development of agricultural conditions all over the State, and the possibilities for the future indicated by this demonstration work are astounding.

The organization for the demonstration work in this State consists of Mr. C. W. Watson, State agent; Mr. W. J. Jernigan, assistant State agent, in charge of the boys' and girls' club work; Mr. R. C. Davidson, Mr. J. C. Barnett, and Mr. Harry F. Kapp, district agents, each having charge of 25 counties in the northeastern, northwestern, and southern sections of the State, respectively. Under this supervising force there were 72 local agents in the various counties who were in direct contact with the farmers and conducted operations on the farms along the lines of scientific agriculture prescribed by the department. Of the local agents, 9 were negroes, doing work among the members of their race in the counties heavily populated by negroes. The following figures given do not include any of the boys' and girls' club work or the work done by the negro agents; they pertain entirely to results accomplished by 50 local agents among the white adult farmers of the State.

These 50 agents had 1,454 demonstrators in corn, 1,520 demonstrators in cotton, a total of 2,974 farmers whom they visited regularly and supervised the growing of the crops. These 2,974 demonstrators had 16,258 acres in corn and 25,910 acres in cotton, or a total of 42,168 acres, making the average size of the demonstration plats 14½ acres per demonstrator. In addition to the 2,974 demonstrators the local agents had on their lists 10,407 cooperators, whom they are not required to visit regularly, but who receive the department literature and advice from the agents. Hence the demonstration force was in touch with 13,381 farmers in our State during the year 1913.

On the 16,258 acres in corn under demonstration methods last year 580,901 bushels were produced, an average of 34½ bushels per acre. On the 25,910 acres in cotton were produced 27,516,420 pounds of seed cotton, an average of 1,062 pounds per acre. These average yields of both corn and cotton are larger than the averages obtained under demonstration methods last year, and this was accomplished in spite of an unusually severe and extended drought and a heavy boll-weevil infestation, indicating that demonstration methods are effective in getting good results in the face of unfavorable weather conditions and insect depredations. Also, the average yields were obtained from every character of soil, upland and bottom, varying in fertility from very poor to rich and embracing every section of the State.

The average corn yield per acre for Arkansas, as shown by the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for 1912 was 20½ bushels. It is fair to presume that the average yield for the State last year was not greater than this. But the average yield on the demonstration farms was 34½ bushels per acre, a net gain of 14 bushels, or a total of 227,612 bushels for the 16,258 acres under demonstration methods. Figuring this increased yield at 70 cents per bushel, we have a net gain of $9.80 per acre, or a total gain of $159,328.40 for the total demonstration acreage over the ordinary yields.

The average yield of cotton per acre for Arkansas, obtained as above, was 570 pounds for 1912. The average yield on the demonstration farms was 1,062 pounds per acre, a net gain of 492 pounds per acre, or a total of 12,747,720 pounds. Thirding this for lint, and figuring the increased yield at 10 cents per pound, we have a net gain of $16.40 per acre, or a total of $429,924 for the 25,910 acres under demonstration methods over the ordinary yields.

The total amount contributed by the people of Arkansas, quorum courts, and otherwise for last year was $53,013.37. The increased earnings of the demonstration acreage over the ordinary yields was $159,328.40 on corn and $429,924 on cotton, or a total of $584,252.40. Hence it is shown that for every $1 expended by the people in fostering demonstration work more than $11 has been returned—more than 1,100 per cent on the amount invested.

Viewing these figures from another standpoint, it becomes evident that if the 2,475,000 acres planted to corn in 1912 had been under demonstration methods in 1913 and the same increased yields obtained, the farmers of Arkansas would have had 34,650,000 bushels more of corn, worth $24,255,000, at 70 cents per bushel. And if the 2,363,000 acres planted to cotton in 1911 had been under demonstration methods in 1913, the farmers would have had 1,162,596,000 pounds more of seed cotton, which at a price of 10 cents per pound for the lint would have been worth $38,753,200. In other words, if demonstration methods were universally practiced and such yields obtained as the demonstration work shows to be possible and practical, the increased income from the farms of the State on these two crops alone would have reached the astounding sum of $63,008,200.

In the above discussion no account is taken of such other wealth-producing factors of the demonstration work as the boys' corn, cotton, and pig clubs, and the girls' canning and poultry clubs. Neither does it include the vast amount of work done by the local agents in other lines. These men are conducting hundreds of demonstrations in the growing of the various clovers and other legumes and grasses for hay crops; superintending the sowing of thousands of acres of grain and cover crops; establishing permanent pastures; encouraging the better breeding and growing of all kinds of live stock; restoring impoverished farms and showing how to maintain and increase the fertility of the soil; teaching the growing of crops for silage and the building of silos; urging the efficiency of the dipping vat in tick eradication even in the very southern limits of the State; terracing and draining land; administering hog-cholera serum; helping to organize truck growing and cooperative marketing associations; getting in touch with the greatly increasing number of home seekers coming to our State and informing them as to climate, soils, crops, and cultivation in order that they may become contented, prosperous, and permanent citizens; preaching the gospel of good roads, schools, and churches for the material and moral uplift; assisting in everything that makes for the betterment of the farm and farmer and the upbuilding of the home. The local agent is a missionary of progress wherever he goes, and the demonstration force as a whole is a most potent agency for the material advancement of our great Commonwealth along every line.

Mr. Speaker, from the above compilations of Mr. C. W. Watson, State agent for Arkansas, and Mr. W. J. Jernigan, assistant State agent in charge of demonstration club work for Arkansas, it can be seen at a glance that Arkansas is living up to her privileges and opportunities in the great work of farm demonstration. All are entitled to a portion of this credit.

The man in the city has done his part in this work. He has joined hands with the farmer and left nothing undone to gain from this work, and for the benefit of the farmers, all that could be accomplished with the means afforded.

THE QUORUM COURTS OF ARKANSAS.

Especially should the quorum courts of Arkansas be given their just proportion of credit, for had not the funds in part come from these sources farm demonstration work in Arkansas would have been most seriously hindered. I take pride, Mr. Speaker, in making a recital for Arkansas of the growth, development, and progress along lines so essential to the upbuilding of every Commonwealth. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that until a few years ago the State of Arkansas in many respects was somewhat handicapped in raising the money to supplement or complement the appropriations made by Congress. In all of this work the State has to make an appropriation before Federal funds are available. However, the State of Arkansas remedied the condition by passing a law authorizing the quorum courts of each county to appropriate money for this work. Previous to the passage of this act the quorum courts had no legal power to authorize an appropriation for this work, and private individuals had contributed the necessary amount of money called for by the Government. In this way the work was carried on and Federal aid secured. I am glad now to say that in all the 75 counties of the State of which I have the honor in part to represent, except five, if my memory serves me correctly, appropriations have been made for the demonstration work, and it is thought that it is money wisely expended when we come to compare the good that has been accomplished as a result.

For the purpose of diffusing this knowledge among the people at large, and in order to encourage those who are lukewarm and are not giving it the support it should be given, I asked to extend my remarks. And my further object in rising to-day, and so asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, was for the purpose of avoiding any trespass on an already tired House that has done an honest day's work. It seems there have been some objections coming from Members in this regard, and what prompted them I am unable to say; but in my limited experience in this House, in the time that I have been endeavoring to represent my district, I believe the personnel of this House will bear me out on this occasion when I say that I have not outraged the proprieties on many occasions and indulged myself on the floor. I try, however, when I have something for the benefit of my district and my State and the Nation at large, to submit what remarks I think may be pertinent and that may be of advantage and benefit to the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOWAY. I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman first propounded his request I was under the impression that it was a compilation of statistics framed by some outside source and thought that the matter could be as serviceably placed in a document. I now learn from the gentleman's explanation that it is a speech prepared by him, and, of course, I have no objection to any matter prepared by any gentleman of this House being inserted in the RECORD——

Mr. JACOWAY. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin——

Mr. STAFFORD. And if the gentleman wishes to extend his remarks in the RECORD I will not raise any objection.

Mr. JACOWAY. I will say, in answer to that, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will take the time in the morning to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and note the work that has been done by the people of Arkansas, and send it over his State, it will be a source of inspiration to him and to the people of his

State, and in the years to come they, too, may catch the strains of the martial music of progress and do likewise. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF REPORT—ALASKAN COAL-LEASING BILL.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Report No. 352, on the bill H. R. 14233, known as the Alaskan coal-leasing bill, for correction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent to withdraw the report which he has named for correction. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, March 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting an item of appropriation in connection with the sundry civil bill, authorizing the Secretary of War to lease buildings of the Shiloh National Military Park to former owners or other persons and apply proceeds to the maintenance of the park (H. Doc. No. 844); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for the necessary expenses and salaries, Customs Service, Panama-Pacific International Exposition, San Francisco (H. Doc. No. 825); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the disposal of certain lands in the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 371), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13667) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Argentine Republic, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 372), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUDGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11254) to increase the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States post-office building at Mandan, N. Dak., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 373), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12169) providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 374), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANTRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13819) to increase the limit of cost of the Federal building at Pendleton, Oreg., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 376), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14546) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 370), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1090) for the relief of Alonzo D. Cadwallader, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 375), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 14544) to incorporate the Mothers' Day International Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 14545) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Andrew Jackson Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Talladega, Ala., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 14547) to prevent the use of the United States mail and all common carriers engaged in interstate traffic, in carrying, transporting, or conveying any written or printed matter or other device for advertising, selling, delivering, or in any way disposing of any false or fraudulent cures for injuries, diseases, or other physical ailments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 14548) to amend section 195 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 14549) to authorize the President of the United States to provide for coal-mine development in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FESS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio relative to proper Federal and State action to abate the loss sustained from hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: Resolution (H. Res. 438) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House certain information regarding alleged statements of Walter H. Page, ambassador to the Court of St. James, and other information; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HAIR: Resolution (H. Res. 439) to investigate the condition and affairs of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors, and to determine the nature and treatment of the members thereof, and to determine whether said homes should be placed under the management of the War Department; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14546) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 14550) granting a pension to D. W. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14551) granting a pension to William J. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14552) granting a pension to R. H. Landrum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14553) granting a pension to Frances M. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14554) granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14555) granting an increase of pension to Bonaparte Hunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14556) granting an increase of pension to William H. Koffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14557) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Leaming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14558) granting an increase of pension to John P. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14559) granting an increase of pension to Gustus A. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 14560) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14561) for the relief of William Mattson, alias William Madison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 14562) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Bissonette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14563) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 14564) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Royal G. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 14565) granting a pension to Iva Blair Booher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 14566) to correct the military record of Andrew Ballon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 14567) granting a pension to Henry C. Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14568) granting an increase of pension to L. R. Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 14569) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Venning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14570) removing the charge of desertion from the name of George A. McKenzie, alias William A. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14571) granting a pension to Josephine G. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14572) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Diedier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14573) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 14574) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Witmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 14575) for the relief of Samuel M. Crosby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 14576) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 14577) granting a pension to Sarah J. Bogert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 14578) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14579) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Helmling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14580) to appropriate a sum of money to pay to the heirs of Myra Clarke Gaines for certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 14581) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition signed by 67 employees of the Martin B. Brown Printing & Binding Co., of New York City, urging the passage of the Bacon-Bartlett bill, known as S. 927, H. R. 1873, which exempts labor unions and agricultural societies from the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protests from sundry citizens of Villa Ridge, Washington, Herman, and Labaddie, State of Missouri, against the national prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 482 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Altoona, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry Spanish War veterans of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of the Western Pennsylvania Master Brewers' Association and the Local Union No. 91, American Flint Glass Workers' Union, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY: Petitions of various voters of the first congressional district of Kentucky, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan City, Ind., protesting against literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the German-American Christian Civic League, of Goshen, Ind., and sundry citizens of Michigan City, Ind., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Petitions of H. E. Alberts and 1,980 other citizens of the State of Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of George Cornelle, Dr. C. W. Davis, H. E. Wilson, and others; J. Warren Ayer and others; and Charles Wilson and others, all of Hamilton County, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 2, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Jersey, favoring increased salary and retirement pension for letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the memorial and executive committee, Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Electrotypers Union of New York City, and the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Jacob Seligson, Jos. Pfeiffer, and Louis H. Bold, of New York City, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Horace White, New York City, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State of New York Conservation Commission, favoring appropriation for Forest Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petitions of the officers of the Erie County Savings Bank, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Local Union No. 660, Carpenters and Joiners of America, favoring House bill 1873, Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Morris McMillan Post, No. 58, Grand Army of the Republic, against changing the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Citizens' National Bank, of Lebanon; the Lebanon National Bank, of Lebanon; the Morrow National Bank, of Morrow; the First National Bank of Morrow; the Mason Bank, of Mason; the Waynesville National Bank, of Waynesville; the Franklin National Bank, of Franklin; Warren National Bank, of Franklin; the Farmers' Bank, of Springboro, all in the State of Ohio, favoring amendment to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bethel, Ohio, and vicinity, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bowersville, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church of 400 members in Ripley, Ohio, favoring House joint resolution 168, prohibiting traffic in intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Centenary Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of 150 members, of Ripley, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petitions of the Lodge Valkyrian Society and Lodge Sven Banes, No. 12, Scandinavian Grand Lodge of International Order Good Templars, of New York; the Gota Lyon Society, of Mount Vernon; Swedish Folk Dancing Society; and Swedish Gymnastic Society, of New York, favoring passage of House bill 11648, for erection of suitable memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of the Riviera Commercial Club, of Riviera, Tex., against repeal of exemption clause of Panama

Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of 29 citizens of Houston, 25 citizens of Greenville, 51 citizens of Sidney, and 12 citizens of Gomer, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOOD: Petitions of 125 citizens of Mount Auburn, 32 citizens of Laurel, 65 citizens of West Branch, 90 citizens of Cedar Rapids, and 100 citizens of Albion, all in the State of Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry Spanish War veterans of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldierr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of 170 citizens of Lakefield, Minn., and vicinity, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Salem, Oreg., in favor of Senate joint resolution 88 and House joint resolution 168, for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Memorial of various members of the Baptist Young People's Union of Sharon, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Petition of various banks of Hawaii, favoring amendment of income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of H. C. Davidson, of New Orleans, La., favoring increase of postal rates on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various Spanish War veterans of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas Roulston, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the anticoupon bill, relative to 2-cent tax on coupons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of Frank S. Hartley, presiding officer, and 24 other members of the General Baptist Church at Oakland City, Ind., urging favorable action on House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various bankers of Maryland, favoring amendment of income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Investors' Financial Monitor, of New York, in favor of an investigation to determine if competent protective guidance concerning the protection of principal can be furnished; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, of New York City, protesting against Sunday labor for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the New England Association of the United States Department of Labor, of Boston, Mass., in favor of the Austin bill (H. R. 196) relative to retirement of employees in classified service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Woodlawn Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, relative to sending seeds through parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Farmers' Creamery Co., of Maltby, S. Dak., protesting against any tinkering with present parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKELLAR (by request): Petition of the Memphis (Tenn.) Theatrical Union and other citizens, relative to prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MOORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Maritime Exchange, favoring legislation that has in view the upbuilding of the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of Camp Robert C. Anderson, No. 26, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Clayton (N. Y.) Grange, No. 647, favoring passage of a rural farms credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the German-American Alliance of Ellinwood, Kans., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Garfield, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, against limiting the power of the Postmaster General in relation to the parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of the Major Frank Kerk Camp, No. 53, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various banks of Clyde, N. Y., favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of sundry citizens of Poughkeepsie and Arlington, N. Y., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petitions of 380 citizens of St. Paul and 70 citizens of North Branch, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition signed by members of District Lodge, No. 32, of International Association of Machinists, of St. Paul, Minn., urging the enactment of legislation exempting labor organizations from the operation of the antitrust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14488) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret Mars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of A. H. Nordlorn, G. D. Mantto, and George W. Dickerson, of Adairville, Ky., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: Petition of Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford and others, of Georgia, relative to preparing for signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Alliance, Ohio, against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and churches of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Advance Grange, No. 1882, of Mechanicsburg, Ohio, in favor of House bill 11897, providing for the establishment of a system of farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Rev. J. M. Prickett and 26 other citizens, of Findlay, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Federated Central Body, of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, against repeal of the exemption clause of the

Mr. DU PONT. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1575) authorizing the President to issue a commission as major of Cavalry in the name of John T. Haines, with rank to date from March 3, 1911, to report it adversely. I move that the bill be postponed indefinitely, as a Senate bill on the same subject has just been reported favorably by me from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1805) for the relief of Benjamin E. Jones, reported it with amendment and submitted a report (No. 343) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2334) for the relief of S. W. Langhorne and the legal representatives of H. S. Howell, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 344) thereon.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1063) for the relief of Philip Cook, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 345) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

S. 4031. A bill to correct the military record of William Miles; and

S. 4385. A bill to correct the military record of Henry Woodard.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9671) to appropriate $5,000 to erect a suitable monument on the battle grounds at the Horse Shoe, on the Tallapoosa River, in the State of Alabama, reported it without amendment.

### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as chairman of the commission appointed to investigate and study in European countries cooperative land-mortgage banks, cooperative rural credit unions, and similar organizations, I submit Part III of the report of the commission and ask to have the letter of transmittal read. It is very brief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the letter of transmittal.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 13, 1914.*

*To the Senate and the House of Representatives:*

We have the honor to submit herewith Part III of the report of the United States commission appointed by the President and authorized by an act approved March 4, 1913, "to investigate and study in European countries cooperative land-mortgage banks, cooperative rural credit unions, and similar organizations and institutions devoting their attention to the promotion of agriculture and the betterment of rural conditions" and "to submit a report to Congress as early as practicable embodying the results of its investigations and such recommendations as it may see fit to make."

Parts I and II, relating to land-mortgage or long-term credit, were submitted to Congress on January 29, 1914, and printed as Senate Document No. 380, Parts I and II, Sixty-third Congress.

Part III relates to personal or short-term credit.

Respectfully,

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, *Chairman.*
RALPH W. MOSS, *Vice Chairman.*
THOMAS P. GORE.
HARVIE JORDAN,
JOHN LEE COULTER, *Secretary.*
KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD.
CLARENCE J. OWENS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the letter of transmittal and the report be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

### THANKS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. PERKINS. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce to report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 217) to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno*, in the north Atlantic Ocean, and I submit a report (No. 336) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, extended to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for promptly going to the relief of the burning steamer *Volturno*, in the north Atlantic Ocean, on the 9th and 10th days of October, 1913, and heroically rescuing 89 people then on board said burning steamer.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized, empowered, and directed to cause to be purchased and presented to Capt. Paul H. Kreibohm, of the said steamer *Kroonland*, a suitable American-made solid gold dial watch and chain; and said Secretary is further authorized, empowered, and directed to cause to be made at the United States Mint 5 suitable gold, 5 silver, and 29 bronze medals, which watch and medals shall be appropriately inscribed to express the high admiration in which Congress holds the services of the captain, officers, and crew of the steamer *Kroonland*, and be presented to the officers and crew, to whose promptness, vigilance, bravery, and skill was due the rescue of 89 lives.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purchase of such watch and chain and for the purpose of purchasing the necessary materials for said medals, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the report of the committee may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report this day submitted by Mr. PERKINS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 336, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

EXTENDING THANKS OF CONGRESS TO CAPTAIN AND CREW OF STEAMER "KROONLAND."

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following report (to accompany H. J. Res. 217):

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res 217) to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno*, in the North Atlantic Ocean, having considered the same, report it without amendment with the recommendation that it pass.

The bill has the approval of the Department of Commerce, as will appear by the annexed report, with accompanying papers, together with a report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, which is annexed hereto and made a part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, December 27, 1913.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg respectfully to hand you herewith copy of letter from Arnon L. Squiers, a gentleman well known to me, dated December 24, 1913, together with copies of the inclosures referred to therein.

This department would be very glad if some official recognition can be given to the heroic action of the officers and crew of the American steamship *Kroonland*, and regards this as of especial importance in view of the statement made in the inclosed that the respective foreign Governments which were represented by the other ships engaged in the rescue of the passengers and crew of the *Volturno* have all taken some official action in honor of the services of their own seamen.

Recommending the suggestion herein, therefore, to your thoughtful attention, I am,

Yours, very truly,
WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
*Secretary.*

Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE,
*Chairman Committee on Commerce,*
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Kindly send to Hon. RUFUS HARDY, acting chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the inclosed clipping from the Brooklyn Eagle after you have examined it.

—

DECEMBER 24, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
*Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. REDFIELD: I wish to write you on a matter which is of great personal interest to me. As perhaps you know, I was a passenger on the steamship *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, at the time of the rescue of the passengers on board the *Volturno* on the 9th and 10th days of October last. Of 12 ships that were on the scene of this tragedy, the *Kroonland* was the only ship commanded by a citizen of the United States and flying the American flag. It is to the credit of the *Kroonland* that she rescued 89 souls from the *Volturno*, including Capt. Inch, of the *Volturno*, and a number of his officers and crew. I am advised on good authority that the respective governments represented by the various ships engaged in the rescue have all taken official notice and honored the captains, officers, and volunteer crew of the rescuing ship, with the single exception of the *Kroonland*.

After the event a testimonial was drawn to Capt. Kreibohm, of the *Kroonland*, signed by all the first-cabin passengers, testifying to his skillful seamanship and heroism, and to that of his officers and crew who volunteered to man the lifeboats.

I am inclosing herewith a copy of that testimonial, which also has attached the names of the volunteer officers and crew who manned the lifeboats.

I do not know what recognition the Government can take of these noble men, but if there is any appropriate recognition that the Government can give I am sure it would be greatly appreciated by all who witnessed this thrilling event, and I know would be greatly appreciated by the captain and officers and crew of the *Kroonland* who took part in this heroic rescue.

The passenger marine service of England, Russia, Germany, France, and Belgium were represented among the rescuing ships, and I am authoritatively informed that each one of these nations has taken official notice of the captains and volunteer officers and crew of the ships respectively. No ship played a more important part in this rescue than the *Kroonland*, and as I was a passenger on board and on behalf of the first-cabin passengers presented the testimonial (a copy of which I inclose) to Capt. Kreibohm, I am anxious that some recognition of these noble officers and men be taken by our Government if it be possible.

I inclose my personal account which I gave to the Brooklyn Eagle on the evening of our arrival in port.

With the season's best wishes, I am,

Respectfully, yours,

ARNON L. SQUIERS.

ON BOARD STEAMSHIP "KROONLAND."

We the undersigned first-cabin passengers on board Red Star liner *Kroonland*, bound from Antwerp to New York, do hereby certify:

That on the 9th day of October, 1913, about 10 a. m., Capt. Kreibohm, in command of the *Kroonland*, received a wireless message from steamship *Volturno* to the effect that the latter was on fire and required immediate assistance.

Capt. Kreibohm immediately responded to the call, and at full speed proceeded in search of the *Volturno*, which was reported more than 100 miles away.

The weather at this time was very bad and a heavy sea was running. The *Kroonland* reached the *Volurno* at about 5.30 p. m. of the same day and found three other steamers standing by, which had been unable to take off any passengers on account of the heavy sea.

At that time the *Volturno* was in flames from the smokestack to the bow. The steerage passengers on the *Volturno* were crowded in the afterpart of the vessel.

Immediately on reaching the scene Capt. Kreibohm ran his steamer close by and within hailing distance, to observe for himself the conditions. He caused lifeboat No. 1 to be lowered at the greatest possible risk. This boat returned in more than an hour, but was unable to get alongside the burning ship because of the dangerous sea, but did come within speaking distance of the captain of the *Volturno*.

After the return of the first lifeboat and about 9.30 p. m., the magazine on the *Volturno* was seen to explode and a rocket was sent up, showing that the *Volturno* was in the direst distress.

Capt. Kreibohm at once caused lifeboats Nos. 4 and 8 to be lowered in a desperate effort to effect rescue from the *Volturno*. These boats did not return for a period of three or four hours, but succeeded in saving 13, who jumped overboard from the *Volturno*, the boats being unable to get alongside. It being at that time in the early hours of the morning, and, by reason of the weather and sea, it was determined to suspend further efforts until daylight, it evidently being the judgment of Capt. Kreibohm that this could be done.

However, in the meantime the *Kroonland* stood close by until daylight, closely observing.

At daylight on the morning of the 10th Capt. Kreibohm caused lifeboats Nos. 4, 6, and 8 to be dispatched to the burning ship, and these boats between that hour and 9 a. m saved 76 persons from the *Volturno*, including the captain and a portion of the crew, the captain of the *Volturno* being the last person to leave the burning ship.

The meritorious action of the officers and crews of the lifeboats, who all volunteered, resulted in saving 89 lives from the burning vessel, and we trust due recognition and consideration will be given the matter and that these heroes will receive some reward from the hands of your society.

The skillful seamanship and noble act of Capt. Kreibohm, who was in command, will no doubt receive careful attention.

The following are the members of the crews of the boats above mentioned:

No. 1 boat: Fifth officer, Bernhard Anton Heinrich; first boatswain, Franz Reinhard Emil von Hymmen; first carpenter, John Ernest Tobmann; second carpenter, Joan Michailovitch Konstantinoff; quartermasters, Karl Freidrich August Meinjohannes and Emil Moritz Bohme; able-bodied seamen, Jack Roelands, Herman Karl Brand, Jakob Arens Fischer, Roman van Drom, Gerhard F. Borrenberg, Leon Coppens, Gustave Wilhelm Maron, and Ernest Richard Bennecke. Left at 8 p. m. and returned at 9.10 p. m.

No. 8 boat: Fifth officer, Bernhard Anton Heinrich Kummel; second boatswain, Anton Christian Pederson; first carpenter, John Ernest Tobmann; lookout man, Fred Becker; A. B., Louis Bateste Schreiwers; A. B., Ingolf Fritz Loode; fireman, Georg Hertzog; fireman, Gustav Ebeling; oiler, Franz Ouedmann; trimmer, Theodor Hubertus Timmermann. Left at 10 p. m. and returned at 1 a. m.

No. 4 boat: Senior second officer, Frederik Mansfield; first boatswain, Franz Reinhard Emil von Hymmen; quartermaster, Karl Friedrich August Meinjohannes; lookout man, Desire August Coopmann; lookout man, Heike Martin Peter Janssen; A. B., Erich Johann Weststrom, A. B., Peters Augustinus Stobbelner; Gustave Wilhelm, Gustave Wilhelm Maron; fireman, Alfons Josef Roll; trimmer, Heinrich Schaub. Left at 10.20 p. m. and returned at 12.20 a. m.

No. 4 boat: Senior second officer, Frederik Mansfield; fourth officer, Erik Hans Hirschfeld; quartermaster, Karl Friedrich August Meinjohannes; quartermaster, Emil Moritz Bohme; quartermaster, Jacob Rumberg; quartermaster, Charles Samuel Svenson; A. B., Gustave Wilhelm Maron; A. B., Ingolf Fritz Loode; A. B., Jack Roelands; A. B., Leon Coppens. Left at 5.55 a. m. and returned at 7.15 a. m. Left at 7.15 a. m. and returned at 9 a. m.

No. 8 boat: Fifth officer, Bernard Anton Heinrich Kummel; first carpenter, John Ernest Tobmann; second boatswain, Anton Christian Pedersen; A. B., Erich Johann Weststrom, Roman von Drom, Jakob Arens Fischer; barkeeper, Arthur George Ingram; storekeeper, Jack Hubert Fletcher; steward, Harry Ericus Josef Guelinchs. Left 5.50 a. m. and returned at 7.05 a. m.; left 7.25 a. m. and returned at 8.15 a. m.

No. 6 boat: Third officer, Guillaume Jean Frederic Wynen; first boatswain, Franz Reinhard Emil von Hymmen; lookouts, Heike Martin Peter Janssen, Fred Becker; A. B., Gerhard Franoisous Borrenberg, Peters Augustinus Stobbelaer, Louis Bateste Schreiwers, Ernest Richard Bennecke; engineer, Alexander Sandiland; steward, August Friedrich Reokangel. Left at 6.25 a. m. and returned at 7.15 a. m.; left at 7.45 a. m. and returned at 9 a. m.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, January 2, 1914.*

SIR: On the 27th ultimo I sent you a copy of a letter from Mr. Arnon L. Squiers, dated the 24th ultimo, in regard to the heroic action of the officers and crew of the American steamship *Kroonland*, with the suggestion that official action be taken in honor of the services of our own seamen. I now wish to submit also the statement of the master of the *Kroonland*, dated November 19, giving further details of the occurrence. I hope this statement will be placed with the papers which I sent you on Saturday.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
*Secretary.*

Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE,
*Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.*

VOYAGE BOUND ANTWERP ON NOVEMBER 6, 1913.

STEAMSHIP "KROONLAND,"
*November 19, 1913.*

The MANAGER RED STAR LINE.

DEAR SIR: On October 9, at 9.30 a. m., in latitude 47.44 north, longitude 36 west, we received a wireless call from the steamship *Carmania* to the effect that the steamship *Volturno* was in distress, ship being on fire and in extreme danger. The *Volturno's* position at that time was given as latitude 49.12, longitude 34.51 west. We immediately altered our course and steered for the position indicated, and on reaching there found the *Volturno* burning from bow to funnel. At the time of our arrival there were three other vessels standing by, viz, *Carmania*, *Grosser Kurfurst*, and *Sendlitz*. It was blowing a fierce gale from the north, with tremendous high and dangerous sea running. We steered as near to the *Volturno* as safety would permit, and noticed that two-thirds of the ship was burning like a furnace. The after part of the vessel was crowded with people, apparently emigrants, and it was evident that something had to be done without any delay to save those on board the burning vessel, as the situation was very critical. We endeavored to get a rope connection to the *Volturno* by means of the Lyle gun, but this proved to be impossible.

Under these circumstances I called for volunteers, and in spite of the fierce gale blowing and the dangerous, high sea running, my appeal met with a most hearty response, and every member of the crew, officers, engineers, sailors, and firemen, as well as waiters, stepped forward. At 8 p. m. No. 1 lifeboat, manned by the fifth officer, Mr. B. Kummel, and a volunteer crew of 10 men, was swung out and succeeded in getting close to the *Volturno*, but returned at about 10 p. m., after two hours' strenuous work, without having been able to save anybody, it being impossible to get alongside owing to the prevailing high sea, and none of those on the *Volturno* could be induced to jump and be saved. I might here mention that our boat was the first one of all the vessels standing by which managed to get near the *Volturno*. Shortly afterwards the same boat set out once more for the burning ship, and at the same time lifeboat No. 4, under the command of the senior second officer, Mr. F. Mansfield, and a volunteer crew, was launched. Both boats returned between 12.30 and 1 a. m., one with 3 survivors and the other with 10, all of whom had jumped from the *Voturno* into the sea and were picked up by the boats' crews and taken safely on board the *Kroonland*. Seeing that no others could be persuaded to jump, under these circumstances, I decided to wait a little while, but before the boats could be hoisted up under the davits a heavy sea struck lifeboat No. 1, completely smashing it to pieces, but fortunately none of the crew were hurt. At about 5 a. m we again maneuvered the *Kroonland* as near as possible to the *Volturno* and lowered three lifeboats, Nos. 4, 6, and 8, under command of Mr. Kummel, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Wignen, third officer. By this time the gale and heavy sea had moderated a little, and after several attempts we managed to get 88 people, all in all, on board. The boat in charge of Mr. Mansfield was the last one to leave the doomed vessel with the captain and part of the crew on board, and, knowing that every living soul had been taken off and having hoisted the lifeboats on board, we proceeded on our voyage.

All the survivors were disembarked safe and sound on our arrival at New York on the 16th of October.

In conclusion, I beg to say that the excellent work performed by the *Kroonland's* lifeboat in rescuing the passengers and crew of the *Volturno* is undoubtedly due to the fact that every member of the crew in all three—deck, engine, and steward's—departments are exercised in boat drill at every opportunity offered, in Antwerp as well as the harbor of New York, when the boats are lowered in the water, and the crew assigned to each boat have to pull about. The splendid work done on this occasion also proves that the firemen and waiters are not only as equally able as the best seamen to handle boats during stormy weather, with a high, dangerous sea running, as was the case on the night of October 9–10, but they likewise display great courage.

I am, dear sir,

Yours, very respectfully,

PAUL H. KREIBOHM, *Master.*

Lifeboat No. 1, commanded by Mr. Kummel, Bernhard, fifth officer, left the *Kroonland* at 8 p. m.,; returned at 9.10 p. m. on the 9th of October; rescued nobody.

The crew was composed of: Fifth officer, Kummel, Bernhard; boatswain, von Hymnen, Frank; first carpenter, Jobman, Ernst; second carpenter, Konstantinoff, John; quartermaster, Keinjohanns, Karl; quartermaster, Bohme, Emil; sailor, Roelants, Jacques; sailor, Brandt, Hermann; sailor, Fischer, Jakob; sailor, Van Drom, Armand; sailor, Borrenberg, Berard Franz; sailor, Coppens, Leon; sailor, Maron, Gustav; sailor, Esnecke, Ernst.

Lifeboat No. 8, commanded by Mr. Kummel, Bernhard, fifth officer, left the *Kroonland* at 10 p. m.; returned at 1 a. m. on the 10th of October; rescued 10 persons.

The crew was composed of: Fifth officer, Kummel, Bernhard; second boatswain, Pedersen, Anthon; first carpenter, Jobman, Ernst; lookout man, Becker, Frederick; sailor, Schryvers, Louis Fredegandus; sailor, Loode, Ingoff; oiler, Quednan, Franz; fireman, Herzog, Georg; fireman, Ebling, Gustav; trimmer, Timmermans, Theodor Hubert.

Lifeboat No. 4, commanded by Mr. Frederick Mansfield, second officer, senior, left the *Kroonland* at 10.20 p. m.; returned at 12.20 a. m.; rescued 3 persons.

The crew was composed of: Second officer, senior, Frederick Mansfield; first boatswain, Frank von Hymmen; quartermaster, Karl Meinjohanns; lookoutmen, Desire August Coopman and Keike Janssen; sailors, Johann Erik Wesstrom, Petrus Strobbelaar, and Gustav Maron; fireman, Alphone Roll; trimmer, Heinrich Schaub.

Lifeboat No. 4, commanded by Frederick Mansfield, second officer, senior, left the *Kroonland* at 5.55 a. m.; returned at 7 a. m. on the 10th of October; rescued 28 persons.

The crew was composed of: Second officer, senior, Frederick Mansfield; fourth officer, Erich Hirschfield; quartermasters, Karl Meinjohanns, Emil Bohme, Jakob Rumberg, and Charles Svenson; sailors, Gustav Maron, Ingolf Loode, Jaques Roelants, and Leon Coppens.

Lifeboat No. 4, commanded by Frederick Mansfield, second officer, senior, left again at 7.15 a. m. with the same crew; returned at 9 a. m.

Lifeboat No. 8, commanded by Mr Bernhard Kummel, fifth officer, left the *Kroonland* at 5.50 a. m., returned at 7.05 a. m., on the 10th of October; left again at 7.25 a. m. and returned at 8.15 a. m.; rescued 24 persons. The crew was composed of: Fifth officer, Bernhard Kummel; first carpenter, Ernst Jobman; second boatswain, Anthon Pedersen; sailors, Johann Erik Wesstrom, Armand Van Drom, and Jakob Fischer; barkeeper, Arthur Ingram; storekeeper, Hubert Jack Fletcher, and waiter, Henry Guelinck.

Lifeboat No. 6, commanded by Mr. Guilleaume Jean Wynen, third officer, left the *Kroonland* at 6.25 a. m., returned at 7.15 a. m.; left again at 7.45 a. m. and returned at 9 a. m.; rescued, altogether, 23 persons. The crew was composed of: Third officer, Guilleaume Jean Wynen; first boatswain, Frank von Hymmen; lookout men, Heike P. M. Janssen and Fred Beker; sailors, Gerard Frans Borrenberg, Petrus Stobbelsar, Louis Fredegandus Schryvers, Ernst Benecke, and Wilhelm Otto Muller; junior fourth engineer, Alexander Sandilands, and waiter, August Fried Reckzugel.

---

[House Report No. 283, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred House joint resolution 217, intending to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain and crew of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, for prompt and heroic services rendered by them in rescuing 89 persons from the burning steamer *Volturno* in the North Atlantic Ocean on the 9th and 10th days of October, 1913, having had the same under consideration, report thereon with recommendation that it be passed with the following amendment:

On the printed page 2 strike out the whole of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. That the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purchase of such watch and chain and for the purpose of purchasing the necessary materials for said medals, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The purpose of this resolution is to recognize, on behalf of the American Nation, the skillful and heroic services rendered by the captain, officers, and crew of the American steamship *Kroonland* on the 9th and 10th of October last, in rescuing 89 people from the burning steamer *Volturno*. That tragic occurrence is fresh in the minds of the American people, and we do not consider it necessary in this report to recite the details in full. A similar resolution of thanks was passed by Congress shortly after the *Titanic* disaster in 1912. There is, however, this difference between the two resolutions: The resolution relating to the *Titanic* disaster conveyed the thanks of Congress to Capt. Arthur Henry Rostron of the steamship *Carpathia* by name, and thereby conferred upon him the privilege of the floor of the Houses of Congress. Your committee considers it unwise to grant this great privilege too frequently, thereby lessening the high appreciation in which such a privilege should be held. This resolution extends the thanks of Congress to the captain of the *Kroonland* by title and not by name, and does not confer upon him the high privilege of the floor of the Houses of Congress.

The resolution provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall purchase and present to Capt. Paul H. Kreibohm, of the steamship *Kroonland*, a suitable American-made, solid gold-dial watch and chain, the estimated cost of which is placed at $250. There were actually engaged in the work of rescuing 5 officers, 5 petty officers, and 29 of the crew, the names of whom have been certified to the Secretary of Commerce. It is proposed to have made at the United States Mint 5 suitable gold medals, properly inscribed, for presentation to the officers, and 5 additional silver medals for the petty officers, and 29 bronze medals for the members of the crew, all suitably inscribed. The cost of the gold medals is estimated by Mr. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, at $80 each, and the silver medals at $5 each. The cost of the bronze medals is estimated at $2 each. All medals are to be suitably inscribed, and as some of the officers and crews made more than one trip in the work of rescuing, the medal of each officer and member of the crew will show by the number of bars across the face of it the number of such trips made by such officer or member of the crew. The total cost of the gold medals will be about $400, of the silver medals $25, and the bronze medals $58, making the total for material $483; and it is further intended that leather and plush cases shall be provided for the medals at a total cost of about $50.

By having the medals made at the United States Mint, Congress saves the expense of manufacturing the same and pays only for the material. This provision was inserted at the suggestion of Mr. Roberts, Director of the Mint.

LOAN OF TENTS.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in May, 1914, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It authorizes the Secretary of War to loan, at his discretion, to the equipment committee of the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in the month of May, 1914, such tents, with necessary poles, ridges, pins, and cots, as may be required at said reunion; and that no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered to the committee designated at such time prior to the holding of the reunion as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and H. L. Covington, jr., general chairman of said equipment committee; and that the Secretary of War shall, before delivering such property, take from said H. L. Covington, jr., a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of the property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS EDER.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 4714) to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws, and I submit a report (No. 337) thereon.

Mr. WARREN. This is a very short bill, regarding a local matter, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes Louis Eder, of Laramie County, Wyo., to enter and secure title under the homestead laws of the United States to 160 acres of unappropriated public lands in lieu of the north half of north half of section 28, township 14 north, range 70 west, of sixth principal meridian, relinquished by him to the Government for inclusion in the withdrawal of lands for the protection of the water supply of a military post, and no charge shall be made for making the entry of record to cover the tract selected; and that the requirements of the laws respecting settlement, residence, improvements, etc., are complied with on the new claim, credit being allowed for the time spent on the relinquished claim.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCY B. KASSON.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 297. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to the resolution.

Mr. BURTON. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lucy B. Kasson, widow of H. A. Kasson, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, the said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back Senate resolution 299.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and that said stenographer be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate resolution 292.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, from time to time as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and that said stenographer be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SHIVELY. In the same connection, I submit a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 302), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to hold hearings upon any bill or matter pending before said committee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate; and that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Does it not involve an expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate? It ought to go first to the committee.

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes; it would probably involve some expense in sending for witnesses.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the law it should go to the committee.

Mr. SHIVELY. I have no objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I caught the reading of the resolution, it simply provides that the committee may sit while the Senate is in session.

Mr. SMOOT. And they are to send for persons and papers, and that, of course, would involve expense.

Mr. SHIVELY. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it does go further than merely to authorize the committee to sit during the sessions of the Senate. It authorizes the committee to send for persons and papers for the purpose of taking

testimony. I am satisfied that under the statute it must first go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I caught rather imperfectly the reading of the resolution which was just passed, which provides for the employment of a stenographer for the committee. Does that resolution provide that the stenographer shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does. The Chair is of the opinion that the resolution of the Senator from Indiana could have been made an amendment to Senate resolution 292, and if there is no objection it will be treated as an amendment to that resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think that can be done. In the first place, the original resolution has been passed by the Senate. That resolution provides for a stenographer, to be paid as compensation not to exceed $1 per printed page. In the second place, nothing can be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, by amendment or otherwise, unless the matter has first been considered by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

### NAVIGATION IN BUZZARDS BAY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4235) to mark the approaches to the Cape Cod Canal and Buzzards Bay and Barnstable Bay, and I submit a report (No. 338) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make such changes in and additions to the existing lights and marks for the aid of navigation in Buzzards Bay, between Wings Neck Light and the mouth of the Monument River, as shall be necessary for the safety of vessels navigating that part of Buzzards Bay under the changed conditions caused by the construction of the Cape Cod Canal and the dredging of new channels incident thereto, and that the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and required to change the lights in Barnstable Bay to conform to the requirements of navigation in approaching and leaving the eastern end of the Cape Cod Canal.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4882) to erect a monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4883) for the relief of Milton C. Conners and George G. Conners, doing business under the firm name of Conners Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4884) granting an increase of pension to William Wallace, 2d; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 4885) granting a pension to Philip H. Chambers (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4886) to place the name of Capt. Henry S. Howe upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; and

A bill (S. 4887) to place the name of Capt. Addison L. Ewing upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 4888) granting a pension to James T. Fitzgerald (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4889) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Samuel N. Pryor, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4890) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Wesley W. Wallace, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4891) to provide for the purchase and equipment of a mine-rescue car, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 4892) granting an increase of pension to Julia Taylor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4893) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 4894) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4895) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification for cotton; to provide for the application, enforcement, and use of such standards in transactions in interstate and foreign commerce; to prevent deception therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### AMENDMENTS TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted an amendment providing that all wagon transportation from the point where delivery is made by the last common carrier to the Indian agency, school, or elsewhere, shall hereafter be made from the funds appropriated or otherwise available for the support of the school, agency, or other project for which the supplies to be transported are to be purchased, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $68,800 for the support and education of 400 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### INTERSTATE TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4160) to create an interstate trade commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

### COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

*Ordered*, That Mr. LIPPITT be appointed a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining and of the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department;

That Mr. GALLINGER be appointed a member of the Committee on Manufactures;

That Mr. DU PONT be appointed a member of the Committee on Railroads; and

That Mr. BRANDEGEE be appointed a member of the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

### FEDERAL ANTITRUST DECISIONS.

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the Senate* (the *House of Representatives concurring*), That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of the Federal antitrust decisions, 1911 to 1914, to be compiled by the direction of the Department of Justice, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

### SWISS SCHOOL SYSTEM.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 306), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That Bulletin No. 56 of the United States Bureau of Education, entitled "Some Suggestive Features of the Swiss School System," be printed as a Senate document, and that 5,700 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

### PAYMENT UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday, March 18, upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall move to take up Senate bill 4628, Calendar No. 261, being a bill extending the period for payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

### POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITORIES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9318.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 9318) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes."

Mr. BRISTOW. Am I to understand the Senator from New Jersey has asked for the immediate consideration of this bill?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have.

Mr. BRISTOW. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7967) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a postal savings system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

### W. H. PRAY.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the morning business is closed I desire to call attention to Senate resolution 182, directing the Postmaster General to transmit to the Senate all papers, and so forth, relating to the removal of W. H. Pray as postmaster at Valley City, N. Dak., which is still on the calendar. I note that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is anxious to go on with and to complete the District appropriation bill in his charge. The resolution which I desire to have passed seeks to secure certain data from the Post Office Department for hearing before the Post Office Committee. A certain nomination has been reported twice to the Senate, and I have had it recommitted to the committee because I myself desire a hearing before that committee in connection with those papers. I do not wish to take up any time now, for I know the Senator from Maryland is anxious to go on, but I wish those who have charge of post-office matters in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the chairman of that committee not being present, shall note that I desire to have that hearing upon those papers before that name is again reported to the Senate, so that I may have an opportunity to be heard. If I delay pressing the matter now in order that the appropriation bill may be considered, I do not wish it charged up to me that I am delaying the consideration of action upon the matter to which I refer. With that understanding I shall not call up the resolution at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10523, being the District appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, on page 85, after line 16, to insert:

> For the preparation of plans and specifications, necessary grading of site, and for the erection of hospital buildings, including power house and domestic-service building, for municipal purposes, to be located and erected on the site now owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, and hereafter to be known as Gallinger Hospital, with authority to contract for the completion of said buildings at a total cost not to exceed $300,000, which amount is hereby appropriated and made immediately available.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the amendment reported by the committee, on page 85, proposes to appropriate the sum of $300,000 for the erection of a hospital building for municipal purposes, to be erected upon a site now owned by the District of Columbia. The reasons which have been assigned for the action of the committee are to the effect that this is a necessary structure, made essential because of the unsatisfactory and insanitary conditions of the hospital, or hospital building so called, which is now used to serve the purpose for which this new building is designed, and that the conditions of the diseased and the helpless are such as to require this appropriation.

Mr. President, I have heretofore adverted to the fact that these conditions may be, and doubtless are, as unsatisfactory as has been here stated two or three times. They are, nevertheless, conditions which are not new to the District, but seem to have prevailed for a considerable length of time. My experience—and I think I can say the experience in common of all of us—is that such conditions depend not so much upon the character of the structure in which they exist as upon the nature of the management which has characterized the conduct of the institution. A good housekeeper can make a hovel very comfortable, while a poor one can make a palace repulsive; and I have no doubt that the conditions which are so eloquently portrayed here are more largely than anything else the result of mismanagement or lack of management or careless management. But, Mr. President, I am convinced that, whether or not that be so, there is no immediate necessity for this very large appropriation.

I am not at all sanguine that anything I shall say will change the course of this body with reference to this appropriation. Certainly, I have had but very little influence so far and have produced but very little effect in making objection to some of the appropriations contained in this bill, but I want, Mr. President, to record my objections, which I think are intelligent ones even though not convincing, to this very large appropriation which will be added to this bill.

In the first place, I find by referring to page 68 of the estimates of the commissioners that only $60,000 was requested for this hospital. The amount of the appropriation therefore is five times the amount of that estimate. A reference is made to the subject on page 219 of the statements before the Senate committee by Mr. Wilson, who said:

> Mr. Chairman, the next item omitted was on page 68, between lines 10 and 11, which was an estimate of $60,000 for the preparation of plans and specifications, necessary grading of site, etc., for beginning the work for hospital buildings on the hospital site at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets. That is an item concerning which you have already heard Dr. Kober at length, and I presume you do not want me to discuss it. I would only like to say this, that, regardless of what the future general hospital policy might be, I hope in some way in the very near future that improved accommodations will be available for our people down at the Washington Asylum Hospital. The estimate here submitted, $60,000, with authority to contract for an expenditure of not to exceed $300,000, could not possibly anticipate any numbers beyond those now needing care and not cared for in other institutions, and of course the future policy as to buildings and maintenance is in the hands of the Congress entirely.

We start out, therefore, Mr. President, with the initial appropriation——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. We start out, therefore, with the initial appropriation for this purpose of $300,000, or five times the amount which is estimated as required at the present time by the commissioners. I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is not strange the Senator should be perhaps misled by what he has read. The facts are that they have been demanding a municipal hospital to cost $3,000,000 instead of $300,000, and the appropriation of money for plans referred to, and so forth, in the paragraph of the report just read was intended to lead to a total appropriation of that amount in time. In the present case it is intended to build this hospital complete for $300,000, so that it is possible to effect a saving between hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars. All that has preceded this in past years regarding a municipal hospital is well understood by those who have worked on the committee, and the Senator is wrong in concluding that this appropriation is in the nature of a larger final expenditure, when, as a matter of fact, it is for a smaller ultimate expenditure.

Mr. THOMAS. I now yield to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that he will see, if he will notice the provision, that the hospital is authorized at a cost not to exceed $300,000, which was the amount asked for, but only $60,000 of that amount is appropriated.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not draw the conclusion the Senator does from the language of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, I will read the amendment. It is as follows:

> For the preparation of plans and specifications, necessary grading of site, and for the erection of hospital buildings, including power house and domestic-service building, for municipal purposes, to be located and erected on the site now owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, and hereafter to be known as Gallinger Hospital, with authority to contract for the completion of said buildings at a total cost not to exceed $300,000.

Mr. THOMAS. But the amendment provides that $300,000 is "hereby appropriated and made immediately available."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. It is $300,000.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is so; but that does not represent the amount that was requested for the building of this hospital.

Mr. THOMAS. If I thought that this building or this improvement—because I presume it comprises more than one structure—would be confined to an ultimate cost of $300,000, I should feel a good deal better about it; but I am reminded that in a hearing before the committee on the 12th day of February, 1914, attention was called to the fact that there exists upon the premises where the Washington Asylum Hospital is now located an uncompleted workhouse structure

which, when completed, it is estimated will cost close to $700,000. The construction of this building at that price was in violation of an express provision of the act of Congress limiting its cost to $150,000. I will read the statement of Mr. Curriden concerning this subject before the committee on the date previously mentioned. Upon inquiry by the chairman of the committee Mr. Curriden went into the particulars, which are found in the statement to the committee. Among other things there is quoted a proviso having reference to this structure, which is an amendment offered by former Senator Cockrell, of Missouri, at the time the appropriation was made, which I will read:

*Provided*, That the total cost of the building shall not exceed $150,000, including the $100,000 heretofore appropriated; and said commissioners are hereby authorized, in their discretion, to expend for temporary frame structures to meet present institutional needs not exceeding $20,000 of the sum heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

That is the language of the proviso, but Mr. Curriden continues:

Our association, as well as myself, rested in the belief that this clause subsequently enacted into law would settle the business. In the meantime plans for this ambitious structure, to cost between $600,000 and $700,000, were being discussed in the papers, and pictures of it were printed in architectural and other professional papers.

But in spite of the above prohibition, the powers in charge of the construction used nearly all of the $150,000 in expensive plans and in the erection of but one wing, a small portion only of the building costing in the end sums vastly in excess of half a million dollars, and this for a permanent construction and a permanent occupation of Reservation No. 13 in complete violation of Senator Allison's understanding of the desire of the Senate.

Some of us have been criticized for making objections to appropriations for the District of Columbia; but if any justification were needed for it, that justification is found in incidents like this. It appears from the testimony that plans have been heretofore prepared for a hospital which may be used for this purpose. Reference has been made by the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that a $2,000,000 structure has been contemplated heretofore for this hospital. Those plans doubtless referred to that contemplated institution.

Mr. WARREN. It was a matter of $3,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Three million dollars?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, that appropriation was made for a combination of hospitals, and not for a municipal hospital.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but I wish to record here and now the prediction that if this appropriation is made the purpose for which it is appropriated, the final cost of which by this bill is expressly limited to $300,000, will be five times that sum.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. On this very site, occupying a small part of it, is a tuberculosis hospital, for which we appropriated $100,000, and it was built absolutely for that amount. It did not cost a dollar over the amount.

I think the Senator is right in calling attention to an abuse that occurred a good many years ago; but my observation has been that as a rule where there is a provision that these appropriations shall not exceed a certain amount, they do not exceed it in the District of Columbia. That is the case as a rule.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's experience concerning this subject is, of course, superior to mine; but when I find an instance of this kind it is so familiar and so much like similar appropriations for buildings in some of the States that I am inclined to think human nature is the same all the world over. I am very glad the Senator has interrupted to record the fact that in the matter of the tuberculosis hospital the appropriation has not been exceeded.

I stated, however, some time ago that my opposition was largely based upon the fact that I thought this appropriation was unnecessary. My information is that the city of Washington has many hospitals, ample to take care of all indigent cases, and that only a small outlay in the way of an addition to the present almshouse hospital would amply provide for future needs, if at all.

I have been furnished with a list of the following hospitals, showing the number of free beds which each contains, together with the number of free beds now unoccupied. The date of this statistical statement is the 12th day of March, 1914:

Garfield Hospital has a free-bed capacity of 270 beds. Free beds empty, 124.

Providence Hospital, free-bed capacity, 100; free beds empty, 7.

Georgetown University Hospital, free-bed capacity, 98; free beds empty, 43.

George Washington University Hospital, free-bed capacity, 45; free beds empty, 10.

Columbia Hospital for Women, free-bed capacity, 104; free beds empty, 23.

The Tuberculosis Hospital, free-bed capacity, 120; free beds empty, 10.

Hospital, Home for the Aged, the Almshouse, free-bed capacity, 25; free beds empty, 15.

The Freedman's Federal Hospital for Colored People, free-bed capacity, 240; free beds empty, 29.

This hospital has one entire ward vacant in addition to the above vacant beds, which, if provided with 10 more nurses and 1 maid, would add 26 more vacant beds, bringing the total empty-bed capacity of this hospital up to 55.

The total free-bed capacity of the hospitals of the District of Columbia, excluding the Sibley Hospital, the Children's Hospital, the Episcopal Eye and Ear Hospital, the Naval Hospital, the Walter Reed Army Hospital, the Soldiers' Home, and other private hospitals, is 1,002 beds; vacant beds, 261.

From the above it is clearly shown that by the use of existing institutions which have contractual relationship with the District government all present needs could be met, and with a slight appropriation for a building at Blue Plains, where the Municipal Almshouse is located, to cost not more than $25,000, all the objectionable chronic cases of the future years could be accommodated.

The deplorable condition of the Washington Asylum Hospital necessarily reflects bad management that must have prevailed there for some years past to justify the open public criticism that has been made against it.

Mr. President, assuming this statement to be true—and I have no reason to doubt it—it appears that the free-bed capacity at present for indigent cases in these institutions which have contractual relations with the Government is more than 25 per cent in excess of the demand.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how these hospitals are now maintained. Are they maintained under the half-and-half plan?

Mr. THOMAS. As to that I must refer the Senator to the committee. My impression is that they are maintained in part, at least, by appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And very largely by contributions from different people in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. I think there are appropriations in this bill to most of the hospitals.

Mr. THOMAS. There are appropriations for some of them in this bill, but whether for all or not I can not state offhand.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The efforts of the people here to maintain hospitals are supplemented by the Government to a certain extent.

Mr. KENYON. Are certain hospitals maintained by different church organizations?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; I do not think so. They are maintained by different charitable organizations and by contributions from various people throughout the city, and possibly people residing elsewhere.

Mr. GALLINGER. The question can be easily answered. We make appropriations, not of very large amounts, to the Garfield Hospital, Providence Hospital, George Washington Hospital, Georgetown University Hospital, National Homeopathic Hospital, and possibly others, and they earn it in this way: The appropriation is in the hands of the Board of Charities. They pay those hospitals an average of about $1 per day for taking care of each destitute patient.

Mr. SMOOT. For all expenses?

Mr. GALLINGER. For all expenses; and in some cases they do not exhaust the entire appropriation and it goes back into the Treasury. It depends upon the number of patients that are sent. If we should take the 300 patients that we hope to provide for in this hospital—there will not be that number at first, of course—and pay $1 a day to these hospitals for caring for them, and they charge a little more than that in some cases, it would amount to $109,500 a year.

Mr. KENYON. For all the hospitals?

Mr. GALLINGER. For all the hospitals. We have one Government hospital, the Columbia Hospital for Women. That is on Government land and is owned by the Government.

Mr. WARREN. Of course the Army and Navy hospitals are for persons belonging to the Army and Navy. As I understand, we did not build these other hospitals enumerated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. WARREN. We simply provide in them for the care of our people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course we could not invade the Army and Navy hospitals, anyway. The Walter Reed Hospital, which is a military hospital, we could not invade. The Senator will observe in his list there some hospitals, such as the Soldiers' Home Hospital, that in the very nature of things we could not invade.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Government contribute anything toward the sectarian hospitals?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; not as a rule, unless the Providence Hospital should be called a sectarian hospital. It is under the auspices of the Catholic Church, and is a very ably managed hospital. We do make an appropriation, I think, of $19,000 a year, and that is dispensed through the War Department, as I recall; and they take patients at $1 or $1.10 or $1.20 a day, I am not sure which.

Mr. KENYON. The hospital earns it, as I understand the Senator, under this arrangement?

Mr. GALLINGER. Every hospital earns every dollar that is appropriated by Congress in that way. Through the Board of Charities the patients are sent to the hospitals, and the hospitals are paid $1 or $1.10 a day, and I think in the case of the Children's Hospital 60 cents a day, for caring for the indigent patients, until the amount is exhausted. That is the modus.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know who furnished the figures the Senator has read in relation to the empty beds, but the Senator must know that it is absolutely impossible for any hospital anywhere to have full beds at all times. No one builds a hospital without at least having room for 10 to 15 per cent more patients than the number they estimate that they will treat. That is the case in Washington. I believe if the Senator really knew the number of public patients that are treated in these private hospitals and paid for as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire the question of empty beds never would be taken into consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I ought to have added, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. That when this appropriation for any given hospital is exhausted by the payment of $1 a day the hospitals care for these indigent patients at their own expense, and a very considerable amount is contributed by them in that way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is quite obvious, of course, that such hospitals as the Army and Navy Hospital are not open to the general public, but it is equally obvious that the cases for which they care do not have to be provided for by a general hospital. In other words, the fact that they are confined to a certain class of the community minimizes to that extent the necessity for general hospital provisions.

It is quite true, of course, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, that the capacity of a hospital should be somewhat in excess of the demands made upon it, but where a general showing is made that the free-bed capacity—and that is what I am emphasizing—is 25 per cent and more in excess of the demands made upon it, to my mind it is a controlling reason why this particular appropriation of $300,000 should not be made at this time.

Mr. President, I now approach another phase of this amendment with much reluctance. It is not at all pleasant to refer to it, because one's purposes are sometimes open to possible misconstruction. I wish to say in advance that I am actuated by no sinister or personal motives whatever in what I shall say about the matter, and I should express the same sentiments if the name of any other Senator were connected with a great appropriation made by the Senate of the United States. I refer to the fact that it is the purpose of this amendment to christen this building by the name of one of the honored Members of this body.

I am not aware that in the past any such precedent has been set by either House of Congress. My judgment is that it is in bad taste, that it is ill-advised, that it is inappropriate, and that it will result in the establishment of a precedent that may be subject to frequent abuse.

There are plenty of excuses now for making appropriations without adding to them the desire for permanent distinction as applied to Members of the body making the appropriation. I think, therefore, this amendment is objectionable, among other things, for that reason, as any other appropriation of a similar character, attaching to it the name of any living Senator, would be equally objectionable.

If this were an amendment providing for the Ashurst asylum, or for the Smoot sanitarium, or for the Brandegee boulevard, or any other object coupled with the name of a Member of this body, I think that fact should condemn it, although not because of the motive which lies behind it, albeit of the loftiest character and designed to recognize long and continuous and arduous and honorable service. My contention is that we can not afford to begin this method of appropriation.

I trust, therefore, for the reasons I have assigned, that the Senate will refuse to adopt the amendment which I have criticized.

Mr. WARREN obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to enable me to ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator how many free beds, in the aggregate, there are? I did not get that. Has the Senator summed up the figures?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. There is a total capacity of 1,002 free beds. There are 261 vacant beds.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as I remarked when interrupting the Senator a few moments ago, this appropriation, in my judgment, would tend to economy rather than to extra expense, because there has been a plan which has been followed up here, in which it has been sought to induce the committee time and again, year after year, to build a great municipal hospital. This provision for a hospital is much like the provisions we have made in the case of the Army and Navy in the way of manufacturing part of our own arms and material and seeing whether we could manufacture it all, if necessary. The idea is to depend partially upon these privately owned hospitals, and also to depend partially upon one which is owned entirely by the municipality.

I believe that in civil life, as in military life, the place to begin is with the sick, the wounded, and the destitute, to progress toward a higher civilization and humanity; and I think the present appropriation, instead of being excessive, is exceedingly moderate.

As to the name, I am very sorry to have heard the Senator from Colorado make the slightest objection. The committee, of course, was not influenced by the Senator for whom it is named. The hospital naturally would have some name. Other hospitals and other institutions have been named for Senators.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to inquire what hospitals or other institutions have been named for Senators in service at the time of making the appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator will remember that there was a hospital named after a Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. While he was a United States Senator?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very sorry that there ever was such a precedent established in this body.

Mr. WARREN. The Garfield Hospital, while it may not have been named for Senator Garfield, bears the name of an honored Member of Congress and Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Was not that name conferred upon the hospital after the death of President Garfield?

Mr. WARREN. I assume it might have been.

Mr. THOMAS. Was it not?

Mr. WARREN. But there are those who believe that no man should receive honor until after he is dead, and I am sorry the Senator from Colorado is liable to be termed one of those.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not one of those, Mr. President. On the contrary, I believe in honoring the living; but I do not believe in coupling that honor with an appropriation made by the body of which he is a member.

If the Senator will yield for a moment longer, the truth is that our motives may be, and justly so, misconstrued, and it may be thought that we are not inspired so much by the necessity of the appropriation as by the desire of conferring distinction in matters of this kind.

Mr. WARREN. That suspicion, in my judgment, is too trivial to be given attention here or anywhere else.

Mr. THOMAS. In that particular the Senator and I differ.

Mr. WARREN. It does not enter into the case here, as everyone knows.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield to me for a moment. This matter was agreed to by the committee before there was any thought whatever of naming it for the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. It was never spoken of, and the naming had nothing whatever to do with the appropriation. It was not understood that his name should be con-

nected with it, because it was not spoken of until after the appropriation had been agreed upon.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not so charged, and I do not intend to so charge, even indirectly. Neither do I wish it to be inferred from what I have said that the Senator whose name is connected with it was at all instrumental in the matter. I am endeavoring to criticize what seems to me to be the establishment of what may become a bad and undesirable precedent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have too much confidence in the American public, in the judgment and good sense of the people, to believe that when an appropriation is made and a hospital built and a name is sought they will cavil at a name which represents one in this body who has served more days and weeks and months than any other Senator in the body; who came to this body before any other Senator now a Member came here, except one, and whose service has been continuous and longer than that of any other in this body, and, besides, served most honorably through two Congresses in the House of Representatives. No man could have been more conscientious, more attentive, more continuous in his service, which has been arduous, because he has been a member of hard-working committees of the Senate—the Committee on the District of Columbia for over 20 years, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Finance, and other active committees—and he has always been found faithful, resourceful, and efficient.

We should have to search long, indeed, in my judgment, for a name that could be more happily bestowed than that of Gallinger upon this hospital. And it must have a name.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator let me complete my sentence? Here is the great Army hospital that bears the name of an individual. Other individuals in many cases have had their names bestowed upon public institutions.

Mr. President, I am not going to occupy any further time to portray the absolute fitness of this proposition as it appears in my mind, and I believe it will be so considered by the general public and by considerate people. It has no relation whatever to the necessities for this hospital; it has no reference whatever to the intent on the part of the committee to recommend to Congress the establishment of the hospital; but it happens that in naming it we are able to do honor to a much-loved and greatly respected man who yet lives instead of honoring the dead.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I fully agree that in point of service and standing the Senator from New Hampshire is all that has been claimed for him, but if that be an argument in favor of this action, then it must follow that when the Senator from Wyoming is the senior Senator in point of service we should make another appropriation for some other institution and christen it with his name.

Mr. WARREN. I am glad to be apprized of the Senator's real motive.

Mr. THOMAS. And then we would have to do the same with each successive Senator in point of seniority. It leads up to what I felt it to be my duty to criticize the item for, to the establishment of a precedent that may ripen into a custom and disfigure the appropriations of the future.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word in reply to what the Senator from Colorado said.

I do not believe that this case would be a precedent that would be followed in the future. I hardly think that there will ever be a Senator in the future serve so many years on the District Committee as Senator GALLINGER has served. The particular line of work during his service has been such as to suggest that a hospital established in the District of Columbia by an appropriation from the Government should bear the Senator's name.

Senator GALLINGER has been a member of the District Committee during his entire service in this body. I believe, Senators, that there is no Senator in the history of this country who has served and given the detailed attention to affairs of the District of Columbia as has the Senator from New Hampshire.

The Senator from New Hampshire, before he was a Senator, was a physician, and particularly has his work benefited institutions in the District of that character. I can not for the life of me see what objection there could be to naming this hospital "The Gallinger Hospital." I do not believe that any serious effect would ever come from it, and I do not believe that the public generally would ever think for a minute that the appropriation was influenced because of the name that was given to the institution.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, several days ago, in going over this bill, I for the first time discovered that it had been proposed to give the name of the municipal hospital to this honored Senator. I confess I was very much gratified to feel that the committee proposed to pay him this compliment. It has been my pleasure to serve for several years on the District Committee with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and I know that he has labored in season and out of season for what he believed to be for the good of this District. I have not always agreed with him, but I have never questioned his honesty, integrity, or good faith.

We are year after year spending money to erect statues to the memory of those who have rendered distinguished service both in military and civil life. This hospital, I understand, is a necessity to this, the Capital city. We are not making the expenditure for the purpose of doing honor to a Member. We are simply christening it for the purpose of doing honor to this Member from the great State of New Hampshire. I shall vote for this provision cheerfully and feeling that I am helping to bestow an honor where it is well deserved.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have had the honor to serve upon the Committee on the District of Columbia most of the time since I have been here, under the chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire. I have learned to respect him very highly, and I know that he has done conscientious and earnest work on behalf of the District of Columbia and the whole country.

I do hope that the Senators will be broad-minded enough to recognize his great services, particularly in that committee. I hope—I feel I may say I am sure—that all the members of that committee, both Democrats and Republicans, would be glad to see this honor bestowed upon him, if there is any honor in having a hospital named after one. I shall be greatly disappointed if the Senate, now that this matter has gone so far as it has, should deny the Senator from New Hampshire that honor.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is proper, Mr. President, that I should say just a word. I did not intend to be in the Chamber when this item was discussed, but I was invited in.

It is absolutely immaterial to me what the Senate does about this matter. I have had nothing to do with it whatever. It never occurred to me that my name might be attached to this institution of benevolence and good work, but others saw fit to do it.

Mr. President, whatever happens to the amendment providing for this new hospital, the kindness of the committee and the generous words spoken two days ago by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] concerning me personally will be a sufficient recompense to me for any work that I have done for my State, for the District of Columbia, and for the country in general during the 23 years that I have been in this body.

For 22 years I served upon the Committee of the District of Columbia, and for about 12 years as its chairman; and the only criticism that has ever been made against me that had any potency was a criticism on the part of some people of my own State that I was giving too much of my time and efforts to building up the National Capital.

I have some monuments in Washington already that I can point to with some degree of satisfaction, because I have been instrumental in a degree in bringing about certain great improvements; and as I am not an exploiter or a man seeking personal honor or emoluments, I have already received from the Committee on Appropriations, concurred in largely, as I understand, by the Committee on the District of Columbia, a sufficient reward for any service that I have rendered this great Capital, the State I in part represent, or the country of which I am proud.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I feel that I have already expressed my opinion in regard to this matter in the previous remarks made by me, but I want to say a word in reference to the remark made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] that in future it might be that we would want to make appropriations for the purpose of giving the name of some person to an institution. I will merely direct the attention of the Senator to the fact that this appropriation was agreed to by the committee without any idea of giving it the name of any man, and that the Senator from New Hampshire knew nothing about it whatever until it was agreed upon by the committee and we determined to give it the name. Afterwards, personally, I went to him and asked him if it would be acceptable to him if the institution should be called for him. He knew nothing of it whatever, he had never heard of it, and the committee had never thought of doing it until after the appropriation had been agreed upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Chamber by illness. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], and for that reason and a personal reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GORE (when Mr. NEWLANDS's name was called). I was requested to announce a pair between the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably detained by sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the city on important business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I had not been notified of the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] when I voted. I therefore withdraw my vote.

I take this occasion to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE], on account of sickness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], but I am informed that, if present, he would vote as I shall vote on this question. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I am informed that, if present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], but I am advised that, if present, he would vote on this question as I shall. I therefore consider myself released from the pair, and I vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], but as I am informed, if he were present, he would vote as I shall vote on this question, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] having returned to the Chamber and voted, I now transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. WEST], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WALSH. I am generally paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I am advised, however, that, if he were present, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote on this question as I shall vote. Accordingly I vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRADLEY (after having voted in the affirmative). I see that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], with whom I am paired, has not voted. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLAPP. I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. Not knowing how he would vote, if present, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BRADLEY. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I find that I can transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and vote, which I shall do. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—53.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bradley | Hughes | Page | Sutherland |
| Brady | James | Perkins | Swanson |
| Brandegee | Johnson | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Bristow | Jones | Ransdell | Thornton |
| Bryan | Lane | Robinson | Tillman |
| Burton | Lea, Tenn. | Saulsbury | Townsend |
| Catron | Lee, Md. | Shields | Walsh |
| Chamberlain | Lewis | Shively | Warren |
| Clark, Wyo. | McCumber | Smith, Ariz. | Weeks |
| Dillingham | Martin, Va. | Smith, Md. | Williams |
| du Pont | Martine, N. J. | Smith, S. C. | Works |
| Fall | Nelson | Smoot | |
| Gore | Overman | Stephenson | |
| Hitchcock | Owen | Sterling | |

NAYS—8.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | Norris | Shafroth | Thomas |
| La Follette | Poindexter | Sheppard | Vardaman |

NOT VOTING—34.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Cummins | Lodge | Root |
| Bankhead | Fletcher | McLean | Sherman |
| Burleigh | Gallinger | Myers | Simmons |
| Chilton | Goff | Newlands | Smith, Ga. |
| Clapp | Gronna | O'Gorman | Smith, Mich. |
| Clarke, Ark. | Hollis | Oliver | Stone |
| Colt | Kenyon | Penrose | West |
| Crawford | Kern | Pittman | |
| Culberson | Lippitt | Reed | |

So the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Child-caring institutions," on page 86, after the word "expenses," at the end of line 5, to strike out "$3,100" and insert "$3,500," so as to make the clause read:

Board of children's guardians: For administrative expenses, including expenses in placing and visiting children, city directory, purchase of books of reference and periodicals not exceeding $25, and all office and sundry expenses, $3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 6, to strike out:

For agent, $1,800; clerk, $1,200; placing officers—1 at $1,000, 2 at $900 each; investigating clerk, $900; record clerk, and 2 visiting inspectors, at $720 each; clerk, $660; messenger, $360; in all, $9,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 10, to insert:

For agent, $1,800; clerk, $1,200; placing and investigating officers—1 at $1,200, 3 at $1,000 each, 4 at $900 each; record clerk, $900; clerk, $720; messenger, $360; in all, $12,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 23, after the word "board," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$60,000," so as to make the clause read:

For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, with authority to pay not more than $1,500 to institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control and not more than $300 for burial of children dying while under charge of the board, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 25, after the word "guardians," to strike out "$82,980" and insert "$96,280," so as to read:

In all, for board of children's guardians, $96,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 17, before the word "each," to strike out "$480" and insert "$540"; in line 18, after the word "each," to insert "temporary labor not to exceed $300"; and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "$7,440" and insert "$7,860," so as to make the clause read:

Industrial Home School for Colored Children: Superintendent, $1,200; matron of school, $480; 2 caretakers, 2 assistant caretakers, nurse and sewing teacher, at $360 each; 2 teachers, at $480 each; manual training teacher, $600; farmer, and blacksmith and wheelwright, at $540 each; stableman, and watchman, at $300 each; cook, and laundress, at $240 each; temporary labor, not to exceed $300; in all, $7,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 23, after the word "grounds," to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 88, to insert:

For erection of residence for superintendent and for administrative purposes, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 3, after the words "Colored Children," to strike out "$18,490" and insert "$24,910," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for Industrial Home School for Colored Children, $24,910: *Provided*, That all moneys received at said school as income from sale of products and from payment of board, of instruction, or otherwise, shall be paid over to the commissioners to be expended by them in the support of the school during the fiscal year 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 10, after "$1,500," to insert "supervisor of boys, $900"; in line 11, after the word "matron," to strike out "$480" and insert "$600"; in line 13, before the word "each," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$360" and insert "$420"; in line 13, after the word "nurse," to strike out "$300" and insert "$360"; in line 14, after the word "teacher," to strike out "$600" and insert "$660"; in line 16, before the word "each," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$240" and insert "$300"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "$8,620" and insert "$10,180," so as to make the clause read:

Industrial Home School: Superintendent, $1,500; supervisor of boys, $900; matron, $600; three matrons, housekeeper, and sewing teacher, at $420 each; two assistant matrons, at $300 each; nurse, $360; manual-training teacher, $660; florist, $840; engineer, $720; farmer, $540; cook, and laundress, at $300 each; two housemaids, at $180 each; temporary labor, not to exceed $400; in all, $10,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 22, after the words "Industrial Home School," to strike out "$26,320" and insert "$27,880," so as to read:

In all, for Industrial Home School, $27,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Temporary homes," on page 89, line 8, before the word "yard," to strike out "and stone"; in line 9, after the word "Superintendent," to strike out "who shall also act as foreman"; in the same line, after "$1,200," to insert "foreman, $480"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "$3,530" and insert "$4,010," so as to make the clause read:

Municipal lodging house and wood yard: Superintendent, $1,200; foreman, $480; cook, $360; night watchman for 6 months, at $25 per month, $150; maintenance, $1,820; in all, $4,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 18, to insert:

Southern Relief Society: For care and maintenance of indigent and infirm men, women, and children under a contract to be made with the Southern Relief Society for the support of those under its care by the Board of Charities, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 2, to insert:

AID TO THE BLIND.

Aid Association for the Blind: For aid, maintenance, improvement of grounds, and purchase of mechanical equipment for the workshop of the Aid Association for the Blind, located at 3050 R Street NW., $10,000, said sum to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 10, to insert:

Library for the Blind: For aid of the Library for the Blind, located at 1729 H Street NW., $5,000, said sum to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 15, after the word "superintendent," to strike out "$720" and insert "$900," so as to make the clause read:

Workhouse.—Administration: Superintendent, $2,500; chief clerk, $1,200; assistant superintendent, $900; stenographer, $720; stenographer and officer, $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 19, after the word "electrician," to strike out "$900" and insert "$1,200," so as to make the clause read:

Operation: Foreman, construction, $900; foreman, stone-crushing plant, $360; foreman, sawmill, $900; chief engineer and electrician, $1,200; superintendent brick kiln, $1,500; clay worker, $480; superintendent tailor shop, $480.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On behalf of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "1, $1,000; 1, $900," and insert "2, at $1,000 each," so as to read:

Receiving and discharging officers—2, at $1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 92, line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "$56,510" and insert "$56,990," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance: Physician, $1,350; superintendent of clothing and laundry, $720; storekeeper, $660; steward, $900; stewardess, $480; veterinary and officer, $780; captain of guards, $1,200; captain of night watch, $900; receiving and discharging officers—2, at $1,000 each; superintendent laundry, $480; day guards—2 at $720 each, 30 at $660 each; 15 night guards, at $600 each; 2 day officers, at $480 each; 4 night officers, at $480 each; hospital nurse, $480; captain of steamboat, $900; engineer of steamboat, $840; in all, $56,990.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 4, after the word "wagons," to insert "harness," and in line 5, after the word "harrows," to strike out "drills, etc.," and insert "and drills," so as to make the clause read:

For farm implements, including wagons, harness, plows, planters, harrows, and drills, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 6, after the word "workhouse," to strike out "$177,010" and insert "$177,490," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for workhouse, $177,490, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 11, after the word "buildings," to insert "including personal services connected therewith," so as to make the clause read:

Reformatory: For grading, fencing, road making, water supply, sewerage, draining, and other necessary work of preparation for the erection of buildings, including personal services connected therewith, for a reformatory, and for the beginning of construction of such buildings to be erected on the site authorized to be acquired for that purpose, to be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1909, authorizing the acquirement of land and the construction of buildings for a reformatory and workhouse and all acts amendatory thereof, $15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Militia of the District of Columbia," on page 94, after line 20, to insert:

For pay of troops, other than Government employees, to be disbursed under the authority and direction of the commanding general, $24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, after line 9, to insert:

ANACOSTIA RIVER FLATS.

For continuing the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats, from the Anacostia Bridge northeast to the District line, to be expended under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, upon plans heretofore authorized to be prepared; said sum to be available for the preparation of plans, the prosecution of the work, the employment of personal service, and for such other purposes as may in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers be necessary to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, $100,000. In connection with said reclamation and development of the river and flats from the Anacostia Bridge to the District line, the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by purchase or by condemnation, for highway and park purposes, the fee simple and absolute title to the land along the Anacostia River on both sides thereof between the high-water lines of said river, as determined by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and lines following approximately the contour of 10 feet elevation on each side of said river above mean low water at the United States navy yard, from the Anacostia Bridge to the northeast boundary line between the District of Columbia and Maryland; and also all land below the high-water lines on each side of said Anacostia River between the limits named that is not now owned by the United States; and the appropriation herein made for the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats from the Anacostia Bridge northeast to the District line, and all appropriations heretofore made for said purpose are hereby made available for the purchase or condemnation of said land and for the payment of amounts awarded as damages for said land and the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings in the event that it is necessary to institute such condemnation proceedings: *Provided*, That if said land or any part thereof can not be acquired by purchase from the owners thereof at a price satisfactory to the Secretary of War, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the request of the Secretary of War, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land under the provisions of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Water department," on page 98, line 2, before the words "meter computers," to strike out "three" and insert "five," so as to make the clause read:

For revenue and inspection branch: Water registrar, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, $2,400; clerks—one $1,500, one $1,200, two at $1,000 each; index clerk, $1,400; five meter computers, at $1,000 each; chief inspector, $1,000; meter clerk, $1,000; tap clerk, $1,000; inspectors—eight at $900 each, eleven at $800 each; messenger, $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 6, after "$3,300," to insert "engineer, $2,400; assistants engineers—one at $2,000, one at $1,600"; in line 8, before the word "foreman," to strike out "draftsman, $1,600"; in line 9, after the word "clerks," to strike out "two at $1,500" and insert "one at $1,800, one

at $1,500"; in line 11, after "$900," to strike out "three steam engineers, at $1,100 each; assistant engineers, one $2,400, one $1,600"; in line 15, after "$1,125," to insert "master mechanic, $2,000"; in line 16, after "$1,750," to insert "two steam engineers, at $1,100 each"; after the words "inspector of valves," in line 21, to strike out "$1,400" and insert "$1,600"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$84,635" and insert "$88,435," so as to make the clause read:

For distribution branch: Superintendent, $3,300; engineer, $2,400; assistant engineers—one at $2,000, one at $1,600; foreman, $1,800; clerks—one at $1,800, one at $1,500, four at $1,200 each, stores clerk $1,500, one at $1,000, one $900; timekeeper, $900; assistant foreman, $900; leveler, $1,200; two rodmen, at $900 each; two chainmen, at $675 each; draftsman, $1,050; assistant foremen—one $1,275, one $1,200, one $1,125; master mechanic, $2,000; chief steam engineer, $1,750; two steam engineers, at $1,100 each; three assistant steam engineers, at $875 each; four oilers, at $610 each; three firemen, at $875 each; inspector, $1,200; janitor, $900; watchmen—one $875, one $700, one $610; drivers—one $700, one $630; two messengers, at $540 each; chief inspector of valves, $1,600; in all, $88,435.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 8, after the word "motor," to strike out "trucks" and insert "vehicles," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, repairs to boilers, machinery, and pumping stations, pipe distribution to high and low service, material for high and low service, including public hydrants and fire plugs, and labor in repairing, replacing, raising, and lowering mains, laying new mains and connections, and erecting and repairing fire plugs, purchase and maintenance of motor vehicles, horses, wagons, carts, and harness necessary for the proper execution of this work, and including a sum not exceeding $800 for purchase and use of bicycles by inspectors of the water department, $37,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, after line 15, to strike out:

SEC. 8. That to the extent the revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1915 shall exceed the proportionate part of the appropriations made in this or any other act and chargeable against said revenues, the same shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 8. That all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands there are two committee amendments which have been passed over. The Secretary will state them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I asked that the first two amendments be passed over. I did that because I wanted to see just how the other amendments recommended by the committee were going to be acted upon. As they were agreed to as the committee had recommended them, I shall not now make any point on the first two amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 5, after the words "Two commissioners, at," the committee proposes to strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 7, the committee proposes to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 23, after the numerals "$1,050," it is proposed to insert the words "one computer, $1,200."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this amendment does not create a new office or employee, but simply changes the compensation from a per diem to a salary. It is estimated for in the estimates, and the amendment is suggested. The position has been occupied by one man now for 14 years, and he has been paid $4 a day. He is denied sick leave and vacation, which are allowed to all of the other employees. It seems to me only an act of justice to him that he should be placed on the regular salary list.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from California that we agree to the amendment. As I understand, this is not a new office. It is only giving a man who has been getting $4 a day a certain salary.

Mr. WORKS. Yes; about the same compensation, but a regular salary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We agree to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to come in on page 10 at the end of line 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

On and after the 1st day of July, 1914, the Washington Gas Light Co. shall not charge or collect for gas furnished a consumer in any part of the District of Columbia a rate in excess of 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet of gas so furnished: *Provided*, That if a consumer of gas other than the Government or the District of Columbia shall not pay monthly any gas bill within 10 days after the same shall have been presented, said gas company may charge and collect from any such consumer so failing to pay said gas bill as aforesaid 10 cents additional for each 1,000 cubic feet of gas represented by said bill: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as limiting or taking away any of the powers now vested by law in the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I take it for granted that every Member of the Senate is desirous that the gas companies of Washington shall furnish gas at as low a rate as possible. We all want that. I take it for granted further, however, that there is no Member of the Senate who has sufficient information to determine the price at which the gas companies of Washington should furnish gas to their patrons. My idea is that the Public Utilities Commission was created for that purpose, and that is the object of having the commission. If there is any grievance, that is the place to carry it, and not to the Senate, it seems to me. I shall be forced to raise the point that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator if he will withhold his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will, and reserve the right to make it later.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that we are all anxious that the people of the District of Columbia shall be furnished gas just as cheaply as it can possibly be furnished, giving, of course, to the company that furnish the gas a fair and honest return for their money invested in the gas company. I expect to be able to convince the Senate, including the Senator from Maryland, with information here from the gas company themselves, from their various reports, that this amendment, if adopted, will still leave the gas company in a position where they will receive returns, from their own figures, away beyond any reasonable interest on the money they have invested in the business. I am offering this amendment in good faith, believing as I do that the Senator from Maryland expresses the sentiment of the Senate when he says we are all anxious to do what is right on this proposition.

I have no desire, and it is furthest from my intentions even if I had the ability, to take away one penny from the Washington Gas Light Co. that honestly and fairly belongs to it. I am induced to offer this amendment on this appropriation bill because the committee having charge of and bringing in this bill had offered at this very place in the bill an amendment providing for the consolidation of the two gas companies, based, as I take it, upon the fact that a consolidation of the companies would reduce the cost of the manufacture of gas to the people of this District, and therefore would be economically right. There was nothing, however, coupled with the committee amendment that actually made any reduction. Personally, I think the two gas companies ought to be combined, and I believe that by a merger of the two companies gas could be manufactured and furnished to the people of this city and this District at less than the cost which is necessarily involved when it is manufactured by two companies.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered applies only to one of these gas companies. There are in the District of Columbia two corporations engaged in the manufacture and sale of gas. They are not competitors. The line of demarkation is marked out clearly by law. The Washington Gas Light Co., the one to which this amendment applies, manufactures and has the sole right to manufacture and sell gas on this side of Rock Creek. The other company, known as the Georgetown Gas Light Co., operates in Georgetown, on the other side of Rock Creek. The company on this side is a mammoth one as compared with the other one. I am going to offer some figures here most of which are calculations based upon the figures of the gas companies themselves; and I think from their own figures, from their own reports, I shall be able to show that the amount named in this amendment is still too high.

I wish to say to the Senate that if you will take the last report of this gas company and take their own figures, without the change of a single one, take the amount of gas they themselves say they have manufactured, and every item of expense

they have included in their reports, and just figure it at 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet instead of the price they charged, they still would have made last year, 1913, over 14 per cent on their capital stock. I shall show that not all of that capital stock has been paid in by this company in cash, but a large proportion of it has been paid in by enormous prices charged the consumers of gas and in that way stock dividends made possible.

This company was organized in 1848, with a capital stock of $50,000. From time to time it has increased its capital stock, until now and for several years last past it has had a capital stock of $2,000,000. I have no desire to give to the Senate any figure or any estimate or any calculation that is not absolutely correct, and I should be pleased at any time during the course of my remarks, if I give any figures that are wrong or that any Senator wants to question or any Senator doubts, to have him interrupt me at any time for the honest purpose of getting the real truth before the Senate of the United States.

I am going to be very brief. I am not going into all the details that might well be gone into in searching the history of this corporation, unless as a result of questions that may be asked it is necessary to go further into details.

I have here a report made to the Senate on the 7th day of July, 1886, by Senator Spooner, from the Committee on the District of Columbia. It seems that in 1886 the Committee on the District of Columbia made a considerable investigation into the affairs of the Washington Gas Light Co. If it were not for taking up too much of the time of the Senate, I should like to quote at length from this report. It is a very valuable report, giving a great deal of valuable information that was gleaned by this committee from an investigation; but for fear some Senator may think that is ancient history, I am only going to refer briefly to some of the things therein contained.

Senator Spooner, on page 3 of that report, in referring to some of the capital stock of this company, uses the language I am about to read. By the way, it is well to remember that at one time in the history of this company they burned up all of their books, so that it is perhaps an impossibility to get all of the information pertaining to their history, their growth, and their manufacture and sale of gas, because all the evidence was at one time destroyed.

On page 3 Senator Spooner uses this language:

> It is difficult to resist the suspicion arising from an examination of the sums hereinbefore given as alleged increase of capital from 1872 to 1883, aggregating $800,000, that they represent nothing else than stock dividends, however called, in addition to the large money dividends from time to time declared and paid by the company.

He finds that they have been paying dividends, most of them at rates that I think everybody will concede are away beyond what a public-utility corporation of this kind ought to be allowed to earn. Let me read some of them.

In 1855 they paid 10 per cent on $500,000 capital. In 1856 they paid 10 per cent. In 1857 they paid 10 per cent. In 1858 they paid 10 per cent. In 1859 they paid 10 per cent. In 1860 they paid 10 per cent. In 1861 they paid 10 per cent. In 1862 they paid 10 per cent. And in 1863 they paid 10 per cent.

I am giving these figures to show that even though you concede that 10 per cent was a reasonable return that the corporation should be allowed to have, they have at least been getting through practically all the years that have passed a sufficient return, so that there ought to be no excuse whatever for a larger dividend and allowance.

In 1862, 10 per cent; in 1863, 10 per cent. It is alleged, says Senator Spooner, that no dividends were paid in 1864 and 1865. Whether this is true or not, I can not tell. In February, 1866, 5 per cent was paid on $500,000, and, in August, 5 per cent was paid on $1,000,000. In 1867, 10 per cent was paid. In 1868, 10 per cent, and in 1869, 20 per cent on $1,000,000 capitalization.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, those who are in favor of this proposal of woman suffrage are desirous, apparently, that it shall be delayed to some future time.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. OWEN. I certainly am mistaken with regard to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I want the Senate to proceed to a vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say that I have received a letter from one of the two branches of the woman-suffrage management. I have left it in my office. I will bring it over later if I can put my hands upon it. In this letter they direct me to inform the Senate that they do not agree with the other branch, and that they want the matter voted on. I do not know which branch is in control.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that the National Woman Suffrage Association desire a vote upon the joint resolution as soon as possible. There are some who have expressed an opinion to the effect that they would very much prefer to have a vote delayed, but the National Woman Suffrage Association have expressed, not only once, but time and time again, their desire to have a vote taken at as early a date as possible.

Mr. OWEN. I was not aware of the activity of this controversy, otherwise I should not have risen to make a suggestion to postpone the matter, as it is obvious that it would be useless, because there would be objection made, and one objection would defeat the suggestion I had intended to make.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator or any Senator inform us as to when we will be permitted to vote on this subject?

Mr. SMOOT. We would have been permitted to vote before this time if it had not been for the appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not hear the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I simply asked as to when we might be permitted to vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. That depends upon the bill now under consideration. We have given way to that because of the exigency which existed with reference to the appropriation bill. I do not think that we ought to be charged with delay on account of that fact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that it be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is that the joint resolution shall be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that we would be delighted to go on with it this afternoon, and the only reason why we ask to have it laid aside is that the appropriation bill may be finished.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate joint resolution No. 1 is temporarily laid aside. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the District of Columbia appropriation bill be proceeded with.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We are very anxious to finish the appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Chair lays before the Senate the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, at the time when I was interrupted I was giving the dividends, and I had just given the dividend of the company for 1869. In 1870 it was 10 per cent, in 1871 the dividend was 15 per cent, in 1872 it was 15 per cent, in 1873 it was 15 per cent, in 1874 it was 55 per cent, in 1875 it was 20 per cent, in 1876 it was 65 per cent, in 1877 it was 15 per cent, and in 1878 it was 15 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. Is that the per cent on a capital of $1,000,000?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the per cent on the capital stock.

Mr. OWEN. Of $1,000,000?

Mr. NORRIS. Well, the amount first was $500,000. At the time of which I am speaking it was $1,000,000 and over. I will give all the details before I get through, as to just when it was increased.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if the dividend is upon the original price of the stock?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the dividend, of course, is always fixed on the par value of the stock. I think it is the same with every corporation. I do not know of any exception.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator stated a few days ago that they made a dividend of 24 per cent last year?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. As a matter of fact, upon the selling price of the stock the dividend was only 5 or 6 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true of every corporation.

Mr. GALLINGER. So, if the Senator had bought a share of stock a year ago he would have gotten 5 per cent?

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. That is true of every corporation with stock. I will come to the selling price of the stock later on. The dividend is always figured on the par value of the stock.

In 1879 the dividend was 15 per cent; in 1880 it was 15 per cent. The treasurer of the company stated in a letter to Senator Spooner—I am still reading from Senator Spooner's report—and to the Hon. Samuel J. Randall, February 25, 1881, that "for the 31½ years the average of cash and stock dividends has been 16⅝ per cent." That is practically 17 per cent for 31 years. I want to quote a little further from Senator Spooner's report, from which I have been reading thus far. He shows that these dividends were made as shown by the figures of the gas companies themselves, but the investigation of his committee showed him that the figures were not always accurate. They had sometimes been at a loss to know just how to cover up the immense profits that they were making, and he calls attention in this report to one item as an illustration in the way in which some of the expenses were increased on the books above what was legitimately proper. He says:

> The committee is not satisfied with the testimony as to the cost of coal. It is for the interest of the company to carry its accounts so as to swell before the public eye the cost of the commodity which they sell. The committee feels justified in making this suggestion by the fact that in its investigation it has been developed that in this account 15 cents, or thereabouts, per ton of coal for handling after delivery to the gas company is figured as an element in the "cost of coal," and that the same item is also included in the "wages" account.

He gives this only as an illustration, and says in substance in his report that if they had had the ability to summon witnesses and to go into a thorough investigation they would undoubtedly have been able to find a great many other instances where this kind of bookkeeping had taken place. But, notwithstanding this, the enormous dividends I have read you were made.

It is interesting in connection with this subject, not as bearing alone on the question of gas, but on other public-utility activities, to notice what the committee thought even in 1886. Mr. Spooner says on page 12:

> It is not certain to the committee that the time may not come, if indeed it has not already arrived, when the best interest of the Government as a gas consumer and of the people of the District require that the United States should acquire, by purchase or condemnation, if it may lawfully do the latter, the plant of the Washington Gas Light Co. and supply gas to the inhabitants of the city and for Government uses, as it now controls the water supply. The people are certainly entitled to have put into operation in this city for their benefit the best and most approved appliances and methods for making gas cheap and pure, whatever revolution that may require in the methods now here in use. Economy and the public health alike demand it.
>
> The committee has not felt justified in recommending at this time, with its present information, that the Government enter upon the manufacture and sale of gas in this city. It is suggested here as a remedy which may be employed, if abuses under the present system shall call for it, but the committee have thought before a step so radical would be warranted, an investigation of a more thorough and scientific kind than it has been able under this resolution to make should be conducted and the testimony reported to Congress. It is hoped that the Washington Gas Light Co. will, with the patronage and under reasonable regulation by the Government, so use its exclusive privileges in this growing city as to afford a healthful and satisfactory illuminating gas at prices which shall be fair to the people and which shall bring to the company a reasonable measure of profit. More than this the company has no right to ask. With less than this the public will not be, and ought not to be, content.

I call the attention of the Senate to those prophetic words uttered in 1886 by Senator Spooner, saying, in substance, we are proposing to give to this company now another opportunity to make good, another trial to treat the public fairly and give to the public and the consumers of gas in the District the benefit of reduced prices, fair prices, and if they do not do so, it will become the duty of the Government to take over the business and operate it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator inform the Senate as to the price that was charged for gas when the Spooner report was made as compared with the present price?

Mr. NORRIS. It was above a dollar—I think $1.50.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is now 85 cents.

Mr. NORRIS. It is now $1.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been reduced to 85 cents.

Mr. NORRIS. It is $1, with a rebate of 15 cents if paid within a certain time, 10 days, I think; so you can call it 85 cents, if you desire.

Mr. GALLINGER. There was a time when, I think, the citizens of the District of Columbia paid about $10 for gas. I think if the Senator will look back——

Mr. NORRIS. There has been no time since 1848 down to this minute, March 13, 1914, when, in my judgment, they have not been paying almost, if not quite, twice too much, according to the figures that the gas company give—their own figures.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the citizens of the District of Columbia are getting gas at a little more than one-half what the citizens of Nebraska are paying for it. How does the Senator account for the discrepancy?

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I can account for that. If the gas company is making 24 per cent on its investment and charging a rate that is high enough to make that in the District of Columbia, it is no defense to say that out in Nebraska, where they pay about three times as much for coal, in cities that are smaller, they are charging a great deal more.

The Senator the other day referred to the gas in my home town, a village compared to Washington, a town of about 5,000 people. The gas company went in there only a few years ago, because we have a system of electric lighting that is used almost exclusively, and they have not a profitable business now in gas. I pay when I am at home for anthracite coal from $13 to $15 a ton.

This same report here, made in 1886, in a part which I did not read, goes into the question of the cost. They produced an expert here, who testified before them, showing what the cost of gas was at that time. His name was Vanderpoel, a coal-gas expert. He figures the net cost of pure coal gas per thousand feet to be 35.8 cents. I will later on give what the actual cost of gas was in Washington. I presume there are many other cities where the people are paying as exorbitant prices as they are here; but I submit, Mr. President, that it is no defense if I am arrested for stealing a horse that I should offer before the jury the fact that the Senator from Washington had stolen a horse and was not punished for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. No one has suggested anything of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. Not with reference to the horse, but in reference to the price of gas the Senator did.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did not.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I misunderstood him.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] a few days ago, in discussing this subject, said gas could be made in a small place cheaper than in a large place.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from New Hampshire must not charge up to me what the Senator from Missouri claims. I never said that.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. NORRIS. I know. I think the Senator will admit that you can not go out on the plains of Nebraska that he is referring to, where they pay a high price for gas, and manufacture gas in a city of from three to five thousand people as cheaply as it can be manufactured in the city of Washington, almost at the mouth of the coal mines.

Mr. GALLINGER. That depends on the kind of gas that is manufactured. The Senator will do me the credit to say that my suggestion the other day about the Senator's home town was brought out by the observation made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will now say to the Senator that so far as gas manufactured in Washington is concerned it has been pronounced by experts as among the best manufactured in the world, of a higher candlepower than is necessary, and I think much higher than is required in the State of Nebraska; that the gas is almost entirely so-called water gas, in which enormous quantities of oil are used; that only about 10 per cent of it is coal gas and 90 per cent of it is gas in which oil is used, which makes the best gas on earth.

Mr. NORRIS. They use a great deal of oil, I notice from the report of the gas company, and a great deal of coal. I do not know that it is material for the purpose of this discussion, but the proportion is about half and half.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is about 10 per cent of coal and 90 per cent of the other kind.

Mr. NORRIS. In one of the reports I have here I notice in the testimony referred to by Senator Spooner it is stated that it is about half and half.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was so at that time.

Mr. NORRIS. And in the last report of the gas company they show it about the same. Now, Mr. President, I want to submit this proposition, and if it is wrong I should like to have some Senator correct it. A corporation like the Washington Gas Co., given a monopoly within a certain territory, with a right to use the streets of the city, that belong to the public, ought to be allowed to make no more on the investment of its capital than a reasonably fair return. If that is wrong, then

my argument is based upon an erroneous hypothesis. If that is wrong, I should like to have some Senator now rise in his place and tell me what is right instead of that, if he can.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we will soon have undoubtedly under the operation of the Public Utilities Commission, which some of us were active in creating, a valuation placed upon all these public utilities. The Washington Gas Light Co., I think, about two years ago called in some of the most famous experts in the country, and they, I apprehend, were not prejudiced men, who made a valuation of that property, and upon that valuation the company is paying between 5 and 6 per cent.

I will add that that valuation is filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I have the valuation claimed by the company; but I will show presently that a large amount of that value was paid by the people who paid an exorbitant and unreasonable price for gas. I undertake to show, and I do not believe the Senator from New Hampshire will dispute it, that if the gas company charges, we will say, enough to make it possible for them to pay a dividend of 10 per cent on a certain amount of capital stock, whatever it may be, that that will be at least a large enough return, so that no man could say that it was unreasonably small. If they were allowed to make 10 per cent, that would certainly be a very large return on their investment. Nobody could object to that on account of its being too small, at least. But if in addition to that 10 per cent they were allowed to charge enough for what they sold to the public in a city like this so that they could lay aside 50 per cent more, and with that 50 per cent build additions, extensions, without ever putting a dollar into it themselves, they ought not to be allowed, then, the next year to come in and say, "Now, our property is more valuable, and we must get a fair return and dividend on this extension"—not one that they paid for, but that the public paid for. That is what happened in this case. That is what happened all the way through.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is not that what happens in every manufacturing concern in the world?

Mr. NORRIS. It may be the case with a manufacturing concern, but owning a plant and manufacturing anything that goes into commerce is an entirely different corporation from a public-utility corporation that is given by law not only the right to use the property of the public, its streets and its alleys, but is given a monopoly, an exclusive right, within certain defined limits, to manufacture and sell goods to the public. That is a different proposition from a corporation organized, we will say, to manufacture clothing, that must come into competition with everybody else that wishes to go into the business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is courteous in yielding. I want simply to say that I gave a good many months, coming from my home for that purpose during one recess of Congress, to framing with help a public-utilities-commission measure. That utilities commission has jurisdiction over this gas company and can fix the price of gas, subject to appeal, of course, as it sees proper.

Now, Mr. President, I rose to say to the Senator that I will not interrupt him again——

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to the Senator interrupting me at any time. I am very glad to have him do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. But when the Senator gets through I will take two or three minutes to make a simple statement about what has been done, so far as this gas company is concerned, during the time I have been a member of the committee that had more or less jurisdiction over that corporation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. If the Public Utilities Commission have absolute jurisdiction over the question of the price of gas, upon what pretext do they compel the people of Georgetown to pay more than the people of Washington are compelled to pay?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will answer that by saying that the Public Utilities Commission has scarcely got to work yet. We made a small appropriation for the board. It is proposed to make a much larger appropriation this year, and under that appropriation they will proceed to ascertain the value of these properties and have the data upon which to fix the price. That is my answer to the Senator.

The board is undoubtedly constituted of most excellent men, and from my knowledge of those men I will say that they are men who are inclined to take a pretty strong position against monopolies or against placing any burdens upon the people in this District which they ought not to bear.

Mr. REED. The bill was passed and the commission created, I think, about a year ago, and a commission for any town would get busy in 30 days to ascertain the cost of the plant, its value, and the cost of producing gas, if it is a live commission.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator. I will say, however, I hope Senators will not go into a discussion as to these two gas companies, because it is not pertinent to the amendment that I have offered.

Mr. POMERENE. I simply desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri. I know from personal interviews with one of the commissioners that their work as a Public Utilities Commission has been very much hampered, because they were not provided with the necessary funds to do this work, and in my judgment the fault lies with Congress, in not providing the necessary funds, rather than with the commission.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Nebraska pardon me just one word? A public utilities commission required to pass upon a question of this kind, having the example of one gas company furnishing gas in this very city for 85 cents, does not need to spend much time investigating it. It ought to spend a few minutes writing an order and do the investigating afterwards.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not intend to discuss the public-utilities proposition, but I want to say, since it has been brought up, I have great confidence in the members of the Public Utilities Commission, and I have no doubt but that in due time, when the money is furnished, it will go to the bottom and make an investigation of this corporation. But the amendment that I have offered, at least as far as that amendment goes, can be ascertained by the report of the gas company itself. I would not ask any Senator to vote for the amendment if he did not believe, taking the figures of the gas company, that they demonstrate that this amendment is fair.

You will notice also that the amendment makes provision for the Public Utilities Commission and provides that nothing in it shall be construed as in any way taking away their power to make a further reduction. If you will permit them to bring in only a fair return, and for the sake of argument let us say that the return is 10 per cent, there is not any question on earth but that if you will limit the price of gas so that they shall make only 10 per cent on the money they have invested in this business, the price might be reduced 10 or 15 cents lower than the price named in the amendment.

Now, Mr. President, coming to a more modern date, I have here the report of the gas company for the year ending December 31, 1906. I find that they paid a dividend of 10 per cent and set aside a surplus of $170,879.83. A peculiar thing has occurred there. I have not gone back in these reports further than the year 1906. I wish Senators would give attention particularly to this point. They had issued what they called in their report "dividend certificates of indebtedness"—$2,600,000 were issued without one cent of consideration.

Bear in mind that their capital stock at that time was $2,600,000—the same as it is now. I am speaking now of 1906. They gave to every stockholder a certificate, showing that the gas company was indebted to him to the amount of the stock that he held; in other words, they practically doubled their capital stock by issuing those certificates. Those certificates bore 6 per cent interest. So, while their own returns show that their stockholders had received a dividend of 10 per cent, in reality they had received a dividend of 16 per cent, for every stockholder got not only his 10 per cent dividend but he got 6 per cent interest on his certificate of indebtedness, equal in amount to the stock he held, for which he had not paid one red cent.

The next year, 1907, taking their own report—and I am arguing now entirely from their figures—they had again paid a dividend of 10 per cent and also 6 per cent additional to every stockholder on his share of the $2,600,000 of certificates of indebtedness still outstanding, making a dividend of 16 per cent on the capital stock. In addition to all this they made extensions amounting to $130,602.44, which was increasing the value of their property, but it was not doing it with their money. In addition to this enormous dividend of 16 per cent which they took from the consumers of gas—over $130,000, which they invested in extensions—they also set aside for depreciation that year $144,068.96. Think of that one year's transactions now—16 per cent dividend, extensions for more than $130,000, and over $144,000 set aside for depreciation,

every cent of it coming out of those who paid for gas that they consumed in their homes.

Now, let us take the next year, Mr. President, which was 1908. The same thing again happened as to dividends. A dividend of 10 per cent was then paid, and 6 per cent interest was also paid on $2,600,000 of those certificates of indebtedness, making another dividend of 16 per cent. That year, in addition, they made extensions of over $323,000. They added that much to the value of their property; and on the theory, I judge, of the Senator from New Hampshire, the next year they would be entitled to charge to the consumer of gas enough to make a dividend on that money which the consumers gave to them. They set aside that year for depreciation over $155,000.

The next year was the year 1909. They then paid a dividend of 20 per cent, and they were still paying interest on this $2,600,000 of certificates of indebtedness for which the stockholders had not paid a cent, making a dividend that year of 26 per cent. They set aside as a surplus that year $238,355.03.

The next year was 1910. They paid a dividend that year of 13½ per cent; they set aside as a surplus $106,796.51; they set aside for depreciation $64,251.02. They did that year another thing different from what they had done the year before. I described to you how this $2,600,000 of certificates of indebtedness had been issued. I will illustrate it in this way: If the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] had owned $100 worth of the stock, they would have given him a certificate of indebtedness for $100. During the preceding years they had all the time been paying him 6 per cent on that certificate, though he had never paid a cent for it.

The holders of the stock had for several years carried these certificates of indebtedness, for which they had paid nothing. It was only one method of covering up an extra dividend to the stockholders. They had been receiving 6 per cent all the time. That year they did a remarkable thing. They took up these certificates of indebtedness; and if the Senator from Kansas had had $100 worth of stock and $100 worth of certificates of indebtedness they would have given him a hundred dollars for the certificate. So they had not only taken from the consumers of gas a sufficient amount of money to pay interest on this certificate of indebtedness, that represented nothing in the world but water, but that year they changed the water into pure gold, paid it out in cash, and issued bonds in place of it. So from that time on, instead of carrying the certificates of indebtedness, they have been carrying bonds; so that they gave to their stockholders that year, if you figure it out and put it in plain English, a dividend of 13½ per cent and another dividend of 100 per cent, because every stockholder had just as large an amount of certificates of indebtedness as he had of stock. They paid it out in full. This, in reality, made a dividend of 113½ per cent. That was the year 1911.

Now we come to 1912. That year the company paid a dividend of 24 per cent. They built extensions, in addition to that, out of the money that they received from the sale of gas, amounting to $172,821.18, and they set aside for depreciation $64,660.60.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire interrupted me a while ago and asked me what the people here were paying for gas away back in 1886, and I stated that it was over a dollar; but at that time I think Congress passed a law limiting the price to $1. I have the average price of gas which they sold in 1912, the year I am speaking of, when they paid a dividend of 24 per cent. They then built additions amounting to over $172,000; they set aside over $64,000 for depreciation, and got 83 cents and 74 mills as the average price of gas. So what has been true in thousands of other cases we find to have been true here, that when you reduce the price of a commodity which a corporation of this kind sells you increase the number of consumers and the amount that the individual consumer uses, and you increase the revenue and increase the dividends; so that, while they had reduced the price of gas——

Mr. NELSON. How much?

Mr. NORRIS. To 83 cents; that is what it averaged on the whole. They sold a good deal of it for more than a dollar; but probably most of it was sold for 85 cents; but all of the gas which they sold averaged a little over 83 cents for 1,000 cubic feet.

Now, mark you, Senators, I am discussing their report. Anybody can send to the document room and get the report for any of these years and obtain from them the same figures. They are, however, not given as I have given them; you have to figure them out sometimes, which makes it a little difficult for you to get at the real facts, but they are all there. There is not anything that I have stated here that is not demonstrated by their own reports.

The facts are that they have had difficulty for more than 60 years in covering up their enormous income and trying to keep from the public the knowledge of the profits which they really make.

Now, we come to 1913, the last year for which we have a report. We find by that report that they have again paid a dividend of 24 per cent; that they have increased by extensions the value of their property over $161,000; that they have set aside for depreciation over $37,000; and that the average price of gas was a little over 82 cents per thousand cubic feet. That is the last report that has been made.

Mr. President, I want, as I promised a while ago that I would, when some Senator interrupted me, to give you the history of the increase of the capital stock and just how it was paid in. This company was organized in 1848 with a capital stock of $50,000, $37,500 of which was paid in cash and $7,500 of the stock was issued without any consideration. In 1852 the capital stock was increased $300,000, and the increase was paid in cash. In 1858 the capital stock was again increased by $150,000, all paid in cash. In 1866 the capital stock was increased by $500,000, all paid in water; it was purely a stock dividend.

I want to say, however, in connection with that matter, that the books were burned, and there is nothing definite about it. As I think I showed—I do not remember—from the committee report, made in 1886, it appears that the books of this company were destroyed. They were purposely destroyed; in fact, they got $100 for the books. They took all the books that they had—made a clean sweep of everything—and sold them to a paper-manufacturing company for $100. They thus blotted out the past entirely; so that there is a good deal of mystery back of that, as to just what the books would show if we had them. It is said, however—and I want to be fair to them—that, as to that $500,000 stock dividend, two years before they had not paid any dividend. Former Senator Spooner said in his report that that statement was doubtful, and he was unable to say whether it was true.

In 1872 they added $200,000 more to their capital stock, all paid in cash. In 1876 they added $300,000 to their capital stock, paid in cash. In 1882 they added $500,000. That was paid in cash. In 1896 they added $600,000, all of which was water. That was the stock dividend that I have had something to say about in the past.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Senator know whether the money which was paid in cash for this additional stock was expended in betterments of the property, or was there a "melon-cutting" of some kind among the stockholders—a dividing up of this money in the company's treasury as a result of the sale of this stock?

Mr. NORRIS. Back of the time when the books were destroyed there is not any evidence one way or the other, excepting what might be surmised from some things that have happened and from what former Senator Spooner said in his report, but I can not give the Senator from Kansas directly the information for which he asks, except in so far as I have given it. There are other things connected with the matter. I want the Senator to remember that the figures I am giving are from the company's own reports. No Senator can tell what an impartial and thorough investigation which would go behind the company's own reports might show; but this appears from their own showing——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I merely want to ask the Senator if the $500,000, which he says was issued without any cash being paid, was out of a surplus which had been accumulated, or for what purpose was it issued?

Mr. NORRIS. It was simply a stock dividend as the others were. The company had too much money in their hands, and they had to do something with it. If the Senator heard the beginning of my remarks, he will recall that I said that at one time they paid dividends as high as 65 per cent. Of course that did not look well on the books; the public would have become worked up about it, and they would have begun to protest about the price of gas.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, this additional $500,000 really meant a surplus which they had gathered, and was paid out in new stock.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir. Now, adding up the columns of figures, we find that the company have a capital stock of $2,600,000, of which $1,492,500 has been paid in cash, and the balance, $1,107,500, is made up either of water or of stock dividends, whatever you please to call it; at any rate, it was not paid in by

the stockholders, though the dividends have been paid on a capital of $2,600,000. Last year the company paid 24 per cent on that valuation, although the stockholders never put in more than $1,492,500 of that capital, if they paid in that much.

Mr. STERLING. What was the total capitalization?

Mr. NORRIS. Two million six hundred thousand dollars. I believed I promised, when some Senator interrupted me awhile ago, to give the actual cost of the gas manufactured during the last year.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator allow me to finish this statement before he interrupts me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. After I have done that I will be glad to yield to the Senator. I will say that this computation which I am about to give was not made by me; it was made by Mr. Williams, who is the statistician of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia. He assures me that he has made it entirely from the figures in the reports of the gas company itself, and he tells me that anybody can deduce the same figures by making the computation from the reports of the gas company. His figures include all of the items of expense which they claim, and on this basis he says that the actual cost of producing 1,000 cubic feet of gas in 1913 was 47.26 cents.

I gave those figures the other day when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] was speaking, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] interrupted and said that they did not include the distribution cost. I told him that I thought they did; but the Senator was so emphatic about it that I did not wish to dispute him; so I again took the matter up with Mr. Williams, the statistician, and he told me that these figures cover every item of expense, including distribution cost, and, more than that, they make an allowance of 7 cents on each 1,000 cubic feet of gas for the depreciation of the plant.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if the cost he has given includes overhead charges?

Mr. NORRIS. It includes overhead charges and everything else.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think there is not a gas company in the world that would not like to employ that man and have him make gas for them at that rate.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be; but, Mr. President, if you will take the figures the gas company give and the per cent of dividends they have paid, you must reach the conclusion that they are making gas at a cost which is away down below what they are selling it for, and that they are receiving an enormous profit of 24 per cent, even taking their own figures, which at least would not be unfavorable to the gas company.

Mr. Williams, the same statistician, also gives me figures as to the average price received for the gas consumed. You must remember that in the manufacture of gas there is a certain per cent that is lost by leakage, also lost through bills that can not be collected, and from other causes; but taking all of the losses, whether caused by leakage, by unpaid bills, or otherwise, the figures show that the company has received for the gas which they manufactured, whether it has run away in leaks, whether it has been given away, whether it was used by themselves, or paid for or sold and the charges therefor uncollected—they have received during 1913 for all of the gas they have manufactured 74.38 cents for each 1,000 cubic feet. That, as I have said, includes loses of all kinds, and it shows an average profit on all the gas which they have manufactured, whether or not it was lost, of 27.12 cents on each 1,000 cubic feet.

Here is something else about these figures which I want to call to your attention. While they include the total cost, the distribution charges, and everything else, there are other sources of income of the gas company which are not included in the figures of profit I have given. They sell a great deal of coke and other articles.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator a question right there?

Mr. NORRIS. Let me finish this first. They have received during the last year $26,754.17 for coke, $5,010.77 for tar, and $2,252.89 for ammoniacal liquors, making a total, as I figure it, of $33,308.95. That is not included in the figures which I have given you—and it is all clear profit—but the cost of producing all these things is included in the figures which I have given you. Now I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I merely want to ask the Senator whether the costs were increased very materially by excessive salaries in the management, as is often the case in corporations? If the Senator could tell us what are the salaries of the president, vice president, and other high officials, I should be glad to have the information.

Mr. NORRIS. I have seen a memorandum of the amounts paid for salaries during the last year, and I do not think they are very exorbitant; but, of course, these reports do not give the salaries. As I have said to the Senator, I have been basing my argument entirely on the reports. For instance, since the Senator has mentioned it, I will call his attention to one item in the report for the year 1912, as follows: "Administrative expenses, including law expenses, $81,689.83." That is as nearly as I can give it to the Senator. It is not itemized. It may be all right, but to me it looks pretty big; and there are a good many other items here which, if Senators would run through them, they would probably be apt to think quite large; but I have not gone into them, because, as I have said, I am basing the deductions which I have made entirely on the company's own figures. I am taking them at their face value. We would find perhaps some interesting things if we went behind the returns.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator would find one interesting thing at least, and that is that during that year an investigation was forced upon this corporation which cost them a great deal of money. Some of the newspapers in this city would not publish a line of it without being paid so much per line, and a great many thousand dollars were paid into the coffers of the newspapers of Washington in that way. That was their way of treating the matter. The Senator would find that out if he investigated the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I would be glad to find that out; I would be glad to go into that if the gas company would furnish it in their reports, but I do not think there is anything in the item which I have read to indicate that that is the case.

Now, I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, on the newspaper proposition, that up to—I do not know when; I could find it here if I would take the time—but up to a few years ago, at least, the proprietor of one of the greatest newspapers in Washington was also president of this gas company, and I judge that while he was running a newspaper with one hand and the gas company with the other he was not letting the newspaper hurt the gas company very much. It might have been one way of covering up some of the dividends to have said to the gas company, "Let us pay for a lot of advertising in this newspaper; we only take it out of one pocket and put it into the other."

Mr. GALLINGER. I feel very sure, Mr. President, that that newspaper did not do that.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not saying that they did; but I say, if the Senator is going into suppositions, as he did about the newspapers at least, that one of the leading newspapers—and I presume the leading newspaper—was owned by the same man who was running the gas company.

On that point I should like to say, Mr. President, right here that we have seen in the Washington newspapers for the last several weeks a great deal about taxation. Some of the people have been worked up to the point of hysterics, and perhaps their fears may be well founded. I am not going to argue that proposition; I may be with them when it comes to a vote; I am willing to consider the question, at least. But I am only using it here as an illustration, because the Senator has called my attention to the manner in which the newspapers have abused this gas company.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator to say that they did; that they held up the gas company and made them buy advertising matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. The gas company paid for the report of the hearing as advertising matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. They treated the gas company a good deal like the newspapers frequently treat political candidates who are running for office.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and I think that is wrong.

Mr. NORRIS. I have always thought so when I was running for office, at any rate.

A committee of 100 has been appointed to call on Members of Congress, and all the newspapers of Washington for several weeks have been filled with arguments against a bill which has passed the House of Representatives, or was about to pass that body—I do not know whether it has passed or whether they thought it might pass—but, at any rate, a question of taxation is involved, and they have been saying "Congress is going to increase our taxes." All the newspapers are worked up about it; the people of Washington are worked up about it; they are excited about it; but, Mr. President, if Congress were to pass that bill and enact it into law it would not increase what the taxpayers of Washington have to pay more than one-

twentieth of what they have paid, erroneously and wrongfully I believe, to this gas company for the last 60 years. We do not hear the newspapers crying out against this gas company now. We do not see the newspapers calling the attention of Congress to the fact that this gas company, with a capital stock nearly half of which is made up of stock dividends, is paying a dividend of 24 per cent besides various other things; and yet the people of this District have paid, and are paying, more to this gas company above a reasonable and fair profit on the money invested than they would pay on account of increased taxes in the lifetime of every man who lives in the limits of the District if the bill which they are now fighting were passed.

A year or two ago, Mr. President, we became excited—and I was one of those in that category—about the loan sharks in Washington. We enacted a law limiting the blood money which the loan sharks could take from the unfortunate victims who were often compelled to borrow money from them. We limited the amount of interest which the loan sharks could collect. Washington was worked up about the matter. Recently cases have been commenced in court against the so-called loan sharks to bring about a just punishment. I was one of those who helped to pass the bill; I did what I could to get it enacted; I believed it was right, and I am not complaining of that law; but all the money which the loan sharks ever took from the people of Washington would not be a drop in the bucket compared with the enormous amount of excess charges that the people who consume gas in this District have paid for 60 years to the Washington Gas Light Co. We hear nothing about that, although the stockholders of the gas company, a great big corporation, having a monopoly by law over most of the District, receive a return on an average of from 20 to 50 per cent, with stock dividends sometimes, as in the instance of their certificates of indebtedness, amounting to 100 per cent; and in other instances, quite a number of years back, it is true, of 62 per cent, and other great dividends of 50 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent, and 24 per cent. That has become almost a common, every-day occurrence. The loan sharks have not been in it with this gas company. The gas company is charging over 2 per cent a month now. You do not allow the loan shark to do that. In addition you give the gas company the use of the public streets and a monopoly in the city. The loan shark has competition and has no exclusive use of the streets. An ordinary loan shark will hold up both hands and surrender when he runs up against this gas company.

Where have these enormous amounts come from, Mr. President? They have come from the poor people of this District, whom we ought to be here to protect. Are we making a model city of this Capital, as we boast we would like to do, when we will give to a corporation a monopoly of this kind? It seems to me the responsibility is on us. Are we going still to remain idle here and let a corporation that for 60 years has been carrying on this business continue to do this?

Mr. President, I have asked that the price of gas be reduced to 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. As I said in the beginning, if, instead of getting 85 cents during the last year, when they did charge that, they had received 75 cents they would have made a dividend of more than 14 per cent, according to their own figures. Then what is the danger of cutting it down during this next year to 75 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, when by that time the Public Utilities Commission will be able to finish their work and will undoubtedly reduce it still lower?

I am aware that the Senator can give statistics of other cities showing a higher rate. That is true. I have no doubt of that. There are some cities that pay a lower rate, and I have some here on my desk that I could give, but I did not consider it the right thing to do, because I started out on this proposition: I am going to take their own figures and assume that they are all right, and if they are all right these deductions must follow. It is a mathematical proposition. There is not any possibility of getting away from it. That being true, we can afford to take the step, it seems to me, of reducing the price at least to 75 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I understand the matter, a point of order has been made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] against the proposed amendment. In view of that fact, I shall take but two or three minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator from Maryland intend to insist upon his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, is the Senator from New Hampshire going to address himself to the amendment offered by me?

Mr. GALLINGER. For a few moments.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this gas controversy is an old matter. The so-called Spooner report has been the text for a great many speeches precisely such as the Senator from Nebraska has made to-day. Since that investigation, which was somewhat famous in its time, I think at least half a dozen other investigations of this gas company have been held. Just what they found, I do not know. I was associated, I think, as a member of a committee, with one of those investigations; and while it was evident that the gas company had in its early days and perhaps in its relatively later days made larger profits than it ought to have made, it did not appear at any of those investigations that it had done all of the wicked things that the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out.

I wish to say, in passing, that the District of Columbia is being used as an experiment station by Senators who come from States where they pay twice as much for gas as is paid in the District of Columbia to make speeches, I suppose, for home consumption. I do not know what other purpose they can have in view. It is a prolific field for oratory.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that his supposition in my case is entirely erroneous. If he has any idea that I am moved here by any other desire than to do some good to the people of the District who consume gas, I should like to have him say it in explicit terms instead of indirectly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I spoke in general terms. The Senator can attach to my words any meaning he chooses. I think if the Senator should go to McCook, Nebr., where he lives, and go before the common council, if they have one, and declaim against those people being compelled to pay a dollar and a half for gas when the citizens of the District of Columbia get it for 85 cents, he might be doing a service to his own city and his own people.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I feel that the reference of the Senator from New Hampshire to the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not yield for that purpose. The Senator from Nebraska can take care of himself without any help from the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is quite true; and if the Senator declines to yield now——

Mr. GALLINGER. I do decline for that purpose.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will take my own time to express my views on the Senator's reference.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can do that.

When I became a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia—and I am gratified to know that I am not a member of that committee now—in Georgetown the consumers of gas were paying a dollar and a half per thousand cubic feet, and in the city of Washington proper a dollar and twenty-five cents. The late Senator McMillan was chairman of the committee at that time, and after a long hearing an item was placed in the bill reducing the price of gas in Washington 5 cents per year for five years, so that in five years it was reduced to $1.

Since that time I was somewhat actively connected with that committee for a good many years as chairman, and it was my constant endeavor to secure a fair reduction in the price of gas from year to year. The consequence has been that in Georgetown it has been reduced from a dollar and a half to $1, and in the city of Washington proper from a dollar and a quarter to 85 cents.

It may be that the reduction has not been sufficient, but it has seemed to me to be a very considerable reduction—40 per cent at least. I think if we allow this matter to go along, it being now in the hands of the Public Utilities Commission, if it shall be found that the facts warrant it, and not simply upon the figures presented in a speech here which have been furnished to the Senator by somebody, the price of gas will be further reduced in the District of Columbia. It ought to be done, however, upon a careful, honest, and impartial inquiry, and not merely upon the wishes of some individual or some body of men.

I have alluded to the price of gas here. I put in the Record the other day a table showing that gas is being furnished in Washington cheaper than in most other cities of the United States of the same size, and very much cheaper than in the cities of the United States with a smaller population. It may be that we ought not to regard that as controlling in any way. I do not contend that we ought to regard it as controlling, and yet it is a circumstance that we can not entirely ignore.

In New Hampshire we have an active public utilities commission; a commission that does not spare corporations; that goes into their affairs with a great deal of earnestness and zeal; and it has been looking into the price of gas in New Hampshire, more or less. It has found—and no present complaint is being made about it—that the average price of gas in New Hampshire is $1.10 per 1,000 cubic feet. At a time when we were paying in New Hampshire from $1.30 to $1.50 per 1,000 cubic feet, an emissary was sent into the State of New Hampshire, imported from the State of Iowa and financed in the city of Washington, to defeat me for reelection on the ground that I was a friend of the gas company of the District of Columbia. Of course, however, he did not find any comfort when he confronted a community where they were paying $1.30 and $1.50 for gas, as compared to less than $1 in the District of Columbia; and in due time he folded his tent and returned to his home, and I was reelected, notwithstanding that I was pictured in a certain Boston newspaper in great headlines, paid for at so much a line, as a "friend of the Gas Trust."

I have no relations to the gas company. I have never received a favor from them in my life. I never expect to. I want them to be compelled to furnish their gas at as cheap a rate as they can furnish it and pay a fair return to the men and women who have invested their money in that property.

The Senator talks about a 24 per cent dividend last year. Why, a widow came into my office two weeks ago and said that she had bought some gas stock two years ago, I think, and that she was receiving between 5 and 6 per cent dividend on it; and she said she thought it was not a fair dividend, because it was said they were making a much larger dividend than that. Upon the present price of gas stock—and I apprehend it is not excessive; it is on the market; it is listed—between 5 and 6 per cent is being paid at the present time.

Mr. President, I do not know that I ought to say more. As I said a moment ago, this matter is in the hands of the Public Utilities Commission. They will be given $110,000 in the deficiency bill, as I understand, to carry on their work. We voted them $40,000 when the commission was created. It was not enough. There are men, earnest men—the Senator from Nebraska knows them—who, I think, entertain the view, very likely, that these corporations ought to be compelled to furnish service cheaper than they do at the present time.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Senators come here from cities where they pay a straight 5-cent car fare, and they get car fare here for 4½ cents, with underground construction, which costs three times as much as the construction in some of the cities from which they come, and yet they complain about the extortions of the street car companies of the city of Washington. It is a favorite theme. I do not sympathize with it. I do not believe that after all the people of the country will be very much moved to believe that extortions are practiced here to the extent that is being pictured.

I have suggested that in New Hampshire we pay, net, $1.10, and from that up to $1.30 and $1.40, at the present time, for gas. I consume it in my home in Concord. I consume it in my home here. I wish it were cheaper there. I wish it were cheaper here. Yet we are not going to cheapen it by oratory, and, of course, we are not going to cheapen it by putting, or trying to put, an amendment on an appropriation bill which will go out on a point of order.

The Senator says they pay more for coal in Nebraska than they do in Washington. That is true, no doubt. They pay less for oil in Nebraska, however, than they do in Washington. The gas here is made almost exclusively from oil, 90 per cent, and it is very expensive.

Here the gas companies are required by law to supply gas of 22 candlepower. It is an excessive rate. In London they have 14 candlepower; in Boston they have 16; but in Washington we compel the companies by law to make gas of 22 candlepower, and it costs money to give that excessive lighting power. Last year their candlepower averaged 22.87. The gas is inspected every day by a Government inspector, and they are kept up to the prescribed candlepower, and they are fined if for a single day it falls below the standard. In Nebraska and in New Hampshire the candlepower required is less than 20, as compared with 22 here. That is never taken into consideration, however, as of course it would be and will be if there is ever a careful investigation made of all the facts connected with the manufacture and distribution of gas in the District of Columbia.

I think the Senator is right in saying that it costs more to manufacture gas in a small town than it does in the District of Columbia. I think I was right the other day when I said it costs less in New York City than it does in the city of Washington, although the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] challenged that statement. Why should it not?

Take Broadway, in New York. Take the downtown section of New York. Why, in a quarter of a mile they have more gas meters there than there are in half the District of Columbia. It may cost a little more to put mains in those streets, but it certainly costs less to distribute the gas, because in a single building 35 stories high there is as much gas distributed as there is in the whole of the city from which the Senator from Nebraska comes, I apprehend; and it is very cheap distribution.

Mr. President, I know there is not any argument in it, and yet it is well enough to call attention to the fact that in the State of Nebraska the lowest price at which gas is furnished in any city is $1.15, and it runs from that up to $1.90. I hope the people of Nebraska are getting their gas as cheaply as they ought to get it. If they are not, I hope a movement will be made in Nebraska to compel cheaper gas to be furnished to the citizens of that great State.

I might say more, Mr. President, but it is not necessary. My position in Washington has been utterly and absolutely misrepresented in certain quarters. I think I know who is agitating this question at the present time, but it is inconsequential what people say about me when I am discharging my duty. I shall continue as long as I remain here, be it longer or shorter, to try to hold the balance even between the consumer on the one hand and the producer on the other. I try to do that; and if that is doing injustice to anybody, I am willing to suffer the penalty.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, may I ask him if he challenges the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska that the actual cost of producing gas here is about 47 cents per thousand feet?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am not a gas expert.

Mr. McCUMBER. I assumed the Senator had some information on the point.

Mr. GALLINGER. I chance to have friends who know a great deal about the question of gas, and I know the statement has been challenged. It has been challenged before the Committee on the District of Columbia within 10 years. It was challenged in a hearing that we had there. I can not turn to it now. I think probably it is not an absolutely correct statement. I have an impression, from what I know about the matter, that the cost of manufacturing gas in the District of Columbia is larger than the figure at which it has been placed by the Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me inconceivable that the statement can be correct. If it is correct, if that covers all the charges—overhead charges, manufacture, distribution, and all the other charges—I think the price of gas can be reduced to some extent in this District. Yet, in addition to the mere matter of the cost of the gas, there must be considered other matters which go into the calculation, which of course would be brought out only after a very careful and impartial investigation.

I assume that the amendment will go out on a point of order, and I think I ought not to detain the Senate further.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask for the ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. I will concede that the amendment I have offered is subject to a point of order. If the Senator from Maryland insists on the point of order, I will withdraw the amendment, and I will offer one that is not subject to a point of order. I send it to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 15, page 104, it is proposed to add:

**No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for payment to the Washington Gas Light Co. for any gas furnished by said company at a rate in excess of 70 cents per 1,000 cubic feet of gas so furnished for use in any of the public buildings of the United States or the District of Columbia.**

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this amendment, of course, is not subject to a point of order, because it only applies to the appropriation in this bill. It fixes the amount at 70 cents instead of 75, because it is a great deal easier for the gas company to collect from the Government of the United States and from the District of Columbia, to which appropriations are made by this bill, at the rate of 70 cents than it would be to collect at the rate of 75 cents from private consumers, where they have to make out bills to every one every month.

While I am on my feet I wish to say just a word in reply to what the Senator from New Hampshire has said. He seemed to think this amendment was an attack on the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; I did not think that.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator did not think it, he came very near saying it at various times in the course of his remarks.

The fact is that it is unbecoming, it seems to me, for the Senator from New Hampshire to charge, as he did at least indirectly, that in offering this amendment I was moved by the fact that I wanted to make political capital out of it at home, that such amendments were offered for the purpose of circulating out home. I assured him at the time he made the remark that there was not any such intention. I can only give my word to the Senator, of course, that I was moved only by a desire, however foolish it may be, to benefit the consumers of gas in the District of Columbia.

I wish to say to the Senator, however, that he has not produced and he can not produce a single iota of evidence to show that this amendment was offered with the motive he attributes to it or that ever in my public life have I offered such an amendment. If the remark had come from some one who was a politician rather than a statesman you could understand why such a charge might be expected; but coming from the Senator from New Hampshire, who even this day has had his name assigned to a hospital, that is going to be erected here, for his statesmanship and his guardianship of the District of Columbia, it seems to me it comes with poor grace.

He starts out, too, by saying: "Why, out in McCook, where the Senator lives, they pay a dollar and a half for gas." The same statistics which he read, if he had read them further to the Senate, would have shown that there were only 250 consumers of gas in that city.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all.

Mr. NORRIS. In the city of Washington, in the case of this company about which we were talking, there were during the year 1913—and I take it that is exclusive of the Government business and the District business—56,941 meters. The total number of consumers' meters in use December 31, 1912, was 56,941. Yet the Senator wants to compare the price of gas here with a little town where they have to pay from $13 to $15 a ton for coal. That may be a good argument from the Senator's point of view.

For the sake of the argument, however, let us assume that I am moved by improper motives in offering this amendment. Let us assume that the insinuations of the Senator from New Hampshire are true, and that I want to make political capital in some distant place out of some amendment that I am offering here in the Capital City of Washington. Suppose I am that kind of a man; does it make any difference with the facts I have produced? Is that an answer to the argument that the Washington Gas Light Co. are charging an exorbitant rate to the people here who give them a monopoly of the business? Shall we say for them, if it has been demonstrated from their own figures that this rate ought to be cut down, "You must not cut it down, because the man who makes the motion is not moved by the Christian spirit that he ought to possess"?

Why, Mr. President, in all the argument I made I made no reference to the Senator from New Hampshire, except to answer his interruptions. It strikes me that it comes with poor grace from a man of his experience to attribute to me motives that never existed and that were never thought of. It is a common thing, if a lawyer has no evidence to back up his case, for him to put in his time trying the prosecuting witness or abusing the other lawyer; but it is not evidence, it is not logic, and it is not becoming to a Senator of the United States.

The Senator from North Dakota asked the Senator from New Hampshire whether he had anything to say about these figures. I gave the source of my information as to the cost. I told the Senator from North Dakota just where I got it. The other day, when I gave the figures, the Senator from New Hampshire said they did not include overhead charges; and if you heard him say it, and were here when he said it, you know that the way he said it was such that no man would dare dispute him without being subject to criticism. It had a finality and an emphasis about it that simply said: "Oh, no; that does not include it," although I said it did. "No, it does not"; and nobody dared dispute it, of course. I had to submit to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. But the expert who did the figuring tells me that it does include it. It includes taxes——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked the Senator in the first place if it included distribution. The Senator said he did not know; he was inclined to think it did. I suggested that I was inclined to think it did not, and that was all there was to it.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will read in the RECORD just what happened, and it is right before him on the desk, he will find that he has not stated it correctly now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish the Senator would put it into the RECORD to-morrow morning, and then I will read it.

Mr. NORRIS. It is in the RECORD now, right on the Senator's desk.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in some RECORD. I do not know what RECORD it is in.

Mr. NORRIS. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I have not that particular CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before me.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will find, if he will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that he has not given a correct statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I have given a correct statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if you even quoted it from the RECORD, it would not give all that was said, because it was the way it was said. It would have been necessary to have a kodak and phonograph to have gotten it all right.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have my way of saying things, which compare favorably with the way the Senator from Nebraska says them.

Mr. NORRIS. Even though the Senator from Nebraska has not a good way of stating things, that is no defense. That is the same kind of way the Senator is defending this gas company. He insists somebody else is charging more at some other place; that they are doing worse elsewhere than they are here, and therefore we should let them alone.

On this amendment, if there is to be no further debate, I want a yea-and-nay vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will take only a moment to say that my observation concerning criticisms that were made in speeches in Congress on matters relating to the District of Columbia was a general observation. I have in mind that we were held up for over two years in making a much-needed improvement in the District of Columbia in connection with the street railroads by a gentleman who lives in a congressional district where they had 4 miles of horse railroad in the entire district. But he held us up for two years and discussed matters regarding the District of Columbia, showing that the people were very greatly oppressed here, and hence the much-needed improvements that the companies themselves wanted to make at an expenditure of a million dollars could not be authorized.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, it seems to me that the interest he is trying to serve would not be served by the amendment. The Government uses very little gas. Of course his amendment does not affect the gas that is served to the people of the District of Columbia.

As I before said, my judgment is that this is no place to fix the price of commodities, and we are not in a position to judge at what price they can be served. We have not the proper information to come to a conclusion as to how low a price at which they can be served. The object for which the Public Utilities Commission was created was to investigate these prices and to ascertain whether the people are being imposed upon.

I want to say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned nobody will go further than I to see that the people get proper consideration and proper treatment at the hands of any of these corporations. I think myself that they should be compelled to furnish gas at as low a price as they can with proper and due consideration for the stockholders, but I do not think this is the place to fix prices. I think it would be a mistake to put any such amendment on the bill, and I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the Senator's statement that this would not reach the ordinary consumer of gas here, I want to say that is true, and if the Senator would withdraw his point of order on the other amendment that would reach the consumer. I am sorry we can not reach the consumer.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The reason I have given is a sufficient answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order has been ruled on and sustained, and the Senator from Maryland could not withdraw it if he wanted to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. The figures given me by one of the clerks of the Public Utilities Commission as to the amount of gas used by the Government and the District show that for 1913 there was paid on account of the District buildings where gas was used $13,842.77 and on account of the United States Government $53,368.66, making a total of $67,211.43. If next year's consumption were the same as this year's, that would be the amount of gas to which it would apply.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire, does that include the price paid for street lamps?

Mr. NORRIS. No; they are paid for under lamp contracts, at so much a lamp, I understand.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, it is an interesting argument when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] criticizes the amendment that is now pending, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, because it does not reach the consumer and protect him from an excessive charge, when the Senator from Maryland made a point of order against an amendment that did reduce the price to the consumer, and was himself responsible for the inability of the Senator from Nebraska to protect the consumers of the District of Columbia from the excessive charges.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that I would have made the point of order under any condition. I do not think this is the proper place to consider prices. As I said before, there is a Public Utilities Commission that has been created for that purpose, and it is their duty to see that the people are properly dealt with. For that reason I would make the point of order, if for no other. This is not the proper place to consider it because we have not the proper information.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not doubt that the Senator would have made the point of order under any circumstances if it would prevent the reduction of the price of gas to the consumers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that I am in favor of a reduction in the price of gas if it can be made, and he has no right to make any such declaration as that. I have——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment. The Chair can not permit language such as the Senator from Kansas just used with reference to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to invite the Chair to state why the Senator from Kansas can not use that language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is imputing improper motives to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRISTOW. What motives did I impute? I would like to inquire of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas said he had not any doubt but that the Senator from Maryland would make the objection if it resulted in a reduction of the price of gas to the people of the District.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Chair say that that is improper language?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that in Indiana a statement of that kind would be considered to be offensive. In Kansas it may not be so considered.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am glad to know that in Indiana there is such a keen sense of propriety.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled, and it is the duty of the Chair to enforce the rule.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I appreciate the courtesy and good temper of the Chair to-day. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Apropos of the suggestion that this bill is not the proper place to fix the price of gas, does the Senator from Kansas see how it can then be a proper place to provide for a merger of the gas companies and a condemnation suit by one company against another.

Mr. BRISTOW. If it is proper for me to express my opinion as to that, with the kind permission of the Chair, I would say I think it would be much more in order to reduce the price of gas than to merge these two corporations and enable them to continue these extravagant prices and earn these extravagant dividends.

I have discovered in my brief service here that all of us, when we attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill, are perfectly willing that the legislation shall be made, provided it is in harmony with our views as to what ought to be done. Legislation goes through on nearly every appropriation bill. If a point of order is not made, it is taken for granted that it is in order, and it goes through. If a Senator is opposed to the legislation, then he undertakes to prevent the legislation by a point of order, and the fact that he makes a point of order is evidence that he is opposed to the legislation. If he is not opposed to the legislation, he never makes the point of order. That is well known to every Senator here. But it seems under this new rule just announced, if a suggestion is made——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will permit me, I will call his attention to a fact to which I am sure he has not adverted, and it has some relation to the matter under discussion. The urgent deficiency bill, which has passed the House, contains an appropriation of $100,000 to enable the Public Utilities Commission to make a physical valuation of all the public utilities in the city of Washington. It is, of course, the commencement of an effort to secure proper charges for all the public utilities to be paid by those who use them.

That provision is in the bill as passed by the House and, as far as I can control it, it will be provided for in the report of the bill to the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to commend the proposition that is contained in the bill referred to by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I think it is very proper legislation, and I am heartily in favor of it, but under the showing that has been made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the presentation of facts that are undisputed, that this gas company is now earning 24 per cent on a capitalization half of which is water, and that this reduction could be made without reducing its earnings below what any public-utilities commission or any court would say would be entirely adequate, I do not think the fact of that provision in another bill is any reason why it is not perfectly proper for us to make the reduction suggested in the pending bill. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], when I sought to interrupt him and file a protest against the imputations he was casting upon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], in a somewhat spirited manner took me off the floor and declined further to yield, stating that the Senator from Nebraska was abundantly able to take care of himself. This the Senator from Nebraska has demonstrated entirely to my satisfaction. I am very glad indeed the Senator from New Hampshire, in his exceedingly courteous manner, did decline further to yield to me, because the Senator from Nebraska has handled the case much better than I could have done. I want to state, though, if I may be permitted under the new rules announced for this body, that the statement that the average rate on gas in New Hampshire, which is probably 500 miles from the coal fields, a State embracing a number of small cities, is higher than it is in the city of Washington is very poor evidence as to the value of gas in this city. It is on a parallel with the Senator from New Hampshire citing McCook, Nebr., where coal is hauled for hundreds of miles and where the consumers of gas are comparatively very few as a comparison with those in the District of Columbia.

But really the thing in which I am most interested and in which I feel that Congress, and especially the Senate, should have taken an interest years ago, is the development of the electric power at Great Falls. I have been asked to-day why it is that, with one of the finest water powers in America within 15 miles of the capital, it is running to waste, not utilized year after year, when enough electric power could be created from the waterfalls there to supply a half dozen cities like Washington and run the street railways and everything else.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. In this connection I should like to say to the Senator that a bill is now pending before the District of Columbia Committee making provision for the building of proper dams and the development of that power.

Mr. BRISTOW. How long has it been there?

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with the committee, because I understand the report on it has not come in. It has been there ever since the 12th day of January, I think.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of this year?

Mr. NORRIS. Of this year. It proposes to carry out the report that was made by one of the Army engineers in pursuance of a provision of law that we passed a couple of years ago providing for the investigation and making plans and specifications, and so forth, all of which has been done under that law. The bill carrying out the estimates of the Army engineers is now pending before the District Committee, awaiting a report, I understand, from the commissioners, who themselves have not reported on it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am pleased to know that legislation along that line has been started, because I never have visited Great Falls and looked at the magnificent rapids but what I wondered why it is that they lie there year after year unused when the possibilities are simply enormous. The power, the heat, and the light that they could furnish the people of this section of the country if that power were utilized is very great. In this modern day of electrical development it certainly ought not to be permitted to remain in an unused state much longer.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that probably the power capacity of the falls are being preserved for posterity, like millions of power capacity in the West are being preserved for posterity.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think they are being preserved, and if they go unused it is a preservation for posterity.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I will ask the Senator from Kansas if it had occurred to him in case the power which might be developed from the Great Falls is so valuable why some private company had not undertaken the building of a dam and the development of a power plant there?

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not able to answer the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think I can, in part, answer the Senator's question. The railroad corporations own a large interest, a controlling interest in the upper Potomac Falls. That same proposition came to my mind. I visited the spot last year and thought immediately why it was that right here, at the threshold of the city, there should not be power and illumination obtained, why the Great Falls should be running to waste with a natural condition when the development of this power would require a comparatively small expenditure of money. I made that inquiry and the answer came to me that it is under control of the railroad company; that, in fact, it owned the land and the water privileges there.

Mr. WEEKS. It seems to me incomprehensible that that can be entirely correct. I would like to have the Senator from New Jersey let us know from whom he obtained that information.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not state that, for I did not learn, but my information came from parties who were there in actual possession of the property for such purposes as were going on, a sort of amusement park. I made the inquiry on two occasions, and that was the information that came to me.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say as to the proposition suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senator from New Jersey is in part correct, although I do not believe that the railroad company own what might be called a controlling interest. They own considerable property there. The Government itself already owns and has rights there and quite a large number of private parties, I understand. I gather from ordinary conversation with those who have been investigating the proposition under the statute passed by Congress that the Government's interests up there are quite large already.

Mr. WEEKS. I know nothing about the subject, but to the casual observer it would seem that there is sufficient power there to be very useful in developing the resources of the District and surrounding territory. But that not having been done led me to the conclusion that there was something about the engineering conditions with which I was not familiar and that there were reasons why the power had not been developed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest further to the Senator from Massachusetts that the report of the Army engineer recommends the carrying out of a program that he has mapped out. He has carried it out in detail, even to the extent of providing plans and specifications for depots of distribution of the electricity that shall be developed at the falls and brought down to the city. His report, by the way, is one of the most accurate measurements, as far as waterfall is concerned, that has taken place anywhere in the United States. The river has been accurately measured for 15 years, and there are tables in that report that are accessible to every Senator giving the average flow, showing where under the plan—and there are several plans—a dam should be constructed, its cost, the amount of power that could be developed, the average flow of water over the dam, developing power, I will say, in round numbers, as I remember it now, running up to a maximum of something over 99,000 horsepower and down to the lowest, something over 8,000 horsepower, that, on the driest day in the driest year for 15 years, would be the minimum, with an average development of somewhere in the neighborhood of between 60,000 and 65,000 horsepower.

Mr. BRISTOW. I brought up this matter because I would like to have an opportunity to aid as far as my capacity goes in the forwarding of legislation which will develop that power. I think the Government ought to have all the power. If the corporations, railroads or any other kind, have interests there, they ought to be condemned for the use of the Government and let the Government develop this power. It certainly offers the finest opportunity for usefulness in the industrial line that is before Congress to-day or that is possible within our supervision at least.

One of the reasons why I arose to indulge in this discussion at all was to make inquiries in regard to why that power had not been utilized. I am pleased to know that the Senator from Nebraska is so well informed upon the subject and has given it the attention he has. I know in the near future we will hear from him further along that line.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], and vote "nay."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I am not at liberty to vote, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. On this question I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. CLAPP (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent on business of the Senate. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I will ask if the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WARREN. I am paired with that Senator and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I was requested to state that the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is detained from the Senate by necessary emergent business of the Senate itself. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KERN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. I observe that he is not present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. THOMAS (after having voted in the affirmative). Since announcing the transfer of my pair the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has entered the Chamber. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. SAULSBURY. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. THORNTON. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on official business.

Mr. THOMAS (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—32.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Martine, N. J. | Sheppard |
| Borah | Hughes | Nelson | Shively |
| Bristow | Jones | Norris | Smith, Ga. |
| Chilton | Kenyon | Overman | Sterling |
| Clapp | Kern | Page | Thomas |
| Gore | La Follette | Perkins | Thompson |
| Gronna | Lane | Poindexter | Tillman |
| Hitchcock | McCumber | Shafroth | Vardaman |

NAYS—17.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brandegee | Gallinger | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Burton | Lea, Tenn. | Smith, Md. | Williams |
| Dillingham | Martin, Va. | Stephenson | |
| du Pont | Pittman | Swanson | |
| Fall | Ransdell | Thornton | |

NOT VOTING—46.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Cummins | O'Gorman | Smith, Mich. |
| Bradley | Fletcher | Oliver | Smith, S. C. |
| Brady | Goff | Owen | Smoot |
| Bryan | James | Penrose | Stone |
| Burleigh | Johnson | Pomerene | Sutherland |
| Catron | Lee, Md. | Reed | Townsend |
| Chamberlain | Lewis | Robinson | Walsh |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lippitt | Root | Warren |
| Clarke, Ark. | Lodge | Sherman | West |
| Colt | McLean | Shields | Works |
| Crawford | Myers | Simmons | |
| Culberson | Newlands | Smith, Ariz. | |

So the amendment of Mr. NORRIS was agreed to.

Mr. LANE. I offer an amendment to the provision of the bill beginning in line 10 on page 26. I move, in line 11, after the word "relaying," to strike out the word "asphalt," and after the word "pavement," in the same line, to strike out down to and including the date "1904" in line 17, and to insert "except to the lowest responsible bidder upon free and open competition."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. LANE. In regard to this amendment I shall not take much time.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to understand the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LANE. I will explain it.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator intend to strike out the inhibition against paying more than $1.80 per square yard for this character of pavement?

Mr. LANE. No; I wish to strike out the word "asphalt" and the other words I have indicated, and to provide for letting the contract to the lowest bidder. This provision apparently seems to confine the District to the laying of asphaltum pavements.

Mr. HUGHES. As I understand the provision, it only attempts to deal with asphalt pavements, and no other. If any other kind of pavement is desired, this provision would not apply to it. It simply says that where an asphaltum pavement is to be laid the District shall not pay more than $1.80 per square yard, but it does not confine the District to the laying of asphalt pavements. Under this language any kind of pavement could be laid, but the provision is that if asphalt pavements are laid the District shall not pay more than $1.80 per square yard for the work.

Mr. LANE. The objection I have to that portion of the provision is that it does not specify or give sufficient information as to the character of the asphalt pavement, but proposes to pay the same price for relaying asphalt pavements as was paid for putting them down originally.

Mr. HUGHES. I will call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that the provision does not fix the price of this pavement; that it simply states the maximum price.

Mr. LANE. It states the maximum price for both laying and relaying.

Mr. HUGHES. It states the same maximum for both.

Mr. LANE. The same maximum. Under this provision the District can pay $1.80 for relaying a street with asphaltum after the concrete base has already been put in place and after the grading has been done. The grading and the concrete base constitute fully half the cost. If the bill makes any provision different from that, I do not properly understand it. It seems to me that all of the hard-surface streets in the city are of asphaltum, with the exception of a few basalt or Belgian blocks and some composite block pavements.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the District of Columbia has machinery of its own for repairing the pavements and that the pavements are repaired by the District with that machinery. Of course the District does not pay $1.80 per cubic yard, but only what it costs through their own machinery. That is the amount they pay.

Mr. LANE. But is not this a continuation of the policy and a confinement of this District to use asphalt for paving?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not so consider it. It only fixes the price which shall not be exceeded. It provides that no asphalt paving shall be done at a price exceeding $1.80 per square yard.

Mr. LANE. Does the price of $1.80 apply to the relaying, the resurfacing?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It applies to the new pavements. The Senator will allow me to say that the District itself repairs the pavements. As I have stated, they have machinery for that purpose.

Mr. LANE. Well, Mr. President, the point I wish to make is this: In laying a new pavement it is necessary to first grade the street; in the second place, it is necessary to put down a concrete base; and then, upon the top of that, it is necessary to put down the surfacing material. The specifications for that work may vary. You can put down any depth, any thickness of the surfacing material that you care to. I think 6 inches is what is considered the best type of that character of pavement.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that this work is always done under the supervision of the District engineer, and it has to be done in a certain way and under certain conditions.

Mr. LANE. That is the point I wish to make, that it leaves it optional with the engineer to pay the same price for resurfacing that is paid for originally laying down a pavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will excuse me, I am very sure he is mistaken in that. All this work is done after bids have been invited, and the contract is given to the lowest responsible bidder. The specifications are made by the engineering department and bids are invited for the work.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, that was another point I wished to make, that it leaves the matter open, so that they may or may not accept the lowest bid, so far as anything contained in the bill shows to the contrary; and the same compensation is allowed for resurfacing a street, which is about a third of the cost, as is allowed for the entire paving of the street.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator is certainly mistaken about that. That is a matter which depends on the bidding. There is a maximum point beyond which they can not go; and the price at which the work is done depends upon the bids that are made for it. I repeat, bids are invited, and the commissioners give the contract to the lowest bidder, if he is responsible and able to carry on the work.

Mr. LANE. The language of the bill is that—

> Under appropriations contained in this act no contract shall be made for making or relaying asphalt pavement at a higher price than $1.80 per square yard.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is true. Unless, however, somebody bids under that price the work can not be done; they can not go above that, but the price actually paid depends upon the bids.

Mr. LANE. That is the outside limit. It is proposed, in my opinion, to pay too much for relaying the pavements. That may be a proper expenditure for paving a street in the first place, but there should be a difference in the sum allowed for that work and the sum allowed for relaying a street.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We are not allowing any particular price. The price, I repeat, is fixed by the bidding.

Mr. LANE. Then, what objection would you have to changing it so that the clause will provide that these contracts shall be given to the lowest responsible bidders, after free and open competition, and cutting out the word "asphalt"?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is a general law to that effect now. That is the law of the land to-day.

Mr. LANE. If I am mistaken about that, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the Senator from Oregon is mistaken. The law already provides for it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I do not think the law does provide for it, though I do not wish to question, and I do not question, any man's word. I have a great deal of respect for the Senator's opinion, but as I came down the street this morning I saw a workman digging up one section of a street for the purpose of making repairs upon it or something of the kind. It was one of the streets with a surface covering of asphaltum, and on that street, at Thirteenth, off New York Avenue, the asphalt covering did not exceed 2 inches in thickness. I do not believe that an asphaltum surface of 2-inch thickness placed on top of

a base is worth $1.80 per square yard. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that I think there should be a 6-inch surface.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The price paid is $1.45½.

Mr. LANE. You propose to pay $1.80.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; they can not exceed that; and whoever is the lowest bidder gets the contract, if he is responsible. I repeat, the contract goes to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. LANE. Very well. I will accept the assurance of the Senators and withdraw the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator what are the words "or relaying" interpreted to mean?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The government of the District, as I have stated, has machinery of its own for repairing the streets, and they use that machinery for that purpose.

Mr. OWEN. I asked for an interpretation of the words "or relaying."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I presume it might be as expensive in some cases to relay as it would be to make a new pavement; and in that case it is a question of how small a bid they can get. The work, of course, would go to the lowest bidder.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill will permit me, a few years ago we entirely removed the pavement from Pennsylvania Avenue, and, of course, it was relaid. I apprehend a case of that kind is meant.

Mr. OWEN. Including the base?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know about that.

Mr. OWEN. The base is a very important part of the cost of the construction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. And I wish to know whether the words "or relaying" are intended to put the price, regardless of the base, at $1.80 a square yard as the maximum price? If so, it is entirely too high.

Mr. GALLINGER. Two years ago we made an appropriation for a portable asphalt plant, which is now being used for all ordinary repairs of streets in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senator from New Hampshire that the provision under consideration relates to work done under contract, and not work done by the District plant.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that; that is the language of the House provision. I am not quite sure whether or not it follows the language of former appropriation bills, but I do know that those in authority in the District are guarding its finances very carefully, and that they would not pay for the ordinary relaying of a pavement as much as they would pay for making it in the first place. Perhaps the language is unfortunate; I do not know how that may be; but I feel justified in saying to the Senator that they do not pay for repairs of any kind as much as they do for original work.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, on the assurance of the Senator, I withdraw the amendment. Now, I wish to offer another amendment; and I do not think it will take long to dispose of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator withdrawn his first amendment?

Mr. LANE. I withdraw it on the assurance of the Senator that the point raised by me is covered and that the city is safeguarded.

On page 58, beginning in line 3, there is an appropriation of $450,000 for the new Central High School. In line 6, in that item, I move to strike out "grading of an athletic field, construction of retaining walls, and construction of an athletic stadium," so that the item will read:

> Toward the construction of the new Central High School on the site purchased for that purpose and toward grading and other work necessary to prepare the site, $450,000.

This is a matter which I brought up some time ago. I submitted an amendment in relation to this subject on February 18. I appeared before the committee and urged my reasons for the proposed amendment. I will state them here to the Senate.

In the first place, the site which has been selected for the new Central High School is not fortunately located, in my opinion, particularly in view of the fact that so large an expenditure is involved. There is a total authorization for this structure of $1,200,000, and the school is designed to take care of some 1,200 students, as I understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of 2,500.

Mr. LANE. Twenty-five hundred; that is one of the objections I have to it. The new building is to be located between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on the top of a hill. Lying to the east of it, within a half mile, are the grounds of the Soldiers' Home, which cover several hundred acres and extend perhaps for a mile or even farther; I do not know how far. Just below those grounds and immediately adjacent to them is the filtration plant of the city, which covers a large number of acres. The children who live on the other side of these grounds, in order to reach the new school, will have to make a journey clear around and then back halfway up again to reach this location. The people upon the east side of the city are in the same condition; they are far removed from the new high school, and it will cost many of the children double carfare to reach the school. Such an expenditure will be taken out of the pockets of people who are the least able to afford it.

Over to the west of this school, within a distance of a half or three-quarters of a mile—not farther than three-quarters of a mile, I think—is Rock Creek Park, which extends for 2 or 3 miles in a direction somewhat parallel to the Soldiers' Home grounds. The children living upon the other side of that beautiful tract of land must also journey around it to reach the new high school. It seems to me wrong to appropriate twelve hundred thousand dollars for a school building for 2,500 children which is inaccessible to a majority of the children of the city on account of its geographical location. I think it is too much money to be expended in that location. There should be a high school there, but one to accommodate several hundred children, and not several thousand, would be ample, instead of the large high school proposed to be constructed. At the time we are authorizing the expenditure of this sum for the Central High School there are hundreds and hundreds of children over to the east who are deprived of adequate high-school facilities.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I merely want to call his attention to the fact, of which he perhaps is not advised, that the new building for the Central High School has already been authorized. This bill does not contain an authorization for the construction of the building, but a law passed at the last session of Congress contained an authorization for the acquirement of a site and the construction of this building at a cost of not exceeding $1,200,000, of which $300,000 were actually appropriated. The land has been bought and considerable work has been done. This is simply an additional appropriation of $450,000 to carry out what a law passed at the last session of the last Congress authorized to be done.

So far as the eastern part of the city is concerned, there is an additional school provided for there. I think it was authorized in the District appropriation bill of last year; but, at any rate, there is an appropriation of $150,000 for that school in this bill.

The provision under discussion does not involve the commencement of a project; the project has been adopted after discussion and an act of Congress has been passed providing for the purchase of the ground and the construction of the building, the entire cost not to exceed $1,200,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he is correct in the suggestion that the last District appropriation bill provided for a high school in the eastern part of the city?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is provided for in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was under the impression that the last appropriation bill provided only for one great Central High School.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct; but the pending bill provides for an Eastern High School in the eastern part of the city.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to say that when the item for the Central High School was before the Senate in the last Congress I sought to point out the mistake of erecting such a building and the folly of making such a large appropriation for that purpose. I urged then that, instead of providing for one enormous building, we should authorize a site to be acquired in the northeast and divide the appropriation so that we could have two new high schools instead of one high school. I was then told that one large high school would be very much better than two; that the one proposed would be all we would need for a long time; but now, after authorizing this enormous appropriation for the new Central High School, at the very next session of Congress we are asked to add an appropriation for another high school. If there is any possible way left to stop the excessive appropriation for the very large new Central High School and to build two high schools instead of one, I wish the committee would point it out to us and give us a chance to do it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will call the Senator's attention to the provision made in the present bill, which has met the approval of the Senate:

> For the purchase of a site for a new Eastern High School, to be located east of Tenth Street east and north of D Street south, $150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, can we not stop the appropriation for the

other building? It is useless to erect the enormous high-school building authorized at the last session of the Sixty-second Congress if we are also going to build a high school in the eastern section of the city.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that matter was decided last year. I understand that the Senator was opposed to it; but I also understand that the plans and specifications have been prepared and the contract has been let for the construction of this school. It is one of those things that can not be taken back.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then we ought not to erect the new high school in the eastern section of the city, but ought to stand by what we have done and only have one new high school.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We also felt that they needed a school in the eastern section. Statistics show that in the year 1920 there will be over 2,000 pupils in the new high school, or more than enough to fill the building about to be constructed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In 1920?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes; we do not build for a day only, but we have to look somewhat into the future.

Mr. GALLINGER. The situation is this: We have now an Eastern High School, a Western High School, and a Central High School. The Central High School is entirely inadequate, and the provision now under consideration is intended to remove that difficulty. I want to corroborate what the Senator from Maryland has said, that the plans for the new Central High School have been prepared, the ground has been paid for, and a contract for building the school has been let. The Eastern High School is badly crowded; it is located in an old building; and we propose in this bill to grant an appropriation to purchase a site recommended by the commissioners and by the board of education, so that they will have in due time a school adequate for their wants. The Western High School, which is in Georgetown, is a magnificent school building; it is not now overcrowded, but it is comparatively full. The McKinley Manual Training School is full to repletion, and the same, I think, is true of the Armstrong Manual Training School. We have a number of large school buildings in this District, and the only question that can arise about the Central High School is whether it is wise to build so large a school. I think it is. The population in that section of the city is growing by leaps and bounds. It is a white population almost exclusively, running to the north and northwest.

I would limit the time to a greater extent than has the Senator from Maryland in charge of the bill. He says that in 1920 the new Central High School will be full, while I am satisfied that long before that time it will be housing 2,500 pupils. We have a magnificent lot, and ought to have a very fine school building on that location.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will excuse me, before he resumes I desire to call his attention to a statement made by Mr. Blair, president of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, in which he says that before this new building is completed it will barely be sufficient; that it will be full of pupils.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When is it expected to be finished?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will take several years, of course, to construct a building of that size. Here is the statement of Mr. Blair:

> The wisdom of Congress has been demonstrated by the subsequent developments in our school system, and the estimates of the principal of the Central High School, who, of course, is interested in this proposition; of the principal of the Business High School, who has a school which is already crowded; of the principal of the Technical High School, who knows the conditions at his school; and of the principal of the Eastern High School, who is anxious to have a new school; all of them unite in this, that when we get this 2,500-pupil school built and equipped and ready to open we will practically be in a position where the high-school population of the District will fill the building, and more than fill it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President we ought not to commence any high-school building that can not be constructed in a year. The idea of erecting a high school for the District which will take seven years to complete in itself involves a plan of construction which is extravagant; but I do not know that there is anything now that can be done to remedy what I think was the blunder of the last Congress.

I do not believe in high schools for 2,500 pupils; I believe in high schools of reasonable size; and I believe they should be reasonably distributed and placed in locations for the most convenient use of the people of the District. I only call attention to this to justify what I said during the last Congress, that this large high school would not meet the demand of the city; that the eastern section of the city would ask at once for an additional high school, and it ought to have had a part of the appropriation that was then being made. There ought not to have been so large an amount authorized to construct the very large high school about to be erected, but we should have erected a school to accommodate a thousand pupils, which would have been ample for the time being, and when it became inadequate we ought to build another.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator, however, that the superintendent of schools believes that this new school will be filled in a few years; in fact, by the time it is completed. I do not know how long it will take to complete it, though I presume it will take several years; but he says it will not be too large, and that a school of the size designed is required to accommodate the children who will go there. To be conservative, I said that in about 1920 I thought the school would be filled, but the superintendent of schools says that by the time it is completed there will be a sufficient number of scholars attending the new school to fill it. If that is the case, why do we want to make it any smaller?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Because the children would be better handled by not massing so many together.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There are schools in this country that accommodate more than 2,500.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; there are, but I think the sanest educators disapprove them. The sanest educators approve schools of reasonable size.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. This is half the size of quite a number that are in use in the country now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is no necessity at all for such a very large school in a city of this kind. Land is not very expensive here. Land spreads all around us; and if, instead of building such a school, we should follow the policy of putting high schools around the edge of the city, convenient and in the direction of growth of population, and build them of reasonable size instead of such an extravagant size, I should think it would be far better for the District. Of course, that is past, and I suppose it can not be helped, whether I was right or wrong.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is just what I was going to submit to the Senate.

Mr. LANE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Is it not necessary, in order to have effective work, that some consistent and continuous policy shall be adopted? The Senator must bear in mind that this item was put in at the last session of Congress. The Congress then determined to have one high-school building, to cost $1,200,000, and appropriated $300,000 to commence the work. The work has been commenced, the lot has been bought, and some contracts have been made. An estimate comes in to the Appropriations Committee asking for an additional $450,000 on that $1,200,000 undertaking, and we are asked to appropriate it.

Was the Appropriations Committee to undertake to revise the action of the last session of Congress? What could the Appropriations Committee do but recommend the appropriation to carry out the policy which the Congress had adopted? It had settled this controversy between different schools of thought in respect to the size which a public-school building should be, and had fixed upon a building that will cost, together with the lot, $1,200,000. We have simply recommended the appropriation of $450,000 in addition, as I say, to the $300,000 appropriated at the last session of Congress, in order that the will of Congress might be carried out.

If this policy is to be stopped and to be changed it ought to be done, but I do not see how it can be properly done at all. I think it is essential that we should have a continuous policy to carry out plans and purposes of this sort. If a change is to be made it will take a carefully prepared repeal of existing laws and the substitution of new laws.

I look upon it as entirely impracticable. I think there is nothing remaining for the Congress to do but to carry out the purpose which it has started out upon, and make the appropriation for a building to cost, in all, $1,200,000.

As to the eastern part of the city, we find there is a necessity for additional school facilities there, and we are trying to provide them in this bill as well as we can. We think there ought to be an additional school building there. I think the Government is able to provide all the school buildings that are needed. Educational opportunities ought not to be provided in a stinted or in a meager way. We need an additional building in the eastern part of the city, and we recommend the appropriation of $150,000 in addition to the large high school, and the Senate has approved it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senate has already approved the appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The appropriation of $150,000 for the Eastern High School; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That has been passed on in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Yes; in Committee of the Whole. It was passed on by the House and also approved by the Senate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LANE. That is subject to amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is subject to amendment. It will be when it gets in the Senate. It has been agreed to by the Senate in Committee of the Whole, though.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I have procured some very interesting information this afternoon in regard to this matter, if nothing else. It seems that that is about all I shall get out of it. However, I am deeply grateful for that.

I have ascertained now that this matter has already been decided upon, and that contracts have been let. I introduced this amendment on February 18, and it was referred to the committee. Later along, just a few days ago, I was called before the committee to speak in behalf of my amendment, and I received no such information from them at that time. They did not tell me that the matter had gone too far for me to talk on the amendment; but they listened to me, more or less patiently, and did not give me the information which would have saved me the expenditure of my time here.

At the time I submitted this amendment, or shortly after that, a report came in here from the school commissioners who have charge of this subject. It was in favor of the plan I submitted. I was informed, on what I think is good authority, that no contracts had been let at that time. I should like to ask whether or not it is true that these contracts have been entered into since I introduced my amendment, for I wrote and asked the commissioners to delay entering into binding contracts until such time as this matter might be taken up in the Senate, for the reason that there was question as to the legality of the act. I stated that this appropriation had been made without an estimate from any quarter, asking for the appropriation of any such sum, coming to either House; that the appropriation was some four or five hundred thousand dollars in excess of any estimate which up to that time had ever been submitted to either House of Congress, and I understand that that is not the proper way of passing appropriation bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that the law was signed by the President on the 4th day of March, 1913. That law, when approved on the 4th day of March, 1913, authorized the ground to be purchased and the contracts to be entered into for all of these buildings, provided they did not exceed in the aggregate $1,200,000.

I hear, though I can not vouch for it, that a contract has been made for the entire construction. I do not know whether that is true or not, or when it was made; but I do know that since the 4th day of March, 1913, full authority has existed for entering into contracts amounting in the aggregate to $1,200,000.

Mr. LANE. I wish to say that I should have appreciated that information if I had had it sooner. I should have thanked the Senator very much for it if it had come a little earlier; it would have saved me this trouble.

Is it a fact, and is it a custom of this body, that appropriations can be lawfully made in excess of estimates, and that they become operative and good law? Is that true?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not the custom. It is very difficult to get Congress to agree to appropriations that have not been estimated for, but Congress has the full power to do it. I have no doubt in this case the estimates were made; but Congress has the full power to authorize a building that costs $1,200,000 even if there have been no estimates.

I have no doubt, however, as I say, that there were estimates showing that this ground and these buildings would cost $1,200,000. It is customary to have estimates made before the laws are enacted, and I have no doubt such was the case, and that Congress acted with full information before it, and authorized this expenditure of not exceeding $1,200,000.

Mr. LANE. I am also informed, on what seems good authority, that this sum of $1,200,000 was not authorized either by the House or by the Senate, but was fixed up by the conference committee, and then was adopted by both Houses. Now, is that a legal and lawful way of appropriating money?

I am inquiring in order to find out. There is a lot of information floating around here that a person can pick up if he is attentive and has time enough. I want to gather this unto myself and find out if this is really the way in which we do business here. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. This estimate was regularly made.

Mr. LANE. It was?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, yes. It came to the committee in the Book of Estimates in the regular manner; and the committee acted with that estimate before it, that they needed $450,000 additional to pay for work under this authorization of the last session, on the 4th day of March, 1913. It was duly estimated for, and we acted with that before us.

Mr. LANE. Then I will acknowledge that I have received information which is not correct.

Now I wish to offer another amendment to the item about this little $150,000 school over here on the east side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This amendment is not yet disposed of, unless it is withdrawn.

Mr. LANE. It does not seem to be in order, Mr. President. It "died a-borning."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes; the amendment is in order.

Mr. LANE. I will withdraw it. If it is a fact that it can have no effect upon this legislation, I want to withdraw it, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can offer his amendment if he wants to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What page of the bill is it on?

Mr. LANE. Page 58. I wanted to strike out that language and divide this fund up afterwards so that other high schools can be built in other portions of the city. That was the amendment I offered.

What is the parliamentary procedure in regard to this, Mr. President? Has the law gone into effect so far that it can not be amended in this manner? Is that the ruling?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not made any ruling at all.

Mr. LANE. That seems to be the opinion of all the more learned and experienced Senators. If not, then I will insist upon the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I made no point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. I want it voted upon, then. I want the Senate to vote upon it, if the Secretary will kindly state it. Before that is done, however, I wish to say a few words further, and I shall be brief.

I think it is a mistake to expend so large a sum for a large building, and to concentrate so many children under one roof, when there are other sections of the city that are in need of the same school facilities, and the same amount of money would provide for all of them. It is my opinion that the children will be better cared for, they will come out much better men and women, if they are kept closer to the home influence. I believe forcing poor people, who can ill afford it, to pay double car fares, which many of them will have to do, to ride upon the cars from half to three-quarters of an hour to reach this school, and put in that much time again to return to their homes, is a useless waste of money and of time and not for their good. I believe that for the larger interest of the city, which is growing in different directions, this fund should be divided up, and four high schools can be built with the money with better advantage to the city. In fact, that was the recommendation of the board of school commissioners itself and in line with their recommendations. They wished that done, and I think it ought to be done.

I submit this amendment, and I should like to have a vote on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator knows it or not; but I am informed, and I think reliably informed, that the contract has already been agreed to and let for constructing this high-school building.

Mr. LANE. When was that done?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the date here; but I am quite sure that if the Senator will make an examination, he will find that the contract has been entered into.

Mr. LANE. Since this amendment was introduced?

Mr. SMOOT. No. I think under the law the contract was entered into, and I believe it will be binding on the District. I do not believe the Senator ought to offer this amendment at this time, although I admit that it is in order, for the reasons stated. I am quite sure that the party informing me is correct in saying that the contract has been agreed to and executed; and if so, the Senate of the United States certainly should not adopt this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The newspapers published the statement about two weeks ago, and of course it was accurate, that the contract was let the day before, long after the resolution introduced by the Senator from Oregon was pending before the committee.

Mr. LANE. I wish to say to the Senator that I took the trouble of writing to the commissioners, and asked them to withhold the awarding of the contracts or the consideration of bids until after this matter was settled in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the resolution of the Senator did not pass, and the District officials certainly could not take that as a direction from Congress. I believe the Senator ought to withhold this amendment. I do not believe he ought to offer it now, because of the fact that, the contract having been executed, it would be an improper thing to do.

Mr. LANE. The District will not forfeit over $50,000 or $60,000 if it has to pay the architects their fees for completing the plans, whereas the city of Washington and the District of Columbia and the Government will be a hundred thousand dollars ahead if they will adopt this amendment, change the type of the building, and put high schools in different portions of the city. It will mean the difference between an education and no education for hundreds of children. It will mean giving the opportunity for an education to hundreds of children who never will receive it if this bill goes through. It means that difference. They will be denied the opportunity, for the reason that they will not be able to bear the expense or give the time. In the larger interest of the city, the loss of the architect's fee of fifty or sixty thousand dollars, or whatever it may be, will be the least of the evils; so I will insist upon the submission of my amendment to this body for its decision.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 58, line 6, after the word "site," it is proposed to strike out the words "grading of an athletic field, construction of retaining walls, and construction of an athletic stadium," and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

*Provided, however*, That the appropriation of $1,200,000 authorized by the act of March 4, 1913, entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," etc., for the erection of a central high-school building in the city of Washington, D. C., be divided, $750,000 thereof to be applied to the erection of a central high-school building on the site at the corner of Eleventh and Clifton Streets NW., heretofore acquired under authority of Congress, and that the remaining $450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be applied under the direction of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the purchase of a site, preparation of plans, and erection of a high-school building in the eastern section of Washington, in accordance with the general plan outlined in Senate Document No. 329, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I will say that there is an appropriation made here, later along, for a high school in the eastern portion of the city; that is, it is an appropriation of $150,000 merely for the purchase of a site. Is not that true?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. LANE. We could save some of this money by striking out that provision a little later, which I am going to ask to have done. We will be money ahead, for the reason that the city already owns plenty of land over here immediately adjoining the present high school, without expending a dollar for a site. I am informed by a number of citizens who live over in that part of the city that such is the condition. If that is true, here we have another opportunity to save money.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes appear to have it. The noes have it and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LANE. The noes got it all right. I have no doubt at all of that.

Now, Mr. President, I will offer another amendment, on page 59, to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For the preparation of plans and the construction of a modern building for a new Eastern High School on reservation No. 13, located between B and E and Nineteenth and Twentieth Streets SE., Washington, D. C., $150,000.

The argument advanced to me—and this has been submitted to me by people who live over in that section of the city—is that the District already owns a tract of land there of quite a number of acres, that if a building should be constructed at the location called for in this amendment there would be plenty of room around the building for carrying out agricultural experiments or playgrounds, and that in many ways it is a superior location. I am informed that it is not far from the present location and only two blocks from the car line, and that in every way it will save the city money and afford better facilities.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand that the location the Senator is proposing is down near the asylum and jail and almshouse. Is that the place?

Mr. LANE. I am informed that the jail and the almshouse have been moved away, or are about to be moved away, and that the ground and the buildings there will be vacant.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I was down there the other day, and the jail is there now, the asylum is there now, and the almshouse is there now. Has the Senator ever been down there himself?

Mr. LANE. No; I must say I have not.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I thought the Senator had not.

Mr. GALLINGER. The smallpox hospital and the crematorium are there, also.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say, Mr. President——

Mr. LANE. Just a minute. I will yield the floor in a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. All right.

Mr. LANE. I am like the committee in that respect. I have not visited this locality. I was informed the other day, when I was before the committee, that they had never visited the site where they are going to spend $1,200,000. I am just as ignorant about this site as they were about that. Now, if the Senator wishes, I will yield to him.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say, so far as this site is concerned, that I have been there and have visited it, and I think it would be absolutely impossible to locate a school there. It is a site down here near the river, a long distance away, where the jail, the almshouse, the asylum, and the crematorium are located. It is entirely unsuitable as a site for a high-school building. I am satisfied that the Senator never has been there, or he would not for a moment consider the place.

In regard to the location that has been selected by the committee, it is a location that has been recommended by the school board and by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I am free to say, so far as I am concerned, that I do not know anything about the location. We were informed, however, that it was the proper location; the amount of money that we have recommended here has been asked for by the District Commissioners, and the place has been recommended by the school authorities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are you going to do with the existing Eastern High School Building?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have an impression that it has been suggested that it can be used for other educational purposes. I do not know exactly what they are, but manifestly we can not erect a new building on that site without destroying the old one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought perhaps an addition could be made to the old one.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is altogether worn out and inadequate. It is not capable of economical reconstruction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much land belonging to the Government is there where the present Eastern High School is?

Mr. GALLINGER. As I recall, not very much.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My recollection is that there are 2 or 3 acres.

Mr. LANE. I am informed that there are 2 or 3 acres.

Mr. GALLINGER. That may be so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When I used to live over here one of my boys went there, and I have an idea that it is a pretty large place. I have not seen it for I do not know how long. It struck me that it would be rather bad business to go out and buy a site if we could possibly utilize anything we already have. The present building is very conveniently located for an Eastern High School, and I thought perhaps we could add to the building that exists there more easily than to construct an entirely new building.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has been discussed more or less. This Eastern High School matter is not a new one. The contention for a new Eastern High School building has been before us for six or eight years, and it has been gone over. I know I have myself inquired what use they could put the old school building to, and while I can not definitely state what the proposition was it was stated that it could be utilized in other ways.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course if it can be utilized, that is different. I do not want to be misunderstood. So far from opposing these appropriations, they are in line with my own thought. I should like to see Washington have four or five great high schools, and I should not care a cent if they cost a million dollars apiece. I think it would be a very much more profitable investment than half of one battleship, and redound very much more to the prosperity and improvement of the people. I should like to see them, and I should like to see each one of them built up into a regular little college, and a good college at that. I should like to see the Federal City itself set the example in educational matters for all the country; but I do think that wherever we have land we ought to try to use it instead of purchasing new sites.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say, if the Senator will permit me, that I am personally acquainted with the site mentioned in the bill, and it is admirable in every way. I feel sure that if the Senator from Oregon should visit the site he suggests he would not urge it. It is a Government reservation on the Eastern

Branch, or Anacostia River. There is a jail there which we probably could not duplicate short of a million or two million dollars, and I do not know where we would put it if we did duplicate it. There is the Washington Asylum and Hospital, that must remain there for a while. There are other buildings, including a smallpox hospital and a crematorium. The reservation is in every way, according to my notion, not well located for a high school. It is at the extreme end of the eastern section of the city. It runs right down to the river. There is a cemetery of some considerable note, the Congressional Cemetery, in the immediate vicinity; and at the present time there are no car tracks reaching within half a mile of it.

I feel sure that if the Senator should go there he would not urge that such a site be selected for an Eastern High School.

Mr. LANE. All right. I was assured, Mr. President, that the penal institutions and the almshouse either had been removed or were about to be removed; that the hospital was in a dilapidated condition, that the Senate had declared it to be almost a nuisance, and that it was about to be removed; that in the event these institutions were removed there would be buildings left there the construction of which had cost the Government some $400,000, and that by a little alteration they could be made useful for the purposes of the schools. If that is not the case, however, I will withdraw the amendment and substitute another one for it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that the jail, the asylum, the crematorium, and the cemetery are all there at this time, and in all probability they will remain there indefinitely.

Mr. LANE. Then I will withdraw the amendment and substitute one proposing to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, on page 59, and to insert in lieu thereof:

For the preparation of plans and the construction of an addition to the Eastern High School, located near the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Eighth Street SE., $150,000.

Now, there is where the idea of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] comes in. Here is a piece of property already owned by the Government, which has a school building on it. There are two acres of land in the tract, so that there is plenty of room to build an addition. This will save the expenditure of this other money and will accommodate the people of that district as well as a new location, to which, as well as I can estimate, they are pretty generally opposed.

I have had interviews with members of the civic association there, which takes a great interest in this matter. They have urged me to call it to the attention of the Senate and to pray that you will give them an opportunity to have a school in a more desirable location and save the expenditure of this money, which they claim to be unnecessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will ask the Senator if he does not think a proposition of that sort ought to have been offered in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, so that it could be investigated? Nobody knows anything about it now. I do not know about it. I have not the slightest particle of information about it.

Surely the Senator does not want the Senate to make an appropriation of $150,000 and locate a public school here without any human being except himself knowing anything about it. I do not know whether the Senator went and visited this site or whether he has examined it at all, but surely the Senate can not be expected to agree to it without any information.

The committee ought to have had an opportunity to investigate the matter. If the Senator had sent his amendment to the committee, the committee would have investigated it, and would have been prepared to tell the Senate something about it. As it is, the committee can not tell the Senate a thing about it.

Mr. LANE. I was under the impression that we act a good deal of the time here without much information on the subject which we have under consideration. I did not consider that to be a valid objection to putting it in here at the last hour. I know I have been swallowing items in this whole bill and statements in regard to it about which I knew nothing.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will ask the Senator if he has himself examined this location personally?

Mr. LANE. I know where it is.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Has the Senator examined it?

Mr. LANE. I have not given a particular examination. I have taken that largely through representations——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator is asking the Senate to appropriate $150,000——

Mr. LANE. As an addition to the present high school, where the Government already owns the ground, instead of going off, as you are intending to do, and spending $150,000 for a new location.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. This $150,000 is appropriated under an estimate officially made and certified to the committee.

Mr. LANE. You are paying $150,000 for a site, without furnishing a cent for the building, whereas under my proposition we have the site now, and it will only cost $150,000 for the building. That is the whole case. It seems to me that as an economical proposition it is good business.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor, but I was about to make a point of order against the amendment. It has not been estimated for and has not been reported from any committee.

Mr. LANE. I will accept the ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. MCCUMBER. On page 61, under the head of "Metropolitan police," line 15, I move to strike out the numerals "$1,500" and to insert in lieu thereof "$1,800."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, line 15, where it reads "11 captains, at $1,500 each," it is proposed to strike out "$1,500" and in lieu insert "$1,800."

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, as bearing upon this particular amendment I wish to call attention to the fact that we have provisions here for 13 lieutenants, at $1,320 per year each; 1, at $1,250; 7 privates of class 3, at $1,200 each; 107 privates of class 2, at $1,080 each; and 56 privates of class 1, at $900 each. These sums, ranging from $900 to $1,500 per annum, represent the compensation that we pay the police force in the city of Washington.

I find that we are paying in most of our departments to the average high-school boy and girl as he or she enters the Government service a minimum salary of $900 per year, and it is increased up to about $1,200 or $1,400 a year in a very short time.

I think there is not a Senator here who will not agree with me that $900 is not a proper compensation for a policeman doing the work that he is compelled to do. Remember that these men must work early and late; that in blizzards, in storms, they must perform their duty; and that their duties are sometimes very hazardous and never very agreeable.

I know it has often been said if these men do not want the positions let them resign and other persons will take the position at those prices, but, Mr. President, that is not the standard we have fixed in providing compensation in other departments. We have not taken advantage of the necessitous condition of people to give them the lowest possible value for the services for which they may be employed. On the contrary, our rule has been right along to pay a reasonable and fair compensation.

I know of no class of men in any city in the United States who are superior to the members of the Metropolitan police. On the contrary, I believe on the average in intelligence, standing, capacity, education, and so forth, those in the Metropolitan police service are superior to those employed in any other city in the United States. Yet the compensation upon the whole I think is very much lower than in any other large city in the country.

Mr. President, we must remember that these men are not right out of school. They are men who have reached the age of discretion. They could not hold their places unless they had. They are men, as a rule, who have families to support. I submit that their compensation certainly ought to be as high as that of the boy or girl just out of school in one of our great departments.

I am not at all in harmony, and never have been in harmony, with the gradations that have been fixed in the police service or in any other method by which we have made our gradations for fixing the compensation of those employed in the Government service. The steps in the gradation are altogether too large. I can see no reason for jumping from $900 up to $1,200 and then to $1,500 and, finally, to $4,000 for a superintendent. I admit that after a man has served it may be a year or so upon the police force he may be more competent and may be worth more than one who has served a single year, and that we might give a little additional compensation because of that longer service; but if one has not proved himself as good as the best within one year, he probably never will be able to do it. Therefore there ought not to be any gradation beyond at least one year's service, and we ought to have a higher grade than that at present fixed by law.

In justice, Mr. President, to these men, I am asking for the adoption of the amendment, and if it is allowed I will then move to raise the compensation of all the others to $1,800 per annum.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, however much I dislike to differ with the Senator from North Dakota or refuse to grant what he may desire, I will state that there has been no estimate for this amount, and therefore I shall have to raise the point of order against the amendment. We have no estimates whatever for it in any way.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think that that has been ruled on before affirmatively. However, I have my doubts about the correctness of the ruling that has been made upon that proposition. I suppose it is governed by Rule XVI of the Rules, which provides:

And no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill—

This, of course, will increase it—

or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless—

These are the exceptions—

or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate—

Of course the amendment does not come within that rule—

or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

The only question upon the latter clause is as to the estimate. I understand there has been an estimate by the department for the cost of the service of the Metropolitan police. Therefore the amendment would not be subject to the point of order that there had been no estimate. The only way the Senator from Maryland could ask that it come within the rule would be, possibly, that the amendment would make the appropriation a little greater than the estimate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say to the Senator that the official estimate from the department is 11 captains, at $1,500 each.

Mr. McCUMBER. All I want the Senator to admit is that there is an estimate, and then I want the ruling of the Chair upon the proposition whether when there is an estimate it precludes an amendment increasing the amount estimated. If we could make an amendment that would cut down an estimate, can we not also move an amendment to raise it? Are we bound to follow the estimate or at least make that estimate the limit to which we may go in an appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that these estimates are made and the aggregate is the whole amount of money necessary. If we were allowed to amend these matters and go beyond the estimates, there is no telling to what point we would reach or where the money would come from to pay for the appropriations.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then the Senator would say that Congress is limited in its power in making appropriations to an estimate made by an executive department?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the rule is very clear.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can hardly conceive that that is the rule.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator ought not to state it in that way. It is simply that it is not in order to offer something that neither has an estimate nor has the report of the committee, but which raises the amount. Estimates have been made specifically as to each case, as to the salary, and so forth.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator is mistaken as to the rule. The rule is in the alternative; that is, there must either be a report or it must be "proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of one of the departments." The estimate has been made, and the only question wherein I differ from the statement made by the Senator is whether when an estimate has been made we are by the rules precluded from making an appropriation by an amendment beyond the estimate. If we are precluded from increasing the estimate, then we by our rules have necessarily given over the power of making appropriation to the executive department.

Mr. WARREN. Not at all, Mr. President, because an amendment can be submitted and go to a committee. If the committee does not act, then the amendment can still perhaps be offered; but the Senator might say we were debarred from passing a bill because under the rules it is required that it shall first go to a committee. The idea is that if we did not have these rules all kinds of legislation would be done upon propositions presented by individual Senators rather than have it go under the rules to a committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if I may just answer in a word, as I understand the rule, an amendment is not in order unless the same be moved by direction of a special or select committee of the Senate or proposed in pursuance of an estimate, and so forth. I do not care to longer delay the Senate, but I insist, if that is the construction of the rule, then that rule precludes the Senate from exercising its legislative authority in increasing an appropriation beyond the estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the point of order is well taken. The Chair does not care to rule on all the reasons set out in the rule inhibiting the increase of an appropriation, but in the ruling the Chair will say that the bill now contains the entire estimate made by the department. The Chair would be of the opinion that if the committee had allowed these men only $900, the estimate being for $1,500, the Senator from North Dakota could have proposed an amendment, because there had already been an estimate to the extent of $1,500. But the amount of the estimate now having been granted by the committee, the Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think that is the same reason that has been heretofore given for the same ruling. I am not challenging it, although I still think it does infringe upon the authority of the Senate to act as a legislative body.

Now, I am going to offer several amendments that might be divided, but, as undoubtedly the same objection would be made to each one, I will submit them as one, and then the objection can apply to all of them and save that much time. But I wish to make a record of them.

On the same page, page 61, line 23, I move to strike out "$1,320" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800," and on line 25, to strike out "$1,250" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800."

On page 62, line 1, in the clause relating to the seven privates of class 3, I move to strike out "$1,200" and to insert in lieu thereof "$1,800."

In the provision for 107 privates of class 2, in line 2, page 62, I move to strike out "$1,080" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800," and in the third line, relating to 56 privates of class 1, at $900, I move to strike out "$900" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make the same point of order. None of those amounts have been estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a motion pending that I offered yesterday. It occurs on page 5041 of the RECORD. My motion is to recommit to the District of Columbia Committee all of the bill beginning on line 5, page 17, down to and including line 20, page 18, with instructions to so amend the same as to strike out all appropriations for maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles, except for the fire department and the police department and the emergency health service.

I want to get permission to amend the motion by putting after the word "automobiles" the words "or carriages drawn by horses." In that event it will read to recommit that part of it with instructions to so amend the same as to strike out all appropriations for maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles or carriages drawn by horses, except for the fire department, the police department, and the emergency health service.

I do not want to talk about it at any length, because yesterday I said what I wanted to say. I wish to add only that I have thought this the best method to go about it, because the Committee on the District of Columbia can find out at once just in what departments these automobiles and carriages are used by officials, and they can strike out that number, whatever it is, and leave the number that is thought by them to be necessary for emergency work in the fire department, the police department, and the health service.

I do not care to add any more to the discussion. I just desire a vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I hope the motion will not prevail. It seems to me that if this is a matter which is wrong, it should be corrected, but——

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Maryland will allow me, as I understood the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], it was to recommit, with instructions, a part of the bill. I know of no rule under which we can recommit a part of a general appropriation bill with instructions and pass the remainder of the bill. Of course, if the Senator moves to strike out a part of the bill, we can pass on that motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may be, Mr. President, that the parliamentary point made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is correct and that a recommittal of the bill with instruc-

tions to amend this part of it would be necessary, but I do not think so. I think we can recommit this part of the bill, and the bill would go over until the committee reported upon this part of it. If, however, the Chair rules otherwise, I shall change the motion so as to make it read to recommit the bill with instructions to amend that part of it beginning with a certain line and ending with a certain line.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I was going on to say that I hope that this bill or any part of it will not be recommitted. It has been considered by the Senate and its various items have been passed upon. It seems to me if the Senator from Mississippi wants any change in the manner and mode of transportation in the District of Columbia, there is another way to accomplish that object. If the Senator desires to do so, he may offer a resolution providing for the appointment of a commission to investigate these matters, so as to ascertain what is best to be done. I do not think, however, that this bill ought to be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee, or that any part of it should be so recommitted, and I hope it will not be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I, of course, am well aware of the fact that if I introduced a separate bill or resolution upon this subject and had it sent to a committee, it would not be considered, but that that would be the end of it. I do not know of any way to get at these reforms except when appropriation bills are under consideration, when considerations of these questions can be forced.

I think we are all agreed that this use of automobiles by officials has grown into an abuse; I think we are all agreed that we ought to begin to reform it; and if I thought this was to be the be-all and the end-all of it I would not make this motion; but I expect upon each appropriation bill which is brought here—the naval bill, the military bill, and the remainder of them—to offer amendments similar to this, so that we may eliminate this entire abuse in order that there shall be no longer public officials using automobiles and carriages purchased by the public, mainly for the purpose of carrying them to their offices and back, and partially for social and other purposes, which are certainly not within the purview of the appropriation power of the Congress of the United States.

I do not know any other way to get at it except this. If I knew, or if I could get the information myself, I would now move to strike out the three automobiles used in this department, the two used in the other, and the one used in the other, but I have not the information and I can not get it. The committee can get it; the committee can ascertain it in a telephone conversation, if it does not already know it, in 30 minutes at the Municipal Building, and it can furnish the information. So I merely lay down the rule to guide them, to wit: Strike out all of the appropriations for the maintenance or purchase of the automobiles except for these three departments, where it is evident that there are occasions when quick service must be had—the fire department, the police department, and the emergency health department. It can be done very easily, and will merely cause the postponement of final action upon the bill until to-morrow. The committee can get the information to-morrow morning before the Senate meets and come back here with it.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, I will say that I think the only way to reach his object is for the Senator either to move to strike out the language and let us vote directly on that motion or to recommit the entire bill. There is, however, another way to reach it. It can be reached in all the other bills where the same matter comes up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not hear the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. I say it can be reached on other appropriation bills as to all of these appropriations for the various departments.

I think I ought to say to the Senator that there has formerly been a great deal of discussion on this matter, and undoubtedly there has been more or less use of these vehicles for private purposes as to the general transportation in the departments; but when we came to ask officially, by resolution duly passed here, from every department the exact number of vehicles which they had, we found the number a great deal less than had been reported. The information came in here tabulated and went to the Committee on Appropriations. The automobiles that are now being provided for are to take the places of horses and carriages, so that they are not additional vehicles, as a general thing. It is true that there is one automobile added in this bill, but as to the others, they are to take the place of the horse-drawn vehicles for personal transportation and of horse trucks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator please, I wish to do away with the horse-drawn vehicles for the transportation of officials themselves, as well as the automobiles. I do not want one to take the place of the other; I want to do away with both.

Mr. WARREN. That being true, I presume the Senator desires his motion to apply to the departments as well as to the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. So that there are other bills on which it would be just as important to put this restriction and where it would be just as effective as upon this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I can not introduce a resolution upon this appropriation bill to apply to all the departments, nor could I introduce upon another appropriation bill a resolution to apply to this. I have to take each bill as it comes. If the Senator please, the situation is this: I can not move to strike out without running the risk of striking out certain motor vehicles which are used for truck purposes, for the transportation of material. I do not want to strike that out; I think it is wise to use them; I think they are much cheaper than the horse-drawn vehicles for that purpose.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. I understood him to say that, in response to a resolution passed by this body, lists of the vehicles used by the different departments, or, rather, the automobiles used by them, have been furnished to the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Lists were furnished.

Mr. VARDAMAN. At what time?

Mr. WARREN. It was something more than a year ago. I saw the returns here yesterday. They were in the hands of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do those lists embrace all the departments?

Mr. WARREN. They embrace all the departments and subdivisions of the departments. The lists were very complete.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like very much to see those lists, Mr. President. I agree most heartily with my colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS] that this is an inexcusable expense and should be stopped. I can see no more reason for supplying automobiles to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or to the heads of the different departments, than there is for supplying automobiles to the United States Senators. And no Senator would dare provoke the wrath of his constituents by proposing to have the Government furnish automobiles for Senators. It is an unwarranted prodigality of public funds; and I agree with the senior Senator from Mississippi that now is the time to begin the pruning. It is unfortunate that a little more pruning had not been done before this. If it had, the abuse would not have grown to such rank proportions.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that the information to which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] refers was furnished the Senate two years ago, in 1912. I think we ought to have the information up to date. I am in thorough accord with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely want to say that I quite agree with the two Senators from Mississippi, and I want to support this motion. It is a very small matter, in my judgment, however, compared to some of the appropriations which have been passed here without even a division.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say in reply to that, Mr. President, that there is no item upon this bill more indefensible; I do not care how small it is—that is not the question—if it is not justified in law, in morals, and good policy, it ought to be cut off.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to inquire of the Senator if he is aware of the fact that this bill increases the salaries of the commissioners $1,000 a year?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand it does. I have been unfortunate, Mr. President, in the fact that I have been sick and compelled to be absent——

Mr. THOMAS. That is an item quite as indefensible as this, as they were appointed with the full understanding that they were to serve for a certain amount, and we have given them $1,000 a year more.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly there seems to be no limit to our liberality.

Mr. THOMAS. None whatever.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Absolutely none; and I am growing very tired of it.

Mr. THOMAS. In addition to that, we supply each one of them with an automobile and with a chauffeur.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As I said a moment ago, I have been detained from the Senate on account of illness until this morning. I am very much in favor of cutting off this needless lagniappe that the Government officers are enjoying, and I for one am going to insist hereafter that the gentlemen who hold these places shall either ride on the street cars or furnish their own conveyances.

Mr. President, in performing the functions of United States Senator we are executing a sacred trust committed to us by our masters—the people. We must be just, but to trench upon the generous in matters of appropriating public funds would carry us far beyond the limits of our authority and make us traitors to the constituents who sent us here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to amend the proposition by putting it in a better shape. Instead of moving to recommit that portion of the bill I wish to move to insert the following:

That no money appropriated by this act shall be used for the maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles or carriages drawn by horses, except for the fire department, the police department, and the emergency health service.

That overcomes the difficulty suggested by the Senator from Wyoming and brings the question squarely before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is rather a summary way of getting at a matter of this kind. I am of the impression that probably there are irregularities in this respect, but automobiles have been purchased and carriages have been purchased, and what are you going to do with them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sell them.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Well, you can do that——

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what we did with the Senate horses and wagons which we did not need. You have 31 of those automobiles in the service of the District of Columbia, and everybody knows that is too many.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There may be too many, and I presume there are too many, but at the same time it is the mode of transportation; it is the mode of doing business that this age of progress warrants.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me for a moment——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I yield the floor.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest, if the Senator thinks we have too many, that he adopt the suggestion made by my colleague, take the matter under advisement, and discover whether or not there are too many and whether we can not dispense with a few of them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request for the yeas and nays seconded?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What did the Chair decide as to the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had no opportunity to decide. Is the request for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and vote "yea."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WARREN. I transfer my standing pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] so that he may stand paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent on the business of the Senate and that he is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on account of important business.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). When I voted I had forgotten that my pair, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was absent from the city. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—28.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Kern | Poindexter | Sterling |
| Bristow | La Follette | Reed | Thomas |
| Clapp | Lane | Shafroth | Thompson |
| Gore | McCumber | Sheppard | Tillman |
| Gronna | Norris | Shively | Vardaman |
| Jones | Overman | Smith, Ga. | West |
| Kenyon | Owen | Smoot | Williams |

NAYS—19.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brady | Gallinger | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. |
| Brandegee | Hughes | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. |
| Bryan | James | Page | Swanson |
| Catron | Johnson | Perkins | Warren |
| Dillingham | Lee, Md. | Pittman | |

NOT VOTING—48.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Cummins | Myers | Shields |
| Borah | du Pont | Nelson | Simmons |
| Bradley | Fall | Newlands | Smith, Mich. |
| Burleigh | Fletcher | O'Gorman | Smith, S. C. |
| Burton | Goff | Oliver | Stephenson |
| Chamberlain | Hitchcock | Penrose | Stone |
| Chilton | Hollis | Pomerene | Sutherland |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lea, Tenn. | Ransdell | Thornton |
| Clarke, Ark. | Lewis | Robinson | Townsend |
| Colt | Lippitt | Root | Walsh |
| Crawford | Lodge | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Culberson | McLean | Sherman | Works |

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as it appears that it is necessary for me to vote in order to make a quorum, I shall vote. I am permitted to do so under those circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator can not vote now, after the result has been announced.

Mr. MYERS. I had no way of knowing that my vote would be necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But under the rules the Senator can not vote after the result is announced.

Mr. MYERS. Is that the fact, Mr. President? May I not vote now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that a Senator can not vote after the announcement of the result is made. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Myers | Smith, Ga. |
| Brady | Hughes | Norris | Smith, Md. |
| Bristow | James | Overman | Smoot |
| Bryan | Johnson | Owen | Sterling |
| Catron | Jones | Page | Swanson |
| Chilton | Kenyon | Perkins | Thomas |
| Clapp | Kern | Pittman | Thompson |
| Dillingham | La Follette | Poindexter | Vardaman |
| Fall | Lane | Reed | Warren |
| Gallinger | Lee, Md. | Shafroth | West |
| Gore | McCumber | Sheppard | Williams |
| Gronna | Martin, Va. | Shively | |
| Hitchcock | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ariz. | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I should like to have the amendment stated from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, after the words "District of Columbia," on line 21, it is proposed to insert:

*And provided further*, That no money appropriated by this act shall be used for the maintenance or purchase of passenger automobiles or carriages drawn by horses except for the fire department, the police department, and the emergency health service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I announce the same arrangement of pairs, so that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] will stand paired with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I again announce the absence of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on account of important business.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—29.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Jones | Poindexter | Thomas |
| Bristow | Kenyon | Reed | Thompson |
| Chilton | Kern | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Clapp | La Follette | Sheppard | West |
| Fall | Lane | Shively | Williams |
| Gore | McCumber | Smith, Ga. | |
| Gronna | Norris | Smoot | |
| Hitchcock | Overman | Sterling | |

NAYS—21.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brady | Hughes | Myers | Smith, Md. |
| Bryan | James | Owen | Swanson |
| Catron | Johnson | Page | Warren |
| Dillingham | Lee, Md. | Perkins | |
| Gallinger | Martin, Va. | Pittman | |
| Hollis | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ariz. | |

NOT VOTING—45.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Cummins | Oliver | Stephenson |
| Borah | du Pont | Penrose | Stone |
| Bradley | Fletcher | Pomerene | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Goff | Ransdell | Thornton |
| Burleigh | Lea, Tenn. | Robinson | Tillman |
| Burton | Lewis | Root | Townsend |
| Chamberlain | Lippitt | Saulsbury | Walsh |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lodge | Sherman | Weeks |
| Clarke, Ark. | McLean | Shields | Works |
| Colt | Nelson | Simmons | |
| Crawford | Newlands | Smith, Mich. | |
| Culberson | O'Gorman | Smith, S. C. | |

So Mr. WILLIAMS's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when the bill comes into the Senate I want to reserve, for a separate vote, the amendments offered by the committee found on line 5, 6, and 7 of page 2 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That reservation will be made.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, reserving the amendments on lines 5, 6, and 7 of page 2.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the first amendment reserved, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 5, after the words "two commissioners, at," the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, agreed to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I may be obtuse, but I did not quite understand the form of the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question was on agreeing to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. Concurring in the committee amendment on those lines?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurring in the committee amendment on those lines.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the vote will be taken again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the committee amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not concurred in.

The SECRETARY. In line 7, on page 2, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, agreed to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to read:

Engineer commissioner, so much as may be necessary to make salary $6,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it. The noes have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not concurred in. The bill is still in the Senate and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be ordered to a third reading.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, and Mr. GALLINGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, earlier in the day a statement was made that the elements in this country in favor of passing the joint resolution to amend the Constitution to force States to accept woman suffrage wanted a delay and a postponement of the vote. I said that one branch of them had written to me to say that they wanted no postponement, but that at that time the letter was in my office. I have since gotten the letter from the office, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the letter is read I want to say that the chairman of that branch is Mrs. Medill McCormick; that one of the very distinguished members of the committee is Mrs. Helen Gardener, whom we all know as a very intellectual, bright woman, and another is Mrs. Desha Breckinridge, of Lexington, Ky., who stands very high. I think they perhaps speak as much for the woman rights sentiment as any other ladies in the country. Now I ask that the letter be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 11, 1914.*

DEAR SENATOR: In view of the fact that a discussion has arisen between the two national suffrage associations as to when we desire a vote to be taken on the pending amendment, I wish to explain that the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which I have the pleasure of representing, is desirous of having a vote immediately upon the close of the debate.

We shall appreciate any assistance you may be able to render us.

Sincerely, yours,

RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK,
*Chairman Congressional Committee,*
*National American Woman Suffrage Association.*

## NOTICES OF BUSINESS, ETC.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in order to accommodate the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] I wish to give notice that on Wednesday, the 18th of March, instead of the 16th, as previously stated, following the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) relating to waters of the Rio Grande in Colorado and appropriations thereof for irrigation, and authorizing the State of Colorado to institute suit against the Secretary of the Interior to determine its rights to appropriate, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In this connection I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that in looking over the notices already given I gave notice that I would make a motion immediately after the morning business on that day to call up the irrigation bill. I gave that notice this morning, and I gave it with reference to the time that had been set by the Senator from Colorado for the speech he purposes to make. Inasmuch as I am very anxious to get away from town on matters of some importance to me, I was desirous of having that bill disposed of before I left. While I am very adverse to taking up any of the time of the Senate, as a matter of accommodation to me I should like very much to have the Senator adhere to his former notice if he can do so without inconvenience to himself.

Mr. THOMAS. I could do it without inconvenience to myself, Mr. President, but I can only do it by inconveniencing the Senator from North Dakota. He has not completed his speech on a subject upon which he addressed the Senate some days ago. I do not want to interfere with the convenience of the Senator from Arizona in the slightest degree, but at the same time I should like to have this notice prevail unless it very seriously inconveniences him.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the purpose is to adjourn over from to-day until Monday. That being the purpose, I will give notice then that I shall ask the Senate to allow me to finish my address on Senate bill 120, providing for a system of grain inspection and grading, immediately after the close of the morning business on Monday.

Mr. KERN. I was about to express a hope that the Senate may adjourn until Monday, but whether it does or not will depend upon the action of the Senate in executive session. I understand that there is an important matter to come before the Senate in executive session, which if disposed of will enable us to adjourn until Monday.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will change my notice and state that I shall ask the Senate to permit me to finish my address on the next day the Senate is in session immediately after the close of the morning business.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adjourn until Monday. There are a great many bills on the calendar which many of us want to have considered. We can not get consideration for them in the morning hour. I hope we will be able to have a session at some time when the calendar can be taken up. For about a month the calendar has not been gone through a single time.

I for one think that when a committee works and reports bills that are considered to be of public interest and they are placed on the calendar they ought to be considered. There is a disposition to put aside the calendar every day, and then when a time comes when we may consider the calendar, when no special measure is pressing, we adjourn over from Friday until Monday. I think the calendar is entitled to some consideration. It is becoming crowded. For a month now I have been very anxious that it should be considered. There are bills upon it that ought to be considered at this session of Congress. I hope some arrangement will be made by which the calendar can be called at some time. We have been here for the entire session and the calendar has not been gone through with.

Mr. THOMAS. Personally I have no desire to adjourn over until Monday; I am willing to do so to accommodate others; but if there is no adjournment over, then, of course, the notice which I gave a moment ago is unnecessary. My understanding was that there had been an agreement reached whereby when the Senate adjourned to-day it would adjourn until Monday. If I am mistaken about that, I am not to blame for it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope that a motion to adjourn over until Monday will be made and that it will prevail. We have a number of committees that meet to-morrow. I have one that I expect will be in session all day. Not only that, but there has been an accumulation of matters on every Senator's desk and it is almost imperative that we should have one day to attend to business outside.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator what is the use of a committee considering and reporting a bill if the bill is never to be considered after it reaches the calendar?

Mr. SHAFROTH. There will be plenty of time to consider the bills on the calendar.

Mr. SWANSON. There will not be if we expect to adjourn any time this summer. Every time a request is made in the morning hour for the consideration of the calendar, it is pushed aside for the consideration of some special bill; and then every time when the Senate may be considered to be free to consider the calendar, the Senate adjourns over until Monday. The calendar is congested, and some of us want to have the bills on it considered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That situation will clear itself because, when the time comes, Senators will agree to set a time when a vote shall be taken.

Mr. SWANSON. We can not agree on a time for a vote to be taken on the calendar; it will have to be called. We have not gone through with it this session. It has been considered for a few minutes, but it has not been gone through with.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 18 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1914.*

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

William Phillips to be Third Assistant Secretary of State.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Jacob A. Mayer to be receiver of public moneys at Havre, Mont.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frank Langley to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

I. C. Thoresen to be surveyor general of Utah.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Robert W. McNeely to be a commander.

Lieut. John C. Fremont, jr., to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut (Junior Grade) Earle J. Johnson to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. Col. John A. Lejeune to be a colonel in the Marine Corps.

Maj. Wendell C. Neville to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

Capt. Harry Lee to be a major in the Marine Corps.

Albert L. Bass to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Boatswain Niels A. Johnsen to be a chief boatswain.

Boatswain Isidor Nordstrom to be a chief boatswain.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

L. D. Conant, Monte Vista.

MICHIGAN.

Michael Doherty, Escanaba.

MISSISSIPPI.

Newton D. Goodwin, Gulfport.

Mrs. Lallie H. Humphreys, Greenwood.

WYOMING.

A. N. Hasenkamp, Laramie.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *March 13, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we hail with gratitude every rebuke for sin, every commendation for righteousness, since both spring from the same loving heart and are administered for our eternal good. The one is loss, the other gain; the one discord, the other harmony; the one alienation, the other home; the one hell, the other heaven. May we be apt scholars, avoiding the one, seeking the other, that the peace which passeth understanding may possess our souls. In Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1739. An act to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve;

S. 2337. An act to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 4172. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, in the State of Florida;

S. 4173. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; and

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish one United States garrison flag to William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and a joint resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4173. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4172. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1739. An act to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2337. An act to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Live-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish one United States garrison flag to William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, before putting that motion, I would like to ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that we have given way to the Agricultural bill, that the pension bill be brought up immediately after the conclusion of the Agricultural bill, unless it would come on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday.

The SPEAKER. What kind of a pension bill is it? Which committee reports the pension bill the gentleman refers to?

Mr. HELVERING. The Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this, under the rules, is pension day, and I have yielded to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not know that the gentleman had yielded.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] is asking to do it now.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HELVERING. I say, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are yielding our rights this morning, I ask unanimous consent that the pension bill be considered——

The SPEAKER. Is it a pension bill or pension bills?

Mr. HELVERING. An invalid-pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but is it one bill or more?

Mr. HELVERING. One bill, comprising a number of cases.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] asks unanimous consent that, this being pension day, immediately after the disposition of the Agricultural bill, unless it comes on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday, the pension bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions be taken up and considered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Committee on Pensions also has an omnibus bill on the calendar, and if one is considered the other ought to be.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] that he couple them together in his request.

Mr. HELVERING. I include both of them, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas includes in his request a bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and also a bill from the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions what kind of a pension bill is coming up from the Committee on Pensions? I am not speaking now of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. SHERWOOD. An omnibus pension bill, containing about 50 names.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. For the purpose of gaining some information about this measure. I would like to ask the gentleman how long, in his judgment, it will take to dispose of these two measures?

Mr. HELVERING. I do not suppose it would take over an hour. I was proposing to ask for 30 minutes for general debate.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Not to exceed an hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CAPT. FRANK PARKER.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To make a request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to withhold his motion for a moment in order that I may ask that a matter be taken up by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] say?

Mr. LEVER. I withhold the motion temporarily.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take up by unanimous consent Senate bill 746.

Mr. HAMLIN. State what it is.

Mr. RAGSDALE. It is a bill giving the right of exemption to Capt. Parker to go to the School of War, in France. He was already there, and the bill that was passed in this body ordered him away.

This bill was unanimously passed, as I understand, in the Senate. It went before the Committee on Military Affairs here, and was unanimously indorsed by that committee, and it has the indorsement of Gen. Wood and of former Secretary of War Stimson and the War Department generally. I ask that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] asks unanimous consent to take up the bill and consider it. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the bill is. Let it be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That nothing contained in the proviso under the heading "Pay of officers of the line" in the act approved August 24, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," shall be held to apply to the service of Capt. Frank Parker, United States Army, for the period necessary for him to complete his present tour of duty at L'Ecole de Guerre, France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I was about to reserve the right to object myself for the purpose of ascertaining about how long the gentleman thinks it will take to get the bill through. If it is going to consume very much time, I shall have to object, because it is very important that the Agricultural bill be gotten through.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will take more than five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I am afraid it will.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Then if there is to be objection on the part of the minority, I will withdraw the request. I understood this morning, however, that there would not be.

Mr. MANN. I have not objected as yet.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope there will not be any objection on this side of the House, because this certainly is a very meritorious measure and it ought to be passed now.

Mr. MANN. This is to waive in a particular case a law passed in the last Congress. I think it would require some discussion as to the law and policy of starting in immediately after we have passed a law to waive it in individual cases.

Mr. RAGSDALE. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to state that Capt. Parker has been duly assigned to this place by the Government. I would like to read the short letter that came from the War Department on the subject under date of January 15, 1913. It reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
*Washington, January 15, 1913.*

DEAR SENATOR TILLMAN: Replying to your letter with reference to Capt. Parker, the facts in this case are as follows:

Capt. Parker has spent practically the last six years in Camp Columbia, Cuba; 1906 to 1909 in command of his own troops (F) of the Eleventh Cavalry; 1909 to 1912 in active and actual command of a troop of cavalry organized, armed, equipped, and instructed as a regular troop of United States Cavalry (Troop A, Rural Guard). Therefore his service during practically the last six years has been troop duty in its true sense.

His service has been such as to merit favorable consideration of his case, with a view to allowing him to finish his course at the Ecole de Guerre of France, upon which he was engaged until relieved under recent orders. I have reason to believe that he will be admitted to the school and allowed to finish his course if his status were such as to permit him to return.

I should be very glad to see this officer finish his course, as he has spent a great deal of time and energy in preparing for it, and it is a course which should be of great value to Capt. Parker and to the service of which he is a member.

Very sincerely,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

Hon. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Now, the facts are, briefly, these: He was assigned to this duty, but under this rule he has had to resign. Unless he can be reinstated—in a very short period of time his successor will have to be named—it will absolutely preclude him from getting the right to which we think he is entitled and which we think he deserves.

This has been unanimously reported by the Military Committee; and, as stated in the letter I have just read, he has been in active duty with his command. It is only technically that he is barred from these rights. Ordinarily I would not object to the fullest discussion; but in view of the fact that I would like to get this through by the first of April at the outside, it seems to me it ought to be disposed of at once.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that this House at this time is anxious to proceed with the consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill, and therefore I object.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, before moving to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, I ask for a change of reference of Senate bill 533, to consolidate certain forest lands in the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg., which bill has been improperly referred to the Committee on Agriculture. I make this request at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. What action does the gentleman wish to have taken?

Mr. LEVER. To change the reference of this bill from the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of Senate bill 533, and to refer the same to the Committee on the Public Lands. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 24, after the word "nuts," strike out "$55,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$58,000."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of restoring to the grape belt, on the southern shore of Lake Erie, in Erie County, Pa., a station which was removed during 1913. For many years the Government has maintained a station at North East for the purpose of studying insect pests in the vineyards. I can safely say that the fact that the vineyard business is alive to-day is entirely owing to the Government assistance which we have had. Mr. Johnson was stationed there for many years, and he seems to have had a faculty of studying out ways to combat all the insect pests. He did this up to the time that he left the service, which was entirely of his own accord. During the last year the grape-berry moth has infested this district. I will say that this moth can be found in all parts of the world. In fact, last year the entomologist of France, Mr. Marechal, came to this country and visited our district for the purpose of investigating the grape-berry moth. Even Mr. Johnson himself, in an article which he published at the end of his labors in 1912, declared that he knew nothing about it, that the grape-berry moth had been largely misunderstood. In this article he says (Bulletin 116):

The grape-berry moth (*Polychrosis viteana* Clem.) is an insect enemy of the grape of long standing in the vineyards of the Lake Erie Valley. Since the first reports of its serious injury to the grape crop near Hudson, Ohio, in 1868, it has been an almost continual menace to grape production in vineyards located along the shores of Lake Erie from Sandusky, in Ohio, eastward into Pennsylvania and New York. Most of the data dealing with this insect cover a series of life-history records and field experiments conducted during the seasons from 1907 to 1909, inclusive, in connection with the investigations of the grape-root worm and other insect pests of the grapevine which have been carried on at North East, Pa., by the section of the Bureau of Entomology engaged in deciduous fruit insect investigations under the direction of Mr. A. L. Quaintance.

* * * * * * *

During the seasons of 1907 and 1908 the investigation of the grape-root worm occupied the greater part of the time of the force engaged in the study of grape pests. For this reason the life-history studies covering those seasons were rather fragmentary. During the season of 1909, however, the junior author devoted the greater share of his time to a detailed study of the life history of this pest. From the records secured by him in this relation the data covering the various stages of a large number of individuals, presented under the topic of "Seasonal history for 1909," have been compiled.

Recommendations offered for the control of this insect in regard to the time and manner of making spray applications are based upon the data obtained in the study of the life history and habits of the grape-berry moth during this investigation, correlated with the field experiments and observations covering that period. Since these life-history studies have shown considerable deviations from those previously recorded in regard to the time of appearance of certain stages of the insect and in the number of broods each season, it has been necessary to revise our ideas somewhat as to the relative importance of the spray applications formerly recommended; and since suitable opportunities have not presented themselves for a thorough trial of this revised spray schedule, some of the recommendations along this line are offered rather in the form of suggestions than as definitely demonstrated and proved methods.

* * * * * * *

At the present state of our knowledge of the habits of this pest and of the methods that have been suggested and employed for its control it is impossible to recommend any one method which of itself has given results that are as satisfactory as could be wished.

Mr. Johnson says that they have been in error in their studies and investigations of the proper means of eradicating this pest. Now, in my own district, where we have 10,000 or 15,000 acres of grapes, the damage last year amounted to several hundred thousand dollars, and I have a number of telegrams from our people which I wish to read. The first is from Mr. George E. Pierce, who is a wholesale dealer in grapes:

NORTH EAST, PA., *March 6, 1914.*

M. W. SHREVE, *Washington, D. C.:*

I understand there is a movement to reestablish a Government station in this county. I investigated grape pests. Please use your utmost efforts in its favor. Some of the best located and cultivated vineyards are being cut down on account of berry moths, and the pests are spreading rapidly. The output is decreasing. The acreage in the township is 7,000. My shipments in 1912 were 550 carloads; in 1913, 100 carloads.

GEORGE E. PIERCE.

I have also received the following telegrams:

NORTH EAST, PA., *March 6, 1914.*

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Grape industry in urgent need of expert help to find way to control pests that threaten its ruin. Do everything possible to secure the help needed. You know from personal knowledge grape crop is decreasing, whereas to supply markets a substantial gain is required.

A. I. LOOP.

NORTH EAST, PA., *March 7, 1914.*

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:*

If the Government withdraws its assistance and support, this great grape belt will be ruined, as was the Ohio belt. We can not combat the numerous pests alone. Many vineyards are now being torn out owing to ravages of berry moth and other insects. We need an expert permanently.

JAMES B. STULL.

These telegrams show something of the serious loss we have sustained in that district. Some of the largest manufacturers of grape juice are located in this district, particularly Mr. Welch. Here is what that company says on the subject:

WESTFIELD, N. Y., *March 6, 1914.*

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:*

Grape growers of this belt facing serious problem in keeping up quality of grapes and tonnage per acre. It is not too late to check this alarming tendency, but we greatly need additional help to study conditions and spread knowledge among growers. Recommend an expert stationed at North East.

THE WELCH GRAPE JUICE CO.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we understand there has been a largely increased demand for grape juice recently. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] has brought this matter to my attention, and he demonstrated to my satisfaction that the work he desires to have done is a work that ought to be done. It is a new line of investigation which has developed since these estimates were submitted. Inasmuch as the gentleman is asking for only $3,000, which will be sufficient to employ one expert to make an investigation, after having consulted with some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. I concur in the statement of my colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. MANN. With the assistance of Mr. Bryan, the gentleman seems likely to get his amendment inserted in the bill. [Laughter.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, $104,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, proposing to increase the appropriation $10,000, is not offered simply as the basis for a speech, but I offer it in good faith, believing that it is very important to the constituency that I represent as well as to the farmers in the surrounding States. I am only asking to restore to the bill the estimate of the Agricultural Department.

This service that is now being successfully carried on by and through the Entomology Bureau of the Agricultural Department was, as I understand, established about 17 years ago, and I confess that until within the last few years I and a great many others were somewhat skeptical of its success and value; but later information has convinced me that it is not only successful in many of its investigations but has proven of inestimable value to the agricultural interests of the country, by either exterminating or reducing the number of pestiferous insects or by teaching the farmers how to better protect themselves from their ravages.

I visited the Panama Canal Zone last year, where I had understood that formerly mosquitoes infested the country to such an extent as to make life there intolerable, and that the spread of disease caused by them was very alarming and the death rate very high. I was in the Canal Zone 10 days in the latter part of May and the first days of June, and did not see a mosquito during the time, nor many other insects of any character. Their extermination had been accomplished by the United States medical authorities that had in charge the work of sanitation, which I have no doubt has saved the lives of hundreds of our employees and made possible the completion of the Panama Canal at an earlier date. This actual demonstration and other information has convinced me of the practical utility of the Bureau of Entomology.

If this bureau is furnishing useful service to the agricultural interests of the United States, as I am convinced that it is, I insist that its laboratories or field stations should be located where they are most needed and where they will do the most good.

The district that I represent is in the heart of the Mississippi Valley, bordering upon the Mississippi River opposite the mouth of the Ohio River. The fertility of its soil and its productiveness is not surpassed by any other part of the Mississippi Valley or of the country, and the same may be said of the States that surround and adjoin that district, namely, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Illinois. Southern Illinois—that is only separated from my district and from the county in which I live by the Mississippi River—is known as Egypt, because we are taught in the Bible that in time of famine the Canaanites went down into Egypt to buy corn.

We have for the last four years exported from this country farm products to the value of more than a billion dollars per year, enough to pay the current expenses of running this Government, and we all understand that cotton, corn, and wheat constitute the chief agricultural products that are exported. All of these staple commodities are produced in great abundance in the district I represent.

One county of my district—Dunklin County—produced more than 30,000 bales of cotton in 1913.

The last statistics that I am able to obtain at this moment giving the production of other products in Missouri are for the year 1909. I find that in that year the county in which I reside, Mississippi County, produced 1,152,808 bushels of corn. Scott County produced 508,800 bushels of wheat; Pemiscot County, 5,963 tons of alfalfa; Howell County, 10,041 barrels of apples; and Oregon County, 319,934 baskets of peaches.

These six counties are all is the district that I represent, and I may say that the other 10 counties of that district are equally as productive in their respective lines. I feel safe in saying that if I had a later table of statistics it would show a large increase of production in the more recent years.

Last year the farmers of my district found that some insect—at that time supposed to be cutworm—was doing very serious damage to the growing corn in that section, and upon the urgent request of more than a hundred prominent citizens interested in Agriculture I succeeded, through the courtesy and efficiency of the officers in charge of the Entomology Bureau, in obtaining the services of an expert, Mr. Vernon King, who was sent there from the field station at Wellington, Kans. Upon his first visit he was unable to ascertain the cause of the great destruction of the crops and went away without giving much encouragement. However, the people, finding that their corn was being very seriously damaged, requested his return, and when he came the second time found an insect, a peculiar species of wireworm, that was destroying many acres of growing corn.

I am not able now to state the remedy that he applied nor the extent of benefit realized from his efforts, but he was there several months, and the farmers of that section believed that he rendered very valuable service and are anxious to have located in that part of the country a laboratory or a field station, believing that it will be a great protection to growing crops and of great value to the people.

I received recently the following letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture relative to the investigation of this expert, which I ask to include as a part of my remarks.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, March 10, 1914.*

Hon. J. J. RUSSELL,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: In response to your telephone request to Prof. F. M. Webster, in charge of cereal and forage insect investigations, Bureau of Entomology, for information relative to the work of Mr. Vernon King on certain insects attacking corn in southeastern Missouri and northeastern Arkansas, I would say that this investigation was taken up early in May, 1913, in response to a request from you, which request was accompanied by two petitions from nearly 100 of your constituents explaining the situation and the great losses that had previously been sustained, and urging that an expert from the Bureau of Entomology be detailed to investigate the source of these ravages and devise means for prevention of the same.

In response to this request Mr. Vernon King, at that time attached to the entomological field station at Wellington, Kans., was instructed by wire to proceed to Charleston, Mo., and to thoroughly investigate the cause of these depredations. From the meager information we were able to obtain the difficulty was supposedly, as stated by farmers, due to attack of cutworms. On his arrival on the ground and taking up the investigation Mr. King was not able to find cutworms in any numbers in the fields, and a continued search during the month of May did not reveal either the presence of these pests or any indications of their probable future occurrence. He was therefore instructed to return to his field station.

On June 2, however, Mr. King received a letter from Charleston, Mo., relative to an 80-acre field of corn, half of which had been totally destroyed after his leaving that point. He was at once hurried back to Charleston and soon found that these ravages were not due to cutworms at all, but to an entirely different insect, a peculiar species of wireworm, whose work on the roots of corn is so obscure and elusive as to almost entirely deceive farmers as to the true nature of the insect involved. But in one case Mr. King detected 47 of these destroyers attacking one hill of corn. The insect involved is one that has never been heretofore known to cause serious injuries, and its connection with these ravages came as an entire surprise. For this reason we know comparatively little about the pest or its habits and we were, therefore, at that time helpless to suggest measures of relief. Beginning, therefore, with the 6th of June Mr. King continued his investigations for the entire summer, remaining until the 13th of December, when he returned to his field station.

At present our information in regard to this pest is that it frequently destroys 50 to 75 per cent of the corn crop over considerable areas and that it winters in the fields. The work of the pest in the fields is shown in the accompanying photographs, 1 and 2, and the effect of its attacks on the individual corn plant is shown by photographs 3 and 4.

Later investigations of Mr. King show that the ravages of this pest are much more widely spread than we at first supposed, while owing to its confusion with other insects farmers have not understood its nature and have therefore not been able to devise means for its prevention.

Very respectfully,

B. T. GALLOWAY,
*Assistant Secretary.*

There is to-day no field station of that sort in Missouri and, as I understand, none in Illinois, Kentucky, or Arkansas, and the nearest stations to that country are located at Nashville, Tenn., and Wellington, Kans., the latter place being from where the expert was sent to us, probably 400 miles away.

I am exceedingly anxious as a Representative of a great agricultural district located in the very center of the fertile valley of the Mississippi to have this amendment adopted, in the hope of having a field station established somewhere in that section of the country, and I hope that my friend the able and efficient chairman of this Agricultural Committee, whose faithful work to the cause of agriculture I take pleasure in commending, will consent to the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I hesitate to ask for an increase in an item in the bill which we have reported, but I want to say in this connection that this is to my mind one of the most important items in the bill. It has reference to the eradication of those insects which affect corn, wheat, oats, and all of the staple grain products of agriculture. I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact, and emphasize it, that the Department of Agriculture, when it sent its estimates to the committee, asked for an appropriation of $114,000 for this work. Not only that, but in the increase it asks of $24,000 it sets out every item of expenditure and states exactly how it proposes to carry on this work. I called the attention of the Committee on Agriculture to the great demand that is being made for this kind of work from all over the country. I sincerely trust, in view of the fact that more than $400,000,000 are lost every year on account of insects which work upon these grains, that our chairman will consent to this increase, and that it will be allowed. The Department

of Agriculture in making its estimates studies very carefully what it wants, and if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], we will not then be appropriating one cent more than the department has asked for this work. I sincerely trust that it will be agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the committee thought it had given very careful consideration to this bill, I say frankly, however, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], after the bill was made up came to me, as chairman of the committee, and produced the evidence that he has submitted this morning, and I felt then that if I had had that evidence before the committee before the bill was made up I would not have objected to allowing the estimates of the department. Again, as I said in reference to the Pennsylvania item, I have consulted my colleagues on both sides, as far as possible, and I think I can say that it is agreeable to the committee that the amendment be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the Argentine ant, $49,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, line 5, strike out "$49,000" and insert "$59,000."
Also, line 5, after the semicolon, add the following words:
"*Provided*, That of this sum $18,000 is to be expended for investigation of insects affecting tobacco, of which $2,000 shall be available for immediate use."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on the amendment I reserve the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the amendment the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by withdrawing the proviso. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will ask to have the amendment reported as it would be if modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, line 5, strike out "$49,000" and insert "$59,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. How much time has the gentleman from Kentucky remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. None at all. His time has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] will prevail. I know something of the importance of this particular section of the bill to the tobacco grower. Like my friend from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] I have had some personal experience in the tobacco fields, and am familiar with the difficulties which confront the tobacco grower. There is no more serious trouble with which the tobacco grower has to contend than that of the hornworm. It constitutes possibly the greatest expense in the cultivation of tobacco. It is estimated that it costs probably $10, and even more in some years, per acre to keep the tobacco clear of the hornworm. By reason of the fact that in the last few years farm labor has increased in price, and it is more difficult now for the farmer to procure labor, the farmers have found it necessary to resort to some other expedient in order to get rid of this great pest. They found it necessary to try some sort of an insecticide, and first began the use of Paris green; but it has been found, as the result of several years' experience, that while Paris green does a great deal toward destroying the hornworm it results frequently in seriously damaging portions of the tobacco. And I am not sure but that the damage done as the result of the use of Paris green sometimes outweighs or equals the amount of money saved in protecting the tobacco from the worm.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman tell what is the difference between arsenate of lead—that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS], my colleague, has described as an efficacious remedy for these worms—and Paris green?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was just about to state, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years the Government has been conducting experiments for the purpose of finding some insecticide to take the place of Paris green, some remedy which will serve to rid the tobacco of the hornworm and at the same time not result in seriously injuring the tobacco.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call my friend's attention to the fact that Paris green affects the leaf of the tobacco, while this new insecticide does not do so at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely. It has been found that Paris green results in injuring areas of the lower tobacco leaves; also that when it is driven down by the rain from the leaf and accumulates in between the stalk and the leaf of the tobacco it frequently causes the leaf to fall from the stalk. As a result of these experiments by experts on the part of the Government, it has been discovered that by the use of the proper amount of arsenate of lead this injury will not result, and that as good, if not better, results can be obtained, in so far as the worm is concerned.

For some time Prof. A. C. Morgan has been located at Clarksville, Tenn., in the district I have the honor to represent, making investigations in the effort to find some remedy which will relieve the tobacco farmer of this horn worm. He is a man of splendid ability and has worked diligently and faithfully, and I am happy to say has by repeated experiments discovered that arsenate of lead, a combination of lead and arsenic, if applied in the proper way and the proper quantities, will destroy the worm and save the farmer much labor and expense. You gentlemen who have not worked in the tobacco fields as I have, and who do not know the amount of labor involved, can hardly appreciate the importance of this to the farmer. I have sometimes thought that the tremendous importance of this industry and the great number of our citizens who are engaged in it is not fully appreciated by Members of Congress. More than 20 States grow tobacco. In 1909 there was a tobacco acreage of more than one and one-quarter of a million, producing over 1,000,000,000 pounds, with a value of over $104,000,000. Tobacco paid in as a revenue to the Government over $70,000,000. We are asking you to increase this appropriation by only a very small amount, and certainly no class of our citizens has greater claims than the splendid tobacco farmers of Tennessee and Kentucky and other States.

In the State of Tennessee over 100,000 acres of tobacco are cultivated nearly every year, in the aggregate; most of it in the district I represent. Possibly the acreage in the State of Kentucky will be three or four times that amount. And when I state that from $3 to $6 per acre can be saved to each tobacco grower by the proper use of this insecticide, you gentlemen can easily estimate the amount of money that will be saved to the tobacco growers in those two States alone if the department and its corps of experts are given sufficient money to demonstrate to the farmer how they should use this arsenate of lead, what quantity should be used, and how it shall be applied. It is for that purpose that we ask that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to offer an amendment as a new paragraph. That would not apply?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty sympathy with the purposes of this amendment, and in order to show the House the necessity for it I want to describe the work of the tobacco worm just briefly. In the months of February and March the farmer who raises tobacco burns and sows what he calls a plant bed. He burns it with brush and logs, as large or as small an area as he may see fit, and then pulverizes the soil after it is burned completely, and then sows the tobacco seed.

Now, as soon as the tobacco plants come up in this tobacco bed it is necessary for the farmer to cover the top of it with canvas in order to keep insects from destroying the bed of plants before he replants it. After he has replanted his tobacco in the spring, after the soil has been prepared, when it gets about 10 or

12 leaves high, then he is compelled to top the tobacco so as to make it spread out and make the leaves larger and heavier, so that the substance of the plant will be diverted into the leaves that remain upon the stalk.

Now, this horn tobacco worm grows to be about the size of your finger, and it is almost matured within a week after it is hatched. The tobacco worm, as my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] has explained, gets under the tobacco leaf, which makes it necessary for the farmer to raise each individual leaf and discover whether there is a tobacco worm under it or on the stalk or anywhere about the tobacco plant. If he overlooks one, before he can get around to that plant again that worm will have matured, and from a week to two weeks can consume from one to two whole leaves of tobacco on that plant.

The tobacco worm is exactly of the same color as the tobacco leaf, which makes it difficult for the farmer to discover it, and if the worm is permitted to mature he goes down the stalk of the tobacco and burrows in the ground, and remains there during the winter, and he comes out the next spring a tobacco fly, and flies around over the farm and deposits eggs, which hatch other tobacco worms, which go on hatching out and producing tobacco worms in an endless chain. So that it makes it necessary for the farmer to resort to some other method of killing this tobacco worm besides going to the tedious process of looking under and over each leaf in order to discover whether one is existing there on the plant. As has been explained here, realizing the absolute impossibility on the part of the man who is looking for these tobacco worms to discover all of them and thereby with his fingers mash their heads and kill them, as they are compelled to do, they have resorted to the use of Paris green, which not only injures the tobacco plant and leaf but also is calculated to injure human life by reason of tobacco chewers chewing the leaf when it is matured. As is stated here, the Department of Agriculture has discovered a remedy in this arsenate of lead, which is not injurious to the plant and does not injure the users of tobacco; and it seems that $18,000 is not a sufficient amount of money, in view of the great amount of revenue that the Government obtains from tobacco, with which to undertake to get rid of this tobacco worm, which is the pest of the tobacco farmer.

As I stated a moment ago, if the farmer overlooks one worm, in a week's time that worm will be able to destroy the value of from one-tenth to one-twentieth of the tobacco plant, because if the worm strips the tobacco leaf of all the substance and leaves nothing but the stem, that reduces the price of the tobacco and the value of the farmer's crop, and in addition reduces the revenue that the Government obtains from the tobacco. So that from a financial standpoint the Government can well afford to appropriate this sum to help eradicate this pest.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman tell the House, if he knows, how much his State has appropriated or is spending along this line?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know exactly how much. The department of agriculture of the State of Kentucky is appropriating a sum of money for that purpose and carrying on work along that line, but by reason of the limitations that are placed upon it, it is unable to accomplish the work that the Federal Government should be able to accomplish. And, besides, I will state to the gentleman, the State of Kentucky gets no revenue into its treasury out of the tobacco crop, even after it is matured.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman does not know that they are expending any particular amount?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what they are expending, but they are carrying on experiments for that purpose to the limited extent that they are permitted under the law.

Mr. NORTON. The State of Kentucky levies a tax against the tobacco, does it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no. The only way in which tobacco can be taxed is when the farmer has been unable to sell it before the assessor comes around, and then it might be assessed as other personal property is assessed. All property in the State of Kentucky must be assessed as of the 1st of September, but at that time the tobacco crop is in the field and therefore is not taxable. For many years the Tobacco Trust reduced the price of tobacco so that the farmer could hardly pay his taxes on other property. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks, made this morning. I want to incorporate a letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] as to the amount of money that is expended by the State of Kentucky in this tobacco work, I will say that I have ascertained the amount, and it is about $1,500.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina if it is not a fact that over $3,000,000 in revenue is collected on the tobacco raised in the State of Kentucky and paid into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. LEVER. I have not those figures in hand, but I am sure the gentleman makes an accurate statement of it.

Mr. THOMAS. The amount is over $3,000,000, paid on the tobacco crop of Kentucky.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understand that this increase of appropriation under this item is largely with the intention of benefiting the tobacco growers in studying insects that interfere with tobacco growing. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture stated that this work is done in cooperation with agricultural experiment stations, with agricultural colleges, and with individuals, and that it is done in Tennessee, in Kentucky, in Florida, in Virginia, and Pennsylvania. I would like to call his attention to the fact that there are extensive fields of tobacco in Connecticut, and likewise in western Massachusetts, the section of the State which I have the honor to represent. I desire to inquire whether or not this appropriation will apply equally to the tobacco grown in western Massachusetts and elsewhere, even though there are no stations designated in the list that the gentleman read?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly that is true. Undoubtedly it would be available for work wherever the department thinks a necessity has arisen.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any provision in this bill for the study of potato bugs?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that any special provision is made, but the language of the appropriation bill is so broad that they could do it, and, in fact, they are doing it. Yes; I recall now that they are spending quite a little sum of money for the study of potato bugs.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do in connection with the study of potato bugs?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will glance down a few lines on page 48 of the bill, he will find this paragraph:

> For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products, $41,500.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the department do with the information it obtains as the result of these studies? Does it write a pamphlet and send it out to the agricultural communities, giving them the information as to how to get rid of potato bugs?

Mr. LEVER. I am prepared to give the gentleman all the information he desires about this potato-bug business——

Mr. MADDEN. I would be glad to have it——

Mr. LEVER. But I suggest that the gentleman allow us to reach that item in its order.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not a fact that the word "southern" there is merely a description of the crop, and not a geographical limitation?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen have been exceedingly praiseworthy this morning, but that would not entirely affect the position of the committee on this amendment, except for the fact that four delegations in Congress have talked to me about this proposition. First of all, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

THOMAS] appeared before the committee and made a very earnest plea for this work. Then the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] did likewise, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] have explained to me personally about it, and I got into communication with Dr. Howard, of the Bureau of Entomology, and inquired of him if he thought there was any great necessity for this line of work. His reply was that they had discovered this new insecticide by which the horn worm could be destroyed without injuring the quality of the tobacco itself, and that he desired sufficient funds to employ a few men to bring this insecticide to the attention of the people in the various tobacco districts of the country. In view of that statement and in view of the interest manifested in it by these gentlemen from the various tobacco districts, speaking for the committee, I shall not object to this amendment.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HELM. The insecticide that the farmers have been accustomed to use commonly is Paris green, which is a composition of arsenic and copper, as I understand.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. This insecticide that the department has discovered is a composition of arsenic and lead. The buyers of tobacco——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HELM. I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks an article by Mr. A. C. Morgan, published in the Southern Field Planter. Mr. Morgan is connected with the Bureau of Entomology. This article is upon the subject which we have been discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating the article that he indicates. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, at the end of line 5, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the introduction of the Argentine corn weevil through the importation of corn from Argentina to the United States, by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best method of controlling and destroying this pest, and by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as he shall deem best, in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $100,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment which I have offered is adopted it will accomplish two things. First, ti will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make a scientific investigation and study of the Argentina corn weevil, a pest that has recently been introduced into the United States and which threatens the prosperity of one of the most important industries in this country. In the second place, it will give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to quarantine against the spread of this pest. Already this morning we have adopted an amendment increasing the appropriation for the purpose of aiding in the eradication of the wireworm, another enemy of corn.

This Argentine corn weevil is an entirely new proposition. Scientists must admit that it is different from the weevil that attacks the corn in our Southern States. By experimenting it has been discovered that the damage caused by the southern corn weevil has to a large extent been removed by the propagation of flint corn in those localities. It was found that the white corn was very attractive to the weevil, which would destroy it, and that by the introduction of the flint corn and yellow dent corn damage by the weevil has practically been removed. But the corn that is coming into the United States to-day from Argentina containing this weevil is flint and yellow dent corn, the very kind of corn that the weevil in the Southern States does not attack. I have here a statement from a paper printed in Iowa, to the effect that samples of corn from Argentina contained in a glass jar and placed in a window in the sun show where the weevil has eaten its way out of the kernels, and the small weevils can be seen in the jar with the naked eye. Samples of corn imported from Argentina contain a small hole in the kernel, and by cutting open the kernel it is found that the weevil has eaten up a good part of the starch contained in it.

Mr. Chairman, the corn crop in this country is the largest of our agricultural products. In 1912 we produced 3,125,000,000 bushels. Last year we had about three-fourths of a crop and produced 2,447,000,000 bushels. I have here the report of the Secretary of Commerce, issued under date of March 9, 1914, in which he states that—

In the fiscal year 1912 only 23,909 bushels of corn arrived in the United States from Argentina. In the three months of October, November, and December, 1913, however, imports of Argentina corn rose to 4,102,598 bushels, while official reports indicate even larger arrivals during January and February of the present year.

Last year Argentina's yield of corn was sufficient, not only to supply her home demand but to export to this and other countries 280,000,000 bushels. The corn crop that is now ripening in Argentina is one of the largest crops ever produced in that country. It is estimated that of this crop Argentina will have a surplus for export of 500,000,000 bushels, or an export surplus of more than twenty-two times the total corn crop of the State of Kansas for 1913. Yet in 1907 Argentina, with 7,000,000 acres planted to corn, only produced in the entire country 70,000,000 bushels. The weevil destroyed the crop. The average yield per acre was only 10 bushels that year.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think a scientific study of the movement of this corn from Argentina would prevent its coming here?

Mr. GOOD. I think a scientific investigation of this weevil, together with authority given the Secretary of Agriculture to quarantine against its spread, can prevent its introduction and spread; and if it is necessary the Secretary of Agriculture could by the adoption of my amendment stop the importation of corn carrying these weevils altogether. And why should we not stop the importation of corn which contains those pests that will attack the greatest product of our farms—a product having a value every year aggregating more than $1,500,000,000. I think Congress should not hesitate to amend the law so that Argentine corn containing this pest can not be imported into the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. When this appropriation bill was before the House last year I offered a modest little amendment of $250,000 for the purpose of eradicating hog cholera. Some of the gentlemen on that side of the aisle laughed at the proposition and the amendment was lost. The bill at that time did not carry a dollar in specific terms for the eradication of hog cholera. But when the hog cholera spread over this country last year, resulting in the loss of more than $100,000,000 to the farmers, the Committee on Agriculture at last came to the rescue and reported a bill this year appropriating $500,000 for the eradication of hog cholera. That bill just recently passed the House without a dissenting vote. I believed then that the passage of that amendment last year would have been an economy to the Government. While this may seem a large appropriation, I believe it will be economical to adopt this amendment to-day and prevent at the very outset the importation into this country of a dangerous pest that threatens the prosperity of 12,500,000 people engaged in agriculture in the United States. If we do not act now, but wait until this pest is firmly established, the loss to our farmers will be staggering, while the expense to the Government to eradicate it will be enormous.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was this danger from the corn weevil apparent last year when we were considering the appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. When we passed the appropriation bill last year there was a duty on corn of 15 cents a bushel, which practically prevented the importation of corn. We only received 23,000 bushels of corn from Argentina for the whole year of 1912, and now we have received, in less than three months, under free trade in corn, 4,125,000 bushels from Argentina. Why this large importation? In the first place, we have taken off all the duty on corn that comes to our ports from Argentina and other countries. Then, too, the regular freight rate on corn from Buenos Aires to New York City is only 5 cents a bushel, and tramp steamers carry corn all the way from Argentina to New York

City for 3 cents a bushel, less than one-half of the freight rate on corn from Omaha to Chicago. These are the reasons that make large importations of corn possible, and with large importations of corn containing these pests the situation becomes alarming.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Could not this insect be got rid of by fumigating the corn, placing it in cribs above the ground and fumigating it with formaldehyde?

Mr. GOOD. I think not. This is difficult to answer. This weevil might be exterminated in the way suggested. Scientists claim that it finds its way into the ear of corn just before it reaches the roasting-ear stage. It lays the egg, and the egg produces the weevil, the weevil being found in the kernel. The weevil may remain in the corn all winter, living on the food product, and when it becomes warm the weevil eats its way out, leaving the kernel with much of the starch consumed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The Agricultural Department has recommended that method of procedure in the South—the use of formaldehyde.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know about that; no one seems to know much about this pest. This is the reason we should have an investigation. If we had knowledge of this pest—its habits of life, and the best way to destroy it—I would not offer this amendment to provide for an investigation.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, would not the best way to eradicate the evil be in this case to restore the tariff on corn.

Mr. GOOD. That, of course, would eradicate it. This appropriation would give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to place a quarantine on corn that contains the weevil, and I think that would eradicate it.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Does not the gentleman think that the weevil thrives best under a Democratic administration?

Mr. GOOD. It was never introduced into the country until a Democratic administration put corn on the free list, and when they put corn on the free list and tramp steamers give a freight rate of 3 cents a bushel from Buenos Aires to New York, a means was afforded of introducing this pest, which may add to the farmer's difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes' more time, I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his colleague's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to this item: Does not the gentleman think that the appropriation in this item is sufficient to accomplish the work that he speaks of?

Mr. GOOD. I went to the Agricultural Department and learned that there is not a dollar in this bill for the investigation of Argentina corn weevil.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GOOD. The Agricultural Department has other projects on which it will expend this appropriation. The chairman of the committee to-day recognized that fact and consented to an amendment of $10,000 for another purpose. It was necessary to have $10,000 for wire worm. Now, if there had been $10,000 of the $104,000 available for that purpose, it would not have been necessary for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] to secure the adoption of his amendment to provide for the eradication of the wire worm.

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee understands that this appropriation authorizes any work that may be contemplated by the department. If the gentleman has outside information that the committee has not and the department has not, I submit that the proposition should receive consideration, if it is a new matter.

Mr. GOOD. It is an entirely new matter that has not been called to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture until very recently.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understood the gentleman to say that the weevil flourished better under Democratic administration.

Mr. GOOD. I did not say that. That question was asked me, however.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I wanted to ask the gentleman if an animal with the characteristics of the weasel would not flourish better under the Republican administration?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in good faith. I object to gentlemen on either side of the House trying to laugh out of existence amendments that are offered here in behalf of an industry of 12,500,000 people. You laughed at them when you passed the tariff bill in response to your demand for cheap farm produce. You admitted then that the removal of the duty on farm produce would lower the prices which the farmer would get for his products, but said that the farmer would be able to buy farm machinery cheaper. Six months have elapsed since the enactment of the Underwood bill and there is not a gentleman on that side of the House or anywhere else who can point to a dealer in the United States who is selling farm machinery a penny cheaper than he sold it for a year ago. Being personally interested in the subject, a few days ago I wrote to an implement dealer making inquiry as to what reduction had been made in farm machinery since the passage of the Underwood bill, and here is his reply to my letter, which bears the date of February 27, 1914:

> In reply to your favor of the 24th instant, will say the Underwood tariff has not lowered the price of farm machinery yet. We are paying higher prices for same than last year. The farmer seems to be getting the worst of it, as his produce is on the decline.

You were correct, however, in your prophecy that the removal of the duty on farm produce would lower the price which the farmer would receive. How much the removal of the duty of 15 cents a bushel on corn has lowered the price is difficult to say. We do know, however, that the importation of more than 4,000,000 bushels of Argentine corn in the months of October, November, and December, 1913, was followed by a reduction in the market price of corn in this country of all the way from 10 cents to 15 cents per bushel. A reduction of this kind at that season of the year, when farmers usually expect a raise in price, is unprecedented and can be chargeable to but one thing, and that is the removal of the duty on corn.

A comparison with the price which the farmer receives for his corn this year with the price he received last year proves absolutely nothing. It is unfair and dishonest to say to the farmer that if he is getting as much per bushel for his corn in 1913 as he did in 1912 he ought to be satisfied. In 1913 the farmer only raised three-fourths of a crop and naturally would receive considerable more per bushel. Following this logic, if by the importation of Argentine corn containing a weevil this pest shall further reduce the farmer's yield of corn, you say he ought not to complain if he receives as much per bushel in the future as he did in 1912. The following excerpt from a letter just received well illustrates what has happened:

> ———, of Tipton, a young Democrat—his father and grandfathers on both sides were Cedar County Democrats: I know them all—I understand has announced that he will not stand for any more of it. He was offered 65 cents for his corn in the field, but he thought it was going up to 75 cents. He refused to take it. He had to sell for around 53 or 55 cents. He told one of my friends that he went home and told his wife that he was in favor of protecting his own interest and not helping Argentina.

That a most serious situation confronts the American farmer because of the removal of this duty is apparent. The danger to the agriculturist is well pointed out in a recent editorial in the Washington Post, which I shall append to my remarks.

The lot of the farmer who raises corn is not an easy one. He has much to contend against. The natural drawbacks incident to his own land and climate offer enough discouragements. He must contend with poor seed corn and after the seed is planted must protect it from the squirrels and the birds until the seed germinates, and even then the tender shoots are often most inviting to the cutworm. After a season's successful contest with weeds and native insects he has seen his crop devastated by storm or ruined by drought or swept away by flood. This year he suffered a shortage of more than 678,000,000 bushels because of drought, and by the time he had safely harvested his corn he was brought face to face with the proposition that the removal of the duty had brought about a decrease in the market price of at least 10 cents per bushel. This decrease meant a loss to the farmers of the United States of approximately $245,000,000. In the State of Iowa alone it meant a loss of approximately $34,000,000, but this is not the full measure of his loss by reason of the removal of the duty on corn. If the fears of many of our farmers that the importation of this weevil will become a menace to the corn raiser should become a reality, no one can even approximate the loss which the American corn raiser will sustain by reason of the removal of the tariff on corn.

The amendment I have offered appropriates only $100,000 for the Secretary of Agriculture to make an investigation with regard to this pest and, if necessary, to quarantine against its spread in the corn belt. This appropriation bill which we are considering contains some very remarkable provisions. On page 11 we have an appropriation for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle and the inspection of southern cattle, and so

forth, of $625,530. Another provision on the same page reads as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $400,000.

On page 19 of this bill we appropriate $378,240 for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil. On page 49 of this bill is an item, which will be adopted without discussion, appropriating $297,540 to prevent the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths. More than two and a half millions of dollars is carried in this appropriation bill for study, investigation, and eradication of the pests and insects which affect plant and animal life; and yet when the greatest agricultural industry in the country is threatened by this new pest, which our good Democratic friends by their votes and policies have introduced into this country, they oppose appropriating a single penny to study its habits and, if possible, ascertain the best method to prevent its spread and for its eradication.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. I would like to ask how he came to the conclusion that it would take $100,000 to carry on this scientific investigation?

Mr. GOOD. Well, it is a new problem. Of course, I do not know what it may require to make this investigation. I hope that our farmers may never be bothered with this pest, but, as I said a moment ago, we are producing in the United States between two and three billion bushels of corn every year; we are raising corn in many of the States of the Union, and the Secretary of Commerce now tells us that there is being imported into this country from Argentina corn to the extent of 4,000,000 bushels in three months, and that the indications are that it will come in in larger quantities in the future. I have called the attention of the committee to the fact that some of this corn contains the Argentine corn weevil, and I submit that the appropriation should be in some proportion to the damage this enemy might do if it should attack our cornfields. I can not tell how much it will take, but I have faith enough in your Secretary of Agriculture to think that he will not expend a single dollar more than is necessary. If it is not necessary to do anything, then nothing will be expended. This is your child, not ours, and you ought to welcome the aid offered from this side of the House to prevent your program of free trade in farm produce from becoming even more obnoxious to our farmers than it now is. I think the situation is dangerous enough so that we ought to appropriate enough to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make a scientific investigation on this subject and if necessary to quarantine against this threatened pest. [Applause.]

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1914.]

AGRICULTURAL PROSPECTS.

The farm reserves of wheat, corn, oats, and other staples are surprisingly heavy this year, as the Government report is viewed in the grain markets. No official explanation of the presence of such quantities of foodstuffs in the bins so late in the year has been given out, but the absence of demand for wheat and corn for export is the reason assigned by western shippers—that is, the American farmer refuses to part with his surplus, the prices for which are not to-day, as in former years, fixed at home. Liverpool and Buenos Aires have become the price fixers, and the ruling quotations are at a point which enables shippers to fill orders from coast cities at a lower figure by importing the supplies than by drawing upon Chicago.

With 225,000,000 bushels of newly harvested Argentine corn available for export, the immediate outlook for our corn growers is most discouraging. Unless there is a change for the better within a year or two, the grain growers will be in the same boat with the sugar-beet and sugar-cane growers, when, two years hence, Cuba's 2-cent raw sugar will go on the free list.

Judging from the prospect of keen competition between Argentina and Australia when the Panama Canal puts the latter in easy communication with our Atlantic ports, the corn and wheat belts in the great West will be as ready for Government assistance in finding a new occupation as are the Louisiana planters and other prospective beneficiaries of the pending Lever Agricultural bill, carrying an item of $50,000 for experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in sugar-cane and cotton districts. Who does not perceive, in the light of what we have already experienced, that putting wheat and corn and oats on the free list must prove as ruinous to such branches of agricultural industry as such action is in the case of sugar?

Argentina has as yet only undersold the American farmer by a small margin—just enough to make it an object to import her products, and meet every concession on our part by setting a new low mark—but once that country comes in competition with the cheap products of other countries, prices will be slashed to the bottom. Eventually the new tariff will prove as revolutionary a factor in many, if not all, of the Northern States as in Louisiana, and probably even more far-reaching.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to appropriate $100,000 to investigate the Argentine corn weevil, which has been described here as a new insect in this country. My information from the Bureau of Entomology is to the effect that the life history of this insect is well known to entomologists, and that the insect not only appears in Argentina, but that it is likely to appear anywhere that corn or grain or rice is kept in storage. It seems to develop itself under storage conditions.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that it develops and becomes active under conditions where the climate is warm, such as you have in the Southern States?

Mr. LEVER. I have no information about that. But it may bear out the gentleman's suggestion to state that in Argentina the name was not the corn weevil, but the rice weevil.

Mr. TOWNER. I would state for the information of the gentleman that I understand that it does develop particularly and peculiarly in the warm countries, and, as the gentleman says, after the corn is stored it develops in that way.

Mr. LEVER. So that, inasmuch as this insect not only is likely to come to this country from Argentina, but is likely to develop under our own conditions at any time, it does seem to me that an appropriation of $100,000 is a large sum of money for the purpose. Again, if my friend from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] will examine the item above, which is for the investigation of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, he will find there an appropriation of $104,500, which was increased this morning by $10,000, and every dollar, every single penny, of that $114,500 is available to the Secretary of Agriculture for such use as he desires to make of it in connection with insects affecting cereal and forage crops. If the Secretary of Agriculture comes to the conclusion that this Argentine weevil is creating an emergency in this country, he will concentrate his fire in that direction and use some of this appropriation for that purpose. I would say, further, to the gentleman that the chairman of this committee, as, I think, every Member of the House knows, is disposed to be probably too liberal in matters of this kind; but I think I ought to say, in justice to the committee and in justice to myself, that the gentleman from Iowa did not bring this to the attention of the committee, and we have no information whatever from the department on the subject, except what little information I had from my clerk over the telephone just now. I would dislike very much to put the committee in the attitude of agreeing to a proposition of which we have so little information.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest a compromise of $50,000. That would not be an unreasonable sum.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I could not do that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa where he gets his information?

Mr. GOOD. Some of the commercial organizations in Iowa have passed resolutions concerning it. My attention was first called to it after the estimates were made up. The chairman of the committee is entirely right. I have not spoken to him, and did not call the attention of the Department of Agriculture to it until about a week ago, because I did not know much about it myself. I have been investigating it since that time, and I want to say that I think the chairman of the committee will recognize that in making up the estimates the department did not estimate for more than $104,500, and the committee reported out an amount that it thought was actually necessary to bear the expenses of the work before them. This is a new work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat, however, that every dollar of the $114,500 carried in the item above is available to the Secretary for use in this line of work, if the Secretary of Agriculture believes that the emergency is great enough to justify him in doing that. Of course he would have to withdraw from some other lines of work, but the projects of the Department of Agriculture are constantly changing with the changing necessities of the situation. The committee has no information as to the widespread area in which this Argentina weevil occurs, how much damage it is doing, how we can find out how much money will be necessary to fight it. If we appropriate a dollar here we will be appropriating it in the dark.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this has been called to the attention of the committee at this time, and is evidently a new matter, and is worthy of consideration, knowing the gentleman's generosity in this direction and his always giving due consideration to worthy projects, would he not be willing to allow a reasonable increase, say $25,000, or whatever might be deemed necessary to carry on the work?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will make this promise to both gentlemen from Iowa. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]

will introduce a separate bill, I will call the committee together immediately after we finish the consideration of this appropriation bill, get the experts before the committee, and find out the situation; and if it appears from the testimony that there is an emergency, I will very promptly, if the committee is willing so to do, report that bill to the House and try to get it through.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman recognizes the fact that there is already more legislation outlined for this House than it will be able to discharge in the next six months, and that a bill such as he refers to, however meritorious it might be, coming in at this late hour of the session, very likely would not get very far; and if it did not fail here of consideration, it would likely not receive consideration at the other end of the Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the hog-cholera bill, and also the agriculture extension bill, carrying an appropriation of $3,400,000, were passed under suspension of the rules. I could easily put this bill upon the Suspension Calendar, and I believe, if it is an emergency proposition that can be shown to the House, that we would have no difficulty in passing it under suspension of the rules. I call the gentleman's attention to this further fact, that unless this money is made immediately available in this bill it does not become available until the beginning of the next fiscal year, so that if it is really an emergency matter, I think the gentleman's proper course and best course is the one I suggest.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the quickest way would be to amend this bill, and if it is necessary to make the money immediately available, do so. I believe that the gentlemen will agree with me that there is an emergency—that the weevil is here. Of course, if it is found not to exist, the appropriation would not be expended. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has made a showing that the weevil exists, and that we should provide for this emergency to some extent. Of course, it is an entirely new matter, and I suggest a reasonable appropriation. I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree to an appropriation less than $100,000, and I would like to know what he thinks is actually required.

Mr. GOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa that I recognize the fact that the chairman of this committee has been extremely liberal, and I was in hopes of getting this pressing matter in the bill by appealing to his liberality.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman had done so before he came on the floor and had given the members of the committee any information he possibly could.

Mr. GOOD. I went over to see the gentleman yesterday, as he recalls, but he was very busy at the time, and my time was taken up, so it is hardly my fault that I have not been able to confer with the gentleman. I will say I believe, because of the seriousness of the situation, we ought not to consider less than $50,000. If nothing is necessary, in the information of the Secretary, nothing would be expended; but it will give protection to this great industry, and if you are going to give protection there it must be for a considerable amount of money.

Mr. LEVER. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman, and it is this: That we temporarily pass this amendment over without prejudice, and in the meantime perhaps I can get in touch with the department and get some information in reference to the existing situation. The gentleman can very well see how embarrassing it is to me to allow any appropriation whatever without some information from the experts of the department.

Mr. HAUGEN. I trust the gentleman from Iowa will agree to that suggestion.

Mr. MANN. If this request is to be made, I ask to have the amendment again reported; and I would like to take the floor for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The request has not yet been made.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but pending that, the gentleman has yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item to which reference has been made for investigation of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, which was $104,500 and which has been increased this morning by $10,000, I think is not available for the purpose covered in the amendment, although the gentleman from South Carolina stated the fact was so. Possibly it is within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to use it, and yet where the Secretary of Agriculture has made an estimate for a particular purpose and has indicated in his estimates to the committee the method by which he proposes to spend that money and the purposes for which the money is to be used it would be entirely contrary to the ethics of the business for the Secretary to divert that money and use it for some other purposes although it might be covered by the scope of the authority in the appropriation act. I do not think that the Secretary would be justified. For instance, this morning we increased the appropriation by $10,000. Now, the Secretary could have used the money for the purpose for which that $10,000 will be used, which is already covered in the bill, but he would not be justified in doing it. Gentlemen will remember a year or so ago we were threatened with the invasion of the Mediterranean fly, called in this bill the Mediterranean fruit fly, and hastily, by the way, we enacted legislation for the purpose of preventing the invasion of the Mediterranean fruit fly from the Hawaiian Islands to California or elsewhere in the United States. If we are threatened with the new corn weevil coming from Argentina, a weevil which is not now in the United States, considering the importance of the corn grown in the United States, we would be very neglectful if we failed to exercise every possible precaution to prevent that weevil obtaining a hold in the United States.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman have any information that the Argentina weevil is not in the United States now?

Mr. MANN. I have no information upon the subject.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman made a positive statement in regard to that.

Mr. MANN. I said "if."

Mr. LEVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa said it was a different weevil from the weevil that attacked the corn in the South, where we have the flint corn, and that this weevil was a weevil which did attack flint corn. I take it that if it attacks flint corn that it will probably attack the dent corn, the softer varieties of corn. Is there anyone here who would question the desirability of keeping out some of the imported pests which now attack the various crops of the United States? Is there anyone here who would question the propriety of keeping out some of the imported weed seed which originally came from abroad, but which have now spread all over the United States? That is where we get the most of our weeds in the fields. If we can by adopting precautions now keep out this weevil, we ought to do it. It will be too late after the weevil has come in and been disseminated throughout the United States. Many millions of dollars then will not accomplish what a few thousand dollars will accomplish now.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I have not the language before me, but it is to strike out $100,000 and insert in lieu thereof $50,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is, to add to that that the same shall be immediately available.

Mr. MANN. That is not in order.

Mr. WILLIS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment. Strike out the figures "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

Mr. WILLIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment I desire to say that it seems to me that these facts which have been presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], who has given very careful attention to this matter, are worthy of the most careful consideration by the committee at this time. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just said it is quite probable that an expenditure of a few thousand dollars now might avoid the expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of dollars by the Government later on with an attendant loss to the farmers of this country perhaps running into many millions of dollars.

The illustration that was given here a little while ago concerning the hog-cholera proposition is a good one. I think it is quite likely if we had listened to the wise suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] a year or two ago, and had made the appropriation as he urged then for the eradication of hog cholera, it would not have been necessary to make so large an

appropriation as we recently did in this House, and we should have avoided the loss of many millions of dollars to the farmers of this country. Now, not speaking in a partisan sense, I wish to say that there is not any doubt that under the existing tariff law there is a large importation of corn from Argentina, and as long as we have free trade in farm products that importation, most unfortunately for the American farmer, is likely to increase. I think there is no serious doubt but that there is grave danger of the introduction of this corn weevil by means of this importation. Of course the best remedy for this condition would be the enactment of a protective tariff on farm products. But it seems to me that just now is the time when we ought to act, if the present system of free trade in farm products is to continue, just as the importation is beginning and just as this pest is being introduced.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman any information that the pest is not already in this country and has not been in this country for years?

Mr. WILLIS. The information, I will say, that I have is similar, although not nearly so complete, as the information possessed by the gentleman from Iowa, namely, that it is not the same pest that we have here, and it is quite a different corn weevil from that which has infested the corn of certain of the Southern States.

Mr. LEVER. I understand from the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] that the department itself was not entirely sure whether there was any difference between this insect and the corn weevil in the South; that they had not made up their minds as to that. I thought the gentleman probably had investigated it.

Mr. WILLIS. No; I have not that information. I wish I had. But I do have this information, that whereas the corn weevil in this country has not heretofore attacked the flint corn it does successfully attack this corn which is raised in the Argentine, which is flint corn. I think that that statement of fact will not be assailed by anyone. Now, that being the case, I believe we can afford to act at this time, when we have the opportunity, to prevent the introduction of this evil and pest, which, if it comes here, will cost the farmers of the country nobody knows how many millions of dollars, and will work hardship on all our people by decreasing our food supply. Right now at the beginning of it, when we have the opportunity, I think we ought to make a reasonable appropriation to stop this pest. Some objection has been made to the amount proposed to be appropriated in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. Though I think money appropriated for extermination of insect pests and disease is well expended, I have offered the amendment to reduce the amount to $50,000 in order to meet that objection.

I recognize the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the membership of the committee are vigilant in the public interest and are liberal in granting appropriations for the extermination of all insect pests and plant diseases that are deleterious to the interests of the farmer. But this matter has come up just recently—since the new tariff law went into effect. They had no opportunity, of course, as the chairman said, to pass upon it; but here we have these facts now, and, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said, it does not seem to me it would be feasible to propose that this should be included in a special bill to be introduced. Everybody familiar with procedure here knows that at this stage of the proceedings it will be hardly possible to give favorable consideration to a measure on that subject introduced now. I think, in fairness to all, we ought to make some appropriation. And, as I started to say a moment ago, I recognize that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is entirely fair, and there is no disposition on the part of anyone to question his sincerity and ability, but I do believe we ought to appropriate $50,000, as contemplated in this amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to consider this question in a reasonable way, in the light of our present knowledge. It is true that this knowledge has come to us at a late date, but, nevertheless, the requirement for immediate action is certainly very great. We have it stated by the press that there is a surplus of corn in Argentina for export, estimated at 288,000,000 bushels. We know, if that be true, that a very large portion of that surplus will come to the United States, and Mr. Chairman, if that large importation should come, and if, as will be the case, it will be distributed throughout this country, if it shall carry with it the danger of infesting all of the corn crop, the most important crop that is raised and the largest in money value in this country, then certainly the emergency is upon us, not in the future, but now. We ought to act now. If we shall appropriate $100,000 or $50,000 for the purpose of protection against the introduction of the Argentine corn weevil into this country, and it shall not be necessary, certainly it shall not be used, but we ought to make it available. The emergency is upon us now. We know enough now to realize that this is a real danger. It is not an imaginary one. Even with our meager information, we know that the introduction into this country of the Argentine weevil is a menace to our home production, and for that reason we ought to do everything we can to protect ourselves.

And let me say to gentlemen on the other side, those who represent Southern States, you are doing everything in your power now to increase the production of corn in your sections, and, I will say, with remarkable success. I congratulate you upon that fact. And this is a danger that will probably be a menace peculiarly to your section of the country, because, as I am informed now, this weevil develops in a southern country, where the climatic conditions favor it, much more readily than it does in the North. It may develop in the North. It may be a menace to the entire corn-growing section of the United States, but it is peculiarly a menace to you in the South, and certainly, for your own protection, you ought to be as anxious to do everything possible as we are. We who represent the great corn-growing States represent, of course, a larger interest than perhaps you do. This bill appropriates $49,000 for the investigation of insects affecting cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugar cane; for insects affecting forests, $49,000; for insects affecting tropical and subtropical fruits, $20,100; for investigation of the Mediterranean fruit fly, $33,200; to prevent the spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, $297,540; and many other like appropriations. It is not unreasonable that in behalf of the corn growers of the United States we should ask that at least $50,000 be made available for their protection.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is so great a menace that we ought certainly to act, and act now, when we have the power and the opportunity and before it is too late. The day may come, as has been suggested here, when it will require millions for the extirpation of a pest that now can be prevented from being introduced by the expenditure of a few thousand dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PALMER). The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in eight minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has stated, and stated properly, that we have not as full information in relation to this subject as we would desire, nor such information as we ordinarily have when we act upon an item of such importance or when we appropriate this amount of money.

But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, an emergency confronts us, and it is a matter of such great importance, the value of the corn crop at this moment on the farms being above a billion dollars, that we can not afford to take the risk of passing it by and permitting by chance, or by our failure to act at this time, the introduction of some new noxious insect into this country that will be the destruction of this crop of such enormous value—the greatest agricultural interest, by itself, of any that we have. The time to act, as has been stated here, is now, lest this insect, like some others, like the gipsy moth and other insects that have been imported from Europe——

Mr. EAGLE. And the boll weevil from Mexico——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and, as the gentleman from Texas says very properly, like the boll weevil that came from Mexico, before it gets a foothold here. Let us not take the risk when, by appropriating a few thousand dollars now, we might do away with this great danger that threatens this important crop at this time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, when I spoke before I did not have any definite information from the Department of Agriculture as to this proposition. Since that time the clerk of the Committee on Agriculture has gotten into communication with the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Galloway, and Dr. Galloway has gotten into communication with the entomologist of the department. The Assistant Secretary informs me that this pest is well known in this country and is scattered all over it from one end of it to the other, and has been here

for many, many years; that no emergency exists whatever; that no reason for a quarantine against Argentine corn, or any other corn for that matter, exists; that this insect is liable to show itself in any section of the country where corn is stored or where other grain is stored.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GOOD. The State of Iowa produced last year, 1913, something over 338,000,000 bushels of corn, and in the year before, 1912, 432,000,000 bushels. That is about the average production. I was born and raised in that State, and was born and raised on a farm, and I never saw a corn weevil in my life. I never until about a month ago heard of a corn weevil in the State of Iowa.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman to make a speech in my time.

So, after all, the gentleman is not in any great danger, because, repeating again the information we got from the people in the Department of Agriculture, who ought to know, this weevil has been in this country for years, is spread over a very large area, and there is no emergency existing at this time. If an emergency did exist, the Assistant Secretary informed me that he could meet the emergency with funds from some other item in this bureau.

Now, with those facts before me and before the Committee of the Whole, I do not believe that this committee would be justified, nor would I be justified, in accepting this amendment; and for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained—in fact, I feel it my duty—to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Why is it subject to a point of order?

Mr. LEVER. It is subject to a point of order, but I will withdraw the point of order and have a vote on it.

Mr. MANN. How is it subject to a point of order?

Mr. LEVER. If I had the amendment in my hand, I think I could point out why it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I think it is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order withdrawn?

Mr. LEVER. I will withdraw it, but I think I could convince my friend that it is probably subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina withdraws his point of order.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 37.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. GOOD and Mr. LEVER to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 41, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting forests, $54,790.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, out West much confusion exists as to the method of distributing the 25 per cent of the money received by the forest reserve counties from the sale of Government timber in those counties. I also receive many inquiries in regard to the distribution of the 10 per cent, which is allowed in addition to the 25 per cent. I desire to make clear the method of distribution, as it has been reported to me by Chief Forester H. S. Graves.

The communities within and adjacent to the national forests receive assistance from the Government in the construction of public improvements in two ways—first, a portion of the receipts from the national forests is paid directly to the counties within which said forests are situated, to be used for road and school purposes; and second, the Forest Service, out of funds at its disposal, constructs roads, trails, telephones, and other permanent improvements.

THE 25 PER CENT FUND.

By the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat., 260), 25 per cent of all receipts from the national forests, from whatever source, is returned to the States to be expended "for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the forest reserve is situated."

The act further provides that the money shall be distributed in proportion to the area of national forest land within the county. The total amount for each State is paid over at the end of the fiscal year to the treasurer of the State and thereafter passes from the jurisdiction of the Government. The unit of distribution for this fund is the county, and the Federal Government has no responsibility whatever in the expenditure of the money.

THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION.

In addition to the direct payment as shown above, the Department of Agriculture has two funds handled by the Forest Service which are used for the construction of permanent improvements within the national forests. These are the general "improvement fund" and the "10 per cent road fund." The improvement fund is for the "construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, * * * and other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests." This fund is a lump-sum appropriation for all of the national forests and is distributed among them by the Forest Service in accordance with what appear to be the relative needs of the several forests. The national forest is the unit of distribution for this fund, and the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, is solely responsible for the allotment and use of the money.

In the Agricultural appropriation bill for this year, 1914, which has just been passed, the improvement fund is placed at $400,000. As stated just above, this sum may be distributed as thought best by the Bureau of Forestry.

THE 10 PER CENT FUND.

Now comes the next step in the distribution of money.

The Agricultural bill also provides that an additional 10 per cent of the receipts from the national forests shall be available for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests "in the States from which such proceeds are derived." This amount is not turned over to the State or county authorities, but is expended under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture by the Forest Service. The unit of distribution for this fund is neither the national forest nor the county, but the State. The act further provides that the "Secretary of Agriculture may, whenever practicable, * * * secure the cooperation or aid of the proper State or Territorial authorities."

In accordance with this provision Mr. Graves writes me that the Forest Service has attempted to secure the cooperation of local communities, and in several instances has submitted its list of proposed projects and allotments therefor to the governors of the States for comment or suggestion, in order that the program which the service has attempted to carry out might have the cordial support of the local authorities.

Mr. Graves says:

The responsibility, however, for the selection of projects and the allotment and expenditure of funds rests solely on the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service.

HOW IT WORKS OUT.

Now, then, concerning the expenditure of money in that part of the Rainier Forest Reserve near Randle, Mr. Graves says there is apparently a misapprehension as to the authority of the Forest Service over the expenditure of moneys from the 10 per cent fund for permanent improvements within the national forests.

With respect to the other matters mentioned, Mr. Graves says the facts are substantially as follows:

On July 10, 1913, and before information was at hand of the exact amounts which would be available for road building out of the 10 per cent fund for the State of Washington, the acting forester mailed to the governor of the State a list of the projects upon which it was proposed to expend funds and the tentative allotments for these projects. Among these projects was one for the expenditure of $1,000 in the construction of a road up the Cowlitz Valley from Randle, and another for $1,000 for a bridge across the Cowlitz River.

On August 25 the lieutenant governor telegraphed his approval of the projects and allotments, and on the following day wrote a letter in detail with respect to them. When the reports of the actual receipts from the national forests in the State of Washington were received it was found that the amount was somewhat less than the total given in the tentative estimates of July 10.

ROAD AND BRIDGE PLANS CUT DOWN.

Furthermore, steps had been taken for the elimination from the Rainier National Forest of that portion of the Cowlitz Valley on which

the proposed road would be constructed. The elimination has been approved by this department and is awaiting final action in the Interior Department.

For these reasons the list of projects of July 10 was revised and on September 4 resubmitted to the governor for his information, and mention was specifically made of the abandonment of the Cowlitz Valley road and bridge, and the reasons therefor. On September 15 Gov. Lister expressed his approval of the changes which had been made.

Later, on the recommendation of the district forester, $1,000 of general improvement money was allotted for the construction of the bridge across the Cowlitz River.

Mr. Graves concludes that it is his understanding that the money has been expended and the bridge built.

SMALL SUM FOR SURVEYS.

In addition to the $400,000 given by Congress for the general improvement fund, there is provided for classification and survey of agricultural lands in forest reserves $185,000. This is an increase of $85,000, and should advance this line of work. The total, however, is a small sum when one considers the great area over which it must be spread. Then on top of the $400,000 and the $185,000 comes the direct appropriations for salaries and maintenance in the 162 reserves of the Western States. These direct appropriations run from $860 for a little forest reserve in Nevada, probably treeless, to $41,440 for the Coeur d'Alene Reserve in Idaho. The average direct appropriation per reserve is $11,147, and, as before stated, there are 162 reserves.

DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS FOR WASHINGTON FORESTS.

The direct appropriations for the reserves in the State of Washington are this year as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Chelan National Forest | $9,130 |
| Columbia National Forest | 17,880 |
| Colville National Forest | 9,210 |
| Kaniksu National Forest (partly in Idaho) | 26,690 |
| Okanogan National Forest | 14,800 |
| Olympic National Forest | 25,650 |
| Rainier National Forest | 15,400 |
| Snoqualmie National Forest | 18,860 |
| Washington National Forest | 13,130 |
| Wenatchee National Forest | 9,330 |
| Total | 160,080 |

Now, that sum, $160,000, is not large—certainly not large enough for much headway or advancement. It is provided by the people of the whole United States. That small sum—and whatever the Forest Service in its wisdom sees fit to put into the 10 great forest reserves of the State of Washington out of the general appropriation of $400,000—is all we get from the five and one-half millions appropriated for the Bureau of Forestry in this agricultural appropriation bill. The total sum, $5,500,000, is a gigantic slice out of the $19,000,000 agricultural appropriation—more than one-fourth of the "pie" which has been cut by the generous Committee on Agriculture. The most of the sum goes for salaries and upkeep of a great bureau.

Washington's direct share is $160,000—a mere fraction, for it is hardly necessary to say that the 25 per cent of sales and the additional 10 per cent come back to us for sales in our own localities. This was concisely stated by Senator FALL, during a colloquy with Senator SHAFROTH, as follows:

Senator FALL. The Senator says that certain counties derive revenue from the forest reserves. From whence is that revenue obtained, except from the people of that locality who use the forest reserves? The great Government of the United States is giving you nothing. It is what your own people, in your own locality, in your own State, have paid in for the preservation of the Government reserves; and you get back 25 per cent of the money which your local people pay in, not outsiders. Then, to make up the difference, to make up the 25 per cent—in fact, to make up 100 per cent of the difference—they come here every year and secure from Congress an appropriation for the support of that very reserve. So the people of the United States, instead of benefiting by these reserves, are taxed to support them; and the people of the locality, instead of being benefited, are merely getting back 25 per cent of the money which they themselves paid into the Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations, indentification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, $54,280.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman what is the reason for inserting, under this item for the investigation of miscellaneous insects, the language, "identification and systematic classification?"

Mr. LEVER. The statement of Dr. Howard is in this language. The question was asked:

Is there any special reason for that new language?
Dr. HOWARD. No; it simply makes it plainer.

That is the only testimony we have. I presume it more nearly designates the character of the work that they are doing.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The department is importing from foreign countries a great many insects which are the natural parasites of insects that are the enemies of fruits and crops in this country; and I suppose that new language is inserted in order that they may identify scientifically the particular species they want to attack, in order to know what insects to procure from abroad.

Mr. MANN. That is hardly the case. They identify them now.

Mr. LEVER. The language is not necessary to give them that authority by any means?

Mr. MANN. No; not at all.

Mr. LEVER. I think the only reason for estimating for it at all is that that may be set out in the bill.

Mr. MANN. I know they do the work now, and I did not know but there had been some ruling of the comptroller or auditor to the effect that they could not do it any more.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. They want to describe their work more accurately; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, line 21, after the figures "$54,280," insert:
"*Provided*, That $10,000 of this sum shall be applied to the investigation and suppression of the mosquito."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared two amendments, this being one of them, and the other being:

*Provided*, That the Department of Agriculture shall cooperate with such States as may have provided by appropriation for the investigation and suppression of the mosquito.

Mr. Chairman, for several sessions I have been endeavoring to have Congress take cognizance of this question. This amendment proposes no increase in the appropriation, but instructs the department to inquire concerning the mosquito and to aid in its suppression. It gives specific directions to the department to consider the question of the mosquito. The aggregate appropriation here for the investigation of a variety of insects amounts to $427,370. It is almost entirely for insects that affect the field and the farm, fruits and flowers, products of the soil, and so forth. There is no provision whatever for investigating or identifying or classifying or suppressing those insects that affect the health of man except as to a part of $54,280.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit me, I desire to say that the Bureau of Entomology is now doing considerable work along the very line of his amendment. I read from the project statement of the bureau:

The investigation of malaria-carrying mosquitoes was begun by a study of the prevalence of these species and malaria on a typical plantation in Madison Parish, La. By cooperation of the owners of the property it will be possible to determine accurately the importance of malaria-bearing mosquitoes in connection with agriculture.

Mr. MOORE. That seems to be an investigation only in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. LEVER. Then in the reasons submitted for the increase asked I find this language also:

The increase for which the estimate is submitted is intended for use in the cooperative work against the house fly, which has been begun, and to enable the bureau to meet the demands made upon it for careful study of the malaria-bearing mosquito.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask the gentleman whether that investigation is carried on anywhere else than in that State?

Mr. LEVER. I have no information as to that. I presume not, however.

Mr. MOORE. What objection has the gentleman to accepting the amendment proposed, which does not increase the appropriation, but simply gives a direction to the department?

Mr. LEVER. I will answer the gentleman frankly. If I had had the time to go into it as thoroughly as I wished to do, I would not have permitted this language in the bill, which gives authority to the Bureau of Entomology to study insects that affect the health of man; because I believe if they do that you are going to see a duplication of the work of the Public Health Service. I believe we ought to concentrate as far as possible in one department the lines of work that that department is doing. Now, the Public Health Service is doing a great deal of work along these lines, and I think has an appropriation of about $200,000. I will ask my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina], who is on the committee which appropriates for the Public Health Service, if that is not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The appropriation is more than that.

Mr. LEVER. My colleague from South Carolina informs me that the appropriation is more than that, to study those insects which affect the health of man. Now, why should we build up in the Department of Agriculture another public-health service? I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania very frankly that when the bill comes in next year, if I can prevent it, this authority will not be carried in the bill again.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will permit me to suggest it, the activity of the mosquito goes beyond the health of man. It drives man from the field in more instances than one, and there are certain sections of the country that are to a large extent devastated because the mosquito is active there and because very little has been done to exterminate it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows of no disease of animals other than man that is caused by the mosquito, does he?

Mr. MOORE. I do not know, except that investigations have shown that the mosquito does carry disease.

Mr. LEVER. Affecting animals other than man?

Mr. MOORE. They affect poultry, if the gentleman refers to that.

Mr. LEVER. Sheep, cattle, and horses.

The time of Mr. MOORE having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The mosquito is very injurious to animals as well as to man. I do not know whether it conveys diseases, but it is a well-known fact to those who pasture stock that if you can get away from mosquitoes the animals put on flesh much more rapidly and the pasturage is much more valuable.

Mr. MOORE. I think that is entirely true, and I thank the gentleman from Iowa, who is better versed in agriculture than I am, for making the statement. This is the only place in the bill where anything is done for the health of man. The bill purports to be entirely for agriculture itself, which is proper. But I was calling the attention of the committee to the fact that the farmer, the human being, has to abide wherever cattle abide and wherever vegetation grows or wherever agriculture develops, and if the mosquito is pestiferous in any section that tends to affect the welfare of agriculture itself, because if man does not thrive agriculture does not thrive and live stock does not thrive, so there is a collateral interest there, if not a very direct connection.

I think that my amendment might be accepted by the gentleman from South Carolina, since it does not affect the appropriation. On page 65 of the bill provision is made to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the development of reclamation projects. That might be held to be in the nature of a move to suppress the mosquito, because reclamation projects would help to drive the mosquito out.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say to the gentleman that if the committee thought it would bear that construction it would not be in the bill.

Mr. MOORE. If Dr. Gorgas was correct in his treatment of the mosquito in Panama, why not try to meet it in other sections where the drainage of swamp areas will help to alleviate the mosquito nuisance?

Mr. LEVER. No one denies that.

Mr. MOORE. The amendment that I offer proposes that a portion of the $54,000 appropriated for investigations, identification and systematic classification of insects, including "the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals," which is largely theoretical, which goes into the books and bulletins largely—that at least $10,000 of that sum, not raising the amount appropriated a dollar, shall be applied by the department to the specific investigation of the mosquito.

Mr. LEVER. It had not been called to my attention until just now, but I am afraid the gentleman's amendment is going to have exactly the opposite effect to that which he desires. To put it another way, I think the gentleman is going to reduce the amount of the appropriation now used for this purpose. I hold in my hand the project book of the Bureau of Entomology, and I find, under the head of "Study of insects affecting the health of man," they spent, in 1913, $2,402.02 for the study of insects affecting the health of man, among which is the malarial mosquito. And for 1914 they have allotted $15,000 for that work, and in the estimate for 1915 in this bill they have allotted $20,000. Now, the gentleman ought to stay by the mosquito and not cut the appropriation.

Mr. MOORE. But it does not appear from the gentleman's statement that that applies to the mosquito itself. It applies to other insects affecting the health of man. That may be the house fly or the bedbug. I want a specific application to that common, that well-known nuisance, the mosquito.

Mr. LEVER. It applies to the house fly, the malaria-carrying mosquito, the stable fly, and the Rocky Mountain spotted fever tick.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has confirmed what I said; the bulk goes to the investigation of other insects than the mosquito. I simply ask that a part of this money be specifically spent for the purpose of investigating the mosquito.

[The time of Mr. MOORE having expired, by unanimous consent he was given three minutes more.]

Several States have undertaken to suppress the nuisance on their own account, but the gentleman is aware of the fact that the mosquito does not abide within the limits of any one State. It is an interstate nuisance. It may originate in Delaware, but it goes into Pennsylvania and Maryland. It may originate in Louisiana, but it connects up with other States. Therefore it is a nuisance that can not be entirely controlled or suppressed by a State.

What is the Federal Government doing to aid the States in the suppression of this nuisance? It spreads everywhere; it is a nuisance everywhere; it interferes with business everywhere; and it certainly disturbs the comfort of people everywhere. It has been indicated in this discussion that it affects the well-being of animal life in that stock and poultry do not grow as rapidly as they would if they were not harassed by the mosquito.

What is the Federal Government doing to aid the State of New Jersey, which makes a direct appropriation for this purpose? The Government has splendid machinery and facilities for determining the origin and effect of the mosquito. Why not cooperate with the States and get rid of it?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does not the treatment of the mosquito in Panama and its eradication show that we can get rid of it?

Mr. MOORE. The project there might be too large for one State to undertake. But if it was a good thing there, why is it not tried out in Louisiana or New Jersey?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It might be a good thing anywhere. If we have the information how to do it, why appropriate money to get more information?

Mr. MOORE. If we know, why spend any money at all? We seem to be spending $54,000 for the purpose of finding out. We are spending money for the study, and spending no money at all to effect a remedy.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The purpose of the study is to find out how to eradicate it.

Mr. MOORE. But how are we going to get results? The mosquito comes and bites just as hard and is just as much of a nuisance after we have investigated him as he was before. We want results.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. Is this not an absolute duplication of work done by the Marine Hospital Corps or the Public Health Department?

Mr. LEVER. I made that statement a moment ago.

Mr. SISSON. Did the Committee on Agriculture consider the amount of money that is being expended in that department for this particular investigation?

Mr. LEVER. Twenty thousand dollars. I made the statement a moment ago. The gentleman was evidently in the cloakroom at the time. If my attention had been called to this line of work sooner, this item would not have gone into the bill, or the bill would not have come upon the floor with the item in it, because I do believe it is a duplication of the work of the Public Health Service. In the future it will not come in this bill if I can prevent it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: That it has been my purpose within the last few months to look somewhat into the various appropriation bills, and that is why I interrupt the committee at this time. You will find in the various departments of this Government work of this kind duplicated many times. I do not mean this particular character of work, but other characters of work are being duplicated repeatedly in various departments, and it seems to me that, in respect to all of these different appropriation bills, the chairmen of the committees or the clerks of the committees, or some machinery at any rate, ought to be put into force for the purpose of eliminating duplication of work. Why should there be instrumentalities established with certain overhead charges which could be eliminated if all of this work could be done in one department and under one direction?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that the thought has been in mind for quite a while that it would be money well spent if we created a commission of some description to go through all these various lines of work of these various departments and point out to Congress where the work is duplicated.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit this suggestion, I think if the chairmen of the various com-

mittees that appropriate money would get together at the beginning of some Congress, after the estimates shall have been submitted, and go through the bills, those chairmen of the various committees, without the appointment of a commission, could accomplish a great deal of work along the line of the elimination of duplication of work.

Mr. LEVER. That is undoubtedly true and it is a very good suggestion.

Mr. SISSON. And my only purpose in rising was to make that suggestion to the chairman of the committee, and he might be the chairman of the committee to initiate that work in the next Congress, because, if something is not done, it will be found that there are numbers of items duplicated in the various appropriation bills.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to be heard on the merits of the amendment. This is an amendment to set aside $10,000 of this appropriation for the study of the mosquito.

It is a matter which has engaged the attention and thought of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] for several years. I would like greatly to accommodate him, but, as I have suggested, we are already using $20,000 of this item for the study of insects affecting the health of man, and I take it that the department, in making its allotment, will make the allotment upon the ground of the urgency of the situation.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know whether the department cooperates in any way with any States that already make appropriations for the suppression of the mosquito?

Mr. LEVER. The statement was made that the department in its investigation in Louisiana is cooperating with the State authorities.

Mr. MOORE. I do know that the State of New Jersey makes an appropriation for this purpose, and I want to know whether the officials in the State of New Jersey obtain any of the benefits of the Federal governmental investigation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the Government is cooperating in this work of the study of insects affecting the health of man with the authorities in the District of Columbia, at New Orleans with the authorities of the State of Louisiana, in Texas at Dallas, in Montana at Ravalli and Missoula Counties, and in South Carolina at Spartanburg.

Mr. MOORE. I think, in all fairness, the work ought to be extended into other States, because the mosquito is just as bad on the Great Lakes as it is on the Atlantic coast or in the Southern States.

Mr. LEVER. If this were the only department of the Government which is making these investigations, I would feel inclined to favor the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I believe that it is the province of the Government to make these studies of the malaria-bearing mosquitoes, which are very greatly affecting the health of man; but the Public Health Service is doing that work. It was created to do that kind of work, and I do not believe that we should attempt to build up duplication of service in these various departments of the Government. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] is a very good suggestion, and something ought to be done to prevent a continuance of duplication of work. Hence I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 48, line 21, after the figures "$54,280," insert "*Provided*, That the Department of Agriculture shall cooperate with such States as may have provided by appropriation for the investigation and suppression of the mosquito."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, notwithstanding the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in order that I might say a word of approval of what has been said both by him and the gentleman from Mississippi with regard to a cooperative method of preventing duplication of appropriations. We ought not to have duplication. It makes no difference whether these pestiferous insects that affect the health of man and animals are investigated by the Medical Department of the Government or by the Department of Agriculture, but they ought to be investigated by somebody, and we ought to have the benefit of the scientific knowledge for which we pay so much, and we ought not to pay twice for that knowledge. My point in offering this amendment is to draw attention to the fact that certain States have undertaken to make this kind of mosquito investigation on their own account, but that it is manifestly impossible for any one State to control the situation. There must be Federal cooperation, just as there is in the case of the Mediterranean fly, the boll weevil, the gypsy brown-tail moth, and the Argentine ant, or any of these nuisances on account of which we make appropriations.

And in view of the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina that the Committee on Agriculture in the future may resolve that the mosquito is none of its business, I hope that at least some committee may eventually take cognizance of it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think I am safe in assuring the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this item with this language carrying this authority will not be in the next year's Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE. Very well, that will bring it squarely up to the medical authorities.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing spread of moths: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as he shall deem best, in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $297,540.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a list of the Democrats who are Members of the present Congress who voted for the present law permitting American ships engaged in the coastwise trade to pass through the Panama Canal without the payment of tolls.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain data which he indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Why not include everybody?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this matter already in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The newspapers are very much interested in it and the public would like to see a list of those who——

Mr. BARTLETT. What is the proposed list the gentleman desires to publish?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I propose to publish a list of the Democratic Members of Congress who voted——

Mr. BARTLETT. Democrats, for what?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In favor of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal without the payment of tolls. I give also the attitude of three Members of the present Cabinet. I thought that would be of interest to the country to know, especially in view of the fact we are going to vote on that matter soon.

Mr. FOSTER. That is already in the RECORD?

Mr. MANN. No; it is not in the RECORD, except one would have to go over it and pick it out.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Why does the gentleman limit it to Democrats? Why does he not put in Republicans and everybody else?

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe I had the gentleman's permission to interrupt him.

Mr. HEFLIN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] if I can yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order has been demanded, and the question is, Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LEVER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not intend to object myself.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of the Montana National Bison Range and other reservations under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rockwork, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservations, and for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," $21,000, of which sum $2,500 may be used for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. If I may get the attention of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can always have my attention.

Mr. LEVER. I desire at this point, as I explained awhile ago, to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] may address the committee for 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of course I shall not object to that. I just sent for the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who is engaged in the Committee on Appropriations and who is interested in the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] may be permitted to address the committee for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to apologize to the committee for asking for the time. I am called upon to perform the most solemn and sacred duty of my life, and can not be here to-morrow when this fisheries treaty is coming up under a special rule. I represent a district on the south shore of Lake Erie that is more interested in this treaty than any other district in the United States. The treaty has been amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and if the amendment stands as agreed upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs I am paired to vote for the treaty. If the amendment is stricken out, then I am paired to vote against the treaty. This is the paragraph that has been amended:

48. TRAP NETS PROHIBITED.

No concealed movable trap net shall be used in these treaty waters. On and after January 1, 1916, no trap net of any kind shall be used for the capture of fish in these treaty waters.

This is the amendment agreed upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning:

Section 1, page 3, after line 3, strike out the words "January 1" and insert the words "March 1: *Provided also*, That the enforcement of regulation No. 48 is suspended pending revision by the International Fisheries Commission and the approval of said revision by Congress; but the commission shall have the right to regulate the construction and operation of trap nets."

I will say that this amendment meets the approval of the United States Fish Commissioner, Dr. Smith.

Before discussing the features of this highly important measure I desire, on behalf of my constituents along the south shore of Lake Erie, to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], and the committee he so ably presides over for the kindness and consideration shown our interests in this bill.

The Government fish hatcheries of Lake Erie are located at Put-in-Bay, in the district I represent, also the Ohio State fish hatchery. That splendid group of historic islands near the spot where Commodore Perry fought the most signal naval battle ever fought on fresh water, Put-in-Bay Island, lies about 16 miles from shore, and this group of islands—North Bass, Middle Bass, and Put-in-Bay, emerald gems that rise above the bosom of Lake Erie—are peopled by a class of citizens not excelled in intelligence, enterprise, and patriotism in the United States. And these islanders are lake fishermen, grape and fruit growers. Not only are the finest and most wholesome food fishes caught in the waters around these islands, but the finest peaches and the most luscious grapes are here produced. These islands have a peculiar charm and attractiveness, especially in the early autumn, when the fields, which are all gardens, are in the brilliant glow of vineyard and vintage. The fishing industry in my district and the adjoining district east, on the south shore of Lake Erie, is an important element of food supply. The international treaty we are now called upon to ratify abolishes all trap-net fishing. The number of trap nets operated along this shore in 1913 was 4,058; money invested, $650,000; fish caught, 10,407,500 pounds; value, $457,000; 1,200 men employed directly. The trap-net catch was 65 per cent of the total catch of fish in Ohio waters in Lake Erie.

The bill as now amended allows temporarily continuation of the trap-net industry, or until the further action of Congress. We have agreed to accept this concession. The trap net was originally discriminated against. Many think this device an ingeniously contrived trap different from and more destructive than other nets and devices. The facts are that there is nothing in trap-net fishing that differs materially from pound-net or fyke-net fishing, both of which are permitted under this treaty now under consideration. The manner of catching fish in trap nets is identical with that of the pound net, both of which are so constructed as to permit the escape of the small or undersized fish. Fyke nets are used in the shallow waters of Sandusky Bay, and is a small net. Trap nets are so constructed that they may be submerged, being closed at the top, while pound nets are open at the top and supported by stakes forming a circle and projecting out of the water. This is the chief difference, except that pound nets are larger and more expensive of operation. Both nets have what is known as leaders. This is a netting set perpendicular in the water and running out some distance from shore, which serves to guide the fish into the nets. Right now and here I want to refute the statement that the waters of Lake Erie are being depleted of their food supply of fish. The efficient work done by the United States and Ohio State Hatcheries maintained at Put-in-Bay, Ohio, is strikingly evidenced by the remarkable fact that of the principal species propagated artificially—whitefish, herring, and blue pike—there is a greater supply in Lake Erie to-day than at any time in the past 25 years. This is proved by the greatly increased catch of these kinds of fish in the same nets and same localities. In some localities the increase has been more than 400 per cent within recent years. In the Ohio State Hatchery alone more than a thousand million fry are produced annually. A "fry" is a minnow just escaped from the egg and not able to take care of itself in the water. If only 4 per cent of these grow to maturity it adds annually more than 50,000,000 pounds of fish to the supply of Lake Erie from this one hatchery alone.

The Ohio waters of Lake Erie are peculiarly adapted to the propagation of fish, both natural and artificial. Here are the best spawning grounds of the whole Great Lakes system. The billions of little fishes produced in the two hatcheries at Put-in-Bay are placed in the waters, and many of them find their way into the deeper waters on the Canadian side of the international boundary line, there to be caught by Canadian fishermen in pound and gill nets and brought over to be sold to the ultimate consumer in the United States. Again let me call your attention to the fact that a large amount of the spawn that is developed in the fish hatchery of Ohio is bought of the Canadian fishermen and paid for by the State of Ohio, and when this spawn is hatched into fry, which means a fish which has emerged from the egg, he goes into deep water and becomes the prey of the Canadian fishermen, and as long as we in the State of Ohio maintain a hatchery on the south shore of Lake Erie, and the Government of the United States maintains its extensive hatchery at Put-in-Bay, and the Canadians establish no fish hatchery on the north shore of Lake Erie, this condition of affairs is bound to exist, whether the treaty under consideration is ratified or otherwise.

It is agreed by all interests on the south shore of Lake Erie that this treaty forbidding trap-net fishing in Lake Erie is solely in the interest of Canadian fishermen. And the American commissioner, Dr. Smith, admitted in my presence not five days ago that there is now no objection to trap-net fishing. It is also agreed that this bill, unless amended, will ruin all the trap-net fishermen on the south shore of Lake Erie and practically confiscate their property.

As to the cost of carrying into effect the provisions of this treaty, I have made some investigation. I will take the eastern group of waters: Passamaquoddy Bay and St. Croix River, between New Brunswick and State of Maine, will probably require at least two patrol boats; Lake Memphemagog, in northern Vermont, one patrol boat; Lake Champlain, between New York and Vermont, extending into Canada, one patrol boat; Lake Ontario one patrol boat; Lake Erie two boats; Lake St. Clair one boat; waters connecting Lakes Erie and St. Clair one boat; waters connecting Lakes St. Clair and Huron one boat; Lake Huron two boats; St. Marys River one boat; and Lake Superior three boats. This completes the Great Lakes system, so called. Lake of the Woods, between northern Minnesota and Canada, will require one boat; Rainy Lake and Rainy River one boat. Take the Pacific group, including Washington Sound, Strait of Juan de Fuca, Strait of Georgia, and Puget Sound, and four boats at least will be required. The Government would be required to build 20 patrol boats at the cost of $25,000 each. The cost of maintenance of each of these boats, estimated by what it is costing Ohio now for her patrol boat in Lake Erie waters, at least $20,000 a year. Then there is a question of maintenance, of repairs, and manning these boats. Each boat would require a captain, a pilot, two wheelsmen, first and second engineer, two firemen, one oilman, besides the deck crew. I have made an estimate of these costs per year, based upon the cost of the Ohio boat now in Lake Erie waters, and a million dollars per year I believe to be a fair estimate.

It is estimated that 90 per cent of the fish caught in Canadian waters affected by this treaty are sold in the United States. In the deeper waters of the north part of Lake Erie trap-net fishing is not practical, while in the south part, in the more shallow waters trap nets are practical and have, therefore, come into

general use. If trap nets were abolished by law, it would not only put our Ohio fishermen out of business, but it would also give to Canadian fishermen a very important advantage.

The principal opposition to the use of trap nets on Lake Erie at the time this treaty was negotiated came from the sporting fishermen, who fish with rod and line and who are interested in black bass. But since the laws of Ohio and other States, as well as those of Canada, prohibit the catching of black bass except with hook and line, all sensible opposition to trap nets has now ceased.

The revenue derived from fees for licenses on trap nets in the Lake Erie fishing district of Ohio amounts to more than $20,000 annually, which is used in maintaining the Ohio State fish hatchery at Put-in-Bay.

Regulation 45 prohibits fishing with nets in Lake Erie within one-half mile of the international boundary line. This regulation is disadvantageous to the fishermen on the south shore of Lake Erie. During the summer months, when the sun is ardent, fish naturally take toward the cooler and deeper waters in the middle and north part of the lake, and for this reason this one-half mile strip of United States waters extending the whole length of the lake is of great importance to the fishermen on the south shore. In view of these conditions, this is manifestly an unfair regulation, especially when the artificial propagation of fish by the United States and State of Ohio is considered. For instance, the water boundary line is only a few miles north of North Bass Island in Lake Erie, and as we move north to the Canada shore the water grows rapidly deeper to the depth of 70 feet. All the more wholesome and palatable and nutritious fishes, especially the whitefish, take naturally to deep water. The whitefish is a noncombatant, and not a fighter like the black bass and grass pike. Hence the whitefish, as soon as able to go it alone from the United States and the Ohio fish hatcheries, takes to the deeper Canadian waters. Canada has no fish hatchery on Lake Erie. Hence, in any event, we are breeding fish largely for the benefit and profit of Canadian fishermen.

The revocation of the half-mile limit would result in considerable gain to Ohio fishermen on the south shore of Lake Erie. I will say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs at a meeting this morning refused to amend the bill in that particular.

Much has been said about the preservation of that valuable fish, the sturgeon, in these international waters. It is to be regretted that this fish seems to be doomed to extinction. Our efforts ought to be directed more toward the protection and artificial propagation of the more important food fishes, those which from their very nature always have constituted and always will constitute the great bulk of supply to an ever-increasing demand. Sturgeon can not be successfully propagated artificially, and if they could the great length of time required for a sturgeon to grow makes it impossible to prevent their ultimate extinction.

All alimentary scientists agree that a fish diet is the best and most potent brain feeder; and the Lake Erie whitefish, when properly larded, leads all the rest in brain nourishment. With all the great and perplexing problems now pending in this Congress, the question of a higher quality of brain evolution should appeal to every Member on this floor as of the most vital moment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HENSLEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] in reference to this national bison range in Montana. How many bison do we have now? It goes against my feelings, by the way, to say "bison," because when they were plentiful we called them "buffalo."

Mr. LEVER. On what page is that?

Mr. MANN. On page 50, the paragraph now under consideration.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that I asked that question of the witness before the committee, Dr. Henshaw, in this language:

> How many bison have you in your herds altogether?
>
> Mr. HENSHAW. We have exactly 96 on the Montana range; we have just transported 14 animals to the South Dakota range, and we have 10 in Nebraska. They are all in fine order, and the Montana herd, particularly, is increasing at a very rapid rate, the increase being over 200 per cent for the first four years, which is exceedingly high.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You think, then, you can save this animal from extinction?

He replied:

> I do not think there is any doubt at all about the future of the bison. I think it is absolutely safe. There is, of course, a possibility that on any one of these ranges some contagious disease might break out and endanger that one herd. We now have three under our jurisdiction.

Mr. MANN. What good does it do? Have we not enough? What good does it do to increase that herd 200 per cent in four years, which seems like a remarkable reproduction?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the bison is a great American animal. It is fast becoming extinct.

Mr. MANN. It is increasing in numbers now.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; but it would have been extinct if we had not taken care of it; and the committee thinks that we ought to preserve the species.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing that. What are we going to do with the increase now? Here is a remarkable productivity.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that if the increase becomes large enough, these animals will be turned out on the range to shift for themselves.

Mr. MURDOCK. They would not last very long.

Mr. MANN. They have them on the range in some places, do they not; for instance, in Yellowstone Park?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; in Yellowstone Park. But all the bison in this country are under control.

Mr. MANN. What good are they after they are turned out on the range?

Mr. LEVER. They are good to eat.

Mr. MANN. Well, not very.

Mr. LEVER. I have never eaten any myself, I will say frankly.

Mr. HOWARD. Their hides are good to make shoes from.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Georgia suggests the hides are fine for shoes and things like that.

Mr. MANN. Nobody would use the shoes. I suppose some of us can remember—at least I can—when we could get a good buffalo hide for about $1.50, or a buffalo coat.

Mr. SLOAN. Did you ever eat a buffalo steak? They are good.

Mr. MANN. Yes. But nobody who eats good meat will eat it. The gentleman has a good imagination, and anyone with imagination can eat any kind of meat, but give me a good corn-fed ox.

Mr. LEVER. I wish this to go into the RECORD—from Dr. Henshaw:

> The total number of bison is about 3,500, of which about 1,700, including 345 in Government herds, are in captivity in the United States at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield? How many bison are on this range which is designated in this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. Ninety-six.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying noxious animals, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, $65,000: *Provided*, That of this sum $15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests: *And provided further*, That of this sum not more than $5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 51, line 8, strike out "$65,000" and insert "$85,000."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to increase by $20,000 the appropriation under this head. This appropriation is used for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture and horticulture, for experiments and demonstrations in destroying noxious animals, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals; $15,000 of it is specifically appropriated for the destruction of ground squirrels in the national forests.

My object in increasing the sum by $20,000 is to enable the Biological Survey to make experiments and demonstrations in extermination of the rodent commonly known as the prairie dog. But few people realize the destructive character of the American prairie dog. In these days, when we are endeavoring to increase the food supply of the Nation, I know of no way in which we can accomplish that by Government aid to such an extent, with the same expenditure, that we can by clearing the range of the prairie dog.

There are approximately 350,000,000 acres of unentered public land, mostly in the intermountain States. It would be difficult to form an intelligent opinion of the proportion in that area that is inhabited by the prairie dog, but I think it would be an entirely conservative estimate to say that 50,000,000 acres is

inhabited by that rodent. The prairie dog is the most gregarious of all rodents and the most destructive. He lives in villages, and in the area covered by his villages, and for a considerable surrounding area, nothing that affords feed for live stock is allowed to grow. In other words, the area of the prairie-dog towns of the intermountain country are barren and worthless so far as producing anything for grazing animals is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question for information? When these prairie dogs have eaten up all the roots or vegetation, what do they do then? I mean in a locality such as the gentleman has described?

Mr. MONDELL. They seem in a way to be fairly intelligent conservationists. I think they seldom destroy the roots sufficiently to prevent the growth of enough grass to keep the villages going. They generally eat the grass as fast as it grows and to a very considerable extent eat the roots, but not to an extent, as a general thing, to prevent reproduction of the grasses. It takes some time to restore the grasses to a normal growth, however, after the dogs are killed or driven out. As they eat the grass on the ground they occupy, they forage farther and farther out onto the surrounding territory, so that when you approach a dog town you pass from a region having a fairly good growth of grass to one without any grass whatever, for as fast as the grass grows on the dog town the dogs eat it—constantly eat the tender grass as it comes up.

As the settler goes upon those lands he destroys the dogs upon his own land, but he constantly suffers from the incursion of the prairie dog from the surrounding territory; and oftentimes you will see a green field mowed as clean as though it had been struck by a Kansas cyclone, with no living vegetation upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is a moderate estimate, as I said a moment ago, to place the territory denuded yearly by the prairie dog at 50,000,000 acres. Assuming that this area, if it produced its ordinary growth of grass, would feed one steer to 50 acres—and that is more than a moderate estimate—the prairie dogs are each year destroying grass enough to feed a million steers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the State of Wyoming taken any steps to eradicate prairie dogs?

Mr. MONDELL. We have paid bounties for the destruction of noxious and predatory animals for years—I think at one time for dogs.

Mr. MURDOCK. With what result?

Mr. MONDELL. With the result that the appropriation was very quickly used up. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. And the prairie dogs not diminished?

Mr. MONDELL. We have been diminishing the prairie dogs very greatly. The settlers kill the prairie dogs on their own lands and on the adjacent public domain to a certain extent. Last year one small settlement of stockmen in my State spent $2,800 for the destruction of prairie dogs. We do not expect the Federal Government to kill all the prairie dogs on the range, although last year $12,000 was expended for killing them on the forest reserves, and the department estimates that with the expenditure of this sum they saved grass worth $150,000; so that, in my judgment, it was a very excellent expenditure.

Several years ago the department began to experiment in the development of methods for the destruction of these animals. They developed a formula, which has been very generally adopted—a strychnine formula. They also developed a formula using a certain chemical which, placed in the hole, produced a poisonous gas that killed the dog.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. What is called the "Prairie Dog Sure Shot" is an effective remedy.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, the condition attending the application of these remedies is that they must be applied with very great care, and they must be applied just at the right time, and the farmer oftentimes makes a failure in applying them. What we desire to have the department do is to demonstrate at widely separated points in the range country the effectiveness of these destructive agencies, and we believe that with the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money the stockmen and the farmers will be so assisted and encouraged that within a few years we can very largely destroy these creatures throughout the entire range country and make a range for thousands and hundreds of thousands of farm animals.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. PLATT. When you get these animals nearly all destroyed will not the Government be buying a national park to keep them still in existence, as in the case of the buffaloes?

Mr. MONDELL. The Government will not at any suggestion of mine.

I hope the committee may see its way clear to accept this small addition to the appropriation. It will be of very great value in our country. It will be utilized from Texas to Montana, and from Nebraska to California; and under this appropriation demonstrations can be made that within a few years ought to give us millions of acres of grasslands where there is to-day practically no vegetation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the matter to which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] calls attention is recognized by the Committee on Agriculture to present a very important problem. It was estimated to the committee a few years ago that the country was losing annually something like $25,000,000 on account of the destructive characteristics of the prairie dogs.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman has got that too high.

Mr. LEVER. That may be. But we feel that if we have discovered a remedy for these pestiferous little animals it would not be a waste of public money to use it in demonstrating the method. The amount that the gentleman from Wyoming asks, however, in the judgment of the chairman of the committee, is entirely too high, because the work is new work, and it must be organized and put on its feet. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree to an increase of $10,000 instead of $20,000? Then I think there would be no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the department could use $20,000 to advantage; but I agree with the gentleman that this is new work, and if the committee would agree to an increase of $10,000 I believe it would make a good start, and I think I should be satisfied.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. While we have no prairie dogs in Idaho, we have another animal there that is equally destructive, and that is the jack rabbit. There are millions and millions of these rabbits in the Rocky Mountain country, and anyone going a few miles from a settlement to found a new homestead finds it almost impossible to raise crops without being constantly on the alert for these animals, which destroy the grain fields and the alfalfa fields.

The Department of Agriculture has been making some experiments in Idaho, and has made some progress in destroying these jack rabbits in certain localities. In view of the fact that these jack rabbits are scattered over almost as large an area as the prairie dogs, and in view of the fact that the department is already interested in their extermination and is cooperating with the people there, I think the sum of $20,000 ought to be added to this appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that we made some inquiry about the method being used for the destruction of the jack rabbit, and the gentleman in charge of that work, Dr. Fisher, told us:

Dr. FISHER. We are using oats at the present time, for the simple reason that poisoned alfalfa is dangerous to stock and sheep. We are now making little corrals of a few feet broad and perhaps 20 or 30 feet long, and we put the alfalfa in them so that the rabbits can get into the corral and larger animals will be kept out; and in that way we can kill them over a considerable area.

Mr. HOWELL. That method can be employed only during the winter months?

Dr. FISHER. Poisoning is most economical and effective then, when green food is lacking.

Mr. HOWELL. Rabbits are most destructive in my State while the crop is growing in the early spring.

Dr. FISHER. It is for that reason that the rabbits should be destroyed in winter. We find that rabbits like oats better than anything else in the way of grain, and this grain can be used generally in a district, even in unfenced lands. We have to consider the safety of the stock

The department is now doing some work in this direction, and I could not agree to increase this appropriation any more than $10,000. I hope the gentleman will not press his amendment in its present form. If the gentleman [Mr. MONDELL] will modify his request, and if no member of the committee makes any objection to it, I shall not object.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment by making the sum $75,000 instead of $85,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified if there be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 1, strike out $65,000 and insert $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from South Carolina a question. The last proviso in this paragraph is this:

*And provided further*, That of this sum not more than $5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah.

I should like to ask the gentleman what this disease is, and what is the purpose of protecting these wild ducks? It was stated here a few minutes ago that the Government is trying to do away with the jack rabbit, and here is an attempt to preserve the wild duck.

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee is to this effect. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HOWELL], who is a member of the committee and who comes from the State where this destructive disease occurs among the wild ducks, made this statement:

I want to present to the committee at the proper time a condition that prevails at Salt Lake. Hundreds of thousands of ducks for the last four years have been visited by some malady that has baffled all the skill we were able to bring to bear to combat it. It occurs from the middle of September to the middle of October, along the marshes of the Great Salt Lake. The game warden of Utah has told me that during the last four years there has been something over 400,000,000 wild ducks that have died in this unknown manner, and it is a matter of very serious concern to the people of the Great Salt Lake Basin, involving the loss of over $1,000,000 a year in wild game. I would like at the proper time to ask the committee to make provision for the investigation of this condition.

Mr. FOSTER. Who counted those ducks?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The game warden counted them.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not believe there were that many ducks in the whole world. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Then the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Galloway, who was present, made this statement:

Mr. Chairman, that matter has been before the department. Arrangements have been made to have the Biological Survey, which handles wild-game work, make a survey of the situation, and it is proposed to take up the investigation next spring. It will be necessary perhaps to have a little laboratory located out there, because we have not been able to secure any very definite information as to the cause of the trouble from an examination of the birds sent in here to the department.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there anything in the hearings which shows that the preservation of the wild duck is in the interest of agriculture? I ask this question; I have asked it before. I should like to know what is the object of preserving these wild ducks?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Kansas has asked me that question privately on several occasions. As far as I have been able to ascertain there is no specific language in this bill which makes the connection that the gentleman is seeking to make between agriculture and wild ducks, but the gentleman realizes, of course, that there is a number of items carried in this bill which do not affect agriculture any more than the wild duck does. For instance, we are carrying an item here for the protection of migratory game birds, which, in my judgment, ought never to have been put upon this bill. We carry in this bill also a number of other items which in no way affect agriculture.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, as a matter of fact, the preservation of the wild duck has nothing to do with agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I think not. But in my judgment it is a very valuable thing to protect the wild duck, because he is a great game fowl.

Mr. MURDOCK. But he does prey upon the farmers' crops?

Mr. LEVER. In Kansas, where he can not find any water.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are trying to get the right to shoot him in Kansas, but by a Federal regulation we are barred from doing it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I see there is an appropriation here of $15,000 for the destruction of ground squirrels in the national forests. Is that for the protection of the persons who have farms within the national forests, or is it for the preservation of the health of the general public, to prevent the spread of the bubonic plague?

Mr. LEVER. That is the purpose of the appropriation, to prevent the spread of that plague.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Would the gentleman have any objection to inserting after the word "squirrels" in line 10, page 51, the words "and prairie dogs on the national forests"?

That would come directly under the agricultural provision, and in my judgment would make this a much better bill. I will state further that the reason for putting this prairie-dog provision in here is that the national forests are rented to stockmen, and the Government is deriving revenue from the grazing lands within these forests, and it would add vastly to the value of these national forests as grazing lands if we were to kill these prairie dogs.

Mr. LEVER. Evidently the gentleman from Texas was not here a moment ago when we were considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. We have just increased this appropriation $10,000 for the purpose of handling the prairie-dog situation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I was not here when that was done.

Mr. LEVER. I would not like to have anything further inserted in the bill than what we have already put in.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman says that $15,000 is to be used for the destruction of the ground squirrel because they carry bubonic-plague germs. Does the gentleman know that there is a large sum of money expended by the Public Health Service for the destruction of these animals in California?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that my information is to this effect: The Public Health Service, under the direction of that very distinguished South Carolinian, my friend, and one of the most distinguished men in this country, Dr. Rupert Blue, discovered some years ago the cause of bubonic plague—that it was communicated by the bite of a flea. This flea seems to be indigenous to these squirrels, and there has been no authority, as we understand so far, for anybody to use any public money to go into the national forests and use it for the destruction of these squirrels until this was put in the bill several years ago.

Mr. BARTLETT. What part of the national forests is this expended in?

Mr. LEVER. Largely in California.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I say. Nobody esteems Surg. Gen. Blue more than I do. I know him personally, and his character is of the highest, personally and professionally. I am not calling attention to this to minimize the work, but Congress, in the appropriation bills that come from the Appropriations Committee, in the urgent deficiency bill passed this session of Congress, and others, have appropriated large sums for this identical purpose of destroying the squirrels which carry the flea that carries the germ of bubonic plague.

Mr. LEVER. That may be. I made a statement this morning that there was a number of lines of duplicating work being carried on by the various departments, and, as far as I was able, I would try to remedy it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman might say that there are innumerable instances.

Mr. LEVER. As far as I am concerned, I stand ready to prevent any duplication. I will state an example. A demand was made, and the department estimated for it, for work now done by the Health Service in reference to the oyster. As soon as it came to my attention I investigated it, called for the Public Health Service officials, found out what they were doing, and ascertained that the work which the Department of Agriculture wanted to do was already being done by the Health Service, and I cut it out. Now, if the gentleman will permit this appropriation to stand, I will promise a careful examination of this matter next year.

Mr. BARTLETT. California ought to do something itself toward this matter. The Public Health Service, as I say, has spent a large sum of money in doing this very thing which the gentleman proposes to do by this item.

Mr. LEVER. That is true; the Public Health Service has done a wonderful work in discovering the cause of the spotted fever in Montana, and yet we discovered recently that the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Entomology, is duplicating the work. I propose in the next bill that comes from the committee to look into the situation carefully, and if convinced myself, and the committee agrees with me, that the Agricultural Department is duplicating work of the Health Service, I promise the gentleman from Georgia that none of these items will appear in the next bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will render a great service to the United States if he does that. I do not mean to say

that this department has been doing as much duplication work as some of the other departments, but there is place after place where specific work is being done by three bureaus, with a duplication of the work and three times as much money spent for printing and other things as is necessary.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that with my little experience in handling this department of the Government, which I think is doing as little duplicate work as any department, I believe that a proper investigation would develop lines of duplication going on in the Government service that if done away with might save millions of dollars to the public service.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman tell us briefly how this money is expended for killing the squirrels.

Mr. BARTLETT. First, catch the squirrel.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I do not have any direct information at hand, but my recollection of the testimony before the committee several years ago is to the effect that the method is by the use of poison.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is done by men employed in the Forestry Service?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; by the forest rangers, and the like of that. I would not be certain of that. Of course, the gentleman understands that it is a difficult matter to keep all of these things in one's head.

Mr. McKENZIE. I realize that.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to call his attention to the fact that the language in regard to the squirrel destruction reads, "shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests"? I think the word "on" should be "in."

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is a better grammarian than I am, but this language has been submitted by the department from time to time.

Mr. TOWNER. As I understand it, these squirrels can not climb trees and could not very well be on the forest reserve.

Mr. LEVER. They could not very well be in the ground. I think the language had better stand.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., pp. 847 and 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, $50,000.

Mr. FOWLER and Mr. BARTLETT rose.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to have the point of order settled.

Mr. BARTLETT. I intended to move to strike it out.

Mr. LEVER. I call attention to the fact that the language is not subject to a point of order. It is an appropriation to carry out an existing statute. I would like to have the point of order settled. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that the migratory game law was passed by Congress last year. The language of the bill was put in on the floor of the Senate, and the conferees finally agreed to it; the language in question is only for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, which is now a statute of the United States.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would read that act.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have read it not once, but a dozen times. Does the gentleman want me to read it to the Chair?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The act goes through two or three pages of printed matter.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, no; it does not. It is a short paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman evidently has not read the act. I will read it to the Chair:

All wild geese, wild swans, brant, wild ducks, snipe, plover, woodcock, rail, wild pigeons, and all other migratory game and insectivorous birds which in their northern and southern migrations pass through or do not remain permanently the entire year within the borders of any State or Territory, shall hereafter be deemed to be within the custody and protection of the Government of the United States, and shall not be destroyed or taken contrary to regulations hereinafter provided therefor.

The Department of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to adopt suitable regulations to give effect to the previous paragraph by prescribing and fixing closed seasons, having due regard to the zones of temperature, breeding habits, and times and line of migratory flight, thereby enabling the department to select and designate suitable districts for different portions of the country, and it shall be unlawful to shoot or by any device kill or seize and capture migratory birds within the protection of this law during said closed seasons, and any person who shall violate any of the provisions or regulations of this law for the protection of migratory birds shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both, in the discretion of the court.

The Department of Agriculture, after the preparation of said regulations, shall cause the same to be made public, and shall allow a period of three months in which said regulations may be examined and considered before final adoption, permitting, when deemed proper, public hearings thereon, and after final adoption shall cause the same to be engrossed and submitted to the President of the United States for approval: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to affect or interfere with the local laws of the States and Territories for the protection of nonmigratory game or other birds resident and breeding within their borders, nor to prevent the States and Territories from enacting laws and regulations to promote and render efficient the regulations of the Department of Agriculture provided under this statute.

The language in the bill is nothing more or less than the language in the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the statute referred to in this paragraph in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is. This is an appropriation to carry out existing law.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has read the statute correctly.

Mr. LEVER. Surely the gentleman would not think that I would read it otherwise?

Mr. FOWLER. No; certainly not; and the gentleman could not construe my language any other way. I have never on the floor of this House questioned the integrity of a Member in discussing any matter, and certainly, with the high respect I have for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, it is impossible for me to question his motives and sincerity.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in this act is there any provision whatever giving authority to appropriate money. When this act is boiled down to its essence, it means nothing more or less than an act prohibiting the killing of certain migratory birds.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the reading of the statute, it enjoins upon the department the enforcement of that law.

Mr. FOWLER. It does—rules and regulations—that is true; but the act itself is an act fixing a penalty for the violation of a statute.

The CHAIRMAN. If that duty is imposed on the Agricultural Department—and this is a provision for all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act—it is not for the Chair to determine whether the amount carried is too much or too little or whether any of it is needed, but does not that statute authorize Congress to make an appropriation of whatever expenses would be needed in the enforcement of that law?

Mr. FOWLER. I think not, Mr. Chairman. It is a statute prohibiting the killing of migratory birds and fixing a penalty for its violation. It is true that it confers upon the Agricultural Department the powers to fix rules and regulations concerning the killing or the destruction of migratory birds. It places in the Government—or attempts to—the ownership of migratory birds, and that does not confer upon Congress any authority to make an appropriation whatever. I think the Chair has in view a question which he desires to submit, and I always desire to be courteous and to conform to the wishes of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was simply going to ask the gentleman this question: If the duty is laid upon the Department of Agriculture to see that this statute is enforced, and if the statute prohibits the killing of birds, may there not be some expense attached to the enforcement of that statute? And if any expense is attached to that, would not Congress, under the law, be authorized to make an appropriation to meet that expense?

Mr. FOWLER. That is an inference to be drawn by each individual as he deems proper. This law now is carried out by a proclamation of the President, and I must say in justice to the people and to all concerned that the proclamation is so complicated that it can not be understood by the citizens of the States. There is not a Member of Congress on the floor of this House who understands the proclamation, and I challenge the wisdom of the combined membership to understand the proclamation regulating the killing of migratory birds. I repeat that there is nowhere in that statute read by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a provision authorizing the appropriation of money, and before an appropriation can be properly made there must be an authorization. If we were proposing to construct a bridge across Rock Creek, first there should be a statute authorizing the construction of the bridge, and in that statute there should be an authorization for an appropriation. But here is an act which is criminal in its nature, a penal statute prohibiting the killing of migratory birds, and fixing a penalty for doing it. Nowhere in this statute is there any provision authorizing Congress to make an appropriation for the purpose of doing anything with the act, and I say the point of order ought to be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for just a moment. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] makes an erroneous construction of the rule which is quite natural for one who has not carefully examined paragraph 2 of Rule XXI. The only limitation upon these amendments in the way of appropriations is in paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, and that provides that no amendment shall be in order, and so forth, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law. My distinguished colleague repeatedly used the language, "no appropriation authorized by law." There is quite a difference between an authorization of expenditure and an authorization of appropriation. The passage of an act directing that something shall be done is an authorization of the expenditure for that work, and that is all that is necessary. We sometimes put into laws a provision authorizing an appropriation. It is rather crudely done when it is done, because that is not the purpose of the bill; and you may search the statute through and you will very seldom find that anybody has been so green as to say that when you direct that a thing shall be done you are authorized to pay for it.

Mr. FOWLER. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] cites Rule XXI. The section which he read applies to amendments offered to appropriation bills, and if he had scrutinized it a little more carefully than he has done he would have known better. With his 15 or 16 or 17 years of service here in the House, he has come to the conclusion that all of the wisdom in this House is centered around one hub, and that he is that hub. Unfortunately for him, there are a few spokes around here in this House that have something to do with the wheel. It is the wheel as much as the hub that bears up the vehicle and renders it useful. It is the wheel that carries the load as much as the hub. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. What about fellies?

Mr. FOWLER. And its framework is supported by the wheel. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard further? The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOWLER. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN]——

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GARNER. I understood the Chair to state he was ready to rule. Unless the gentleman has something——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no disposition to shut off anyone, but the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GARNER. I have no desire to cut the gentleman off, but——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair has fully made up his mind on this question without further discussion or further hearing upon the matter, of course I will cheerfully yield the floor, but I do not want to be taken off the floor of the House by some man who does not know any more than I do. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know to whom the gentleman from Illinois refers. If the gentleman refers to the Chair the Chair desires to say that he has no disposition to take the gentleman off the floor without discussion for a reasonable time.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to submit I did not refer to the Chair at all, because it is presumed that the Chair knows all of the parliamentary laws.

The CHAIRMAN. A very rash presumption in this instance.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I see my colleague from Illinois, the hub, wants to hub again, and I am perfectly willing for him to hub as much as he wants to until he gets done hubbing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague stated I read the wrong rule. I stated before the gentleman was not familiar with the rules. He said I read the rule in reference to amendments and not in reference to items in the bill. I call his attention to paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, which reads as follows; and I hope that my colleague will let it saturate finally some way into the inner recesses of his brain, so that he will remember:

> No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

That is the only rule there is on the subject. If my colleague, who is making points of order frivolously so often, would once in a while look at the rules themselves he would know so much more than he now does that he would not persist in his course.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The present occupant of the chair does not——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, just one parting word on this proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Does my colleague intend to indicate that he is going to have a parting word with his colleague?

Mr. FOWLER. I am going to submit to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that he get up a school, a night school, for the purpose of elevating somebody up as high as he thinks he is in parliamentary law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair does not claim to be an expert parliamentarian, but he is very clear upon this proposition. The law specifically imposes upon the Agricultural Department the duty of enforcing the law referred to in this particular paragraph, and that carries with it undoubtedly the implication that Congress can and will furnish whatever money is necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon the department or bureau. It appears to the Chair that it would be a monstrous proposition to think of in any other way, and therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph beginning with line 22, page 51, and ending on line 2, page 52.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT. That strikes out the whole paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this motion of the gentleman from Georgia, or amendments to his amendments, shall be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Make it 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. This question never has been before this House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition has not been stated.

Mr. HILL. I thought the request was for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request by asking unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and amedments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a moment, until the Chair puts the request. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to know who will control that time?

Mr. LEVER. The Chair will control that, under the rules.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know if I can have five minutes of that time.

Mr. LEVER. You will have to address yourself to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that a member of the committee should have precedence in recognition. Without that, if the gentleman rises and addresses the Chair he will certainly be recognized. Is there objection?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the motion which he has made includes amendments to the paragraph as well as the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. My motion is on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MANN. Thirty minutes?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is to carry into effect the provisions of a bill known as the "McLean bill," which had never been discussed on the floor of this House, and on which a fair vote has never been taken here. The bill passed the Senate more as a compliment to Senator McLean than anything else. It came over here and was never considered by the Committee on Agriculture, and was never before this House for consideration. When the Agricultural appropriation bill went back to the Senate, it was bodily put in the Agricultural appropriation bill as an amendment. That conference report was brought in here about 4 o'clock one morning before the House adjourned on the 4th of March, and was put through under those conditions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman mean to say there was no discussion of the amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT. I mean to say there was no discussion of this bill, because it was never before the House except as a Senate amendment. The House disagreed to it and it went back to conference, and it was put upon this bill by the conferees agreeing to it, without its ever having been considered by this House or discussed or voted upon, except in that way, during the closing hours of the session.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up more than my share of the time. I am opposed to this appropriation because it is an unconstitutional expenditure of public money. We were told when the bill came here it required only $10,000 to carry it into effect. That amount of money was appropriated by Congress in the original bill. Now, the estimate submitted to the Committee on Agriculture, or to Congress, by the Secretary of Agriculture for the ensuing year was $100,000, and this committee has only recommended half of that sum, with the department declaring that it will not be a sufficient amount. I desire to call your attention to the estimates made by this department for the enforcement of this law for the ensuing year, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Salaries (lump fund) | $65,000 |
| Travel, station, and field expenses | 32,000 |
| Stationery | 300 |
| Rent (outside District of Columbia) | 1,000 |
| Telegraph, telephone, and postage | 100 |
| Miscellaneous supplies, services, etc | 1,000 |
| Reserve | 600 |
| Total expenditures (lump fund) | 100,000 |

They propose to appoint in the various States 48 game inspectors or wardens. They wanted to give them $3,000 a year each, but under this you will have to give them $1,500. So you are to have most of this money expended by payments in the various States of inspectors, men to hunt down alleged violators of the law, who have a right to believe that under our form of government this General Government has no authority or power to invade the States and enact purely police regulation laws for the protection of game. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In some of the States of the West they have issued licenses to hunters which extend three or four years in advance. Are those licenses affected legally by the passage of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. They are not affected legally, because this national game law is not worth the paper it is written on. In exercising the sovereign power to regulate by police regulation the killing of game, we must have to conform to the supreme law of the land. Fortunately for this country, this kind of despotism—because that is what it is—will not be permitted to be enforced unless the Supreme Court shall see fit to retrace its steps from a decision made by them in the One hundred and sixty-first United States Supreme Court Reports, page 533, known as the Connecticut case—the case of Geer against Connecticut. In that case, in an opinion delivered by Chief Justice White, it says:

> The preservation of such animals as are adapted to consumption as food or to any other useful purpose, is a matter of public interest; and it is within the police power of the State, as the representative of the people in their united sovereignty, to make such laws as will best preserve such game and secure its beneficial use in the future to the citizens, and to that end it may adopt any reasonable regulations, not only as to time and manner in which such game may be taken and killed but also imposing limitations upon the right of property in such game after it has been reduced to possession. Such limitations deprive no person of his property, because he who takes or kills game had no previous right of property in it, and when he acquires such right by reducing it to possession he does so subject to such conditions and limitations as the legislature has seen fit to impose. (See, also, State v. Northern Pacific Express Co., 58 Minn., 403.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course, I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is also familiar with the case of Ward against Race Horse?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but I did not get to that, because this is so much to the point, and I do not know that I will have the time to even read this.

Mr. MONDELL. That is a later case, and I think so much stronger.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank you; but this is so much in point that I wish to read this:

> So, also, in Magner v. The People (97 Ill., 320, 333) the Supreme Court of Illinois said:
>
> "So far as we are aware, it has never been judicially denied that the Government under its police powers may make regulations for the preservation of game and fish, restricting their taking and molestation to certain seasons of the year, although laws to this effect, it is believed, have been in force in many of the older States since the organization of the Federal Government. * * * The ownership being in the people of the State, the repository of the sovereign authority, and no individual having any property rights to be affected, it necessarily results that the legislature, as the representative of the people of the State, may withhold or grant to individuals the right to hunt and kill game or qualify or restrict, as in the opinions of its members will best subserve the public welfare. Stated in other language, to hunt and kill game is a boon or privilege, granted either expressly or impliedly by the sovereign authority—not a right inherent in each individual, and consequently nothing is taken away from the individual when he is denied the privilege at stated seasons of hunting and killing game. It is, perhaps, accurate to say that the ownership of the sovereign authority is in trust for all the people of the State, and hence by implication it is the duty of the legislature to enact such laws as will best preserve the subject of the trust and secure its beneficial use in the future to the people of the State. But in any view, the question of individual enjoyment is one of public policy and not of private right."
>
> See also Ex parte Maier (103 Cal., 4476); Organ v. The State (56 Ark., 270). It is indeed true that in State v. Saunders (19 Kans., 127) and Territory v. Evans (2 Idaho, 634) it was held that a State law prohibiting the shipment outside of the State of game killed therein violated the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, but the reasoning which controlled the decision of these cases is, we think, inconclusive, from the fact that it did not consider the fundamental distinction between the qualified ownership in game and the perfect nature of ownership in other property, and thus overlooked the authority of the State over property in game killed within its confines and the consequent power of the State to follow such property into whatever hands it might pass with the conditions and restrictions deemed necessary for the public interest.
>
> Aside from the authority of the State, derived from the common ownership of game and the trust for the benefit of its people which the State exercises in relation thereto, there is another view of the power of the State in regard to the property in game, which is equally conclusive. The right to preserve game flows from the undoubted existence in the State of a police power to that end, which may be none the less efficiently called into play, because by doing so interstate commerce may be remotely and indirectly affected. Kidd v. Pearson (128 U. S. 1); Hall v. De Cuir (95 U. S., 485); Sherlock v. Alling (93 U. S. 99, 103); Gibbons v. Ogden (9 Wheat., 1). Indeed the source of the police power as to game birds (like those covered by the statute here called in question) flows from the duty of the State to preserve for its people a valuable food supply. Phelps v. Racey (60 N. Y., 10; Ex parte Maier, ubi sup.; Magner v. The People, ubi sup., and cases there cited. The exercise by the State of such power, therefore, comes directly within the principle of Plumley v. Massachusetts (155 U. S. 461, 473). The power of a State to protect by adequate police regulation its people against the adulteration of articles of food (which was in that case maintained), although in doing so commerce might be remotely affected, necessarily carries with it the existence of a like power to preserve a food supply which belongs in common to all the people of the State, which can only become the subject of ownership in a qualified way and which can never be the object of commerce except with the consent of the State and subject to the conditions which it may deem best to impose for the public good.

Mr. MURDOCK. Wherein does he show that the National Government can not invade this field?

Mr. BARTLETT. Because this man in this case made the point that dead game—not only the living game, but the bodies of game, dead—when shipped from Connecticut out of the State could not be interfered with by the State of Connecticut because it would interfere with commerce and because the act was in conflict with the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution; and the court said that that sort of game, and laws passed to protect it, by preventing the shipment outside of the State of the bodies of dead game was not interstate commerce, but was subject solely to the law of the State where it was killed; that it did not come under the commerce clause of the Constitution, but came within the great police powers of the State to regulate game.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows we have a national law on that subject, enacted only a few years ago?

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has reference to the Lacey law, with respect to transportation of game?

Mr. MANN. Yes. There are several laws on the subject. Has the gentleman any decision of any court denying the constitutionality of those laws?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Lacey law is upheld by the courts.

Mr. MANN. Those laws are directly contradictory to the gentleman's position.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the trouble about this miserable bill. Congress, in dealing with this subject, has never had an opportunity to deliberate or an opportunity to discuss the question as to whether it is a legitimate exercise of power by Congress, and we are now confined to a 20-minute discussion of the question.

Mr. Chairman, this is but another attempted invasion of the rights of the States by the General Government. It was at one time thought that the Democratic Party, founded upon the principle of protecting the States in the exercise of their local authority, was the chief defender of this great principle of State rights and local self-government. But I find myself very frequently, Mr. Chairman, in a state of lonesomeness when I undertake to call attention to the police powers of the States to regulate matters of this sort, when an attempt is made by Congress to take charge of them. And, Mr. Chairman, if we are to continue to progress and progress along these lines and

invade the rights of the States in every particular; if we are to have national game laws and every other kind of laws to regulate the affairs of the States, their morals as well as their general welfare, then let us abolish the sovereignties of these 48 different States and have all the power lodged here, all the appropriations made here, from this great big, overflowing Treasury, which can be filled at will simply by increasing the taxes upon the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] that this is an invasion of the rights reserved to the States. I think it is an attempt without due deliberation on the part of the House to usurp for the Federal Government the authority which I do not believe was conferred upon it by the Constitution. The rules and regulations which have been promulgated for the purpose of carrying into effect this statute so conflict with the laws of the various States that no citizen can tell whether he is bound by the laws of any State, by a license which he carries in his own pocket and for which he paid his own money, or by the proclamation issued by the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Illinois have undertaken to regulate by wise laws the killing of game birds and game animals in my State, and they have done it with that degree of certainty which, in my judgment, will afford sufficient protection for their future propagation and conservation.

Mr. Chairman, I undertook to get some information from the Department of Agriculture for the benefit of inquiring citizens of my own district and my own State, and I have gone there some two or three different times, and on each occasion a different construction has been placed upon the proclamation of the Executive; I have never had a like construction placed upon it. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I have been told that the "open season" for killing ducks and geese in my territory is the same as that prescribed by the statute of Illinois. Then I have read carefully the proclamations and the provisions prescribed for carrying into effect this Federal law, and I can not harmonize them with the instructions of the Department of Agriculture. I do not believe there is anyone in authority to-day who knows just when a duck or a goose can be killed on the Mississippi River, or the Ohio River, or in any State in the Union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe in giving Congress all the authority that is provided for in the Constitution of the United States, with a liberal construction of the terms thereof; but I am bitterly opposed to the United States, through Congress, undertaking to extend its jurisdiction over those subjects which are not within the powers granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution. Why, if this law is carried into effect, it will require in the future an appropriation as big as the appropriation for the Army, or as big as the appropriation for the Navy. It is an entering wedge to a squandering of the public funds which will rise to such enormous degrees in the future that it will be appalling to the most unsuspecting citizen within the United States. [Applause.]

The provisions of this act can be enforced in the Federal courts; and anyone who knows anything about Federal courts will tell you that the people have a hard time in these courts, and are summarily dealt with, at great cost. Beware of placing common affairs in the hands of the Federal court, because it is both expensive and arbitrary.

But this is only a beginning. You will soon be confronted with a new conservation scheme. The Agricultural Department is not big enough yet, and it is ample in its powers to take care of many new subjects. The wild animals, such as the wolf, mountain lion, bears, elks, deer, antelopes, fox, raccoon, lynx, rabbit, rats, mice, moles, wildcats, opossum, mink, weasel, squirrel, gophers, and ground hog will soon need protection and conservation, and the Agricultural Department will be only too glad to undertake the momentous task. It is waiting for just such an opportunity. Some scientific chief in this department will soon make known the great necessity of protecting and conserving these useful animals. It will only take a few millions annually to do this, and as soon as the Agricultural Department gets ready to take over this work Congress will have plenty of men here who will be able to convince a majority of both Houses that it is our duty to make this sacrifice in order to perpetuate the native animals of America in abundance. Then we will have wolf wardens, rat wardens, ground-hog wardens, and a horde of wardens all of whom must be scientific men, commanding large salaries.

When we get this work under full control and have looted the Treasury of millions, then another chief in the Agriculture Department will discover that we are neglecting another very important branch of the animal kingdom exceedingly useful to man. The poisonous reptiles, such as the rattlesnake, cottonmouth, copperhead, and hissing adders will claim our attention. The lizzard, salamander, alligators, terrapin, tortoise, toads, and frogs must not become extinct, and in order to conserve them and properly protect them it will be necessary to place them under the supervision of the Agriculture Department and provide plenty of servants to go all over these States and Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands to see that the people do not harm or kill any of these harmless and useful animals. It will take only a few more millions, and what are millions when considered with the immense value these animals will prove to be to man in his struggle for a higher civilization.

But the mission of the Agriculture Department will not stop here. It would be idle to suggest even a resting spell. The fish in the lakes, seas, rivers, creeks, rivulets, and branches will demand the attention of this department. They will be destroyed entirely if present conditions are allowed to continue, and in order to properly protect and conserve them it will be necessary to create a new bureau for this important work, with a provision in the act declaring the ownership of all fish of whatever kind or character, lobsters, crabs, oysters, mussels, shrimps, and all animals that live in the water to be in the United States. This will give employment for thousands of new men, who will in the course of time become scientific men and of course the Government will not be able to keep them unless their salaries are raised to what they can command in other places; just where the places are we will never learn, but it will serve the purpose of the heads of bureaus and divisions in this department to induce such men as my colleague from Illinois to denounce every Member who opposes the scheme as being ignorant of the great progress of the country and its needs in conservation. Then we will have garfish wardens, turtle wardens, and minnow wardens; yes, but it will only take a few millions, and who would be so ignorant of the needs of our country as to oppose an appropriation of millions for such an important work.

The end has not yet come, for the capacity of the Agricultural Department has not been exhausted, and will not be as long as there is a "wild-goose chase" in sight. It will be discovered that our insects are about to become extinct, and that some scientific health doctor has lately discovered that all of the insects were created for the use of man, and that we have neglected to investigate and determine the uses to which they can be put. He will capture one of the agricultural chiefs and then the Committee on Agriculture will be informed that it is necessary to pass an act to protect and conserve the insects of the country. This committee will bring in a bill with a provision declaring the ownership of all the insects in the country to be in the United States, and in that act there will be a provision for an appropriation to systematize the work and place it on a plane with the other foolish bureaus, with a few millions to pay salaries and traveling expenses, and a big appropriation for a museum building for the collection of these insects for scientific study. Uncle Sam will then own all mosquitoes, ticks, fleas, flies, crickets, roaches, bedbugs, grasshoppers, moths, butterflies, locusts, and all worms which develop into any insects, for it will be necessary to protect the worms in order to protect and conserve the insects properly, and it will be a crime to kill any of these insects or the worms, and any violation of the law will subject the criminal to a fine not less than $500 or imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term of two years, or both, in the discretion of the Federal court. Then anyone killing a bug, flea, mosquito, or a louse will be subject to indictment in the Federal court and dealt with summarily hundreds of miles away from his home. I suppose this will be for the benefit of his family in order that they may not be present to see him handcuffed and hurried off to a Federal prison.

But this is not all. Some scientific gentleman in the Agriculture Department will discover that the wild animals are carnivorous, and that they live on the flesh of other animals and birds. Another chief, equally smart, will discover that the birds live largely on insects and little fish, and that the fish prey upon each other, and that the insects are either bloodsuckers or vegetarians, and that to properly protect all of these animals and conserve them it will require a large army of scientific men who are experts in their ability to handle these animals and to keep them from jumping on each other in deadly conflict for a meal. This will only take a few millions more, and who would hesitate to make sure of means and men sufficient to feed and train all these agencies of civilization? Then great will be the Agriculture Department. "On with the dance."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Which side of the proposition is the gentleman on?

Mr. COX. I am for the motion to strike out.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize some one on the other side. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Which side is the gentleman on?

Mr. HOWARD. I am against striking out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not entertain the same fears with regard to the administration of this law as does my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] or as my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]. I think this law is a good one, and I do not think it is a proposition that the States can handle.

In my lifetime I have had a great deal of experience as a sportsman to the extent that I have hunted game all my life, ever since I have been able to carry a gun.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the State of Georgia have the most drastic laws for the protection of game?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. The gentleman is not in favor of prescribing an open and closed season in this statute?

Mr. HOWARD. We have a provision for an open season and a closed season. In the State of Georgia we have a 90-day open season for quail.

Quail became almost extinct in the State of Georgia because the pothunters were turned loose on them. Ten years ago the woodcock was plentiful, but I do not suppose a sportsman in the Southern States, where they migrate in the wintertime, has killed a dozen in the last five years. The woodcock is one of the most valuable of game birds. It has become almost extinct.

The snipe is a migratory bird. It breeds in the north, and the old birds with their young start south in the latter part of August. They remain some time in practically every State in the Union from the Canadian border to the Everglades of Florida. Every one of those States has some law for an open season, when they turn the hunters loose on these migratory birds from the minute they start south with their young until they reach the Everglades of Florida and the southern part of Texas. If this ruthless slaughter of the migratory game birds of this country is not stopped by some legislation, these game birds will become extinct. The only way to reach the question is by Federal legislation, because the State of Georgia can not make a law relative to the killing of duck, snipe or woodcock, brant or wild geese, in the State of Tennessee. Why not? Because when the migratory birds reach Georgia they have left Tennessee for the season, and so on south.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Has not the leaving of this subject to State regulation resulted in the practical extermination of many kinds of game birds?

Mr. HOWARD. Absolutely.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman mean to say he is in favor of a law which violates the Constitution of the United States, simply because the States do not attend to their business?

Mr. HOWARD. I do not know whether it violates the Constitution of the United States or not. I have not investigated that enough to satisfy my mind that migratory birds would not be amenable to the same principle that a migratory freight car would be in going from one State to another. Although I have the most profound respect for the legal attainments of my distinguished colleague, I am not convinced yet that this law is unconstitutional, and I shall have to study it a good deal more before I will admit that it is. It is a salutary law, a good law. It ought not to be tampered with unless you know what you are doing. Those of you who are in favor of turning the pothunters loose on the migratory game of this country, which is almost extinct to-day, will vote to strike out this appropriation. Georgia can not regulate this question. Tennessee can not regulate it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Georgia has done it.

Mr. HOWARD. You have a State law which regulates the killing of your domestic birds. It took 25 years to get that, and when that law was finally passed it was rare music to hear an occasional partridge whistle in Georgia. You very nearly let them become extinct.

Mr. BARTLETT. Georgia is full of partridge now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, if I may be permitted to do so, I would like to warn Members of the House not to be frightened because they may have received a few letters from sportsmen in opposition to the enforcement of this law. It is quite natural, when the law is enforced and somebody feels hurt by it, that he should write a letter protesting against it. But the great mass of the American people are in favor of this legislation, which undertakes to preserve the migratory birds of our country. [Applause.]

Nor am I at all frightened by my genial friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] on the constitutional question. The law is upon the statute book, and this proposition is to give the money for its enforcement. If the law be not constitutional, the quickest way to find it out is to endeavor to enforce it; and if it be constitutional, then it ought to be enforced. In this country we have seen the great mass of the birds disappear entirely. Everyone at all familiar with country life and bird life has been shocked by the disappearance of the birds—both those that sportsmen seek and those that render great service to the farmers and gardeners of the country by destroying insects and weed seeds. This bill contains many appropriations to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry on its warfare against insect pests. Let gentlemen remember that as the birds decrease, these insect pests increase.

No one except the National Government can control this situation. It is beyond the power of the States. The States in the South can not control the States where the birds breed, and the States where the birds reproduce can not prevent their slaughter in the States where they winter. It requires national legislation, universal legislation, for this action to be taken, and it is not within the power of the State of Georgia to protect itself from unwise legislation in Minnesota or Illinois, nor is it possible for Minnesota and Illinois to protect themselves against unwise legislation in some other State.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MANN. A very brief one.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman assume that we have a right under the commerce clause of the Constitution to enact this law; and if not, under what clause?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we discussed that question for several terms of Congress. I supported the Weeks bill, voted for it, and did what I could to help to put it upon the statute book; and I have just as much deference for the Constitution as the gentleman from Georgia has. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not doubt that. I never did question that.

Mr. MANN. I understand that is an answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has not told me under what clause of the Constitution.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry the gentleman determines to take up my time with a question which is not relevant to this discussion.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thought I had the gentleman's permission to ask him a question.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I never quarrel with my genial friend from Georgia. No one else will do it; will we do it? Will we make the effort to protect the birds of the country both in the interest of the farmer and in the interest of the food supply? Having passed a law on the subject to furnish the necessary protection, will we refuse to permit the Department of Agriculture to enforce the law? That is the question.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition to provide money for the purpose of enforcing a Federal statute.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Just how is this statute to be enforced? What provisions were made for the enforcement in the several States?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that the law carried an appropriation of $10,000. Of course $10,000 would amount to nothing, so far as the purposes of the statute went, except to make a skeleton organization. The plan of the Department of Agriculture is, as we get it from the testimony of the witnesses, that game wardens will be appointed and that they will cooperate with the State game wardens.

Mr. GARNER. These game wardens are appointed in the District of Columbia and hold their offices in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman from Texas and other gentlemen on the floor of the House will realize that the seat of the Federal Government is Washington, and when you organize a force you must have people in Washington to do the work. I hope the gentleman will not make that frivolous complaint against the department any more.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BARTON. How many wardens will be appointed throughout the United States?

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee is that we shall be able to spend about $1,000 in each of the several States of the Union in the enforcement of the law. The time may come, and I think will come, when the Federal Government will have to employ one game warden in each State; but the committee did not think, inasmuch as this was new work and the organization had not been completed, that it was profitable or wise to give them as much money as they wanted in the first instance.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask the gentleman if these game wardens are to be appointed under the civil service?

Mr. LEVER. They will be appointed under the civil service.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman, in view of what he has just said about the department, that I did not mean to criticize the department or the committee in the inquiry that I propounded.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; I understood the gentleman's position quite well.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You are appropriating $50,000 to enforce this statute. Do you appropriate money for Federal officers to enforce each and every one of these statutes of the United States?

Mr. LEVER. I take it that every such statute requires an expenditure of money to provide for its proper enforcement, and we appropriate it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do not the Federal officials throughout the country look to the enforcement of these laws?

Mr. LEVER. This law will be enforced just as the meat-inspection law, where we have 2,400 meat inspectors, and just as the Lacey law is enforced.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Then each of these individuals, as Federal officials throughout the country, look out for the specific statute only that he is designated to enforce?

Mr. LEVER. Of course, and that is not unusual. You are a Member of Congress, and your business is to look out for your constituents. You are not down there in Texas killing boll weevils. [Laughter.] We either ought to do the manly thing in this matter—repeal the law outright or make the appropriation to enforce it. [Applause.] The Committee on Agriculture does not believe in the process of repealing laws by the process of starvation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROCKSON) there were 31 ayes and 50 noes.

So the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 2, strike out the figures "$50,000" and insert "$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEY) there were 24 ayes and 47 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, at the end of line 2, insert the following: *"Provided,* That after July 1, 1914, said act is hereby repealed."

Mr. LEVER and Mr. MANN made a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. BARTLETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did the Chair sustain the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has the Chair forgotten the Holman rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not read the gentleman's amendment, but he heard it read, and it was intended to repeal an existing statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. It was to repeal the act, and that would reduce expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was sustained.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read the item for "Salaries, Division of Publications," beginning on page 52 and ending line 23, page 53.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do it in order to ask unanimous consent to insert a newspaper account of an experiment made by one of my constituents in the eradication, or attempted eradication, of the boll weevil.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

COTTON DESPITE WEEVIL—MISSISSIPPIAN HAS PLAN TO FIGHT DESTROYER OF CROP.

YAZOO CITY, MISS., *February 18.*

G. M. Manor, a merchant and planter of Anding, a few miles south of Yazoo City, has made a discovery that enabled him during the last season to make a splendid crop of cotton in probably the worst infested boll-weevil section of the county. Mr. Manor feels so good over the success of his plan that he wants everyone else to know of it, in the hope that the damage by reason of the weevil infestation may be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. Manor's plan was to attach to all the plows, as soon as the cotton is ready to work, a gunny sack or other heavy cloth saturated with the following mixture: Lubricating oil, 1 gallon; moth balls, 1 pound; boil together and add 1 pint of tar; and mix with 5 gallons of coal oil.

The sacks are saturated with this mixture and attached to the singletrees, and as the plowing is done the sacks drag automatically over the plants. The fumes of the mixture are very obnoxious to the weevils, and as the fumes stay on the plants a long time, the pest will not attack the plants. As the crop is plowed frequently the fumes stay on the plants from one plowing to the next, so that the plants are thus made immune from the ravages of the pest.

As evidence of the success of the plan, Mr. Manor made 47 bales of cotton the last season with 4 families, while a neighbor, who relied wholly on the Government cultural methods of picking and burning the squares, made only 23 bales with 14 families and 3 wagon hands.

Mr. Manor would have gotten a great deal more cotton than he did but for the heavy rains in September and October, which rotted a great many bolls in the field. He thinks it conservative to say that the entire crop averaged at least a half bale to the acre, which is a good average under normal conditions.

Mr. Manor also takes the precaution not to use any cotton seed that has been raised on the place the previous year. His idea is that some weevils hibernate in the old seed and in this way some of them are kept alive and perpetuated in the new crop. By buying new seed from some section where the boll weevils do not exist he thinks the damages of the weevils are reduced considerably.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of agricultural forecasts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I do not know whether a paragraph which is a mere heading could be subject to a point of order or whether it has any place in the bill. The purpose of this is to change the name of the Bureau of Statistics to the bureau of agricultural forecasts. Are not the members of the committee afraid that that will be a confusing name? The public for years have been using the word "forecasts" in connection with the Weather Service, and in this bill forecasters in the Weather Service are provided for. You provide in this Agricultural bill for a forecaster. He is in the Weather Service, but agricultural forecasts is in another bureau of the Government. That seems to me confusing. Is there not any title that can be taken without taking one that is already preempted? I suppose the very reason that some one suggested "agricultural forecasts" in reference to crops and statistics was because we have become accustomed to using the term in reference to the weather as indicating the probabilities, the belief that what was predicated might come true.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to him that the department desired this change, and the committee, after listening to their statements and after giving careful consideration to the matter, agreed that the words "agricultural forecasts" more nearly and accurately describe the character of the work being done than do the words "Agricultural Statistics," as now used.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with that statement.

Mr. LEVER. My friend, of course, understands that the Agricultural Bureau of Statistics in the past has never undertaken to say absolutely accurately what a crop was. The best they have been able to do was to estimate within a reasonable

certainty what a crop was to be. Of course, it is an estimate more than a guess, and it is an estimate based on facts.

Mr. MANN. Of course it is an estimate after it has been made. But here is a bill that carries, for instance, forecasters in one item of the bill, and then it carries another item for the bureau of agricultural forecasts. They do not have forecasters in the bureau of agricultural forecasts, but they have forecasters in the Weather Bureau. Of course, they are trying to steal the name—perhaps I ought not to say that, but take the name—that we have become used to in connection with the Weather Bureau. It seems to me that this will be very confusing. I think it is a perfectly proper thing to change it from the Bureau of Statistics, but I should think they would have originality enough in the Agriculture Department—and they have shown lots of it in other directions—to find two names without taking the same name for two different purposes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I think the use of these words very clearly describes the character of work that the Bureau of Statistics of the Agriculture Department has been doing and will continue to do. I want to say, in that connection, that I have a great deal of complaint from many of my friends in South Carolina because the people down there, on account of the fact that the bureau heretofore has been called the Bureau of Statistics, have the idea that it is a bureau doing work along the line being done by the Census Bureau, and that when the bureau makes a statement it is supposed to be an absolutely accurate statement in accordance with the census plan.

Mr. MANN. And yet only recently we changed the name "Bureau of Labor" and put it into the Department of Labor under the title of "Bureau of Labor Statistics," and it has nothing whatever to do with gathering statistics as the Census Bureau does. It is a bureau not to forecast, but to make scientific investigations.

Mr. LEVER. I really do not know what the character of its work is.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, would it not be a good idea to change this name to the bureau of agricultural estimates? That is really what it amounts to.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think there would be a very great deal of objection to that, but for the present I prefer this language to stand.

Mr. MADDEN. That would come more nearly expressing the work done.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but my friend from Nebraska suggests that somebody might think it was a bureau for the preparation of estimates to be submitted to Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it agricultural estimates or crop estimates.

Mr. MANN. There was practically no meaning to the word "forecast" in connection with this kind of work until the Weather Bureau gave it a meaning. The Weather Bureau having given it a meaning, these people now want it to apply to something else.

Mr. LEVER. I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], looking at this matter hurriedly, that I do not see very much objection to his suggestion.

Mr. MADDEN. That would distinguish it from the Weather Bureau of Forecasts.

Mr. LEVER. What would the other gentleman from Illinois think about that suggestion?

Mr. MADDEN. Make it the bureau of agricultural crop estimates.

Mr. MANN. That would be all right.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it the bureau of crop estimates and leave out the word "agriculture."

Mr. MANN. Why put in "agriculture"?

Mr. LEVER. I would suggest that it might be better to make it read "The bureau of crop estimates."

Mr. MADDEN. That is really descriptive of what it is.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask my friend from Iowa if that meets his wishes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The object sought is simply to call the bureau by a proper descriptive name, and whatever term will express it is all right.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I move to amend——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The other gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to offer an amendment so as to make the language which now reads "bureau of agricultural forecasts" read "bureau of crop estimates."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 18, strike out the words "agricultural forecasts" and insert in lieu thereof the words "crop estimates."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the province of this bureau is to collect statistics and to make crop estimates, so that the farming people of the country may have a forecast of what the crops are going to be at maturity? Is that the object of this bureau?

Mr. LEVER. That is the object.

Mr. FOWLER. Then why not call it the bureau of crop forecasts, because that is what it really means?

Mr. LEVER. We called it in the first instance the bureau of agricultural forecasts, but it did not meet the approval of the gentleman from Illinois, and I can see some reason for his line of objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Because we have that same work done under the Weather Bureau?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. I will say to my friend, if he will permit me, that if it needs to be changed I will see that it is changed in the Senate, because I do not want to commit myself absolutely to that language.

Mr. FOWLER. There is but little difference between the word "forecasts" and "crop estimates," that is true; but there is a difference, truly, because the information which is collected throughout the United States on what the crop will probably be is for the purpose of forecasting what will be ultimately the whole crop in the country in advance of its maturity. However, I do not desire to quibble upon the character of words that are used, because they practically mean the same thing.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. FOWLER. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Agricultural Forecasts.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words "Agricultural Forecasts," in line 19, be stricken from the bill and to insert in lieu thereof the words "Crop Estimates."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Forecasts.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words "Agricultural Forecasts" may be stricken from the bill and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "Crop Estimates."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting data relating to agricultural industries; for making and publishing periodically crop and live-stock forecasts and estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products, as follows:

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, in order to make this conform with the action taken, I move that, on page 55, line 9, the words "forecasts and" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 9, strike out the words "forecasts and," so that the line will read "crop and live stock estimates."

Mr. HAWLEY. I think that is all right. I see no objection to it.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, travel, and other necessary expenses of employees out of the city of Washington engaged in field investigations, $135,200.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In last year's appropriation act the committee segregated this item by dividing it up into salaries and traveling expenses for special field agents and those for State statistical agents. I have read the report of the chairman of the committee, and I wish to compliment him for the very extensive and complete report that he has submitted, well worthy of the emulation of the chairman of any committee; but I do not obtain from it the reason for combining these two items of service. As a believer in the principle of segregation, so that the Congress may follow out the amount expended for the various kinds of service, I can not understand why they should not have been continued separate.

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad to give the gentleman that information. It appeared to the committee, after hearing the

officials of the department, that it would be well to make this division so as to carry the expenditures out of the city of Washington in one item and the expenditures in the city of Washington in another item, for this reason: It is the purpose of the Department of Agriculture to endeavor to increase very greatly the efficiency of the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me, he does not grasp my criticism. My criticism is directed to the two items outside of the departmental service here. In last year's appropriation bill you had two separate items for field service, one for which $68,000 was appropriated, and one for special State statistical agents, for which $32,000 was appropriated, both expenditures being made outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. LEVER. I wish to say to the gentleman that the first item to which he calls attention, an item carrying a total of $68,900, was carried for the purpose of paying the salaries of the departmental officials of the bureau simply, and I will give the gentleman the distinction in a moment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am acquainted with the services.

Mr. LEVER. And the other item carried an appropriation of $32,200 for the purpose of paying the State agents, who, of course, were reporting to the Department of Agriculture these various crop conditions. Now, then, it is the purpose of the Department of Agriculture to increase very greatly its State force. In other words, they want to build up a strong State system of reporting. In my State, I happen to know, they are paying a man $300 or $400 as a State agent. He is a railroad engineer, and, of course, can give no special attention to his duties, and must be dependent entirely upon a few of his friends scattered here and there about the country, who write to him and tell him the condition of the growing crop and what their judgment is as to the final results. Now, instead of having a system that is carried on in that way and depending almost entirely on a dozen or more Federal special agents, it is the plan of the department by this increase and by this line of segregation to put into each State a good, strong, capable, live man, who will be in charge of the work and who will devote all of his time to it, and this increase will enable the department to pay a salary that will provide such a man.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, if that is the purpose, why can not the gentleman continue the phraseology in the second item of last year's bill, namely, "Salaries and traveling and other necessary expenses of said statistical agents," and retain the other provision as to the special agents sent out from the department, so as to give the committee control of the amount of expenditure in the respective services?

Mr. LEVER. I may say to my friend, it may have been all right to have used that language, but the information we had was that the department wanted to get this bureau, along with other bureaus, absolutely upon a project basis, and to do so they submitted this method to the committee for its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee can understand that the merger of these two items has nothing whatsoever to do with the project basis, but it is merely an instance of where the committee is surrendering control over the respective expenditures.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman would not absolutely contradict me on a statement like that in that tone of voice?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not intend to be in any way severe in my expression at all.

Mr. LEVER. I was giving the statement of the department and not my own statement about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I had not looked over the report and the estimates, I would not be so positive in my statement, but I still maintain, with all due deference to the genial chairman of the committee, that by consolidating these two items you are surrendering control as to the amount of expenditure for the respective services, and by so doing you are accommodating, naturally, the department, because they will have that much further latitude in the expenditure of the larger appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend very frankly I do not believe that is the case. It is not the judgment of myself or of the members of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Having used phraseology that bore upon the sensibilities of the chairman a little harshly, in saying that it was not violative of the principles of the project system, will the gentleman kindly explain wherein it is in accordance with the project idea?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman, here is the language used by the department in submitting its estimate:

The three special appropriations above have also been combined in order to simplify bookkeeping, the handling of accounts, and to bring together the expenses of the field force in one item.

I will say that is all I know about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I will reply to the gentleman that that is the old thread-worn argument advanced by Government officials when they wish to be relieved of the scrutiny to which the expenditure of separate items in the appropriation bills is subjected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Crop Estimates, $274,180.

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LEVER. If my friend from Illinois will permit me a moment, Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the same amendment that has already been offered.

Mr. MANN. That has been done before.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ] is recognized.

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me but for a moment, I want to say that as an actual farmer I am very much interested in this bill. How does the Department of Agriculture get the estimates throughout the United States upon the crops of this country?

Mr. LEVER. The present method of reporting involves about five or six different sources of information, upon which the department relies for its final judgment. As I recall it, they have township correspondents and county correspondents and State correspondents. Then they have correspondents such as, in the case of cotton, the cotton-compress men and the fertilizer men and such other men as are intimately acquainted with the cotton situation. Then each State has a State statistical agent, who has under him a number of people reporting to him directly from time to time, and he in turn makes his report to Washington.

Then, in addition to that, the department has a number of special agents who travel over a given territory. Of course they are experts, well acquainted with the situation. They in turn report to the department. Now, then, when all this information is gathered, and when the final estimate is to be made, some of these special agents are called here to Washington, and they constitute the crop-reporting board. This information that has been gathered is kept in the safe of the Secretary of Agriculture. It comes here in a specially prepared envelope. It is not touched by anyone, not even the Secretary of Agriculture, until the day when the crop reporting board looks over all the figures. Then the Secretary turns this testimony, as you might call it, or these facts, over to the crop reporting board. The window blinds are drawn, the telephone is disconnected, and the door is locked, and then the estimate is made.

Mr. BALTZ. This is a good deal of guesswork, is it not? The estimates are very inaccurate?

Mr. LEVER. I will say frankly that I do not think it is guesswork. There was an investigation with reference to the estimates on cotton some three or four years ago, and in that investiagtion it was shown that they had underestimated the crop slightly five times, had overestimated it slightly five times, but they were out of line with the actual commercial crop, as shown later, on an average of only about 2 per cent. I think that was pretty good estimating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ] has expired.

[Mr. MANAHAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Library, Department of Agriculture: One librarian, $2,000; one assistant librarian, $1,600; one clerk, class 2, $1,400; four clerks, class 1; three clerks, at $1,080 each; six clerks, at $1,000 each; five clerks, at $900 each; one clerk, $840; one junior library assistant, or messenger, $720; three junior library assistants, or messenger boys, at $600 each; one messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, $480; one charwoman, $480; in all, $27,860.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee how many new places are carried in this provision.

Mr. LEVER. No new places carried at all. There is an apparent increase of $840 due to one transfer from the lump sum, which fund is reduced. The actual increase of $240 is indicated in the following table. I am reading from the estimates. There are three clerks at $1,080 each in lieu of three cataloguers at $1,000 each, an increase of $80 each in salary.

Mr. FOWLER. I compared the bill with the last appropriation act, and if I made no mistake you have an assistant librarian, new, at $1,600, provided for in line 23.

Mr. LEVER. That is a change only in title. One clerk of class 3 has been changed so as to make one assistant librarian at $1,600.

Mr. FOWLER. Was that done for the purpose of dignifying the place in order to have an excuse to increase the salary in the future?

Mr. LEVER. No; I will say frankly to the gentleman that we did not take any testimony on this matter.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention later to push up the salary until you get it raised to $4,000 or $5,000?

Mr. LEVER. No. I will say that this item for the Department of Agriculture has been standing in practically the same language for many years.

Mr. FOWLER. There has not been much increase since I have been here, I know. In line 24, page 55, you appropriate for four clerks instead of two. The last bill carried an appropriation for two clerks of class 1. This bill carries a provision for four clerks of class 1.

Mr. LEVER. The old language is changed from "two clerks of class 1" and "two cataloguers." It is a change of title. As a matter of fact, we have classified them and called them clerks instead of cataloguers and translators.

Mr. FOWLER. Now there are three clerks at $1,080.

Mr. LEVER. Those are the clerks that I have already explained. They have been carried at $1,000, and we have permitted an increase of $80 each.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the reason of this increase of salary?

Mr. LEVER. As I stated to the gentleman, we took no testimony, but the Committee on Agriculture has always felt that it was a pretty hard matter for a poor clerk to live on a salary of $1,000, and if a small increase of $50 or $100 was recommended by their superiors we ought to give it to them.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not going to object to it, for it is a small salary. If it were one of the higher salaries, I should object to it, as a provision in the last appropriation bill fixed the salaries for the future the same as was carried in that bill.

Now, on page 56, there appears to be three junior library assistants or messenger boys. Is that new?

Mr. LEVER. That is a change of title. They are not new at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one question about the next paragraph, and that is in reference to the official traveling expenses for the library force.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the language of this item has been carried in the bill ever since I have been a member of the committee. If they incur any very great expense for travel, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MANN. The next item carries official traveling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I was inquiring about. That paragraph has not yet been read.

Mr. MANN. Sometimes they are required to go out of the city.

Mr. LEVER. They would not expend very much for traveling expenses.

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I was unable to understand why they would need official traveling expenses.

Mr. MANN. Just like Members of Congress. They may have to be sent somewhere outside of the city.

Mr. LEVER. Suppose there is a convention of librarians, say, in Chicago. I think the Librarian of the Agricultural Department should be sent there as a matter of information.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is not a general library.

Mr. LEVER. It is the finest agricultural library in the United States, and probably in the world.

Mr. MANN. In the world.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be true, but still I do not understand the item for official traveling expenses.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have the information that the gentleman is seeking. Traveling, station, and field expenses for 1913, $29.52. I suspect that the illustration I made a moment ago of sending the librarian to some convention of librarians for the purpose of getting information for the public service accounted for that, in all likelihood. I do not know just how it was expended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain what a junior assistant librarian is?

Mr. LEVER. I take it that that term is used for the purpose of distinguishing him from the full-grown librarian. He is called a junior librarian or messenger.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that this person does messenger service and is very likely a young boy who is studying to become a librarian.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman in charge of the bill that, as a matter of uniformity, he ought to strike out the figures "$1,400," in line 24, page 55, where it reads:

One clerk of class two, $1,400.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is a good suggestion, and I will accept such an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Then I offer that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 24, after the word "two," strike out the figures "$1,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Rent of buildings, Department of Agriculture: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, namely:

For Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,220;
For Bureau of Plant Industry, $26,420;
For Forest Service, $25,075;
For Bureau of Chemistry, $17,320;
For Bureau of Soils, $306;
For Division of Publications, $5,000;
For Office of Solicitor, $2,160;
For Office of Experiment Stations, $5,000;
For Office of Public Roads, $3,500;
For additional rent in cases of emergency for any bureau, division, or office of the department, $21,328;
In all, $108,329.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have looked very carefully through the hearings of the committee and through the report of the chairman and I do not find anything about these particular rent items.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee to look into the whole question of rents, and the chairman of that subcommittee is the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY]. I think that he will be able to give a full explanation. The reason there is no reference to it in the report is that he had not completed his information at the time the report was written.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the whole House ought to have this information from the chairman of the subcommittee, and I suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that it is now almost half past 5 o'clock.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that the gentleman make his report, in order that it might be printed in the RECORD and that we might read it in the morning.

Mr. JACOWAY. It will not take more than a few minutes to inform the committee of the investigation.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that it is time to rise.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to rise at this time. I suggest that the gentleman from Arkansas ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD his report in respect to this rent proposition.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to his printing it in the RECORD, but that will not satisfy me. I read the RECORD a great deal, but I never have been foolish enough to read fine print in the RECORD.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this matter is very important. We are paying here more than $100,000 for rent, and I think it is due the House that we should have this information, and I believe the gentleman should be given unanimous consent that he may print it in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; that could not be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why not?

The CHAIRMAN. No proposition has yet been submitted asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and print whatever he wants on this subject.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will state this: The explanation I would make——

Mr. MANN. We will hear that in the morning, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the proposition. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to extend his remarks

in the RECORD by inserting certain data in connection with the item of rent.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will request the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw that, for the reason that what explanation I have will be more valuable to the House to come in as a whole than by piecemeal.

A MEMBER. Regular order!

Mr. FOSTER. I object to it to-night.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, withdraws his request, and I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHERWOOD, for one week, on account of the funeral of his wife.

To Mr. BAILEY, for one week, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, March 14, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4247) to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy by the appointment of six vice admirals, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 377), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5890) for the relief of settlers within the limits of the grant to the New Orleans, Baton Rouge & Vicksburg Railroad Co., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 378), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2563) for the relief of Rebecca C. Pepper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 379), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of George W. Cary, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 380), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11040) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James Harvey Dennis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 381), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9092) for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 382), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1781) providing for the refund of certain duties incorrectly collected on wild-celery seed, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 383), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10205) for the relief of the estate of William H. Willis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 384), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2041) granting a pension to Edward Wilson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3509) granting an increase of pension to Cash Kelley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13450) granting a pension to Katherine M. Reichherzer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 14582) to amend an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 14583) providing for the payment of pensions monthly by means of the annual issue of 12 coupons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 14584) providing for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Scranton, Pa., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14585) to amend sections 4888 and 4889 of the Revised Statutes relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 14586) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel and set aside segregations of public lands under the Carey Act, and to regulate the same; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) authorizing the President to acquire Mexican territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution (H. Res. 440) to provide for the appointment of three additional policemen for the House Office Building; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 441) to provide for the appointment of two additional elevator conductors for the House Office Building; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Memorial from the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring House bill 5139, for the retirement of certain civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to certain payments by the United States Government in aid of the Massachusetts Nautical School; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to certain payments by the United States Government in aid of the Massachusetts Nautical School; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, praying the payment of $25,000 to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for each of the years 1911 to 1914, both inclusive, as per act of Congress approved March 4, 1911, entitled "An act for marine schools and other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, requesting Congress and the Secretary of the Navy to take such steps as

may be necessary to make Boston the permanent resting place of the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, praying the payment of $25,000 to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for each of the years 1911 to 1914, both inclusive, as per act of Congress approved March 4, 1911, entitled "An act for marine schools, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress and the Secretary of the Navy to take such steps as may be necessary to make Boston the permanent resting place of the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 14587) granting an increase of pension to James K. Barkalow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14588) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 14589) for the relief of Wesley S. Crane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14590) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Halbritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 14591) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Desmuke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 14592) granting an increase of pension to Peter S. Hess, guardian of John E. Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14593) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Lovell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 14594) for the relief of James Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14595) for the relief of Dana Dudley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 14596) granting an increase of pension to George S. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14597) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Lunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14598) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Lake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14599) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. McCrillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14600) granting an increase of pension to George M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 14601) granting an increase of pension to John M. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14602) granting an increase of pension to William H. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14603) to correct the military record of Caleb T. Holland and issue to him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14604) to correct the military record of Jacob Klutts and issue to him an honorable discharge; to the Committe on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14605) to correct the military record of Hiram Jackson Osborne and grant to him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 14606) granting a pension to Etta F. Pickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: A bill (H. R. 14607) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14608) granting an increase of pension to Butler Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14609) for the relief of Cyntha Ramey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 14610) granting a pension to Edward B. Earl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 14611) granting a pension to Maggie C. Slaughter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14612) granting an increase of pension to Christian C. Whistler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14613) granting an increase of pension to James T. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14614) granting a pension to Louise C. Kimberly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14615) granting an increase of pension to William C. Tarvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14616) for the relief of Thomas B. Salts; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14617) to appropriate a sum of money to pay Rhoda Menz, W. W. Christmas, and James M. Christmas, heirs of Myra Clarke Gaines, for certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14618) granting a pension to Carrie Gumm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14619) granting an increase of pension to Lyda Tankersley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14620) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Beebe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 14621) granting a pension to James H. Lacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 14622) granting a pension to Carrie McIntosh Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14623) providing pay for extra services performed by persons in certain navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Protests from citizens of Rosebud, Bland, Labaddie, St. Charles, Leslie, Beaufort, and Union, all in the State of Missouri, against the prohibition amendments proposed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Ottobee Grange, of Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 11897, the farm-credits bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Alameda County Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, of Oakland, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 13723, the anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the United Brethren Church and Sunday School, of Bryan, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of the Brotherhood of Millersburg, the Baptist Church of Newcomerstown, the Christian Endeavor Society of Wooster, the Methodist Protestant Church of Coshocton, and sundry citizens of Doylestown and Fredericksburg, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Carrick, Pittock, West Homestead, Knoxville, Farm Haven, and New England, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petitions of various voters of Summit County, nineteenth congressional district of Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and various other Christian organizations of the State of Ohio, favoring an increase of chaplains in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pavenna, Ohio, protesting against House bill 9674, the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of various voters of Trumbull County, Ohio, and of Columbia Council, No. 21, Daughters of Liberty, of Akron, Ohio, favoring the immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the First National Bank of Garrettsville, Ohio, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of M. M. Glidden and other citizens of Summit County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Cuyahoga Falls, Niles, Akron, Mineral Ridge, Ravenna; the Methodist Episcopal churches at Jefferson, Mineral Ridge, and Richmond; and Jefferson Seventh-Day Adventist Church, of Jefferson, all in the

State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Protestant Church of Delta, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of New York: Petition of Henry Medd, of Southampton, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14590) granting an increase of pension to Frederic M. Halbritler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of the Wesley Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of B. T. Hays and other citizens of South Dakota, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Thomas Elsom Post, No. 54, Department of South Dakota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring passage of bill for monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Baptist Temple Bible School, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of certain citizens of Brooker, Fla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER: Petitions of William Sanders and others, of Waterford, Wis., favoring passage of an act by Congress giving applicants right to settle on and purchase from the United States the land which they applied to purchase from the Oregon & California Railroad Co., etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Stewart Publishing Co., of New York City, protesting against the anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, favoring passage of bill for acquisition and improvement of Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of 151 citizens of Rich Hill, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHOE: Petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse, relative to Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of citizens of Xenia, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 200 members of Union Grange No. 77, at New Vienna, Ohio, opposing any legislation curtailing the effectiveness of the parcel post, and favoring rural credits as provided for in the Bathrick bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of 116 citizens of Smithfield and vicinity, 440 citizens of Barnesville, 25 citizens of Carrolltown, 450 members of Third Presbyterian Church and other citizens of Steubenville, various voters of Mount Pleasant, sundry citizens of Scio, Neffs, and Shadyside, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of various banks of Idaho, favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Salmon, Idaho, against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Newburyport, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of 15 citizens of Greenville, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring House bill 3328, relative to building of revenue cutters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14517) granting a pension to Emma A. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of 80 citizens of Sheffield, 153 citizens of Franklin, 558 citizens of Oil City, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Alexander Covriveau and sundry citizens of Central Falls, R. I., and of William H. Lovett and others, of Providence, R. I., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Peter McArdle and other citizens of Providence, R. I., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Civic League of Blossburg, Pa., and of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Colorado, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of the Findley Patch Post, No. 137, of Blairsville, Pa., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Peter Wallrath, Phil F. Grill, H. E. Sauer, C. W. Kratz, G. W. Geissler, Will O. Ferguson, Edward F. Sonntag, George W. Haynie, Norman J. Brizius, S. M. Haussermann, Charles Krausen, Louis Wolfgang, Leopold Scholem, H. Heines, and Theodore Rechtin, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of the official board of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Macon, Mo., protesting against passage of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Pittsburgh Board of Trade, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of sundry voters of the first congressional district of Nebraska, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of George W. Lendewing, of Windham, Conn., against the adoption of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 80 citizens of Moodus, 150 citizens of New Britain, 60 citizens of South Coventry, 200 citizens of Higganum, and 150 citizens of Mystic, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of 100 citizens of Kent Willow, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of 403 citizens of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Past Presidents' Association, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Middlesex County, Mass., against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 14610) granting a pension to Edward B. Earl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from E. P. R. Traffic Bureau, San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 12471, relative to the personnel of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Paul Rieger & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 12303, exempting extract manufacturers from special tax for recovering alcohol from the vanilla bean; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alameda County Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, of Oakland, Cal., favoring House bill 13723, the Underwood anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Charles E. Dowd, of Wallingford, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Oregon Retail Hardware & Implement Dealers' Association, of Milwaukee, Oreg., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Scandinavian Grand Lodge of Connecticut, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of the State of New Jersey and of E. A. Bedler and other citizens of Monmouth County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petitions of 200 citizens of Clifton, 90 citizens of Colorado Springs, 125 citizens of Delta, 50 citizens of Fountain, 50 citizens of Kit Carson, 111 citizens of Montrose, 50 citizens of Pueblo, 500 citizens of Hayden, and 200 citizens of Victor, all in the State of Colorado, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petitions of various members of the Prospect Avenue Baptist Church, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Moorhead, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Minnesota State Dairymen's Association in annual convention, protesting against the enactment of the so-called McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, communication from J. M. Burke, secretary of the International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Nymore, Minn., transmitting letter signed by the general chairman of the Canal Zone divisions of the international trades organizations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (by request): Petition of R. R. Rice, of Lincoln County, Ark., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Frank Bebout, I. G. Sanders, and 250 others from the Young Men's Christian Association of Monongahela, Pa., in support of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of various members of the Emanuel Baptist Church, of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring legislation preventing transmission of sporting information by telegraph over interstate lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Old Washington and vicinity; of Rev. Charles E. Baird and 25 others of Hopewell; of L. B. McBurney and 70 others of Cambridge, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of G. W. Halsey and other citizens of Wyandot County, Ohio, against House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Washington Grange, No. 1748, of Mount Gilead, Ohio, in favor of House bill 11897, to provide for the establishment of a system of farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of A. M. Smith and other citizens of Van Buren, Ohio, in favor of the passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various Spanish War veterans of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Financial Chronicle Chapel, of Typographical Union No. 6, and of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bay County, Mich., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### SATURDAY, *March 14, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, whose laws environ us, whose touch inspires us, whose love is reflected in every intellectual, moral, and spiritual movement looking to the betterment of mankind, so move upon the hearts of these Thy servants that their resolves and enactments may be in consonance with Thy will, lest their work come to naught, since nothing is permanent that does not have its source in Thee. We are Thine. Thou art good. We are finite; Thou art infinite. We are weak; Thou art almighty. We know but little; Thou knowest all things. Help us, therefore, to lean with more confidence on Thee and follow without fear where Thou dost lead. In the spirit of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a short statement in the RECORD.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Upon what subject?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington upon what subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is upon the subject of the Panama Canal tolls. It gives a list of the Democrats who voted for the present bill who are now Members of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include also the Republicans and show how they voted?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No. The country is not interested, I take it, in the Republicans.

Mr. FOSTER. Recent events would indicate that they were not. I object, Mr. Speaker.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WATKINS. Bill H. R. 14331, No. 112 on the Union Calendar and No. 69 on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, was reported from the Committee on Revision of the Laws. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors states that it has been customary when a bill is passed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and has become a law that, after that, any other bill amending the original bill, having come from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under the rule or custom would be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This bill has been referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws, and has been favorably reported and placed on both of these calendars. If that is the custom, I do not want to have the appearance of any discourtesy on my part either to a Member or to a committee. I ask if that is a rule or the custom?

The SPEAKER. What is the rule?

Mr. WATKINS. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has informed me that as this bill to which I have referred is a bill to amend a law which was several years ago passed by the House, having come from or reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that under the rules of the House or custom of the Speaker, such bill should be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and not to the Committee on Revision of the Laws. If that is the custom or the rule, I do not want to have the appearance of infringing by having asked that the bill be referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws, which I did, and which was done.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the bill is but, as a matter of fact, neither the Committee on Revision of the Laws nor the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the subject matter. It is a bill that belonged to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is true that this bill, which was referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws, was a bill to amend a provision in the river and harbor act. The bill was in the river and harbor act, but is still subject to a point of order in that act.

The SPEAKER. What is the bill about, anyhow?

Mr. MANN. For removing obstructions in navigable waters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If there is any bill that could be properly referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, this is one of them. It is entitled "A bill to amend section 19 of an act

making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899," which was a bill reported from that committee. Now, this bill seeks to amend a provision in the law of 1899, so as to permit the removal of certain obstructions in the Sabine River.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Has this bill been referred to any committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. MANN. And been reported by that committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has been reported by that committee. I called the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] to this matter the other day, and told him it was my opinion that it should have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and while I am not, I trust, supersensitive about these things, I do not wish such references to go unnoticed.

The SPEAKER. Has the bill been reported back?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it has been reported.

The SPEAKER. It was clearly a mistake to refer it to the Committee on Revision of the Laws. That committee has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If any bill should go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that bill certainly should.

Mr. MANN. The bill should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which committee has jurisdiction over obstructions in navigable waters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, any bill, I do not care what it is or what its relation to the question of rivers and harbors may be, should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. This whole proceeding is out of order, anyway. If either one of the gentlemen will give the Speaker a memorandum of the matter, the Speaker will look into it and report on it some morning.

Mr. MANN. It will probably be before the House next Wednesday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] that the motion should be made now to refer the bill to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. If that motion is in order, while I do not wish to precipitate any lengthy discussion of that or any other subject now, I would like to make it.

The SPEAKER. It is in order if made by direction of the committee which reported the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is not now before any committee. It is on the calendar.

Mr. FOSTER. It is reported. It is not before any committee now.

The SPEAKER. Is it on the calendar?

Mr. FOSTER. It is on the calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was intending to bring the matter before the Speaker when the bill is called up.

The SPEAKER. It was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it was referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

The SPEAKER. It was incorrect to refer it there. That much is absolutely clear. If the gentleman will give the Chair a memorandum about it, so that the Chair can dig it up to-day, if there is any way of getting at it, it shall be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have already arisen to a parliamentary inquiry on that question. The Speaker has said that we are all out of order; but while I have the floor I wish to ask unanimous consent to dispose of this now, because the river and harbor bill is the next bill on the calendar in line for consideration, and I would like to have the matter disposed of now, if possible. I have no objection to its being referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, so that it can be disposed of when the next bill on the calendar is taken up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] asks unanimous consent to dispose of this now. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

### ADDITIONAL ROOMS IN THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. BOWDLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOWDLE. I want to present a question that pertains to the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOWDLE. I promise to be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, with 39 other Congressmen I have been quartered for 12 months in the Maltby Building. Now, I do not object to that in itself; but under the circumstances it has imposed on the 39 of us, or the 40 of us, an immense amount of inconvenience. I am a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have been in session about 90 days in the last three months, and attendance twice a day has made my mileage about 247 miles [laughter] in order to attend the meetings of that single committee, to say nothing of the meetings of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands. Of course I am not going to present a bill to Uncle Sam for mileage. [Laughter.] I do not even object to that inconvenience.

But there is another thing: The distance between the Maltby Building and the Hall of the House is great—far greater than it appears to be; indeed, so great that frequently many Members have been placed in a rather embarrassing position in the matter of roll calls. Of late we have had some very serious blizzards, so serious that at times I have proceeded from the Hall of the House to the Maltby Building simply by dead reckoning. [Laughter.] I have missed in the past three months about three roll calls. On two of those occasions my friend BILL MURRAY, the distinguished Oklahoma Member, and I were caught in a snow bank just beyond the Senate. [Laughter.] I saw him wigwagging for help, and I rendered it. [Laughter.] But we missed the roll calls on the bills—at least I did. Thus, for illustration, I was recorded as not voting on that convict-made goods measure of Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. LEWIS, in charge of the bill, knew I wanted to vote for it, but I was called over to the Maltby Building in a blizzard.

Then the other night—Sunday night—after church, I found myself in the Maltby Building in the terrible storm that was then blowing. Now, the building is not safe. The rafters of that building, like the Government at times, show a decided tendency to centralization. [Laughter.] The building is going down in the center very rapidly. I sat there meditating on things of great pith and moment while the rafters groaned and creaked. [Laughter.] The situation is dangerous there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want very much to get into the House Office Building, not only on account of pleasant associations, but for other reasons. I do not know when we are going over there. Every time I make an inquiry at the building there is a different reason given. Four months ago we were to be there the following Monday. On the following Monday I found that the washstands were not yet in. Now, I agree that a good many Congressmen can waive washstands. [Laughter.] I was willing myself to waive washstands. Still later I made an inquiry, and I found out that the locks for the doors had not arrived. Under those circumstances, I offered to buy a staple and a hasp for my door and put them on myself, but the custodian would not agree.

And then I have been compelled to think of the danger impending over the statesmanship of the Nation incident to the falling in of the Maltby Building. [Laughter.] There is a large section of us over there, and I would not want to contemplate that building falling in and burying us under it, and our wives clamoring here at Gen. SHERWOOD'S office later on for pensions. But that is the situation. [Laughter.] If anybody would undertake to give us a rational answer to the question as to how soon we shall be relieved of this dangerous situation, I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the gentleman has already been notified that the assignment of rooms in the House Office Building to Members who are now in the Maltby Building will be made as of 12 o'clock on Monday next, and the gentleman will undoubtedly be able to get a room there at once, or very soon after that. Most of the rooms are practically finished.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand this further addendum, that the gentlemen who are in the Maltby Building are to get such offices as are left over.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is not correct. I should like to suggest to the gentlemen in the Maltby Building, however, who complain about lack of opportunity to answer to the roll, that if they were in the House, where they belong, they would not have to come from the Maltby Building to answer to the roll call. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOWDLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois is generally accurate, and I take it that he is perfectly accurate when he says 12 o'clock noon on Monday is the time when we will be relieved from the perils of the Maltby Building, and our constituents will be relieved from the peril of losing us; but

as to the latter part of his statement, he knows perfectly well, a great deal better than I know it, that as a practical matter we are not expected to be here every minute of the time, and I have no doubt if the RECORD were carefully examined it would show that the gentleman from Illinois, through his long and honored career, has followed the usual practice.

Mr. MANN. If I had followed the practice of the gentleman from Ohio I would change it now, but I have not done so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the increase in the membership of the House under the last census resulted in a number of Members in excess of the number of rooms that had been provided in the House Office Building. Some provision was necessary to accommodate these additional Members. Congress authorized the raising of the inner portion of the roof, so as to provide the additional accommodations so that no gentleman might be without an office. Provision was made for the utilization of the Maltby Building until the additional accommodations could be provided in the House Office Building.

I am very much relieved to know that those gentlemen who have been quartered in the Maltby Building have come to the conclusion that it is so unsafe that they wish to leave there as quickly as possible. During most of the past summer that band of 40 patriots pursued and haunted me about this Capitol, insisting that immediately the addition to the House Office Building be completed and they be moved into it. During the winter, as the time has approached for the completion of the building and the removal of these gentlemen to the House Office Building, a complete change has taken place, and I have been besought by these gentlemen to make arrangements to permit them to continue in the Maltby Building, as they did not wish to be removed; so that it has seemed as if whatever could be done was the very thing these gentlemen were not anxious to have done.

Mr. BOWDLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a moment. These gentlemen have not suffered any great inconvenience. I served seven or eight years in the House when no Member had an office; and for over a hundred years Members of Congress had patriotically and unselfishly and devotedly served their constituents, satisfied with the job, without these accommodations.

Mr. MANN. At $5,000 per.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to me that in view of the situation everybody should be glad to accommodate himself as best he possibly can until the additional accommodations can be completed. I must agree that perhaps the gentleman, or rather some of those with him, did have a grievance at being caught in a snow bank, and I am glad to see that one of his associates in the Maltby Building, to whom he refers, has suffered no serious injury as the result of that episode.

Mr. BOWDLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOWDLE. Is it not true that those gentlemen in the Maltby Building who have indicated a preference for that building are as a rule Republicans, who feel that their presence on committees is somewhat irrelevant?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted to differentiate politically between the gentlemen in that building. They all seemed to look alike to me. They have all had the same hungry, determined, fierce look. I have had no time to ascertain whether they were Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Or Bull Moose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was too busy in attempting to escape. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. This whole proceeding is out of order.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to refer to some statements made by the gentleman from New York. I did not start this discussion——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman will not take up the time of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I have not taken up any time on this bill since you started.

Mr. LEVER. I understand that.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will not object to that, but I will object to any further time being used in this way.

Mr. MANN. Let us hear how the gentleman escaped from the snow bank. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the room when the discussion started with reference to the Maltby Building, and I should not have said anything but for the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The gentleman said that Congressmen "went on for a hundred years without rooms." That is not the question, Mr. Speaker. The condition is that Members are now given commodious rooms, but because a man is a new Member he is not given equal treatment. I would resent giving me the best room in the building, if intended to insult me, whether it came from the gentleman from New York or anyone else.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And I say it is absolutely unfair for the gentleman from New York to undertake such a policy. Now, the Maltby Building, as was stated——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No; I do not yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very well.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The situation is such that we have been compelled to come through the snow or through the rain to get to the Hall of the House, when from the other building gentlemen have had the opportunity to come through a tunnel. Now, when the rooms are about completed, older Members file on rooms that we have waited for. Will the gentleman from New York contend that that policy is right when that is not the law? There is not a lawyer in the land but what would say that after a man is sworn in as a Member of Congress, if there is a statute that is susceptible of a double construction, it must be construed to mean the largest degree of equality between the membership of the House; and I want to say this on behalf of the new Members who are in the Maltby Building. I have not complained to this House, but since the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] makes the remark that he does, I resent such an insinuation, that because other Members in the past have gone on without offices we, because we are new Members, must remain in that building and endure the taunts of the gentleman from New York.

I resent it here and I would resent it elsewhere. I say and repeat again that because we are new Members it does not signify that we are not the equal, so far as rights are concerned, to any other Member on the floor of the House. [Applause.] I am not complaining of personal treatment at all. I have been treated by the old Members perhaps better than I should have been treated as a new Member. Nor do I complain of the great body of the membership of the House, but I am complaining of the insinuating remarks of the gentleman from New York, who seems not to understand the distinction between an insult and a joke.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma was present during the entire discussion or not. If he were not, it perhaps accounts for the remarks he has made; if he has been present during the entire discussion, then I can only say that I am entirely indifferent whether he resents here or elsewhere what I do or say. I have no apology to make to the gentleman from Oklahoma for what I have said. I stated the result of certain statements, certain facts. There has been no attempt to discriminate by me against gentlemen who are new Members in favor of gentlemen who are old Members or between old Members and new Members. The assignment of rooms, so far as they have been made and are being made, have been conducted strictly in accordance with the law that controls them. It is a matter of indifference to me whether it meets with the satisfaction of Members or not. Any part that I have to perform in connection with the matter is done under the law and in accordance with the law. If the gentleman from Oklahoma is so sensitive as to feel that I have offended him, I regret the sensitiveness of his nature.

### THE CLERK'S DESK.

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair puts the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] to go into the Committee of the Whole House, inasmuch as there is quite a large attendance of the House this morning, the Chair desires to make a statement. It is against the rule for Members to come to the Clerk's desk during roll call, asking how they voted or trying to get their names in when they did not vote. Of course Members do it out of no bad intention. It is more thoughtlessness than anything else, but it bothers the clerks, and it has been increasing in frequency lately. The clerks do not want any trouble with Members of the House, and can not afford to have. The rule prohibits any Members being around the Clerk's desk during roll calls except those necessary to be there.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Chair is speaking of the period of roll calls?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. How far does the rule go upon this proposition? Frequently when an amendment is offered a Member wishes to know the exact terms of it and approaches the Clerk's desk to see the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think there is any objection to that, although the Chair once raised the question and drove a distinguished statesman from the Clerk's desk for doing that identical thing, but the Chair at that time did not know what the statesman was doing.

Mr. MANN. That was during the roll call.

The SPEAKER. It was. This applies to the period of roll calls, and the Chair repeats that the clerks do not want any trouble with Members and can not afford to have any, and therefore they submit to it with such grace as they can.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned last night I had moved to strike out the last word, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] was going to make an explanation of some rent items in the bill, on page 57. Before we pass that item, I would like to hear the explanation of the gentleman from Arkansas, and make a few remarks myself.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday it was suggested that the records show that there had not been any testimony taken by the Agriculture Committee in its hearings, to any extent, relative to the rents that were being paid by the Government for the various buildings in the District of Columbia for use and benefit of the Agriculture Department. That matter was discussed in the Agriculture Committee, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MAGUIRE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PATTEN], and myself were appointed a subcommittee to investigate the matter.

As nearly as I am capable, from the standpoint of energy and intellect, I have attempted to collect the information in the form of a schedule, giving the information to the House.

There are 20 buildings occupied by the Department of Agriculture other than governmental buildings. Seven of these quarters for the Agriculture Department are portions of buildings occupied by the department in part and not in whole. Thirteen of the twenty buildings are occupied in whole by the Department of Agriculture. So I have made a schedule under the following heads: First, "Name or location of buildings"; second, "Character of building"; third, "Number of rooms occupied"; fourth, "Occupied by"; fifth, "Occupied as"; sixth, "Floor space per square foot net"; seventh, "Floor space per square foot gross"; eighth, "Annual rental"; ninth, "Annual rental per square foot net"; tenth, "Annual rental per square foot gross"; eleventh, "Owner or lessor"; and twelfth, "Assessed value of buildings." It is also shown the gross per cent received by the different owners from the amount invested by them.

From this schedule I find that the Government pays for the 13 buildings occupied in whole a rental of $67,194, and that the assessed valuation is $435,644. The law provides that no property in the District of Columbia should be assessed at less than 66⅔ per cent of its value.

Assuming that this property is assessed at 66⅔ per cent of its value, we find that the Government is paying $67,194 on $653,766 for value in ground and buildings, making in the aggregate a per cent of 10¼ plus on all buildings occupied by the Government. I have computed that in the individual per cent on each, which I will not trespass on the time of the House to give, as it is set out in the schedule, but will say it bears out that which is found in the aggregate. For the information of the committee, I beg to state that the rental bills, so far as I have been able to ascertain, for the Agricultural Department are cheaper than paid by any other department of this Government. We pay from 7 cents and 2 mills per square foot up to 69 cents per square foot. In this estimate is not included those portions of the buildings occupied in part by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I think the gentleman should be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. JACOWAY. I do not think I will take over 10 minutes longer—15 minutes at the outside.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then I make the request that he be permitted to continue for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to continue for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that we might now come to some agreement as to how long we shall debate the rent items.

Mr. HAUGEN. O Mr. Chairman, this is an important item. It is a matter that we did not have an opportunity to look into in the committee. A subcommittee was appointed, and that subcommittee is now just making its report. I do not think there is any disposition here to abuse the privilege or take up unnecessary time.

Mr. LEVER. Very well. I withdraw my suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to continue for 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to further call the attention of the House to some comparisons of the rent paid by the Agricultural Department with that paid by other departments of the Government.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOWAY. For a question.

Mr. COOPER. Is this all the rent that is paid by the Agricultural Department in this city?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes. In other words, I will say that the total rent paid by the Government for the Agriculture Department in exact figures is $99,277.

Mr. COOPER. That is practically 5 per cent on $2,000,000.

Mr. JACOWAY. I will come to that later. It is 2½ per cent on $4,000,000, and I understand the Government can secure money at 2½ per cent, or it is 5 per cent on $2,000,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOWAY. For a question.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman stated that the rent paid was about 10 per cent upon the real value of the property?

Mr. JACOWAY. No; I did not state that. I said that assuming that the assessed value of the property in the District of Columbia, as is shown on the tax books, complied with the law, which requires that it shall be assessed at 66⅔ per cent of its value, and arguing from that premise, then the rent paid by the Government on all of these buildings occupied amounts to 10 per cent plus. If the assessment is an erroneous one, then, of course, the per cent would vary.

Mr. HAWLEY. On the estimated value?

Mr. JACOWAY. The above per cent given is gross.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman know whether there has been any estimate made as to what it would cost to connect up those two wings of the Agricultural Building?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. How much will it be?

Mr. JACOWAY. I will state that I took that matter up with Dr. Galloway, and he stated to me that he thinks the entire Agricultural Department can be housed under one building, or several buildings in close proximity, for an amount not exceeding $3,000,000. That will take care of the Agricultural Department for the present as well as for a number of years in the future.

Mr. HAUGEN. And that would give them a fireproof building and a much better building all around than the buildings which they are now occupying.

Mr. JACOWAY. That will give them a fireproof building, and it will eliminate a number of messengers and extra telephones and facilitate the work of the department and enable it to reach its maximum efficiency.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to ask the gentleman if he has investigated the amount of rent paid by other departments and made any comparison along that line?

Mr. JACOWAY. I was coming to that when I was interrupted by the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. I asked the first question preliminarily to this: What per cent of estimated tax is paid on the valuation according to the gentleman's statement, taking it at its estimated valuation, based on 66⅔ per cent, assessment rate. How much in per cent in tax does the Government pay?

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that I can not follow this investigation down into details so fine and shadowy.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman does not know what per cent of that 10 per cent is represented by taxes?

Mr. JACOWAY. I think 1 per cent will cover taxes, insurance, repairs, and other overhead charges. I can answer the gentleman in another way by referring to page 1 of the report on the assessment and taxation of real estate in the District of Columbia, which is signed by the full subcommittee of which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman. That says—

That real estate is assessed irregularly, unscientifically, without system, and with gross discrimination between section and section, between class and class, between land and improvements.

That in the practice of the assessor's office, in the assessment of real estate, the law that real estate shall be assessed at "not less than two-thirds of its true value" is a dead letter and is kept alive solely to make a one dollar tax rate appear to be one dollar and a half.

That real property in the District of Columbia is assessed $414,000,000 below its true value; the true value being $744,000,000, while the assessment is only $330,000,000. (See testimony, pp. 416–419.) This is not an assessment at even two-thirds of the true value, but only slightly more than two-fifths (p. 419).

* * * * * * *

That considering ground values by themselves, those areas occupied by small homes are assessed at 60 per cent of the true value (p. 416); those by middle-class houses at 50 per cent; those by fine residences at 30 per cent; the business area at 30 per cent; and the large suburban areas at 20 per cent. Here again is heavy discrimination against the small home in comparison with the better house and the business property, while the large suburban speculative area bears less than a third of its proper burden.

From the same report, on page 20, we find that—

Of the following tables the first shows the assessment of ground values in the 5 classes and 10 sections into which the District has been divided for the purpose of this investigation, the ratio of assessment to the full and true present value of the property, and the statement of that full and true value, based upon the testimony and evidence as set forth. The table shows a steady gradation downward from a 60 per cent assessment on ground values in the small-home area to a 20 per cent assessment of ground values in the suburban and speculative areas. The total assessment in the District averages almost exactly one-third of the true value, or one-half of the two-thirds assessment which the law requires as a minimum.

Again, in the report, on page 13, we read the following:

On personal property the tax rate is 1½ per cent of the full true value. On real estate the tax rate as applied is less. The Commissioners call it 1½ per cent on two-thirds of the value, which would make the rate 1 per cent if the assessor had assessed the true value. But he has not. The assessment shows approximately but 44 per cent of the true value, so that 1½ per cent on a theoretical two-thirds reduces itself to 0.66⅔ of 1 per cent on the true valuation. Therefore the real estate tax rate, which looks like one dollar in the hundred, turns out to be only 66⅔ cents in the $100.

Surely this is an extraordinarily low realty rate for a large city; but whether low or high, the rate should not be fixed. At one time a fixed rate may raise too much revenue, at another too little. The only businesslike and just way is to let the rate be determined by the needs of the budget, as is done in other large cities.

At this time this is as completely as I can answer the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Now, for the benefit of the committee I will say that in the Munsey Building a standard rent is charged per square foot, and the Government pays the same rent as do all tenants. The Agricultural Department is not paying any more than anybody else. In the Atlantic Building, which the Government occupies for the Forest Service, and located at 930 F Street, the Government pays approximately 20 per cent less for the housing of its offices than offices in this neighborhood usually command. In the Union Building, on G Street near Seventh Street NW., the rent paid by the Government is considerably less than is usually paid in this section. In the Star Building the Government pays less than the average per square foot than is now being paid by the other tenants. In the Globe Building, 339 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. (warehouse), the rental paid here is low in comparison with rent paid for other warehouses in this section and occupied by other interests. On buildings south of B street SW. there is no basis of comparison. No other interests have offices or laboratories in this section. Now, the overhead charges——

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman state in reference to the comparison of rates paid for private property?

Mr. JACOWAY. I could not go into that at any length.

Mr. HAUGEN. Now, will the gentleman state the amount paid by the Government per square foot on B Street?

Mr. JACOWAY. Seven cents and two mills.

Mr. HAUGEN. The memorandum I have indicates we are paying more; that is the information I got from the gentleman last night.

Mr. JACOWAY. I am in error. I thank the gentleman for the correction. The actual rental is $3,500, and that costs approximately per square foot 23.1 gross, and the net is 26.7. That is Fourteenth and B NW.

Mr. HAUGEN. Some time ago I made an inquiry, and I find that the people in a house in that vicinity paid a rental of $35 a month, or $420 a year; so it is about 13 cents per foot, and the Government is now paying 26.7 or 23.1, and in the other instances it is paying 34.6 or 27.4, which would indicate that the Government was paying two or three times as much as private individuals are for residential purposes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Well, I will state to the gentleman, in answer to him, that I am of opinion, after the investigation I have been able to make, that the Government, from the standpoint of the Government and not from the viewpoint of the individual, is paying too much rent for all of those buildings; but I state and assert that the rent paid by the Government for the buildings for the use of the Agricultural Department is the cheapest rent paid by the Government for any of the great departments of this Government.

Mr. HAUGEN. That may be true as to the other buildings, and I know nothing about that. Of course, the gentleman has made a comparison of the rent paid for others; but if in the vicinity of the department buildings are rented for 13 cents per square foot, it seems to me the Government is paying high if it is paying 26——

Mr. JACOWAY. I have but a limited time, and I want to make some further comparisons. The gentleman will have to excuse me if I can not yield further. Now, in the Army appropriation bill for 1915, in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs I find buildings and quarters rented by Quartermaster Department, District of Columbia, which table is as follows:

*Buildings and quarters rented by the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, in the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.*

| Location of building. | For what purpose used. | Square feet floor space. | Total rental per annum. | Cost per square foot per annum. | Assessed valuation of land. | Assessed valuation of improvements. | Remarks. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eckington Place | Warehouse | 26,386 | $5,048.00 | $0.138 | $12,878.00 | $12,000.00 | No allowance in rental for any special service. |
| Do | do | 19,320 | 3,000.00 | .186 | 5,507.00 | 17,000.00 | Do. |
| Nineteenth and C Streets NW | Stable | 21,929 | 2,700.00 | .123 | 4,506.00 | 15,000.00 | Do. |
| Do | Stable and warehouse | 20,944 | 3,600.00 | .171 | 8,795.00 | 26,000.00 | Do. |
| Do | Quartermaster's garage | 10,000 | 1,500.00 | .15 | | | |
| First and North Capitol Streets | Medical supply depot | 27,114 | 5,567.10 | .15 | 7,678.00 | 26,000.00 | Do. |
| 721 Thirteenth Street NW | Army Medical School | 21,612 | 8,650.00 | .39 | 41,280.00 | 40,000.00 | $1,200 extra for heat; $120 extra for light; $360 extra for elevator. |
| 1720 H Street NW | Medical dispensary | 1,020 | 1,000.00 | .98 | 5,031.00 | 7,000.00 | Assessed valuation for 3-story building. Department leases only 1 story. |
| Seventeenth and F Streets NW | Offices, depot quartermaster | 7,024 | 2,500.00 | .355 | 11,290.00 | 8,500.00 | No allowance in rental for any special service. |
| 1710 Pennsylvania Avenue | Signal Corps laboratory | 5,714 | 2,100.00 | .367 | 10,080.00 | 4,500.00 | Lease requires United States to maintain and repair building when necessary. |
| The Marlborough | Quarters for officer (5 rooms) | 826 | 720.00 | .87168 | | | Does not include heat and light. |
| 6929 Georgia Avenue NW | Quarters for officer (4 rooms) | 586 | 576.00 | .9828 | | | Do. |
| 1332 Kenyon Street NW | Quarters for officer (3 rooms) | 451 | 432.00 | .9576 | | | Do. |
| 606 Butternut Street NW | do | 405 | 432.00 | 1.0656 | | | Do. |
| The Portland | do | 445 | 576.00 | 1.2936 | | | Do. |
| 1645 K Street NW | Quarters for nurse (2 rooms) | 210 | 288.00 | 1.3716 | | | Do. |
| Do | do | 210 | 288.00 | 1.3716 | | | Do. |
| 1803 Calvert Street NW | do | 384 | 288.00 | .75 | | | Do. |
| 339 O Street SW | Quarters for noncommissioned officer (1 room) | 168 | 144.00 | .85704 | | | Do. |
| 822 Fifth Street NE | do | 256 | 144.00 | .56244 | | | Do. |
| 1907 H Street NW | do | 192 | 144.00 | .75 | | | Do. |
| 3418 Prospect Avenue NW | do | 288 | 144.00 | .49992 | | | Do. |

*Buildings and quarters rented by the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, in the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914*—Continued.

| Location of building. | For what purpose used. | Square feet floor space. | Total rental per annum. | Cost per square foot per annum. | Assessed valuation of land. | Assessed valuation of improvements. | Remarks. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 927 K Street NW | Quarters for noncommissioned officer (1 room). | 168 | $144.00 | $0.85704 | | | Does not include heat and light. |
| 613 Rock Creek Church Road | do | 208 | 144.00 | .6924 | | | Do. |
| 1822 H Street NW | do | 260 | 144.00 | .5532 | | | Do. |
| 1514 W Street SE | do | 180 | 144.00 | .7992 | | | Do. |
| 201 T Street NW | do | 126 | 144.00 | 1.1424 | | | Do. |
| 1807 G Street NW | do | 288 | 252.00 | .9136 | | | Do. |
| 506 Kenyon Street NW | do | 150 | 144.00 | .96 | | | Do. |
| 73 Myrtle Street NW | do | 170 | 144.00 | .8472 | | | Do. |
| 714 Eighteenth Street NW | do | 120 | 144.00 | 1.20 | | | Do. |
| 1024 Eighth Street NW | do | 132 | 144.00 | 1.0284 | | | Do. |
| Do | do | 224 | 144.00 | .64284 | | | Do. |
| 3326 Georgia Avenue NW | do | 168 | 144.00 | .85704 | | | Do. |
| 625 Harvard Street NW | do | 224 | 144.00 | .64284 | | | Do. |
| 5 Girard Street NW | do | 169 | 144.00 | .852 | | | Do. |
| 475 G Street SW | do | 196 | 144.00 | .73464 | | | Do. |
| 1735 Willard Street NW | do | 180 | 144.00 | .79992 | | | Do. |
| 2124 P Street NW | do | 224 | 144.00 | .64284 | | | Do. |
| 917 Fifth Street NW | do | 144 | 144.00 | 1.00 | | | Do. |
| 1024 Eighth Street NW | Quarters for enlisted man (1 room). | 168 | 144.00 | .85704 | | | Do. |
| 332 Fourteenth Street NE | do | 120 | 144.00 | 1.20 | | | Do. |
| 1020 Eighteenth Street NW | do | 140 | 144.00 | 1.0284 | | | Do. |
| 720 Thirteenth Street NW | do | 300 | 144.00 | .48 | | | Do. |
| 1024 Eighth Street NW | do | 130 | 144.00 | 1.10856 | | | Do. |
| 310 C Street NW | do | 143 | 144.00 | 1.0068 | | | Do. |
| 422 Second Street NW | do | 168 | 144.00 | .85704 | | | Do. |
| 1607 H Street NW | do | 192 | 144.00 | .75 | | | Do. |
| 310 C Street NW | do | 143 | 144.00 | 1.0068 | | | Do. |
| 506 Kenyon Street NW | do | 120 | 144.00 | 1.20 | | | Do. |
| 600 Harvard Street NW | do | 228 | 144.00 | .60492 | | | Do. |
| 610 Irving Street NW | do | 140 | 144.00 | 1.0284 | | | Do. |
| Do | do | 140 | 144.00 | 1.0284 | | | Do. |
| 1512 Corcoran Street NW | do | 252 | 144.00 | .5712 | | | Do. |
| 221 G Street NW | do | 260 | 144.00 | .5532 | | | Do. |
| Total for leases in effect at the present time if same are not terminated until June 30, 1914. | | | 45,231.10 | | | | |
| Total for leases for fiscal year 1914 terminated before this date (Oct. 15, 1913). | | | 1,080.00 | | | | |
| Estimated amount required for rent of buildings, etc., for the remainder of the fiscal year 1914. | | | 49,587.00 | | | | |

Mr. JACOWAY. From this table, I will state, the fact is developed that the rent for the Agricultural Department is much less than the rent set out in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield before he goes on further?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes; gladly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it the purpose finally to house all the agricultural bureaus in a single building?

Mr. JACOWAY. I do not know what the purpose is, but I think probably it would be wise business policy on the part of the Government to appropriate a sufficient amount of money—not be stinting, but generous—to house the great Agricultural Department under one or more roofs in close proximity.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman remembers how that building is built, and I have often wondered about it. There are two wings, two separate buildings, and a hole in the middle. Now, is it the idea to construct something to take the place of the vacant space in the middle?

Mr. JACOWAY. I understand it is part of unwritten history that when these two wings were built there was not sufficient funds to build the structure as desired, and it was deemed best to build the two wings as they stand to-day, hoping that a future Congress would appropriate funds ample enough to build to the two present wings. This is my informatoin in regard to the matter. I believe it to be correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman mean he built those two structures as separate buildings——

Mr. JACOWAY. For the purpose of adding to them in the future.

Mr. MURDOCK. At different times? They were not constructed at the same time?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes; at the same time, I understand.

Mr. MURDOCK. But he did construct them, and there was a hole left in the center for a central building?

Mr. JACOWAY. This is my information. As to whether it is accurate or not, I do not know. I believe it to be correct, however.

This bill also carries an item of $21,328 for additional rent. I will state that the last bill carried $11,328 for this item, but the committee eliminated from this bill an appropriation of $7,500 for the Bureau of Entomology; so, in fact, there is only an increase of $2,500. I took the matter up with Dr. Galloway and interrogated him as to the increase in the rent of $2,500, and his answer was that Congress had made an appropriation of $500,000 for the investigation of the hog cholera and $100,000 for the investigation of a disease of the horse, known as dourine, $200,000 for a bureau of markets. He said to carry these projects to a successful consummation it would take additional quarters and additional men, and he thought the item now would meet the requirement in full; that the additional amount of $2,500 was in no sense excessive.

There is an item in the bill of $142.50 for additional rent. That occurs in this way: When the Government enters into a lease with a private individual, the owner or lessors, there is a clause in the lease which provides that the building shall be turned back to the owner in the same condition in which it was found. This $142.50 was used for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it embarrass the gentleman if I asked him a question?

Mr. JACOWAY. Not in the least.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman's investigation led him into an inquiry as to the terms which the Government entered into for the special office building which the Bureau of Chemistry occupies?

Mr. JACOWAY. Is that the Keator Building?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not give you the name of the building. I know it was especially erected for governmental purposes, and is the building where the Bureau of Chemistry is housed.

Mr. JACOWAY. If it is the Keator Building, I will say that this is now being constructed and the department gets 25,000 more square feet than formerly and at the same price.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring to a building now occupied by the Government, but especially erected for governmental purposes.

Mr. JACOWAY. I am unable to answer the gentleman. Generally, I will state, that the lease of these buildings is entered into for one year only. These leases are drawn either by or under the direction of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, and the term of the lease is one year. As to the per cent paid to the owners of the Atlantic and Union Building companies, light may be thrown upon this matter by reading a

portion of a letter written me by Mr. Myron M. Parker, which in part is as follows:

The Atlantic Building is a little over 20 years old, well constructed, the walls being of unusual thickness. The building is equipped with all modern devices for protection against fire, with a fire-alarm service connecting with general headquarters. Considering the location and the value of the ground, the rent of 69 cents per foot being paid by the Government is far from excessive, being considerably lower than that paid by commercial tenants in the same locality and cheaper than rents paid by the Government in buildings of a like character for the use of other departments.

I am also president of the Union Building Co., a large office building on G Street, between Sixth and Seventh Streets, which at present is occupied by different auditors of the Treasury Department, the General Supply Committee, and Station G of the city post office. This building was erected about 20 years ago at the request of the then Postmaster General for occupancy in part by the city post office. It is six stories high, each floor containing about 18,000 feet of uninterrupted space and capable of carrying any weight. The building never has been used as a warehouse. During the taking of the census in 1910 about 500 clerks were employed on one floor. This building has six fire escapes and is also equipped with modern devices against the hazard of fire. The rent paid by the Government averages 37½ cents per square foot. At this low price the rent received from the Government has never enabled us to pay more than an average of 2¾ per cent dividends, so that if, as alleged, the Government has been robbed through the exacting and relentless landlords it can not be charged up against either the Atlantic or Union Buildings Cos.

Very respectfully,

THE ATLANTIC BUILDING CO.,
By MYRON M. PARKER, *President.*

As the Government occupies only portions of these buildings, it was impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion as to the per cent paid to the owners of these properties, due to the fact that I was unable to ascertain what the cost of the quarters occupied by the Government in these buildings compared with the entire total cost of these structures. As the letter of Mr. Parker purports to throw light upon this matter, it might not be amiss for the information of the House to incorporate into the RECORD the conclusion he reaches as set forth in his letter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is about all the report I have to make, but under the leave to print I wish to insert the following table:

*Statement showing data in relation to rented buildings of the department.*

| Name or location of building. | Character of building. | Number of rooms. | Occupied by— | Occupied as— |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Atlantic Building, 930 F Street NW.[1] | Old brick office building (8 stories) | 162 | Forest Service | Offices. |
| 913 E Street NW. (rear) [1] | 1-story building in alley | 1 | ....do | Work shop. |
| Star Building, third floor [2] | Third floor modern granite fireproof office building | 13 | Bureau of Animal Industry. | Offices animal husbandry. |
| Star Building, Nos. 410 and 411 [2] | (See above) | 2 | Bureau of Entomology | Offices forest insects. |
| Star Building, No. 409 [2] | (See above) | 1 | ....do | Offices chestnut bark disease. |
| Munsey Building, Rooms 914, 915 [2] | Modern granite fireproof office building | 2 | Bureau of Animal Industry. | Offices meat inspection field work. |
| Munsey Building, Rooms 622–627 [2] | (See above) | 6 | Bureau of Plant Industry | Offices chestnut bark disease. |
| Globe Building, 339 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.[1] | Old 4-story brick building of warehouse construction | | ....do | Congressional seed distribution and storage. |
| 224 Twelfth Street SW.[1] | 3-story brick, double building | 36 | ....do | Offices farm management. |
| 216 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 6-story and basement modern fireproof laboratory building. | 98 | Bureau of Chemistry | Offices and laboratories. |
| 212–214 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | Old 3-story brick residence | 18 | ....do | Supplies, distribution and storage. |
| 215 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 4-story, basement, brick building for warehouse purpose | 17 | Division of Publications | Offices storage and mailing. |
| 1304–1306 B Street SW.[1] | Double brick structure; 3 stories and basement | 31 | Bureau of Plant Industry | Offices forage-crop investigation, seed distribution, and laboratory. |
| 1316 B Street SW.[1] | Modern 3-story brick structure | 19 | Office of Solicitor | Offices files and storage. |
| Fourteenth and B Streets SW.[1] | 4-story and basement brick building; remodeled and fireproof. | 23 | Office of Public Roads | Offices and laboratories. |
| 220 Fourteenth Street SW.[1] | Modern fireproof 6-story and basement office building | 39 | Plant Industry and Experiment Stations. | Offices storage cotton machinery. |
| 221 Linworth Place SW.[1] | Modern brick and concrete fireproof warehouse; 5 stories and basement. | 28 | Bureaus of Plant and Animal Industry. | Offices warehouse, cotton and paper work. |
| 1228 C Street SW. (rear)[1] | Old 1-story and loft stable | | Office of Pubic Roads | Storage. |
| 220 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 3-story brick warehouse, remodeled | 21 | Insecticide and Fungicide Board. | Offices and laboratories. |
| Seventh and K Streets SW.[1] | Old warehouse | 7 | Exhibits and Bureau of Soils | Exhibit material and soils storage. |
| Union Building [2] | Old office and warehouse | 7 | Statistics, Entomology, and Plant Industry. | Storage and offices. |

| Name or location of building. | Floor space. | | Annual rental. | Annual rental. | | Date of first lease. | Owner or lessor. | Assessed value of building and grounds. | Per cent, gross, on separate properties. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Net. | Gross. | | Net. | Gross. | | | | |
| | *Sq. feet.* | *Sq. feet.* | | | | | | | |
| Atlantic Building, 930 F Street NW.[1] | 35,658 | 54,600 | $24,805 | $0.69 | $0.45 | July 1,1901 | Atlantic Building Co | $128,670 | ..... |
| 913 E Street NW. (rear). [1] | 1,470 | 1,470 | 270 | .18 | .18 | Nov. 1,1902 | Emmons S. Smith | 12,344 | ..... |
| Star Building, third floor [2] | 2,680 | 3,342 | 3,200 | 1.19 | .957 | Nov. 1,1912 | Evening Star Newspaper Co., Fleming Newbold, business manager. | 383,190 | ..... |
| Star Building, No. 410 and 411 [2] | 540 | 540 | 700 | 1.296 | 1.296 | Nov. 16,1912 | ....do | 383,190 | ..... |
| Star Building, No. 409 [2] | 250 | 250 | 300 | 1.20 | 1.20 | Apr. 5,1913 | ....do | 383,190 | ..... |
| Munsey Building, Rooms 914, 915 [2] | 366 | 366 | 420 | 1.15 | 1.15 | July 1,1909 | F. A. Walker, agent | 500,170 | ..... |
| Munsey Building, Rooms 622–627 [2] | 1,100 | 1,100 | [3]1,260 | 1.14 | 1.14 | Apr. 1,1913 | Frank A. Munsey | 500,170 | ..... |
| Globe Building, 339 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.[1] | 33,000 | 40,000 | 4,800 | .145 | .12 | Sept. 1,1912 | Weaver Bros., for R. W. Shoppell, Washington, D. C. | 30,476 | 0.10¾ |
| 224 Twelfth Street SW.[1] | 8,380 | 12,360 | 2,500 | .298 | .20 | Dec. 22,1902 | J. H. Bradley Co | 17,332 | .9+ |
| 216 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 50,350 | 59,000 | 16,000 | .319 | .271 | Mar. 8,1909 | Nicholas H. Shea | 97,861 | .10¼+ |
| 212–214 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 7,200 | 8,600 | 1,320 | .183 | .153 | Dec. 1,1894 | Nicholas H. Shea and James W. Shea; Nicholas H. Shea. | 16,024 | .054+ |
| 215 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 15,340 | 19,390 | 5,000 | .326 | .258 | Mar. 1,1905 | William H. H. Allen and Charles William Ricketts. | 21,287 | .15+ |
| 1304–1306 B Street SW.[1] | 11,386 | 13,530 | 2,500 | .218 | .185 | Sept. 1,1901 | Tyler & Rutherford | 16,449 | .10+ |
| 1316 B Street SW.[1] | 6,230 | 7,884 | 2,160 | .346 | .274 | May 1,1904 | John M. Beavers | 11,789 | .12+ |
| Fourteenth and B Streets SW.[1] | 13,100 | 15,140 | 3,500 | .267 | .231 | July 1,1900 | R. Harrison Johnson | 29,415 | .10+ |
| 220 Fourteenth Street SW.[1] | 51,000 | 60,000 | 20,000 | .392 | .33 | Aug. 28,1912 | Western Investment Co., F. T. Nesbit, manager. | 115,099 | .12+ |
| 221 Linworth Place SW.[1] | 19,000 | 21,600 | 5,400 | .284 | .245 | June 1,1906 | Sidney Bieber | 30,630 | .11+ |
| 1228 C Street SW. (rear)[1] | 1,000 | 1,195 | 144 | .14 | .12 | Aug. 1,1907 | Heirs at law of J. A. Harvey, deceased. | 3,520 | .027+ |
| 220 Thirteenth Street SW.[1] | 8,470 | 9,900 | 3,000 | .35 | .30 | Apr. 14,1913 | Charles W. Darr and Julius I. Peyser | 17,234 | .116+ |
| Seventh and K Streets SW.[1] | 8,110 | 8,280 | 600 | .074 | .072 | June 1,1913 | George E. Walker | 16,393 | .024 |
| Union Building [2] | 3,729 | 3,729 | 1,398 | .375 | .375 | May 1,1912 | Union Building Co., M. M. Parker, president. | 184,450 | ..... |
| Total | 278,359 | 342,276 | 99,277 | .357 | .289 | | | | |

[1] Occupied wholly by Government. [2] Occupied in part by Government. [3] See appropriation bill 1914, p. 29, "Special appropriation for rents."

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I will say that my investigation leads me to the fact that the Government is paying yearly for the use of the Agricultural Department, all buildings considered, a rental of $100,000, and these buildings are scattered over a considerable area and in different sections of the city. Assuming that the Government can borrow money at 2½ per cent, it might be wisdom and sound business policy to construct its own buildings in close proximity. Certainly this would facilitate and expedite the work of the Agricultural Depart-

ment. In many respects the Agricultural Department is the greatest department of the Government. It has grown by leaps and bounds, and its beneficent and far-reaching influences can not be too zealously encouraged, fostered, and supported. From this department no reasonable amount of money should be withheld to enable it to evolve its maximum efficiency. It is an old aphorism, but nevertheless true, that the farmer is the producer of the wealth of our country, and to improve his status and to promote his efficiency we should deal with him in a manner generous and unstinted.

The ramifications of the different branches of the Agricultural Department spread out like a network over the entire length and breadth of our country. Either direct or indirectly, it touches every phase of human endeavor. Sooner or later all are benefited by this department. In a sense it is the leaven in the lump that permeates the whole commercial, industrial, agricultural, social, and political mass. The different activities of this branch of the Government reach out like invisible fingers to touch the highest and the lowest, from the cottage or the humble home upon the mountainside to the prince in the palace, surrounded by all the appointments and trappings of the rich.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the basis of all wealth. When the man who wields the hoe and follows the furrow cast up by the plow dwells in peace and plenty prosperity radiates into every vocation, avocation, and calling of man, whether agricultural or otherwise. Likewise, when the seasons are against him and Mother Earth fails to yield her fruits to his endeavor, the rigors of poverty are felt throughout the land. When the soil fails, want encroaches.

While, Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, I do not think the rents paid by the Government for the buildings used by this department are excessive, I am convinced that the work of the Department of Agriculture would be infinitely bettered by permanent housing under one roof. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, we have had practically no information up to the time of his very illuminating statement as to these rent items. There is absolutely nothing in the hearings and there is absolutely nothing in the report, and I personally am very grateful to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] for his very elucidating statement.

I am opposed, as a general proposition, to the practice of renting buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the various bureaus and departments of the Government. As the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas shows—and he has evidently prepared it with great care—we are paying on the actual value of the property we are renting an equivalent of 10 per cent. In other words, we are paying for these rattletraps, not particularly suited to the use of the bureaus, every 10 years——

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. The gentleman means 10 per cent gross?

Mr. ANDERSON. Ten per cent gross; yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Taxes and insurance and overhead charges and deterioration, and matters of that kind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, the gentleman refers to insurance, overhead charges, and things of that character. The gentleman knows, as everyone knows, that the Government is now paying, under the sacred half-and-half plan, one-half of the taxes of the District of Columbia. Of course, when we pay the rent of these buildings, in addition to paying our proportionate share under the half-and-half plan, we are also paying the insurance on the building and the taxes on the building which have to be paid by the private owners of the building, because in renting the buildings to us they are taking into consideration the fact that they are obliged to pay taxes for the support of the District government on the building and also for the insurance.

Now, the Government can borrow money at about 3 per cent. It is paying interest on the money invested in these buildings at approximately 10 per cent gross. There certainly can be no possible economy in that sort of a proposition. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] also refers to the fact that the Department of Agriculture is paying lower rents than are paid by any other department of the Government. I have no doubt that that is true. They are paying at a smaller ratio, a less rate, than any other department of the Government.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not consent to that statement going into the RECORD unchallenged, because I have investigated that matter myself, and I am certain the department is now paying more rent than individuals do in that vicinity. I refer to B Street, opposite the department.

The buildings in that vicinity are now rented at from thirty to fifty dollars a month. A larger building than a 16-room building is rented at $75 a month; and, according to the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY], the department is paying from 16 to 25 cents a foot, while the individual pays from 10 to 15 cents per square foot. That is the information that comes to me from the people who hire buildings in that vicinity.

Mr. JACOWAY. Has the gentleman gone into all the neighborhoods where these buildings are located, or is this but an isolated case?

Mr. HAUGEN. On Virginia Avenue and on B Street, in that vicinity. I also wish to say that valuation of property is no basis upon which to compute the amount of rent. The only basis you can take is the rent paid by the adjoining tenants.

Mr. JACOWAY. The gentleman misquotes me. I never said that the rent paid by the Department of Agriculture is less than the individuals pay. I said it was less, as compared with the departments other than the Department of Agriculture, according to my investigation.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the gentleman's statement, but I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] did not quite understand the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas. The gentleman from Arkansas stated that the Government paid less rent where buildings were jointly occupied. As to the rent paid on B Street, no comparison was made.

Mr. JACOWAY. I said, as compared with other departments in that vicinity.

Mr. HAUGEN. On B Street?

Mr. JACOWAY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. What other department hires buildings in that vicinity?

Mr. JACOWAY. I could not name them, but I think they are in the record here.

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not think the gentleman can name any of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think I understood the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY]. The statement was, as I remember it, that the Department of Agriculture, or the bureaus of that department, were paying a lower rate of rent than was being paid by other departments and bureaus of the Government.

That statement may be true. I have no doubt that it is true. But it is not necessarily a fair comparison, because the rate of rent would necessarily be dependent on the location of the building, and I think it will be admitted by everyone that the Department of Agriculture is located in a section in which the rents are as low as they are anywhere in the city. If the Department of Agriculture is getting rents at a lower rate than other departments of the Government, it is doing no more than it ought to do under the circumstances.

But the point that I was trying to bring out particularly, Mr. Chairman, was the lack of economy which the report presented by the gentleman from Arkansas illustrates. In other words, it is a situation under which we are, in effect, purchasing the old rattletraps now rented by the Government, ill suited, many of them, for the purposes of the departments, and paying for them in the gross every 10 years, and then we do not own the buildings. It would be much better to use the credit of the Government to build buildings for the use of the departments, because in that way we would not only economize but we would be able to furnish buildings suitable and convenient for the purposes for which they are to be used.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that, so far as I am personally concerned, I do not believe that the Government of the United States ought to be renting buildings at all. It is a false idea of economy. No business man who is engaged in business for himself would rent buildings under the same circumstances as the Government of the United States is renting them to-day.

I have intended for some time to look into this question myself, not only in reference to the Department of Agriculture, but in reference to other departments of the Government, but my time has been engaged otherwise, and I have not had the opportunity to do so. I intended to make that investigation for the purpose of calling the attention of the House of Repre-

sentatives to the amount of rent that is being paid by the Government in the District of Columbia.

Now, as was stated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] a few moments ago, the Department of Agriculture, in comparison with other departments of the Government, is paying a less rent than is being paid by any other department for buildings rented, and so far as economy can be practiced the Department of Agriculture is exercising that economy.

The Committee on Agriculture is not responsible for this rent situation. We can not help ourselves, because of the fact that we have no jurisdiction to provide for the construction of buildings. When the department has to have buildings as a matter of necessity to carry on the business of the department they must go out and rent them or lease them to the very best advantage possible. When the leases are made and the obligation is incurred, then the Committee on Agriculture is compelled to provide the appropriation to meet those obligations. That is exactly what we have done in this bill. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has jurisdiction in reference to the construction of buildings.

This building that has been erected over there, with the two wings, as have been referred to, and a hole between them, as expressed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], was erected a few years ago. There are two wings to it. The two wings were constructed at the same time, and one remarkable thing about it is that they absolutely dug down into the ground and put one story of each one of those buildings beneath the ground. Why that was done I have not found out, and I do not know to-day and I do not think anybody else knows.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman does think they should supply that center?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The plans provide, as I understand, for a court, to include this center; and if constructed in accordance with the plans it would practically house all the employees of the Department of Agriculture. That is what ought to be done. The Department of Agriculture ought to have sufficient buildings in which to transact its business, and I say that every other department of this Government in the city of Washington ought to have sufficient buildings in which to transact its business, close together and with convenience, because when so situated it will be economy in the end.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. In a moment. So long as "Uncle Sam" has the money he can afford to construct the buildings, and if he has not the money he can get it at such rates of interest as will justify him in making the expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to ask me a question?

Mr. COOPER. I can answer the gentleman's question as to why those buildings were put somewhat lower than the surface of the soil.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That has been a matter of inquiry by many people.

Mr. COOPER. The explanation is very simple. The Burnham Commission plan provides for what European and American experts have declared will be, when completed, the most magnificent avenue in the world—that is, an avenue extending from the foot of the Capitol straight to the river, having on its sides the Department of Agriculture, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, and other splendid structures; in its center the monument to George Washington, at its end on the river the memorial to Abraham Lincoln, and beyond that the Memorial Bridge to Arlington. The whole conception of this avenue is magnificent—Arlington, the bridge, Lincoln, Washington, the Capitol.

There must be scientific grading to make such an avenue, and for this the Burnham Commission plan provides. These buildings are all constructed—the wings of the Agricultural Department building and the Museum—with that end in view.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. There is no excavation at the Museum, is there?

Mr. COOPER. There does not have to be any, because that is considerably lower. It is downhill from the other building.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the idea is that the high ground which now surrounds these two buildings will be cut away.

Mr. COOPER. Will be cut away and leveled.

Mr. HAUGEN. The object is to cut down all the ground in that vicinity, is it?

Mr. COOPER. The object is to make a magnificent avenue through there, and, of course, that necessitates proper grading.

Mr. HAUGEN. About how many hundred feet wide?

Mr. COOPER. The roadway would not be very wide.

Mr. HAUGEN. Several hundred feet.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] for this information. I am sure it will be read with interest by many people.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] as to the adoption of plans of construction of the wings of the Agricultural Department Building. If what he says is exactly true—and I have no doubt but he makes the statement believing it to be true—it clears up a matter which has been seriously in doubt. It has been charged—I am glad the charge is now cleared away—that individuals and associations interested in real estate in that part of the city objected to the construction of buildings so high as to overshadow other buildings erected or to be erected by private enterprise in that vicinity. I am glad to know that the sinking of these buildings away down in a hole was done not at the behest of individuals or associations interested in real estate in that vicinity but in accordance with a general plan established and later to be carried out.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I happened to be before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds two or three days ago when that very matter was discussed before that committee. Col. Harts, the Army officer, who is superintendent of public buildings and grounds, was before the committee, and he said that there would be an avenue beginning at the Grant monument and extending clear over to the river, this avenue to be 900 feet wide, and that the Agricultural Building was on the south line of that particular avenue.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; and that they gave up 10 feet of this avenue in order to put the department building where it is. The first proposition was to put it over in a hole in the other corner of the grounds.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am willing to accept the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and will not make any further suggestion of improper influence exerted at the time these buildings were sunk half their height in the ground. I wish to say a word in regard to the rent the department is paying on the buildings that it is occupying. I have given some attention to that, and it seems to me there is only one piece of property rented by the department the rent for which is objectionable, and that is the property occupied by the Forestry Service on F Street, between Ninth and Tenth Streets. I have never been able to see good reason why that building, in the busiest section of the city, where rents are highest, should be occupied for offices of the Department of Agriculture. The only explanation I have heard is that at the time the Forestry Service was organized and must be located there was no available building in any cheaper part of the city; that it seemed necessary at that time to occupy that building, although the rent was very high and much more than the Government ought to pay now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the rent is, but the gentleman knows that on that same street and paying proportionately, I suppose, the same rent for equal facilities, are the Geological Survey, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and there used to be the Bureau of Statistics and several other governmental offices.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the Department of Commerce in the Willard Building on Fourteenth Street, opposite the Willard Hotel.

Mr. MANN. I did not suppose the upper floors of those buildings would be any more expensive now than buildings in any other part of the city.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. My understanding is that the rent of that building occupied by the Forestry Service is very high. I believe it is the highest per square foot of any rent paid by the Federal Government, at least by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman know how much is paid per square foot?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] has a table showing all these figures. I do not have the figures in mind, but I make the statement that the highest rent paid by the Department of Agriculture is for the building on F Street occupied by the Forestry Service. I believe it is due the Department of Agriculture to say, if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] has not already said it, that the terms of the leases now made by the department are very favorable indeed. They contain clauses permitting the cancellation of the leases, and, although the leases are made for long

terms, they can be canceled at the end of any year as the years go by.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This building on F Street has been occupied by the Forestry Service for many, many years; I do not know how long, but ever since I have been here, and that is quite a while.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism to offer of the department, but I believe the reports brought in suggest to the committee that this matter should be investigated. I believe the department is paying a much higher rent than is paid by tenants in that vicinity. My information comes from reliable parties, and I believe there can be no question about the fact that the department is paying a higher rent than other tenants are in that vicinity, though there may be some reason for that. I am not now in position to say, and do not criticize the department; but I beg to suggest to the committee that the matter should be investigated. The comparison made of rents paid by other departments has nothing to do with the matter, because the other departments are located elsewhere, and we should compare the rents paid in that particular vicinity. I fully agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. I believe that all the employees of this department should be housed under one roof. They ought to be given fireproof buildings, well lighted and ventilated. The comfort of the people employed ought to be taken into consideration as well as economy. I believe it would be a matter of economy to construct suitable office buildings, and knowing something of the interest of the chairman of the committee in securing the greatest economy and having justice done everywhere, I have full confidence that he will see that the matter is given attention and due consideration.

Mr. LEVER. Does not the gentleman think that it would be a very good idea to have a special committee of this House appointed to investigate the whole subject of rents on the part of the Government, not only in the Agriculture Department but in the War Department, the Post Office Department, and all other departments of the Government, and that such committee be authorized to make report to Congress with such suggestions as it might think wise?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would be in full accord with the suggestion of the gentleman, and also the suggestion made yesterday, that a commission or a committee be appointed to investigate as to all departments in regard to the duplication of work and waste of money year after year, to correct errors over which no committee has control. The only way it can be remedied is by cooperation of the various committees.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that the Committee on Agriculture has no authority except to call witnesses in reference to making appropriations for that department. It seems to me that a committee specifically authorized to take testimony, swear witnesses, and investigate the whole proposition of rents from the governmental standpoint in the city of Washington might be able to save to the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars in the way of rent.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think that is a good suggestion, and I hope it will be carried out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would not take the floor except for the suggestion of the gentleman from South Carolina. He suggests that there should be a special committee of the House appointed for the purpose of investigating the subject of rents paid by the Government, and with the implied proposition that they should recommend the building of buildings by the Government itself. We have a very efficient committee of this House now with complete and full jurisdiction of that subject. They not only have jurisdiction, but they frequently exercise it. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has at various times in the past investigated the subject of the rents paid by the Government, what buildings could properly be built by the Government and save money, although I think they have never been able to discover many instances where buildings built by the Government would be profitable as far as economy was concerned.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman ever given any thought to the suggestion that instead of having a magnificent architectural building for the purpose of office work it would be wise economy to have an ordinary office building, such as is used by private establishments?

Mr. MANN. I have, and I think that is impracticable and impossible however much the gentleman from South Carolina and I might favor it.

Here is the Bureau of Engraving and Printing just erected. After we had authorized it, after we had commenced work, after they had let the contracts, it was held up a year or two for the purpose of getting Congress to appropriate more money to build it out of marble instead of stone. They want monumental buildings. If the gentleman gets a building in his town, he wants a monumental building. All the buildings we build throughout the country are monumental buildings. You could duplicate the buildings throughout the country and get twice the amount of space for the same amount of money.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is true.

Mr. MANN. But that never will be done. A conspicuous instance of how new Government buildings are constructed is the building for the Department of Agriculture, which has just been built. We authorized a building for the Agricultural Department, intending to have one building properly placed. What was done? First, they decided to build two wings, although the law provided for a building. They decided to build two wings, and they wanted to put them on the surface of the ground where they belonged, but along came gentlemen who had been connected with the Burnham Commission, and insisted that they should be put 10 or 20 feet below the surface of the ground, because they said the Government some day would dig away all the ground surrounding them, which is never likely to be done, and the President ordered the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture, over the wishes of the committee, to have the building constructed in that manner.

Mr. LEVER. In other words, we have this enormity over there on account of the use of the big stick.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can be assured that Congress will never authorize any other Agricultural Department building located in connection with those two buildings, with the first floor way below the level of the surface, expecting some day, 50 or 100 years from now, that they will dig away the ground so as to give proper light and air to that lower story.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that Congress will never do it with my vote.

Mr. MANN. Then what is the use of talking about the subject or having a commission appointed. The Public Buildings Committee has reported a bill for a Department of Justice building to cost $3,000,000. It may be a good thing. I presume it is. Every once in a while we build a new building, but the Government service grows so rapidly that you will never be able to get out of renting buildings.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume very much time, but I do desire to say that it does seem to me that the Government is wasting millions of dollars in the city of Washington in the character of the buildings that are being erected for officing its force. I believe that if we would adopt a plan of building skyscrapers, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] for offices, we could save millions of dollars. Yet I appreciate the fact that Washington is the Capital city of the Nation and that our buildings should probably be of a monumental and architectural type, representing the best architecture in the country.

We are spending a great deal of money for rent, and if there could be any plan worked out to save money it ought to be worked out.

Mr. HAUGEN. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the building occupied by the Pension Department is not in line with the monumental buildings.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; and the Government Printing Office also.

Mr. Chairman, without pursuing this subject further, I trust there will be no more discussion of this rent proposition. My colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY] I think has presented a very comprehensive and lucid report which shows, not only great ability but great industry, and I desire on behalf of the whole committee to thank him and the subcommittee for his able presentation of the matter. [Applause.] I am glad to see this manifestation of approval of my statement in reference to my friend from Arkansas. He has been most attentive upon the work of the committee, attending all of its meetings, and has been of incalculable aid to me as chairman of the committee. I have come to rely very much upon his ability as a lawyer, his good horse sense, and his capacity for delving to the bottom of a proposition. I expect to see him grow rapidly in the esteem and confidence of this House, and these reasons induced me to make him chairman of the subcommittee to handle this delicate and most important matter of rents.

The Clerk read as follows:

Irrigation investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws of the States and Territories as affecting irrigation and the rights of appropriators, and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation, and upon the use of irrigation water at home and abroad, with especial suggestions of the best methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture, and upon the use of different kinds of power and appliances for irrigation, and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation, including the employment of labor in the city of

Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, supplies, and all necessary expenses, $106,400.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not share in a very usual complaint about duplication of work in the different departments. Undoubtedly there may be some duplication, but as a rule not. I would ask the gentleman if there is not some duplication, however, in this irrigation work in the Department of Agriculture? We now have in the Department of the Interior a very large Reclamation Service dealing with irrigation. Why is it not better qualified to investigate subjects relating to irrigation than the Department of Agriculture, which necessarily must obtain a good deal of its information from the Government reclamation projects?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that as far as I am informed there is no duplication of work as between the Department of Agriculture and the Interior Department in this irrigation work. I take it that the Department of Agriculture, on account of its knowledge of agriculture, should be better informed as to this line of work than would be engineers of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MANN. Here is a provision to report upon the laws as affecting irrigation and the right of appropriators, and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation. Those are subjects which necessarily must be considered by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. LEVER. That may be very true, and yet the expenditure for that work is a very small item in this bill.

Mr. MANN. And also upon the use of different kinds of power and appliances for irrigation. If there is any department that ought to know about that, and must know about it, it is the Reclamation Service, which is making use of these different kinds of power and appliances.

Mr. LEVER. But the gentleman, I think, will understand that the appliances referred to in this language would be appliances that affect agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. They are appliances that affect irrigation, getting water, not appliances that affect agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Getting water on a very small scale for agricultural uses.

Mr. MANN. Not necessarily.

Mr. ANDERSON. Pumps.

Mr. MANN. Pumps? The reclamation service is engaged in pumping water for irrigation purposes. I do not question that the work may be profitably done here, but why can it not be better done by the Reclamation Service, which has grown up so rapidly in the last few years?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the exact language:

With especial suggestions of the best methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture.

Mr. MANN. That is one portion of a very long paragraph. I have called attention to other portions to which it is not related.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. This item applies to other work in irrigation than those works constructed by the department. Farmers under the Cary Act project and all private projects could receive information under this.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, but the Reclamation Service must study these problems.

Mr. LEVER. That may be very true.

Mr. MANN. Why is it not better qualified to investigate and report on the subject than the Agriculture Department, which comes in and studies it anew?

Mr. LEVER. I was just about to add that while the Reclamation Service would study the proposition from an engineering point of view, the men employed under this language are studying the problem from an agricultural point of view.

Mr. MANN. So is the reclamation under all of these irrigation projects. It finds that the land gets saturated with water in some places—I forget the technical term that is used in respect to that—and the Reclamation Service has to study that. The Agricultural Department is also studying it. It may be that neither one of them has yet discovered the proper remedy, and that there is no harm in having them both study it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois makes the statement upon knowledge of the facts, as he usually does, that the Reclamation Service is duplicating this work——

Mr. MANN. I did not say it was duplicating the work. It is studying what I have said it is studying.

Mr. LEVER. That would be duplication of work. I am very glad to have the information. I would like to see all of these lines of work concentrated under one director.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The work done by the Reclamation Service is primarily for the purpose of getting water on land, and, following that, to secure its removal by drainage, so that its passage through the land will not cause any damage—not leave the lands waterlogged or cause pools or swamps on any portions of the land under the project. After the Reclamation Service has got the water on the land and provided drainage to get the water off the land its function is ended. It may study these other questions about agriculture or the relation of the growth of plants to the lands simply as an aid to determine what they ought to do in the matter of drainage——

Mr. LEVER. And as an incident to their work.

Mr. HAWLEY. And as an incident to their work; but the irrigation work done under this item in the bill is for the purpose of illustrating to farmers how to use water, how much water to put on the land for a given crop, how much at a given time, at what season to put it on, and also to advise the farmer in the matter of appliances to determine how to distribute his water and also the matter of the construction of gates and ditches and the dividing of his land into sections, so that the water from one section may be carried to another; and if the water is alkaline, how it may be drawn off, so that the alkaline deposits will not cause damage to the land.

The Agricultural Department studies those questions simply from the standpoint of growing the crops on the land. It only takes up the engineering features in a very minor way in order to determine for the farmers how to get the water distributed on their lands and to get it off again when it has been used.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. BORLAND. My understanding is the Reclamation Service, after it got some of these projects started, was unable to get the farmers to successfully use the land.

Mr. HAWLEY. The farmers had difficulties in farming the lands.

Mr. BORLAND. And in order to encourage the farmers to use the water in this direction they established some sort of agricultural experimental institutions.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; experimental farms.

Mr. BORLAND. Was that originally inaugurated by the irrigation people themselves?

Mr. HAWLEY. It was done at the request of the people, I think.

Mr. BORLAND. Is this the same work?

Mr. HAWLEY. That work is only a small portion of this work.

Mr. BORLAND. My understanding was it was to be taken out from under the Reclamation Service, not being under their jurisdiction, being engineering, and put in under the Agricultural Department. Is that true?

Mr. HAWLEY. The experiment farms, so far as I know, are put under the Department of Agriculture, and we provide for them year after year.

Mr. BORLAND. Are those covered in this item?

Mr. HAWLEY. They would probably be included in this.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment. I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri that we have appropriated in this to do demonstration work on these reclamation projects.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is not in reference to the farms he speaks of.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman from Oregon when he was answering questions of others, but I would like to know now if he can tell how much it costs per acre to prepare and irrigate land?

Mr. HAWLEY. That would depend entirely upon the nature of the soil, what slope it had, and many other factors that enter into it which make it difficult to give an estimate.

Mr. MOORE. I have heard it reported that it costs approximately $40 an acre.

Mr. HAWLEY. On the Klamath project, with which I am more intimately acquainted, it costs $30 an acre, but it is almost all a gravity system.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from South Carolina discussed yesterday the duplication of appropriations, which the gentleman probably heard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is this work which you are now providing for covered by any other bureau of the Government?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not that I know of.

Mr. MOORE. What does it mean—this $106,400 for furnishing legal information to men who start irrigation projects?

Mr. HAWLEY. It is for the study of questions of farming under irrigation; as to how the water should be used and the time it should be used, the amount of water for different kinds of crops and the effect of its use on the growing of crops, and the drainage of the water off at different seasons. How much and when there should be irrigation for certain crops; and all questions connected with the growing of crops under irrigation where water is placed on the land by artificial means, and so they may study the laws and know what they can do within the limits of the State laws in regard to the appropriation of water. But the amount expended under that, as I say, will be infinitesimal.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman said in the earlier part of his remarks that this would come under the head of demonstration work, but this paragraph provides for—

a report upon the laws of the States and Territories as affecting irrigation and the rights of appropriators and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation.

Now, does that mean we are to employ lawyers to advise farmers or those who manage irrigation projects how they are to conduct their business?

Mr. HAWLEY. It seems to me that in the work of aiding in the solution of these problems the department will necessarily have to know these facts, would have to know the laws of the States, so as to advise the farmers correctly. The gentleman will understand that this part is infinitesimal, and probably will be done by the solicitors of the Department of Agriculture, without employing any additional assistance.

Mr. MOORE. How many men would be employed to furnish this information to the farmers?

Mr. HAWLEY. I should say there would not be any others but the solicitors employed in the department.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know how many there are there?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not.

Mr. MANN. In the Department of Agriculture? Why, there are more than you can count on your fingers.

Mr. MOORE. It suggests itself to me that apparently this does not go into demonstration work. I have no special objection to demonstration work for the benefit of the farmer, but it seems to me we are going rather rapidly if we are to employ attorneys and furnish legal advice to people who start out on irrigation projects and advise them in regard to riparian rights or the rights of appropriators.

Mr. HAWLEY. No special attorney is employed for this work. The attorneys in the department already furnish the information that is needed.

Mr. MANN. There are 26 lawyers now in the department, in the Solicitor's office.

Mr. MOORE. Then that is not an "infinitesimal" number of men employed to furnish information. I call attention to the fact that we do not employ lawyers, so far as I know, to give legal advice to any branch of industry. We do not employ lawyers—I mean, the Government does not—nor do we make appropriations therefor, to tell people how to avoid accidents or how to bring suits for injuries as the result of their occupation in the mills.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. We employ lawyers in certain departments. For instance, in the Bureau of Mines, and the results of their work are incorporated in bulletins sent out by that department, so that legal information goes out along with the rest of it. And in the Bureau of Labor we have employed lawyers, and they have compiled many publications, giving a synopsis of the labor laws.

Mr. MOORE. Does this paragraph mean that if I buy a farm and a question of riparian ownership arises——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Does this mean that if I buy a farm and want to know something about my riparian rights or if I want to know something about the rights of irrigation, in a controversy with some one else, I can get that legal information from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MANN. I will suggest to the gentleman that if he will buy a farm any member of the Committee on Agriculture will give him all the information he wants—scientific, legal, or otherwise.

Mr. MOORE. If I was as well to do as the gentleman from Chicago is, and had as much love for agriculture as he has, which I dare say I have, without being able to indulge it, I would buy a farm. But I am not situated as is the gentleman from Illinois. He is most fortunate in having a little farm of his own, but he ought not to throw it up to one who has not.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say that if the gentleman is on a reclamation project, and various subjects being studied, including the legal phases of the use of water and riparian rights, and he should ask some demonstrator as to the rights he had and what the law was in the case, and the demonstrator knew, he would tell him, and ought to tell him.

Mr. MOORE. The difference is just this. I do not object to this item, because, as I have said many times, I want the farmers to have the value of all the appropriations and all good law they can get. But it does seem odd that in the case of a man who conducts an enterprise in a city, that much of the law we pass is employed to harass him and put him out of business. This is the first time I have learned that lawyers are employed by the Government to protect the settler in his riparian rights.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do you not think it is good work for a lawyer to do?

Mr. MOORE. If there is anything that we have not done for the lawyer, in adding to the confusion of laws, I have failed to see it since I have been in the House. I think we have done much for the lawyer and are continuing to do it all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Drainage investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes, and to prepare plans for the removal of surplus waters by drainage from such lands, and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on drainage, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, supplies, and all necessary expenses, $96,280.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move to strike out the last word. I notice in an examination of the estimates that this item is an instance of the rapid growth of the appropriations for the Agricultural Department. Less than 10 years ago, in 1906, we merely appropriated $37,100 for this item of service. It has almost trebled in 7 years, until it has now nearly reached the $100,000 mark.

I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee what is the necessity of carrying on this work year in and year out? It would seem to me that with all these appropriations that we have given to the Agricultural Department, which I understand is employed largely for engineers, a large part of them employed here, one-fourth of this amount being in salaries and administrative expense here in Washington, that some day or other they might be able to finish their investigations, at least to an extent that would permit of a reduction in the expenditure.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the fact that this item is said to have grown rapidly is not a criticism against the item. As a matter of fact, the item has been remaining stationary for about five or six years, as I recall it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman is in error as to that. It was $100,000 last year and $100,000 the year before that, but prior to that it was $78,000 or less.

Mr. LEVER. The chairman was not very much mistaken. It is a pretty close guess.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is still up to the $100,000 mark.

Mr. LEVER. It is not quite $100,000 now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, we do not consider $2,000 in a $100,000 item.

Mr. LEVER. We do not very much consider a difference of $20,000 either. The gentleman will realize, of course, that all the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture have been rapidly increasing, and they have been rapidly increasing upon the suggestion of the House of Representatives; and when the House of Representatives has shown any disposition not to be generous in that respect, gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol have taken care of the situation. It has been only 27 years since the Department of Agriculture was organized, or about that length of time, when there were no appropriations at all. Now we are spending practically $19,000,000 a year. And it shows this: That the agricultural interests of this country have had vigilant and industrious Members of Congress to take care of them on the floor of this House. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to appropriate every dollar that I be-

lieve to be necessary for the promotion of the greatest industry of the people of the United States; an industry that takes care of the largest percentage of the people of our country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is an item for investigation and report. I would assume from that language that they would some day or other complete their investigation and report. Now, will the gentleman inform the committee and give us some information as to this specific item, as to the necessity for continuing this large appropriation for investigation and report upon drainage?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that there are hundreds of millions of acres of overflowed and swamp lands in the United States. The department is having each day an increasing demand for the use of its engineers in cooperating with local authorities to make surveys and suggestions as to the cost of the work of drainage after the survey has been made. The gentleman understands, of course, that the Department of Agriculture under this item does not do any actual drainage work, but only makes the survey, estimates the cost, and then retires from the field.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not only that, but it prepares the reports and illustrates them, and I presume, under the phraseology here, sends out bulletins.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that that language means bulletins of a general nature on the subject of drainage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more, inasmuch as the gentleman from South Carolina has occupied most of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LEVER. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. I will use an illustration in my own State, because I am more familiar with that than with any other. A former Representative—Mr. Ellerbe—of this body secured a drainage survey of a South Carolina district near Georgetown. The department sent its experts. They made their survey and submitted their estimates of cost, and then, as I said a moment ago, retired from the field. The local community did the actual work of drainage, in accordance with the plan submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

The result was the reclamation and opening for settlement of many thousand acres—I do not recall how many thousand acres—of the best land in the lower part of South Carolina. The land was divided into small farms of about 50 acres, I think, and immigrants from the East have come down there and purchased those farms and built up a truck business and established a splendid community where before there was nothing but underbrush and swamps and the like of that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any information furnished by the bureau as to when this work will be completed in the Southern States? I believe five-sixths of this work is being done in the Southern States.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know how the work is being distributed, because I do not carry it in my head, but the testimony taken before the committee shows that the surveys during the year 1913 covered 1,000,000 acres of land.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose when this work is likely to be completed, so far as the territory in which they are now engaged is concerned?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I will say that, if it is the will of Congress, this work will be of an indefinite nature.

Mr. STAFFORD. They will keep on indefinitely doing this character of work in the Southern States?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that there is more land subject to drainage in this country than is subject to any other kind of reclamation.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a great deal of land in the Northern States which is subject to drainage, but nothing seems to have been done for those lands——

Mr. BORLAND. There is more land in the Southern States subject to drainage than anywhere else——

Mr. STAFFORD. And I agree with the gentleman that it is a good project to make them utilizable for cultivation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina will proceed for two minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would not like it to go into the RECORD that five-sixths of this work is being done in the South unless the gentleman has positive information on the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I have before me the statement of the Department of Agriculture under this very item, and it gives seriatim the amount expended in the various States, and by glancing over those items the gentleman will see that five-sixths of the appropriation at least is expended in the Southern States. I do not believe the gentleman will gainsay the statement that there is as large a territory in the North suitable for drainage purposes as there is in the South.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman's statement is true—and I have no doubt it is, although I have not the facts at hand to dispute it, and would not attempt to dispute it if I had the facts—if the statement is true, it argues two propositions—first, that the former administration of this department, under Secretary James Wilson, was a nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration, so far as the South was concerned; and, second, it argues that Members from the South, realizing the great opportunities in their sections for development, have been, maybe, a little bit more enthusiastic and energetic in taking care of the interests of their sections than have been gentlemen from other sections of the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. There can not be any question of the statement of expenditures, which, I assumed, was fully within the knowledge of the chairman of the committee—that more than five-sixths of this work had been performed in the Southern States. The statement is here.

Mr. LEVER. I do not question that, and the reason for it is the reason I have suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] be allowed two minutes in which to answer a question I will propound.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] be allowed two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina that we have a great deal of swamp land in our State of Maryland, and I know of no work of consequence of this kind that has been done there. I would like to know how you get this work started, and how we could secure some survey in that region?

Mr. LEVER. If the people of a neighborhood interested in this work show some enthusiasm to follow up the work after the survey is made, I have no doubt the gentleman could get an expert from the department to go there and make a survey.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How would you get a survey? We have a great deal of this land near the city, and that breeds mosquitoes, of course, and we would like to get rid of them.

Mr. GARNER. This bill, you know, is simply in the interest of agriculture.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, I will say that this land is splendid land for agricultural purposes, and some of it has naturally drained itself and is being used for agricultural purposes. How do you get a survey for it?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will get his constituents—and I understand the gentleman's constituents include, or will shortly include, the whole State of Maryland——

Mr. LINTHICUM. I thank the gentleman for his compliment——

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will get them to organize a drainage district and make application to the Department of Agriculture, and make a showing that they are willing, after the surveys have been furnished, to follow them up with actual drainage, I do not think he would have any trouble in getting experts to make the survey.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, before this section is passed, I ask the gentlemen of this committee to agree to an amendment. I feel they should offer one for the committee increasing this appropriation. It is one of the most important appropriations carried in this bill. Some time since I introduced a bill

providing for an appropriation of $300,000 for drainage purposes.

The gentleman from Maryalnd [Mr. LINTHICUM] has asked some questions I will undertake to answer. I had the pleasure in my district of seeing one of these draining projects carried to successful completion. It created a great deal of enthusiasm in the district to see the process by which these swamp lands were being drained. It interested many men in the district who had any swamp land, and they came from 25 to 200 miles to see those great plows at work cutting channels and draining the swamp. After this drainage project was carried through successfully, I had repeated requests from my district for Government engineers, and I went to the bureau and almost begged for surveyors to go to my district and survey these lands and give these people an opportunity to drain the swamps, but for two years, since the first survey was made, I have obtained only two additional engineers to survey other projects. As I said, I have had numerous and repeated calls for help from the Government. I went to the department, but those in charge of this bureau would tell me, "We have not sufficient money; we can not send an engineer there to make the survey?"

From remarks made by other gentlemen who are interested in surveying these swamp lands and draining them, I believe that the able gentlemen of the committee, who are interested in every project that is succeeding as this one is succeeding, as everyone knows, should increase this appropriation. It ought to be at least $300,000 instead of $96,000. Gentlemen, give us at least $300,000. This Government should not delay support to the farmers of this country in draining swamp lands.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to make this observation: The suggestion has been made that most of this money is spent in the South, and it is true, no doubt, that most of it is spent in the South. The lands in the South, along the Mississippi River and along the Gulf of Mexico, are naturally on a lower level than the mountainous and higher lands of the North. But who is going to say that it is any more the duty of the South to bear the burden of the drainage of these particular lands than it is the duty of the owners of the lands of the North, on the higher ground, to bear the necessary burden incident to the removal of the flood waters that run down from the mountain peaks and cover the fields? So, while it is true that this land is low, while it is true that the alluvial lands of the Mississippi, for instance, need artificial drainage, it is just as true that the higher lands of the North need similar attention. So I think this is one of the biggest problems and one of the most important matters that can possibly be presented in an Agricultural appropriation bill. I am heartily in favor of granting as much money as may be necessary for this purpose.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact that we have spent about $70,000,000 in the arid portions of the West, most of which has gone to the North, and does not that far more than offset the very small amount of money that is going to the South, so that it should not create any sectional question on this floor?

Mr. BRYAN. Indeed, the people of the Northwest are very proud of the attention which the dry and arid plains in certain parts of the West and Northwest have received from the Reclamation Service, and the money that has been appropriated; so that I do not consider that this ought to be looked upon in any sense as a sectional matter. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in opposition to the motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember a year or two ago when this matter was under consideration on the Agricultural appropriation bill I offered an amendment to increase this appropriation so as to take care of these swamp and overflowed lands wherever they might be. That amendment was ruled out of order, and I think my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made the point of order. At least he had something to say about it, and he said this was intended for lands belonging to the Government, if I have a right recollection about the matter. Now it appears that this money has been used upon private lands. I do not know where we stand to-day on this proposition.

Mr. MANN. If my colleague will yield——

Mr. FOSTER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MANN. I reserved a point of order on one or two occasions on this item and another item in this bill, and stated that unless they could show that they were doing some good with this item on the next occasion I should make the point of order. I think they are doing good with this work. Gentlemen have referred to the fact that the appropriation is being used largely in the South. In many cases work is being done under this appropriation, which was done by organizations forming themselves into drainage districts in the North, where the land was more valuable after it was drained than it is in many of these places in the South. But we have undertaken to give paternal advice to all the farmers about everything they do——

Mr. FOSTER. So that since my amendment was offered and ruled out of order it has become the custom to use this fund upon private lands?

Mr. MANN. I think it is being used upon private lands. A good deal of this fund was used at one time upon State lands in Florida. There was a good deal of criticism in reference to something of the kind down there, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would not like to have the statement go into the RECORD that this fund is being used for the survey of private lands, except in this way: The fund is never used unless the people of a community get together and agree to pool their interests and organize themselves into a drainage district for the purpose of having a survey made. The fund has been used for surveys in a community sense and not for private lands.

Mr. MANN. It is private land as distinguished from Government land.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; private land as distinguished from Government land.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I meant.

Mr. MURDOCK. An individual could not get it done.

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am very much in favor of this proposition, because some of the best lands that have been reclaimed in the United States were formerly swamp and overflowed lands, and I think the Government can well afford to spend something for this work. I wish we might do more to help along in this good undertaking.

Mr. MADDEN. Does my colleague know whether any actual drainage work is done out of this fund?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand from statements made here that nothing is done except engineering work.

Mr. MADDEN. The Bureau of Entomology sometimes employs a thousand men in cutting brush.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that is for the purpose of getting rid of insects.

Mr. MADDEN. They cut brush—use axes and scythes in the actual work of brush cutting.

Mr. MURDOCK. On private property?

Mr. MADDEN. On private property, purely a local activity. It ought not to be done out of the Government appropriation. I wanted to know whether any of the expenditure out of this fund was for the actual work of draining.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all; and in reply to the suggestion which the gentleman has made I will say that in the fight against the brown-tail moth they have employed laborers for the purpose of cutting brush, in trying to prevent the spread of the brown-tail and gypsy moths, at certain seasons of the year. But I believe that expenditure is justified, because we do the same thing in regard to the cattle tick.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is justified. I do not think it ought to be allowed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to call attention to these matters because I am interested in it and tried a year ago to do something more, but at that time I was thrown overboard. I am glad to see that at this time more interest is taken in it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 60 to ask a question. There is a provision—

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws of the States and Territories as affecting irrigation and the rights of appropriators, and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation—

And so forth.

I desire to ask if there would be any objection to returning to line 25, so that I might offer an amendment to include "Indians as individuals or as tribes." That would be done for the purpose of eliminating a question of very serious import to the Indians. It was recommended by the department and stricken out of the Indian bill on a point of order. Some State laws are contrary to the laws of the United States on irrigation matters, and for the protection of the Indians there ought to be an investigation, and if this money is to be expended for this purpose I think some of it ought to go to the wards of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. I have had no opportunity to study that question, and I will say to the gentleman that I can not consent to

go back to it. If the gentleman will call my attention to it before making up the next bill, I will look into it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I shall be glad to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC ROADS.

Salaries, Office of Public Roads: One director, who shall be a scientist and have charge of all scientific and technical work, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $1,900; 1 clerk, class 4; 3 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, $1,500; 1 clerk, $1,440; 1 clerk or instrument maker, $1,440; 1 clerk or tabulator, $1,440; 1 clerk, $1,380; 2 clerks, at $1,320 each; 4 clerks, at $1,260 each; 3 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,200; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,000; 2 clerks, at $1,140 each; 2 clerks, at $1,080 each; 1 clerk, $1,020; 4 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 clerk, $900; 1 clerk or instrument maker, $1,200; 1 messenger or laboratory helper, $840; 2 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers, at $720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $660; 4 messengers, laborers, or messenger boys, at $600 each; 1 laborer or messenger boy, $480; 2 messenger boys, at $480 each; 2 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $53,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the increase in the compensation of the director.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting, in line 23, page 61, after the word "work," the figures "$4,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 23, insert, after the word "work," "$4,000."

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to reduce this to $3,000 or $2,000?

Mr. MURDOCK. If you have the votes. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice the appropriation for the office of director of good roads has been increased from $279,400 to $353,060, making an increase of $73,660. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what the special need is of this added appropriation for the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman to take that up when we have finished the statutory roll. All that increase is set out in the various items, and I will explain it as we come to it.

Mr. MADDEN. There are a number of new clerks in this item.

Mr. LEVER. No; we have added only one clerk; the others are all transfers from a lump sum, and is only a change of title.

Mr. MADDEN. They were in the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman a question. Has the committee taken into consideration the good-roads appropriation bill passed by the House, and which we hope will be passed by the Senate?

Mr. LEVER. The statutory roll? The department asked for one clerk or tabulator on account of the work which is being done in cooperation with the Post Office Department in respect to that item of $500,000 in the Post Office appropriation bill for Rural Delivery Service roads. The other item in the bill, general expenses, has been increased for the purpose of taking care of the anticipated legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the bill that has passed the House has been taken into consideration in providing for the general expenses of the road department?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management throughout the United States and for giving expert advice on this subject, $44,800.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What character of expert advice is expected to be obtained as provided for in this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the plan of the department is to give expert advice in the best method of road building, road management, and road maintenance through experts and lectures and by the method of personal contact.

Mr. FOWLER. In what way is the compensation to be given for that expert advice? By employing experts for any given length of time, or in what way is it to be done?

Mr. LEVER. Experts, of course, are provided for by the fund fixed in this bill.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to know how we get the benefit of the expert advice, and then how that advice is to be paid for.

Mr. LEVER. It is to be paid for by this appropriation. How else could it be paid? The advice is to be given in the form of lectures, personal contact in the way of demonstration, by the way of bulletins, and the usual ways of getting information to the people.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it proposed by the department to take in an expert, sit down, and counsel with him as a client would with his lawyer, get a diagnosis of the matter, and then charge for it?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. The work is done by sending out to the field these experts from the Department of Agriculture, who have the information that the department has gathered from time to time in its research work, and through these men carry the information to the people of the country who desire it.

Mr. FOWLER. Where the road building is being done?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the information I was after. If it is to be paid in that way, I can see no objection to it, but if it is to be used simply for the purpose of having some one dignified high enough to be called an expert just for counsel, I can see no use for it whatever.

Mr. LEVER. I would be as strongly opposed to it as the gentleman would, if I thought it was being expended in that way, but that is not the fact.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman means, then, that some man who is well versed in good road building is to be sent out where roads are being constructed in order to instruct the people as to the best method of construction.

Mr. LEVER. To supervise, for instance, the building of a mile of model road, or to come in contact with the county or township supervisor and give him information as to the best methods of building a road under local conditions, and as to the best methods of maintaining the road, and the gentleman understands that this is a very important factor; and in addition to this, information is given as to the best materials to be used, the kind of bridges and culverts to be built, and all of the various things that go into making a good road.

Mr. FOWLER. It is well known that there is not a general knowledge of how to construct good roads.

Mr. LEVER. That is true, and I think that lack of knowledge in this respect is costing the people of this country hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Mr. FOWLER. Probably millions wasted that way simply because of a want of knowledge how to construct a road.

Mr. LEVER. If we could confine the estimate to millions, and not carry it into hundreds of millions, I think we would be fortunate.

Mr. FOWLER. If the gentleman is making that kind of provision, to send out men who are thoroughly versed in the construction of good roads, I want to bid him Godspeed and say he could not do better work for the benefit of the people of this country.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will give me his attention, I can give him a concrete case right along the line he is inquiring about. Not a great while ago one of the counties in my district authorized the issuance of bonds in the sum of $100,000 for the construction of roads. The question at issue was whether or not the road materials out of which the roads could be constructed were accessible in that immediate vicinity. The Director of the Office of Public Roads, at my instance, sent one of these experts down there, who examined the materials at hand. He went through it very carefully and advised the officials of the county and the people with reference to it, and it was found that the roads could be constructed out of the very material they had right there, which saved thousands of dollars to these people.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, $145,000.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of making a few observations upon the manner in which the Office of Public Roads is being conducted as at present constituted. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that this office was created for the purpose of having the Government cooperate with the States, with the subdivisions thereof, and with the people of the States in the improvement of roads. A short time after I came to Congress it occurred to me that I might be able to give my people some valuable help in road improvement if I should send out to the road overseers and the teachers of my district bulletins upon the subject of road construction. I secured from the Office of Public Roads all of the available bulletins. I made a very careful examination of these bulletins, and I say to you gentlemen, that I found but two bulletins, one on the use of the split-log drag on dirt roads and the other upon the value of improved roads, that were of any practical benefit to the people out in my country. I found plenty of bulletins, but they all had reference to the building of high-grade, high-class roads. I found pamphlets issued on

dust prevention and on materials for binders on motor roads and things of that sort. The people of my country, and I may say the masses of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land, are not able to build these expensive boulevard roads, costing from $10,000 to $25,000 a mile. They are able and willing to build roads at a moderate cost, and are very anxious to get information as to how those roads can be constructed. They are not concerned as to the matter of dust prevention, but they want to know how to get rid of the mud. They can stand a little dust, but they would like to be informed as to the best method of constructing and grading to the end that the water may be kept off the road in the rainy season. The only criticism, and that is a serious one, which I have to offer against the management of the Office of Public Roads is that too much attention and too much money are given to high-class, expensive road building and not enough to road construction at moderate cost.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will ask the gentleman if in this bill we did not try to meet that question by inserting the language which he will find on page 63?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; we inserted in this bill the language—

Especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads.

We did that in order to meet this particular phase of the question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is that new this year?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the only criticism I have is that too much money is spent on expensive roads and not enough on dirt roads. This House has twice gone on record and has spoken by its votes to the people of the United States in favor of the building up of the country roads. I voice the sentiment of every member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I speak the opinion, I believe, of four-fifths of the Members of this House, when I say that national aid should be extended to the construction and maintenance of those roads which extend from the farmer's home to the market place.

Why was the Office of Public Roads made a part of the great Department of Agriculture? Was it intended that it should direct its efforts to the building of military roads? No; if that had been the purpose it would have been connected with the Department of War. Was it placed there for the purpose of building interstate highways over which to carry the commerce from State to State? No; if so it would have been placed in the Department of Commerce and would to-day, probably, be under the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not use all of that time, but I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his courtesy. Gentlemen, it was intended that the Office of Public Roads should be directed toward the improvement of those roads over which the products of the farm are carried to market, and for that reason it was made a part of the Department of Agriculture. Let us read what the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture says in his report:

What roads should be improved is a matter of great moment.

Now listen to this:

Unmistakably the roads of greatest economic and social importance are those over which the products of the farm can be taken to the nearest railway station and which minister to the entire economic and social needs of the community.

So you see, gentlemen, the Secretary of Agriculture says the market road is the important road, and his conclusions are the same as those of the House of Representatives itself.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman said that he sent various road bulletins to his constituents. Did the gentleman go any further in this matter in reference to roads with his constituents?

Mr. RUBEY. I said I found only two that I could send out, and I sent those out.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the gentleman get any results from them, did the gentleman ever hear from his constituency in reference to them?

Mr. RUBEY. I get many letters from my constituents. I have endeavored to induce the public-school teachers, 1,100 of them in my district, to teach the boys and girls of the schools the value of good roads, and I have sent out all the bulletins I could get, which I deem valuable to them, and have received many letters, and I know that much good work is being done by the teachers toward instructing the boys and girls the importance of building good roads.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the gentleman what would he do, if he had the right to do it in reference to this item, toward increasing its utility?

Mr. RUBEY. I do not think there is anything that can be done now, but I want to sound a warning, which I hope will reach the proper source, and that in the future we will get the results we desire without any legislation whatever.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is, the department will give some attention to the dirt and clay roads rather than the macadamized roads?

Mr. RUBEY. That is exactly what I am endeavoring to do—to impress upon those who have charge of the Office of Public Roads that the Congress of the United States believes in the building of country roads; and I believe that when they realize that they will follow out our wishes in the matter.

Just a word more, Mr. Chairman. There has been a great awakening in road building throughout the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture tells us that 10 years ago the States spent $2,000,000 for road building, and that in the year 1912 that sum had been increased to $43,000,000, an increase in 10 years of over 2,000 per cent, and there was even a greater increase in 1913. In my State alone it has been estimated that last year we spent $8,000,000 for the improvement of the roads. If, Mr. Chairman, in the midst of this great awakening the Director of the Office of Public Roads will cooperate with the people of the country, if he for a moment will lay aside his high ideals of high-priced roads and get away from the building of boulevards between cities and go out into the country among the plain people and assist them in road building, he will accomplish great results in the improvement of the roads in all parts of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the improvement of the transportation facilities of the country districts has become a vital necessity of the times. Good roads are imperatively demanded to articulate with the railways, and to connect and bring together the farm and the factory, the garden and the workshop, the food producers in the country and the food consumers in the towns, cities, and industrial centers.

We hear much to-day not only about the high price of food products but about the scarcity of the supply and the consequent high cost of living to the people who must depend upon others. Thus far we have been unable not only to solve the problem of high cost but to explain why high prices have not stimulated production and brought us an adequate supply. It would be presumptious for me to claim a full solution of this great problem, but I want to offer one reason for this economic condition and to suggest at least a partial remedy.

In order to understand the present it is necessary for us to know something about the past. In order for us to understand contemporaneous history we must know something about ancient, medieval, and modern history. In order to understand our system of government it is necessary to know something about the system of other Governments. And so, in order to understand the economic and industrial conditions of to-day, it is necessary for us to know something about the economic and industrial conditions of former days.

In the early history of our country every man produced enough with his own hands and under his own roof to supply all or a greater part of his wants, or his wants were supplied from the same crossroad, village, or city in which he lived. Every man provided all or a greater part of his own food supply—his vegetables, his meat, and even his milk. No matter whether a professional man, a business man, a laboring man, or skilled mechanic, he cultivated his own garden, raised his own meat, kept his own cow, or he obtained his supply from his next-door or near-by neighbor. In other words, production and consumption went on at the same place, and the vital necessity of transportation facilities between producer and consumer to enable them to live did not exist as it does to-day.

Now, looking at the present day we find that production and consumption are widely separated. We find that production goes on at one place and consumption at another place often remote and distant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Speaking of production going on in one place and consumption going on in another, does the

gentleman refer to the eggs that are being produced in such large numbers in China and being sent to this country?

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to answer you more fully when you have gotten the trend of my thought and when you can ask your question more intelligently. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, we find that the people in the towns and cities now live in flats and apartments and houses closely crowded together, without an open space for a garden, without the right under ordinances to feed animals within the municipal limits, and without the opportunity to keep a cow, to provide for the food supply. We find that every man except those living in the agricultural districts is wholly dependent upon others for all or a greater part of his food supply. We find that he must obtain this food supply regularly, promptly, and in small quantities at a time, as the food grows, ripens, and matures, to be of wholesome use. We find that he can not purchase his food supply in bulk, even if perishable articles could be preserved without being subject to exorbitant charges for storage and the rehandling of the same.

The food consumers in the towns and cities at the factories, mills, and workshops can not obtain the food regularly at frequent intervals and in small quantities as required for wholesome use at prices they can afford to pay, and the farmers and gardeners can not deliver the same at the time and in the quantities required and sell at reasonable rates. The farmer and gardener finds that the cost to market this produce as the same is required is as much, or almost as much, as the cost of its production.

Under these conditions a more extended and complete system of transportation has become an imperative necessity for the welfare of the people. Production and consumption must be again brought together by transportation and made to conform to the new and changed conditions under which we are living. The food supply must be made available to those who are dependent for food upon others. A system is imperatively called for which will make possible the delivery of food products regularly at frequent intervals and in small quantities, as the same may be needed and required for immediate consumption. The railroads can not and do not supply this want of transportation. The system must reach direct from the farm and garden gate to the markets and to the consumers' door in the towns and cities.

We find that under present economic conditions no transportation facilities exist for the carriage of the food supply from the food producers to the food consumers in the manner, at the time, and in the quantities required for economical and wholesome use. We find that for the want of such transportation facilities fruits rot in the orchards and vegetables decay on the farms and in the gardens, while the consumers in the towns and cities famish for the want of them and are compelled to pay exorbitant prices for an inadequate supply, and that fertile and productive land in the country lies idle or only partly cultivated and used except for the production of such food products as are not perishable and may be marketed in bulk.

We also find that individuals can not furnish this service of transportation required to meet this demand, but that the same presents a problem of cooperation and collective effort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. If you will get my time extended, I will. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I can not do that, but I want to say to the gentleman that the impeachment he makes of transportation is correct. The president of the Santa Fe Railroad discovered that situation along the line of the Santa Fe and has tried to remedy it, and will, to an extent, remedy it by supplying cars for less than carload lots of fruit and other products.

Mr. GRAY. I would appreciate your compliment more if you were not taking up my time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, while every man who produces food can not afford the great number of trips required to market his produce as the same is needed and required for wholesome use by consumers, one man, with one team, with one conveyance, can deliver for many at a low rate of carriage and delivery, and thereby sustain himself in such enterprise and perform a great public service.

To illustrate, let us suppose that there are 50 farmers or gardeners along a certain rural route out of a town or city, and that on a certain day each one of these farmers or gardeners has a surplus of one-half bushel of potatoes which he wishes to sell. For each one to deliver this one-half bushel of potatoes, 50 men with 50 horses and 50 wagons would be required for each to make the delivery to market or the consumer's door and the aggregated amount of time required by all would not only consume the profits of the whole amount, but would go far to consume the entire value of the 50 half bushels of potatoes. Instead of 50 men with 50 horses and 50 wagons, one man, with good roads, with one team and one wagon could make the delivery of the whole 50 half bushels of potatoes at such a charge that no one of the farmers or gardeners could afford to leave his work on his farm or in his garden for a single hour. Thus food production and consumption would be again brought together by transportation. But this is not all the economy that would be effected.

The man undertaking the transportation for all would be able to carry and deliver to the farmers and gardeners on the line along which he was performing the service their supplies from the railways, and the equilibrium in production and consumption would be restored and great economy and efficiency effected. The farmers and gardeners would be able, by reason thereof, to sell for less at a greater ultimate profit, and the food consumers of the towns and cities would be able to buy at lower prices better and more wholesome food.

Without such a transportation system connecting the country and rural districts with the towns and cities and by articulating with the railways the great food markets of the country there will continue a scarcity of food production and suffering for the want of an adequate supply. With good roads and the initiation of such a delivery system there would come a stream of fresh food products from the country daily to the towns, cities, and railway stations, the surplus there to be carried on by the railways to the great cities and food-distributing points. The stress of consumption would not only be relieved by an ample supply of food at reasonable cost, but production would be stimulated upon every farm and in every garden. Relief from the waste of individual delivery and transportation would invite and make profitable a full food supply and its distribution in accordance with the demand for wholesome use. Such is the imperative necessity for the improvement of the highways of the country to-day, and the great economy and efficiency that would be effected by such improvement and the transportation system that would be made possible thereby.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious to complete the consideration of this bill this evening. There are a number of very important items yet ahead of us. I will ask if the gentleman would not be willing to get unanimous consent to insert his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. GRAY. I would if I did not have a very important subject. I was not here when this good-roads proposition was considered, and I want to give even the chairman of the committee the benefit of my suggestions.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. But this demand for highway improvement is not confined to a special use or purpose.

There is an economic necessity generally for better roads throughout the country to-day. Every ton of freight carried on a railroad or transported on a ship must first be hauled over some part of a road, street, or highway. Transportation is a part of production, and the same economy is to be effected in the transportation of material to the manufacturing plant and from thence in a prepared state for consumption back to the people as in the operations and processes of finishing a product for ultimate use. Wasteful and inefficient transportation adds just as much to the increased cost of an article produced as the same waste and inefficiency in other stages and operations in production adds to its price to the consumer.

But there is even a greater and more vital necessity for the improvement of highways to facilitate and economize in transportation than in production by manufacture. Good highways are imperatively needed to-day to articulate with the railroad and steamship lines, and to connect and bring together the farm and the factory, the garden and the workshop, the food producers in the rural districts and the food consumers in the towns, villages, cities, and the great distributing markets. [Applause.]

Now, if I had three minutes more I would like to speak of the automobile proposition.

A MEMBER. Go ahead.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that automobile manufacturers are favoring the construction of one great interstate highway as against the improvement of the rural routes and the main roads leading out from the railway stations to the country districts. I do not know that this is true, but if it is true I believe the automobile industry is making a grievous mistake against its own interests. The automobile business is a legitimate industry and deserves to be substantially encouraged as such. Like every other legitimate business, the automobile industry can be best promoted and advanced by a just, fair, and equitable policy toward all the people. I believe that the automobile industry can and will prosper best under a policy of road improvement fair and impartial to the best interests of the masses.

The improvement of the rural routes and the main roads leading out from the railway stations into the country districts not only meets the requirements of a just and equitable policy toward all the taxpayers of the country, but will be to the best interests of the automobile industry. If the roads used by all the people all the time in their everyday and most important business affairs are improved, it will lead to the use of automobiles by all the people, all the time, on all the roads of the country for all their important business. The improvement of the rural routes will, in addition to this, lead to automobiles being used generally by mail carriers, and if a system of rural transportation is in time inaugurated over these roads, many automobiles instead of horses and wagons will be used. The automobile industry would not only prosper, but the business would leap and bound to keep pace with the new and increased use of automobiles by all the people, all the time, and upon all the roads of the country, in their traveling and transportation business. To build one great interstate highway would make a demand for a few large automobiles a part of the time, for a limited and special purpose only. The automobile industry would languish or fall far short of the expected development. A just and equitable policy toward all the people of the country would not only bring prosperity to them, but to all interests which must depend upon them for support, including the automobile industry.

While there is a demand for both the construction of a trunk-line interstate highway and the improvement of the rural routes and the main roads leading out into the rural districts from railway stations, it is evident that the country can not undertake and complete both of these systems at the same time. The interstate system is demanded more for the purpose of special travel and touring, while the improvement of the rural routes and roads leading out from the railway stations is demanded more as a pressing and economic necessity of the times. Both systems will be eventually taken up and completed. Business, however, to supply the everyday needs of the people to live, must take precedence over recreation, and the stern realities of life must be given higher consideration than matters of pleasure and pastime. While I favor both of these road systems as necessary to meet the demands of the times for travel and transportation, I will first favor the improvement of rural routes and the roads leading out from the railway stations, as the same are used by all the people all the time in all their everyday important business affairs, as well as for local travel; and while the interstate highways will be improved along with all the other roads, their ultimate completion will follow in the natural order of things in the development of the country, and will, with the network of the rural routes and the roads leading out from the railroads, become a part of one great complete system of improved highways.

The next question, after conceding the power of Congress to improve the highways of the several States and realizing the necessity of improved rural transportation facilities, is the expediency of entering upon such a policy by appropriations from the Federal Treasury. It is conceded that under our system of indirect taxation by the General Government for every $1 which goes into the Federal Treasury more than $3 is paid by the taxpayer as a part of the increased cost of the article upon which the tax is levied. Therefore the cost to the taxpayer for the improvement of roads by the Federal Government will be more than such improvement when made by appropriations from direct taxes levied by the several States, under which every dollar collected from the taxpayers goes into the State treasury. Looking at the question from this viewpoint, road building by the General Government will be far more burdensome upon the taxpayers of the country than if the same expenditures were made from treasuries of the several States.

But this advantage in direct taxation may never be more fully appreciated in the future than it has been in the past, nor the advantage more readily accepted by the people of the country generally, and the payment of $1 by direct taxation, of which the taxpayer is plainly conscious, may continue to be regarded as a heavier burden than the payment of $4 when hidden and concealed in the price of the article which he buys and upon which the indirect tax is levied.

If the Federal Government shall enter upon the policy of road building, it should be more with a view to aiding and encouraging State activity in highway improvement than to assume the whole burden of the work entered upon. But the time for improvement in highways has come, and the work must either go forward as a State enterprise or an undertaking by the General Government. If the several States will not undertake this work and can not be encouraged and induced to do so, the General Government, even at a disadvantage in cost to the people, must undertake and bring about highway improvement.

And there is a way by which this increased cost of road improvement by Federal appropriations instead of by State appropriations could be compensated for. If all the appropriations which are now being made for the improvement of rivers and harbors at points where there is very little, if any, navigation, and all the appropriations for public buildings and works to favor certain localities, and all the appropriations which are now being made and contemplated for the construction of new battleships, of which we now have a greater number and of a type more powerful than ever before, and for which we have not enough trained men nor the proper complement of auxiliary boats and craft to properly man and make effective the number of battleships we now have—if all these appropriations were made available for the improvement of highways, macadamized roads could be built and maintained for every rural route and for every main highway leading out from the railway stations into the rural districts in every part of this whole country, including the great interstate highways across the continent now being urged as an interstate system. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, $18,327,232.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the other day, when the Forest Service was under discussion, I made some statements relative to the transactions wherein the Santa Fe Railroad and the Northern Pacific Railroad received a large amount of land in exchange for certain lands that they owned. Since making that statement it appears that it has been read. Mr. S. M. Stockslager, who was at one time a Member of this House and afterwards Commissioner of the General Land Office, has transmitted to me a statement of facts in regard to those transactions that I think is very pertinent and interesting. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the article in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by publishing the statement that he indicates. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

A FEW PERTINENT FACTS TOUCHING THE PRESENT DISCUSSION OF THE PUBLIC-LAND SYSTEM.

June 4, 1897, Congress passed an act entitled "An act to provide for the survey and protection of the forest reservations" (30 Stat., 34). Under the provisions of this act the owners of perfected or unperfected claims within such reservations were permitted to exchange such lands for other public lands upon conveying the lands thus held by them in the forest reserves unincumbered to the United States.

As stated by Senator Carter, of Montana, in the Senate in February, 1907, it was understood the Land Office held this act did not apply to lands granted to railroad companies within the limits of such reservations, but was overruled by the department, and therefore it was held to apply to them as well as to individuals.

Under the rulings of the department selection was permitted of unsurveyed as well as surveyed lands, but on June 6, 1900 (31 Stat., 614), Congress passed an act providing that after October 1, 1900, selections could be made for surveyed land only.

March 3, 1905 (33 Stats., 1264), Congress repealed the acts of June 4, 1897, and March 3, 1901, but among other things provided that the validity of contracts entered into by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the passage of this act shall not be impaired.

By instructions of the department of May 16, 1905 (33 L. D., 558), the provisions above referred to were held to protect certain contracts entered into between the Secretary and owners of certain odd-numbered sections of land in the Santa Fe Mountains and Grand Canyon Forest Reserves in Arizona, and the owners of certain lands not theretofore reserved, but included by the President's proclamation of December 23, 1903, within the Santa Barbara Reservation in California. The effect of this exception in the act was to permit selections to continue to be made in satisfaction of tracts relinquished or to be relinquished, as follows: First, of odd-numbered sections within the Santa Fe Mountain Forest Reserve in Arizona relinquished or to be relinquished by the Santa Fe Pacific Railway Co., the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., the Sagina & Manistee Lumber Co., William F. Baker, and Edward Lee Perrin; second, of odd-numbered sections within the

Grand Canyon Forest Reserve, Ariz., relinquished or to be relinquished by the Santa Fe Railroad Co.; and third, lands of both odd and even sections in the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, Cal., and defined by the President's proclamation of December 22, 1903, relinquished or to be relinquished by the Santa Barbara Water Co. or Jed L. Washburn.

The proceedings leading up to and embracing the contract above referred to are fully set out in House Document No. 613, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session. An examination of the letter of Secretary Hitchcock at pages 93 and 94 of said document will show that said odd-numbered sections embraced an area of about 900,000 acres, of which 750,000 acres was proposed to be relinquished to the United States under said contract.

The reservation proposed was established, but instead of the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co. relinquishing its lands to the United States, as agreed, on May 30, 1903, it conveyed practically all of its lands embraced within the contract and still held by it to the Santa Fe Development Co., which it has been reported was composed largely, if not wholly, of the officers of the railroad company. But the Commissioner of the General Land Office, in the selection of one Mary Coffin, as shown by his letter to the Secretary of February 13, 1904, declined to accept the title of this development company for the reason that it was a violation of the agreement made by the railroad company with the Secretary, but permitted the development company to reconvey to the railroad company, a deed from which would be accepted, which conveyance was subsequently made. It may be added that on February 13, 1904, the commissioner made a report to the department on the subject of his refusal to accept the conveyance of the development company.

It may be observed also that while under the regulations of the department settlers and other individual claimants could not have their titles passed upon except in cases where they made selections of lands in lieu of those owned or claimed by them in such reservations, yet in the case of the Santa Fe Railroad Co. and all the railroad companies, Mr. Perrin, and perhaps other large holders of land, lists embracing large quantities were certified to in advance of any selection the effect of which was to make them what is known as "certified scrip." That is, the Government had already passed upon their abstract of title, and hence the purchaser from them would take no risk upon this point.

It is also pertinent to observe that notwithstanding the bad faith of the Santa Fe Railroad Co. in attempting to divest itself of the title to its land in the reservation, and thus defeat, practically at least, the agreement made with the Secretary, yet, when Congress repealed the act of 1897, which repeal prevented the settlers and individual claimants who had not already availed themselves of the exchange privilege from doing so, it permitted by a saving clause this railroad company, Perrin, and others embraced in the agreement aforementioned, to continue such exchange, and they are still permitted to do so. That this very greatly enhanced the value of their holdings is well known to everyone. * * *

In connection with the same subject attention might be called to the act of March 2, 1899 (30 Stats., 993), creating a national park known as Mount Rainier, in the State of Washington, it being a part of the lands embraced in the Pacific Forest Reserve, now known as Mount Rainier Forest Reserve. This park is a comparatively small affair, in one corner of the immense forest reserve above referred to. Nearly, if not quite, all of the lands embraced in the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., which runs through this forest reserve, were and are utterly worthless.

By the second section of the act the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. was given the right to select lands surveyed or unsurveyed through any State into or through which its road ran, in lieu not only of this small national park, but of the immense forest reserve also.

The department has held that this not only does not confine them to the lands within their indemnity limits, but permits them to select lands in any State into or through which the road runs, and that it may also select the reserved sections within the limits of its grant, thus enabling it to obtain solid bodies of timber or other lands (33 L. D., 634).

It is proper to observe also that while Congress by the act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stats., 614), prohibited the selection of lands under the act of June, 1897, which were unsurveyed, yet, as held by the department (34 L. D., 88), this did not affect the right of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. to select unsurveyed lands outside of all of its limits and in any State which its road touched, for the reason that the act granting it the right to make such selection was a special act and was not affected by the repealing act of June 6, 1900. It is also held that for the same reason the repealing act of June 4, 1897, did not affect the right of this railroad company to continue its selection of surveyed or unsurveyed lands.

The effect of this has been to make the privilege of exchanging these utterly worthless lands for the most valuable lands in the country of immense value. If what is known as the Northern Pacific scrip were on the market at all, it would be difficult to say how much it would bring. But it is said the company declines to sell, but prefers to hold and use this privilege which Congress does not seem to be willing to take away, as it did from the poor settlers and individual claimants.

Can anyone tell why, when the exchange by private individuals in forest reserves for unsurveyed lands was repealed, it was not made to include also the exchange privilege granted to the Northern Pacific Railroad Co.? This privilege still exists, and no effort has ever been made to our knowledge to change it. It is very remarkable also that when the entire exchange law was repealed, leaving hundreds of private individuals who had conveyed lands within forest reserves to the United States, but whose selections had not been approved without either their lands surrendered or those selected, and to this day no relief has ever been granted them, while the exchange privilege of the railroad company for unsurveyed lands, which makes it exceedingly valuable, remains.

Who can tell what vast bodies of our best lands belonging to the public domain, especially timberlands, would have been saved if the Secretary of the Interior and the President had sustained the position of Commissioner Herman that the act was not intended to and did not apply to lands held by railroad companies, or how many acres of valuable timberlands would also have been saved if his position that they should be permitted to exchange their holdings for lands of the same class as those surrendered to the United States had been sustained?

Did anyone ever hear of any of the outspoken conservationists protesting in any way against this legislation and these departmental decisions? We certainly never heard of any such, although millions of acres of our best timberlands have thus been acquired by these companies which seem to be immune to either departmental or legislative opposition.

Respectfully,

S. M. STOCKSLAGER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 13, 1914.*

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. The other day I made a point of order on a provision in the Agricultural appropriation bill authorizing the sale of the Mount Weather station by the Weather Bureau. I have a letter from Mr. Marvin, the Chief of the Weather Bureau, which contains some interesting information in reference to the Mount Weather station which was not brought out in committee. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD. I will ask to have it read in my time. I send it to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WEATHER BUREAU, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF,
*Washington, D. C., March 9, 1914.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
*United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MANN: I have read with great interest the debate upon the appropriations for the Weather Bureau, and especially your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6 (p. 4699), wherein you reserve and make the point of order against the proposed authorization for the sale of Mount Weather. I hope you will permit me to place before you certain information that was not fully brought out in the discussion, and that will clearly explain just what are the intentions of the Weather Bureau.

To begin with, I wish to say that I am quite in accord with your general views relative to the disposal of Mount Weather, as a reading of my testimony before the committee will show, and there is no intention of selling the property at once or disposing of it in an unreasonable manner. The language was inserted in the appropriation bill simply for the purpose of conferring upon the Secretary the authority to dispose of it at the proper time.

I wish also to say in a very emphatic manner that the exploration of the upper air by means of kites and balloons, conducted at Mount Weather for the past six years, and the scientific investigations in the measurement of the intensity of solar radiation more recently carried on there, have yielded data of the greatest value to scientific meteorology. These and other investigations to be carried out in the future will become more and more useful as time goes on and we learn better how to interpret all the details of the information about the upper air that can be obtained in this way. It is not surprising that some Members of the House could hardly credit the statement that little balloons, each equipped only with a delicate meteorological instrument, have ascended to heights in the atmosphere exceeding 22 miles and returned to earth bearing a record of all the conditions of the atmosphere during both the ascent and descent. Nevertheless, such is a scientific fact, and observations obtained in this way have revealed permanent and definite conditions of temperature and circulation in the upper air that were never even imagined to exist. The causes of the unexpected conditions, undiscoverable for a time, have been fully elucidated, and the explanations were first published by one of the experts of the Weather Bureau. I am glad to be able to say, moreover, that much credit for the inauguration and prosecution of this important work belongs to the former Chief of the Weather Bureau, Willis L. Moore.

However, Mount Weather is not well suited for these investigations, and never has been, for the following reasons:

1. The station is so close to the sea that free balloons can not be sent up from that point at all, because they are carried out over and descend into the ocean and the records are lost.

2. The location is not favorably related to the path of storm movements and the general atmospheric conditions that are chiefly the subjects of investigation.

3. The isolation of the station and its general inaccessibility render it undesirable for the purpose for which it is used and necessitate unnecessarily large expenditures for the simple upkeep of the establishment. Every dollar that is spent at Mount Weather for useful scientific investigation requires the expenditure of 83 cents additional to provide the heat, the light, and the power, etc., required to run the institution. The same amount of work can be done elsewhere at a much smaller cost for running expenses.

All these matters were carefully considered by a committee of experts appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the conclusion was reached that by transferring the work to points in the Middle West not only could better conditions for observation be obtained, but more work could be accomplished by the same expenditure of funds. Mount Weather is unsuited for the particular work being done, because of its proximity to the sea and the unavoidably heavy cost of maintenance.

I wish also to correct a mistaken impression in regard to the total cost of Mount Weather, which in the discussion was represented to be something like half a million dollars. The reservation and the buildings thereon, including one building that was destroyed by fire, have cost in the aggregate, roughly, $207,000. The Weather Bureau has spent, in addition, about $276,000 for very useful work during the 10 years the station has been in operation.

I hope the foregoing will enable you to better understand the situation at Mount Weather.

Very respectfully,

C. F. MARVIN,
*Chief of Bureau.*

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks in reference to certain features of this forestry matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain matter indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. I would like to be recognized for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MOORE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized and has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, in the Philadelphia Inquirer, a paper published in the home of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who just rose, there was published yesterday a statement under rather heavy headlines, "Charge of looting against Pinchot," and the challenge of Representative HUMPHREY, of my State, was reproduced in that article, which seems to me to indicate a kind of local coloring which was more or less exploited here on the floor while the matter was being discussed, and the statement made that any man was challenged to present any evidence that Mr. Pinchot ever protested against what is known as the Santa Fe lieu-land exchange.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. So long as the gentleman has drawn my name into what appears to be a controversy, I would like to ask him whether it is not a fact that when this matter was before the House my remarks referred wholly to the question of residence of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] and the gentleman from New York or Washington, Mr. Pinchot, and whether my participation in this controversy did not deal wholly with the Pennsylvania senatorial question and not with the forest ranges?

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman's language is as he says, but his vote was with the gentleman from Washington, aiding him on the front seat in the voting.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman evidently did not know that I was counted as an employee of the House. [Laughter.] I stated that subsequently.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask if the gentleman repudiates the position taken by the gentleman from Washington, with whom he voted?

Mr. MOORE. I wholly repudiate any vote that I have accidentally cast for the expenditure of any money upon a treeless forest. [Laughter.] But so far as any vote of mine was concerned for the expenditure of public money for a worthy purpose, of course I will acknowledge that vote. [Laughter.] If the gentleman will tell me when I voted on the question of treeless forests I will tell him how I voted, and whether or not I voted as an employee of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Pinchot made this statement, when asked concerning Representative HUMPHREY'S attack on him:

> Representative HUMPHREY has at various times made attacks upon the conservation policy which have been completely refuted and disproved. He now occupies substantially the same position formerly occupied by Senator Heyburn whose frantic accusations finally ceased to command any attention whatsoever. I presume an answer is necessary, and it certainly is easy, to this latest explosion of Mr. HUMPHREY.
>
> He challenges me to say that I ever protested against the Santa Fe Railroad exchange. He might almost equally well challenge me to say that I protested against Eve taking the apple in the Garden of Eden. This exchange was managed entirely by the Department of the Interior. I was in the Department of Agriculture. I had no responsibility of any sort, shape, or kind in connection with it. The Government, because of bad laws and faulty administration, had got into a difficult position and was obliged to take the least of two evils. Mr. HUMPHREY knows that I had no responsibility in connection with this exchange, and has known it a long time. I was given charge of the national forests in 1905. The Santa Fe exchange was made several years before that time. If he chooses to repeat accusations repeatedly disproved and which he knows have been disproved, that is his affair.
>
> Did you know of the exchange at the time it was made? I did. As I have said, it was the best the Government could do, because of the unfortunate situation into which it had been engineered. Such a partial surrender of the public welfare ought never to have been made necessary. Responsibility for its having been made necessarily rests directly upon the faulty land laws passed by the Congress of the United States.
>
> Was it necessary to make that exchange?
>
> The exchange was made necessary by the granting of alternate sections to the old Atlantic & Pacific Railroad, and the balance of advantage, on the whole, to the railroad and to the Government was almost equally distributed. Each profited by the exchange.
>
> What about the other charge he makes?
>
> I am not able to identify the second case mentioned—the exchange with the Northern Pacific Railway—but I presume there is as little basis for it as the first.
>
> It was the infamous lieu-land law passed by Congress, and which I had as much as any other man to do with getting repealed, which was responsible for that exchange.

I have already shown how Mr. Pinchot put the timber looters out of business by his persistent opposition to all the tricks and devices by which these Washington Republican Congressmen were feathering the nests of their political backers. In that day the railroads ran the conventions of all political parties. When the railroad attorneys gave the politicians advice it was very much like "his master's voice." I would not handle the matter in just this way if I did not know that my colleague knew he was trying to put over a fake pure and simple when he levels charges against Pinchot in this matter.

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRYAN. I shall have to ask the gentleman to rise in his own time.

Mr. MOORE. Very well; I will.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr HUMPHREY] made these same charges on the floor here a few months ago, and immediately upon his making the charges there appeared in the State of Washington at that time, and now in the State of Pennsylvania, newspaper publications with glaring headlines announcing his speech and his charges. Most extreme statements were made in these headlines. Those charges were answered then, and it was shown that at this particular time Mr. Pinchot, while forester, was merely forester in the Interior Department, and the Bureau of Forestry was like the Bureau of Plant Industry, in that it had no jurisdiction or authority whatever in matters of this kind. That was thoroughly gone over, and I can not understand why gentlemen should persist in that charge here in face of that fact.

Now, one other thing, as to something that the gentleman refers to in Montana. We can not locate that particular thing, and I merely suggest that if he wants an answer in reference to Montana he will have to be more definite and particular and to announce the particular reserve he is talking about.

It does not appear what this refers to. The repeal of the lieu-land law passed the House on April 25, 1904. It passed the Senate on February 28, 1905. The records show that between these dates the only lands added to forest reserves in Montana were 130,560 acres added to the Yellowstone—in Wyoming and Montana—on May 4, 1904.

The statement that the lieu-land selections whereby lands of little or no value within national forests were exchanged on a great scale for valuable public lands outside were carried through with the acquiescence and even the active assistance of the Forest Service is directly contrary to the facts. The right to make lieu-land selections was given by the act of June 4, 1897. It was repealed by the act of March 3, 1905, practically one month after jurisdiction of the national forests was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Prior to the transfer the administration of the national forests was wholly in the hands of the Department of the Interior. In the debate in the House of Representatives preceding the adoption of the conference report on the bill repealing the lieu-land selections law it was expressly stated by Mr. Lacey, of Iowa, that—

> The future reservations have been held up for fear of forming a base for looting the timber in Oregon and Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LEVER. I should like very much to have these gentlemen continue their washing of linen, but I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Five minutes is all I want.

Mr. GUDGER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition has not been submitted to the committee yet.

Mr. LEVER. I should dislike very much to move to close the debate. I am sorry my friend from North Carolina objects.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GUDGER. I object to that.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman insist that the debate shall be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls attention to the fact that this debate is not in order, if anyone chooses to raise the point.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman in charge of the bill understands that fact, but is trying to be lenient with these gentlemen from Washington and Pennsylvania, who are fighting out a double-barreled senatorial situation.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman know that this will be the most interesting part of the debate on the whole agricultural bill?

Mr. LEVER. The senatorial situations in Washington and Pennsylvania are not very interesting to me.

Mr. MOORE. The debate upon this question would be illuminating upon many propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. LEVER. I must insist that debate on this paragraph be confined to the paragraph. We must get through with this bill this evening.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I trust the gentleman will not do that until I have three or four minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] being here to speak for himself, will it help at all if I withdraw my request for time, so that the gentleman from Washington may have 10 minutes in which to reply?

Mr. LEVER. I dislike very much to deprive the House of the illuminating remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but if he will withdraw his request, I will make no objection.

Mr. MOORE. I will withdraw my request, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] being here to speak for himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I read in the paper this morning the same article that my colleague has referred to, in which Mr. Pinchot denies his responsibility for the transactions whereby the Santa Fe Railroad received 1,200,000 acres of valuable timbered land in exchange for land that was practically worthless. There is no denial or dispute that the transaction took place. Mr. Pinchot says he was not responsible for it. I never charged that he was responsible for it. But prior to that time he made a great protest against certain eliminations being made from a forest reserve in my State, and he has attempted to show his great virtue by repeating on every occasion, at every opportunity, the statement that he protested against that elimination in my State. And to add virtue to that transaction, my colleague [Mr. BRYAN] has twice repeated it upon the floor of the House. But after that transaction occurred, and while Mr. Pinchot was in the Government service, while his duties were with reference to the national forests, 1,200,000 acres of land were taken from the public domain by the Santa Fe Railroad for practically nothing. Now, the question I have been asking is, Why did not Pinchot protest then? What sealed his mouth? What was there about this transaction that he could not see it? Was it so small? He could see the eliminations out in my State when they were made, and eventually a large portion of the timberland came into the control of private individuals. What was there about the 1,200,000-acre transaction of the Santa Fe Railroad that he could not see it?

The records show that a public protest was made against that transfer. The records show that people from Arizona came and appeared before the President and protested against that transfer. Do you tell me that Mr. Gifford Pinchot, then the trusted friend of President Roosevelt, did not know anything about this transfer of 1,200,000 acres from the public domain into forest reserves? Does anybody within the sound of my voice or any man in the United States acquainted with the history of these transactions believe that statement? Of course he knew about it. If not, why did he not know about it; and if he did know it, why did he not protest? Why did he not say something about the Santa Fe Railroad getting some of the best timbered lands in this country in exchange for treeless lands, worth only from 15 to 18 cents an acre? That is what I am asking him to explain. He has posed for years as the guardian of the public domain of this country; and yet, when the railroads take in this case 1,200,000 acres, he says nothing. Now, in regard to the transaction that occurred in Montana, his denial is very illuminating. He does not deny that transaction at all. My statement was that something like 240,000 acres of land were included in an extension of a forest reserve in Montana, or else it was a new creation. It is hard to trace it, because the names of some of the forest reserves have been changed; but, at any rate, 240,000 acres of practically worthless land, practically treeless land, were included in forest reserves that belonged to the Northern Pacific Railway. Then while the bill was pending for the repeal of the lieu land exchange law in the United States Senate with the assistance of Mr. Gifford Pinchot the Northern Pacific Railway received 240,000 acres of valuable timberland for that practically worthless land. [Applause.]

Now, then, let Mr. Pinchot deny it if it is not true. I made the statement on the floor of the House that a Member of this House went to him and protested against the exchange. If it is not true, let Mr. Pinchot deny that statement and deny that such transaction ever took place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the committee has omitted from the present bill an item under the "Miscellaneous" heading, as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to continue investigations on the cost of food supplies at the farm and to the consumer, and to disseminate the result of such investigations in whatever manner he may deem best.

I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, why that item is omitted.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that we were informed that that information could be gathered best under the division of markets, which we will soon come to, and through the Department of Labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the information I wanted to get. I had supposed this information would be obtained under the division of markets.

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Here is more money for the forest reserves. In this clause the United States appropriates $100,000 for the protection from fire of forests in the reserve, which is all right and proper, except to me it seems a little bit unfair that wealthy men and corporations should be able to procure great portions of these forests, taking them up as investments, and intending that they shall become an investment for the next 50 years, paying nothing in the way of taxes or anything else, and all of the time under protection from fire by the United States Government. Is it fair?

Only to-day I received a paper from the southwestern part of Washington, where there are three great forest reserves. In this newspaper is a letter from a hard-working citizen, who says he went 12 years ago onto a piece of eliminated land at the edge of a forest reserve, built him a little home, which is pictured here in the newspaper, cleared the land, and the forest ranger reports that the improvements alone are worth $3,000.

The man has on that piece of land of 149 acres some timber—two and three-quarters million feet of spruce timber. Now, two and three-quarters million feet of spruce timber in that section of the country on 149 acres is not enough for the forest ranger to declare that it is timberland rather than agricultural land. It is in a river bottom. This man begs for somebody to come and buy this piece of land of him at the value put on the improvements by the ranger, $3,000, and says that he will throw in the two and three-quarters million feet of spruce timber, or more than one-fourth as much as all of the timber, the same kind that you are protecting in the Chugach Range in Alaska at great expense. Is this fair?

This man says that he wants to get a little bit of money from anybody who will take his homestead at $3,000, with all of the timber thrown in, so that he and his family can get across the line into Canada, where he says the farmer who tries to get along in the world can have his home and place and be protected, and where he is not starved out by a conservation policy which bids fair to starve out all of the present generation in the most heavily conserved localities.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. Can the gentleman say whether any portion of the emergency fund for the fighting of forest fires was expended during the last calendar year?

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee was that there was no money expended from the fund during the last fiscal year. Seventy-five thousand dollars was expended from the other fund of $150,000 carried in another part of the bill.

Mr. MANN. That was not all expended in fighting fires?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MANN. I am inclined to think that there ought to be a differentiation of the item, so that it could not be used for fighting bugs, although I am in favor of fighting the bugs wherever it is necessary.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; because the bugs create a great deal of destruction. I will say that I never thought that this item had any business in the bill, because I think when the emergency arises it can be taken care of under existing law.

Mr. MANN. The item during the current year carries $200,000. It is proposed to reduce it to $100,000. When the first appropriation was made it was half a million dollars. In other words, it is a fund for extraordinary emergencies, such as when there happens to be a very dry season and a dangerous fire is started, or it may be many of them. It is not expected that the money will be used in an ordinary season. I do not

know what they would do if an emergency should arise and they did not have the money.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will recall that in 1910 the worst forest fire the West ever saw occurred, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under what he regarded as authority of law——

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; regardless of law.

Mr. LEVER. No; I think not.

Mr. MANN. He did not think so, and neither did the President.

Mr. LEVER. He created a deficit of more than a million dollars, which Congress allowed.

Mr. MANN. That is true, and I do not criticize the department or the President, for I think they did the proper thing. An emergency had arisen which Congress could not foresee; they had no money with which to fight the fires. They ordered the money used, regardless of law. But now when we foresee that such an emergency may arise and do not provide for it, then doing the thing regardless of law is quite a different proposition.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, as I have said so many times, I am not a lawyer, but the gentleman of course is familiar with the section of the Revised Statutes, which I will read, which provides among other things:

Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept volunteer service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

Mr. MANN. That does not relate to this sort of matter at all.

Mr. LEVER. I confess that I can not find any reason why it should not relate to this kind of a proposition, and I would be glad to have the gentleman's view upon it.

Mr. MANN. That is a different case. The Government is not authorized under ordinary circumstances to accept volunteer services.

Mr. LEVER. But this goes beyond that and it says it shall not employ service except in cases of emergency.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and it can not employ service in case of emergency unless it has some money to pay for it with.

Mr. LEVER. Again, from this same section of the statute, I read:

And all such apportionment shall be adhered to, and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment.

Mr. MANN. That is the apportionment. Every department has the right to vary the apportionment upon making a certificate, but that has nothing to do with this question. They can not expend more money than is appropriated, and they are not authorized anywhere to incur obligations.

Mr. LEVER. I admit, of course, the superior legal attainments of the gentleman from Illinois——

Mr. MANN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I do not make any claim any longer to being a lawyer. I was when I came here.

Mr. MADDEN. What the gentleman read presupposes an appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. It seems so to me.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, this forest-fire protection is one of the most important functions of the Forest Service, and if it had not been for the efficiency of the Forest Service and the determination of men who are now condemned by those who desired to see the public domain pass into private hands, there would be no timber there now to protect. Away back in 1901 there were a series of attempts made to repeal the lieu-land selections by which these selections were made——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, we are on the subject of fire protection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I insist that the gentleman shall proceed in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. But I submit the gentleman is proceeding in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will proceed in order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the fire protection in those forests is one of the important issues before this House at this time, because of the fact that there was a determined effort, which was successful, in breaking up those lieu-land selections. There was a bill introduced here to repeal the authority by which those selections were made, and it was finally put through, and the authority was taken away from these railroads to take these lands in that way—and who was the author of the bill? Mr. Gifford Pinchot has a carbon copy of the bill——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BRYAN. Only five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may have five minutes, and I suppose as a consequence that the other gentleman from Washington may have five minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the gentleman was proceeding in order.

Mr. MANN. Oh, he was clearly not in order.

Mr. BRYAN. But if I could get the five minutes in addition to what I have consumed, I would be very thankful.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. And that the other gentleman from Washington, Mr. HUMPHREY, may also have five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I couple with that a request to put in the RECORD the balance of this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can put only one proposition at a time. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. BRYAN, and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HUMPHREY, may each have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to know if the gentleman from Washington is going to trespass upon the Pennsylvania senatorial situation. If so, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I will guarantee my friend from Pennsylvania that I will not trespass upon that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire, if there be no objection made, if these two gentlemen from Washington will then let us complete the bill?

Mr. MANN. No one can tell about that.

Mr. LEVER. I will not ask for an answer.

Mr. BRYAN. I will guarantee to be on my very best behavior.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I object to my name being used until I have made the request. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, on October 22, 1903, the President appointed a commission, of which Mr. Gifford Pinchot was a member, to investigate and report on these lieu-land laws. On February 13, 1905, the President transmitted in a message to Congress Mr. Pinchot's report, and urged that the law be repealed and that the authority to make lieu-land exchanges be revoked. And there was introduced then an administration bill into this House which was adopted and did away with that practice and made it impossible for further lieu-land exchanges to be made, and that bill was drawn by Mr. Gifford Pinchot, and Mr. Gifford Pinchot has in his files here in this city the carbon copy of the original of that bill. He was the man who worked it out and prepared the bill, and the gentlemen from Washington, the delegation from Washington representing that State on this floor at that time, the members of the Republican Party here on this floor, were generally unfriendly to the proposition. They did not join in any effort to repeal these lieu-land provisions which had been slipped in by amendment. Not at all; but, on the contrary, every possible effort was put forth during years of contest on the part of those gentlemen against the efforts that were made by different Members of Congress here on the floor to repeal these particular provisions, and I want to call the attention of Members of Congress to the fact that it was impossible for Gifford Pinchot or anybody else to stop that without a law, but when he did produce the law and send it up to a Member and it was introduced, and Theodore Roosevelt backed that up and it became an administration measure, then Pinchot did everything he possibly could do to effect the reform and encourage the enactment of the measure, and it was passed, and instead of being condemned, instead of being censured here repeatedly by men who know as well as they know their names that their censures are wrong, he ought to be praised. He is entitled to credit for what he did, and the people of this country know that Gifford Pinchot was never a party to this looting, they know that he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I would rather not.

Mr. MOORE. Then I will make the point of order if the gentleman does not.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse, I decline to yield; now make the point.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let the gentleman from Pennsylvania make his point of order and get through with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. In view of the gentleman's statement that he would not discuss the senatorial candidacies, has he any right to boom the candidacy of Mr. Pinchot?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I protest that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor by unanimous consent for five minutes, and I do not have to discuss any subject in particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MOORE. We have two bona fide candidates in the House.

Mr. BRYAN. Even before this exchange was made Mr. Pinchot had written a letter to the department mentioning the exchange, and said he understood certain lands were to be given in exchange, but he had nothing to do with that; and when they came to make the exchange—that is, when they came to report the resolution—the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hitchcock, sent over a message which required or caused them to amend so as to make good all exchanges that were then in process of negotiation, and it was necessary it should be so, because the law had been passed that way. There was no effort to get out of those exchanges that had been agreed to. They were tremendous frauds, but they were legislative frauds, and Congress was to blame. Mr. Pinchot was merely a member in a subsidiary department, a member of a kind of plant bureau—a bureau to determine about the way to plant trees, and so forth—in the Interior Department; but upon the suggestion of Gifford Pinchot, backed by the big stick of Theodore Roosevelt, there has been established the present Forest Service, and there has been none of that kind of business since. They did it all. They stopped the looting. That is why these men from Washington are heard howling; that is where the shoe pinches.

There is a lot of timber out there that a great number of men, timber barons and operators, are extremely anxious to get under the saw; they are anxious to get it in private ownership, and that is what they are howling about. They kick about the telephones, they complain about the trails, they roar about the roads——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take the gentleman off his feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A gentleman can make a point of order, but no point of order has been made at present.

Mr. BRYAN. They rise to points of order and proclaim their parliamentary inquiries and all that kind of thing, but, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the people of Washington are back of this Forest Service; that they are back of Gifford Pinchot and know who are the true friends of that service and of the people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has obtained time for me I will occupy a minute or two of it. Since my distinguished colleague has appeared upon the floor of the House as the champion of Mr. Pinchot—I do not know whether he is self-selected or appointed by Mr. Pinchot—I will give him another transaction and let him explain that at his leisure. The Santa Barbara Water Co., in California, owned 63,000 acres of land upon which there were no trees and which had an actual value of about 25 cents an acre. The Santa Barbara Water Co. wanted that land taken into a forest reserve and wanted the privilege of going out and selecting 63,000 acres of public land anywhere in the United States except timberlands. The Commissioner of the General Land Office protested against the exchange.

He said the land was worth only 25 cents an acre, and that if the city of Santa Barbara wanted it included in a forest reserve they ought to buy it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No.

Mr. SABATH. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. My point of order is that the committee is not in order, and inasmuch as the gentleman is giving the committee valuable information, every Member should be in a position to hear it.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman that it refers to water.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] will proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Commissioner of the General Land Office protested against this exchange being made. He said if the city of Santa Barbara wanted this land included in a forest reserve worth 25 cents an acre they ought to buy it. He protested it would be a fraud upon the Government to permit this corporation to exchange this land for other lands of greater value, acre for acre. Mr. Gifford Pinchot at that time was occupying the subsidiary position that my colleague speaks about, down in the Agricultural Department; but notwithstanding that subsidiary position which he occupied, he made a visit to Santa Barbara and wrote a letter favoring this exchange; and he had enough influence to have it made, or, at least, it was made soon after that. And that was just about the time that these other transactions with the Santa Fe Railroad occurred, and if Mr. Gifford Pinchot knew about the 63,000 acres exchanged by the Santa Barbara Water Co. along about the same time when he was occupying the same position and recommended that that transaction take place, how did it happen he did not know about the 1,200,000 acres of the Santa Fe Railroad, and why was he not expressing some opinion about that?

Now, if the gentleman can explain that, I will have some more for him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. I know the gentleman can get a good deal of advice on any subject along there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Markets: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $200,000.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] rise?

Mr. SUMNERS. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] has been recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Is that in order?

Mr. MANN. He can not take the gentleman off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take his colleague off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this market provision of the Agricultural appropriation bill has appealed to me as a matter of great interest. We hear much of the high cost of living in these days, and, indeed, it is true that the expenses of the average family mount higher and higher as the days go by.

The Government has entered into a new line of work with reference to the marketing of farm products. In the last Congress we made an initial appropriation of $50,000 for the beginning of this work, and now we have increased that appropriation to $200,000. I introduced a bill carrying this amount some time in the month of December, and I am gratified to say that the Committee on Agriculture adopted the provisions of my bill, and it is now before the House for final action.

Mr. Chairman, take it in our section of the country where cotton is the chief product of the soil, a crop that in value amounts to more than $1,000,000,000 annually, that great crop that takes from one end of the year to the other to mature and harvest, and it is absolutely forced on the market in a period of 90 days. In 1910, when our cotton crop aggregated 12,000,000 bales, the world said that was not enough to supply the demand. The very next year we produced 16,000,000 bales, and those 16,000,000 bales brought $125,000,000 less than the 12,000,000-bale crop. This system of marketing as to the cotton product of the South has caused our people, instead of growing rich on this great crop that blesses the world, to be tied down, and the producers are not prospering as they should. It is believed that under the scientific study to be made by the

Government under the provisions of this bill a system of marketing will be worked out so that when our cotton supply is "long" and not needed by the world by means of storage warehouses and other scientific methods to be applied to the work the farmer will not have to dump his surplus crop on the markets of the world in three months' time.

That is one item that amounts, as I say, in the aggregate to over $1,000,000,000 annually. Sixty-five per cent of that product goes to the foreign markets and brings back to us the gold that gives us the balance of trade as measured with the nations of the earth. And is it not an important matter for the Government to use every legitimate endeavor to see that that 65 per cent of so valuable a product that means so much to the wealth of our Nation and that goes to foreign nations of the earth is not slaughtered? [Applause.] Foreign manufacturers are alone benefiting at the expense of the cotton grower of the Southland.

Then another proposition, Mr. Chairman: One of the essential features of this office of markets will reach the perishable products of the farm—the peach industry, the apple industry, the tomato industry, and other industries whose products go to the table of the poor man as well as the rich.

The district which I have the honor to represent is a great fruit and truck growing district, and yet I have seen orchards with hundreds of acres where the Elberta peaches covered the earth, because no market could be found for them, although at that time in other sections of the country people were crying out for this fruit. What was the trouble? We had a few great centers to which the product is shipped, but no system by which information could be carried to these fruit growers as to the daily state of the market supply, and consequently some of those centers would be glutted and the farmer who produced the fruit could not get anything for it, and thus he lost the value of his crop.

It is believed that by a scientific investigation this peach industry, the apple industry, the vegetable industry, and the tomato industry, by means of information furnished to the farmers of the country by which a plan of cooperation with each other and facts respecting markets, standardizing the grades, methods of shipment, and so forth, can be made profitable, to the end that the farmer can get value for his product and the consumer who needs the product can get it at a reasonable price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I am intensely interested in this item, because the very condition that exists in my district exists in many other sections of the country. I want to appeal for the man who lives on the farm. You take an Elberta orchard, where a man has put every dollar he has into peach trees, and has cultivated those trees and where he must contend with the frost and insects that may wipe out his crop, so that he can not depend on that crop as a safe crop each year. When a successful yield is made, usually the yield is abundant throughout the entire fruit-growing section, and the farmer has this marketing condition based on the oversupply to contend with. What does it result in? It results, just as it has resulted in my section of the country, in farmers uprooting their trees and planting that soil in cotton or some other crop from which they hope to derive a benefit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Surely.

Mr. MADDEN. In what way does the gentleman believe that the expenditure of this $200,000 will help the farmer market his crop?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I believe that the farmers, being individuals, scattered throughout the communities of the States, each man engaged in growing some crop, some product, or the fruit I have mentioned, or potatoes or tomatoes, do not keep in touch with the wholesale market. They are now absolutely at the mercy of the commission men, and too often the commission men pocket the profits of the industry and the farmer pockets the loss. I believe that by means of detailed information furnished by the Government a plan of cooperation can be brought about by which the farmer will not be at the mercy of the middleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to say to the gentleman that most of the farmers whom I know know a great deal better when to market their products than the officials that will be appointed under this item will be able to tell them.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The officials under this item will be able to get together data as to successful cooperation among the farmers. I understand that the citrus-fruit people have successfully cooperated and that now they get reasonably fair market prices. I understand that in a certain district in Arkansas the strawberry farmers have a system of cooperation by which they get fair prices. I also understand that last season, by a system of cooperation among the cotton growers in the vicinity of Scott Station, Ark., those cotton growers received from one-fourth cent to 1 cent more per pound for their cotton and from $3 to $4 more per ton for their cotton seed than did their neighbors who had no such plan of cooperation. If the Government will get together these successful organizations and the methods used and carry the benefits of these schemes to the individual farmer, it will give him information by which he can improve his present market conditions.

Mr. STEENERSON and Mr. MADDEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. To either one of them.

Mr. STEENERSON. I rose first.

Mr. MADDEN. Just one question. Does the gentleman wish the House to understand that he is in favor of the Government collecting and furnishing information by which the farmers can make a combination for the purpose of getting better prices for their products?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I want them to get all the information they can with reference to packing and shipping, and when certain markets are glutted receive directions by which they can send their products to some market that is not glutted. In other words, I want the Government to use every available means at its command to see that the rewards of the farmer's labor may go to the farmer, where it belongs, and not be enjoyed by that class of middlemen "who toil not, neither do they spin," yet prosper at the expense of the farmer.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman says he is in favor of raising their farm price and enabling them to get a higher price for their farm products?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Oh, I will say to the gentleman that I do not intend by this measure to legislate value into the product of the farm, but I do believe that when the bulls and bears, the gambling leeches of this country, get together and try to throttle the farmer and destroy the value of his product, that the Government should come to his relief and give him information that will enable him to act wisely and intelligently.

Mr. STEENERSON. Would not an increase in the price received by the farmer for his products tend to increase the cost of living?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. No; because now the middleman gets the benefit of it and the ultimate consumer does not.

I read some figures from high authority that show the workings of the present system of marketing, and I commend them to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. They are as follows:

*Distribution of cost of American farm products of 1911.*

| | Amount. | Per cent. |
|---|---|---|
| Received by the producers—the farmers | $6,000,000,000 | 46.1 |
| Received by the railroads | 495,000,000 | 3.8 |
| Legitimate expense of selling | 1,200,000,000 | 9.2 |
| Waste in selling | 1,560,000,000 | 12.0 |
| Dealers' and retailers' profits | 3,745,000,000 | 28.9 |
| Total paid by the public | 13,000,000,000 | 100.0 |

Ah, Mr. Chairman, these figures speak more eloquently than I can hope to do, and prove the necessity for this legislation. It is the stopping of the criminal waste between the producer and the ultimate consumer, with the resultant effect that the farmer will get better prices and at the same time the cost of living to the consumer will be reduced.

Why is there the constant tendency to abandon the farm? Why the "back to the farm" cry? The one great answer is when prevailing prices for the products of the farm are not commensurate with the capital, labor, and energy expended in producing the crop, the farmer, like other men, is going to seek new fields of endeavor. If we as Members of this Congress will make this appropriation and increase it as occasion demands, I sincerely believe that the beneficent effects will be felt by every farmer throughout the land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas proceeds I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. I do not care to occupy any time myself.

Mr. MANN. Close how soon?

Mr. LEVER. In 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am about to offer an amendment here which will require some discussion. I do not know how much time other gentlemen may require, but I wish the chairman of the committee would reserve his request.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas present his amendment and let it be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first submit the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection to the request that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the word "products," in line 19, page 65, the following: "To aid in improving the methods of and facilities for the sale and distribution of such products," and amend by striking out "$200,000," at the end of line 22, page 65, and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have not finished the previous paragraph. We have not yet reached this paragraph.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing, Mr. Chairman, to reserve my point of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves his point of order for five minutes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that a point of order against this amendment, if the gentleman who has reserved the point makes it, may be sustained. There are a great many provisions in this bill that would go out if a point of order were made against them. I want to speak at this time not to the point of order, but with reference to the merits of this proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee on Agriculture has rendered a great service to the country in providing for the department of markets; but when they provide merely for the accumulation and dissemination of information they do not go far enough; they do not meet the necessities of the times in which we are living. My colleague from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] spoke with reference to the benefits that would come to the farmer by wiping out the waste resulting from the present methods of marketing. But that can not be done by accumulating and disseminating information merely; there is need of help to construct the marketing machinery which would make possible the practical use of the information gathered. I beg to call attention to the fact the farmer is not the only one concerned in this proposition either. The time has come when the man in the city, who eats what the farmer produces, must pay the men who do the farming as much net profit as they could get in any other kind of business. Therefore the profit to the farmer can not be reduced, and the only way by which the man in the city can lower the cost to himself is to reduce the intervening cost of marketing the crop, and to get to market the products which now rot in the field or on the side track.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to enable the Department of Agriculture to aid in improving the facilities for marketing. I submit that this ought to be done. It is the necessary, the common-sense thing to do. Merely to give a man out on the Rio Grande, or in Arkansas, or anywhere else information with reference to the fact that the country needs so much stuff will not benefit him or prevent waste. The Agricultural Department goes down to the Rio Grande and says it is a good section for the production of vegetables. The people there respond to the suggestion of the Agricultural Department and put in crops. I told the House the other day of a man who raised nine carloads of head lettuce. He sent out 100 heads by parcel post to different markets, and they were pronounced to be as fine as the market produced. He shipped two carloads. On one carload he paid freight amounting to $9 in excess of the price that the lettuce brought him and on the other $13 freight in excess.

The Agricultural Department went out in east Texas and told the people there that that was a great fruit country. They went into the fruit-producing business, and one concern spent $400,000; but the year before last they cut down 400 acres of these trees. Now, gentlemen, we approach a situation that is entirely different from anything that has heretofore confronted the world. In the old days every man produced practically what he needed, and the communities supplied their own wants; but to-day we must depend upon shipping our stuff from the field of production to the field of consumption. The individual farmer sends out his stuff without knowing where to send it. He sends it out into the dark. One market may be glutted, while another is inadequately supplied. The purpose of this amendment is to enable the Department of Agriculture to aid in the constructive work of improving the methods of sale and distribution. We go out and teach a man how to raise the stuff, but after he has raised it he says: "What shall I do with it? I do not know where to send it." The farmer is better prepared to deal with the difficulties of production without help from the Government than he is with the difficulties of marketing it, and everybody knows it. We know that the individual farmer out in the fields does not know where to send his products. He has plead with Congress for help along constructive lines in improving methods of and facilities for sale and distribution, help which he is entitled to and which the interests of the country demand should be given, and we toss him a few packages of garden seed, with our names on each package, send him some bulletins, and tell him what a deep affection we have for him. It is a shame. No Member has offered or can offer a meritorious reason why the department should not help improve the methods of sale and distribution in order that the farmer can get a fair return for his labor, where the hungry consumer in the city can get his food supply without paying an exorbitant price. Why, then, insist on this point of order, if we are really concerned in the farmer's welfare, when item after item in this bill which the chairman of the Agricultural Committee and every Member knows is subject to a point of order has been passed without objection? There is no item in this bill which can be expended to better advantage than the amount proposed in my amendment, and I hope that the point of order will not be insisted upon.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I approve heartily of what was said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], and also I approve in a way that which has been said by the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], but when the Secretary of Agriculture was giving his testimony before the Agricultural Committee upon the question of marketing he stated that at this time he could not use over $200,000 in the work now in hand. He put this sum as the extreme limit of money that could be used at the present for this work. For this reason I will be unable to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] asking for an appropriation exceeding $200,000.

There are few questions that are engaging the attention of the American people to-day which are of more importance than the question of proper and sane marketing of farm products.

This fact was appreciated by the Agricultural Committee, of which I am a member, and at the last session of Congress the Agricultural bill carried an appropriation of $50,000 for this purpose. At this session of Congress this amount was increased rightly to $200,000 by the Committee on Agriculture in the House.

For multiplied years we have read much of the high cost of selling and the high cost of living. Writers of note have submitted observations in regard to this matter; newspapers, periodicals, and magazines have had much to say in regard thereto. It is with pride to-day that I refer to the fact that at the hearings before the Agricultural Committee of the House, at this session of Congress, Mr. Brand, of the bureau of markets, went before the committee and called attention to the fact that a company of men in Arkansas, at Scott Station, Pulaski County, in my district, had evolved a plan which he considered most

meritorious. As I say, I take especial State pride in referring to this fact, because I am acquainted more or less with the details of this plan. Everything is the result of evolution, and I dare say that in time the plan evolved by the association at Scott Station will be much more improved upon, but the fact remains that it was the genius of Arkansans that evolved this plan that I believe means so much to the farmers, and I desire to place in the RECORD the facts in relation thereto.

A few months since, Hon. C. C. Kirkpatrick, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, Little Rock, Ark., invited and prevailed upon Mr. H. S. Mobley, president of the Farmers' Union of the State of Arkansas, to deliver an address at Scott Station, Pulaski County, Ark., on the question of marketing. Mr. Mobley was ably assisted by Messrs. Kirkpatrick, Gordon N. Peay, J. R. Alexander, T. W. Newton, G. W. Heilman, C. A. Schmitzler, John C. Small, editor of the Arkansas Homestead, and others.

In letters written me by Mr. Kirkpatrick and Hon. George A. Cole, principal of the agricultural school at Russellville, Ark., and others, they stated, in substance, that they were anxious that a record of the work of this association be made, and that Mr. Mobley receive the credit due him for the great work that he and his associates and those interested in the matter had done along this line. They authorized me to make use of any statements contained in these letters, that these results might be shown. The address of Mr. Mobley at Scott Station, outlining the plan in detail of a correct system of marketing, is probably too long to insert in the RECORD; but, in substance, he said:

At the last State meeting of the union the committee on cotton selling reported a plan that was in line with the recommendations which I made at the meeting last year. In brief, it called for the election by each local of an agent, with whom the members were recommended to sign a contract appointing him their agent for selling their cotton and cotton seed, the cotton to be graded and sold on its grades and not on a flat rate; both the cotton and cotton seed to be bulked either in some warehouse or in temporary pens and sheds. Following the meeting the Educator published a suggestion for a contract between the members to carry this plan into effect, and it is a pleasure to note that many of the locals are taking up the plan, notably those in Little River County and Pulaski County.

With regard to this I wish to say that the plan was proposed not as being a complete and uniform method of selling cotton, but as being an elementary and beginning step looking toward such complete plan. But from many of the letters I receive it seems that many have the idea that if they will bulk their cotton that they will find an immediate opening by which they can reach spinners or at least immediately raise the price that they will receive at home. But such was not the intention or expectancy with which I proposed the plan. Back of the proposal was the following idea based on an extensive knowledge of our lack of the most necessary thing to a cooperative marketing of cotton:

The one most important thing that cotton farmers must learn before they can sell cotton direct to spinners is to sell collectively at all times and never, under any circumstances, sell in single bale lots or as individuals. Until the producer learns this there will be but little cooperative selling, and therefore the producers will not succeed in selling direct to the spinner. This is the most important thing in the whole scheme, and until it is learned cooperation will be only a subject among us and not an accomplished fact.

Human experience has decided that many things are right and all schemes and plans must be decided as right and adopted or as being wrong and rejected by experience, not on prejudice or mere faith. This plan and contract will have to undergo the actual trial and our experiences in trying it will have to decide as to whether it is the right thing for us or not, and only by trying it can we gain this experience. But there is this that is true concerning it, those who sell direct to spinners bulk the cotton before offering it to them or contract to do so, which is the same in effect. Therefore I reasoned that if we would learn to bulk our cotton and to have it graded that ultimately we could do as others who bulk cotton—sell it direct to the spinner from the farm.

Those who at present control the marketing methods of selling cotton could not interest a spinner at all without previously having bulked and graded the cotton they offered or being able to contract to do so and to financially back their contract. And until the farmer who raises cotton is willing to learn how to bulk his cotton and have it graded and offer it for same by some one person, instead of every individual raiser going into the market to sell, he will have to remain satisfied to take what he can get and let others make and enjoy the profit of his labor. So please do not think because I proposed the plan that I am able to go to the spinners and make contracts to sell your cotton for you at an immediate advance over your local market, when I can not possibly know how much cotton you have, what it will grade, what its staple is, or whether or not you will let me sell it for you and guarantee its weights, grades, and condition. No human could do this until these questions are settled definitely in such a manner as there can be no doubt at all.

And until a large number of us have learned to quit selling on flat rates and as individuals, no one can approach the spinner in our behalf. Therefore I proposed the plan and had printed an outline of a contract which has for its purpose the teaching of the farmers to sell collectively on grades. If you are willing to undertake with your neighbors to learn this, then sign the contract with your local agent, in company with your neighbors, and make a beginning, otherwise there is nothing in it for you.

No one can expect to live in the house until it is built, nor to live there honestly without having either contributed to the building expense or paying rent. Just so cotton farmers can not expect to control a method of marketing their produce, cotton, or any other commodity, until the method is worked out, and it can not be worked out until a beginning has been made, and I know beyond any doubt that our place of beginning is to learn to sell in bulk through an agent whom we can control instead of as individuals in small lots. Also I know that I have never learned anything that was of much lasting value to me that I did not have to pay for the knowledge, either in cash or experience, and I know that producers will not learn to sell cotton in bulk without making mistakes and having losses; and if you who read this are not willing to risk such mistakes and losses, again I say there is nothing in this plan for you.

I was in a town the other day where a stained bale of cotton was sold by the producer for 5 cents per pound, while the lowest grade quoted on the market was selling for 10½ cents. Thus because he was ignorant of cotton grades and was not willing to sell through the union plan or to take any risks at all—so he thought—he permitted the buyer to rob him of at least $25. This incident is literally true, and there are many witnesses to its truth. On the other hand, if he had been willing to have put that bale of cotton in a bulk sale, to have trusted some competent man to sell the whole lot, his included, on the true grade, he could have undoubtedly saved at least a part of this money for himself and family. But he was afraid to risk anything or anyone but himself, therefore his loss. This incident is characteristic of many that I have seen this fall, and as for that matter that happened every fall to the cotton producer who sells as an individual.

I could cite you the results of the warehouse at Mansfield, in Sebastian County, with J. C. Pettus as manager and salesman, as while cotton was selling by individuals on the street for a flat price for 13 cents he was selling just across the street in bulk for 13.57. This was not much gain, but was worth the effort, and the $2.75 to $3 per bale he was saving to the cotton producers was as good for the man and family who produced the cotton as for the buyer. And now, think if Pettus was surrounded by men who would not sell to a merchant or buyer under any circumstances, no matter what market rumor was started in order to create a stampede, is it not reasonable to believe that he could in a short while get the producer much more for his cotton; and, continuing the supposition, if Mansfield was surrounded by cotton-selling points, where that same plan was in successful operation, could not the agents of these houses or locals get together and call on spinners or any other buyers of cotton to come and buy the cotton on its grades at the point of production and pay for it there?

No one can dispute the soundness of the idea, but it is almost purely a supposition and will remain such until we learn to do as the few farmers who are letting Pettus sell their cotton. Therefore I say again we have first got to learn to sell collectively and not as individuals before we can put such a supposition into the realm of actual fact and reap the results. We must build the house before we can occupy it. And by proposing this idea I have simply invited you to become a student of your own good, or, to carry the figure out, I have asked you to join us in an effort to build a house, and to begin at the beginning. This beginning does not promise to make you rich before you start nor to insure you against mistakes or loss of any kind. No really honest and sincere person could make such a promise. There will be some losses and some gains, but at the first the gains must necessarily be small, and the beginner has no right to expect large gains at the first. The locals that take up this plan will be making an effort to learn a necessary lesson; those who do not will doubtless stand out as individuals and suffer as this party I have above referred to. It is up to you who read this to do as here suggested or not to do it. Those who try and persevere in the trial will, I honestly believe, sooner or later make good money out of it; those who do not can not expect anything better than they are now getting.

About buyers. One place where I proposed this plan I was approached by a sincere man who said he would go into it if I would agree to sell the cotton and not to sell it to the local buyers. There are two things about this I want to ask you to think about. First, he was prejudiced against the local buyers—and I don't blame him—and, second, he was not willing to do anything until the work had been done; that is, he wanted to be able to go around the local buyer and get to the foreign buyers, but was not willing to do the very thing that after awhile would let him reach the foreign buyer. And the attitude of this man is characteristic.

Many would adopt this plan if the purpose of the plan—to reach foreign buyers, preferably buyers for spinners—could be realized and guaranteed to them before they went into it. Well, this will never be done, and no one who will stop to reason can seriously expect such a thing. We will of necessity be forced to sell to local buyers at the first. Of course there will be some exceptions. I know of some localities where I can induce foreign buyers to go now, but not many. And the reason they will go there now is that they have found out that they will be met with business men and business proposals, and that contracts made there will be lived up to. And I will say here that until this is true of a locality there is no hope of foreign buyers going there. So again, until the beginning is made local buyers will be the main dependence. As to them, many of them are unjust and often use dishonest methods, and I don't blame the farmer for being prejudiced against them. But if you will bulk your cotton and have it graded either by the university (write the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville for instructions about this; I succeeded in getting Dr. Adams, while he was dean of the agricultural college there, to undertake this work on behalf of the farmers), or some competent grader, I say, if you will bulk your cotton and have it graded and offer it to your local buyer, you will be able in almost every instance to get more for it than by selling as you do now. And the more bulk and the stronger fight for a price you put up, and the more you persist in it, the better that price will be. And, after a while, after you have established for your agent a reputation, and have come to produce a cotton of about the same grade and staple and have stopped planting every man a different variety, you, in company with other locals, will be able to get foreign buyers, but not until then except in a few exceptional cases. But this plan or some other that will teach these principles is necessary to your getting away from the domination of local buyers. It is certain that if you will not do something like this that the local buyer will always control you as he does now.

As to what I can do to help you, that all depends on you after all. First, the cotton must be bulked under a contract that takes the sale out of the owner's hands and places it in the hands of a competent agent who has the power to sell it. It must be properly stored where it will be dry; it must also be graded and the agent must have financial ability to guarantee the grades and weights, and then if he wants me to help he must contract with me to sell the cotton and pay the actual expense. Wherever this is done I can help some; I do not promise any fancy advances or to pull off any get-rich-quick stunts in your behalf, but to honestly and in a small way help you. If I do not do anything else I can help make your local buyers give you a better deal. By now it will appear that this is no attempt on my part to control your cotton, but to help you to a sensible effort in your own behalf, and the results will depend almost entirely on you. What do you think of it?

Below is also given the contract used by the Scott Station Association, which is entered into by all that are members of that association, showing more or less in detail the plan under which this association operates:

——— ——— (Date.)

This agreement is made between ———, party of the first part, and ———, party of the second part, agent. The first party agrees to deliver to second party ——— bales of cotton ——— pounds of cotton seed on or before ——— day of ———, 19—. To assist second party in piling and shedding said bales of cotton or cotton seed, or both, or deliver the same to a warehouse to be designated by second party. The first party agrees to not remove any of said cotton or cotton seed from the possession of said second party under any condition during the life of this contract, except as hereinafter provided, and should first party remove a part or all of said cotton or cotton seed, except as hereinafter provided, he shall be bound to pay to second party the sum of $5 per bale of cotton or $2 per ton of cotton seed before removing same or any part thereof.

Second party agrees to secure contract on cotton or cotton seed from others, as above, until he has in his possession and assembled and piled or penned at least 100 bales of cotton or one minimum carload of cotton seed, to have said cotton graded by a competent grader, to offer a list of said cotton or cotton seed to at least six different buyers and as many more as he can.

To notify said first party when in his judgment the best price is secured. The first party agrees to meet second party within three days of first party's notice, and that when a majority of all parties who have signed similar contracts to this with second party have agreed to a price to sell his cotton or cotton seed in connection with such other cotton or cotton seed as second party may have in his possession under contract at the price agreed to by a majority of those persons who have contracted with second party to sell their cotton or cotton seed. The first party agrees to then deliver the cotton or cotton seed herein described to the shipping point designated by the second party within three days of notice to be given by the second party. And should first party fail to deliver such cotton or cotton seed, second party shall have authority to deliver the same and deduct from the sale price all necessary expenses of such delivery. The consideration of this contract is the sum of 50 cents per bale for each bale of cotton above mentioned and 50 cents per ton for the number of tons of cotton seed above mentioned, which sum of money is paid by the first party to second party and receipt of same is herewith acknowledged.

It is herewith provided that this contract shall expire and all of its provisions except the consideration hereof be null and void in six months from the date in case no agreement as to price above set forth is reached between the parties. It is further provided that the first party, in connection with the second party and all other persons who sign similar contracts to this with second party, shall elect from their number three persons to whom any misunderstanding which may arise concerning this contract shall be referred for settlement, and their action or decision shall be final and binding on all parties, provided that these three shall have no authority to dissolve or otherwise annul this contract.

The second party is to give bond in the sum of ——— dollars to party of first part, said bond to be approved by the committee of three persons above mentioned, for the faithful performance of his agreement herein with first party, and to pay over to first party all moneys received by him from the sale of the cotton or cottonseed herein described; provided that the payment of said moneys shall be made to first party only after the final completion of the sale of said cotton or cottonseed, weights and grades to be guaranteed by second party, agent.

Second party agrees to sell the cotton only on its grades and staple and not on a flat rate, to keep a record of the grades of each bale of cotton, and pay first party the money received for such cotton according to its grade and staple. It is further provided that neither party to this contract shall enter into any agreement with any other person or persons to fix a set price on any of the cotton or cottonseed mentioned herein, but all sales shall be made on the market at the highest prices to be obtained on grade, staple for cotton, and the highest competitive price for cottonseed.

It is understood and agreed that only members of the Farmers' Union in good standing can enter into this contract, known as the Farmers' Union cooperative contract for selling farm products.

———, *Party of the first part.*

———, *Agent, Party of the second part.*

Witnesses:

———.

———.

Those entering into this association at Scotts Station were large landholders, but the same plan was adopted by the small farmers in the vicinity of Atkins, Pope County, Ark., with success most gratifying, as I am informed. This same plan has been followed by many farmers in Kansas and elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this plan is most efficacious; it occurs to me that when the details of same are adopted by the farmers as a whole that it may be productive of great results.

I am intensely interested in the question of marketing and have introduced a bill carrying an appropriation of $250,000 to establish what might be termed a "chair of markets" in the agricultural schools of the country; but as to my bill I will have more to say in the future and on an occasion when the merits of marketing are being more thoroughly discussed by the House. As stated by me, this is a question of great and prime importance, and I am sure that when the American Congress comes to understand the question as it should be understood, when it takes into consideration that year in and year out the real producers of the wealth of this country are not receiving a fair price for that which they produce, when this Congress realizes that there is a waste of billions of dollars between the producer and the consumer that is criminal and absolutely unnecessary, thereby doing a great injustice to both the producer and the ultimate consumer and giving an unfair remuneration to those who assist in selling the products of the soil between the producer and the consumer, it will leave nothing undone to remedy this most flagrant evil and will rise as one man and say that the system and the error must be corrected, and give to him who really produces and is the burden bearer of the Government those substantial results in the form of better prices to which he is more than justly entitled.

To show the antiquated form of marketing that is indulged in by the American people to-day and the great loss that results annually to the producers of this wealth, the whole question is argued when we take into consideration the fact that the American farm products for 1912 reached the colossal amount of $13,000,000,000. Of this amount the railroads received $495,000,000, or 3.8 per cent; the legitimate expense of selling was $1,200,000,000, or 9.2 per cent; the waste in selling was $1,560,000,000, or 12 per cent; dealers' and retailers' profits, $3,745,000,000, or 28.9 per cent; the amount received by those who produced this, who toiled and labored that it might be given to the world, received $6,000,000,000, or 46.1 per cent.

Even a casual scanning of this table shows that the system is wrong, that it should be corrected; and when corrected, those so doing will be entitled to the unstinted praise of millions of producers throughout the United States and in deed and truth be great benefactors in their day and generation. [Applause.]

At this time I will not further trespass upon the time of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to consume but a moment of time, to say that I am sincerely in favor of this particular amount remaining in this bill. I think the great trouble with the high cost of living in this country is the difference between the cost of production, or the amount paid to the farmer, and the amount paid by the consumer when he purchases the farmer's product. I can give you a concrete illustration. Take a box of 176 Florida oranges. The grower gets $1.50 for that box f. o. b Florida. When that same box of oranges reaches the consumer in the city of Washington he pays $9.40 retail for those oranges. That is the fact, and I can figure it out for any gentleman who doubts it. That difference of $7.90 is paid to somebody between the producer of the oranges and the consumer of them. Now, in Georgia we have formed what is known as the Georgia Fruit Growers' Association.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. What did the gentleman say about Florida?

Mr. HOWARD. I was speaking of the difference between the cost of a box of 176 oranges in Florida from the grower and the amount they sell for at retail.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Oh.

Mr. HOWARD. Whenever I have anything to say about Florida, Mr. Chairman, it is always something very complimentary, even about the able Representatives of that State upon this floor. But to resume what I started out to say: We have in Georgia what is known as the Georgia Fruit Growers' Association.

This association was formed for several reasons, the paramount one of which was that for several years we would miss a fruit crop, say, of peaches. The third year, say, we would have an abundant crop. The result was that the production of peaches in abundance would reduce the price to the exient that peaches were hardly worth picking on account of a crude method of marketing. We formed an association; we had an agent, and he had representatives in the different cities of the country—Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, New York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn—all the great cities in the country. These agents in these large cities would inform the Fruit Growers' Association in Georgia where the market needed this fruit. The result was that no one particular market was ever glutted with peaches; they always brought a fair price. The economic waste was negligible. The result was that none of the crop was wasted. Everybody that wanted peaches got them, and no particular market had all the peaches in the country dumped upon it at once, and the grower received a fair price for his product.

Now, we adopted the same method in dealing with the Georgia watermelon. The result is that no market is glutted with the Georgia watermelon. Everybody wants Georgia watermelons; everybody loves Georgia watermelon. [Laughter and applause.] Any man that does not like the luscious Georgia watermelon is always tried for insanity on the spot, and a unanimous verdict rendered against his sanity.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. He does not need a trial and ought not to have a trial. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. The necessity for a market provision in the Agriculture Department is so great, in my mind, that the House should be as liberal with this particular item in this bill as the department believes it can use. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, not

imposing upon the House any longer, I hope the amount asked for by this splendid committee will not be reduced, and that the beneficent effects of this appropriation may percolate to the many thousands of farmers of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Massachusetts and some correspondence in relation thereto.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what resolutions they are.

Mr. TREADWAY. In reference to aid by the United States Government of the Massachusetts Nautical School.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts prefers a request to print a whole book in the RECORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts been granted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] been granted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair submitted the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts together, but some question arose as to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the Chair did not put the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he put the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts. He will now put it. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman what the nature of the extension is?

Mr. MOORE. It has no reference to the senatorial fight. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. What does it refer to?

Mr. MOORE. Some data on the Panama Canal.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD at a later date the remainder of the letter from which I read extracts a short time ago, and I will be pleased to let that serve as an answer to my colleague from the State of Washington, who seems so concerned because I have during the debate on this bill pointed out Government extravagance in the building of rival telephone lines in one forest reserve; that settlers are being unnecessarily harassed. I am proud to have the right to speak for them, notwithstanding these mean insinuations.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is an extension of a letter that he read a short time ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. My request is to that effect. I do not care to take the time of this committee in replying to offensive language. The letter will answer my colleague.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to occupy the remaining time for debate, but I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. In the current law is an item very similar, almost identical with the item in this bill, although it has not the same heading, appropriating $50,000—

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere.

It is proposed by the amendment to insert, in addition to that, a direction that the Secretary of Agriculture shall study the method and facilities for the sale of crops. That is an entirely different subject from the one that is under consideration in the bill, and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does the paragraph appear which the gentleman read?

Mr. MANN. Page 65, line 16. The gentleman proposes to insert an amendment, after the word "products," line 19, on an entirely different subject. I say entirely different. I will not deny that there is a relationship between marketing farm products and finding methods and facilities for their sale. Yet, under the rules of parliamentary law, the proposition that is offered as an amendment is not germane to the provisions in the bill, nor is there any warrant of law now for the Secretary of Agriculture to study the methods and facilities of fixing the price for which products shall be sold. Under that language, if inserted in the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture could start in to reform all the terminal transportation facilities of the country. In my judgment, it is clearly not germane. If the gentleman from Texas would permit, there was a proposition before the House in the last Congress, by a special act of Congress, to create a bureau of markets. It was thought more desirable, instead of doing that, to provide an appropriation in the Agriculture appropriation bill of $50,000 in order to commence the study along these lines.

This year the committee has recommended $200,000 instead of $50,000. So far as I am concerned, if I thought it were possible to use more money, I would not have made the point of order, but the Department of Agriculture is developing this idea just as rapidly as it can. The original proposition involved the possibility of furnishing to farmers throughout the country every day the market prices at different places in the country. That was contemplated in the original bill, which was not passed, and this provision was inserted in the bill for the very reason that Congress did not desire at that time, with the information that it had before it, to embark on a project which involved furnishing market prices every day by telegraph throughout the country, because nobody could tell what it would cost.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois has evidently examined the bill to which he made reference a moment ago. I desire to ask the gentleman if he does not believe the language carried in this bill is far broader in its scope than the language carried in the bill to which he made reference, and that it provides sufficient authorization to build up such machinery as will be necessary in carrying out this work?

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to admit that the language of this bill is quite broad. As far as we have gone, as far as we know yet, the language of the bill is broad enough to cover anything we want to do without requiring the Secretary to furnish crop prices every morning, as would be contemplated, I take it, by the amendment proposed.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois will realize that the whole Department of Agriculture has been built up upon language that is almost identical with the language submitted here.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for just a few moments. It seems to me clear that the point of order which has been made against this amendment should not be sustained. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in stating his objections to the amendment admits that the language in this section sought to be amended is broad. He complains that the amendment offered is a direction, as I understand his objection, to the Secretary of Agriculture to perform certain services which I submit are included within and germane to the general purposes of this section. This is a section to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products.

The CHAIRMAN. That language provides only for the Secretary of Agriculture gathering such information as he may and diffusing it among the people of the country, but the gentleman's amendment goes further, does it not, and requires him to take affirmative action in correcting any abuse he might conclude he found, and provide definite and better facilities for marketing and distribution of products?

Mr. SUMNERS. Under the general authority of this section the purpose of the amendment is to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to help do the constructive work necessary. He may

expend this money in accumulating this information, but unless the Secretary goes further and helps to construct the machinery the information is of no more value than if the department having in charge the improvement of roads were simply to gather the information with reference to proper material for building roads, and so forth, and then not send anyone into the field to help the people start right.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the language of the gentleman's amendment contemplate that the Secretary of Agriculture would have the right under it, if the appropriations were large enough, to provide terminal facilities, for instance?

Mr. SUMNERS. Not at all.

Mr. LEVER. Does not the gentleman think his language is broad enough to permit him to do that?

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not think so. I had not expected the Secretary would undertake to do it.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary of Agriculture would undertake to do anything that Congress authorized him to do, if Congress provided the money with which to do it.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, to be entirely candid with the gentleman from South Carolina and with the Chair, I will say that this is a great, big problem, and I am willing that the Secretary shall do whatever is necessary to stop this stuff from rotting in the fields. We have just passed a section providing for the office of supervisor of roads and we have done a good many things in this bill that under strict construction of the rule would not pass, and I submit to the Chair that this language in this amendment, under the construction which the Chair has been placing on language with reference to provisions in this appropriation bill, ought not to be held subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is not ready to rule, I desire to be heard briefly on the point of order, if the Chair has any doubt in his mind.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Just for a minute or two.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does the gentleman take?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am opposed to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that it is very likely that the department can not economically expend the amount proposed in the amendment; but referring particularly to the point of order, I want to direct the attention of the Chair to the language in the current appropriation act, which is as follows:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products.

That language is identical with language contained in this bill. Under this amendment the Secretary of Agriculture proposes to undertake investigations of a very broad scope. I read from his report:

> Marketing surveys, methods and costs, including especially available market supplies in given production areas, demand at consuming centers, cold and other storages, marketing systems and prices, and costs of wholesale and retail distribution of farm products.
>
> Transportation and storage problems, having in mind the elimination of waste and the study of problems connected with surplus market supplies; terminal and transfer facilities, including freight congestion, car supply, deterioration in transit, extension of the practice of precooling of perishable products, and other special services.

That is from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I read it merely for the purpose of indicating the breadth or scope of the language in the current appropriation bill as it is interpreted now by the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not think that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas extends the scope of this language at all. It merely directs the activity of the department to a particular channel, a channel which, in my opinion, it now has authority to follow. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas does not extend the language, it does not broaden the scope of the paragraph at all. It is a limitation in the nature of a direction to the department to follow a certain line of investigation or dissemination of information.

Mr. QUIN. Would the gentleman object to the amount of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I do not think the amount has anything to do with the point of order at all, and I am directing my argument to the language rather than the amount.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this amendment suggested by the gentleman from Texas is clearly out of order. I call the attention of the Chair to the language in the bill, which is the language also in the current law:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products.

That language was drawn in order to make it conform as nearly as possible to the language of the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture. I had the honor to draw the language myself, and gave it most careful consideration to see that points of order would not lie against it in the first instance. The language of the gentleman from Texas not only carries with it the proposition of collecting and diffusing information touching the matter of marketing and distribution of farm products, but, if I read the English correctly, it would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to provide the machinery by which farm products in this country might be distributed. I believe the language is broad enough that it would enable the Secretary of Agriculture, if Congress gave him the amount of appropriation necessary, to establish terminal facilities and market places in various cities and towns in this country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In fact, I believe it goes far enough to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish railroad facilities and to do anything that would improve market conditions. Now, such a proposition was never contemplated, certainly in my mind, when this language was drawn and put in this bill. Now I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. It does not seem to me the conclusion can be drawn by the gentleman from South Carolina from the language of the gentleman from Texas. It is a mere direction upon the Secretary to follow a line of procedure, a line of investigation and diffusion of information, under authority which he now has.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, the language, as I recall it, directs the Secretary of Agriculture to find means of improving distribution facilities and to improve facilities——

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly the first proposition is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. To investigate methods and diffuse information in regard to methods and facilities for improving distribution, that is very true; but that does not involve the purchase of machinery or the use of machinery.

Mr. LEVER. To aid in improving facilities for distribution, and that language is in the amendment of the gentleman from Texas also.

Mr. ANDERSON. But it is modified by the prior language.

Mr. LEVER. Under that he may use a portion of this appropriation to help build a depot somewhere. I do not think there is any doubt—certainly not in my mind—that this language is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. It would also enable the Secretary of Agriculture, on the part of the Government of the United States, to join any movement for a combination among the farmers.

Mr. LEVER. Well, it might do that. I think the language is broad enough to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use his own discretion about it in improving facilities for the distributon of farm products.

Mr. MADDEN. And thereby prevent the persons engaged in the combination from being prosecuted under the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I do not know about that; I am not a lawyer, as I have said, but I will say on the point made by the gentleman from Minnesota that from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture and as set forth in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, both in the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture himself and in the testimony of Mr. Brand, who has immediate charge of this work, we are led to believe the department is attempting to do nothing except to gather information along this line and diffuse and disseminate that information in accordance with the language of the act. I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is made against the amendment that it is not germane to the paragraph of the bill under consideration. The Chair quotes the language of the paragraph in the bill:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products.

This provides for the collection and diffusion of valuable information connected with the marketing and distribution of farm products.

The amendment goes very much further than that, it occurs to the Chair, and provides that he shall also aid in improving the methods for facilitating the sale and distribution of farm

products, which might lead us into a very broad field. The amendment would seem to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to go far beyond the scope of collecting and diffusing information to the people in connection with the marketing of farm products. And therefore the Chair concludes that it is not germane to the language of the paragraph which we are considering and feels constrained to and does sustain the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Demonstrations on reclamation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $25,000, of which sum $10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph as changing existing law.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if he will withhold the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN. I will withhold it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, we dispose of the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard very briefly on the point of order. I know, Mr. Chairman, that various Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole have been holding for some time that the language "and elsewhere"—that is, for the employment of persons elsewhere than in the city of Washington—makes the language subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. It is just the reverse.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, section 169 of the Revised Statutes enables the executive officers of these various Government departments to employ persons in the city of Washington, and, as I understand it, the language which makes the paragraph obnoxious to the rule is contained in the words "and elsewhere."

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is in error about that, although I am not sure about it. But my recollection is that there is a provision against employing in the city of Washington help out of the lump-sum appropriation, and I think that is what the gentleman has in mind. There is no question about our right to make a lump-sum appropriation anywhere for people that are employed under the law, and the only thing that is forbidden, if anything is forbidden, is the employment of people in the city of Washington out of the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Chair will find this matter came up on the military appropriation bill some years ago, when we were providing for the employment of persons outside of Washington at some military station, and the point of order was made against the proposition to carry appropriations for the purpose of paying salaries of employees outside of the city of Washington. The Chair then held that such language made the paragraph subject to a point of order; and I submit to the Chair that, while the rulings of different chairmen may be against me on this proposition, unless the gentleman making the point of order can show some statute or authority other than the rulings of the Chair prohibiting the use of such language or the employment of funds for such purposes, the reasoning of the Chair, in my judgment, in these cases has not been good.

Here we have the great Department of Agriculture. We are carrying more than $18,000,000 for it. Necessarily a great deal of that money must be used for the employment of persons and the payment of salaries of the same, who are to do work outside of the city of Washington. It does not seem to me that there is any line of reasoning or any philosophy that would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture, or any executive head, so far as that is concerned, from taking these appropriations and using them for the payment of salaries of persons engaged in doing the work of the department outside of the city of Washington. Now, a great deal—in fact, a large part—of the funds of the Department of Agriculture would necessarily be spent in the field. And if the Chair holds this proposition to be obnoxious to the rule, he can practically destroy the efficiency of the Department of Agriculture by refusing to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to employ the machinery for carrying the information of this department in person out in the field and giving it to the people of the country.

I say again, that I confess I can not understand the reasoning of the different Chairmen in the past. Unless the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] can point his finger to some statute which specifically prohibits it—and I have not been able to find it, and I have made some little investigation—I believe the Chair would be justified in overturning the precedent, which does not seem to me to be founded on any good reason.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order. The fundamental law establishing the Department of Agriculture uses this language:

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

Now, this item in the bill proposes to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development on the Government reclamation projects, and in this way "to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways settlers on the projects." The Government has expended something like $60,000,000 in the building up of canals, drainage systems, and other work necessary to put the water on these arid lands. They have advertised throughout this country and the world the fact that lands were open to settlement and to cultivation on the reclamation projects. The people have gone there, many of them from States where irrigation was not practiced, and they find themselves in difficulties in the matter of applying the water to the crop. Some of them are inclined to apply too much water, some at the wrong season, some to irrigate crops at improper times, and some have made mistakes in determining the crop that ought to be planted, and some have made mistakes in the time of planting the different crops. And they have various other questions connected with the actual development of agriculture on their reclamation projects.

Now, because there are special difficulties attached to this special work a special item has been put into this bill directing the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture to the difficulties that these farmers found, and there is to be done on these reclamation projects the same kind of work done elsewhere—investigate the problems, find the solutions, and convey the information as to how to solve the problems to the farmers on the projects; and the language I read in the law establishing the Department of Agriculture enables the Secretary of Agriculture in the most explicit and definite terms to do any and all of these things that are specified in this item.

Now, in order to get this information to the farmer, he is authorized in that act to convey it in any way that he may think advisable. He has authority to convey it by publication, by written instructions, or by the personal contact of some subordinate in his department with the farmers on the project.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Admitting, as I do, that under the law they have authority to give demonstrations as a method of diffusing information, where it says, "to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects," what does the phrase "other ways" mean? Might not that be construed to assist financially? No one would claim there was any warrant of law for that.

Mr. HAWLEY. I would think there would be no justification for the expenditure of money to assist the settler financially. But the words "in other ways" would mean just the same as if the words "other similar ways" were used.

Mr. MANN. What other similar ways are there after you have advised a man and shown him how? What other ways are there of conveying information except by doing the thing itself? We use the word "demonstration" in various places in the bill—for live-stock demonstration and farm demonstration. That is supposed to cover the whole subject. Now, in regard to that "advice, and in other ways," what other ways would there be?

Mr. HAWLEY. Well, there are a number of farmers, for instance, on a project, endeavoring to grow alfalfa. They have alkali in the soil, and the department has investigated that problem in some other projects and found a solution of it. To the farmers on the project they would say, "On a certain day an expert on alkaline conditions will be on your project. Meet him and hear what he has to say."

Mr. MANN. That is giving advice. If the expert goes and shows them, that is demonstrating. I was simply trying to find a method of striking that out.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have no objection to the language going out. The language, however, is the same as was carried in the law for some time.

Mr. MANN. This item has never been in the law before.

Mr. HAWLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I should have said it was the language suggested by the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain wherein the work under this paragraph differentiates from the

work authorized under the paragraph at the bottom of page 60, to which the gentleman directed his attention?

Mr. HAWLEY. The authority given at the bottom of page 60 in that paragraph is for a general investigation of all subjects in which irrigation agriculture is interested. This item on pages 65 and 66 is a special application to the difficult problems on any project where difficult problems exist, and to carry the work of demonstration and advice to the farmers on the project. It is supplementary to the former item, and gives definite authority for the carrying of the information for the solution of the problem to the farmer.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. I was not going to ask a question. I was going to take the floor in my own right.

Mr. HAWLEY. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

Mr. HAWLEY. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Chair again to that general statute that I read establishing the Department of Agriculture and to the broad and almost unlimited scope that that language gives to Congress in legislating upon this subject. Everything is included; and, therefore, the work to be done under this paragraph is clearly within the limitations of that statute.

Mr. LEVER rose.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Chair——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think we can expedite the consideration of this proposition if I make this statement: I had not noticed in arguing the point of order the words "of which sum $10,000 shall be immediately available." Of course that makes the paragraph subject to a point of order, and I concede it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am going to make that point before I get through with it.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 65, line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 65, after line 22, by inserting the following as a new paragraph:

"Demonstrations on irrigation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of reclamation projects, to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $25,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that as a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina extends the scope of the law under which the Department of Agriculture is organized by the use of the words "and in other ways" in his amendment, which words give a more comprehensive power to the department than it now has under the law under which it is organized.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to modify my amendment by striking out the comma after the word "advice" and striking out the words "and in other ways" and the comma, and inserting between the word "demonstrations" and the word "advice" the word "and."

Mr. MADDEN. How would that read, then?

Mr. LEVER. So that it would read "to assist, through demonstrations and advice, settlers on the projects," and so on.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection to that. I will withdraw the point of order if unanimous consent is given to that change.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of language suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the amendment be reported to the paragraph in the bill. Will the gentleman withdraw his amendment as a new paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I offered it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I know. Withdraw that and amend the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Very well. I offer the amendment to the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph is already out of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is the fact.

Mr. MANN. I did not so understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as a new paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, after line 22, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"Demonstrations of reclamation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstration and advice, settlers on the projects, and for the employment of persons and means necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 5, on page 66, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry-Land Congress, to be held at Wichita, Kans., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid region of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $20,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not reserve any point of order; that is, I hope he will withdraw it. It fell to my lot once, and it was a very disagreeable duty, to stop an emergency appropriation for the dry-land farming congress held somewhere down in the Southwest—I think in the great State of Oklahoma. Now, there is plenty of time to consider this. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] was favoring this very project at that time. If we are going to do it at all, let us do it now and let the House have a vote on it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman object to reserving the point of order? Does he want the gentleman from South Carolina to make it?

Mr. MANN. I want him to withdraw it.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is always persuasive, but I am afraid I can not accommodate him in this instance; so I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment relates to a Government exhibit at the International Dry Farming Congress. Those who live on the Great Plains have what they call a dry-farming congress each year. They invite to it the representatives of other nations, because other nations have dry-farming problems. I understand that Canada usually makes an exhibit. This country has made exhibits. I think the last time the Government exhibit was at Tulsa, Okla., and we provided for it in a paragraph similar to the one which I have introduced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the reading of this great bill from beginning to end, and the consideration of it, now about to conclude. Agriculturally considered, there is no section of the country more fascinating in its problems and more alluring in its possibilities than the Great Plains section. It is distinct as a section. It is about 1,100 miles long and about 350 miles wide. It extends from the ninety-eighth meridian on its eastern border to the 5,000-foot contour at the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. It has an exceedingly rich soil, but its marvelously rich and fertile soil is complicated by an irregular distribution of rainfall. Occasionally and very frequently portions of that land produce prodigiously and profitably.

The first agricultural attack upon these plains many years ago was with the idea that you could apply to it the methods of tillage and the plant life of the section farther east. The men who attempted that were, in a measure, defeated; but there has grown upon those plains in the last 25 or 30 years a strong type of man who has courage, determination, and who understands his climate and his soil. This man has brought to that land improved methods of tillage applicable to that climate and that soil, and with the aid of the Government he has also brought to it a wonderfully interesting adaptation of plant life, as, for instance, the forage crops, kaffir corn, and some drought-resisting grasses.

The men who have accomplished this settlement on the Great Plains have done one of the really remarkable things of our time. Their congress is an expression of their triumph. This year they are to hold their congress in my town, Wichita. It lies to the east of this Great Plains section. It has profited and grown up largely by the patronage of a portion of that section of the country. The representatives of 10 foreign nations which

have similar problems to deal with will be on hand. I understand Canada will be represented there with an exhibit. I think it is fitting that this Government should have an exhibit there. In the last few days we have seen numerous items considered which provided for appropriations to enable the Government to demonstrate its methods of improved agriculture for the benefit of the farmer. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate them through an exhibit to the men who gather there. I hope—although I have no very lively hope in this regard—that the gentleman from South Carolina will sufficiently yield for this once at least to withdraw his point of order at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I appeal to him for information, in the absence of the gentleman from Wyoming, who usually furnishes the House with information on the Dry Farming Congress, because he at one time was president of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Which I never have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman looked up to see what appropriations were made for the Dry Farming Congress when it was held in Canada two or three years ago?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I have not.

Mr. LEVER. I can inform the gentleman. It was $20,000.

Mr. MANN. We have made appropriations several times. My recollection is that these appropriations have been carried heretofore in the sundry civil bill or in a deficiency bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I think the last appropriation was in the Agricultural bill.

Mr. MANN. I think it is more appropriate that they should be in the Agricultural bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. The last one was carried in the Agricultural bill at this point where I want to insert this amendment.

Mr. LEVER. The Agriculture bill has carried two appropriations, one for when the congress was held in Canada and the last one—I do not remember where it was.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was in Oklahoma. Was not one carried for Colorado Springs?

Mr. LEVER. No; I think not. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that these appropriations have always been put on in the Senate. The Committee on Agriculture in the House has been against the proposition without any exception.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, let me appeal to the gentleman from South Carolina. Here is the gentleman from Kansas, Progressive leader in the House, and the exposition is to be held in his home town. It is the custom of Congress to make appropriations for these expositions. Under the circumstances, while it has been customary in the past to require that the item should be inserted in the Senate, does not the gentleman from South Carolina think that it would be the courteous thing on this occasion to permit the item to be inserted here, as it is certain to be inserted sooner or later somewhere, and let the gentleman from Kansas have the credit for the appropriation in his home town?

Mr. LEVER. That is a very strong statement and a very fair statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. It appeals to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. And it appeals to me, for I have a strong personal affection for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]. I suggest, however, that $20,000 is rather large, and I would like to inquire if he would not be willing to make it $10,000?

Mr. MURDOCK. Delighted, I will say to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Of course, if no member of the Committee on Agriculture objects. What does the gentleman from Iowa say?

Mr. HAUGEN. I make no objection; in fact, I think it would be very appropriate and just.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will make no objection if the gentleman will modify his amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by making it $10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. I make my most profound bow to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from South Carolina, the gentleman from Iowa, and all the Members of the House.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to the amendment. I am certainly very much gratified at the success which seems apparent for this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]. I am his neighbor. I live a little farther out toward the semiarid region than he does. I see that he claims that Wichita is just on the border of this region. I have observed that this semiarid region is always west of us.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not use the word "arid"; that is a comparative term in my country.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I live in what some call the semiarid region.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman lives in a subhumid region.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I attended the International Dry Farming Congress held last year at Tulsa. It was a remarkable exhibition, and very impressive. It was largely attended, and I am sure accomplished much good. Few people realize the importance of encouraging the production of products out in this section of the country. We have just passed, I believe, a proposition to appropriate $25,000 to help the settlers on irrigation projects. That is all very worthy. But, after all, only a very small percentage of area can be helped by irrigation. Out in that vast plain country are hundreds of millions of acres of land that I believe in time, under proper assistance from the National Government, will be brought under cultivation and will make homes for tens of millions of people who will become useful and helpful citizens of this great country.

I believe that this Congress and this Government should render every aid possible for the development of Agriculture by dry-farming methods. I myself, in 25 years of residence in the West, have seen millions of acres brought under cultivation which at one time was supposed to be too far west for successful farming. Hundreds of thousands of happy people are now living and sustaining themselves there. Even 20 years ago we in Oklahoma who lived in the center of the State thought that out in the western fourth of the State, where I live now, it was too dry; that you could not sustain a population; that farmers could not support themselves; and yet to-day that is a prosperous section of the State. Through the selection of proper crops, through better understanding of how to cultivate the land, through the assistance given by the National Government, and through the pluck and determination and intelligence of American citizens who have gone to that country, that land is now worth from $20 to $30 per acre and we are building up a splendid civilization, equal to the best in any section of this country.

So I congratulate my colleague from Kansas that he has offered this amendment and is about to secure this appropriation, and I hope no gentleman in the House will object to it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I only want a second. I desire to say that I hope members of the committee will not take this action as a precedent for coming to the Committee on Agriculture with propositions for appropriations for all kinds of exhibits throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 13 of the act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 963), is hereby amended by striking out the word "five," in the first line of said section, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five," the purpose of this amendment being to increase the percentage payable to each State from moneys received, as provided in said section, from 5 to 25 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order on the ground that it changes existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if he makes it against the entire paragraph?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of such temporary farm buildings as may be found necessary, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $50,000, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell in the open market or to exchange for other live stock or farm products to the best advantage, without the usual condemnation proceedings and public auction, such live stock or farm products as cease to be needed: *Provided*, That all moneys received from the sale of such live stock or farm products, or as a bonus in the exchange of the same, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede, of course, that this paragraph is subject to a point or order, but inasmuch as we have just allowed the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] to insert an item which was clearly subject to a point of order, and inasmuch as the Secretary of Agriculture was very earnest in his recommendation of this item in order to do work in the cane-sugar producing belt of the country, I trust the point of order will not be made.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman a question. I am quite willing to appropriate $50,000, but is it intended, as appears from this paragraph, that the Government shall own a farm, erect farm buildings, and raise and fatten live stock and sell the live stock, or is it intended that the Government shall furnish bulls for service in that region?

Mr. LEVER. Neither. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois. The purpose of the work is to redirect, as it were, the agricultural situation and to cooperate with the State authorities in doing so. It may be necessary to erect a very cheap building of some character on a demonstration farm somewhere, but of course the Government would not own the farm and the land would be contributed by individuals, or probably by the State; but there is no intention either to buy breeding cattle or to buy land for those purposes. It is really in line with the demonstration methods being carried on in the South, except that you would have to get a little different type of men to do the work.

Mr. MANN. Is it intended to buy cattle?

Mr. LEVER. No; that is not the intention.

Mr. MANN. If you do not buy cattle, how are you going to sell them?

Mr. LEVER. We do not sell them.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly; because there is an express provision authorizing the sale of cattle without selling them at auction.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will remember, in the estimate submitted by the department it was proposed to buy a few bulls for stock purposes, but when the committee framed this paragraph we specially struck that authorization out, and the rest of the paragraph was not reframed to meet that.

Mr. LEVER. We provide in another place that no part of the funds of this appropriation bill shall be used for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. You provide in another place that no part of that fund shall be used for the purchase of live stock.

Mr. LEVER. I think this is what it means. It may be that some stockman would make a gift of a fine bull to the Department of Agriculture, and it becoming the property of the department, the department would want to dispose of it at some time later.

But I will tell the gentleman very frankly there was no thought in the mind of the committee, and certainly no suggestion from the Department of Agriculture, that any of this appropriation was to be used for the buying of breeding cattle or for the purchase of farms or anything of that kind.

Mr. MANN. Then it could not possibly do any harm to strike out all after the figures "$50,000."

Mr. HAUGEN. In a way it is establishing an experiment station such as we have in the States to experiment in stock breeding, such as we have in the States' experimental stations, and in order to carry on the experiments they must have the stock with which to experiment, and as the stock matures they have to dispose of it. This is along the same line that is carried on in practically all of the States of the Union.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing special about this place——

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I have absolutely no objection to the amendment he suggests.

Mr. HAUGEN. In regard to the disposition of the stock. You must have the stock to demonstrate with, and, if so, you must have authority to dispose of the stock when it is mature and prepared for market.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is done in cooperation with the States?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; my understanding is——

Mr. MADDEN. Allow me to suggest that what I wanted to have covered in my point of order was all after the figures "$50,000," in line 15. I desire to have all that stricken out on my point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking to have some further information. I may make it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Regular order!

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to get some information from the chairman——

Mr. LEVER. I confess there was not a great deal in the hearings on the proposition. I thought I had the full notes here, but I find I do not have them in my papers. I did make a very full statement in the report, as the gentleman will see.

Mr. STAFFORD. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has stated, we are going to adopt an innovation here, so far as certain States are concerned, and establish experiment stations similar to those established by the States. Is that correct?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that is not my understanding of the situation at all. My understanding of it is that the department, in cooperation with the State authorities of Louisiana, will send some of its very best trained men to do demonstration work, in the hope of redirecting the agricultural condition in that State, and that no experiment station, as we understand the ordinary meaning of that expression, is to be established. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not a permanent station, but the proposition is to demonstrate stock raising, and of course in order to carry on the experimentation they must buy the stock, and when the stock mature and are ready for sale there must be a provision in this law authorizing the sale of the stock. The experimentation can be carried on without stock.

Mr. LEVER. And this work is in cooperation with the State experiment station, and there is this difference——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in my own time, that we may thrash this matter out. The only difference is that one is experiment stations and the other is temporary. In this we simply appropriate enough money to carry on the demonstration and teach the people the best methods of stock raising for one year.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. In cooperation with the State experiment station already existing.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly, and it also provides for the buildings necessary. The gentleman will remember that attention was called to a certain process of drying hay, and various things incidental to stock raising.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman refers to State experiment stations of the various States does he mean by that the experiment stations under the control of the National Government or the State experiment stations?

Mr. HAUGEN. Provided for by the National Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is no departure from the existing practice as carried on by the National Government in other lines of activities?

Mr. HAUGEN. The line of work to be carried on in those stations, as I understand it, is identical with that carried on in experiment stations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Maintained by the Government?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; appropriated for by the National Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order to strike out all after the figures "$50,000," page 67, line 15.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman he ought not to do that. If it is to be of any value whatever, they must have the stock.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I reserved a point of order to the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserved a point of order, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] made a point of order against certain portions of it.

Mr. LEVER. A parliamentary inquiry. Am I to understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to make the point of order against the paragraph or only certain language of it?

The CHAIRMAN. Only as to the language after the figures "50,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the entire paragraph. I would like to have the gentleman's attention to that provision on page 19, lines 17 to 22.

which provides for an authorization by the Bureau of Animal Industry as to the investigation and encouragement of improved methods of farm management, and ask why the omnibus provision there stated would not cover this identical case?

Mr. LEVER. We discussed that very question in committee. I have now a good deal more information than I had a moment ago, because I have gotten the hearings. But the committee thought, and the testimony was to the effect, that the item to which the gentleman is now referring, on page 19, is to be used in tick-free areas in the South. Now, this sum of money is to be used entirely in the State of Louisiana, on account of the change in the economic situation. The item which the gentleman here is talking about is to be used in other sections of the South in tick-free areas.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand from your exposition of the subject here, the National Government does maintain experiment stations in various States, carrying on work of similar character?

Mr. LEVER. There are 48 of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. And this is not a radical departure from the established practice of the National Government?

Mr. LEVER. This is along the same line as heretofore, but yet not exactly in the same line, because the work is to be devoted to one special line rather than to the regular work of agricultural experimentation.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long does the gentleman think this line of experimentation will continue if it is established?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that this appropriation will be continued over two or three years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the gentlemen from Louisiana, who are most anxious to have this appropriation, agree with the statement that it will only be a matter of two or three years duration?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, we agree absolutely with the statement that it will not be more than one or two to three years. We are conducting experiments in Louisiana for rice purposes, and we are also conducting experiments, entirely by the State, for sugar-cane production. We propose to change that along the line suggested in the provision by the Secretary of Agriculture; and the State of Louisiana will cooperate and turn over whatever it has toward that work in order to try to change from one great industry that apparently must go out of business, in large part anyhow, and experiment along the lines of producing meats and grains and hay and things of that character. And I do not think that more than one or two, and certainly not more than three, years of this appropriation will be asked of Congress.

Mr. LEVER. In addition to that, I wish to say——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on the exposition made by the gentleman I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. HAWLEY. Did the Chair rule on the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, lines 6 to 7, after the word "production," strike out "in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States"; and in lines 11 and 12, after the word "production," strike out "in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary of Agriculture wants to designate Louisiana or any other State as the one beneficiary of this appropriation, he may do so. But I question whether it is proper to put in a law this special provision that $50,000 shall be expended only in certain States.

Granted that the party in power has the right to do very much as it pleases with an appropriation of this kind, though it be for the employment of experts in certain emergencies or for the employment of labor, the law ought to be general and there ought to be as fair a show for the State of Minnesota, for example, to seek participation in this appropriation for experimental purposes as is conceded to Louisiana or any other State. Experimental work of this kind might result in very great benefit to the farmers of Michigan or to those of California. So that it seems unfair and unwise to specialize at this time and in this way that this appropriation shall not go into any of them. This appropriation should be for the benefit of the whole country, and those who come from other sections, where stock raising and stock experimentation is a part of the life of the community, ought to have a chance to ask the Secretary of Agriculture for the application of some of these funds. The information is as valuable in one section as it is in another, so far as practical purposes are concerned.

If we were to discuss it from the political viewpoint, there is no reason why, if the administration wants to exercise its authority, it could not apply all of this money to one particular State, or one particular city, or one particular county. It is Democratic doctrine that there ought to be no special privileges, that the benefits that are administered as the result of our laws should be enjoyed by all, and that there should be no special privileges to any.

Now, if it is a fact that down in Louisiana, in particular, the tariff legislation affecting the production of sugar has made it necessary for the National Congress to send money there to make good the losses that have resulted from such Democratic legislation, that fact ought to be generally known. Our sympathies on this side of the House go out to the people of Louisiana who have suffered a loss of revenue as the result of Democratic tinkering with the tariff law. Certain sections of the State, it was said, would by reason of the removal of the duty on sugar be depopulated; and the cane producer, we were told, would be very much discouraged in his efforts.

I do not want to interfere with a general appropriation that will help the cane producer to improve his stock conditions or to turn his mind to new avenues of employment. I will gladly vote money to him and to others that have been so unfortunate as to come under the baneful effects of the Democratic tariff law if it will help them, but I do not think we ought to specialize it in our legislation. We ought to make the law general.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. I wish to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LEVER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is entitled to speak for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit a request. I notice a number of gentlemen on their feet. We are likely to precipitate a tariff discussion. The Agricultural appropriation bill has never been a vehicle of political discussion. I want to get through with the consideration of this bill this evening. Gentlemen must realize how tired I am, after a whole week of standing on my feet here, and other gentlemen are tired, too. I wish very much that gentlemen will let us get through with this bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the unique distinction of being one of the many "cousins" of BOB BROUSSARD, having been born down in Louisiana, and I am very anxious to have an opportunity to vote for this thing and against this amendment. I am glad, as a son of Louisiana, to support it, and I hope we shall all support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 12, after the words "United States," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert the following: "$50,000, provided that no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of animals for breeding purposes."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word in regard to the amendment. It is very evident that the people of Louisiana need help; that recent legislation puts them in such a position that they can not carry on the business in which they have been engaged, and they need help in engaging in new work.

But I think a misapprehension prevails in regard to this experiment station. That was evidenced by the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], whether this is to be an ordinary experiment station such as is established by the Federal Government, or by the States assisted by the Federal Government, and I feel that the answer given by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] leads the gentleman from Wisconsin to believe that this is to be one of the ordinary experiment stations.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is my impression. That is the reason why I made a point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This is not the ordinary experiment station. The experiment stations are established at the agricultural colleges by the States, and are carried on by the States, assisted in some measure and to some extent by appropriations made by the Federal Government.

If the language remains as it is in the bill, it will provide for stock farms, for the purchase of breeding animals, and the carrying on of demonstrations, and the raising of stock on as large a scale as the use of $50,000 will permit.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I did not catch the reading of the amendment. There is so much confusion that I can not always hear my own voice. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. I rather think I am going to agree to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be reported again, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] will yield for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Let it be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 12, after the words "United States," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert the following: "Fifty thousand dollars: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of animals for breeding purposes."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has said, in answer to a question asked by some Member on the floor, that the work is to be carried on in the State of Louisiana the same as in sections of the South which are free from the cattle tick.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that I will accept that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has made quite a serious statement here.

Mr. LEVER. I did not hear the statement.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have the floor, and if it is agreeable to the gentleman from South Carolina I will say that I will stop talking and let the amendment be voted upon.

Mr. LEVER. I accept the amendment without further discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has some time left, and if he desires to use it he may do so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not care to use any further time. Let us have a vote.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is to encourage the live-stock industry of the South; and in order to carry on the proposed experiments as they are carried on in the experiment stations, it will be necessary to have the stock to experiment with. Without the stock the experiments can not be carried on. Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] would preclude the department from purchasing stock for breeding purposes. I take it that they would have authority under the law to purchase stock for experiments in feeding and other purposes. Now, why should not the authority be given to encourage breeding as well as feeding. If the appropriation is to be of any value whatever, and if it is for the purpose claimed by the gentleman from Louisiana, then by all means they should have the stock to experiment with.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, let me say briefly that my understanding is that the Department of Agriculture has never had any intention of purchasing breeding stock for this work in that section, but that the intention is to do in a little better way the same kind of work that it is doing in South Carolina, for instance, in teaching the people of that State the better methods of live-stock growing by sending an expert cattle breeder into a community, organizing associations, and teaching them the best breeds of cattle for the particular localities in which they live. I understand that the department intends to do this same character of work in a little more intensive, energetic, and concentrated way in the State of Louisiana, and that there has never been any intention to purchase stock for breeding purposes. Hence I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. If it is not the intention to carry on experiments and to own stock and to purchase stock, then this amendment will do no harm. But I will ask the gentleman, Why was the provision inserted authorizing the department to sell live stock at auction or otherwise?

Mr. LEVER. My answer to that a moment ago was that I understand the language was put in for the reason that some stock breeder in the State of Kansas or Iowa who wanted to advertise his breed of cattle, Hereford or some other type, might donate to the Federal Government a fine bull for breeding purposes. My friend from Louisiana states that a West Virginia breeder has already made just such an offer. Now, the Government having come into the possession of this property at some time might want to dispose of it. I presume the language was put in there for that purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am satisfied that this proposition has merit. If the chairman and the gentleman from Louisiana are satisfied to accept the amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Louisiana informs me he has no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the maximum salary of any scientific investigator, or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriations of the Department of Agriculture, shall not exceed $4,500 per annum.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it the intention to fix the compensation of experts at the rate of $4,500 a year or is it intended to fix it so that a scientific expert may work for 10 days in the year and receive $4,500 annually?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that the language in the bill was submitted by the department, and is intended to raise the salary limit of experts in the department $500. The gentleman knows that the maximum annual salary is now $4,000. The Secretary of Agriculture and the committee desire that that limit be raised by $500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert on page 68, line 2, after the word "exceed," the words "at the rate of."

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 68, line 2, after the word "exceed," insert the words "at the rate of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to prepare a plan for reorganizing, redirecting, and systematizing the work of the Department of Agriculture as the interests of economical and efficient administration may require; such plan shall be submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1916; and the estimates of expenses of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1916 shall be prepared and submitted in accordance therewith.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to offer an amendment to the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Will not the gentleman from Illinois reserve the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I will reserve it.

Mr. MANN. I hope my colleague will not make the point of order. I understand an amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] which will allow the Secretary to prepare a plan and submit it to Congress for its action.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. After hearing my amendment, I think the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Let us hear the amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will send it to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 7, after the word "require," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert "and such plan shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session for consideration."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina, because this is in line with his special work, the advisability of permitting any department head to revise his plan of estimates. You will recall that some years ago we forbade it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If my amendment is adopted, it will not authorize him to change any method of submitting estimates in the slightest degree. All he will be authorized to do is to submit a plan of reorganization to Congress for its consideration. The estimates will be submitted in the regular way.

Mr. STAFFORD. He would continue to submit his estimates in accordance with the present law?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. He would.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. MANN. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter employees of the Department of Agriculture assigned to permanent duty in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leave of absence not to exceed 30 days in any one year, which leave may, in exceptional or meritorious cases, where an employee is ill, be extended, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, not to exceed 30 days additional in any one year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. I think 60 days' leave of absence is more than ought to be granted to anybody in the service. No such leave is granted in any private enterprise in the United States.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, $18,947,232.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. While this item is carried in the present law, it is a memorandum merely, and ought not to be in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is right about it, although this bill has always carried this language.

Mr. MANN. It did last year.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think it makes any difference.

Mr. MANN. If it should be carried at all, the word "bill" should be changed to the word "act." But it is a memorandum merely, and although it is sometimes carried in an appropriation bill, it is simply information.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection to its going out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the last two lines on page 68 be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the last two lines, 21 and 22, on page 68, be striken out. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the following Members were given leave to extend remarks in the RECORD: Mr. SUMNERS, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska, Mr. QUIN, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HELVERING, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement prepared by Judge D. C. Beman, of Denver, in reference to the appropriation for the migratory bird law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would inquire if that is a very extensive statement?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It is not a long statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. RAGSDALE, to Mr. YOUNG of Texas, and to Mr. LANGLEY to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress a very distinguished Democrat was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. In fact, a number of very distinguished men have been chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, even since my service in the House, but I believe that never have we had a better chairman, and I am somewhat doubtful whether we have ever had so patient a chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and as we are now about to close the consideration of this bill and pass it, I think I am speaking the sentiment of every Member of this House when I say we congratulate the gentleman upon his ability, his clearness of expression, his patience, and his constant courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I concur in what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I believe it can be truthfully said that no one has pursued his duty with greater fidelity and conscious rectitude of purpose than has the gentleman who has presided over the Committee on Agriculture during this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago in general debate I expressed my admiration of and my affection for our distinguished chairman, all of which he deserved. I appreciate and I am sure he appreciates the kind expressions that have come from gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. I rise at this time to say that I am sure that all of you will appreciate more, if possible, the patience and courtesy and kindness of our distinguished chairman during the consideration of this bill when I tell you that during all of the time it has been under consideration he has labored under serious difficulties, having had during all of the time very serious illness in his family.

I join most heartily in the congratulations which have been expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and other gentlemen who have spoken. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to add my testimony to that offered by the gentlemen on the other side of the House and by my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] in behalf of the chairman of this committee. I have never served on a committee where the chairman was more devoted to his work or more attentive to his duties than has been the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. [Applause.] He has presented and defended in a masterly manner every provision of this bill, and by his patience and courteous conduct has won the admiration of all. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it is needless to say that I very greatly appreciate the kind expressions of my friends, and I desire to say in this connection that if at any time during the consideration of this bill, laboring under the difficulties I have labored under, I have shown any impatience or in any way wounded the feelings of any Member, I at this time publicly apologize for so doing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct the totals of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct the totals of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCKELLAR, for one week, on account of important business.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, no adverse report having been made thereon—

To Mr. ASHBROOK, papers in the case of Stanford Timmons, Sixty-first Congress; also papers in the case of Frank S. McKee, Sixty-second Congress.

To Mr. HAMLIN, papers in the case of H. R. 4009, pension claim of R. D. Shackleford, Sixty-third Congress.

### CAPT. FRANK PARKER.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill S. 746, which was read in the House yesterday morning, if I can have it reported at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the request of the gentleman.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to call up the bill S. 746, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire, if I might, of the Speaker whether this is to become the practice, if this bill shall be passed to-night, to recognize gentlemen—oh, late in the evening or at any other time to call up bills by unanimous consent which are on the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case I objected yesterday morning to the consideration of this bill because of the anxiety of Members here to conclude the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and I am very anxious now that the gentleman from South Carolina shall have an opportunity to have that bill considered, and I withdraw any objection I made before to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us have the bill read first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That nothing contained in the proviso under the heading "Pay of officers of the line" in the act approved August 24, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," shall be held to apply to the service of Capt. Frank Parker, United States Army, for the period necessary for him to complete his present tour of duty at L'Ecole de Guerre, France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like for the gentleman from South Carolina to make some explanation of this bill. The gentleman is asking that this bill take a course different from the ordinary, and I think it deserves some explanation before it should be passed at this late hour in the evening.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator TILLMAN, because this gentleman was ordered abroad, he having seen a great deal of service in different places. This bill has the indorsement of Gen. Wood and the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the War Department generally, and of both the Military Committees of the Senate and House, who have looked into this matter. This gentleman was ordered to France to complete his studies there in this school of war. On account of a bill which was passed prohibiting the absence of an officer from his troop for a certain period of time it was technically decided that he could not stay in that school of war. He has already leased a home there for his family, and this bill, if passed, would enable him to complete his studies there.

Mr. STAFFORD. If this bill passes, will it enable him to stay there the length of time to complete his studies?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes; to finish his course.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long will that be?

Mr. RAGSDALE. About a year, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand a companion bill has been reported from the House Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes; unanimously favorably reported. I submit herewith a portion of the report from the House Committee on Military Affairs:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker, reports the same back favorably to the House of Representatives with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

In explanation of the action of the committee there is herewith attached and made a part of this report the report made by Mr. Brady of the Senate committee. Therein is shown—

1. That the President of the United States, through the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of War, recommends favorable action.

2. That the Senate has twice passed this bill (at the last and present sessions), calling attention to its merits and to the unique and exceptional circumstances of the case.

3. That a unanimous favorable report has been made thereon from the Military Committee of the Senate of the Sixty-second Congress, from the Military Committee of the Senate of the Sixty-third Congress, and from the Military Committee of the House of the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from South Carolina will yield to me for a moment, I think I can make an explanation which I think will satisfy the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. This bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House also, which had it under consideration. This gentleman was assigned to this war college in France by the department to study certain features of cavalry maneuvers of the French Army, and under the provisions of a statute he had been away from his troops longer than the law allows, and technically he was required, on account of the length of time he had been abroad, to go back to his command; and the War Department has recommended heartily that he be allowed to finish his course, or it will be of no material benefit.

Mr. STAFFORD. Right there, will the gentleman inform the House whether there are any companion cases awaiting similar disposition?

Mr. HOWARD. I do not think there are any pending of this particular character.

Mr. MANN. The only reason this man requires this action is because the law provides an assignment unless the man has been two years with his arm of the service. He was ordered by the President of the United States or the commanding officer of the Army to report for duty in Cuba at the request of the President of Cuba, and performed that service with a Cuban regiment, exactly the same as he would have performed service if he had been with his own regiment. But under the strict interpretation of the law, although he was ordered to do this and perform that service, he could not be counted as having been two years with his arm of the service. He was not to blame for being ordered to Cuba, and he obeyed orders.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question the facts, or that the case is meritorious, but I would not wish such a practice as to unanimous consent to creep in as would subject us to the same criticism as was made when Speaker Cannon presided over the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement what my colleague has just said. If this sort of practice is to obtain, we might just as well do away with the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. This bill can not go on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. COOPER. What the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] said suggests to me that it might be well for the new Members to understand precisely why a few years ago the Unanimous Consent Calendar was created. There had grown up during the previous 25 years or more the practice by which the question of whether a Member should have the privilege of asking for unanimous consent was left entirely to the discretion of the Speaker. A practice by which a Member desiring to ask the House for unanimous consent was compelled first to go to the Speaker, usually in his private room—not alone to Speaker Cannon, but to any of his predecessors as well—and try to secure his promise to recognize him to make the request. If the Speaker felt so disposed, he would promise the Member to recognize him; if for any reason he did not feel so disposed, if he felt aggrieved because of something the Member had done, he could refuse him that privilege; and this private refusal sometimes made it very difficult for a Member to explain to his constituents why certain gentlemen on this floor were enabled to get requests for unanimous consent before the House while he was powerless to do so. And therefore the complaint was made here that this practice not only put a serious burden upon the Speaker, but also made it possible for the occupant of the chair to exercise an unfair discrimination against Members. As a result of this, with practically unanimous approval upon both sides of the aisle, the Unanimous Consent Calendar was created, and thus the asking for unanimous consent placed beyond the possibility of favoritism and discrimination and made the absolute right of every Member of the House. That calendar enables one who examines it to tell for what measures consideration by unanimous consent is to be asked. It thus affords protection to the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I concur in what the gentleman from Wisconsin says in reference to the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I think it is protection to the House and a convenience as well. But the gentleman has overlooked the fact, I think, that this bill is not one that can go on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Probably the rules of the House providing for the Unanimous Consent Calendar should be changed. But this is a private bill, and bills of this class can not be put on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. COOPER. It could be brought up on suspension day.

The SPEAKER. No. The practice is against that.

Mr. MANN. These private bills ought not to be considered in this way at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It does not refer to this particular class of bills. They do have a day; but on certain Fridays, when private bills can be called up, pensions have the right of way, and practically always take the day. On the other days the reports from the Committee on War Claims and the Committee on Claims have the right of way, with the result that private bills coming from other committees in the House go to the rear, and it is almost impossible for a Member to reach them.

Now, it might be wise at this session of Congress, either by unanimous consent at some later day or by a special rule, to provide for a time when these bills can be heard. But this bill is an emergency matter, and it can not wait until that time.

Mr. COOPER. In answer to the gentleman from Alabama, I desire to say that I think the measure presented here by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] is meritorious, and therefore in this particular instance I shall not object. But I will add that every Representative is entitled in advance to know what business can, under the rules, be brought before the

House. He may have a legitimate and very serious objection to a bill which has been introduced and perhaps favorably reported. He knows that under the rules that bill can go only on a certain calendar. He has made up his mind to be present when that bill is reached on the call of committees or otherwise, and to inform the House why it ought to be defeated or perhaps not considered at all. But if at the end of a long session like this to-day we are to have bills brought up without notice, and not in accordance with the printed rules with which every Member is supposed to be familiar, there is no protection——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with what the gentleman says about the calendar, but I will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill can not go on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I am inclined to think that the rule governing the Unanimous Consent Calendar ought to be broadened sufficiently to allow bills of this class to be offered. But as long as they can not be offered they ought to be taken care of in some other way.

Mr. COOPER. The Calendar for Unanimous Consent is prepared and printed in order that Members may have notice of what the business of the House will be and not be surprised by unexpected requests like this. However, this time, as I have said, I shall not object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a moment, I want to remark that I drew the Unanimous Consent Calendar rule and made the first proposition to that effect. It does not cover private bills, and if it is changed so as to cover private bills it might just as well be thrown into the waste-basket, so far as public bills are concerned.

In the beginning of the last Congress the rules were changed slightly with respect to the Private Calendar, and when they were brought in I explained what the effect would be if they were to be construed as they are now construed. In the last Congress the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole made a construction as to when these bills from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims could be taken up. But a few weeks ago a new Chairman was in the chair—I do not recall who he was—and my friend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who sits over there, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], who, I believe, said they drew the rule, although I really doubt whether they knew what was in it at the time——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, that is an offensive remark.

Mr. MANN. Then I withdraw it. I did not mean to be offensive. I was facetious in what I said. The gentleman was in favor of a rule, as he said then, which would put all these bills in a pocket. Now the gentleman can revise his rule if he wants to, since he decides to become somewhat particular himself; but there will be no more bills like this passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is as much in favor of maintaining this Unanimous Consent Calendar rule as anybody in the House can be, and he has never stretched it except in a case of emergency. This bill can not be called up under suspension of the rules, because the practice is against it, and it can not be put on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. It is a meritorious matter and a matter of emergency. In addition to that the gentleman called it up one morning when there was a comparatively full attendance here. The Chair will try to enforce the Unanimous Consent Calendar rule as well as it can be enforced. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAGSDALE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Last Friday was pension day. There was a sort of gentlemen's agreement in Committee of the Whole that the Pension Committees were to give way to the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. No; there was a special agreement.

The SPEAKER. That agreement was made in the House, and by unanimous consent, by special order, Tuesday will take the place of Friday as pension day.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not so understand it. I wanted to know if the pension bills would come up on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Pension bills are in order on Tuesday.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the approval of the Journal on Monday next the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday next the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON] have leave to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Monday is unanimous-consent day and suspension day. If the gentleman desires to select an ordinary legislative day, as far as I am concerned, I shall not object, but I shall object to this request.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What about Tuesday.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object to Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. There is already a special order for Tuesday.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can get in under the general debate on the river and harbor bill. Why should he not get in like any Member of the House?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If there is objection, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the time has been parceled for the general debate on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MANN. I do not think all of it has.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My impression was that it had been, on this side. That is the reason I made the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH HODGES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to file a supplemental report from the Committee on the Public Lands on Senate bill 540. (H. Rept. 361, pt. 2.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on Senate bill 540. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, what became of my request? It was objected to for Monday, but I did not understand that it was objected to for Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objected to it.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m) the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Cedar Creek, Cumberland County, N. J., with a view to deepening and straightening the channel (H. Doc. No. 826); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Farmer D. Bayless, administrator of the estate of William B. Bayless, deceased, against The United States (H. Doc. No. 827); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Mary M. Calef, widow of John H. Calef, deceased, against The United States (H. Doc. No. 828); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Anne M. Post, widow of James Clarance Post, against The United States (H. Doc. 829); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Mildred Van R. French, widow of John T. French, jr., deceased, against The United States (H. Doc. No. 830); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DEITRICK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3334) authorizing the quit-claiming of the interest of the United States in certain land situated in Hampden County, Mass., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 385), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10172) for the relief of L. V. Thomas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 386), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred House bill 5445, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 443) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the relief of the legal representatives of Jonathan Morris, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 387), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2540) for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 388), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3428) for the relief of James Stanton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 389), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to Flora May Baker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6079) granting an increase of pension to John F. Bennett; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7077) granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Merritt; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8585) granting a pension to George W. Casey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8582) granting a pension to William J. Brooker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8583) granting a pension to B. Frank Smythe; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9096) granting a pension to Ellie Jacobs; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10772) granting an increase of pension to Susan Stewart; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14513) granting a pension to Mary T. Kington; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 14624) providing for the erection and completion of a public building at the city of Forrest City, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 14625) providing for the purchase of a site and for public building at Hawkinsville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY (by request): A bill (H. R. 14626) to create a board of financial commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 14627) to exclude Hindu laborers from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14628) providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between certain employers and their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14629) appropriating $10,000 to aid in the erection of a monument in memory of the late President James A. Garfield at Long Branch, N. J.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14630) to provide for the remodeling and repairing of the Federal building, known as the old post-office building, at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 14631) to create an Interstate Trade Commission, to define its power and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 442) requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the House the buildings occupied by the Department of Agriculture, the amount of floor space, the number of employees in each, and other information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial from the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to certain payments by the United States Government in aid of the Massachusetts Nautical School; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, praying the payment of $25,000 to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for each of the years 1911 to 1914, both inclusive, as per act of Congress approved March 4, 1911, entitled "An act for marine schools, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress and the Secretary of the Navy to take such steps as may be necessary to make Boston the permanent resting place of the frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14632) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Crouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14633) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Hutcherson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14634) granting a pension to Frances M. Dumenil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14635) granting an increase of pension to George Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 14636) granting a pension to Eli Mundorf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 14637) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 14638) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14639) for the relief of John D. Carson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GITTINS: A bill (H. R. 14640) granting an increase of pension to John R. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14641) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jerimiah Swisshelm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 14642) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Asa Farnham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 14643) to correct the military record of Andrew Ballou; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14644) granting an increase of pension to August Wendehack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14645) granting an increase of pension to Eugene D. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORBLY: A bill (H. R. 14646) granting a pension to Mary Quill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14647) granting an increase of pension to Herbert C. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14648) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14649) granting an increase of pension to John E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 14650) granting a pension to Martha A. Heathman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14651) granting a pension to Daniel W. Setzer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 14652) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14653) granting a pension to Michael O. Byrne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14654) granting an increase of pension to Jay Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 14655) granting an increase of pension to W. T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14656) granting an increase of pension to Nelson N. Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 14657) for the relief of the Copelan National Bank; to the Committee on the oPst Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 14658) granting an increase of pension to Anna Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 14659) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Garber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolution (H. Res. 443) referring the bill H. R. 5445 to the Court of Claims; to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 371 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Wayne Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Defiance, Ohio, favoring House bill 13944, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of various churches of Paulding, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Harrison Grange, No. 151, of Henry County, Ohio, and of Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 1724, of Williams County, Ohio, favoring House bill 11897, relative to rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the 776 members of the East Main Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newark, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Homestead, Cambridge, St. Clair Borough, and sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Affidavits to accompany a bill (H. R. 14443) granting an increase of pension to John R. Skidmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Association of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., favoring "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Vikingarne Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order of Vikings, of Chicago, Ill., favoring erection of a memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of R. J. Dreier, Edward L. Prockmon, Christ Dreier, Max J. Loeb, Ed. Hersher, Alvin G. Baum, George Schenk, Leon Siegner, William Granofeky, Alfred Hoth, and George Hetzel, all citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures which will interfere with the rights of American citizens and a usurpation by the Federal Government of a domestic question belonging to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 9292, relative to classification of salaries of employees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petitions of sundry citizens of Florida, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of Herman Mackwitz and 9,000 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the literacy test in the immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of 39 citizens of the twelfth congressional district of Indiana, protesing against barring the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the twelfth congressional district of Indiana, protesting against passage of House bill 9674, the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the twelfth congressional district of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, favoring repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of House bill 12292, the national child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the American Arch Co., of New York City, favoring a bureau for legislative reference and bill drafting; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the St. Anthony Commercial Club and the North Side Commercial Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring House bill 5139, relative to retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DIXON: Petitions of 51 ladies and the First Baptist Church of Madison; the Methodist Episcopal Church and 25 citizens of Crothersville, and the Methodist Episcopal Church and 42 citizens of Browntown, all in the State of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Friends' Church at Wilmington, Ohio, representing a membership of over 1,000 members, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of the Lancaster (S. C.) Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to naming of forts on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of sundry citizens of East Springfield, Barnesville, Rock Hill, and Carrolltown, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Southeastern Massachusetts Federated Branches of the American Continental League, against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring passage of Senate bill 1240, for the establishment of a bureau for legislative reference and bill drafting; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of John Bates Clark, of New York City, favoring repeal of the canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the General Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 38, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the passage of House bill 7374, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Financial Chronicle Chapel of Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of John McGiniss, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petitions of sundry citizens and churches of North Dakota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Streator, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of 368 citizens of Franklin, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Credit Men's Association of Tacoma, Wash., relative to flood control of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Hoquiam, Wash., favoring passage of the anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petitions of sundry citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of B. B. Cannon, of Boston, Mass., protesting against 1-cent letter postage, and of the Pentecostal Publishing Co., of Louisville, Ky., protesting against increase of postal rates on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the General Putnam Branch of American Continental League, of Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of F. J. Lingelbach and others, of Oconto County, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of the County Sabbath School, of Eugene, Lane County, Oreg., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Columbia Grange, No. 267, of Corbett, Oreg., relative to loan of money in postal-savings banks to farmers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of George Stuart Smith, of New York, favoring investigation to determine if competent protective guidance concerning the protection of principal can be furnished; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the American Arch Co., of New York City, favoring establishment of bureau for bill drafting, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of New York and Vicinity, protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the memorial and executive committee, Boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Financial Chronicle Chapel, of Typographical Union No. 6, favoring passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Sam G. Kind and other citizens of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of 8,554 citizens of Evansville, Mount Vernon, and others in Posey County; Boonville, and others in Warrick County; Rockport, and others in Spencer County; Princeton, Oakland City, and others in Gibson County, all in the State of Indiana; also of sundry citizens in Tell City and Troy, Ind., and Ridgway, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Leo J. Burke and Alfred Johnson, of Hartford, Conn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of the Alameda County Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, Oakland, Cal., favoring the anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the Wholesale Tobacco Dealers of Boston, Mass., relative to legislation regarding fixing of prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petitions of Ira Howell and other citizens of Arenzville, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Essex County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, at Lynn, Mass., protesting against repeal of the canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of Thomas Cook, of Red Bank, N. J., and others, and of Michael Weir and others, of Sayreville, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of sundry business firms of the State of Idaho, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Realty Board of Riverside, Cal., favoring House bill 5139, relative to retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of San Pedro, Cal., favoring House bill 9291, relative to claims to lands in Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 134 citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. V. H. Ruring, of Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of W. J. Waterman and other citizens of McComb, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petitions of 70 citizens of McClusky, N. Dak., 47 citizens of Cheyenne, S. Dak., and 20 citizens of Rolette, N. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### MONDAY, *March 16, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our unsatisfied heart hunger compels us day by day to turn our faces toward Thee. We can not live upon husks that swine would feed upon. There remains still within us the instinct of sonship. No matter how far we have gone away from Thee, we have never lost the sense of the sweet invitation of the home life waiting for us. Thy love, plenteous, constant, passionate, follows us everywhere. We turn back from all our vain endeavor to Thee for Thy blessing.

Receive us this day. Give to us Thine own grace, that we may fill the hours of the day in Thy grateful service; that we may remember our supreme obligations to Thee; and so live as to win the favor and blessing of God upon us and upon our Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

#### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, March 16, 1914.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLARD SAULSBURY, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES P. CLARKE,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. SAULSBURY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore for the day and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of the proceedings of the last legislative day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF CONVICTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of November 19, 1913, additional data in regard to the employment of convicts in foreign countries, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 217) to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno*, in the North Atlantic Ocean, and it was thereupon signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented a petition of members of the Lynn Chapel Sunday School, of London Mills, Ill., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the employees of the Martin B. Brown Printing & Binding Co., of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the board of trustees of the Stationers and Publishers' Board of Trade, New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a Federal trades commission, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of Lincoln Grange, No. 14, Patrons of Husbandry, of Carl, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a memorial of 163 citizens of Louisville, Ky., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Latonia Council, No. 50, Daughters of America, of Latonia, Ky., and a petition of Local Council No. 57, Daughters of America, of Farmer, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of the Civil War Volunteer Officers' Retired List Association, of Santa Clara County, Cal., praying for the passage of the bill to provide a retired list of volunteer Army and Navy officers of the Civil War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Beaumont, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination in prices, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, of California, praying for favorable consideration by the Army Board of Engineers of the Crescent City harbor project, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURTON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lima, Toledo, and Cambridge; of Local Union No. 307, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Massillon; and of the German Hungarian Singing Society, of Mansfield, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Cowden Memorial Christian Endeavor Society, of Dayton; of sundry citizens of Columbus, Coshocton, Oakwood, Alliance, Springfield, Leipsic, Piedmont, Bradford, Ashland, Thurston, Cleveland, Akron, Newark, Youngstown, and Toledo; of the congregations of First Congregational Church of Toledo, the Friends' Church of Wilmington, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Elyria, and the United Brethren Church of Coshocton; and of the Smith Agricultural Chemical Co., of Tontogany, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the congregations of the First Congregational Church, the Central Avenue Baptist Church, the St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, the Belknap Congregational Church, the Free Will Baptist Church, the Advent Christian Church, the Universalist Church, and the Unitarian Church, all of Dover, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Jackson County, Dickinson County, and Menominee County, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Dundee, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Cassopolis, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Adrian, and the First Presbyterian Church of Pontiac, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Huron County, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., and a petition of the Jewish Woman's Club, of Detroit, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the prevention and control of floods, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Maple Hill Grange, No. 691, Patrons of Husbandry, of Central Lake, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. STERLING presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gettysburg, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a memorial of the St. Croix Ministerial Association of Maine, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present compensatory privilege of post-office employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Robbinston Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington County, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vernon, Minn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Minnesota State Dairyman's Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate cold storage and to control the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Commandery of the Loyal Legion, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a retired list of volunteer officers of the Civil War, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of 100 citizens of Gardner, Mass., and a petition of 93 citizens of Ashburnham, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Evansville, Indianapolis, New Albany, Anderson, Newcastle, Jeffersonville, Vincennes, and Veedersburg, and of Local Union No. 11, International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America, of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of North Webster; the Methodist Church of Oxford; the Newton Presbyterian Church, of Newton; the Church of God of Fort Wayne; the Heltonville Methodist

Episcopal Church, of Heltonville; the Pleasant Run Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pleasant Run; of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Gary, West Lafayette, Clinton, Greencastle, South Bend, Culver, 200 citizens of Bicknell, 235 citizens of Vincennes, 360 citizens of Washington, and 200 citizens of Mooresville, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Hope Grange, No. 2101, Patrons of Husbandry, of Aurora, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of St. Joe, Ind., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a memorial of Lawton-Wayne Post, No. 271, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, of Fort Wayne, Ind., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 157, United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters, of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, etc., and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Fred D. Ballou Camp, No. 32, United Spanish War Veterans, of the National Military Home, Ind., remonstrating against any change being made in the supervision of the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Dodge County, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of Local Union No. 323, International Moulders' Union, of Foxboro, Mass., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Quinsigamond Val Lodge, Independent Order Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Boston Association of Photo-Engravers, of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Jeffersonville, and Evansville, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Monroe County, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Civil War Volunteer Officers' Retired List Association, of Santa Clara County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a retired list of Civil War volunteer officers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sacramento, Cal., and a memorial of the Brotherhood of Teamsters, of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Hawkins Camp, No. 43, United Spanish War Veterans, of Soldiers Home, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions for widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Sacramento Valley Development Association of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the harbor at Crescent City, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of Local Union No. 92, Bakers and Confectioners, of Norwalk; of Local Union No. 307, Sheet Metal Workers' Union, of Meriden; and of sundry citizens of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of General Mansfield Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Middletown, Conn., and a petition of Harmony Council, No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Wallingford Grange, No. 33, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wallingford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. POMERENE presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, and resolutions adopted by the City Council of Columbus, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation granting pensions to superannuated civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of members of the Broadway Methodist Sunday School, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of General Mansfield Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Middletown, Conn., and a petition of Harmony Council, No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

### MANUFACTURE OF BINDING TWINE BY CONVICT LABOR.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from the governor of my State, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *March 14, 1914.*

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, *Washington, D. C.:*

There is a bill before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce prohibiting shipments of convict-made goods into other States. If this bill is passed, it will seriously interfere with the farmers of North Dakota, as at the present time our farmers buy thousands of pounds of Minnesota prison twine each year and at a price less than it can be bought through other channels. Our own penitentiary only manufactures about one-tenth of the twine we use in the State. If this bill is to go through, if possible have twine exempted from its operation.

L. B. HANNA, *Governor.*

Mr. GRONNA. I also present a telegram on the same subject from the chairman of the Board of Control of State institutions in North Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *March 14, 1914.*

Senator A. J. GRONNA, *Washington, D. C.:*

We believe that Senate bill No. 2321, if it becomes a law, will work a hardship to the farmers of this State, and suggest that you oppose the bill on the grounds that the withdrawal of the sale of Minnesota twine in North Dakota would compel many of our farmers to pay a higher price for their twine, as the North Dakota penitentiary manufactures only one-tenth of the amount required to harvest the crop in this State.

BOARD OF CONTROL OF STATE INSTITUTIONS,
R. S. LEWIS, *Chairman.*

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to state that I have a great many telegrams and protests coming in from our State, which I have not with me at the present time, remonstrating against the enactment of a bill which would prohibit the sale of twine manufactured at either the penitentiary in the State of Minnesota or in North Dakota. The protests are most general from the entire State.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I think it ought to be stated in connection with the protests referred to by the two Senators from North Dakota that the proposed bill does not in itself prohibit the importation of material from one State to the other;

that the most it could possibly do would be to authorize a State to prohibit upon its own account the importation into that State. I think that the bill should be modified before it is passed, but there is evidently a misunderstanding as to its scope, and I thought it well enough in connection with the telegrams to make this statement.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. GRONNA. I have received a telegram from the North Dakota Suffragette League, which I ask may be read and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

FARGO, N. DAK., *March 15, 1914.*

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
*Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

It is the earnest desire of the North Dakota Suffragette League that you vote on suffrage amendment at close of the day.

Mrs. E. M. DARROW, *President.*
Mrs. C. F. AMIDON, *Vice President.*

Mr. BRADLEY. I desire to file a telegraphic communication from Mrs. Breckenridge, president of the Kentucky Woman's Rights National Association, which I will ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

LEXINGTON, KY., *March 15, 1914.*

Senator WILLIAM O. BRADLEY,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The Kentucky Equal Rights Association urges that resolution submitting woman-suffrage amendment be put to vote immediately on close of debate in Senate.

M. McD. BRECKENRIDGE,
*President Kentucky Equal Rights Association.*

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I present various petitions and telegrams in the nature of petitions regarding the woman-suffrage amendment. I ask that they may be read at the desk.

There being no objection, the telegrams were read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BOSTON, MASS., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

All suffragists are looking to you to accomplish the impossible and remove the suffrage amendment from the calendar of unfinished business.

LOUISE BURLEIGH.

—

[Telegram.]

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *March 14, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*

Texas women commend your course in pressing vote.

M. ELEANOR BRECKENRIDGE,
*President Texas Woman's Suffrage Association.*

—

[Telegram.]

KINGMAN, ARIZ., *March 14, 1914.*

Senator H. F. ASHURST,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Mrs. McCormick wires that it is expedient to have vote on suffrage at close of debate. Miss Paul wires to postpone until after May 2. Am inclined to trust Mrs. McCormick's judgment, but have implicit confidence in your judgment, so bring to vote if you can pass it.

FRANCES W. MUNDS.

—

[Telegram.]

YAZOO CITY, MISS., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Would advise postponing vote on suffrage amendment. Believe imprudent to vote which requires two-thirds until after suffrage demonstration, May 2, when every section of the country will bring pressure to urge favorable consideration.

ANNIE K. DENT,
*President Mississippi Woman's Suffrage Association.*

—

[Telegram.]

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *March 14, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*Washington, D. C.:*

We look to you to use every effort to postpone vote on woman-suffrage amendment in Senate until after our May demonstrations.

Mrs. DORA S. BACKMAN,
Mrs. FRANK KILTON,
Mrs. JULIUS STONE,
*Representing Franklin County Woman's Suffrage Association of Ohio.*

—

[Telegram.]

RENO, NEV., *March 12, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

As the representative of over 1,000 women of Nevada organized and working for equal suffrage, let me urge you delay Senate vote on national suffrage amendment until after national suffrage demonstration of May 2, when there is every prospect of a larger Senate vote in favor.

ANNE H. MARTIN,
*Nevada State President.*

[Telegram.]

BOSTON, MASS., *March 12, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:*

I beg you will get suffrage amendment off Unfinished Business Calendar. I realize the difficulty of so doing, but a few loyal champions can do the impossible if they are determined. The suffragists of the country have been betrayed. We look to you to help us.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS,
*12 Otis Place.*

—

[Telegram.]

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 12, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Please delay vote on woman-suffrage amendment until after demonstration May 2, if possible.

KATHERINE B. DAY.

—

[Telegram.]

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Please postpone vote on suffrage amendment till after May 2.

ABIGAIL SCOTT DUNIWAY,
*State President.*

—

[Telegram.]

EVANSTON, ILL., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Convention of Illinois Tenth District Federation of Women's Clubs ask you to delay the Senate suffrage vote until you can secure the necessary two-thirds vote. Illinois women can more easily secure full enfranchisement through national amendment than through the almost impossible amendment of Illinois constitution.

MRS. JOHN HARPER LONG,
*Vice President Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.*

—

[Telegram.]

BROOKLINE, MASS., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*

Boston Equal Suffrage Association begs you to do everything possible to postpone vote on suffrage amendment.

MARY HUTCHESON PAGE, *Chairman.*

—

[Telegram.]

BOSTON, MASS., *March 13, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST, of Arizona,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Hold off vote on suffrage amendment till end of session.

ORDWAY TEAD.

—

WOMAN SUFFRAGE PARTY,
602 JACKSON BUILDING,
*Providence, R. I., March 12, 1914.*

Senator ASHURST,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. ASHURST: Rhode Island is planning a votes-for-women week the last of April to culminate in a grand demonstration May 2.

Our presidential suffrage bill is at a critical place and might be lost should the United States Senate take unfavorable action on the bill now pending before it.

We urge you, therefore, to postpone final vote, if possible, until after the May celebration.

Yours, respectfully,

SARA M. ALGES,
*Chairman Woman Suffrage Party.*

—

OFFICE NATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,
NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION,
517 MUNSEY BUILDING,
*Washington, D. C., March 11, 1914.*

DEAR SENATOR: In view of the fact that a discussion has arisen between the two national suffrage associations as to when we desire a vote to be taken on the pending amendment, I wish to explain that the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which I have the pleasure of representing, is desirous of having a vote immediately upon the close of the debate.

We shall appreciate any assistance you may be able to render us.

Sincerely, yours,

RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK,
*Chairman Congressional Committee,*
*National American Woman Suffrage Association.*

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have received telegrams from citizens of a great number of the States of the Union, for and against immediate action on Senate joint resolution No. 1. In my opinion, there would not be one vote changed in this body if we should defer action until after the proposed demonstration of May 2. The joint resolution is now before the Senate as unfinished business, and it seems to me that the only proper course to pursue is to press it to a vote at as early a day as possible. If I thought that the joint resolution could be passed in the Senate by its continuation until after May 2, or even until the next session of Congress, I would not desire a vote at this time upon it; but I am quite sure that the National Organization for Woman Suffrage, at least the board of that organization, is in favor of immediate action upon the joint resolution; and I believe that the proper course is to secure a vote upon it at as early a date as possible.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have a very urgent request from the Woman Suffrage Association in my State that we proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 without longer delay. I do not know just exactly what answer to make to that request, and I will ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] if he has yet determined what course we should pursue in the matter?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from North Dakota, I will say that I am not in charge of the joint resolution, though there exists an erroneous impression prevailing to the effect that I am. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, is the Senator in charge of the joint resolution. He is unavoidably absent for the day; but I have a note from him, in which he requests that any contemplated action to be taken be deferred until he returns, which will be late this afternoon or to-morrow.

Moreover, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has given very valuable assistance to the promotion of this joint resolution and to the suffrage question; and I think I will ask him to reply as to when a vote will be taken, if he is sufficiently informed to do so?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] before leaving for New York called me over the telephone and stated that he desired to be here when the vote was taken, and that he wanted no delay whatever in the consideration of the joint resolution. I replied to him that from the number of Senators who had stated that they desired to speak upon the resolution I had not a doubt in my mind but that the resolution would not reach a vote to-day. The Senator from Colorado will return this afternoon; and at 2 o'clock to-day, when the joint resolution comes up as the unfinished business, I shall ask that it be then considered by the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is at present in charge of the joint resolution, I should like to ask the Senator his own opinion as to whether we ought to have a vote on it in the near future or allow it to go over until after May 2?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota propounds to me a question, the answer to which will involve me in much embarrassment; but I have never yet declined to answer any question propounded to me; no question that has ever been propounded to me have I ever dodged. I would say to the Senator from North Dakota, in all frankness and in all fairness—and the Senate is entitled to know my position—some months ago, most if not all persons interested in this joint resolution requested me to urge this resolution to an immediate vote. Since it has been made the unfinished business, a number of excellent ladies have feared that the present time would not be a propitious or a wise one to vote.

Mr. President, if we should vote now the joint resolution would fail to get a two-thirds majority, for every Senator who indulges in the luxury of thinking into things, instead of thinking around things, is bound to know that the joint resolution will not get a two-thirds vote in its favor; and if we vote now those who are in favor of its postponement could never have dislodged from their minds the idea that they were betrayed. In other words, a large number of worthy people, men and women, feel that it ought to be postponed. Personally, I do not believe the resolution would get one more vote in May than it would get to-day. I am willing to vote now.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have not quite obtained the information I desire. This joint resolution either ought to be voted on within a reasonable time or else it ought not to continue to be the unfinished business, obstructing the way of every other measure. It is immaterial to me, personally, what is done with the joint resolution; but we ought to have some understanding as to whether it is the purpose of the Senator to continue this matter over until after May 2, or whether it is his purpose to secure a vote at an early date.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I will say, in reply to the Senator—not seeking to avoid any responsibility, because that is not a habit of mine—the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is in charge of the joint resolution.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, when did the Senator from Arizona resign control of this measure?

Mr. ASHURST. I have never resigned anything.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Arizona had it made the unfinished business; he has been its champion on the floor; and he opposed, only a few days ago, postponing it until May.

Mr. ASHURST. That was because the Senator from Colorado was ill in his apartments and it devolved upon some member of the committee in that situation to perform the duty in the absence of the able and distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Colorado is absent this morning also.

Mr. ASHURST. He is unavoidably detained.

Mr. BRYAN. Who is in charge of the joint resolution now?

Mr. ASHURST. I will be in charge until the Senator from Colorado returns.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the Senator intend to keep it the unfinished business until the 2d of May, when the proposed demonstration is to be made?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator asks the question merely for the purpose of embarrassment; but I will say that my conduct will be ample evidence of my intention.

Mr. BRYAN. That is what I can not understand. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHURST. There are many things the Senator can not now understand, but he will understand after he has had an experience such as I have had in the last two or three weeks. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word. The Senator from Arizona frankly stated that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has charge of this joint resolution. It is not unusual for a Senator who reports a measure to allow some other Senator to take charge of it. It seems to me that we ought not to haggle over this matter, but let it go over until the Senator from Colorado returns.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope that will be done.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what ought to be done.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is no question about the joint resolution going over until the Senator from Colorado returns. The question that I asked was whether the Senator who has charge of the joint resolution, whoever he may be, purposes to have no vote on it until after May 2, or whether he purposes to have a vote on it prior to that time. We ought to have this information, so that we may be able to determine what we will do with other measures that should take the place of this joint resolution if it is to go off the calendar as unfinished business. I have no objection, of course, to the Senator letting it rest until the Senator from Colorado returns.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to correct an erroneous impression which has been spread by a number of newspapers, whose high standing and high class ought to have preserved them from falling into such an egregious blunder. I noticed in one newspaper on last Saturday the erroneous statement that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] was urging a postponement of the vote on the joint resolution, and that I was opposed to his views. I have no authority to speak for the distinguished Senator from Colorado; but I am very sure that he is not urging a postponement, and certainly I have never entered an objection to a vote in May.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the telegram which I send to the desk, which bears upon this subject, may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

FARGO, N. DAK., *March 15, 1914.*

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,
*Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

It is the earnest desire of the North Dakota Suffrage League that you vote on suffrage amendment at close of the day.

MRS. E. M. DARROW, *President.*
MRS. C. F. AMIDON, *Vice President.*

Mr. McCUMBER. It is evident, Mr. President, that their desire will not be fulfilled, at least so far as voting on the joint resolution to-day is concerned.

Mr. JAMES. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from the president of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

LEXINGTON, KY., *March 15, 1914.*

Senator OLLIE JAMES,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The Kentucky Equal Rights Association urges that resolution submitting woman-suffrage amendment be put to vote immediately on close of debate in Senate.

M. McD. BRECKENRIDGE,
*President Kentucky Equal Rights Association.*

MANUFACTURE OF BINDING TWINE BY CONVICT LABOR.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a telegram from R. S. Lewis, chairman of the Board of Control of State Institutions of North Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *March 14, 1914.*

Senator P. J. MCCUMBER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

We believe that Senate bill No. 2321, if it becomes a law, will work a hardship to the farmers of this State, and suggest that you oppose the bill on the grounds that the withdrawal of the sale of Minnesota twine in North Dakota would compel many of our farmers to pay a higher price for their twine, as the North Dakota Penitentiary manufactures only one-tenth of the amount required to harvest the crop in this State.

BOARD OF CONTROL OF STATE INSTITUTIONS,
R. S. LEWIS, *Chairman.*

COMMISSION ON GENERAL MINING LAWS.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 4373) to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 349) thereon.

WALDO H. COFFMAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4023) to correct the military record of Waldo H. Coffman, and I submit a report (No. 347) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] to the report.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. I think it can be disposed of without any discussion. It is a matter of great importance to a Kansas young man, and it is a bill which, as amended according to the report of the committee, has the unanimous support of the committee and has been approved of by the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to say that there has been a report from the department and that the report is favorable?

Mr. THOMPSON. The report is favorable. The Secretary of War especially approving the bill as amended both by letter to me as well as to the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. And the bill is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is the young man who was court-martialed at Fort Stevens, Oreg., last year on the charge of speaking disrespectfully and indecently against the national flag. He was convicted and sentenced to two years' imprisonement in the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., and to receive a dishonorable discharge and forfeit all pay due him for services as a soldier. I know this young man personally, and am well acquainted with his father and mother, who lived at Iola, Kans., during the five years I resided there. He is a young man of the highest character and wholly incapable of committing such an offense. The young man appealed to me early when he got into this trouble, and I thoroughly investigated the case and became convinced of his absolute innocence. Ocober 7, 1913, with the help of other Senators who became interested in the case, we succeeded in getting the Secretary of War to remit the unexecuted portion of his sentence of imprisonment. He could not, however, remove the disability caused by the dishonorable discharge, which under the constitution of Kansas makes him ineligible to vote or to hold office. This bill is therefore necessary for the important purpose of restoring the young man to full citizenship and to confer upon him the benefits and rights he would have enjoyed had he been honorably discharged. This will extend to him justice and atone, to a small degree, for the injustice of a wrongful conviction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment of the committee was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Waldo H. Coffman, [illegible], a private of the Ninety-third Company, Coast Artillery Corps, United States Army, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of said company on the 18th day of August, 1913: *Provided*, That all pay and allowances due him on said date shall be allowed him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Waldo H. Coffman."

RADIUM-BEARING ORES.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Mines and Mining, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4405) to provide for and encourage the prospecting, mining, and treatment of radium-bearing ores in lands belonging to the United States, for the purpose of securing an adequate supply of radium for Government and other hospitals in the United States, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 348) thereon.

The report contains a brief statement of the case and I ask to have it read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Montana ask for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. No; not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 348, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

RADIUM.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, submitted the following report, to accompany S. 4405:

The Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 4405) to provide for and encourage the prospecting, mining, and treatment of radium-bearing ores in lands belonging to the United States, for the purpose of securing an adequate supply of radium for Government and other hospitals in the United States, and for other purposes, reports:

HEARINGS.

In the belief that the radium situation in the United States in its bearing upon pending legislation had been adequately set forth before the House Committee on Mines and Mining, it was not originally intended to arrange for hearings before the Senate committee; but the parties who appeared before the House committee in opposition to this legislation asked to be further heard before the Senate committee, and the request was granted to the extent that hearings were begun on February 10, 1914, and continued at intervals during the two weeks following. Before the conclusion of these hearings the Director of the Bureau of Mines and Mr. Hess, as representing the United States Geological Survey, were asked to furnish the committee certain information on this subject; and Dr. Anderson, of the Public Health Service, was asked to inform the committee as to the quantity of radium needed for use in connection with the Government hospitals and how this radium could be best used in connection with the needs of the general public.

GENERAL STATEMENT.

The bill as reported gives the Government the prior right to purchase radium-bearing ores mined from the public lands, located after the passage of this act, at such prices, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and published in advance, as will encourage the prospecting for and mining of such ores by private parties. It also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide the necessary building and equipment with which to extract the radium from these ores; to sell the by-products obtained in connection with such operations. The prospector and miner is thus given the assurance of a steady market and prompt payment at reasonable prices for the ores which he mines, and if at any time the Government is not prepared to purchase such ores he is authorized to sell them in the open market.

NECESSITY FOR SUCH LEGISLATION.

The report of the House Committee on Mines and Mining (H. R. 214) sets forth so clearly the radium situation and the need for such legislation that it calls for but brief further treatment.

In the first place, the call for this legislation has a humanitarian basis, because of its relations to public health, and the arguments which might be raised against the Government's entering into mining or metallurgical operations in relation to other mineral substances, which might have a purely commercial basis, might not apply in this instance.

The experiences of the few surgeons in this and other countries, who have been able to secure a sufficient quantity of radium for use in the treatment of disease, have demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt the importance of radium as a cure for certain superficial types of cancer, and give promise of its value in supplementing surgical operations in the treatment of other forms of cancer if this treatment can be begun in the early stages of the disease and as surgeons secure radium enough to become more experienced in methods of its application.

Best statistics available show that there are in the United States at the present time no less than 200,000 persons suffering from cancer, and that the death list in the United States from this dread disease is not less than 75,000 persons each year.

At the present time there are not more than 40 grams of radium in all countries available for the use of medical science, and of this quantity not more than 2 grams are available for use in the United States.

The world's supply of radium ores outside of the United States is so small that the best available estimates indicate that during 1914 all of the ores mined in these countries will yield but 12 grams (less than one-half ounce) of radium bromide.

The most important and the most extensive radium-ore deposits known are those in Colorado and Utah—all of these until quite recently on public lands of the United States. During the past 12 to 18 months all of the known deposits of radium-bearing ores on these public lands have been taken up by private parties. Many of them are now held by foreign corporations, while many other claims are held by American citizens who are acting as agents or representatives of foreign corporations. During the year 1913 of the 2,140 tons of radium-bearing ores mined in the United States ores containing one-half of the radium content were shipped abroad for treatment. The remainder was held in the United States for treatment by two American plants located in the State of Pennsylvania. The radium extracted by these two plants during 1913 from American ores will be sold in the open market at prices which are believed to be largely speculative—$120,000 to $160,000 per gram (a quantity about equal to a garden pea)—and, as brought out before the House committee, the larger of these two concerns is already under agreement to furnish the larger part of this output for 1914 to foreign purchasers.

The quantity of radium needed for the work of the Public Health Service at its more than 20 hospitals distributed throughout the

United States and for the Army and Navy hospitals was stated before the committee to be 30 grams (about 1 ounce). The estimates submitted indicate that a plant to be operated by the Government as proposed in this legislation could produce this quantity of radium at a cost less than half of the above-named prices. And, in addition to this saving to the Government of more than $1,500,000, the publication of the results of all the Government's operations as to processes, costs, etc., would benefit the western miners and the public by facilitating fair dealing and open competition.

As indicating the importance of prompt action in this matter it may be stated that since the introduction of the legislation now being considered the representatives of the foreign purchasers of radium ores and of the two radium-extraction plants in the United States have been making rush examinations of the entire radium ore field in Colorado and Utah, and have been locating every area of public land on which there was evidence of the occurrence of radium-bearing ores.

As the situation now stands the public lands containing this resource of peculiar importance to the people of this country are being taken into private ownership in such manner as seems likely to bring the control of the radium supply into the hands of a few persons, to whom the hospitals of this country must pay exorbitant profits. In addition, the fact that the extraction of radium is carried on by secret processes lends itself to and facilitates the establishment of monopoly.

In view of the foregoing the committee recommend that the bill be passed with the following amendments:

"On page 1, line 3, after the word 'That,' insert the word 'hereafter.'

On page 1, line 9, after the word "provided," strike out "and all said ores here-" and continuing on page 2 strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 and the words "sold and delivered," in line 4.

On page 2, line 16, strike out the period after the word "issued" and insert the following:

"For lands located under this act: *Provided*, That if the United States shall at any time fail or refuse to purchase any such radium ores of sufficient value to be merchantable, extracted from any such lands so located, whether patented or unpatented, upon the tender of the same for sale in carload lots at any railroad station, the exclusive right of the United States to purchase such ore or any ores thereafter extracted from the mining claim from which the same were mined and from all other mining claims contiguous thereto and held in common therewith as well as the right to enter upon the same for failure diligently to mine any of such claims shall thereupon cease and the unrestricted right of disposition of all ores within such claims or extracted therefrom shall thereupon accrue to the owner, lessee, or other rightful occupant thereof."

Strike out section 2 on pages 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease for the purpose of exploration and development of radium-bearing ores unallotted lands within Indian reservations now existing or hereafter established by act of Congress or Executive order in such quantities and upon such terms and conditions and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That such radium-bearing ores when mined shall be sold and delivered to the United States as herein provided: *And provided further*, That all royalties derived from any such leases or rentals or other moneys paid on account of the same shall be deposited to the credit of the Indians entitled to occupy the reservation from which the same come, to be expended for their benefit as the Secretary of the Interior may direct."

On page 3, line 6, after the word "ores," insert the words "from lands located under the provisions of this act."

On page 4, line 1, after the word "at," strike out the words "such prices to be fixed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the market price to be determined."

On page 4, line 3, after the word "year," strike out the words "as will insure the prospecting for and"; and on the same page, in line 4, strike out the words "mining of such ores."

On page 4, line 22, strike out the word "authorized" and insert in lieu thereof the word "appropriated."

Add, after section 6, sections 7 and 8, as follows:

"SEC. 7. That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect or abridge the right, in good faith, to locate or appropriate (under existing laws) any public lands, whether mineral or otherwise, not known by the locator or appropriator to be of value because of any radium-bearing ores therein, and any patent issued for such lands so located or appropriated shall be unlimited in character except as in such laws provided, anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

"SEC. 8. Except as herein provided the general laws in relation to the disposition of mining lands shall be applicable to the lands in this act referred to containing radium-bearing ores."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to give notice that at a later day I will file a minority report on the radium bill just reported by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] from the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4896) granting to the State of Utah title to certain lands in said State for use as a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 4897) appropriating $100,000 to improve the harbor and the Ohio River and the levee at Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4898) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, and sodium on the public domain; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 4899) to reimburse Hill County, State of Montana, for money expended for the support of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4900) providing a remedy for the relief of wronged and defrauded shareholders in corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes incident thereto; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4901) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 4902) granting an increase of pension to John Wortman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4903) granting an increase of pension to John A. Harris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4904) granting an increase of pension to Marcus A. Seabolt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4905) granting a pension to Noah E. Curtis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4906) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Sprague (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

(By request.) A bill (S. 4907) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4908) granting a pension to Thomas J. Craycroft; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4909) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Crittenden (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Scheibel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4911) granting a pension to Charles F. Pegg;

A bill (S. 4912) granting a pension to Edward Lenfesty;

A bill (S. 4913) granting an increase of pension to John McKinney;

A bill (S. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Rogers;

A bill (S. 4915) granting an increase of pension to John W. Thomas;

A bill (S. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Spurlin;

A bill (S. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Robert Magill;

A bill (S. 4918) granting an increase of pension to James B. Day; and

A bill (S. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Frank Sembower; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 4920) to increase the cost of construction of Federal building at Pocatello, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 4921) for the relief of the St. Louis & Cairo Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BRADY submitted amendments proposing to increase the appropriation for maintenance, operation, and improvements at the Fort Hall (Idaho) irrigation system, etc., from $20,000 to $40,000, and to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States money to equip a sanatorium at Fort Lapwai, Idaho, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

## PAYMENT UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

## PANAMA CANAL TOLLS (S. DOC NO. 450).

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask that the statement of Senator ROOT in relation to the Panama Canal tolls, which was made before the Committee on Interoceanic Canals of the last Congress in behalf of his bill to prevent discrimination in Panama Canal tolls, may be printed as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDUSTRIAL COMBINATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 449).

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I send to the desk an address by George W. Wickersham, late Attorney General, delivered before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, on the subject of the relation of the Federal Government to industrial combinations. The address was delivered in Philadelphia on the 26th of February of this year. Inasmuch as it treats of subjects that are now pending before both Houses of Congress and furnishes valuable information thereupon, I ask to have it printed as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to have printed as a public document the pamphlet which I send to the desk. It is an historical review of our various attempts at reciprocity with Canada, written by Mr. Edward Stanwood and taken from the proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. It is a very valuable and compact statement on an interesting and important subject. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

March 13, 1914:

S. 3742. An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York.

March 14, 1914:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon.

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56).

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 13679. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate resolution 285. It will take but a minute to dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) reported by Mr. WILLIAMS from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the 6th instant, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is hereby authorized to employ temporarily a clerk at a salary of $120 per month.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that Senate bill 120 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has been very patient, and I am glad that an opportunity offers when he may complete his interesting speech on an interesting subject. I wish to make the suggestion, however, that in the near future we ought to take up the calendar and go through it once more. I address myself to the other side of the Chamber. I trust some Senator of the majority has that matter in charge, and that it will not be neglected much longer. That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will state that probably there is no bill that has been on the calendar longer than the bill to which I shall now address myself. It has been on the calendar, off and on, for the past dozen years, and I am seeking to get it to final consideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before proceeding from the point at which I left off in my discussion of this subject some days ago, I wish to correct an erroneous idea that seems to be in the minds of so many Senators, an idea that has been promulgated by several boards of trade and merchants' exchanges throughout the country, to the effect that the bill now before the Senate is one that would require inspection at every point where grain is shipped from one State to another. I want to correct that impression and make my statement as forcible as it is possible to make it. The bill contemplates nothing of the kind. The bill contemplates inspection only at those great grain centers where inspection is now carried on.

I can ship a carload of grain from any point in my State to any point in the State of Minnesota without any Federal or State inspection, and can sell it as such without such inspection to-day, unless it be sent to one of the two great grain centers in Minnesota—Minneapolis and Duluth. If it gotes to either of those grain centers, it must be inspected under the State law. This bill does not change the present method in the slightest degree. In fact, it provides to the contrary as clearly as it is possible to express it; first, by enumeration of the cities where it will be in operation; and second, by a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture that he shall designate such other important grain centers as seem to him to be just and proper under all of the circumstances.

Senators are receiving letters which I can easily discern have been influenced by statements from boards of trade that it will be necessary for any man buying, for instance, a carload of grain from some place in Vermont to send somewhere for a Government inspector to inspect it before he is able to unload it. This is not the case. The bill provides inspectors only at certain places. It may be possible, and I think it is, that the bill is not as clear and explicit as it should be in stating that the inspection is to be done at those places, and those places only; but I have already prepared two amendments to make that so definite that no one can possibly misunderstand it.

My discussion so far has consisted for the most part of quotations from the evidence taken at the hearings on this bill. My reason for following that course is that my own statements would be but mere declarations or conclusions, the accuracy of which any Senator might question; but when I produce the evidence itself, which happily for this case in every instance is direct and conclusive, and furnishes its own argument, no Senator can then deny at least the reliability of the statements I make.

It has been stated that there is no general demand for legislation of this kind. I can show that there is scarcely a State in the Union the majority of whose people affected by the grain trade are not strongly and earnestly in favor of this legislation. This is especially true as to every miller throughout the country; and there is not a milling paper in the United States that I know of, representing the sentiment of the buyers of wheat and corn and other milling cereals, which has not again and again, throughout all of these years, been demanding Government supervision, Government inspection, and Government fixing of grades.

I can possibly make that as clear by reading a very late editorial from the Modern Miller, published in the city of Chicago, as I can in any other way. I have been speaking for some time about the methods of dealing in grain at that city; and possibly the Modern Miller is as closely connected with the wheat-buying business as anyone could be. I want to give the expression of this independent paper upon that subject. I shall not read all of the editorial. It is in the issue of February 7, 1914, of the Modern Miller. It begins in this way:

FEDERAL INSPECTION AND GRADING.

Federal inspection and grading of grain, which has been the trend for several years, and freely predicted by the Modern Miller as the ultimate outcome of means for correction in the grain trade, is close at hand. Senator McCUMBER'S bill for Federal inspection and weighing was recommended this week by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and, it is understood, has the support of the Department of Agriculture.

Then, omitting the part which simply describes what the bill provides, I will give the conclusion:

This is the general import of the McCumber bill. Senator McCUMBER is a Republican, and it is possible the opposition will invoke Democratic Members to hinder the passage, but the time has come for Federal inspection and it will find favor generally with millers, although there may be features that need shaping. This has reference, of course, only to interstate trade. The fixing of grades by a Federal law will eliminate a host of abuses that have existed indefinitely under State and board of trade inspection. Undoubtedly many grain dealers will find it interferes with customs that were time-honored and profitable, but eventually it will be to the advantage of the better class of grain merchants, and after due course it will be hard to find an advocate of half-hearted inspection and "liberal" grading. After much agitation and undoubtedly much improvement in grain-trade methods, there are yet

undesirable practices which the exchanges and State inspection have failed to correct.

There is no use of standing in the path of progress in the grain trade, but considerable need of shaping the proposed new law to eliminate any unnecessary red tape. We believe that there are good grain inspectors in practically all of the principal grain markets of the country, but such grain inspectors need the support of a Federal statute. To-day there are markets where the range in price of grades, officially quoted, tells the story of the necessity for Federal action. The abuses of the past are an indictment against existing methods and, after all, exchanges are organized to develop the most efficient commercial methods. When a miller buys wheat of a grade, he should be assured that delivery is in accordance with contract. The buying of futures for milling purposes should have some meaning under Federal jurisdiction besides merely speculative protection; it should include the assurance of delivery of milling supplies.

There will be opposition from the grain trade, and this opposition is in itself wholesome to eliminate any errors in the bill. But the general purpose of this legislation is based on years of demand for betterment that was impossible under State or exchange grades and inspection. The result will be uniformity in grain grading, efficiency in inspection, and finally the elimination of many, many practices that it would serve no good purpose to enumerate here.

Mr. President, the view of the entire milling trade of the United States is expressed in this editorial. I know there are a few millers who may be afraid of national inspection. I have traced the objections of the very few, and I have ascertained that those few reside in those States where they have been compelled to purchase under State inspection; and, feeling that State inspection has had so much politics in it that it has deprived them of their ability to purchase the grain they have attempted to purchase, they have feared that Government inspection would likewise be open to the same charge of political influence. Now, if we can eliminate that idea from their minds we will find that even those few would have no legitimate excuse against Government inspection at all the great terminal points.

Mr. President, the editorial just read is from one of the great milling papers in the United States. Another magazine published for the milling trade is the Operative Miller. I wish now to quote a letter received from the editor of that paper. It is dated February 5, 1914. In this letter the writer says:

We hail with much satisfaction the favorable recommendation of your bill to regulate and standardize all grains. Such standardization and inspection of wheat for the protection of the miller and his product—flour—is something which the Operative Miller has,, with the support of the best millers of this country, been fighting for, editorially and otherwise, for a number of years. We are this day writing a number of prominent millers for an expression of opinion on your bill, and will be glad to aid in any way in our power.

In addition to this, Mr. President, I have reports from hundreds of different mills in the United States, each voicing exactly the same sentiment. If, therefore, the great milling interest and those who are the ultimate consumers of the raw product agree unanimously in the verdict that the present system is bad and agree that it would be remedied by the system for which I invoke the consideration of the Senate, it seems to me that we ought, as representative of the best interests of the country, the consumers and the producers, to join in attempting to secure them the relief which they so urgently request.

The next great interest, Mr. President, is that of the small wheat buyer and seller of wheat, the country elevators, the farmers' elevators. This gets a little nearer the producer. I find everywhere the same desire for Federal inspection, and practically upon the same grounds. The local man buying at an independent elevator makes this complaint. He says, "I can put no dependence whatever in the grade that I will receive at the great terminals. They have in those terminals a system of loose and rigid inspection, and when I send a car to those terminals I never know which rule is going to be applied. Therefore, to be on the safe side, I must always undergrade the grain a little. I must resolve every doubt against the farmer in order to protect myself against the uncertainty of grades at the terminals."

Here is a letter to which I call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. It is from the secretary of the Nebraska Farmers' Cooperative Grain and Livestock Association. It is dated Hampton, Nebr., January 29, 1914, addressed to me, and it reads as follows:

On behalf of the farmers' elevator companies of seven States of the Mississippi Valley—

I call attention to the fact that in this organization are represented seven of those States, all great agricultural States—

I am interested in assisting to bring about the Federal inspection of grain. This makes me interested in the bill you now have pending in the Congress.

* * * * * * *

We farmers' elevator people desire to assist in the passing of a bill for Federal inspection of grain at this session, if we can do so in any way.

I am reading only a portion of these letters.

Now, I wish to go on with some quotations from the evidence itself. I stated the other day to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that the St. Louis Board of Trade had finally come around to the conclusion that they need Federal inspection for their own protection. I desire to call attention to the evidence submitted upon that point. It is important not only as disclosing the desire of this board of trade but also the reasons that are back of the new change of front in asking on the part of that board for Federal inspection. I am taking the statement of Mr. T. R. Ballard, of St. Louis, Mo.:

Mr. BALLARD. Mr. Chairman, in the first place we are very peculiarly situated. The St. Louis market is under the supervision and inspection and control of two State departments. All the grain coming there is received for the St. Louis market either in East St. Louis or in St. Louis proper. Everything coming to East St. Louis is inspected by the State department of Illinois, and everything coming to St. Louis proper is inspected by the State inspection department of our own State. There is a more or less conflicting condition all the time. Kansas City is situated practically the same way. However, I do not know how they get along.

Senator PERKINS. May I ask if your State law makes it mandatory to have all grain inspected?

Mr. BALLARD. Only the grain at the public elevators. When Senator MCCUMBER'S bill was presented to us we called a meeting of the grain receivers and elevator men to discuss it; and after a thorough discussion a committee was appointed to draft the resolutions that were presented to the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange, which were passed, and which I will leave with the committee.

I will quote only a portion of the resolution, by paragraphs:

That the uniform and correct grading of grain and the accurate weighing of same in the United States are not only highly desirable but essential to the continued welfare and growth of our foreign and domestic trade, and can best be secured by Federal control of the inspection and weighing.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that this comes from the St. Louis board. It is their own resolution:

That the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis favors the enactment by the United States Congress of such laws as will place the inspection and weighing of grain under Federal control, under such conditions as will insure (1) uniformity of grading, so far as practicable; (2) the preservation of the individuality and the interests of the various markets which have been built up by their own efforts; (3) a square deal to all concerned.

Mr. President, this resolution could not have more accurately described the purposes of the bill as indicated in its language, first, a uniformity of grades, so that the same grain may be inspected in the same way and by the same method and the same rules, no matter to what center it is shipped; and, secondly, that the inspection may be honestly done, that there may be no loose and rigid rules that may change overnight. That is all that is sought by this bill.

Again, the resolution says:

SEC. 2. That the chief grain inspector and his assistants shall be expert judges of grain and shall pass a satisfactory examination as to their qualifications in this respect before being appointed.

That is provided in this bill—a method of securing accuracy of inspection. Again:

SEC. 3. The said inspectors shall give a good and sufficient bond for the faithful performance of their duties.

That may be provided in the bill or by the rules. Certainly, a bond should be required in every instance.

SEC. 5. That when it is proposed to modify or change any classification or grade a day shall be fixed for a public hearing, at which any person concerned in the proposed modification or change may be heard, and that at least 10 days' public notice shall be given of the time and place of said hearing; and that if after said hearing it is decided to make the proposed modifications or change, at least 60 days' public notice shall be given of the date when said modification or change shall become effective.

I have never thought that that was essential to put into the bill itself, because I assume that under the terms of the bill which require the department to take these exchanges as they now stand, and to make no changes except after they have fully investigated the subject, the rules which the department would apply would accomplish that result; that nothing would be done in a hurried manner, and that the changes would be made gradually and in a way not to interfere with the trade or business in wheat dealing.

I wish, Mr. President, to quote further from Mr. Ballard's testimony. Here is a letter Mr. Ballard received from the Modern Miller and which he puts into the evidence. It says:

[The Modern Miller.]

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 28, 1913.*

Mr. T. R. BALLARD,
*Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to call your attention to an effort made by this publication in September, 1906, to ascertain the percentage of prominent millers throughout the milling States of the United States who are in favor of Federal inspection of grain. We sent out several hundred circulars to the best-known millers in the trade, and of the replies received 61 per cent of the millers favored national grain inspection, 24 per cent were against it, and 15 per cent were undecided or did not care to express an opinion.

I wrote to the Modern Miller to obtain the answers that were given by these 24 per cent, to see what the objections were, and ascertained that they were all based upon the same idea, that there would be danger of having the grades influenced by

politics, and they cited the troubles that they were having under State inspection laws, charging that the State inspection system was nothing but a political machine. Undoubtedly if that 24 per cent had understood what is the real purpose of the bill—to get rid of politics in the inspection department—they would all have earnestly supported it.

I again quote from the testimony of Mr. Ballard. He says:

Mr. BALLARD. I believe that national inspection would have many advantages over State inspection, for the reason that it would be uniform and under civil-service reform. If the men all understood their business, a great many of the difficulties that now obtain would be removed. I believe that a warehouse receipt issued by authority of the United States Government would be as good in the bank where men want to carry their grain for money as any other security.

Now, this is the statement of a man who for 30 years has been engaged in the grain business. I regret exceedingly, Mr. President, that those Senators who have been so opposed to the bill are not present to hear this testimony read. I can not but feel that if they would give attention to the evidence which was produced rather than the letters of opposition which they have received from these boards of trade, every one of them would come to the conclusion that no harm could result to any honest business in any city by having Federal inspection and that an immense amount of good could result to all the producers and consumers throughout the country.

I am not criticizing those who live in the atmosphere of these boards of trade—we absorb the sentiments that are extant in our surroundings—but if we could get those Senators to come out of that influence for a while and listen to the testimony itself, I can not but feel that, as thinking men, men desirous of doing the right thing by the public, they would change their views upon this matter. I again quote from Mr. Ballard:

Mr. BALLARD. We feel that to have the grain of the United States graded under one system of inspection would be much better than to have State inspection in each different State where they now have state inspection, and the inspection that exists in other places where it is under the board of trade rules. There are only a few States, I believe, that have control of it. Evidently, it would be a great benefit to the export trade to have the Government stamp on warehouse receipts showing that a certain cargo of wheat or corn inspected was No. 2 or No. 3, or whatever it may be; and it would go a long way toward renewing the confidence that has been lost.

That certainly is true, Mr. President. There is lack of confidence in the purchase of grain in every one of these centers. Chicago may have a system that is perfect, and we may have confidence in it to-day. A month from to-day we may lose that confidence. So this matter of confidence and lack of confidence seems to shift from month to month and from day to day between different sections of the country as they modify the rules.

I wish now to call attention to the testimony of another gentleman from Missouri, who is connected with the board of trade there and who is a grain dealer.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Before my colleague takes up that question, I want, if he will permit me, to read briefly from the report made by Consul General Robert P. Skinner.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will state to the Senator that I purpose to quote that testimony, in connection with the statements of other consuls, before I conclude my remarks, so that I may have the testimony on that subject all together, if it will be just as agreeable to my colleague for me to do so.

Mr. GRONNA. That will be perfectly agreeable. I simply wanted to remind my colleague that there are reports which show that the Europeans and other countries have discriminated against our grain because our inspection is not uniform.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is speaking with accuracy upon that point.

I now quote from the testimony of Mr. Teasdale:

Mr. TEASDALE. I simply want to say, gentlemen, that there has been a good deal said here in apparent derogation of boards of trade and merchants' exchanges, and that they are not all of them as black as they have been painted. At least, the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange stands for a square deal for everybody. They have evidenced that by coming out flat-footed for Federal inspection, because they think it is going to remedy and do away with some of the abuses that undoubtedly do exist in the grain business to-day.

That is the representative of one of the systems of grain grading.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Is the Senator from North Dakota aware of the fact that the exchange he has just spoken of has passed resolutions opposing this legislation?

Mr. McCUMBER. I quoted that resolution while the Senator was out of the Chamber. I have been dealing with St. Louis for some time; and I have just completed reading the resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis.

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator had just read a statement that that board was in favor of the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; this statement declares that they were flat-footed in favor of Federal inspection.

Mr. REED. It is very evident, Mr. President, that either I do not understand the Senator from North Dakota or that he does not understand me.

Mr. McCUMBER. Possibly I misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. REED. I asked the Senator if it was not a fact that the St. Louis Board of Trade had passed resolutions against this legislation.

Mr. McCUMBER. How long ago, may I ask the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED. My understanding is, within the last three or four months.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is rather difficult for me to keep up, Mr. President, with all of these resolutions. The St. Louis exchange first passed a resolution against this legislation, and then they passed another resolution in favor of it. Then afterwards, as the Senator from Missouri says, they may have passed another resolution against it. Well, I think I can explain that. I do not think any of these boards of trade are acting in this matter in a disinterested way. They are in favor of such legislation as this whenever the rules are such at another center of trade through, we will say, a liberal inspection, that the trade is taken away from St. Louis, and they are against it whenever they are getting the better of the situation. I have found that to be the case as to several of these exchanges, but I have just completed reading a resolution which was adopted by the same exchange in favor of such legislation.

Mr. REED. Of what date?

Mr. McCUMBER. In 1908.

Mr. REED. That is some time ago.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is quite a while ago, I will admit that.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to ask my colleague a question, and that is, if he has ever received a protest from farmers or from farmers' organizations against the passage of this bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I have never received a protest from a farmers' organization against the passage of the bill. Every farmers' organization has been in favor of it, every milling association has been in favor of it, and every independent grain-buyers' association has been in favor of it. So it simply comes down to a question of a few of these great grain-buying centers—the few as against the hundreds and thousands and millions that are interested in the grain trade.

Mr. GRONNA. If my colleague will permit me further, I want to add to what he has just stated that I have received many hundreds of letters and telegrams from farmers all over this country asking that this bill be passed, or a bill similar to this, giving the Federal authorities the right to inspect all sorts of grain. This is nothing new. Canada has had such a law for many years, and I shall later on, with the consent of the Senate, touch upon that question, but I do not want to take up the time of my colleague to do so now.

Mr. McCUMBER. And I might add that by reason of the Canadian law their grain brings considerably more than the American grain in the markets.

Mr. GRONNA. And of the same grade.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; because of the confidence in the Canadian grades.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me just this one statement, the statement of both of the Senators from North Dakota has been very broad and sweeping with reference to the lack of opposition to this bill and with reference to the point from which opposition appears. I simply desire to say that at the proper time I think I shall be able to convince the Senate that there is some very substantial opposition, which is not a selfish opposition, except in the sense that the parties are interested, as, indeed, I presume the farmers are interested. I have no desire, however, to trench on the Senator's time further than to make that statement.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say to the Senator now that I think the grain trade, which a few years ago universally condemned any attempt to secure uniformity of grading, has now crossed that bridge, and has come out, so far as I know now, for a uniform Federal standard of grading. So we see now that it has gone that far. I am addressing myself to the Senator from Missouri. This bill seeks that which now it has agreed to.

It further seeks to obtain honest inspection—an inspection certificate that will be received by the trade with confidence. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with me that such a certificate would be beneficial to the trade? I think that I can answer for him that he does agree to that. Then I would ask the Senator if he believes that such a certificate would be beneficial to the trade? Does he believe that it would be impossible to secure such a result by legislation?

Mr. REED. As the Senator from North Dakota appears to be addressing me personally, I will say that I only asked him the question I did at this time because I did not want the Senator to proceed upon the theory that the Board of Trade of St. Louis was favoring this bill. I am not prepared to say absolutely that I have their resolutions to the contrary; I have such a number of resolutions that I may be in error; but I think I have such resolutions.

Now, the Senator lays down a premise and asks me what I think of it, and answers the question for himself. He then proceeds to the next proposition, and asks another question based upon that assumed premise. The fact of the matter is that everybody will understand that there is some advantage, if we could have it, in having a grading of grain which would be the same thing in all the markets of the world. We will all agree that an honest inspection and an honest grading is a good thing, and that there are advantages springing from an honest grading and from an honest standard; but it does not follow from that that we should take away from the States of this Union and from the commercial centers of the Union the right to deal and traffic in grain, and that we should turn the power of inspection and control over to the Federal Government.

I might follow that up, but I do not desire to trench upon the Senator's time. I might say that it would be a very excellent thing indeed if all the potatoes and all the carrots and all the onions and all the beets and all the cabbages of the world could be graded so that every man who bought a cabbage or any of these articles would know just what he was getting; but between the present conditions and the adoption of such a system there are a good many objections. The objection I see to the Senator's bill is that it proposes to assume another power by the Federal Government which it is not necessary for the Federal Government to assume; it is another movement in the direction of concentration; it is another step toward the taking away from the States the right to control their own business and the affairs of their own people; it is another step toward the ruling of this country by a Federal bureaucracy.

I think I can demonstrate when the time comes that it will vastly increase the cost of inspection; I think I can demonstrate when the time comes that it is utterly unnecessary to have a Federal inspection; and I believe I can demonstrate to an exact nicety that the great arch supporting this bill, the arch of logic and of fact which the Senator has erected, is altogether a mistake, and that the claim that there is wholesale fraud perpetrated is an error.

I did not mean to interrupt the Senator, but I think it is fair to him to say that I shall contend for those things, and at the proper time will address myself to them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wanted to get the Senator's opinion, first, as to whether or not he believed that a certification of a grade that would give confidence to the seller and the buyer of grain would be beneficial to the trade. I think he has answered that in the affirmative. I then asked him whether or not he believed that we could pass legislation that would secure that result. That portion of my question was not answered. On the contrary, the Senator falls back upon the proposition that under this bill the Federal Government is seeking to obtain more power to the detriment of the States. I could answer the Senator by saying that some of the State railroad commissions felt at one time that they could handle the question of freight rates and matters of that kind very much better than could the Federal Government; but, nevertheless, we enacted a law which provided for an Interstate Commerce Commission, giving the General Government full control over the fixing of rates and the control of all commerce over our railways in interstate traffic, and that has been most beneficial to the country in general.

The Senator also thinks that each State should be allowed to have its own laws in reference to the handling of its own grain. Well, Mr. President, if we were to stop there, there would not be the slightest difference between the Senator from Missouri and myself; but Iowa does not sell her grain in the State of Iowa; she is obliged to sell it in Chicago, the great terminal; North Dakota and South Dakota do not sell their enormous surplus of grain within their respective borders; that grain must find its final market and must receive its price according to a certificate that is placed upon it in Minneapolis or Duluth or Superior or Buffalo or Chicago. We have no control, no voice in determining how it may be handled; and, inasmuch as those centers which fix the rules are themselves interested in the buying and selling of grain, it is most natural that their rules should conform to their own best interests, rather than to the interests of either the purchaser or of the ultimate consumer.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator unless he is quite willing that I should pursue this matter——

Mr. McCUMBER. I am quite willing to yield to the Senator for a question or a short statement.

Mr. REED. Because in the midst of his address it would not be fair to break in; but if it be entirely agreeable to him, I would say that the question of whether we did a wise and prudent thing when we set up the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the exclusion in any respect of the rights of the State boards, is a question which might well be debated and which will always be a subject of debate. So long as the Interstate Commerce Commission will permit one class of freight to be shipped from New York to Minneapolis and St. Paul for 80 cents a hundred and charge $1.60 to Kansas City, which is only 47½ miles farther haul; so long as they will permit goods to be hauled through the city of Denver clear to the Pacific coast and shipped back to Denver at a less rate than they can be shipped directly to Denver; and so long as that condition exists with reference to many other cities we may well question the infallibility of this commission, which just at present is riding the wave of popularity.

Now, with reference to the other subject, which is a very much more pertinent one, the Senator states that the people of his State must sell their grain in Chicago or in some other city outside of the borders of North Dakota, and that they sell it in an interested market. The State authorities inspect this grain, not the purchaser; and I hold that it will be found to be true that the officers of a State are just as likely to be honest, just as likely to be efficient, just as likely to be fair between the purchaser and the seller as are the officers of the Federal Government; nay, more, I think they are likely to be more efficient and more honest. Then I remark, in the next place, that if the States of North and South Dakota are not satisfied with the inspection which they receive in Chicago or elsewhere, it is easy enough for them to establish a State grain-inspection department of their own, to grade their own grains, and to sell their grains upon the certificate of their own State inspectors.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am sorry the Senator made that last statement, because it shows how little he understands the grain trade and the movement of grain from the great agricultural States where it is produced to the great centers of trade where it seeks its market.

I should like to know under what kind of a system the State of North Dakota could grade its grain which does not go to any one center, which crosses the State line at hundreds of different places, and which passes from thousands of different stations, without having such an enormous expense that the grain itself could not stand the weight of it. Then, again, if that were possible, I should like to know how we could enforce our grades upon those States at the great terminals where it is disposed of. Why, Mr. President, they would simply laugh at our grades. They would say, "We grade this grain. It is sold in our State, and we will grade it in whatever way we see fit."

The Senator proposes an impossibility.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not think I do anything of the kind. If grain is shipped to Kansas City—and Kansas City is quite a grain market—it is graded there, at Kansas City, by the State grain-inspection department of the State of Missouri; and if the grain merchants of Kansas City want to sell that grain again they sell it on the Kansas City inspection.

Mr. McCUMBER. To which Kansas City does the Senator refer—Kansas City, Kans., or Kansas City, Mo.?

Mr. REED. I am speaking of Kansas City, Mo., where the market is.

Mr. McCUMBER. All right.

Mr. REED. They sell it on that inspection. They sell so many thousand bushels of wheat of such and such a grade, Kansas City inspection. That grain may go to Chicago. It is sold according to the grades at Kansas City and not according to the Chicago grades.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken there.

Mr. REED. It may go to Europe and be sold in the same way.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. REED. I think not.

Mr. McCUMBER. He certainly is.

Mr. REED. The Senator paid me the compliment of intimating that I was utterly ignorant about this question, and I

may be, but I think I was warranted in making the statement I did. If the States of North and South Dakota were to inspect their grain and grade it, and if the man who had bought that grain or the man who sold it had agreed upon that inspection, and delivery was made according to that inspection, the contract would be fulfilled.

The practicability of inspecting the grain leaving those States seems to me to be a question easily answered. There is nothing mysterious about inspecting grain. The grain has to leave the State over a few railroads, and it could be inspected by State authorities in transit. It is not necessary to unload it.

It seems to me the Senator's fundamental fallacy is that he seems to assume as a primary fact that the Federal Government can do things better than they are done anywhere else, and that therefore the Federal Government ought to do everything.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if the Senator will not lay down so many propositions that I can not remember them, I will try to answer each one of them specifically.

The Senator says there would be no trouble at all for North Dakota or South Dakota to inspect its own grain as it passes over the line. Suppose there is a train scheduled to pass between certain points on a railway at certain hours. It contains 40 carloads of grain. We will stop that entire train at the border to inspect 40 carloads of grain, and we will stop another train that may have 60 carloads upon it. Why, the Senator can easily see that we would be spending days, sometimes, in holding up a train in order that we might inspect it. He will understand, also, that after that grain reached Minneapolis, after we had inspected it, the Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota would take hold of it, and it would have to be sold in that city not under the North Dakota grade, but under the Minnesota grade, because it would have to be handled entirely by that system. Linked together as they are, owning the elevators and owning the facilities for handling grain, of course they would handle the grain only under their own State inspection.

That answers both of these propositions, and will answer them to anyone who has made any study of the marketing of grain.

Again, the Senator says that we would have just as honest an inspection under State control as we would under Federal control. We are not going to change men's natures by law; we are not going to make a man honest by law; but you very often keep a man in the path of integrity by taking away temptation. In fact, you generally do.

If the Senator has a carload of grain to sell, and I am the one who is to handle it—and the only person to whom he can sell that grain—and I have certain rules under which I will buy it, and I appoint the inspector, that inspector would be rather liable to favor me, and not the Senator from Missouri. He would be more liable, in fact, because he would be under my control, and he would desire as much as possible to make his inspection conform to my interest. That is all.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, the trouble with that statement is that it is not based at all upon the conditions. Of course, if I sell the Senator a carload of wheat, and he sends out his hired man to inspect it, the hired man would be very liable to incline toward one of the Dakotas, in his judgment. When, however, a trainload of grain comes to a market, part of the cars coming from Dakota, part of them from Kansas City, part of them from Nebraska, part of them from Montana, and so on, and the State officer, who represents nobody except the State, grades that grain, he does not even know who is going to get it. He does not even know, necessarily, into what elevator it is going. He is simply sent out to grade it. It may be that a man of that State will buy it. It may be that a man from Chicago will buy it. It may be that a man in Europe will buy it. Unless he is absolutely corrupt, unless the Senator is willing to characterize him as a man willing to take a bribe and to do a corrupt thing, you get his honest judgment under those circumstances. You get just as honest a judgment, and there is just as little opportunity for crooked work, as if he happened to hold his commission from the Federal Government.

Mr. McCUMBER. I suppose there would be no use in my telling the Senator from Missouri that under the State and these exchange inspections—and remember that there are but a few State inspections, even if the Senator were correct, but nearly all the inspection is under boards of trade or chambers of commerce, who hire their own men to do their own grading—even in those cases where there is State inspection the inspection department is under the influence and control, and the persons appointed are appointed under the influence of the men who do the buying, or else all the testimony from the men who are themselves members of those boards, and who have an opportunity to know, is erroneous. I am quoting the testimony of men from the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange who say they are so influenced, who say they do have a system of loose and rigid inspection at different seasons and times, and that it is under the influence of the members who deal in grain. Unless I can say that all that is merely manufactured testimony, I must assume that there is reason for their statements and some truth as the basis of it.

Mr. REED. In what year were those hearings had?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, they have been having them along from 1900 to 1908 and 1912. The last one was in 1912.

Mr. REED. Of course I do not care to go back and discuss conditions that might have existed 10 or 12 years ago, but for many years I have personally known every member of the State warehouse and railroad commission of the State of Missouri. For many years they have not been of the same political faith. It has been a real bipartisan board, because this difference of politics occurred through elections by the people. The boards have been composed of men of the highest honor. For many years one of the men at the head of that board has been Col. John A. Knott, the editor of a very responsible newspaper in my State and a man of as keen sense of honor as any man who sits in the Senate of the United States. They have appointed their inspectors and other officers, not from the city of St. Louis and not from the city of Kansas City, but generally——

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say to the Senator that I will yield for a discussion of the merits of the bill in any possible way——

Mr. REED. Will the Senator let me finish this one statement?

Mr. McCUMBER. But I can not yield for the purpose of a eulogy upon individuals.

Mr. REED. I am not eulogizing individuals; but the Senator has made a very broad statement here which impugns the honor of the board of railroad commissioners of my own State. I want to say now that I know those men personally, and I know to a large extent their inspectors. They are not picked by the boards of trade. I utterly repudiate and deny that statement. If there were any criticism to be passed, it would be upon the line that they were picked for political reasons, and they are picked from the people out through the State, a few of them, of course, coming from towns. I undertake to say that there is not a single man working for the board of railroad and warehouse commissioners who was selected by a single board of trade in the State of Missouri.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have not found a Senator yet who has come from these great grain centers who has not been imbued with the same idea as the Senator from Missouri, namely, that there seems to be an aura of holiness surrounding these boards of exchange. Now, possibly that may be true in the minds of the Senators from those particular localities; but I think I shall be able to show from this evidence that there are some dark spots upon the disk of this aura of purity surrounding all of these boards of trade.

I am not making statements as against the integrity of the members of the boards. I simply say the system is wrong, the system is susceptible of abuse, and the system is abused. That is the overwhelming testimony that was received by the committee.

I shall proceed now to read a little further from the testimony of a member of the St. Louis board. I think he is still a member of that board.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator kindly put the page in the RECORD?

Mr. McCUMBER. Page 114 of the Federal grain hearings. He says:

> One of those abuses is the nonuniformity of the grading of grain in this country.

Right here, however, before I read that, I wish to correct another statement, made by the Senator from Missouri, that I forgot, in which he assumes that a carload of grain graded in Kansas City, Mo., if it goes to Chicago, Ill., is sold under the Missouri inspection. The Senator certainly is in error upon that point. He will find that everything sold in Chicago is sold under the Chicago inspection. If this carload, certified as No. 2 red winter wheat at Kansas City, reaches Chicago, though it may not have been unloaded from the car, it may be inspected again in Chicago as No. 4. It is then sold in Chicago upon the No. 4 grade in Chicago, under the Chicago rules. It may then be sent down to Memphis and be inspected again under the exchange method down there as No. 3. It may then be sent down to New Orleans without unloading, and it will have the New Orleans inspection, which may be no grade at all. Then it may be taken at New Orleans and shipped from there to Liverpool and given an inspection as No. 1 or No. 2, and sold upon those grades. The Senator will find that the

grade in one State is not recognized in the sale at any one of these terminals in another State.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator think that is the result of an honest difference of opinion or of a dishonest manipulation of the grain?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will admit that it may be ordinarily an honest difference of opinion, but if we had Federal inspection under this bill this carload would remain under the same certificate that was attached to it in Kansas City. It would not have to be regraded again in Chicago, regraded again in Memphis under another system, and regraded in New Orleans under still another system, but it would carry the same certificate until it was unloaded and mixed with other grain.

Mr. SHERMAN. It would still be the same carload of grain, however.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President, it would still be the same carload of grain, but in one instance, under the present system, it would be sold as No. 1, which has a certain price, and in another place as No. 3 red, which would have an entirely different value, and in another place as something else. Now, if you bought all these by samples there would be no necessity of any inspection in the State or otherwise, but the purchasers do not purchase by samples. All the business is carried on by grades, and the grade fixes the value. Therefore that grade ought to be certain upon the identical wheat, no matter in what place it is sold.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I have just received in the last minute or two the following message:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 16, 1914.*

Senator JOHN W. KERN,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Woman's Franchise League of Indiana desires vote on suffrage amendment at close of debate.

AMELIA R. KELLER, *President.*

In view of that I present a unanimous-consent agreement, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KERN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator not to present the unanimous-consent agreement at this time, for this reason: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the city. I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Woman Suffrage ought to be here when the unanimous-consent agreement is considered. It is for that reason alone that I suggest to the Senator that he refrain from presenting it at this particular time.

Mr. KERN. When will the Senator from Colorado be likely to be present?

Mr. SMOOT. He will be here perhaps this afternoon, but surely to-morrow.

Mr. KERN. I withhold it for the present to see if he comes in this afternoon. I shall insist on some kind of an agreement, for several Senators have to go away on account of important business, myself and my colleague among the number. They should be here when it is voted on and I want the joint resolution voted on during this day, or else postponed until some definite day next week.

Mr. SMOOT. I am in full accord with the Senator in trying to secure a unanimous-consent agreement. I only want him to postpone the request until the Senator from Colorado is here.

Mr. KERN. I will withhold it for the present.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] desires to speak upon the unfinished business, and that his address will be rather brief. I wish to state that at the close of his address I will go on, with the permission of the Senate, and finish the address that I am making upon the grain-inspection bill.

Mr. THORNTON. I do not wish to interrupt the continuity of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota. It will not take more than 5 or 10 minutes to submit what I have to say, and I will be perfectly willing to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside in order that the Senator from North Dakota may conclude his remarks.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will state to the Senator that it will probably take me considerably over an hour—it may be two hours—and therefore I wish to have the Senator go on, and I can proceed after he finishes.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, after a continued illness of seven weeks I have neither the physical nor mental ability to speak on this subject in the manner its great importance demands, but I feel it due to myself as well as to the State I have the honor to represent in this body to protest, by voice as well as by vote, against what I consider an unwarranted and unjustifiable attack on one of her most important constitutional rights.

In fact, I am not able now to say much more than repeat what I said on this floor on July 31 last in presenting, by request, a petition from some Louisiana ladies asking for the passage of this resolution.

I said then I was opposed to the passage of the proposed amendment because the effect would be to deprive my State of the constitutional right in that respect she now enjoyed.

I said also that I had not the slightest objection to other States conferring the privilege of suffrage on their women if they so desired, but I was unalterably opposed to allowing other States to force the State of Louisiana to do so without reference to her own wishes in the matter.

I repeat now what I said then, and I believe now as then, that I as a citizen of Louisiana have no moral right to interfere with the determination of this question by the people of other States.

Those few words I then uttered seemed to attract more attention in some quarters than I had expected, for afterwards I was requested by different female antisuffragists to speak against woman suffrage generally in other States and also in this city.

I refused all of these requests, saying that I could not justify myself in doing so, as it would run counter not only to my convictions that this was a question that should be settled by the people of the respective States without outside interference but to the plain inference of my previous remarks in the Senate on July 31.

To the few remonstrances I received from Louisiana women against my position announced on this floor, and the request that I should reconsider it and vote for this resolution, I replied that under my convictions in regard to the rights of other States on this particular matter I could not so vote even if I was personally ever so much in favor of woman suffrage in Louisiana or elsewhere.

I have used these illustrations to show to my brother Senators that my subsequent course in this matter proved the sincerity of my previous utterance on it.

I now declare, and I mean it when I say it, because otherwise I could not say it, that if Louisiana was a woman-suffrage State and all of the white women in the State asked me to vote for this resolution, I would refuse to do it, because I could not do so without a gross disregard of a most vital and fundamental right of the other States of this Union.

The distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives well said in that body on the 4th of February last:

> If the Democratic Party stands for one thing above all others in reference to local self-government, it is that the right of franchise should be governed by the States of the Union and not by the National Government.

That is an absolutely correct statement, and I marvel that Democratic Senators at least can consent to uphold by their votes the opposite view.

I wish to add further, that while in my judgment the denial of this principle through the adoption of this proposed amendment will have no good effect anywhere, I am absolutely certain that in the near future it will have a positively bad effect in many of the Southern States, including Louisiana, by adding to the perplexities of a problem connected with the suffrage that has long troubled them and will continue to trouble them for some time in the future.

This is a delicate subject that I do not propose to discuss more than to state my conclusion.

If these States are left in the enjoyment of their present constitutional rights in the matter of suffrage, they can grant the privilege to their women in the future if considered desirable without incurring the risk to which they will be subjected if it is forced on them in this way.

I do not believe that a single Southern State would deny the privilege of suffrage to its women whenever the white men of

that State know a majority of the respectable white women of the State desire that privilege.

In the name of the State of Louisiana I protest against the passage of a constitutional amendment which would deprive her of one of the most important, if not the most important, constitutional rights she now possesses, and I absolutely deny the moral right of any Senator of another State to seek by his vote on this resolution to deprive her of that right.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that Senate bill 120 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 120 will be laid before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, a similar bill has been pending before the Senate and before the House of Representatives for more than 10 years. The opposition to the bill is practically the same as the opposition that has always come from organizations that are benefited at the expense of the farmer.

I wish to call attention to what was said in a report made by the Commission on Country Life:

The commission finds that agriculture in the United States, taken altogether, is prosperous commercially when measured by the conditions that have obtained in previous years, although there are some regions in which this is only partially true. The country people are producing vast quantities of supplies for food, shelter, clothing, and for use in the arts. The country homes are improving in comfort, attractiveness, and healthfulness. Not only in the material wealth that they produce, but in the supply of independent and strong citizenship the agricultural people constitute the very foundation of our national efficiency. As agriculture is the immediate basis of country life so it follows that the general affairs of the open country, speaking broadly, are in a condition of improvement.

Many institutions, organizations, and movements are actively contributing to the increasing welfare of the open country. The most important of these are the United States Department of Agriculture, the colleges of agriculture and the experiment stations in the States, and the national farmers' organizations. These institutions and organizations are now properly assuming leadership in country-life affairs, and consequently in many of the public questions of national bearing. With these agencies must be mentioned State departments of agriculture, agricultural societies, and organizations of very many kinds, teachers in schools, workers in church and other religious associations, traveling libraries, and many other groups, all working with commendable zeal to further the welfare of the people of the open country.

The President of the United States deemed it important to ascertain the conditions and affairs of country life. The report goes on to show that the so-called middle men, or men who invest a small amount compared with the amount invested in agriculture, are profiting unduly at the expense of the farmer.

This bill, which has been so ably defended by my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER], seeks to do only one thing, and that is to standardize the grain produced so that it may be sold upon its merits. We are not asking for any special benefit or any special privilege in the bill. We are simply asking for an honest inspection of grain.

It will be shown that the grain centers of the United States and that the grain of the United States are being discriminated against in foreign countries because of the inspection which we have in our country. The certificates which have been formerly issued have not been honest certificates. One might say that to have Federal inspection of grain is a detriment to the agricultural class. We are not asking for any favors to the agricultural class. All we are asking is that the Federal Government be authorized to standardize and fix grades.

The great Dominion of Canada has for many years had national inspection of grains, and I wish to call attention briefly to that act. Part 1 of the so-called grain act of the Dominion of Canada reads as follows:

There shall be a commission, to be known as the board of grain commissioners for Canada, which shall consist of three commissioners appointed by the governor in council.

Each commissioner shall hold office during good behavior for a period of 10 years from the date of his appointment, but he may be removed at any time by the governor in council for cause: *Provided*, That when a commissioner reaches the age of 70 years his office shall, ipso facto, become vacant.

A commissioner, upon the expiration of his term of office, if under 70 years of age, shall be eligible for reappointment.

One of such commissioners shall be appointed by the governor in council as chief commissioner of the board, and he shall be entitled to hold the office of chief commissioner so long as he continues a member of the board. The chief commissioner, when present, shall preside at the meetings of the board.

There shall be a secretary of the board, who shall be appointed by the governor in council and shall hold office during pleasure.

No commissioner or the secretary shall, directly or indirectly, hold any interest in any corporation subject to this act, nor directly or indirectly deal in or be financially interested in grain, nor hold any interest in any grain elevator or warehouse, or in any partnership, corporation, or business engaged in the grain trade, or in the transportation or storage of grain.

The commissioners and the secretary shall reside in the city of Fort William or Port Arthur, in the Province of Ontario.

The commissioners and the secretary shall, before acting as such, take and subscribe an oath of office before a superior or county court judge in the form following, which oath shall be filed with the department:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear that I will faithfully, truly, and impartially, to the best of my judgment, skill, and understanding, execute and perform the office of chief commissioner (or commissioner or secretary) of the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, and that while I continue to be such chief commissioner (or commissioner or secretary) I will not, directly or indirectly, deal in or be financially interested in grain or hold any interest in any grain elevator or warehouse, or in any partnership, corporation, or business engaged in the grain trade or in the transportation or storage of grain. So help me God."

The commissioners and the secretary shall devote the whole of their time to the performance of their duties under this act, and shall not accept or hold any other office or employment.

It will be seen from this act that in the Dominion of Canada the officers appointed by that Government are prohibited from being interested in the grain trade. It is not so in the United States. I believe that there are only four States that have State grain inspection. There are about 30 chambers of commerce and boards of trade that fix and establish grades; and while it is probably true that in the States where they have State inspection, where the commissioners are appointed under authority of law, we may assume that we get an honest inspection, we must admit that in the 23 or 30 places where the grain is inspected and graded by commercial bodies financially interested, selfishly interested, it is not for the best interests of the producer that their grain shall be graded and inspected by a commission which is absolutely under the domination of such boards.

To substantiate what I have just said about the number of States that have State inspection and the number of boards of trade, I wish to read from the hearings of 1912 on the inspection and grading of grain, on page 20. I read from the statement of Mr. E. H. Culver, of Toledo, Ohio, president of the association of inspectors. The chairman of the committee asked:

There are how many of those?—

Referring to boards of trade.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are 30. This list comprises the different markets, agricultural colleges, and institutions of that kind that have adopted the above as their standard of grades. We ask that this be filed.

Senator GRONNA. Did I understand you to say colleges?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Agricultural colleges in the different States that adopted the uniform phraseology.

Senator GRONNA. But none of those are boards of trade.

Mr. CULVER. There are 23 boards of trade, 4 agricultural departments in the different States, and 7 of the national organizations of millers—the Fraternity of Operative Millers, the Illinois Grain Dealers' Association, the Indiana Grain Dealers' Association, the Indiana Millers' Association, the Kansas Grain Dealers' Association, the Millers' National Federation, and the Ohio Millers' Association—which comprise all the mills, spring and winter, in the United States that are over, I think, 75 barrels—

He means to say that he is including all the mills that manufacture about 75 barrels.

Mr. President, we find that there are the following exchanges and boards of trade:

EXCHANGES AND BOARDS OF TRADE.

The uniform grades of the association have been adopted by the following exchanges:

Atlanta Grain Dealers' Association.
Albany (N. Y.) Board of Trade.
Baltimore Chamber of Commerce.
Buffalo Corn Exchange.
Chicago Board of Trade.
Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.
Cleveland Chamber of Commerce.
Detroit Board of Trade.
East St. Louis inspection department.
Fostoria (Ohio) inspection department.
Galveston Board of Trade.
Kansas City Board of Trade.
Louisville Board of Trade.
Mansfield (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce.
Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce.
Nashville Grain Exchange.
New Orleans Board of Trade.
Norfolk Board of Trade (excepting corn rules).
Peoria Board of Trade.
Philadelphia Commercial Exchange.
Pittsburgh Grain and Flour Exchange.
St. Louis Merchants' Exchange.
St. Joseph (Mo.) Board of Trade.
Toledo Produce Exchange.

INSPECTION DEPARTMENTS.

These inspection departments have also adopted the grades promulgated by the association:

Illinois State Grain Inspection Department.
Kansas State Grain Inspection Department; has adopted several but not all of the uniform grade rules.
Missouri State Grain Inspection Department.

Minnesota State Department; has indorsed the principle of uniformity, but has adopted only a few of the recommendations.

COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE.

The following State commissioners of agriculture have fallen into line and have adopted the grades:

Commissioner of agriculture, Georgia.
Commissioner of agriculture, Florida.
Commissioner of agriculture, South Carolina.
Commissioner of agriculture, Tennessee.

ASSOCIATIONS AND FEDERATIONS.

The associations and federations of grain dealers and millers that follow have all indorsed the association's uniform grades:

Fraternity of Operative Millers.
Illinois Grain Dealers' Association.
Indiana Grain Dealers' Association.
Indiana Millers' Association.
Kansas Grain Dealers' Association.
Millers' National Federation.
Ohio Millers' Association.

The following colleges, universities, and experiment stations of the United States are using the association's uniform grades as textbooks and teaching them to their students:

Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, Blacksburg, Va.
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.
Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station, Storrs, Conn.
Oregon Experiment Station, Corvallis, Oreg.
University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
North Dakota Agricultural College, Agricultural College, N. Dak.
Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.
Vermont Agricultural Experiment Station, Burlington, Vt.
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Delaware College, Newark, Del.
Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, Orono, Me.
Montana Agricultural College and Experiment Station, Bozeman, Mont.
South Dakota State College and Agricultural Experiment Station, Brookings, S. Dak.
State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, West Raleigh, N. C.
State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Agricultural College, N. Mex.
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans.
Hatch Experiment Station, Amherst, Mass.
New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station, Durham, N. H.
New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, New Brunswick, N. J.

Mr. President, the opposition to this bill comes, as has been stated by my colleague, from the large cities where these boards of trade and chambers of commerce are located. I attribute no sinister motive to anyone who may oppose the bill, but I want someone to give some reason why the bill should not be enacted into law. No valid reason has yet been given. The only reason that has been set up is that the business would be thrown into politics by permitting the Federal Government or the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint these men, and that it would be a great expense to the Government, when as a matter of fact the bill provides that those who sell the grain shall pay for the inspection.

Mr. President, I do not care to say anything further at this time. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator proceeds I wish to ask him a question. My attention was attracted by the closing sentence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], who has just taken his seat, to the effect that the cost of this inspection is to be paid by the owners of the grain and not by the Government. I have not read the bill carefully, and I will ask the Senator from North Dakota if that is correct?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that respect it differs from the meat-inspection act?

Mr. McCUMBER. It does.

Mr. GRONNA. I will state to my colleague, if he will permit me, that the proposed law is similar to the Canadian law. The Canadian law provides that the seller and not the buyer shall pay for the inspection.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the present system, Mr. President, the inspection in every one of the great centers is charged against the grain itself, against the owner of the carload of grain that is inspected, and, of course, it is charged back to the farmer or the elevator sending it. The charges range all the way from 35 up to 75 cents a carload. At 40 cents a carload the amounts received for the inspection would pay the entire expenses of the operation of the new system, according to the report of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GALLINGER. And, Mr. President, from what the Senator said a while ago, I infer that this charge might be repeated four or five times before the wheat was actually sold and delivered?

Mr. McCUMBER. It might be under the present system. Under the present system it may possibly be duplicated three times. If a car is shipped from one State to another, under the proposed system there would be a considerable saving in that respect.

I regret, Mr. President, that those who appear to be so earnestly against this proposition for grain inspection are not present to hear the testimony which I propose to present in this case.

Mr. President, before proceeding further, I want to say to Senators in general that this is only a little matter that is asked for by practically all of the farmers of the United States who deal in grain; it is not a matter of a great deal of importance possibly to many of the Senators; and I shall not object to those who feel that they are not interested in what the farmers of the country want, taking advantage of the smoking room, so as not to be bored by a discussion of matters pertaining to their demands. I am sorry the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] left the Chamber, after he expressed his own opinion, because I wanted to show that his opinion upon the St. Louis Board of Exchange methods differed entirely from the opinion of certain members of that board.

I was reading, when I was interrupted by the unfinished business being laid before the Senate, and I will now go on with the statement of this member of the St. Louis board giving his reasons why he favors inspection of grain as against the system of the board. He says:

One of those abuses is the nonuniformity of the grading of grain in this country. It has been asked here how that affects the farmer who brings his grain in to the country station and sells it on view, or by selling to the little dealer at the country station. But how does the country shipper determine the price which he is going to pay the farmer?

The question is often asked by Senators: "How is the farmer going to get any benefit out of this?" I have answered that question time and again; but possibly you would care more for the answer of some member of the board:

He looks at the market reports of St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City, or Minneapolis, whichever market he may be tributary to. He deducts from that price the freight, the commission he has to pay at the terminal market, the inspection charge, the weighing charge; and there is another deduction for probable natural shrinkage of the weight of the grain in transit. He also has to make up his mind what that grain will grade in that terminal market.

He is speaking now of the man who purchases at the country elevator——

Having all that information, he knows what that grain will net him on his track, and he bids the farmer as much less than that net price as will afford him a fair margin of profit for shipping that grain. Therefore you can readily see that if the dealer's price in the terminal market is reduced by reason of this irregularity in the inspection, or for any other cause, the price which he pays the farmer is correspondingly reduced. And, as one of the gentlemen preceding me has said, that price affects not only the grain which goes to the terminal market, but practically all of the grain that is sold by the farmer, because the price he gets on the farm for any other purpose than market shipment is fixed by the price it is worth in the market.

I wish that Senators would fully understand that. As 95 per cent of all of the grain at these terminals is sold upon inspection certificates, the price of the several grades of grain is fixed in the market by those certificates, and therefore if No. 1 grain is certified as No. 2 and sold as No. 2, that selling price would fix the real price of No. 1, which should have a No. 1 price, and the farmer who has his grain unsold has his property reduced in value just to that extent. Again, he says:

Now, with regard to the uniformity of inspection—

Here, again, the member of the St. Louis board is speaking—

Now, with regard to uniformity of inspection: I have been in the grain business about 30 years. I think there has not been a year of that time that I have not heard talk of uniformity of grades; but it has all ended in talk. I do not believe we ever will get uniform grades by the voluntary action of the various markets, because, while they may think it is a good thing as a general proposition, they do not seem to be able to agree upon the basis of uniformity. I presume if any market could get all the other ones to agree to its grades they would come in and be all right. But you never are going to get uniformity of grades until it is imposed on all the markets of this country by the highest authority—the Federal Government.

Mr. President, that is true. Finally, because of the constant bringing of this matter before the country, the several boards of trade have concluded that they had better accept Government uniformity of grades and Government standardization, but they

still hope to avoid the Government itself inspecting and certifying the grades. Again, the same gentleman says:

And even if it were so that they could do it otherwise, there would be no authority, no power, to hold them to such an agreement in regard to those uniform grades.

Why, Mr. President, they have tried it several times; they have agreed upon uniform grades as between the several markets; but whenever it was found in one market that they could do better by changing the grades and changing the system under which they were operating, they would abandon the old agreement for their special benefit, and then, of course, all the work and all the struggle on the part of the several boards of trade to arrive at uniformity would go for naught. The testimony proceeds:

Senator PERKINS. And, really, the wheat of the greatest intrinsic value is that which will yield the greatest number of pounds of flour to the hundred pounds?

Mr. TEASDALE. That is perfectly true. There are different qualities of No. 2 red wheat, for instance, and different qualities of No. 1 white wheat. But you can get approximate uniformity, and you can so arrange your specifications for the different grades that the man who ships the grain to the market, whether he be the farmer or the country elevator man, can come pretty near telling what his grain is going to grade and what it is going to net him. That is the result which we are seeking to achieve through the medium of Federal inspection.

He has already shown in his testimony that on account of the irregularity of inspection it is impossible to determine beforehand what kind of a grade he will get in any of the central markets. Again, he says:

I do not say that the inspection is dishonest—

And this is an answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] by one of his own constituents—

I do not say that the inspection is dishonest. I think sometimes they do have a dishonest inspector, but more often they have an incompetent inspector. That is perfectly natural by reason of the fact that those inspectors are appointed by the State boards of railroad and warehouse commissioners, the personnel of those commissions changing every two years, and each incoming new member having his own favorites that he wants to get on that inspection board, some of whom have had little or no previous experience in the grain business.

The Senator from Missouri asked me whether or not I believed that we would have more honest inspection under a Government system than under a system controlled by the respective States. I replied at that time that under the present system the fault lies in the fact that the purchasers of grain themselves influence appointments to the several boards of inspectors, and the Senator denied that there was any politics in the State inspection, because they have a nonpartisan board; but here is a member of the St. Louis exchange, engaged for 30 years in the grain business, who says that the inspectors change with every incoming administration, whose own favorites are put upon that board. I am not accusing these men of being dishonest; I say the system is wrong; it is uncertain; and we want to get certainty and confidence in the trade. Again, Senator PERKINS asked the question:

Senator PERKINS. You think, speaking from your 30 years' experience as a grain dealer and your association with other grain dealers and in purchasing as commission merchant and receiving consignments from farmers, that the enactment of a national inspection bill is not only in the interest of the commercial community, but also in the interest of the farmer?

Mr. TEASDALE. I do; most decidedly. I think Federal inspection will be as much stronger and better than State inspection, as the administration of the Interstate Commerce Commission is stronger and better than that of the various State railroad commissions.

I appreciate the fact that that may not appeal to the Senator from Missouri, who seems to criticize the Interstate Commerce Commission, but I dare say that the Senator from Missouri would be the last man in the Senate to-day to vote for the discontinuance of the Interstate Commerce Commission and relegate us to the control of the several State commissions. So after the proposed law shall have been in operation for one year not only the boards of trade but the Senator from Missouri himself will be equally in opposition to any change.

I wish now, Mr. President, to give an Iowa view of this matter. Perhaps one of the Senators from Iowa, if present, would remember Mr. Messerole, who is a grain dealer in that State. Mr. Messerole says:

Gentlemen, to begin with, I wish to say that I represent the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of the State of Iowa—

He speaks here for the farmers who are grain dealers in the entire State of Iowa—

having been secretary of that organization from the time of its inception, from the time it was organized, three years ago last November. I have had some 26 years' experience.

I have stated, Mr. President, that the farmers of the State of Iowa, like those of South Dakota and other States, do favor this change from the board of trade and State warehouse commission control to Government or Federal inspection.

Senator LONG. Have you any State inspection law in Iowa?

Mr. MESSEROLE. We have not. We have no inspection in the State of Iowa.

The Senator from Missouri thinks it would be easy for Iowa to have an inspection department. I have already shown, Mr. President, the impossibility of doing any such thing. If that were possible even at considerable expense, there would not be one of the great agricultural States that would not fix a standard, but its standard would not control when the grain would reach the terminal market in another State.

Senator LONG. And no terminal?

Mr. MESSEROLE. No terminal within the State.

What is true of Iowa is true of most of the agricultural States—

We are tributary to a large number of markets. And I wish to say that the fact is that unless a grain dealer is on the inside—I mean a grain dealer in the country—it is almost an utter impossibility for him to tell which of the several markets is the proper place for him to market his grain. I have a publication with me which shows a prominent member of the Minneapolis Exchange advertising leniency of grades in Minneapolis as an inducement for grain people to ship them their grain.

Both Senators from Minnesota are absent. I suppose that they also would deny that under the system in their State there is anything but honest inspection; but here is a gentleman, a shipper, who says he receives information that there will be great leniency in the grading in Minneapolis for a season—at least until they can get him to ship his grain that way.

The Minneapolis exchange in its testimony before the State Legislature of Minnesota admitted that it was a practice so to do; and a few years ago, upon an investigation into the methods of dealing at that great grain center, it was admitted that during the earlier part of each season, when the grain was coming into the market, they had rigid inspection, but when the grain had practically left the farmers' hands they then had easy inspection, which meant a different grading between the in-inspection and the out-inspection from the elevators.

Senator LONG. Has he gotten any Iowa business as the result of that?

Mr. MESSEROLE. He gets Iowa business; yes, sir. I have shipped him some stuff myself.

Senator LONG. Is it satisfactory?

Mr. MESSEROLE. While we are right there I will show you how satisfactory it is. It is ridiculous for anyone—I do not care whether he is a farmer or a grain man, or who he is—to claims that the Minneapolis inspection is anything like reliable or uniform.

This is the testimony of a dealer in grain who at that time had been so engaged for 27 years. He certainly ought to be as skillful an expert as it would be possible for a man to become. He says:

Here are two cars of corn raised in the same field—

This is Iowa corn—

Here are two cars of corn, raised in the same field, shelled from the same crib, and loaded from the same bin, after being mixed in the bin. As to two cars shipped the same day and arriving and inspected the same day at Minneapolis, on February 8, the commission house writes the following letter. This is my own experience. I shipped this grain myself.

Here is a portion of the letter:

"DEAR SIRS: You car 59266 was in here on February 5 and graded N. G.—

That is, no grade.

"We filed call for reinspection and the grade was sustained. We carried it up to the board of appeals and they made the grade No. 4 corn—

In other words, they raised it one grade—

"and we applied the car on your No. 3 sale at 1 cent per bushel discount, which was the understanding in the terms of our sale.

"The party to whom we applied this corn wish the grade reconsidered by the board of appeals, for the reason that there were 25 or 40 bushels of very dirty corn in this car that did not show up in the original State sample.

"The board of appeals has ordered another sample of the car, and we will watch the reinspection and hope the grade will be sustained, for on the basis of N. G. we could not apply this car at a discount less than 3 cents per bushel."

Here is the other car, loaded from the same bin the same day, and arriving the same day, and inspected the same day:

"Your car 70370 graded 3 yellow and applied satisfactorily on sale."

Senator LONG. Was the trouble there with the law or with its administration?

Mr. MESSEROLE. It is difficult, Senator Long, for us to tell at that distance what the trouble is. In Chicago I am satisfied that the trouble is with the law.

Senator LONG. With the law?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir.

Senator LONG. In what respect is the law faulty?

Mr. MESSEROLE. The law, or the refusal of the officers to enforce the law, permits of a collusion between the inspectors and the elevator people, who are largely responsible for this condition.

Senator DOLLIVER. Will you submit to a question from your colleague?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCREERY. I want to ask you what the farmer who raised those two cars of corn would think of the inspection of the two cars of corn?

Mr. MESSEROLE. I was coming to that now. The fact is that the conditions have been so bad and are so bad, a great many times, that a grain dealer in the country, especially an agent or manager of a cooperative elevator company, is compelled to refuse to settle for corn coming from the farmers until that corn has arrived and been inspected. Just what the farmer would think of that kind of a proposition is largely guesswork.

Senator PERKINS. Was it subject to the same conditions in transit?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir; it was subject to exactly the same conditions, loaded from the same bin on the same day, arrived the same day, and was inspected the same day.

Senator GORE. It is practically certain that one car was purposely graded too high and the other too low, is it not?

Mr. MESSEROLE. That is what I contend.

Senator BURKETT. Why would that be done? What would be the object in doing that? Probably the same man inspected the two cars if they went in together.

Mr. MESSEROLE. That is another thing; that is problematical. The natural result would be that a man acting as a manager of a farmers' elevator company, if he took grain to begin with, knowing that these conditions existed, would resolve every doubt against the farmer.

Very naturally, he would have to do that to protect himself.

Again:

Senator MCCUMBER. On the whole, taking the grain which you send out in that way, is the tendency to undergrade rather than to overgrade?

Mr. MESSEROLE. It invariably tends to undergrading.

In other words, the system is so worked that it operates always against the producer and the ultimate consumer, the former being compelled to sell his grain at considerably less than its true grade and the final consumer being compelled to buy his grain under loose inspection at a grade above its true merit.

Again, Mr. Messerole answers a question by Senator GORE:

Senator GORE. But by reason of grading one No. 3, which you think was really above its merits, and giving the other no grade, you would have made more than if they had given both of them the proper grade, No. 4—about a cent more?

Mr. MESSEROLE. If the error was due to incompetency, and I got the benefit of it, that would not change my views upon this matter, because I would recognize at once that there was incompetency, and the next time I might get the worst of it; and there would be no certainty or anything like certainty about the grain business. The fact of the matter is, Senator GORE, that it is not the slight differences that cause trouble in the grain business; it is the wide differences. For instance, if I ship a car of grain to Chicago, and when I ship it I know that it is on a line between No. 3 and No. 4, and it happens to grade No. 4, I am not going to call then for reinspection, because I think then that the chances are that I may be wrong. But if it grades no grade when I am satisfied that it is No. 3, then I would call for reinspection, if I thought I had any show. But under the present conditions I do not think I would have, because the men to whom I must appeal for a change in the grade are the same fellows who are responsible for the condition in the first place.

There, Mr. President, is the wrong. This is what I have been trying to impress upon the Senate, or, rather, upon the seats in the Senate, in the consideration of this question.

Again, Mr. Messerole says:

I look upon the matter something in this light: It matters very little what my personal views may be on this subject, although I have had some experience; but I came down here to deliver this message to this committee—that our farmers have sent me here to let you people know that they favor the enactment of some legislation of this character.

Senator PERKINS. Those opposed to it have been here and have had their say about it; and they simply represent their own individual pecuniary interests and their own financial interests, as it were. When you come here from the producers, representing as many as you do in the great State of Iowa, it seems to me your statement carries great weight with it.

Mr. MESSEROLE. I do not think there is any doubt that the injustice and inequalities of the present system are proven, to say nothing about those things which are worse than incompetency.

Mr. Greeley gave, in one long day's testimony, those things which were worse than incompetency, and I need not repeat them here.

Senator GORE. Do you think that under this bill you could ship those two cars of corn to any terminal market in the country and be reasonably safe in the assumption that they would receive the proper grade?

Mr. MESSEROLE. I do; yes sir.

Senator GORE. And the same grade in one case as in the other?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir.

Senator GORE. And that would be a source of satisfaction to you?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir. I think it would prove in the end to work out a stable state of affairs upon which a grain dealer or a man acting in the capacity of an agent for the farmers could rely.

Senator GORE. It would give confidence to the farmer that ships to those terminal markets, and to the foreigner who buys from them?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes, sir.

Here I will answer again the statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that a Kansas certificate would hold good in the State of Illinois:

Senator MCCUMBER. Mr. Messerole, suppose you have a carload of grain which you ship from, say, Kansas or Nebraska, over the Missouri River, and it is sold by the car there without being changed. It is then reshipped into Illinois. It is perhaps sold again. It is then reshipped down to New Orleans, and again resold, and shipped out of the country from there. What trouble, if any, would you find with reference to the grading and regrading of this grain? Would it be graded more than once? If so, where would it be graded, and what dangers would arise in the grading that would affect your interests?

Mr. MESSEROLE. It would be graded first at the initial point and at each succeeding point until it reached the destination by a system of grading in which no two inspectors would grade it alike. That would be the result.

Senator MCCUMBER. Then, would not this produce such uncertainty on the part of the shipper of that grain that it would discourage him a great deal in giving fair grades to grain?

Mr. MESSEROLE. It would, certainly. Mr. McCreery here has a case of just that character which I will ask him to state, because it brings that point out very clearly.

Mr. MCCREERY. Do you want me to state that now?

Mr. MESSEROLE. Yes; I should be glad to have you state it now, because it comes in here.

Mr. MCCREERY. In that particular case, Senators, the shipment originated at Mason City, Ill. It was composed of two cars of white corn loaded by us, both shipped to St. Louis, Mo., both inspected by the same inspector or under the same system of inspection. One graded No. 3 white, the other No. 2 white. That corn was forwarded on to Nashville, Tenn. There was no complaint in Nashville about the car that was graded No. 3 in St. Louis, but discussion arose over the weights of the car of corn which was graded No. 2. I have the papers, the correspondence, and a draft refused by us, and so on, in my pocket. A discussion arose over the weights, and the reason assigned for the shortage of weight of this car in Nashville was that the corn arrived in Nashville in heated condition. How could a car of No. 2 white corn in St. Louis be graded "no grade" in Nashville? I have those papers.

I call this especially to the attention of Senators who care to know anything about the question. If the grain is sufficient to grade No. 2 white, it is sufficiently dry so that it is impossible for it to take up enough moisture in transit in a car to cause heating. If it could possibly, in transit, be changed into a heated condition, it is conclusive evidence that it was not No. 2 in the first instance. That may be explained further on. I am not certain.

Senator MCCUMBER. It would have to go down at least from three to four grades?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes; it would have to go from No. 2, which is the best grade of corn. That is, it is the best grade that is handled. There is, I believe, a No. 1, but no one ever heard of a car grading No. 1. No. 2 is the highest that any corn grades. That was the best, then, that there is. We will say it might not have been the best grade of No. 2, but it passed in that class. It then went down past No. 3, past No. 4, and down into "no grade."

Senator DOLLIVER. They claim that it became heated, do they not?

Mr. MCCREERY. How could it become heated in going from St. Louis down to Nashville?

Mr. MESSEROLE. His contention is that the initial grading was wrong, either the one or the other; that either the grade at Louisville or Nashville was wrong.

Mr. MCCREERY. Senator, if it was No. 2 corn, the qualifications for No. 2 corn are such that it would not heat in going to Nashville, or it would not heat in going to New Orleans for that matter, if it took 30 days.

Senator GORE. The best corn of that grade is heatproof, is it not?

Mr. MCCREERY. It is almost heatproof, because there is such a small percentage of moisture in No. 2 that it is impossible to get it in a heated condition within any reasonable length of time.

Senator MCCUMBER. And that would make a difference of how much of the value of that cargo of corn?

Mr. MCCREERY. I would say, going from No. 2 down to "no grade," at least 7 or 8 cents a bushel.

This is the method of inspection under the State inspection system which the Senator from Missouri lauds so earnestly.

Senator MCCUMBER. If he bought that as No. 2 he would lose about 7 cent a bushel?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCUMBER. And that would tend to make him a little more careful about giving a grade of No. 2 if he really thought that it was No. 2.

Mr. MCCREERY. Certainly; and right here is where the farmer comes in and is being injured by this loose system of inspection.

Senator GORE. Did that No. 3 corn go to Nashville, too?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes, sir.

Senator GORE. How did it fare?

Mr. MCCREERY. All right; there was no question about it.

Senator GORE. It held its grade?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes, sir. I have this paper in my pocket, showing that there was no question about it. The point is this, gentlemen: That at one place or the other the inspectors undoubtedly were badly "off." Had there been Federal inspection, gentlemen, the corn that passed the Federal inspector at St. Louis as being No. 2 grade, or No. 3, as the case might be, would have had the same grade down at Nashville. There is no question about that.

Why, it would have the same grade, because it would not be reinspected unless it was unloaded and mixed with other corn or unless there was a special reason for reinspecting it.

Mr. Nelson, who is from the State of North Dakota, then asks a question, as follows:

I want to call attention to a sample of No. 4 wheat taken from a car that arrived in Kansas City from Kansas and a sample taken from a shipment of No. 2 hard wheat out of an elevator in Kansas City and finally transferred at Buffalo to a canal boat for a Rochester mill, which graded No. 2 at Kansas City and at Buffalo. I forwarded the two samples to Senator MCCUMBER, with the request that he submit the two samples to the Agricultural Department for examination, and I have their report showing that there was no difference in the value of the two samples.

I recall very distinctly the occasion. Knowing a little something about grain and its several grades, I could see no difference from an eye inspection, so I submitted the grain to the Agricultural Department in order that they might give it a chemical test, or whatever other test they use, to determine its character. After having given such a test, the Agricultural

Department stated that there was no difference whatever in the two samples, and yet they graded entirely differently—two grades different at the different places.

Mr. Messerole goes on:

It has been contended, I understand, by some of the opponents of the bill that it would create confusion, and that reinspection would be necessary at the point of destination. As I understand the purpose of the bill, it is to provide that the initial inspection would follow the car until the grain lost its identity, and in case of a disagreement there would not be anything to prevent the purchaser who might not be satisfied from calling for a reinspection.

Mr. President, Mr. Messerole understood correctly the purpose of this bill; and yet Senators who absent themselves during the presentation of the evidence upon this question will argue this same thing over and over again without knowing what the testimony is, and will declare that the bill means something different from what it does mean.

Mr. Messerole proceeds:

The present inspection at Chicago, which is our principal market, and upon which we must depend at most times, is absolutely unreliable and without any stability whatever.

I want to call this to the attention of the Senator from Illinois. That was the condition at that time. It may be perfect to-day, but there is no law to keep it perfect, and that is what we want. We want a law that will make them grade properly when it is to their interest to do so, and grade likewise justly when their interest might induce them to manipulate the grades.

As a proof of this, I want to tell you that in our country we have a variety of oats known as the Russian green oats; also an oat known as the Kershon oat. They are of a yellow variety. Those oats upon arriving in Chicago, no matter how sweet or bright or clean or nice they are, are invariably marked "stained and damaged" in the inspection certificate; while an inferior quality of white oats might pass the inspection as No. 3 white, as compared with these yellow oats.

I call attention to the fact that according to this testimony these yellow oats, because they are naturally yellow in color, are of a superior quality to number 3 white oats; and yet under the inspection system in that State at that time they were always graded as damaged or stained because they were of the yellow variety.

Senator DOLLIVER. That is a fine piece of mere stupidity, I should say.

Mr. MESSEROLE. We have been contending with that condition for the last five years. In view of the fact that many foreign countries buy our grain, and we are heavy exporters, we contend that it would be a good thing to offer them a definite basis on which they can base their business relations with us; and we also contend that the Federal inspection would perform that service.

Senator PERKINS. That commends itself to me, Mr. Chairman, especially so as it has been stated by the gentleman who preceded you that they take the grade in foreign countries of the grain shipped from our markets here on the Atlantic coast and the Gulf. On the Pacific coast it is very different, of course, and therefore this is a revelation to me, and a very good one, too. It makes me feel that your advocacy of the measure has a great deal of merit from that standpoint.

Mr. MESSEROLE. Is the remedy in this bill adequate? That is a question that might arise. I want to state to this committee that our people believe that this is a very good measure, and they have not asked for any amendments. They do not expect perfection, and if they find it to be faulty in some particular they are not going to complain about it. But they think, and they have said they think, that it is a move in the right direction and will be much better than what we have at the present time. In view of the testimony as to the outrageous inspection at terminal markets, what evidence is to be more conclusive than that of the men who produce grain and ship thousands of cars of it, as testified to by the representatives of the several organizations? I am inclined to look at this thing somewhat with the idea of trying to find out where the opposition comes from.

I will tell you where it comes from. It is stated here by Mr. Messerole. He says:

It is very natural that a combination of grain dealers, such as we heard about here yesterday, and which I am firmly convinced exists—in fact, I know it does from my own personal experience—should oppose this bill. It is also natural that an exchange having its rules framed up in its own interest should object to any interference with the carrying on of its business as it has planned it. But the farmers, in considering this bill, are looking at their own interests from the producer's standpoint. And I want to say that in making the canvass in Iowa, having intimate connection with a great many farmers' organizations in Iowa, Illinois, South Dakota, and Minnesota, I have yet to find the first farmer and grain producer who will say one word against this bill of Senator MCCUMBER'S. They all indorse it universally.

* * * * * * *

Senator PERKINS. In other words, all the farmer wants is an honest, square deal?

Mr. MESSEROLE. That is all they are asking for. The bill means, first, uniformity.

Now, remember that, although your boards of trade reported resolutions strongly against uniformity but a year or so ago, every one of them comes in to-day and votes in favor of uniformity, because they say: "If we will concede that much possibly we may prevent the Government from doing the inspecting itself, and we will be enabled to carry on the same system with a uniform grade if we are not interfered with."

Next, it means civil service, which means educated inspectors; and, in my judgment, that is the most important thing in the whole proposition—that it will result in the building up of a corps of inspectors who will be educated from a proper source.

Yes, Mr. President, the Federal Government will lay down the rules of inspection; it will determine, by the proper method of grading, how the grades may be established. Its employees will have to measure up in educational qualifications to the standard of efficiency that will be determined by the department, and every incoming administration of two years will not change the members, as is done at present in the State department, and bring favorites into the inspection of grain whose work at the most, in the beginning, will be little better than guesswork.

Mr. Messerole proceeds:

It was admitted by Mr. Reynolds, who I take to be a man of some prominence in the grain business of Indiana, before the Uniform Grade Congress in Chicago in 1906, that these evils exist; that there is no uniformity, and that the reason there is none is because men want to continue sharp practice. He admitted that, and yet he is opposed to this proposition. He wants to work out some reforms in their own organizations, but he says that he has no hope of accomplishing that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MCCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator from North Dakota proceeds further with the discussion of this question, I believe that we ought to have at any rate a few Senators in the Chamber. I notice but one Senator upon the other side. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | Gore | Norris | Smoot |
| Brady | Gronna | Oliver | Stephenson |
| Brandegee | Hughes | Overman | Sterling |
| Bristow | James | Page | Sutherland |
| Bryan | Johnson | Perkins | Thompson |
| Burton | Jones | Pomerene | Thornton |
| Catron | Kenyon | Ransdell | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | Lea, Tenn. | Robinson | Vardaman |
| Chilton | Lee, Md. | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Clapp | Lewis | Shafroth | West |
| Clark, Wyo. | McCumber | Sheppard | Williams |
| Cummins | Martine, N. J. | Sherman | Works |
| du Pont | Myers | Smith, Md. | |
| Gallinger | Nelson | Smith, S. C. | |

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], and the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are absent on the business of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent on account of sickness.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS], and will state that he is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from North Dakota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I wish Senators who take enough interest to do so would read the statement that was made by Mr. Reynolds. He stated this, in substance, to this Uniform Grade Congress, which was a congress made up of wheat buyers: "Gentlemen, unless you will agree to a uniform-grade system, unless you will stop your evil practices under the present system, I want to tell you that, just as surely as the sun will rise to-morrow, you will have the Federal Government doing your inspecting." In other words, "You had better be honest, at least for a while, and put off this evil day." That was, in substance, the statement made by Mr. Reynolds to the grain buyers' association.

Well, they have come partly over. I am thankful for that. It is a step in the right direction. When you get Federal standards and when you have Federal supervision you have gone a long way; but anyone who is acquainted with the grain business will know that you have not gone far enough to prevent and eliminate entirely the present frauds that are practiced in the grain trade.

Again, he continues:

Another thing that I regard in connection with the bill is this: That when a man is found dishonest the Government will punish him for it, and they will be less liable to be dishonest. It will not be simply winked at, as is the case in Chicago and these other markets where they have been caught in the act, and perhaps have discharged a foreman under them somewhere and made a scapegoat of him, and that has been the end of it. I do not think that will be the case under this bill. People fear Government prosecution. It will inspire confidence among foreigners, because the reputation of the Government itself will be at stake in this matter. The official certificate will pass as good as coin. That is the way our people view the matter.

Here is a question that was addressed to me by Mr. Foering, who was opposed to the bill, and the reply answers some of the

questions that are still being asked in the letters that Senators are receiving from these boards of trade:

Mr. FORAKER. I should like to ask Senator MCCUMBER one question. There seems to be considerable opposition among the members of some of the exchanges to this bill on this point: If it should go into effect, what effect would it have on grain that is not interstate grain; that is to say, grain that is going into the elevator? Would not that all have to be kept separate in the elevator?

The moment it gets into the elevator it ceases to become interstate grain, and it will not become interstate grain unless you take it out of the elevator and try to send it to another State. Then it may be inspected.

Senator MCCUMBER. When it leaves the car it becomes intrastate grain. The only object of the bill is to secure, first, a just and proper inspection and grade when it arrives for the purpose of selling it; secondly, to see that a just and proper grade is placed upon it when it starts out into another State, so that it will not defraud the consumer. We want to protect, first, the producer at one end, and then we want to protect the consumer at the other end, so that the one will sell the grade that he is entitled to, and the other will receive, when he purchases, the grade he is entitled to. As long as the grain is in the elevator it is not hurting anybody. We do not care what they do with it in the elevator. It is intrastate grain, and we can not control it if it is sold in that State from the elevator; we can not do anything as to that. But if it starts to defraud a person outside of the State from which it is shipped from the elevator, we want to reach it the same as we reach articles under the pure-food law.

I have here a statement from Mr. J. A. McCreery, of Mason City, Ill. I speak of grain going from one State to another of these agricultural States. I know that I need to apologize to the Senate for quoting so much of the testimony, but the testimony is argument, it is in point, it is from men who know the business, it is from those who are dealing in grain. I am giving you no farmer's guess at it, but I am giving you statements made by those who know from actual experience, and that is worth more to me, and it is worth more upon this record than any statement I could myself make except as I may explain from time to time the testimony that is given:

Mr. MCCREERY. I am manager of the Farmers' Grain & Coal Co. at Mason City, Ill., and am also secretary of the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of Illinois.

These are the representatives of the farmers and independent grain buyers in the State of Illinois, who, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] says, are entirely satisfied. It may be that since this testimony was given they have become satisfied, but I want a condition that will keep them satisfied.

Senator PERKINS. How do these 25,000 farmers speak through you, sir? By resolution adopted by their organization?

Mr. MCCREERY. In answer to the Senator, I will state that we recently held a State convention in the city of Bloomington that was attended by 900 delegates from these various local farmers' associations, similar to the one of which I am manager. To make it clear I will say that they are local organizations composed of the farmers of the community who subscribed $50 or $100, as the case may be, to the stock, and created a fund of five, ten, or fifteen thousand dollars, and built these elevators for the shipping of their own grain, and any other grain that they see fit to buy from those who are not members. The State convention was held in Bloomington on February 26 and 27, and was attended, as I said, by 900 delegates. At that convention, after discussing the bill under consideration, it was unanimously voted to indorse the bill or something in that line.

Senator PERKINS. That is, a Federal, national inspection?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes, sir; a Federal inspection bill similar to this one. I think our convention, if I remember rightly, simply indorsed the McCumber bill, and they are asking (and that is what I am here for)—25,000 of them—for the passage of this bill at this session.

Mr. President, there are 2,500 grain dealers who are opposing this bill, who are getting fatter as our men are getting leaner, while there are not only 25,000 but more than 250,000 of the grain producers who are asking justice at our hands; and it is such a universal demand that we ought to consider their wishes in the matter. He proceeds:

We happen to be in a State that has State inspection. In the same State we have some other inspection, of which I am glad to produce a certificate. Part of our grain is graded under State inspection; part of it is not, even in the State.

According to the testimony of this witness, at least at that time it was optional for the board of trade to determine whether it wanted its own inspection method or whether it wanted State inspection. That may be changed now; I am not prepared to say.

There is not any question in the minds of our people but what a standard established by the Government of the United States would be far superior to the standard established by some little merchants' exchange somewhere, or even by the State of Illinois. We feel, and our people say so, that the establishment of the standard by the United States would mean a great deal more; and we would have some satisfaction in the way of knowing, at least, that when it passed that inspector it meant something; and when we started a car of grain to Chicago we would know that it was to be inspected by Uncle Sam, just the same as the meat. Instead of that, it is inspected by what is known as a State inspection, which is nothing more nor less than the Chicago Board of Trade inspection, when you come right down to the real thing.

That is an answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in reference to the Missouri State inspection. He says it is "nothing more nor less than the Chicago Board of Trade inspection, when you come right down to the real thing." He continues:

To show you gentlemen, if you will permit, that there is looseness in this inspection, I will state that solicitors from different markets call upon us and tell us to ship our corn to their market, because the inspection is easy.

What does easy inspection mean? It means simply that they will resolve the doubt in your favor if you will send the grain to them. What right have they to resolve doubts in anyone's favor? He proceeds:

We go down to Memphis, and there is a Memphis certificate [producing certificate]. Here is one from Illinois, and here is a Baltimore certificate. A representative from a Baltimore house called on us just this last winter and said—

I regret that the Senators from Maryland are not here, but I especially call attention to this:

A representative from a Baltimore house called on us just this last winter and said: "You had better ship your corn down to Baltimore, because the inspection is easy in Baltimore." If they let it be known that it is easy in Baltimore, or that it is strict in Baltimore, do you not see that they use that fact to get business? If there was Federal inspection in Baltimore it would not be any easier than the inspection in Chicago; nor would it be any harder.

Another man will say, "Sell me your corn and ship it down to Buffalo; Buffalo has the easiest inspection that there is." Do you not see that if we had Federal inspection the inspection in Buffalo would not be any easier than it would be in Baltimore, nor would it be any harder?

Senator DOLLIVER. What is the grade of this corn?

Mr. MCCREERY. That steamer-mixed corn is a low grade of corn. That is, there is a discount on that, for it had to be dried and raised to what is known as mixed corn. I simply brought those certificates along to show you.

Now, to go back, what constitutes the inspection in Cairo [reading]:

Here he reads the following:

CAIRO, ILL., *May 6, 1908.*

This certifies that there was inspected this date car No. 34388, I. C., and found to contain two—

That means No. 2—

yellow corn. Inspected and graded according to the instructions and standards adopted by the directors of the Cairo Board of Trade.

Not by the State inspector of Illinois, but by the Cairo Board of Trade.

We have no fault to find with the inspection of that grade of corn. That was a good grade. But suppose, now, that we sold this corn to the Halliday elevator. With all respect to the Hallidays, they are very fine gentlemen, but who constitutes the Cairo Board of Trade, or who forms the rules governing the grading in Cairo? The Hallidays help do it.

Senator DOLLIVER. Where are your State inspectors?

Mr. MCCREERY. They do not have the State inspection now; it is Cairo inspection.

Senator DOLLIVER. Does not the State inspection apply to all the corn marketed in Illinois?

Mr. MCCREERY. No, sir. Decatur very recently adopted State inspection. We had Decatur inspection up to just a short time ago.

Senator DOLLIVER. Is it voluntary with each town to select the State inspection if it wants to?

Mr. MCCREERY. Yes, sir. As far as I know it is; because Decatur just adopted State inspection very recently. They always had Decatur inspection before. There is Cairo inspection; there is inspection in each place for itself. It is not State inspection.

That is the kind of inspection we are now getting. There are different inspections in the same State, so far as that is concerned. Take Baltimore, for instance [reading]:

And again he reads:

"This grain is inspected and graded according to the instructions and standards adopted by the directors of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce."

Who constitute the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce—the Baltimore grain men?

Senator GORE. That is a sort of benevolent association.

Mr. MCCREERY. It is just like the Cairo association. It is the Cairo grain men, and it is the Baltimore grain men that create that chamber of commerce. They fix the standard for the inspection, and the inspector inspects according to that.

The point I wish to make with that is this: Suppose this car that went to Cairo was sold to grade No. 3, or 3 yellow, as the case may be, that would command a fixed price. But had it missed that, had it been what we call a "line grade," and had missed grade 3 and had been graded 4, there would have been a discount on it. For all practical purposes, however, it would have been worth just as much as though it had passed as No. 3. And the danger is that these gentlemen working there as inspectors being under the Cairo Board of Trade, and the Cairo Board of Trade being controlled by and in fact being made up of the Cairo grain men, who buy this corn, it would be natural—I will not say that they would do it, but it would be natural—for them to give the benefit of the doubt to the disadvantage of the shipper.

Yes, Mr. President, it is extremely doubtful, and that doubt is manifested in their favor. There is not a single exchange that does not show between three and four times as many bushels of the higher grades shipped out as there are taken in.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MCCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator in this statement, or this witness from whom he reads, take into account the improve-

ment of the grade by purifying the grain at any of these primary markets.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course he does. You do not change the inherent quality of a single grain of that grade by any process whatever. Whatever is deficient in flour-making properties when it goes in, is deficient when it goes out.

The only difference in quality, if you may call it quality, between that which comes in and that which goes out is that the dirt, the weed seeds, and the foul stuff are eliminated from that which goes out, but there is dockage allowed for that, and dockage is allowed in sufficient quantity not only to cover the foul stuff but also in sufficient quantity to pay for the expense of taking it out. The expense is very slight, because it is elevated; it goes through a spout; a very strong air current is turned upon it, and it practically costs nothing more to take out all the foul stuff than it would to elevate it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator says that dirty wheat is just as good as the clean?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator does not say anything of the kind, and the Senator knows he did not say it. The Senator said that the grade of the wheat is the same with the dirt in it or the dirt out of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will yield to me for a minute I want to correct his statement.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me finish. I said that the quality of the grain itself is not changed. The foul stuff may be taken out, but the grain is not changed. That is true of all the grain centers. You do not make the grade less in Minneapolis or in Duluth because of the quantity of dirt in it. They take out enough to cover that. They do not make a difference in the grade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not controverting what the Senator states in his last answer, but without explanation his response to the first question would indicate that the dirtier the wheat is probably the better it would be if the grain were of the right quality when it was graded at the primary market; that whatever grading it received it would not have a high grade, but it would only be docked. I do not understand that that is the way the grade is made. The berry of the wheat, if that be the specific grain in question, may be tested by its quality; but if it be full of weed seeds or any other foreign grain rather than the grain that is sought to be investigated, it would more or less interfere with the quality of the wheat. It would not be graded at a higher grade or the same grade if the foreign substance were removed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken on that point. I assume that it is an honest mistake. The grade is graded according to the quality. There may be a third of oats in that wheat. The third of oats is taken out in the elevator; allowance is made for it. Therefore the actual grade is given of the bushel of that grain, and after the oats are taken out the grade should continue the same. I will tell the Senator how it is done.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is not any question about the method.

Mr. McCUMBER. The method of grading grain is this: You take under rigid inspection a million bushels of what you may call No. 1 grain. You take in a rigid inspection of 2,000,000 bushels—1,000,000 bushels of No. 2 and 1,000,000 bushels of No. 3. You dump it all into a bin. You have taken it under rigid inspection. When it is all mixed together, you certify that it is all No. 1. To be sure, some of it has been scoured—it has been cleaned—but it is the identical grain of 2,000,000 bushels, and you have gained a grade or so. That is the reason why the outshipping of grain always shows higher grades. It is done mostly in the mixing elevators.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. When the question was asked there was not any expectation that the Senator from North Dakota would escape in the manner he has. I do not refer to some particular acre of boggy ground in a field where there was an inferior grain that might be shipped in. I had reference to the general production of grain in a given area in southwestern Kansas, in North Dakota, or in Minnesota that might be coming in; and when that is all graded out, after being purified, manifestly it will be a better grade than it was before. I do not think there is any real misunderstanding on the subject.

Mr. McCUMBER. I confess there is a misunderstanding, and a very strong one. I certainly do not understand the Senator. Whether he understands me or not I can not say. I simply know that if a million bushels of No. 1 wheat and a million bushels of No. 2 go into an elevator there ought to be a million bushels of No. 1 and a million bushels of No. 2 come out, and if that is not the case somebody gets bit somewhere.

Mr. SHERMAN. But if a million bushels of wheat go into the elevator that come from various parts of the same State, the quality of which is not the same, when it is regraded they will get two grades of wheat out of the million bushels. There are some lighter grains in it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; that is true, Mr. President, but in this metamorphosis in the elevator it always comes from the lower to the higher. They never get a different grade out of it that is a lower one. All the low grades vanish and it all goes out under the higher grade.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is coming back to the main question, that will be argued when we get to it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thought we were at it.

Again, following Mr. McCreery, Senator Long asked him this question:

> You do not want any interference with you and your customer, the farmer?
>
> Mr. McCREERY. Let me explain that, Senator.

Then Senator Burkett, who was a Member of the Senate at that time, gives his own experience, and it is worth while to listen to it. It comes from a Senator from Nebraska who had not any particular interest in the subject but had had some experience:

> Senator BURKETT. Let me tell you about that; I fought that out here the first day. Here is where it is going to help the farmer: They can not get to inspect each load that the farmer brings; but when this elevator man buys that corn and sends it in down at Chicago or St. Louis, or wherever it goes, they can wheedle him up or down on that inspection. If they want to, their inspector will throw it down, say, to No. 3 instead of No. 2. He may have thought it would go as No. 2, and they may throw it down to No. 3. This little elevator man out here that is a buyer has to take the risk of that being done. It is done without any certainty, and it is done without sufficient restraint or enforcement of law about it to make it anywhere near certain and reliable. He has to take that risk; and accordingly he bids down the farmer lower than he would otherwise; and in the end the farmer with his one load of corn bears the risk. Do you see?
>
> Senator GORE. You see, they have no standard.
>
> Senator BURKETT. Here is another thing that I want to tell you: Another man has wheat or corn. He goes to an elevator. He has a carload. If he thinks that the elevator man is buying on too big a margin, he can send that in himself; and he becomes a competitor with the elevator man. His competition, the competition of the few farmers that have enough grain to ship in carload lots, if there is only one elevator in the town, gives abundance of competition to keep that elevator up in price, provided the farmer that has a carload can send it to Chicago and feel that he will be treated reasonably well when his carload gets there. But the fact is that when this farmer ships in his one carload of wheat or two carloads of wheat once a year, the men down there know what he is, and they know that he is not coming back, and they do not care whether they treat him right or not; and he is absolutely sure to get a poor grade. Accordingly, that one farmer, although he has a carload, can not send that wheat in with any certainty of getting anywhere near a proper grade for it. So reliability of grading does affect the wagonload man, because it makes a certainty; and the risk is not shifted back onto him.

Mr. President, I again call attention to cases where these farmers' elevators have shipped to the great terminals and the rule has been adopted by the boards of trade prohibiting their members from selling the farmers' grain. Could that be done under Federal inspection controlling the grades? Mr. McCreery, proceeding, says:

> Here is where we are punished: A car arrives there that is what they call a "line grade," according to the inspector's judgment. He hardly knows whether to say it is No. 3 or No. 4. It is so close to the line that divides them that he can hardly tell. Now, by which system will the farmer be protected? By having a disinterested man say what grade that should be or by having a man say what grade it shall be who is appointed by the grain men at that market?

Again, I want to call the attention of the defenders of these boards of trade and State-inspection laws to the fact that there are only four States that have inspection laws, I think, in the whole United States, and nearly all the great markets are controlled by the local exchanges. I admit State inspection is better as a rule than the local inspection, but Government inspection would be a thousandfold better than either of them. Mr. McCreery proceeds:

> We claim that a disinterested man in that case would be more likely to give us a fair and just decision on it than a man who is appointed by interested parties.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Senator GORE. In consequence of the grade?
>
> Mr. McCREERY. Yes, sir. Take Peoria, for instance: Peoria has State inspection. Chicago has State inspection. It is common gossip among grain men that what will pass for No. 2 corn in Peoria will not be better than No. 3 in Chicago. Yet it is all under the same inspector, or under the same department of inspection. It is not under the same man, of course; but it is all under State inspection. We can ship a car of corn to Peoria that will grade No. 2 or No. 2 yellow. We can ship that same car to Chicago and it will be No. 3 or No. 3 yellow.

I am going over into Kansas for a while now. I want to show that the Kansas farmers are also in favor of Federal inspection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the Senator leaves the last State named and proceeds to a widely different part of the Union, I should like to ask him if he thinks under Federal inspection the judgment of inspectors would be exactly the same throughout the United States, and whether there will be no difference between Federal inspectors, as there sometimes is, it is admitted, under State inspection? An inspector, for instance, in Peoria might arrive at a different conclusion from one in East St. Louis. Would not that same difference of human judgment appear in Federal inspection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have answered that before, Mr. President, and if the Senator had been present a short time ago of course he would not have asked the question at this time. There is no certain line of demarcation between grades. There is a line which must touch on the one side or the other. One man may say it is No. 3 of a poor quality or No. 3. Another may say it is of the best quality of No. 4. But, as already stated, the trouble is not in the mistakes upon getting on one side or the other of this invisible line of demarcation between the grades. It is when you make the jumps from one to two, three and four grades. As is stated by one of the witnesses, if he sent a carload of grain which he thought might possibly grade No. 3, but it is graded No. 2 or No. 4, he would not ask for a reinspection, but if he had what he knew was good No. 2 put down as of no grade at all, he would know that it was a mistake or it was purposely done. All we expect in the matter of Federal inspection is that the inspectors will not be interested, that they will be under the civil service, and that they can not be controlled, or in all probability will not be controlled to the same extent by those who employ them.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the answer of the Senator from North Dakota is what I understood had already been explained in part, if not in whole; and I wish the answer to be inserted here as preliminary to a further question. I ask if the Senator from North Dakota does not know that these nice shades of distinction that often appear, as he said, between one inspector and another, which make a difference in the price of grain in the locality when the grain is shipped out, might not account for the difference in grades between Peoria and Chicago, for instance? It is a well-known condition in that section of the country that Peoria prices for corn, for instance, very often exceed by from 1 to 3 cents a bushel the price out in other western points, because of the demand at that point for local consumption, on account of the very great demand at that point for the local needs of the various enterprises there, not alone of the distilleries but of the glucose works as well. This leads to a desire to hold the corn at that point. We meet with a grading often more favorable at Peoria than elsewhere in order to supply that local demand; and where there is a difference, as the Senator very accurately describes, when you get near the dividing line between a higher grade and an inferior grade might not these facts make some difference? I ask the Senator whether he knows that they do not in fact make a difference?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is not the slightest question but that the Senator from Illinois and myself are in absolute accord. He has probably expressed the idea better than I have done, so far as it governs the various boards in making different inspections of the kinds of grain. That is what we are complaining of. That is true. Peoria wants that grain, and therefore she applies what we call "easy" inspection; she will give a better grade in order to get that grain. Chicago may not want that particular grain, or she may be already loaded up, we will say, with grain, and does not desire to buy any more of that grade, and she will have at the same time a rigid inspection. Now, as grain has its value generally according to its standard, according to the grade that is fixed on it, there ought not to be any difference between Peoria and Chicago.

Let me illustrate this a little further, if the Senator will bear with me. When our grain is rather short up in the Northwest, there is then what is called "an easier inspection." We have the same kind of grain, but we have a bigger crop, and the price is very much lower. When we ought to make up the difference, therefore, by getting the grade which belongs to the grain, then we will have an inspection which will put it down below its real character. But the great trouble lies in the fact that if you allow either one of these centers to make a distinction in the methods of grading, it invariably leads to this, that they will have rigid inspection, under the rule, when the wheat is coming in, until the farmer has disposed of most of his grain, and then the grades will rise until the elevators are filled, when they will have a looser or an easier inspection, and the same grain will be graded out higher than it was when it went in.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota allow me to make an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEST in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator from North Dakota think that the application of civil-service rules will cure all the inequalities of human nature incident to grain inspectors and to everybody else? Is he that optimistic?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have said several times that you can not make a man moral by law; the very best you can do is to remove temptation from him. When you have done that you will have gone a long way toward keeping him in the straight and narrow path. These inspectors go along through temptation and they go along through favoritism. The man who is employed to do work likes ordinarily, when he owes his employment to a particular person, to favor him, and to especially favor him when there is a doubt as to which way he should go. That feeling permeates the breast of every man, and probably it is a very good quality to possess. But in the struggle of life, where your labor is measured by the value of the thing that you are employed upon and the price it will receive in the market, you are entitled to an independent measurement, to an independent weighing, and to an independent certification. That is all that I expect to gain by Federal inspection. I would remove, first, the temptation, and, secondly, by placing these men under the civil-service regulations, I would remove the danger of their being discharged because they insist upon doing their duty.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not care to enter into the abstract question of human temptation. I rather incline to the school that believes a man's internal condition has more to do with his behavior than have the external conditions that surround him. We may some time, on some proper text, reach the point here in this Chamber where we may at length expound our reasons for adhering to the one school or the other; but that is foreign to my desires this afternoon. I would rather take an inspector who is honest with any kind of surroundings than to take one who is subject to temptation and remove from him all attractions to fall; but what I want to get at particularly by way of further interrogatory, if the courtesy of the Senator from North Dakota permits, is to inquire whether this same temptation—conceding that that is the proper method or basis of legislation—could not be as well removed by an efficient system of supervision of grades and weights, as provided, for instance, in the Lever bill, introduced on the 13th of March, 1914?

I will follow that by the statement that I am in entire accord with the purpose of the Department of Agriculture and all those who have worked in joint effort with that department to procure and establish, upon adequate investigation, a uniform system, both of grades and weights, and to make it obligatory upon all grain entering into the interstate commerce of the country to require the States having an inspection system established under their statutes to bring themselves to adopt that standard before the grains in the States of their origin shall be admitted into interstate commerce. I am not opposed to, but, on the contrary, I believe in, these inspections and grades and in a uniform system of weights; but I do not think it is necessary that a new bureau be created here under the auspices of the Federal Government and that the State inspection system of some of the principal grain-producing States in the Union, and also some of the States in which there are the large primary markets of the country, be entirely obliterated and pulled up by the roots, so to speak, in order to accomplish these purposes. I am not against the end sought by the Senator from North Dakota, but I am opposing the means, because, in my judgment, the Lever bill, introduced in the House of Representatives very lately, will accomplish all of the good results desired, and standardize both weights and measures, without any corresponding evils.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the stock argument, Mr. President, of the boards of trade.

Mr. SHERMAN. And it is a very good one, too.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is the stock argument of the boards of trade to-day, though it was not their stock argument a year or two ago, when all of them were opposed even to Government supervision.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not represent any of them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I appreciate that, Mr. President. I know the Senator does not represent anyone but himself and his State, and he represents them very well, indeed; but here let me ask the Senator a question: Will an inspector who is now inspecting—a good inspector, we will say—under the State board of trade rules lose his integrity or lose his efficiency if he is employed by the General Government?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think not; but, if the Senator will permit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator to answer the question.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is a categorical question, and it is answered when answered by "yes" or "no." There is no assurance that any of these inspectors, however honest and capable they may be, will be continued in the service. If I had that hope eternal in the civil-service laws of the country producing such results, I might partake of the Senator's frame of mind; but I am somewhat dubious, under the change of administration that comes with the fluctuations of political campaigns, whether these men will be retained, especially in the large centers of population, where the largest markets are located. I think the greatest complaint is made here in this body. I am very doubtful whether the inspectors now in the service who are capable would be retained.

Further, it occurs to me that in the different States where the large markets are now located it would entirely destroy the State inspection service. That, I think, will be admitted as one of the primary results of the passage of this bill. It may not be the primary design, but it will be the primary result because there can not be a double inspection. Most of the States in which the large grain exchanges are found dealing in any of the grains named in this bill are also States of large production. Many of the grains have their origin in those States, and they are inspected under a State system. If there is any of the surplus used beyond the limits of the States entering into the interstate commerce and trade of the country, they would require another inspection. I do not think that two inspections under a supervision system should be required to work side by side, one representing the Government and the other the State inspection system. On the contrary, under the supervision plan, I believe, the standards being fixed by the Department of Agriculture under some such bill as the Lever or the Gore bill, that the State inspection would immediately be required to come up to that level; if it lacked anything in reaching that degree of perfection or desirability it would immediately go to that level. Otherwise, the State inspection system falling short, grains inspected under that system would necessarily cease to go into the interstate commerce of the country. That would of itself bring State inspection to that level.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator has strayed far afield from the simple little question which I asked him. The question was asked so that I might go a step further into his argument, whether or not transferring the inspectors from the control of the boards of trade or of the State inspection service to the control of the Government would change the integrity of the individuals. While the Senator has not answered that directly, I gather from all of his remarks that he believes it would make no change in the character of the individual. Very well, then, if the inspector will be just as honest, the provisions of this bill purpose that the Federal Government shall, in the first instance, take over all of the inspectors; that it shall proceed to get rid of those who are incompetent, and keep those who are competent, putting them under civil-service regulations and holding them there just so long as they are competent.

When the Senator has once admitted that he believes in Federal standardization and in Federal supervision, he has practically admitted, in my opinion, all we claim for this bill, with the single exception that he says he does not believe in the Federal employees doing the work. He believes in Federal supervision. What is Federal supervision? Here are on one track 250 cars to be examined. Somebody has to inspect them. The only way that the supervisor will know that all of those cars are properly inspected will be to go and see that they are properly inspected; and if he is capable, through his intelligence, of becoming an overseer of an inspector, he is capable of doing the inspecting himself; and if he is not able to do that I say get rid of him. So you see that, in order to get assured supervision, you would need to have just as many supervisors of inspectors as there are inspectors, and you would certainly need to have men who are just as competent. Then, in heaven's name, why can not the men who are inspectors do the work? There is no reason why they should not; there is no reason for duplicating all of this expense.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me answer the rest of the Senator's question before he interrupts me again or I will forget it.

The next thing the Senator says is that he has an idea that this bill is designed to do away with State inspection altogether. The Senator is absolutely right. While it does not force the State to do away with its own inspection, the State will not do its own inspecting; it will not even provide inspection for the purely intrastate business. A State can inspect meat, if it sees fit, but everyone is so well pleased with Federal inspection of meat that not a man in the United States would buy meat on State inspection if he could get meat that had passed Federal inspection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. Every foreign nation is demanding Federal inspection, every miller is asking for Federal inspection, the producer wants Federal inspection, the purchaser wants Federal inspection, and if you will give an opportunity to buy under Federal inspection, with the confidence that would follow a Government certificate, you could not get purchasers to buy under any other system. Remember also that at least 95 per cent of all the grain that goes into the great terminals is interstate grain; that it has entered or is going to enter into interstate trade, and therefore if 95 per cent of the grain is subject to Federal inspection you can rest assured that the State would not fool away its time upon the other 5 per cent.

But that is not all. Just as the Senator anticipates, if the State carried on a separate system at all, it would undoubtedly adopt the Federal system; but my opinion is that there would be not a single instance in which the State would continue its old system. The States are not continuing State systems of meat inspection, although they had them before the establishment of the Federal system of meat inspection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator certainly is not as well informed concerning the State inspection of meats, as well as other food products, as he is concerning Federal inspection. Several of the States of the Union not only maintain a pure-food department, but a most efficient department, and they are working in many instances in very close relation with similar departments maintained by large municipalities. I want to say that some of the rottenest stuff I have ever eaten at lunch counters in this country came from tins that showed on their face that an inspection had been made by United States authority. For a large part of my life I have been "a lunch-counter fiend," and when the Senator talks to me about a United States certificate I want to tell him that I would place no more confidence in it than I would in the well-managed pure-food department of any State. No particular virtue, nor power nor mentality, accrues to a man because he happens to carry a commission from the United States Government. Some of the greatest rascalities I have ever seen committed, Mr. President, have been committed, I am sorry to say, by those who carried such commissions. That is not because the United States Government is a failure, but it goes to show that the Senator from North Dakota is in error if he assumes that the brand of Federal authority immediately absolves from fault and sin everything that it touches.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not suppose that a Government certificate will prevent meat from rotting; the law of nature will apply to it just exactly the same. The Senator may, if he indulges too freely at lunch counters, find some meat that bears the mark of Government inspection upon it which has been opened a little bit too long, exposed to the air, or kept in a hot place, so that it may not be very good.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I want to answer the Senator first.

Mr. SHERMAN. I want to get the Senator right as he is going along.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must hold himself in patience. Somehow or other the law of nature will work just the same when meat is exposed to the sun, to the weather, and to rain after Government inspection as it did before. After we had lost our market in Europe for our meats we gained it mighty quickly after we inaugurated Federal inspection, which was worth millions upon millions of dollars to the great meat packers in the Senator's State. The Government was kind enough to continue it for them, although they opposed it at first. The Government is kind enough to spend between $3,000,000 and

$5,000,000 annually for the benefit of those few packers of meat so that the world may repose confidence in their product because of the Government certificate of inspection; and yet I find the Senate very reluctant even about letting the farmer pay out of his own pocket the cost of the inspection of his grain when he is demanding the right to do so in order to have an inspection by those who he feels are not interested in buying his grain.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, is that all of the answer?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not answering; I am making a speech. The Senator is the man who is asking the questions now.

Mr. SHERMAN. I undertook a while ago to correct the Senator and he said he had not finished answering the question. I am trying to adhere to the record as near as I can. The food about which I specifically complained was contained in a can which was opened after I had given my order; it was not opened in advance of the order; and it bore on it, according to the examination I made, the certificate that is usually authorized by the meat-inspection service of the United States; so that if it was spoiled, it was spoiled before the can was opened.

In regard to the packers, if the United States Government spends from three to five million dollars for them when it will not spend anything for my neighbor, who is a farmer, then the Senator has proven too much. The Government must be in partnership with the packers and discriminating against the farmer. They do not do that in my State; they know better; the State government is stronger than that; it is better administered; and there is no such favor shown there.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, I judge, Mr. President, from the testimony I have read, which seems to differ somewhat from the view of the Senator from Illinois, that a lot of people in the State of Illinois do not think they are getting just and fair treatment under the State law. Of course, there may be a difference of opinion about that; I know the Government may make mistakes; I know that the human mind is not infallible, whether it operates under Government employment or under State employment; but, somehow or other, I think the Senator would be better satisfied with a gold eagle stamped with the Government's certificate of its genuineness than he would with one coined by a private individual who testified to its exact weight. The Government makes no mistakes in its coins; when the Government certificate is upon that gold dollar it circulates anywhere in the world; and there is entire confidence in it. Under Government inspection of grain exactly the same confidence might not be inspired, because possibly there might be mistakes under any kind of a system of grain grading, but there would be a confidence a hundredfold greater than there is under the present system.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. SHERMAN. The comparison is a very favorite one of the Senator and would ordinarily be calculated to carry weight with it. He compares the action of the Government in certifying to the grade of grain and the stamping of the weight and the fineness of gold on a gold coin of the United States. The stamp does not give the coin its legal-tender quality; the metal would have the same value in the market if that fact were determined by other means. That comparison has been used here a great many times; and I wish to ask the Senator if there can be that degree of accuracy in grading grain, which depends entirely on human judgment and the expertness of the inspector, as in the determination of the weight and fineness of gold, whether it be pure gold or gold nine-tenths fine?

Mr. McCUMBER. I answered that a short time ago—and the Senator does not want me to reiterate the statement I made—that there can not be absolute accuracy; but we can reach it to a degree of certainty that may carry confidence; and that is all——

Mr. SHERMAN. It can be approximated.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that is all we expect.

I want now to give a little of the testimony of Mr. Beall, of Kansas City, Kans. I asked the Senator from Kansas if he knew Mr. Beall, and the Senator spoke very highly of the gentleman and of his truthfulness; and, so far as I know, he is telling the truth here. I want the Senator from Illinois to listen to his statement:

Mr. BEALL. In connection with the statement that the last witness has just made in reference to the efforts of the farmers to establish their own commission house, I want to say that the farmers of the State of Kansas in 1905 organized a grain company to be located at Kansas City for the purpose of handling their grain.

I want the Senator to listen carefully, because this will answer his statement that the States are always able to bring about exact justice and see that the people of the country get justice at their hands.

For the benefit of the Senator from Kansas, I will say that these gentlemen were composed of such men as W. T. Harris, of Solomon, president of the Citizens' State Bank there; S. H. McCullough, a large farmer; E. M. Black, down at Preston; and a number of other good men throughout the State. They organized this company and started doing business.

Senator LONG. What was the name of the company?

Mr. BEALL. The National Grain & Elevator Co. They started doing business in Kansas City, Mo. The Kansas City Board of Trade immediately passed a rule prohibiting its members from trading with this company in any manner whatever, the penalty for doing so being expulsion from their board and the loss of something like $3,000 or $4,000 as the price of a membership. So that the farmers in Kansas shipped altogether to this company in Kansas City, Mo., about half a million bushels of grain, which they were compelled to forward on a declining market to other points for sale, at a loss of something like $15,000. The National Grain & Elevator Co. are now suing the Kansas City (Mo.) Board of Trade under the antitrust law of that State for three times the loss they sustained, or about $45,000.

I believe that would be impossible under Federal inspection, and I will tell you why: Because under Federal inspection the Kansas City board would be selling under the same method, and therefore they could not instruct their members not to deal with any other firms that were selling under a different system.

This may be a little foreign to the case here, but I wanted to mention it to show you the absolute control that the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., have of that business, and how impossible it is for the farmers to do their own business, no matter how they may try to do it.

Here is a statement by Mr. Macfadden. He is a banker and a resident of North Dakota. I have read up to this time the testimony of men who were wheat buyers. I shall now quote from the testimony of a banker in my State; and in order that you may understand how the banker gets into it I want to explain this matter.

Our bankers must necessarily deal with our farmers, since North Dakota is an agricultural State. They are therefore interested in the welfare of the farmer. I will assume that as a rule they are better business men and understand the modes and methods of doing business better than the average farmer. They made an investigation of the grain subject and came to the conclusion that the farming people of my State were greatly imposed upon; so the State bankers' association took it up and upon their own motion made an investigation of the grain trade where most of our grain was sold, with the result which I shall shortly call attention to. The secretary of this bankers' association is Mr. Macfadden. Here is a statement made by me:

Senator McCUMBER. I think it is proper for me to state here that on account of the numerous and continued complaints, and the knowledge on the part of the bankers of the State of North Dakota of the injustices perpetrated upon their customers in the State, they appointed a committee at their last annual convention in the State to investigate the grain-trade conditions at the terminals. That committee made its report, and one of the members of that committee was Mr. Macfadden; and he can give you some knowledge of the grain business in that section.

Mr. Macfadden then introduced the resolution and the report of this grain commission. They examined one elevator doing business at this great terminal point, and I want to show the Senator from Illinois the result, and then ask him if that would be possible under Federal inspection. If it is a wrong, it ought to be remedied. We can not remedy it under the State laws or under your board of trade laws. There ought to be some forum to which we can go for a remedy.

Here is the report of the inshipping and outshipping of a certain elevator, and I want to call the attention of the Senator to that. Here is an elevator that received—I think this was during three months—of No. 1 northern 99,000 bushels, and it shipped out 196,000 bushels of No. 1 northern. I am going to give round numbers only. Now, how was that possible? It shipped out about three times as much as it shipped in of No. 1 northern during those three months. Of No. 2 northern it received 141,000 bushels, and it shipped out 467,000 bushels. No. 2 northern is a very good grade of grain. It shipped out 3 bushels of No. 2 northern where it received in 1 bushel of No. 2 northern. No. 2 is the prevailing grade.

Then I will take the next grade. It received in 201,000 bushels of No. 3. It shipped out not a bushel.

What became of the two hundred and odd thousand bushels of No. 3 that were received in that elevator?

Again, it bought in of no grade 116,000 bushels, and it shipped out not one bushel of no grade.

It bought in 59,742 bushels of rejected wheat. It did not ship out one bushel of rejected wheat.

Here you have three of the lower grades, of which there were bought in 201,000, 116,000, and 59,000 bushels, respectively. What became of them? As I stated, they were meta-

morphosed into the higher grades. That was how they were able to ship out 467,764 bushels of No. 2 when they bought in only 141,000. In other words, all of these lower grades of wheat were promoted into the higher ones.

These investigators made an estimate showing that, in the business of undergrading coming in and overgrading going out, this same firm made $83,000 in three months, in addition to the reasonable profits they were making in handling and selling the grain. In other words, with a spread of 3 cents or 4 cents, or whatever the difference in the spread of the grades was, they cleared up, by wrongfully grading, $83,000.

Now, somebody lost that. If it was the farmer that lost it, it was an injustice to him. If he was given an honest grade, and the miller bought the grain and lost this difference, it was an injustice to him, because he was given a grade poorer than that he contracted for. The miller finally will not lose, however, because he will buy again, and the next time he purchases he will pay a less price for the No. 2 grade that was foisted onto him, and which contained several thousand bushels of No. 3, No. 4, and rejected; and as his price, he being one of the purchasers, fixes the selling price in the field of consumption, the Senator can easily see that that will react upon the farmer's price and will reduce the value of every bushel of wheat in the farmer's granary, and may affect every bushel he is raising.

I must read a little bit of Mr. Macfadden's statement here, because it deals with something besides the grades. This was an independent institution, not the farmers themselves, that made this investigation. He says:

We believe in North Dakota that with Government inspection at terminal points State laws could be enacted to govern the handling of grain at the country elevators to at least some extent to conform to Government laws, just as we appoint a State scale inspector or sealer of weights and measures, for instance, to see to it that the scales used in the State are honestly adjusted. Under Government inspection we believe that the shipper would not be compelled to pay freight to the terminal point on the dockage in his grain and then have the dockage confiscated by the terminal elevator without reference to its value.

It is proper here for me to state that not only does the elevator man take the dockage which the farmer ships to him, and on which the farmer pays freight, but when he pays the farmer he does not pay him for the dockage. He sells the dockage back to another farmer, however, who wants cattle feed. It is ground up and he receives $8 a ton for it.

I have seen wheat raised on land which had been seeded to flax the year before and which contained a large percentage of flaxseed, worth double the value of the wheat. The wheat would be docked, say, a pound and a half or 2 pounds for the flaxseed in it, the shipper compelled to pay the freight on the flaxseed in the wheat, and then have the flax confiscated as dockage. We can see no good reason why the shipper should not receive pay for the value of whatever is taken from his wheat as dockage as well as for the wheat itself, less a reasonable charge for cleaning. Nothing taken from grain as dockage by the terminal elevator is lost. The various kinds of seeds or grain are separated and sold on their merits, and even the fine dust collected by the dust collectors is sold for $9 per ton to firms using it in the manufacture of stock food.

I will not say that Government inspection would cure all of this, but I think Government control would go a long way toward curing it by giving publicity to these abuses and showing in what way they might be remedied.

We do not believe that under Federal inspection rules the terminal elevator would be allowed to arbitrarily deduct from the weight of each car 30 pounds, as is now the rule under Minnesota inspection—

Under the Minnesota law and inspection rules at that time, not only did they weigh the grain after it had been cleaned and give the farmer his price for it after the cleaning, but before they paid him they deducted 30 pounds to the car as waste when there was not a bushel of waste in it, as Mr. Macfadden says—

and this after the grain has been elevated to the top of the elevator to the weighing bin and subjected to a suction blast during the process of elevating. There could be no loss to the elevator in simply running the wheat from the weighing bin to the storage bin. You will remember that back there we made the statement that they arbitrarily took 30 pounds from every wagonload that was weighed. In order to make their elevators hold out at the terminal elevators, they take 30 pounds from every carload, but that is after the grain has been elevated. All they have to do is simply to pull the string and drop it into the bin.

Two hundred and fifty thousand cars are annually received and weighed into terminal elevators in Minnesota. Thirty pounds from each car weighed does not look like a large loss to the individual shipper, but the total taken each year amounts to 125,000 bushels, or $125,000 at present prices. How long would the law permit a grocer to openly sell 15½ ounces of sugar for a pound or 35 inches for a yard? I cut the following from a Minneapolis paper yesterday. It is the answer to my question:

"SHORT MEASURE—A MINNEAPOLIS GROCERYMAN IS FINED A HUNDRED DOLLARS FOR CHEATING—WAS ONE OF FOUR RECENTLY INDICTED—THIS ONE PLEADED GUILTY.

"MINNEAPOLIS, *March 31.*

"Dan E. Wright, a grocer's clerk, was fined $100 and given the option of 60 days' imprisonment in the county jail for violating the provisions of the State law in regard to weights and measures. Sentence was imposed by Judge Andrew Holt.

"Wright was one of four grocers indicted. Wright sold to George Mee a paper bag containing 10 pounds and 7 ounces of apples and represented that he was selling Mee a peck of apples. He was the only one of the four grocers and six dairymen indicted who admitted his guilt."

And yet all over Minnesota and the Dakotas, when a country elevator buyer weighs a load of wheat, he gives the weight to the seller as 10 pounds less than it actually is, and the weighmaster, under Minnesota inspection rules, takes 30 pounds from every carload weighed by them.

I could give you some interesting figures to show the profit to the terminal elevator in the matter of dockage, under the rules of Minnesota inspection, and of the profit to the same terminal elevators in the matter of raising grain from the low to higher grades by the process of mixing, but I will not go into that. In 1906 the dockage on wheat inspected into the Minnesota terminal elevators amounted to an average of 27 ounces per bushel, or a total of something over 3,000,000 bushels of dockage on the total amount of wheat handled.

I do not say that all of this would be remedied, but I believe to a great extent it would be under Federal inspection.

The report of the railway and warehouse commissioners of Minnesota for 1906 shows that very little more grain of the higher grades was shipped out of terminal elevators than was taken in.

I want to call especial attention to this. Prior to 1906 I called attention to the table that I have just read. Very well. The next year we found but very little difference between the grades that were shipped in and those that were shipped out; and I really flattered myself that I had accomplished a good deal by even bringing up this question of grain inspection, and the threat that we would have it if there was not greater honesty and integrity in the handling of our grain at the terminals. This witness, however, goes on to show that I was mistaken in that; that while it appeared in their bookkeeping accounts that this was the case, in fact it was not so, because they got persons to purchase it at different grades than those at which they really sold it out to them. He goes on and says:

I have absolute evidence in my possession that it has been the custom for a long time in loading wheat out of terminal elevators to go to mills in the same city to bill it out a grade or two lower than it really is in order to help out the annual reports showing the amount of grain received into and shipped out of terminal elevators of the various grades. A will buy of B a hundred thousand bushels of No. 1 northern wheat in store, and the elevator in shipping it out will report a hundred thousand bushels of No. 2 or No. 3 northern loaded out. All parties concerned understand the transaction, and it cuts no figure to the mill buying the grain.

In other words, if they want to show that they have not raised the grades, that they are shipping out just as much of the No. 2 and No. 3 grades as they bought in, they will get the miller to agree with them that while he pays a No. 1 price he will allow them to certify the grain out as No. 2 or No. 3 grade in order to balance their books right, so that there may be no complaint.

Senator MCCUMBER. They pay the No. 1 price?

Mr. MACFADDEN. They pay the No. 1 price.

We knew that under Federal inspection rules no discrimination would be made in favor of certain terminals. At Duluth, under present rules, all wheat shipped out goes out without dockage. At Minneapolis it is absolutely impossible for an eastern miller or exporter to get any wheat out of the terminal elevators there without dockage. Why is this radical difference made between the two terminals? Why are the rules not the same in both cities?

He proceeds:

The greatest argument in favor of Federal inspection is, of course, in the benefit to the foreign buyers and the consuming public in getting uniform standards or grades. I went to Duluth last week hoping I might be able to get samples of grain of different grades as inspected into the terminal elevator and samples of the same grades as inspected out. I found it impossible to get the samples, for the reason that very little grain is moving just now. It's common talk in the grain trade, however, that cargoes of No. 1 northern wheat going out of Duluth would not inspect any better than No. 2 northern if it were going in.

I do not believe that all of this is smoke with no fire.

I have been told by eastern millers that if our wheat raised in North Dakota could be put in special bins in Duluth or Minneapolis and delivered to them without being mixed or adulterated with other wheats, it would always bring a good premium.

This also holds good with reference to the sale of our grain in foreign countries. I read recently extracts from the Daily Consular Reports giving this mixture as the cause of the serious falling off in the demand for American wheat. This mixing causes a direct loss to the seller of grain of good quality wherever he is, for the price is fixed largely by the quality of the grain sold. Federal inspection would prevent this mixing, to the detriment of the American farmer and the benefit of the owners of the terminal elevators.

It would not prevent mixing, Mr. President; but, if it were mixed, before it could go out into interstate commerce again it would have to be received under the honest grade.

I have picked out at random another report upon another elevator at one of these great terminals, which I inserted in the evidence. While this was a later year and the difference was not nearly so great, I find that in all of these years—and I covered three of them—the inshipping and the outshipping were entirely different.

For instance, of No. 1 northern in 1902 there were received 15,000,000 bushels and shipped out 19,000,000 bushels. In 1903

there were received 21,000,000 bushels and shipped out 23,000,000 bushels. In 1904 there were received 12,000,000 bushels and shipped out 18,000,000 bushels.

When I get to the lower grades we will see a vast difference. There were 7,000,000 bushels of No. 3 northern received in and only 1,971,000 shipped out. In other words, there were nearly four times as many bushels of No. 3 northern received in as were shipped out, all going into the higher grades. I find that they received 1,890,000 bushels of rejected wheat in 1903 and shipped out only 77,000 bushels; that is, there were received in more than twenty-four times as many bushels as were shipped out of that poor grade. So I might follow in the case of all of the others. Of no grade at all there were 2,500,000 bushels received in 1902 and only 500,000 shipped out.

Now, I am going to leave Kansas a while and look over into Indiana, and take the statement of Mr. Brafford, another gentleman who has had years of experience in handling grain. He says here:

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Senators, I have been in the grain business for 16 years as a country grain dealer. I have been a buyer from the farmers since 1892. I have also been secretary for the Indiana Grain Dealers for the last three years. The country grain dealers have organizations, as you probably know, through the different States, and they employ a secretary, and we usually run our elevators in connection with them; and that is what I have been doing.

The Indiana Grain Dealers for the last three years, in all their meetings, have taken action in the matter of grain inspection. They have passed resolutions indorsing Government supervision of grain—that is, they would like to have the Government standardize the grain and fix the grades of grain for interstate business, as the States do now in the matter of fixing the amount of pounds that there shall be in a bushel of corn or a bushel of oats, so that the grades shall be uniform in all the markets, so that the inspectors in all the public markets shall inspect grain according to the same rules, and so that the same class of grain (the condition and everything else being equal) shall grade the same in all the markets.

Our inspection from the farm is final. The farmer drives in with a load of grain, and we get up on the wagon and look at it, and say that we think it ought to be No. 3 corn, say, or No. 2 wheat, and we pass it at that. We make him a ticket, and that settles that part of the contract. We pay for the grain according to that grade. Then, when it comes to shipping it, we have to take the character of the grain, the weight of it, whether it is stained or not, or the condition of it, and figure what market to go to, because the markets vary so. For instance, on oats, if it is white oats that we are shipping, there are about 52 different ways in the United States of inspecting No. 3 white oats. Each market will have a different weight. For instance, in the case of Baltimore, they take 22-pound oats as No. 3 white oats, all other conditions of the oats being equal, because they sell the oats down there by the measured bushel, and they want to buy them by weight, 22 pounds to the bushel, and sell them out by measure, because they gain in that way.

You will see how they will make a great deal by that system. When they want to buy they buy by weight, 22 pounds to the bushel. Therefore if the oats only weighed 22 pounds to the bushel, you see that they would get a measured bushel and a half to every bushel they bought in. Then by selling them out by measurement they would make 50 per cent upon their investment, merely by reason of the different ways of handling the same grain.

It takes more than a Winchester bushel of 22-pound oats, you can readily see, to weigh a bushel. It takes 10 pounds more. But if you happen to go to New York or Buffalo with the oats, they say they must weigh 28 pounds in order to be No. 3 white oats.

Senator PERKINS. That is regardless of the moisture that they contain?

Mr. BRAFFORD. They have only to weigh that. Senator, to be No. 3 white oats. Then they must be dry enough—they must not be musty. There are other things that come in besides the weight.

Senator DOLLIVER. If other things bring them within the No. 3 classification, 28 pounds is the weight?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator PERKINS. I should like to ask Mr. Brafford a question here. My reason for asking the question is that in the San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento Valley, in California, 600 miles long, it is very hot; the evaporation is very great; the grain is very wet. When it is purchased in the interior it is stacked. We have no grain elevators. It is taken down to Port Costa or San Francisco or Benicia and put into a warehouse; and those grain sacks, containing 2 bushels of corn, will increase in weight from 1 to 3 pounds a sack, and still it is not musty, nor is the value of the wheat in any way depreciated. My object in making the statement is to ask whether the same influence of moisture cuts any figure here on the Atlantic coast?

I am reading this, Mr. President, because it answers the objections of some of the Senators.

Mr. BRAFFORD. Not in the case of grain. We do not get wheat dry enough to do that here, except in exceptional years. We have had one real dry year when our wheat would do that in Indiana; but ordinarily we have trouble to get it dry enough to go into the grade of No. 2 wheat. The explanation that you have given holds good in the case of clover seed. We usually hull clover (this is getting away from the grain subject, however) when it is very dry. It is figured by clover warehousemen that if they will put that clover seed in the basement or in the first floor of their warehouses it will take on enough weight to pay the interest and the insurance.

That is another good method of paying your insurance rate and your cost of handling—just to get enough water into it, after it has been graded, to make it weigh that much more.

Again, Mr. Brafford says:

The elasticity of the grades is another thing. Here is a certificate for No. 4 white corn [producing papers]. There is a certificate in Indianapolis of corn that we bought in Indianapolis; and their regulation says: "No. 3 mixed corn shall be mixed corn, may be slightly damp, and not clean or sound enough for No. 2. No. 4 mixed corn shall be mixed corn, and include all corn not good enough for No. 3 but good enough for warehousing." That means good enough to go to the warehouse and keep.

There is a car of No. 4 white corn that went to Baltimore—

I am reading this for the special benefit of the Senators from Maryland—

and graded "contract." It unexpectedly did that. We did not think it would. We thought it would take the grade of "steamer corn" in Baltimore. That is the second grade. But it graded No. 4 white corn.

That is a better grade.

There are three cars that did the same thing. Baltimore did not have much corn then.

This carries out the idea that when they are short they loosen up the grades.

Those cars graded No. 4 white corn, to our surprise, and made us more money than we anticipated. A little later on, when Baltimore becomes congested, under these same rules under which we buy in Indianapolis—there is a car of No. 3 mixed corn with an Indianapolis certificate to it. There is a car of No. 3 yellow corn with an Indianapolis certificate to it. There is another car of No. 3 yellow corn with an Indianapolis certificate to it. That goes to Baltimore, and all of those cars go to the drier. I mean by "going to the drier" that they are sent there to have the moisture taken out of the corn by drying it with steam to bring it up, they claim, to "mixed corn." In the early part of the season we could ship old corn which was damp and only good enough for warehousing, and it would grade "contract." A little later on, when they became congested, we would ship No. 3 corn, the best we could buy in southern Illinois, and it would go to Baltimore and go to the drier.

Now, what certainty is there in buying grain and selling it under those conditions? You never know from the end of one day to the other what you are going to get in your final market. The result is that you never know what to pay to the farmer who brings his load of grain to you.

Senator DOLLIVER. What does that prove?

Mr. BRAFFORD. It proves to us that that grain is not graded the same in Baltimore all the time, or else our man in the West is mistaken.

Senator DOLLIVER. Do they grade it by caprice, or according to the dictates of their local interests?

Mr. BRAFFORD. We hate to charge that the inspector there is influenced by the men that employ him; but the chances are that this might happen.

This answers the Senator's question:

He would come around the office there, and they would say: "Now, here, we are congested. We have two or three million bushels of corn here, and our elevators are full, and the boats are not coming in. It is going to be a considerable expense to hold this corn here in the elevators, and we will have to be careful about the grade." They might say that in his presence. They employ him, you know. They hire him. We pay him. They charge us for inspecting every one of these cars. We have nothing to say about the employment or the discharge of the inspector. We have to sell all of our grain subject to his inspection—destination, weights, and grades being final. The European that buys it from the vessel has to do the same way. They buy it from Baltimore, and his inspection and weights are final in Baltimore.

Senator DOLLIVER. In making their contract for the shipment, they have no right to complain of his grading?

Mr. BRAFFORD. They can complain, but they have got their contracts. If he was a good merchant, and they wanted to hold him over there so as to sell to him again, they probably would try to make some sort of a compromise. But the contracts are made on "sale terms." That means Baltimore weights and grades. The Europeans are in the same boat that the western fellow is. He is subject to the same inspector, without any say about it whatever; and that is why the European complains. I have a letter from John R. Griffiths, consul at London, that I wanted to show this committee. I will send it when I get home. I thought I had it among my papers, but it is not here. It sets forth that very fact.

Senator MCCUMBER. What is the effect, in your opinion, of this quiet suggestion to the inspector that they are liable to lose upon the immense amount of grain that they have on hand, by reason of there not being ready purchasers?

Mr. BRAFFORD. As I said in the beginning, Senator, it simply results in this: A corn that we send in the beginning of a crop, when they need a lot of grain, will grade easily; and in a month or two from that time, when the market becomes congested, we can not make a better grade of grain grade at all. There is the evidence, right there. Here are the sworn certificates from the Indianapolis inspector, and here is the report from Baltimore.

Senator PERKINS. There is no climatic influence that would change the value of it, is there?

Mr. BRAFFORD. It might to a certain extent Senator Perkins. They will probably claim that. They will tell you that the climatic influence changed that grain so as to change that grade that much. But No. 3 corn ought not to change that much. It ought not to do it. No. 4 corn might do it. No. 4 corn might get out of condition.

Senator PERKINS. It might heat?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator DOLLIVER. But in the case of your No. 4 corn the condition seems to have improved.

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes; it got better. The fact is—and here is the evidence of it—that there is one grade in all the markets in, and another grade out. That is a fact. They will not deny that. The Chicago people may say now that they do not do it, but we have the evidence in the last four weeks that they do. If you have been in the milling business, you probably know something about it.

He continues:

Mr. BRAFFORD. We have the same thing here in New York. Here is the inspection certificate of Indianapolis, and there is the inspection certificate of New York, showing that the grades change—just exactly the same thing.

* * * * * * *

Mr. BRAFFORD. As I was going to say about Chicago, Senator PERKINS, three weeks ago a milling company of Monticello, Ind., which runs a large mill, bought in Chicago five or six cars of grain.

I want the Senator from Illinois to listen to this, because I want to show him that they do make mistakes there, and I think bad ones:

They either bought the option and took delivery, or they bought the real grain from some firm there, and took a Chicago contract for No. 2 red winter wheat for market. They shipped that wheat to Monticello. They opened the cars and found it bin burnt and musty, and they could not use it. They resold those cars. They never unloaded them; they never broke the bulk. They resold those cars and shipped them back to Chicago, and they graded No. 3 red winter wheat.

In other words, they grade No. 2 bin burned absolutely unfit for milling from Chicago, and when they find that it does not conform to the contract of No. 2 they send it back to Chicago, and that same grain is reinspected and they call it No. 3 in a very few days, without any change whatever. Call that incompetency, call it what you will, it is at least unjust to both the buyer and the seller.

Again, he says:

Senator DOLLIVER. Will you state that again, please?

Mr. BRAFFORD. They bought this wheat in Chicago, and took a Chicago contract for No. 2 red winter wheat, and shipped it to Monticello.

A little way out from Chicago.

Senator DOLLIVER. Accompanied by a certificate?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Accompanied by a Chicago certificate; yes, sir, for No. 2 red winter wheat—a certificate from their inspector. They opened the cars, and found it was bin burnt and musty. They resold the cars, never unloaded them, shipped them back to Chicago, and the grain graded No. 3 red winter wheat, on account of being bin burnt and musty.

Senator DOLLIVER. That last statement I do not understand. How did it grade?

Mr. BRAFFORD. It graded No. 3 red winter wheat, one grade lower, on account of being bin burnt and musty.

Senator MCCUMBER. By the same inspector?

Mr. BRAFFORD. I would not say that it was the same man.

Senator MCCUMBER. Not the same inspector, perhaps; but the same inspection?

Mr. BRAFFORD. The same inspection department.

Senator PERKINS. It made the trip down to Monticello and back again?

Mr. BRAFFORD. And changed the character of its grade.

Senator PERKINS. Without changing the car.

Senator DOLLIVER. They must have gotten it out of the elevator there that is used for local trade purposes. They got a delivery on the option, I judge, in that case.

Mr. BRAFFORD. I think that is what they did. I think they told me that they bought the option, and they delivered them out the wheat, and they took delivery on the option.

Senator DOLLIVER. And that delivery was duly inspected and certified?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Oh, yes. They give you a Chicago warehouse receipt for it, and give you an inspection certificate. I saw that there were five cars of wheat in Indianapolis last week shipped to George T. Evans & Son, millers there, that was bought for No. 2 red winter wheat—milling wheat—and it was bin burnt and out of condition.

Senator MCCUMBER. They bought it for milling purposes?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir. How they settled it I do not know. I do not know whether they shipped it back or not. I had not found out when I left.

Senator DOLLIVER. What remedy has the buyer in such a case?

Mr. BRAFFORD. They claim that you could sue the Board of Trade of Chicago; but who would go up there and do it? They would tell you that you got what you paid for; that you bought No. 2 red winter wheat, and that is what you got. You say, "I did not get it; and it is bin burnt, and it is musty, and I can not use it for milling." You probably would have a recourse.

Senator DOLLIVER. I do not see how you would have recourse against the Chicago Board of Trade. You might have recourse against the man you bought it from.

Senator MCCUMBER. No; the man you bought it from simply agrees to give you grain that is certified at his market as No. 2; and he has given you that which is certified as No. 2.

So you will see there would be no remedy as against the individual.

Senator DOLLIVER. That is a swindle, of course?

Senator PERKINS. Unless it could be shown by the owner of the wheat and the shipper of the wheat that en route it was bin burnt in the cars.

Mr. BRAFFORD. But, Senator, you know that that would not occur in two weeks.

Senator PERKINS. Hardly.

Mr. BRAFFORD. It would not happen at this time of year.

Senator PERKINS. It might have been sidetracked. I was only trying to qualify the charge that the chairman made, that that was a swindle.

Senator MCCUMBER. Is it not a fact that No. 2 wheat, with the small amount of moisture that could possibly be in it, could not be bin burnt in a car?

Mr. BRAFFORD. It could not get hot if it was No. 2 wheat to start with. It could not get warm, even.

Senator PERKINS. If it was only two weeks en route, it is hardly possible.

Mr. BRAFFORD. No.

Senator PERKINS. I was simply trying to find an excuse; and that is the only thing I could think of.

Senator DOLLIVER. I should think the time would come pretty quickly now when nobody would enter into a contract to receive as No. 2 wheat wheat that was shown to be No. 2 only by being so certified by that board of trade.

Mr. BRAFFORD. Senator, that is a fact. There are a great many men that will not buy wheat from Chicago except subject to a private inspector's report. For instance, there is a man named Costello there who is a private inspector; and a great many firms buy wheat in Chicago on the condition that the grades shall be subject to Costello's approval.

It certainly does not look, Mr. President, as though there was a great deal of confidence in the Chicago grades.

Senator DOLLIVER. If they are certifying it out as No. 2 wheat, it seems to me it would demoralize the wheat market throughout the country tributary to Chicago.

I will not read the balance of that. Further on I read the following:

Senator DOLLIVER. You do not mean to say that the governor of Illinois——

Mr. BRAFFORD. I do not mean that; I mean the men he appoints, the three warehouse commissioners. I do not believe the United States Government would allow that. We never hear anything said about it in the case of meats. We have inspectors there at Kingan's; and I never heard of a complaint about our Government meat inspectors there——

The witness did not hear the Senator from Illinois—

Senator PERKINS. The important point in this line for the benefit of the producer, the farmer, is to have a uniformity of inspection throughout the country?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator PERKINS. In every State there ought to be a standard of weights and measures and grades of grain that is recognized by all commercial communities.

Mr. BRAFFORD. That is exactly what we are asking for, Senator PERKINS, and they claim that they will give it to us; but they do not. These local influences that I have spoken of, in New York and Baltimore and these other markets, are so strong that they soon lose all their power. You have the idea exactly that we would like to see enforced.

So far as the farmers are concerned, speaking for the small dealers, we are in the grain business to make money. If we start a number of cars to market, and we find them tightening up on us in the market, and we can not make the grade, we are not going to buy 8 or 10 more cars at the same grade and lose more money on them. We have simply got to reduce the price to the farmer. It gets back to the farmer. We may get caught on 10 or 15 cars and lose our money.

Senator DOLLIVER. In making your initial estimate of the grain in the country elevator, are you likely to discount the actual grade of the grain so as to, upon the average, correspond to this handicap which you are likely to encounter when you get to the terminal?

Mr. BRAFFORD. I say, we do do that in the end; if we find we are going to lose money, we have to discount it. We do not in the beginning. The competition is so strong between the country dealers that we overreach ourselves, and we sometimes buy grain that we ought not to buy. For instance, we have done that this year on corn. We bought corn that was too wet to ship.

Senator DOLLIVER. We do not suffer in the Northwest on account of that competition of the buyers.

Mr. BRAFFORD. You do not?

Senator DOLLIVER. No.

Mr. BRAFFORD. I do not know how it is in Iowa. I am only speaking about Indiana.

Senator MCCUMBER. To explain one matter of which you spoke to me, and which you have not made quite clear, I think, to this committee, let me ask this question: Is it a fact that in the competition, we will say, between Baltimore and New York, the time when you shipped them a very good grade of your No. 4 corn and got a grade of No. 3 corn was during one of these periods of contest, so that Baltimore could get grain and bid up a higher grade on it?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Baltimore was short of corn at the beginning. They did not have much in stock.

Senator MCCUMBER. Yes. Now, when Baltimore has succeeded in getting the grain started in that direction, and has loaded up rather heavily, and finds that she can not get an export price to correspond with the grade, etc., that she has given, I want to ask you whether or not she then "loosens up," as we will call it, on her certification, so that she will certify this No. 4 corn as No. 3 and pass it off on to the foreign purchaser at that higher grade, higher than it really is?

Mr. BRAFFORD. The foreigner charges that, you know, Senator. We do not come in competition with that end of it; but that is the foreigner's side of it. In Mr. Griffiths's letter he mentions that. I have talked to a number of the New York exporters, and they claim that they are obliged to grade out a lower grade of grain at a higher grade and sell it at a low figure to induce the Europeans to buy it. They say that they are all Jews over in Europe, and that they will not buy it unless they can buy No. 2 wheat at a No. 4 price. We have not got that kind of Jews out with us. We think they are pretty good business men; but that is the claim they make.

In other words, Mr. President, in order to get them to exercise what they regard as a Jewish propensity, they say they will sell them a No. 1 grade for a No. 3 or 4 price, but in reality they sell them the No. 3 or 4, according to their own admission.

Senator DOLLIVER. What effect does that have on the American price of wheat—to have the No. 2 wheat sold at a price that would naturally correspond with the No. 4 grade?

Mr. BRAFFORD. We feel that it depreciates the price of our wheat.

Senator DOLLIVER. That is stated on the exchanges of the world, I presume, as the price of No. 2 wheat?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir; and the European, until the last year or two, has imagined that we had a Government inspection over here. Our consuls have had trouble in explaining it to them over there. It is marked "official," and the European thinks it is Government inspection. The consuls have to tell them that it is private inspection in America; it is not a Government inspection.

Take the city of Toledo. In the year 1896 they made up their minds that they would raise the grade on red winter wheat, and they raised

it to 58½ pounds, without any notice whatever to anybody, suddenly; and when we started to ship the crop, we found that they required 58½ pounds for No. 2 red wheat.

Senator MCCUMBER. Before that it had been what?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Fifty-eight pounds.

Senator MCCUMBER. They could do that overnight?

Mr. BRAFFORD. Yes, sir. So they went through the crop in that way, and there were a number of complaints about it, and people refused to ship to Toledo; and the next year they just changed it back to 58 pounds. It is 58 pounds now. I only bring that in as an instance, to show the caprice of the markets and how they will do. It is like the railroads used to do. They used to put in these "midnight tariffs." We would go to buy grain one week, and next week we would find that a competitor was paying 2 or 3 cents more than we could pay, and we would figure it down and find that he had a special rate somewhere as a result of a "midnight tariff." I am happy to say that Congress has remedied that. I do not believe there are much of any rebates given on grain in the Central West. We fellows that are small in a way can compete with the large dealers in the matter of shipments East.

* * * * * * *

Senator PERKINS. Do its provisions generally meet the approval of the farmers and producers in your State?

Mr. BRAFFORD. The grain dealers have been somewhat divided on the matter. I think 90 per cent of all the country grain shippers are in favor of Government inspection or Government supervision of grain. A great many of them did not seem to want to go further than to have the Government pass a law standardizing the grades and providing that they should have an inspector, something like national banks, to see that the different markets inspected interstate grain under those rules that Congress might set forth, and they called that "Government supervision of grain." Then a great many of them have gone further than that, and simply said that they want straight-out Government inspection. They want the Government to appoint the inspectors. We sent out a list on that subject to the Indiana grain dealers just before I left home.

Senator PERKINS. What percentage, do you say, are in favor of having Government inspectors?

Mr. BRAFFORD. This list here in Indiana shows 80 per cent.

Mr. President, I understand that it is desired to have a short executive session, and as I wish to occupy from half to three-quarters of an hour more on this subject, I will give notice now that immediately after the close of the morning business to-morrow I shall proceed to try to close my remarks upon this matter.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 8 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 17, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1914.*

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Hubert F. Fisher, of Memphis, Tenn., to be United States attorney, western district of Tennessee, vice Casey Todd, resigned.

### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John A. Ross, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Bellefourche, S. Dak., vice William S. McLain, term expired.

Peter Hanson, of Vernal, Utah, to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah, vice Charles De Moisy, resigned.

### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Stephen J. Doyle, of Carrington, N. Dak., to be United States marshal, district of North Dakota, vice James F. Shea, whose term expired February 18, 1914.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

#### INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Harris L. Roberts, Twenty-second Infantry, to be colonel from March 13, 1914. Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911, the officer herein is named for advancement in grade in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm since the date of his entry into the arm to which he permanently belongs.

Lieut. Col. George W. McIver, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from March 13, 1914, vice Col. John T. Van Orsdale, Seventeenth Infantry, retired from active service March 12, 1914.

Maj. Daniel B. Devore, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 13, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. William M. Wright, unassigned, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

Capt. William Wallace, Seventh Infantry, to be major from March 13, 1914, vice Maj. Edward R. Chrisman, Twenty-ninth Infantry, detached from his proper command.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Second Lieut. Charles F. Williams, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Lewis H. Watkins, promoted.

Second Lieut. Gordon R. Young, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Gilbert E. Humphrey, promoted.

Second Lieut. Richard U. Nicholas, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Richard Park, promoted.

### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Raymond Morris, Eleventh Cavalry, to be second lieutenant of Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1913.

Second Lieut. John F. Crutcher, Fourth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1913.

### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Charles F. Pond to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1914.

Commander Edward H. Durell to be a captain in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1914.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank N. Eklund to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

Henry McDonald, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 9th day of March, 1914.

Richard M. Little, a citizen of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1914.

Pay Inspector Frank T. Arms to be a pay director in the Navy from the 19th day of February, 1914.

Asst. Paymaster Harold C. Gwynne to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 7th day of December, 1913.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1914.*

### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Fred C. Pabst to be collector of customs for the district of Galveston.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Lieut. Col. James C. Sanford to be colonel.
Maj. Herbert Deakyne to be lieutenant colonel.
Maj. Charles S. Bromwell to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Alfred B. Putnam to be major.
Capt. Clarence O. Sherrill to be major.
Capt. Ernest D. Peck to be major.
Capt. George R. Spalding to be major.
Capt. Elliott J. Dent to be major.
Capt. W. Goff Caples to be major.
First Lieut. Edward D. Ardery to be captain.
First Lieut. Charles K. Rockwell to be captain.
First Lieut. James G. Steese to be captain.
First Lieut. Roger G. Alexander to be captain.
First Lieut. James A. O'Connor to be captain.
First Lieut. Lewis H. Watkins to be captain.
First Lieut. Gilbert E. Humphrey to be captain.
First Lieut. Richard Park to be captain.
First Lieut. Daniel I. Sultan to be captain.
Second Lieut. William C. Sherman to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Rudolph C. Kuldell to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Roscoe C. Crawford to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Earl G. Paules to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Bradford G. Chynoweth to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Milo P. Fox to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John C. Gotwals to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Francis K. Newcomer to be first lieutenant.

#### INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas W. Griffith to be colonel.
Maj. Almon L. Parmerter to be lieutenant colonel.
Maj. Samuel E. Smiley to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. William H. Simons to be major.
Capt. John F. Madden to be major.
First Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson to be captain.
Second Lieut. Joseph C. Hatie to be first lieutenant.
Capt. Harrison J. Price to be major.
First Lieut. Oliver F. Snyder to be captain.
Second Lieut. Ernest L. Pell to be first lieutenant.

#### CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Charles W. Fenton to be major.
First Lieut. John E. Hemphill to be captain.
Second Lieut. William L. Moose, jr., to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles D. Rogers to be first lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Second Lieut. Philip M. Ljungstedt to be first lieutenant.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

*First lieutenants.*

Morris Fishbein.
Benjamin Hobson Frayser.
Edward Sutton Gooch.
William Henry Huntington.
Hugh Farber McGaughey.
Ashley Baker Morrill.
Charles Benjamin Palmer.
Leo Francis Schiff.
Charles Mason Smith.
Herbert Edward Wheeler.
Reinhard Ernst Wobus.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

*Second lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. Paul D. Carlisle.
Second Lieut. Louis A. Craig.

POSTMASTERS.

MISSOURI.

Adolph B. Bertram, Rockport.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Owen Gudger, Asheville.

TEXAS.

Fred R. Ridley, Campbell.

---

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *March 16, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, our God, our Father, at the beginning of this new congressional week, that we may renew our allegiance to Thee, ourselves, and the work Thou hast given us to do.

The stars follow their courses with unerring precision; the flower springs by the wayside, buds, blooms, and exhales its fragrance; the bird builds its nest, rears its young; these just because they can not help it. Not so with us, since Thou hast made us thinking, willing, loving beings, endowed with the power of choice. Help us, therefore, to think right and bend our will to every task, putting our hearts into them, that we may glorify Thee, ourselves, and our work and enjoy the full fruition of our labors. In Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CORRECTION.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago a bound copy of the permanent RECORD of the extra session was delivered to me. On examination of the RECORD of November 11, 1913, I am recorded as asking for and being granted an indefinite leave of absence. I recognize that it is too late to have it corrected, but I would like to have it appear in the RECORD that I did not ask for and was not granted leave of absence. The Member who was granted leave of absence was the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Curley, who is now mayor of Boston.

The SPEAKER. This announcement will appear in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno* in the north Atlantic Ocean.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4255. An act to mark the approaches to the Cape Cod Canal and Buzzards Bay and Barnstable Bay;

S. 4714. An act to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Confederate veterans' reunion, to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in May, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 10523. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno* in the north Atlantic Ocean.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4255. An act to mark the approaches to the Cape Cod Canal and Buzzards Bay and Barnstable Bay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4714. An act to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Confederate Veterans' Reunion, to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in May, 1914; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, asked unanimous consent that the reference of the bill (S. 751) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be changed from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, has not a similar bill been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. DENT. No; such a bill has not been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs. The section which this bill proposes to repeal is the section which prevents certain officers of the Army and cadets at the Military Academy prior to the Civil War from proving certain claims on account of their subsequent service in the Confederate Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This is unanimous-consent day, and the Clerk will read the title to the first bill on the calendar.

ACTIONS FOR DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6143) relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects, and it will be stricken from the calendar.

PATENTS TO PUBLIC LANDS.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1651) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask that that bill be passed over without prejudice, for the reason that the Senate has passed a similar bill. It has been before the Public Lands Committee of the House, and it has the favorable report of the committee, and should have been on the calendar before this, but owing to some oversight on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] it has not been reported.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says it has not been reported?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It has been favorably recommended by the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is on the calendar. If it was, the gentleman might ask unanimous consent to substitute it, but he can not do that without having the original bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is what I want to do. I can not take up the House bill without its being on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MINE-RESCUE STATION AT M'ALESTER, OKLA.

The next bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3988) for the purchase of a building and lot as a mine-rescue station at McAlester, Okla.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I see that both the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] are not in the Chamber. I ask that that bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS SWINOMISH SLOUGH.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12594) to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across Swinomish Slough opposite the town of La Conner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Swinomish Slough, opposite the town of La Conner, at or near the end of Morris Street, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Insert, page 1, line 6, after the word "Slough," the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TERMS OF COURT AT STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend section 100 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary approved March 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 100 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 100. That the State of Ohio is divided into two judicial districts, to be known as the northern and southern districts of Ohio. The northern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Ashland, Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Carroll, Columbiana, Crawford, Geauga, Holmes, Lake, Lorain, Medina, Mahoning, Portage, Richland, Summit, Stark, Tuscarawas, Trumbull, and Wayne, which shall constitute the eastern division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Auglaize, Allen, Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Henry, Hancock, Hardin, Huron, Lucas, Mercer, Marion, Ottawa, Paulding, Putnam, Seneca, Sandusky, Van Wert, Williams, Wood, and Wyandot, which shall constitute the western division of said district. Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at Cleveland on the first Tuesdays in February, April, and October, and at Youngstown on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March; and for the western division, at Toledo on the last Tuesdays in April and October. Grand and petit jurors summoned for service at a term of court to be held at Cleveland may, if in the opinion of the court the public convenience so requires, be directed to serve also at the term then being held or authorized to be held at Youngstown. Crimes and offenses committed in the eastern division shall be cognizable at the terms held at Cleveland or at Youngstown, as the court may direct. Any suit brought in the eastern division may, in the discretion of the court, be tried at the term held at Youngstown. The southern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Adams, Brown, Butler, Champaign, Clark, Clermont, Clinton, Darke, Greene, Hamilton, Highland, Lawrence, Miami, Montgomery, Preble, Scioto, Shelby, and Warren, which shall constitute the western division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Athens, Belmont, Coshocton, Delaware, Fairfield, Fayette, Franklin, Gallia, Guernsey, Harrison, Hocking, Jackson, Jefferson, Knox, Licking, Logan, Madison, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Morrow, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, Pickaway, Pike, Ross, Union, Vinton, and Washington, which shall constitute the eastern division of said district. Terms of the district court for the western division shall be held at Cincinnati on the first Tuesdays in February, April, and October; and for the eastern division at Columbus on the first Tuesdays in June and December, and at Steubenville on the first Tuesdays of March and October. Grand and petit jurors summoned for service at a term of court being held at Columbus may, if in the opinion of the court the public convenience so requires, be directed to serve also at the term being held or authorized to be held at Steubenville. Crimes and offenses committed in the eastern division shall be cognizable at the terms held at Columbus or at Steubenville, as the court may direct. Any suit brought in the eastern division may, in the discretion of the court, be tried at the term held at Steubenville: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Steubenville shall be furnished free of expense to the Government until the completion of the Federal building: *And provided further*, That terms of the district court for the southern district shall be held at Dayton on the first Mondays in May and November. Prosecutions for crimes and offenses committed in any part of said district shall also be cognizable at the terms held at Dayton. All suits which may be brought within the southern district, or either division thereof, may be instituted, tried, and determined at the terms held at Dayton."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to know how many cases there will be tried at Steubenville in a year, and whether there are any cases, as a matter of fact, tried at Dayton, which already has a term of court fixed for it?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I did not know that this bill was coming up for consideration at this time. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, as my understanding at present is that there is no necessity for a further division of this kind. I desire to look into the matter before it is put upon its passage.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection to its going over.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, PIKE COUNTY, KY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4019) to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Kentucky, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky., where the said Tug Fork forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PATENTED LANDS IN YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12533) to amend section 1 of an act of Congress approved April 9, 1912 (37 Stats., 80), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been a good deal of talk on the floor of the House during the last few days about the iniquity of transferring lands in one section of the country for lands in another section of the country, without knowing what the value of the land to be exchanged is, and unless there is some good reason shown here why these lands should be exchanged without any prejudice to the rights of the people or to the public interests I expect to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in reading the report he will notice that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have made a cruise of all of the timber upon the land desired to be exchanged by the Government, as well as the land the Government is to receive from the private individuals. The land adjoins the several tracts. Most of the land is in the Yosemite National Park, and that now desired to be obtained by the Government which is in private ownership is along the scenic road coming from the valley known as Wawona Road into the Yosemite Valley.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, how much of this land that is proposed to be exchanged for other lands is owned by railroad companies?

Mr. RAKER. Something like 2,500 acres.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, and I know the gentleman will agree to this, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was Senate joint resolution 114, for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in the class "other than Members of Congress" shall be filled by the reappointment of Charles F. Choate, jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the gentleman from Massachusetts can explain how this Board of Regents is appointed—who constitutes the board?

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, there are 14 members on the board, which is composed of 3 Senators, 3 Representatives, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Vice President of the United States, and six private citizens.

Mr. MURDOCK. All appointed by joint resolution?

Mr. THACHER. They are appointed by the Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. THACHER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the three members from the Senate are appointed by the Senate; the three members of the House are appointed by the Speaker; the six nonofficial or noncongressional members are appointed by joint resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. How is the Chief Justice appointed?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He is appointed by the statute, as is the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the tenure of office of this place? How long does the man appointed hold office?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. My impression is that the civilian or noncongressional members hold office for six years. I will not be certain about that. The House members are appointed for two years, and I am not certain about the tenure of office of the Senate members.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know the tenure of office of the gentleman who is now seeking reelection?

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, this is to fill a vacancy. There are two vacancies at the present time, one caused by the death of Senator Bacon, of Georgia, and the other by the fact that the term of Mr. Choate expired on February 24. This is to fill the vacancy caused by expiration of the term of office; to reappoint him, in other words.

Mr. MURDOCK. What do these Regents do?

Mr. THACHER. We have a distinguished Member here who is a member of the Board of Regents, and I will yield to him to answer that question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have only had the honor of being a Regent since the latter part of December last, but my understanding is that the Regents in a broad way direct the policy and activities of the Smithsonian Institution and that the practical work is carried out by the secretary of that institution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I suppose the Regents are purely honorary positions?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Very largely so. I will say, so far as I am advised, there is an executive committee, which, I am rather of the opinion, is really the governing body.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not the case the governing body there is the secretary of that institution, and the Board of Regents do what they are advised to do by him, as a matter of fact?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not able to state that, because of my short service on that board.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And they do well to be advised by him, I think.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Texas that the secretary of the institution is a very able man and a very distinguished scientist as well.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I know that is true. What is the salary, by the way?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Ten thousand dollars a year.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Illinois says the salary is $10,000 a year. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, do the Regents draw any salary?

Mr. THACHER. No, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I have not received any and have not been advised that any was coming to me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does my friend know what the tenure of office is?

Mr ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes, sir; the tenure of office of a Member of the House is two years. They must be reappointed every two years.

Mr. MURDOCK. Without salary?

Mr. THACHER. Without salary.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And without perquisites?

Mr. MANN. Oh, they get one perquisite—a ride to the meeting.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will my friend from Massachusetts inform me whether he has ever attended a meeting?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from New York, I will say I have attended one meeting of the board, the only one which has been called since I have been a member.

Mr. GOULDEN. Then my friend finds the office is not entirely ornamental, but useful as well.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is not wholly ornamental.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ASSAY OFFICE, NEW YORK CITY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13296) for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in New York.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under the authority contained in the acts of Congress approved March 4, 1911, and August 26, 1912, for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in New York City, and for vaults therefor, and architectural, engineering, and other technical services in connection therewith, are hereby reappropriated and made available for the erection of a new fireproof building on said Wall Street front, in continuation, or extension of the present assay office building fronting on Pine Street, together with suitable vaults for use of said assay office and the adjoining subtreasury, and, if necessary, an entrance from or connection with said subtreasury for access therefrom, at a total limit of cost of not exceeding in the aggregate the present limits of cost for building, vaults, connection with the subtreasury, and the architectural, engineering, or other technical services in connection therewith, of $607,408.

SEC. 2. That the authority heretofore given to the Secretary of the Treasury to employ, in his discretion, such architectural, engineering, or other technical services as he may deem necessary in connection with the enlargement, remodeling, or extension of the portion of the assay office in New York City fronting on Wall Street, and to pay for such services from the unexpended balance of the appropriation from which the rear portion of said assay office was constructed, is hereby continued with respect to said new building, payment therefor within the limit heretofore fixed to be made from the amounts herein reappropriated.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, further authorized to employ in connection with the Supervising Architect's Office, and without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations for service, either within or without the District of Columbia, such other specially skilled technical, engineering, consulting, and superintending services as he may deem necessary; all such specially skilled technical, engineering, consulting, and superintending services to be exclusively employed in connection with the plans and specifications for said vaults and the foundations of said building and vaults. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay for such services mentioned in this paragraph such compensation and such actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses in connection with such work as he may deem reasonable, from the amounts herein reappropriated, all such additional services and traveling expenses hereinbefore authorized to be in addition to and independent of the authorizations and appropriations for personal services and traveling expenses in said office otherwise made.

And in razing said Wall Street front the Secretary of the Treasury may dispose, by gift or otherwise, of the façade of said present building with a view to the preservation of said façade: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be put to any expense beyond that for said razing.

The committee amendments were read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "reappropriated and" and insert the words "authorized to be."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the word "reappropriated" and insert the word "authorized."

Page 3, line 8, strike out the word "reappropriated" and insert the word "authorized."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MANN, Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. MURDOCK reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Several gentlemen reserve the right to object.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, several provisions of this bill. It seems to me, that the House ought to have some explanation about. For instance, there is the employment of those men outside of the Supervising Architect's Office being paid travel-

ing expenses, and so on, and I think the House has by act done away with the employment of those men and I do not believe by special legislation, unless there is some very good reason for it, they ought to be in the bill reported specially for some project; and then I notice on page 1 it says, "enlargement, etc." I do not know just what that means. I suppose it refers to the old bill; and then there is another matter in giving away the façade of the present building. It seems to me we ought to have an explanation of this matter also, and I do not know who is in charge of this bill——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand we are to have an explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will explain it.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported this bill favorably, based upon these facts: Under two acts of Congress appropriations equal in amount to that specified in the present bill were made for the alteration and improvement of the assay building in New York and the construction of vaults. An explanation of what change is to be made will be given by my colleague from New York [Mr. CANTOR], but I might say a new building can be erected and safes installed for exactly the same sum of money heretofore provided. This does not appropriate a single penny beyond that which has heretofore been provided. It merely authorizes the use for the erection of a new building of the money appropriated for repairs and alterations.

It actually enables a new building to be constructed for the sums of money heretofore appropriated.

Mr. MOORE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. LOGUE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Looking at the report I find that the erection of this new building became necessary, because of—

the involved nature of the existing legislation it is desired that amendatory legislation shall be passed which will not only authorize the construction of the new building but clear up the situation generally.

The bill presumes to appropriate $607,000. Can the gentleman explain the character of the involved legislation that is referred to?

Mr. LOGUE. It merely seeks to authorize the expenditure for a new building of that which was heretofore appropriated for alterations and repairs. And my colleague from New York [Mr. CANTOR] is familiar with the legislation, and I believe he can give the information the gentleman desires.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman——

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman explain why it is?

Mr. MOORE. No. But I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] again if the necessity for this did not arise out of the concentration of assay offices in the city of New York?

Mr. CANTOR. There is no change in that respect there.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that we abolished assay offices elsewhere and concentrated them at New York?

Mr. CANTOR. I can not answer that question. All I know is that this bill comes from the Treasury Department, and the present assay office in New York was discovered several years ago to be inadequate for the Government needs.

Mr. MOORE. This bill carries an authorization for $607,000.

Mr. CANTOR. It is a reappropriation only. Not a dollar of additional appropriation is made by this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Why, then, does not the committee recommend the substitution of "authorized" for "appropriated"?

Mr. CANTOR. Because it did not go to the Appropriations Committee. I will explain to the House that this bill was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds by the Speaker.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill to which he refers was a bill for the alteration of the building?

Mr. CANTOR. No and yes. The original bills were sent to the Committee on Appropriations. This bill provides for a reconstruction of a part of the building, which made it necessary under the rules for it to go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds instead of to the Committee on Appropriations, and it therefore required a change in the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. The original proposition was to alter this building?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And this is to construct a new building?

Mr. CANTOR. It is not.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. REED. This bill, as I understand it, was in the last appropriation bill, and it went out on a point of order that I made against it, with many other similar items.

Mr. CANTOR. It did not.

Mr. REED. It went out because I made a point of order on it, following the rejection by the chairman of the committee of two or three other buildings of which I had knowledge.

Mr. CANTOR. That may have been so last year, but not this year, as I understand it; now, as to this bill, I have carefully watched it since I introduced it, and it did not find its way into the appropriation bill, so far as my knowledge extends. This bill was introduced by me at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, and there being a change in the character of the construction to some extent, as I have tried to explain, the Speaker sent this bill where it properly belonged, namely, to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and not to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LOGUE. The money has been appropriated.

Mr. CANTOR. The money has been appropriated for this specific purpose.

Mr. MOORE and Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood from the gentleman's explanatory remarks that this bill originated with the Treasury Department?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the gentleman took the floor I intended to direct this inquiry to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE], who reported the bill. I notice in reading the report there is absent the customary recommendation from the Treasury Department. All reference as to whether the Treasury Department approves or does not approve of this bill is wanting, except an excerpt from some memorandum of the Supervising Architect. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] to state whether this bill has been submitted to the Treasury Department or not, and that the committee has had the recommendations of that department concerning this proposition?

Mr. CANTOR. The Secretary of the Treasury authorized one of his assistants in the Supervising Architect's Office to appear before the committee and he made an argument in favor of the bill.

Mr. LOGUE. He did actually appear before us and made an argument in favor of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. This proposition, if the gentleman will permit, was submitted in an appropriation on the deficiency bill of last year by the Secretary of the Treasury. It went out on a point of order.

Mr. CANTOR. Not this year?

Mr. BARTLETT. Last year. The Secretary of the Treasury recommended it to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury has twice appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, favoring this proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is well aware that in bills of this character the reports generally contain the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury approving of the project. In this report there is no such recommendation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that. I suppose the gentleman proceeded on the idea that the recommendation was properly contained in a statement to the Committee on Appropriations, and——

Mr. STAFFORD. The statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is entirely satisfactory to me, so far as the want of a letter in the report is concerned.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know the Treasury Department thinks this the proper thing to do, and from the evidence before the subcommittee, of which I was a member, we thought it was the proper thing to do, and so reported.

Mr. CANTOR. And I will also add that the building is now under construction, and this bill is required to finish it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman explain why the Supervising Architect is relieved from the operation of the civil-service law?

Mr. CANTOR. I will tell you why. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this is an exceptional part of New York. It is sur-

rounded by some of the largest buildings in the world, and it requires engineering experts for the foundation as well as for the architectural features of the building. That is the reason why the exception is made in this bill. There are buildings in that neighborhood ranging all the way from 15 to 40 stories high, and they have to go down to a considerable depth for a foundation to support the building, and we require the services of foundation experts in order to protect the building.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman mean that the regular force in the Office of the Supervising Architect is not equal to the performance of this duty?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes. They have no experts suited for that work. It requires special skill, and there is no such expert in that department.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to ask the gentleman whether the Supervising Architect so holds?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes; the Supervising Architect so holds.

Mr. MOORE. Is not this the result of the so-called policy of economy whereby the assay offices throughout the country were concentrated in the city of New York?

Mr. CANTOR. I can not tell the gentleman in detail what happened before I came here, but I now know that this building is under process of construction and ought to be finished.

Mr. MOORE. The department wanted to economize by abolishing assay offices elsewhere in the country and concentrated them in New York, and this building follows as a consequence of that policy.

Mr. CANTOR. I was not here at that time, I will say to the gentleman, and all I know is that the gentleman and his associates on this floor passed a bill two years ago for this work.

Mr. GOULDEN. The discontinuance of the other assay offices has largely added to the work here, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. The other offices were abolished, and this concentrates that work in the city of New York.

Mr. CANTOR. This appropriation was made before the concentration of the other assay offices in New York took place.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman inform us as to the reason why the Supervising Architect's Office is unable to do this work?

Mr. CANTOR. I tried to explain it to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a little while ago. It requires engineering skill, and there is no one on the staff of the Supervising Architect's Office in the Treasury Department competent to answer the requirements of that particular kind of construction. That is a condition peculiar to the city of New York.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me read to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] what the Supervising Architect states.

Mr. CANTOR. A man of that kind who could undertake the engineering proposition that is required in this particular building could get all the money he wanted from some foundation company in New York City.

Mr. MURDOCK. What surprises me is that a Government officer should admit that he has not an officer under him competent for that work.

Mr. CANTOR. That is one reason, and——

Mr. BARTLETT. Another reason is that men with the proper qualifications are not on the eligible list for civil-service appointment, because if they were to apply for these positions they could not secure such a salary under the Government employ as their skill would command outside.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the case with reference to all these architects employed outside, according to the representation that is made concerning them.

Mr. AUSTIN. The executive officer of the Supervising Architect's Office stated this to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in the hearings on this bill:

> This work calls for engineering skill of the first order, because it will be necessary to go down below the foundations of surrounding buildings. It is a piece of engineering work and calls for the employment of men possessing special training and experience with this kind of work in this locality. They have to go right down to bedrock in order to secure the proper foundations, and must protect the surrounding buildings against injury.

Then, in addition to that, he makes this statement:

> The building is in a very dangerous and dilapidated condition. The façade is what the historical societies want to save; if the Secretary takes it down, it can be set up elsewhere and be preserved. This involves no new expense.

Mr. CANTOR. I have tried to explain that condition, because of the fact that the subtreasury and the assay building are surrounded by high buildings, and it is a special engineering feat to put these foundations down a sufficient depth in the neighborhood of those tall buildings.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is another question that I would like to ask of the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the idea of making a gift of this façade to these people?

Mr. CANTOR. I will explain to the gentleman about that. In the first place the façade is of historical value, and there has been a demand on the part of historical societies in our city to preserve that front. It is an old building, as the gentleman from Kansas probably knows, and a fine piece of architecture.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was it not in front of this building that George Washington was inaugurated as President?

Mr. CANTOR. No; it was in front of the Subtreasury, right adjoining. This assay office adjoins the Subtreasury. There has been a great demand on the part of historical societies to preserve this façade as an historical memento. The historical society has requested possession of it for some time. I do not know where they want to put it, but they want to preserve it, and it is of no use to the Government. It will be preserved as a relic of the early style of architecture found in Wall Street.

Mr. LOGUE. Yes; it will be preserved as a relic.

Mr. MOORE. It seems to me that is a particular feature of the bill that ought to be passed. There are a number of buildings in cities on the eastern coast that ought to be preserved for this reason, like that of the Bank of the United States, in Philadelphia.

Mr. CANTOR. A number of old buildings have been turned over to historical societies, and historical spots have been marked, while Fraunces Tavern, where Washington bade farewell to his officers, has been purchased by the Sons of the Revolution, and the Jumel Mansion is in charge of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. I object.

Mr. CANTOR. May I say to this gentleman before his objection is insisted on, Mr. Speaker, that this building is now in process of construction, and we need this bill to finish it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire has an absolute and indefeasible right to object.

Mr. CANTOR. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. REED] objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next one.

Mr. CANTOR. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, at this time to suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is not possible now. At about 5 o'clock in the afternoon they may get up to that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANTOR. I will see then if the gentleman from New Hampshire is absent or not. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

### MEDAWAKANTON AND WAHPAKOOTA (SANTEE) SIOUX INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11246) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11246) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction be, and hereby is, conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment for any balance that may be found due the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Bands of Sioux Indians, otherwise known as Santee Sioux Indians, with right of appeal as in other cases for any annuities that may be ascertained to be due to the said bands of Indians under and by virtue of the treaties between said bands and the United States, dated September 29, 1837 (7 Stat. L., 538), and August 5, 1851 (10 Stat. L., 954), as if the act of forfeiture of the annuities of said bands approved February 16, 1863, had not been passed: *Provided*, That the court in rendering judgment shall ascertain and include therein the amount of accrued annuities under the treaty of September 29, 1837, up to the date of rendition of judgment, and shall determine and include the present value of the same, not including interest, and the capital sum of said annuity, which shall be in lieu of said perpetual annuity granted in said treaty; and to ascertain and set off against any amount found due under said treaties all moneys paid to said Indians or expended for their benefit by the Government of the United States since the treaties were abrogated by the act of 1863: *Provided*, That the treaty of 1868 shall not be a bar to recovery, but all equities and benefits received thereunder by the Santee Sioux Indians may, in the discretion of the court, be taken into consideration in the determination of the amount of recovery. Upon the rendition of such judgment and in conformity therewith the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to ascertain and determine which of said Indians now living took part in said outbreak, and to prepare a roll of the persons entitled to share in said judgment by placing thereon the names of all living members of said bands residing in the United States at the time of the passage of this act, excluding therefrom only the names of those found to have personally participated in the outbreak; and he is directed to distribute

the proceeds of such judgment, except as hereinafter provided, per capita, to the persons borne on the said roll.

Proceedings shall be commenced by petition verified by one of the attorneys who have been heretofore employed by said bands of Indians to prosecute their claims under this act under a contract which has been approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior as provided by law, upon information and belief as to the existence of the facts stated in said petition, and no other verification shall be necessary. Upon final determination of the cause the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as the court shall find to be reasonable upon a quantum meruit for services performed or to be performed, to be paid to the attorney or attorneys so employed by the said band of Indians and their associates, and the same shall be paid out of the balance found to be due said bands of Indians when an appropriation therefor shall have been made by Congress: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by the court amount in the aggregate to more than 5 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered, and in no event shall the aggregate amount exceed $25,000: *Provided further*, That the court shall by its decree distribute such fees equitably between the attorneys who have been employed by said bands of Indians in said cause.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, did we not have this bill up in the last Congress and have a vote on it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. We had it up on this calendar in the last Congress, and this is practically the identical bill that was passed by this House on March 1, 1911. There is practically no change in it. At that time no objection was made. It passed under suspension of the rules. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] assisted in shaping it up and defending some portions of the measure at that time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I did all I could to prevent its passage.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The record shows that the gentleman from Illinois did not express himself as opposed to the bill. He did state that he approved of the provision at the end of the measure, regulating attorneys' fees, but he offered no objection whatever to any other provision of the bill at that time. I hope that the gentleman will not object to it at this time, because I believe there has never been a more meritorious measure before the House than this one.

The Government owes these Indians for land that it purchased from them in 1837 and 1851. When they went on the warpath in 1863 the Government abrogated its treaties with these Indians, and since then has paid them no money whatever under those treaties. What we ask is that this bill be sent to the Court of Claims, in order that the court may adjudicate the differences between these Indians and the Government. I believe that at the present time every other tribe of Indians in the United States has been forgiven whatever wrong it has done in the past, and all except these have had their treaty rights restored to them. The Five Civilized Tribes were at one time in rebellion against the Government, but they were forgiven their sins and taken back, and their treaties were restored to them, and considerable money paid to them besides the amount that the treaty guaranteed to them originally.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to the number of Indians now living in this tribe?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. There are something like 1,100 Indians now living on the reservation in Knox County, Nebr., in my district. At the time they were transferred to this reservation there were some 1,700 of them, but they were transferred to the Crow Creek Reservation, in South Dakota, three years prior to the time they moved to Nebraska, and 300 of them starved to death. They are poor people, living along the Missouri River bluffs in my State.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit me to make a supplemental statement?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The number in Nebraska is correctly stated by the gentleman. There are in the western part of Minnesota, near the Dakota line, to-day about 900 of these same Indians.

Mr. STAFFORD. How do they maintain themselves?

Mr. MILLER. There are no Indians in the United States who live a more precarious existence than those that have been mentioned here. My best information is that those along the Minnesota River in western Minnesota have subsisted mainly by catching frogs for the Minneapolis markets. During the winter season the frog-catching business is ofter at a very low stage.

Mr. LOBECK. Why do they not join the union?

Mr. MANN. Why do they not go to work?

Mr. MILLER. They do work as opportunity is given them. There is no work in the wintertime. That is a farming country. They do work in the summer. The children and women can not go out to work. The men do work as far as they can get it to do.

Mr. MANN. I have not gone over the bill and reports this year, but I put with my files a memorandum concerning the bill and report in the last Congress, and the recollection that comes to me is that this is a proposition to give these Indians annuities based upon a treaty 70 or 80 years old.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The treaties of 1837 and 1851.

Mr. MANN. And the department having held that the annuities provided for in those treaties were barred by a treaty made subsequent to the war, the bill proposes to remove that bar. Is that correct?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska? Yes; the bill proposes to take into consideration the money that has been paid to these Indians under the treaty of 1868.

Mr. MANN. Does it remove the bar of the treaty of 1868?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Yes; that is not to be a bar to recovery. The reason for that is very apparent, because these Indians deeded to the Government a great portion of the States of Iowa and Minnesota, for which they only received some 12 payments under the treaty, until this outbreak took place. Then the Government, by act of Congress, abrogated the treaty. In 1868 the Government made a new treaty with these Indians, and the Government paid these Indians certain sums of money under the new treaty of 1868 for helping to police the Union Pacific Railroad during its construction.

Mr. MANN. I may have this bill slightly confused in my mind with another bill; but there was a bill, and I was under the impression that it was this one, which it was claimed would, if enacted, cost only a comparatively small amount of money; but I figure that it might cost $10,000,000 or $15,000,000. Is this that bill or is it another bill?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. It is another bill, Mr. Speaker. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill may possibly allow these Indians to recover $1,000,000. It will depend on whether or not the Court of Claims deducts certain amounts that were paid to them under the treaty of 1868 for assistance in policing the Union Pacific Railway. It is a matter that is not very easily ascertained without having a great deal of investigation, but it is impossible for them to receive under this bill any more than the original sum, which was only about $3,000,000, less the amount that the Government has paid them.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit me to make a slight additional statement?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Under the treaty of 1837 the United States agreed to pay these Indians $15,000 a year forever. Under the treaty of 1851 the United States agreed to pay these Indians $61,000 a year for 50 years. At the time Congress declared the treaties forfeited, in 1863, twelve payments had been made. When the treaty of 1868 was made apparently no attention was paid to either of the prior treaties that it was claimed had been forfeited.

Mr. MANN. Why should we remove a bar to the treaty which the gentleman says is no bar? Why should we legislate to remove a bar which the gentleman says is no bar, but which the courts may construe to be a bar? Ought not that to be left to the courts?

Mr. MILLER. I did not mean to state that superficially and perhaps legally it was a bar. I do mean to state that every equity and good conscience require us to say that none of the contracting parties at the time could have had under consideration those facts, because nothing is said about them in making the treaty. There was practically nothing given to the Indians in consideration of the treaty of 1868.

Further, and especially the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Sioux Indians were never parties to that treaty as such. It was a treaty between the United States and 10 different bands of Indians. The Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Indians were scattered; they had no tribal existence, no council, no meetings, and the treaty, as far as it was signed, was signed by seven men then in Nebraska where the treaty was made and where the United States desired to secure certain benefits. They had no representatives, and we do not think in conscience and equity it should be held as a bar to their rights.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska that he ask unanimous consent to pass this bill over without prejudice.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

IMMEDIATE TRANSPORTATION OF DUTIABLE MERCHANDISE, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11245) extending to the port of Providence, R. I., the privilege of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, be, and the same are hereby, extended to the port of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I see the author of the bill on the floor, and I would like to ask him to make some explanation of the needs for this action.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. It is a commercial necessity on the part of Providence, R. I. I am glad to say that Providence is growing, not by leaps and bounds, but commendably, and we want it given the I. T., which means "immediate transportation."

Mr. STAFFORD. It is "It" with a capital I?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes. It will allow us to forward goods immediately without having them entered and appraised at Providence. They will go to the consignees, and that gives a wider latitude to the steamship companies making Providence a port of call or destination.

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill will remove the difficulty of appraising the goods in transit?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. SHERLEY. At what expense to the Government?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. None at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. How many ports have this privilege now?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I can not answer the gentleman. It merely provides for the entry and appraisement of goods at the final port of destination rather than at an intermediate port.

Mr. SHERLEY. There must have been some reason why this privilege was not given to all ports. Why was exception made of any port?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Ports that have not got the business to justify the privilege would not get it. Of course there is a very brief recommendation here from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. They have investigated the matter thoroughly through their agents, and they conclude that the necessity exists for constituting Providence a port for the shipment of merchandise under the immediate-transportation act. We have established a trans-Atlantic line of steamships, and they make Providence not only a port of call but ship freight and passengers through. We feel that the port of Providence, upon which the State is spending millions of dollars in conjunction with the Government—we have an immense pier there and are building another one, and we feel that all the facilities that ought to go with shipping should come to us, in order to make use of the development which has come to us by reason of the money that was appropriated by the Government of the United States and the State.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know but that it is perfectly proper that this bill should be enacted, but what I am trying to find out here is why the privilege was denied to certain cities in the first instance.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will permit me, the general act provided for a number of cities, and Providence was not included. Certain coast cities were included, but Providence was not; this is a privilege asked for by cities as transportation increases. It is a facilitiy for the transit of oceanic shipments.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why was it denied to any city?

Mr. MOORE. It was not, except that at the time the original bill was passed those cities were included that seemed to require it.

Mr. SHERLEY. There must have been some reason why this privilege was not enacted in a general law.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will give me time to get the act, I can name to him the cities to which the act gave the privilege. All cities were not put in, because in the judgment of the Treasury officials or of Congress they did not require the privilege; others have come in as the business increased. We accorded this privilege only a short time ago to the port of Perth Amboy and to Dallas, Tex., which is far up the river. They were included because business had increased and they desired to facilitate shipments in this way.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no knowledge why this should not be granted, but I am trying to find out the theory on which the original act was passed.

Mr. MOORE. When the act was passed those cities that needed these facilities along the coast line were picked out and inserted by the framers of the act. Since that time other cities have come in and asked for the privilege which these other cities enjoy, and Providence is one.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suppose the House will have to take it on faith, though I must confess I do not yet understand the reason for discrimination.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman were framing a law, say, this act of June 10, 1880, and he were to designate certain cities to which this privilege ought to be accorded, he would probably pick out those large cities along the coast which were doing the business.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there any reason why the privilege should not be accorded to any city?

Mr. MOORE. Not if the city shows the business and its worthiness for it. Dallas, Tex., for instance, might have been brought into question, but Dallas demonstrated to the satisfaction of the committee that it did enough business to enable it to have its business facilitated in this way, and the committee accorded it that privilege.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I understand the purpose of the bill, it is to practically permit goods to go in bond to their final destination.

Mr. MOORE. That is true; without being held up at that point for appraisement. It saves money to the Treasury in the matter of inspection, and it facilitates the business of the shipper.

Mr. SHERLEY. What I am trying to find out is why that privilege should not exist in case of goods shipped from any point in the United States.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman would read the act of 1880——

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I can not read it, because I have not got it here.

Mr. MOORE. I have not got it, but if the gentleman will continue the discussion for a moment, I will be very glad to produce it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not like to take the burden of objecting to a bill, but at the same time——

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I take it what the gentleman wants to know is why other cities do not get this privilege. They can get it if they can prove they have commerce enough to justify the customs department to recommend it.

Mr. SHERLEY. There must be some reason why the customs department does not want it to apply generally, and that must also involve both protection of revenues and cost of administration.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I presume it is based on the amount of commerce at the port. It is done in order to facilitate the shipment of goods. Why delay? For instance, a Washington man imports merchandise to the port of Providence. Why should he be compelled to enter those goods at Providence and have them appraised there when they can come right through to Washington?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why should he if they came through at Mobile or Charleston or any other city——

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I presume that all of the cities the gentleman has named have the immediate transportation facilities.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know anything about it, but I think it is due to the House in asking unanimous consent that we get more information than has been given in this matter.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. MOORE. I now have the act of June 10, 1880, section 1, referred to in the report, which provides as follows:

That when any merchandise other than explosive articles and articles in bulk not provided for in section 4 of this act imported at the ports of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland and Bath (in Maine), Chicago, Port Huron, Detroit, New Orleans, Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, Galveston, Pensacola (Fla.), Cleveland, Toledo, and San Francisco shall appear by the invoice or bill of lading and manifest of the importing vessel to be consigned to and destined for either of the ports specified in the seventh section of this act, the collector at the port of arrival shall allow the said merchandise to be shipped immediately after the entry prescribed in section 2 of this act has been made.

Certain cities, the gentleman will see, were designated, and they were, as a rule, cities along the Atlantic coast, around the Gulf, up on the Great Lakes, and on the Pacific coast. They did the business to justify this provision.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I caught the reading of that law rightly, it is entirely different from what has been suggested here, and that is that when the ultimate destination is one of these cities named the goods shall be carried through without being stopped at any other port at which they may enter. The statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] was

to the effect that if the goods came into Providence and were to go somewhere else this act was to enable them to go to that other place, but the law the gentleman reads seems to be just the opposite of that.

Mr. MOORE. I can only say to the gentleman that a number of cities have come in since the passage of this act and asked for the same privilege that is herein granted specifically to cities enumerated, and they have done it upon the ground that their business warranted it and it was a matter of economy to the Government to have it done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the act the gentleman has just read. As I construe the purpose of the bill in question, it is merely to include the port of Providence in the list of cities as are included in section 1, chapter 190, of the Forty-sixth Congress. This bill merely permits these imported goods, when they arrive at the port of Providence, to be shipped through to their destination without any further appraisement, if they are destined to the cities enumerated in section 7 of this same act. It merely postpones their appraisement to the time they arrive at final destination, final destination being at the places enumerated in section 7 of the act the gentleman is referring to, so that they will not be held up. It is a convenience that will be given to the traffic of Providence. There is no reason, if the traffic is of sufficient importance at Providence to warrant their entry, to have the goods held up there, but they should be given the same privilege as the ports of Portland, Bath, and others have been given.

I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] at the outset expressed the purposes of the act in reply to the query I put to him.

Mr. MOORE. As to the importance of the bill, I would like to refer to the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Hamlin, who states the necessity for it. He says:

> From the report of said investigation it is concluded that a necessity——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are learning something about the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Hamlin says that, as a result of their investigation:

> It is concluded that a necessity exists for constituting Providence a port for the shipment of merchandise under the immediate-transportation act, and I therefore recommend to your committee that the bill be enacted into law.

I want to say in regard to the port of Providence—trespassing upon the prerogative of the gentleman from Rhode Island just for a moment—that the port does a business of nearly 3,000,000 tons, and it is gradually becoming one of the great ports of the Atlantic seaboard. If we grant these transportation facilities to Dallas, Tex., hundreds of miles up a river, as we did recently, and to Perth Amboy, N. J., and other cities not covered by the original act, certainly there is no reason in the world why the same privilege should not be extended to a great port like Providence, whose business has been constantly increasing.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have now had the opportunity of reading the law, but I do not quite see why the department should not permit the goods to go through any main port, providing they are going to a final place of destination where there are sufficient officers to take care of the appraisement and the collection of the duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me, the surmise arises in my mind that at these ports specified in section 1 the United States customs officials place a provisional visé upon the manifest and allow them to go through, whereas if this privilege was extended indiscriminately to all ports it would not give the officials the opportunity for scrutiny which might be necessary——

Mr. SHERLEY. But they got that scrutiny at the final place of destination.

Mr. STAFFORD. But to grant entry indiscriminately to all ports would not be a wise thing. For instance, there are only a few ports on the Lakes which are given the privilege of free passage en route for traffic to other places on the Lakes where appraisal is made, because the Government at the port of entry has opportunity to make sufficient scrutiny; but if all lake ports would have the privilege of having entry of goods, they would have to keep customs officials at each one of those places.

Mr. SHERLEY. That would be true if they are appraised there, but the very purpose of this act is to permit the appraisement of the goods at the places to which they are finally shipped.

Mr. STAFFORD. And also permit the Government customs officials to pass upon it provisionally at the first port of entry.

Mr. SHERLEY. To pass upon it as invoiced.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; a sort of checking en route, though the final appraisement is made at the place of destination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was read.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. O'SHAUNESSY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

### RELIEF OF HOMESTEADERS UNDER THE RECLAMATION ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 117) to amend the act of June 23, 1910, entitled "An act providing that entrymen for homesteads within the reclamation projects may assign their entries upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years, the same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act."

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of June 23, 1910 (Public, 243, 36 Stats., p. 592), entitled "An act providing that entrymen for homesteads within reclamation projects may assign their entries upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years, the same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act," is hereby amended by adding the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That any assignment made between June 23, 1910, and January 1, 1913, of which the assignor has submitted satisfactory final proof and the assignee purchased with the belief that the assignment was valid and under the act of June 23, 1910, are hereby confirmed, and the assignee shall be entitled to the land assigned as under the act of June 23, 1910, notwithstanding that said original entry was conformed to farm units and that the part assigned was canceled and eliminated from said entry prior to the date of assignment and prior to the date of final proof: *Provided further*, That such assignee shall in other respects comply with all of the provisions of the act of June 23, 1910."

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the proviso and insert:

"*Provided*, That any assignments made between June 23, 1910, and January 1, 1914, of all or portions of homestead entries upon which the assignors have submitted satisfactory final proof and the assignees purchased with the belief that the assignments were valid, are hereby confirmed, notwithstanding the original entries were conformed to farm units and the portions assigned canceled or eliminated from the entries prior to the dates of assignment or prior to submission of final proof: *Provided further*, That all entries so assigned shall be subject to the limitations, terms, and conditions of the reclamation act and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and all of said assignees whose entries are hereby confirmed shall, as a condition to receiving patent, make the proof heretofore required of assignees: *And provided further*, That this act shall not apply to any lands canceled and eliminated from any such entry and which have been embraced in any valid settlement or homestead entry of another."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the report upon this bill—and I would like to have the attention of the House to it—it says:

> In the administration of the reclamation act, the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat., 388), it has been found necessary to commit somewhat of an injustice upon the homesteaders. When a homesteader makes an entry for 160 acres within a second form reclamation withdrawal he is likely to have his area of 160 acres "conformed" or cut down to 120 acres, to 80 acres, or even to 40 acres.

Now, I apprehend that the gentleman who wrote the bill may know what that means. There may be other gentlemen in the House connected with irrigation matters who know what it means, but I am sure that nine-tenths of the Members of the House would not have the slightest notion what it did mean. I would like to give the gentleman a chance to explain what it means. What is a "second form reclamation withdrawal"?

Mr. RAKER. There was so much confusion I did not get the gentleman's question, although I was listening carefully.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order if the gentleman can not hear the query made by the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. MANN. What does this mean: "When a homesteader makes an entry for 160 acres within a second-form reclamation withdrawal?"

What is the modus operandi and what does it mean?

Mr. RAKER. As I understand it, that means that under the act as it originally existed, when a withdrawal was made under the second form, only homestead entries and no other could be made. A man might make his application for 160 acres of land, stating in his application that he would conform to the unit as fixed and subject to the rules of the Department of the Interior in fixing the size, and so forth, of his final entry.

Mr. MANN. We have not reached that yet. I am asking what is the meaning of a prior provision?

Mr. RAKER. I am trying to explain it. I can not explain one without making the two plain.

Mr. MANN. They are entirely separated.

Mr. RAKER. The second form of withdrawal under the reclamation act is where he makes his homestead entry, and that alone, conform to the rules and regulations specified by the department, whether or not it shall be 160 acre, 80 acres, or 40 acres; whether they have determined the amount necessary for a man to support his family upon, and when he files his homestead entry he puts that in the homestead declaration. That is the meaning of that phrase there and the meaning of the law as it has been applied in many cases under the reclamation act. A withdrawal under the first form, withdrawal under the reclamation act, no filing of any kind can be made.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman again, what is the "second-form reclamation withdrawal"?

Mr. RAKER. The law allows him to make homestead entry only.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The second form of reclamation withdrawal is the form of withdrawal which withdraws the land from all except homestead entry. The first form of withdrawal is a withdrawal for the actual construction of works, and lands withdrawn under the first form are not enterable under any law.

Mr. ANDERSON. What has the homesteader to do with that?

Mr. MONDELL. He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. ANDERSON. This bill provides:

When a homesteader makes an entry for 160 acres within a second form reclamation withdrawal—

And so forth.

Mr. MONDELL. The second form of reclamation withdrawal is the withdrawal for homestead entry.

Mr. RAKER. And in addition, as I have explained, he must conform to the rules and regulations as adopted by the department, which is under the second-form entry.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says he must conform to the rules and regulations. Is that the same meaning of the word "conform" that is used in the report here where it refers to the 160 acres that conformed?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. He conforms to the language as fixed by the department when they have determined the quantity of land that ought to be necessary for a man under the reclamation project to support himself and his family.

Mr. MANN. Well, when a man makes the entry, he takes it subject to the amount of land which the department fixes as a farm unit on the project?

Mr. RAKER. Afterwards; yes. That was the original——

Mr. MANN. If he takes it that way, why should he have any more rights than that?

Mr. RAKER. The people who filed believed that, up to the present time, that they would be given the right to consummate their residence, improvement, and final proof, on the entire 160 acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. What right did they have to believe that?

Mr. RAKER. On every act of the department up to the present time. Men have appeared before the department, records have been taken, and those men in the Salt River Valley, and others, firmly believed they had their rights. In view of that fact, Congress, on June 23, 1910, recognized the very conditions of all of these homestead entrymen, and permitted them to make final payment, and after that was done they could then sell their homestead entries over and above that which conformed to the farm unit.

Mr. MANN. Where did that act of June 23, 1910, originate? How did it get passed? Is it a separate law?

Mr. RAKER. It is a separate law. Here is the whole act, on page 2, to protect these men who believed honestly and fully they had a right to the whole 160 acres of land. They improved it, they cultivated it, and they irrigated it.

Mr. MANN. They improved it? They could not improve it without water.

Mr. RAKER. Lots of them did have water.

Mr. MANN. Where did they get the water?

Mr. RAKER. A good many of them had water under these projects before they were completed. These people irrigated their land.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not pretend that on many of the irrigation projects people have irrigated 160 acres?

Mr. RAKER. Some of them did.

Mr. MANN. And received water from the Government?

Mr. RAKER. Some of them did; yes.

Mr. MANN. He certainly will not pretend they paid anything for it?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. They have not even paid anything toward the construction charges yet, to speak of.

Mr. RAKER. In many instances they made a number of payments. They paid for water, as the reports show.

Mr. MANN. The reports show there has been very little money coming in to the Government, either for construction cost or for maintenance cost, on any of these irrigation projects.

Mr. RAKER. A report has been made on that; but, of course, I did not expect to go into the amount of money that had been paid in and the amount of construction charges, I want to say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, when the Government lays out an irrigation project and proposes to let people take the land and cultivate it, and fixes the limit which they can take under the law, what reason is there why we should permit some man to enter upon more and sell his rights instead of the Government giving the rights to innocent people?

Mr. RAKER. No; the gentleman has a wrong statement for his premises that he starts upon, and that is that they said under the reclamation act, "If men can have more than 160 acres, they are permitted to file under the old law on 160 acres," and did not conform to the farm unit until later. A law has been passed now that no man can file until the project is ready and until the farm unit has been fixed; but the officials of the Reclamation Service and of the Land Department, all of them, acquiesced in permitting a man to file on a full 160 acres of land. That was the law, and the officials did their duty in following it.

Mr. MANN. But subject to the right of the Government, when the water was turned on, to cut down the amount of land which a man could receive on that filing. Everybody understands that.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement of this case? Then I shall be through. By the law of June 23, 1910, Congress recognized that these people made their filings of 160 acres under the project, and they thought they would eventually get the 160 acres. Congress recognized that the parties had filed with the contract and reservation that the Government should fix the farm unit, and then said that where you make final proof, where you make residence and payment, you may sell above the farm unit, and the party who is your assignee may obtain patent if he continues to conform to the law.

The special case involved here is that these people filed for 160 acres. They made final proof and made payments, and then had five years' residence upon the land; and after they had made final proof and complied with all the law, they sold 80 acres or 40 acres, as the case might be, to A and B. Not knowing the fact that it had not conformed to the farm unit, they sold a part of the tract to innocent parties. Those innocent parties paid all the way from a thousand to two thousand dollars for these 80-acre tracts. They have gone on the ground and made improvements, and they are living there now, and the department says it is justice that the Government should permit those innocent parties to obtain patents to the land.

Mr. MANN. Why can they not homestead it now? Supposing the assignment is not good, they can make entry. They have the prior right because they are on the land.

Mr. RAKER. There might be complications in that.

Mr. MANN. How?

Mr. RAKER. The man has spent his money; he has lived there for five years; and the land is under cultivation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not the assignee.

Mr. MANN. None of them has cultivated the land for five years under the irrigation project.

Mr. RAKER. We are justified in accepting that man's sworn statement.

Mr. MANN. The department may take it, but we do not have to take it. Maybe we ought to take it. But when the irrigation law was passed it was repeatedly stated that no man could farm 160 acres on one of these irrigation projects where he was required to irrigate it. It was stated that 40 acres was probably the most at the outside that one man could cultivate, and 10 acres would probably be sufficient in most cases. Then you go ahead and let men make a homestead entry of 160 acres and sell it off without any right whatever; and then, because you say it is purchased by an innocent purchaser, you come in and want to have the law changed. I do not know anything about that. You say that the man who made this entry in the first place shall keep the money, and in order to protect the innocent purchaser you bring in this legislation, where the inno-

cent purchaser would be protected anyway, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. RAKER. Reading again the act of June 23, 1910, this Congress recognized the fact that a man who had filed on 160 acres of land on a reclamation project, who had lived upon it five years, who had cultivated it, and who has made final proof, might sell all above the farm unit as fixed to parties, and that they might obtain the title to that land.

Mr. MANN. Where does the gentleman find that language in the act of June 23, 1910?

Mr. RAKER. That is what it means, and that is what it says.

Mr. MANN. That is not what it says.

Mr. RAKER. I will read it. It says:

That from and after the filing with the Commissioner of the General Land Office of satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for the five years required by law persons who have or shall make homestead entries within reclamation projects under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902, may assign such entries, or any part thereof, to other persons, and such assignees upon submitting proof of the reclamation of the lands and upon payment of the charges apportioned against the same as provided in the said act of June 17, 1902, may receive from the United States a patent for the lands: *Provided*, That all assignments made under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the limitations, charges, terms, and conditions of the reclamation act.

Now, when this assignee has obtained his 80-acre tract of land he must pay his proportion of the construction charges. If it is $50 an acre, he pays that to the Government. He must obtain a water right, and he pays for that; and he pays for the annual upkeep and maintenance of that project like anybody does. Now, Congress has said that that is legitimate and proper.

Mr. MANN. I do not find it in that law. When we passed that law we supposed that meant the right to assign the farm unit as fixed in the project before the matter was finally determined as to the cost, and so forth.

Mr. RAKER. Why, no. He could sell his farm unit anyhow after he made final proof. But this means and it says the assignee. That is not the original homestead applicant.

Mr. MANN. Certainly not. We provided that the homestead applicant might make an assignment before he made final proof, and that the assignee might make the final proof. That is what the law says.

Mr. RAKER. No; it does not. It has never been made that way, and never will be, that a man may sell his homestead before he makes the final proof.

Mr. MANN. That is what this says.

Mr. RAKER. No. That is the assignee.

Mr. MANN. Of course.

Mr. RAKER. The law provides that the claimant himself must live upon the land for five years, make final proof, and consummate it; and then when he has made final proof he can sell his claim. But this says that when there is a division of the land into farm units, he having resided on the place and cultivated it and improved it, he can sell those other tracts to the assignee, and the assignee under the law may obtain patent for that land.

Now the provision of the bill before the House is simply this. The only distinction is this, that where the homestead claimant has filed on a 160-acre tract and has made the five-year residence, and has made the necessary improvements for five years, and then after five years has made final proof, and after that time has sold a part of the tract which has been before his final proof divided into farm units, the Department of the Interior before he made his final proof fixes the farm unit. The assignee of this homesteader does not get a title under the law as it stands to-day, although he may have lived there every day since and paid $5,000 for the land.

The party having bought this claim in good faith and paid his money for it, the department says that in spite of the fact that he made proof subsequent to the order dividing the land into units he should have his patent if he conformed to all the rules and regulations of the law, on condition that he must obtain his water rights and pay the maintenance and upkeep.

Mr. MANN. Under the law can a homestead entryman assign his right before he has lived on the land five years?

Mr. RAKER. He can not.

Mr. MANN. And before he has made his proof?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. But that is what the gentleman wants to let him do now?

Mr. RAKER. No; after he has made his final proof; after he has lived on the land five years; after he has complied with the law and his land has been subject to be divided by the department into farm units, his assignee may get a valid title without making new homestead entry and settlement; but he must continue the qualification under the new reclamation law and must pay all the charges.

Mr. MANN. This talk about paying all the charges is a joke. The gentleman from California knows that there is not a reclamation project in the United States in which the Government has any interest where the charges are paid up to date.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, yes; in the State of California, up to date, they have paid all the charges.

Mr. MANN. Where are those projects?

Mr. RAKER. At Orland reclamation project, California.

Mr. MANN. There is a bill pending now which they expect to call up, fixing it so that a man who wants to go on one of these projects may pay 5 per cent of the cost of construction, and then have nothing more to pay for five years, and then have the 95 per cent remaining divided into 15 installments. Talk about paying the charges! There is no intention of ever paying these construction charges.

Mr. RAKER. I want to say to the gentleman that I believe every dollar that the Government has put into these reclamation projects will be paid back, and that there is not a western man but who is in favor of and working to the end that the Government shall receive every dollar that has been placed in these projects.

Mr. MANN. That is another story.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I know that is irrelevant to this.

Mr. MANN. But when the gentleman talks about paying these charges, they have not been paid, and it is not intended to pay them.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is mistaken in regard to these charges not having been paid.

Mr. MANN. My information comes from a very distinguished gentleman connected with this work.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is a matter that can very easily be ascertained at the department. Take, for instance, the Minidoka project. You will find that only about 10 per cent of the entrymen there are in arrears on their payments. I think on the Boise-Payette project the percentage of those in arrears is probably less. I am not advised in regard to other projects, but I know it is the intention of the entrymen and the intention of the department that all of this money shall be paid back, including not only construction charges, but maintenance charges also.

Mr. MONDELL. Can the gentleman from California inform me where these entries are, and what projects they are located upon, where it is desired to permit this to be done?

Mr. RAKER. I did have a list. There are not over 10 or 15.

Mr. MONDELL. Are there that many?

Mr. RAKER. That may be doubtful.

Mr. MONDELL. Are there more than 2 or 3?

Mr. RAKER. I want to estimate it at the outside. I should think there are not more than from 5 to 8.

Mr. MONDELL. Where are the projects with which the gentleman is familiar?

Mr. RAKER. I can not give the names now. I would not like to state for fear of making a mistake.

Mr. MONDELL. There are none of them on the projects I am familiar with, so far as I know, and I would be glad to know where they are, if the gentleman can tell me.

Mr. RAKER. I know what they are, but I would not want to name the projects for fear of making a mistake.

Mr. MONDELL. This is something new—to provide for special cases in a general law.

Mr. RAKER. No; it is to conform to the law as it was intended.

Mr. MONDELL. Where are the two that the gentleman knows most about?

Mr. RAKER. I have not my memoranda here, and I could not give them.

Mr. MONDELL. I should like to have the gentleman's opinion as to just how the situation that it is proposed to correct could have arisen? The act of June 23, 1910, is the first and only act that gave any homestead settler the right of assignment. Prior to that, every homestead settler knew that he had no right of assignment. A man could relinquish, and if he handed his relinquishment to another qualified entryman, and that person got to the land office before anyone else and handed in the relinquishment with a filing he had a preference right.

Mr. RAKER. Always heretofore under the homestead law any man who had complied with the law and made his final proof and received his final certificate could sell his land?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. RAKER. But under the reclamation act he could not even do that.

Mr. MONDELL. But I am speaking of the right of the entryman to assign. Of course, every homestead entryman can sell after he gets his full title; that is, after he has made his final proof and complied with all the provisions of the law.

In the case of the entryman entitled to the benefit of the act of 1910, his proof is proof of cultivation and residence only, and there are still payments and obligations to be met. The first law which changed the general homestead policy was the law of June 23, 1910, and all homestead settlers ought to have been informed that that was the only law under which assignments could be made. Now, what you propose to do is to legalize assignments made after the passage of that act and prior to January 1, 1914, made at a time when under that law, the only law on the subject, these homesteaders had no right of assignment. That is not all of it. It would seem that it was intended by this act to reinvest certain homestead settlers with portions of their entry that had been lost to them by cancellation and elimination.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no; read the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. I will make my statement, and then I will read the bill. To reinvest certain homestead settlers with portions of their entries that had been lost to them by cancellation.

Mr. RAKER. That is not the purpose of the bill at all.

Mr. MONDELL. I will read the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Read lines 9 to 13, page 3.

Mr. MONDELL (reading):

are hereby confirmed, notwithstanding the original entries were conformed to farm units and the portions assigned canceled or eliminated from the entries prior to the dates of assignment or prior to submission of final proof.

Mr. RAKER. Read lines 9 to 13.

Mr. MONDELL. What sort of a homestead entryman is one that, after he has been called upon to conform and the excess of his entry has been canceled and eliminated, thereafter proceeds to sell it to somebody, although at that very time he had not brought himself within the provisions of the assignment act of June 23, 1910? Can you conceive a man doing that sort of thing in good faith?

Mr. RAKER. There is nothing of that kind in the bill. If the gentleman will read lines 9 to 13——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman accept an amendment putting a comma after the word "entry," in line 11, and in addition the words "prior to assignment"? That is the usual saving clause. You can not pass any bill through the House without a saving clause, saving an intervening claimant in good faith. That is simply a clause to save the man who, without knowledge of the peculiar performance that was going on, had gone onto eliminated excess lands and made settlement. The gentleman when he read that evidently intended that we should understand that this bill did not apply to lands, excess portions, that had been canceled or eliminated before assignment, although right above the bill indicates that these are the only sort of areas that the bill applies to.

Mr. RAKER. Not at all. The gentleman does not want to get in that attitude, because it has no relation at all to the case where there has been a contest and elimination of the entries except as is provided here, where the homestead claimant himself, after final proof—the gentleman must not get up an imaginary case that does not apply to the bill—where the homestead claimant himself, having resided five years on 160 acres, having cultivated it and improved it as the law requires, having made final proof on the 160 acres, then and after that time he sells a part of that entry, because the department having in the meantime conformed the lands to the unit.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows perfectly well——

Mr. RAKER. This is what the report of the department says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, July 21, 1913.*

Hon. W. R. SMITH,
*Chairman Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands,*
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: In reply to your request of June 5, for report and recommendation upon H. R. 117, which proposes to amend the act of June 23, 1910 (36 Stat., 592), relating to assignments of homestead entries in reclamation projects, I have to advise as follows:

A number of homestead entrymen, within the limits of reclamation projects, whose entries were otherwise assignable under the act of June 23, 1910, supra, had been required to conform their entries to farm units prior to the time when they might submit proof of five years' residence, improvement, and cultivation upon the claims, or, where final proof had been submitted, had their entries conformed to farm units before they were able to effect assignments under the act of 1910; nevertheless, after such conformation they, in apparent good faith, executed assignments and received valuable consideration therefor, which assignments have been rejected by this department as not authorized under the terms of the act of June 23, 1910.

Namely, the innocent party, the party who believed that under the act of June 23, 1910, he had received an assignment, who is down there with his wife and family and made a home, who has paid valuable consideration to the original homesteader, now comes in and asks the Government to give him the same consideration that he believed he was honestly entitled to under the act of June 23, 1910.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me make this suggestion: The trouble with the departmental letter is that it does not state the situation. Whoever wrote the letter had not read the law. The letter says:

A number of homestead entrymen within the limits of reclamation projects, whose entries were otherwise assignable under the act of June 23, 1910.

Now, let us read the act of June 23, 1910. Under it an entry, or part of it, is assignable after a man has made final proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation. What do they mean in the department letter by "otherwise assignable"? There is no assignment possible until the man has made proof, and when the department talks about entries being otherwise assignable they evidently had not read the law.

Mr. RAKER. My friend from Wyoming misses the entire point when he passes by the fact that the homesteader provided for in this bill had resided five years, cultivated five years, made final proof, that he believed that he had a right to the assignment, and it had not been conformed to the reclamation project farm unit before final proof.

Mr. MONDELL. If there was any homesteader who had lived five years, cultivated five years, made final proof, he could assign under the act of 1910 and would not need this act. The only homesteader you are seeking to save is the homesteader who had not made proof prior to the time he assigned proof that the had performed cultivation and maintained residence.

The man who can come under this provision is a man of this sort. The gentleman knows perfectly well what the operation is under the reclamation law. When the farm unit is determined upon the entryman is called upon to conform.

Mr. RAKER. He does not conform until the order is made.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me finish my statement. He is called upon to conform. Many entrymen did not conform and continued to hold their entire entry, notwithstanding that they were called upon to conform. On the other hand, many entrymen did conform. Entrymen in my State conformed four or five years ago, without getting a penny for their excess acreage. On the project in the northern part of my State all of the entries were, I believe, conformed, and I do not think any entryman ever got a penny for his excess. But there were a lot of gentlemen who did not conform. They did not want to conform. They wanted to hold on and get the benefit of the values of the excess land. Then, to help them, we passed the act of 1910, and I think it was a good act. It did relieve those who had hung on in spite of the fact that they may have been called upon to conform. We relieved those by saying that if they lived on the lands long enough to make final proof of residence and cultivation they could assign the entire entry or any excess above the farm unit as a matter of course. I imagine there were some gentlemen who for some reason or other did just what many others did—conform—when they were called upon to conform. The entryman has not conformed to a farm unit until he performs the act required. These men had conformed in some cases. In some cases it is questionable whether they had, as a matter of fact, conformed; but whether they did or not, they had not made final proof. Therefore they had not brought themselves under the law of 1910 in any way——

Mr. RAKER. But this does not relieve those people.

Mr. MONDELL. And when the department talks about "otherwise assignable" I can not understand what they are talking about.

Mr. RAKER. This applies to those who made final proof, just as the gentleman is talking about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, they made final proof when? They made final proof after they assigned. If they had made final proof before they assigned, they would not be here asking this legislation, because they would have been authorized to assign by the law of 1910. They assigned and made final proof later. It is true the gentleman does not propose to relieve anyone who has not up to the time of the passage of this act made final proof, although that is rather indefinite.

Mr. RAKER. Surely not.

Mr. MONDELL. They made assignments before they made final proof. On what possible theory could a homestead entryman make an assignment under the law of 1910, or under any law, prior to making final proof? How could he imagine he had the right to do so?

Mr. RAKER. That is not the condition of this bill, and it does not apply to it. There is no need of discussing it on that ground, because these people made their final proof, but the reclamation project had been required to conform before they made their final proof.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to know if the House can be held up indefinitely under the rule in this way?

The SPEAKER. The House can be held up until some gentleman demands the regular order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. RAKER. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. MANN. I notice the gentleman was not able to say how many cases this act, if passed, would apply to.

Mr. RAKER. I am not.

Mr. MANN. That he did not have the number with him, but he knew of two cases?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice the report of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior says a number of homestead entries, and that in the report of the committee this language is used:

> In many instances, however, after making proof or about the time of making proof, such entrymen, acting under supposed sound advice, assigned and shrewd business men and bankers advanced money to intending purchasers fully believing that these assignments were within the law.

Can the gentleman ascertain how many of these assignments were made and whether this bill is for the purpose of protecting these "shrewd business men and bankers" who advanced the money to purchasers, and who undoubtedly hold mortgages on this property, when if they had had any common sense at all they would have known that the law did not provide for that?

Mr. RAKER. There is a great difference in that. We find many bills before the committee all of the time where there have been thorough investigation and examination and where men thought they had titles and find now that they have not. We relieve them. There was one case, but I do not remember the name of it, that had gone to the department. The department has ruled against a woman who has spent in the neighborhood of $3,000 upon improvements, and there are others. I did not gather the names, because I did not think it was necessary.

Mr. MANN. What interest have these shrewd business men and bankers who advanced money in this now?

Mr. RAKER. None that I know of. As a matter of fact, the men who advanced the money thought the title was good.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman must have had some information or he would not have put that in the report.

Mr. RAKER. I took it from the statement of those who seemed to understand it.

I say that was the statement, that the parties advised the committee that business men and others believed that the title was good, that people felt that way, and that is the reason that that language is used. I have no knowledge of any business men having had anything to do with it in any way.

Mr. MANN. I understand; the gentleman would not have any knowledge except what was given before the committee. I think we ought to have information as to the number of these cases, and if the gentleman has a memorandum——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill should be given more full consideration, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

## PAYMENT OF DRAINAGE ASSESSMENTS ON INDIAN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13133) to provide for the payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to approve the assessments, together with maps showing right of way and definite location of proposed drainage ditches, made under the laws of the State of Oklahoma upon the allottees in Salt Creek drainage district No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to pay the amount assessed against each of said allotments: *Provided*, That said assessment shall not exceed $15 per acre on any allotment or portion thereof; and there is hereby appropriated for said purpose, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,183.39, to be immediately available, the said sum to be reimbursable from the rentals of said allotments, not to exceed 50 per cent of the amount of rents received annually, or from any funds belonging to the said allottees, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That in the event any allottee shall receive a patent in fee to an allotment of land in any lawfully constituted drainage district within the State of Oklahoma before the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed as herein provided, the amount remaining unpaid shall become a first lien on such allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited on the face of each patent in fee issued and the amount of the lien set forth thereon, and the receipt of the Secretary of the Interior, or of the officer, agent, or employee duly authorized by him for that purpose, for the payment of the amount assessed against any allotment as herein provided shall, when duly recorded by the recorder of deeds in the county wherein the land is located, operate as a satisfaction of such lien.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question or two about this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. While the title of the bill would seem to cover payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Oklahoma generally, as I understand it, the bill is only intended to apply to one particular drainage district.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes, sir; that is all.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman have any objection to having the title fixed so it will indicate what the bill really is?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No. Let me interrupt the gentleman——

Mr. MANN. It is not intended to apply to any case except this one?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That is all. Let me make this explanation.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman a question or two, if he will permit me, and then I do not care what explanation he may make afterwards. Is this assessment already made?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It is made, so far as the district is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Has the assessment been made upon these Indian lands?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That is, it has not been assessed, but it has been indicated——

Mr. MANN. Well, the bill says to approve assessments made upon the allottees. Now, have assessments been made or is it intended to approve assessments which may be made?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I stated, assessments have been made, but I do not object to a change in the language.

Mr. MANN. Has the assessment been made?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Upon these allottees?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do they make assessments upon Indian lands, upon all the lands embraced in the area, regardless of the fact that a portion of them are Indian lands and they can not collect assessments in those cases?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. They assess them in view of payment by the Government, and they do not start the work until they get the appraisement. I will state this, Mr. Speaker, that I did not draw this bill. This bill is identical with the bill referred to in the letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Senate, and I introduced it without any change except as to the amount. I had a letter from the drainage commissioner, I believe, of this particular district, who informed me that they had $21,000 instead of $20,000, and I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that I expect to offer this amendment: On page 2, line 4, to make it $21,183.39 and to add the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. MANN. Now, the gentleman stated this bill was identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. With the exception of the amount.

Mr. MANN. This bill was not referred to the department for a report. There is no report upon this bill, but attached to it is a letter contained in the report on the Senate bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Senate bill was introduced, I think, July 15, 1913—anyway it was in 1913—and at that time they had secured a partial investigation as to the valuation according to the benefits derived, and the bill was introduced in the Senate making it in round numbers $22,000. Since that time they have completed the calculation of assessments upon all the land, and therefore the amount ought to be $21,000 instead of $20,000.

Mr. MANN. As I understand this bill, it is practically a copy of the law in Thirty-seventh Revised Statutes at Large.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Practically a copy of the law offered by Mr. FERRIS and passed June 3, 1912, for the district of Sacs and Fox in the same county, I think it was. These must be special acts, because these are not assessed until a statute

like this is passed. I think the gentleman is correct about the change of title.

Mr. MANN. I think it is desirable to have the title indicate something near what is contained in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman is correct about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been read.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "$," strike out "20" and insert "21"; and in the same line, after the figures "39," insert the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that it makes any difference, but I would like to say to the gentleman it is entirely unnecessary to insert in a bill of this kind "to be immediately available."

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Possibly that is true. That is like repealing laws in conflict herewith. I would ask the gentleman to suggest the change in the title.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the title be amended so as to read as follows.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:
"To provide for the approving and payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Salt Creek Drainage District No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla."

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KENT, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two weeks, on account of illness in his family.

BRIDGE AT BATON ROUGE, LA.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13985) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Baton Rouge Bridge & Terminal Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, its successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided, however,* That reasonable rates of toll may be charged and received and no rate for passage of a single passenger on a railroad train shall exceed 25 cents.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all of section 1 after the enacting clause, as follows:
"That the Baton Rouge Bridge & Terminal Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, its successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906: *Provided, however,* That reasonable rates of toll may be charged and received and no rate for passage of a single passenger on a railroad train shall exceed 25 cents."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:
"That the time for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1913, to be built across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., is hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from date of approval hereof."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMSON. The committee has instructed me to recede from that amendment. Is it proper to withdraw the amendment or ask that it be disagreed to by the House?

The SPEAKER. It is proper to have it disagreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I fail to catch the suggestion of the chairman as to what the committee directed him to report.

Mr. ADAMSON. The committee desires that the committee amendment reported shall be disagreed to by the House for this reason: The War Department, when it reported on that bill to the committee, supposing it was the original proposition, suggested that we substitute for the bill merely an extension. We did that. We find that the people concerned desire the new bill, which does not include one or two of the provisions that were in the old bill; and because they were in there the enterprise failed.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I read the original bill, my attention was attracted to the part providing for the levying of tolls not to exceed a certain rate.

Mr. ADAMSON. That still goes in.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that provision new to this bill or is it a part of the old measure?

Mr. ADAMSON. A part of the old measure and retained in the new bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the chairman what is the practice as to levying of fares or charges by private corporations over these bridges which Congress authorizes? They do not come under the provision of the interstate act, because they are not common carriers.

Mr. ADAMSON. The general bridge act provides that where tolls are to be collected the Secretary of War shall regulate the amount to be charged. This bill is not in conflict with that. It simply says the maximum shall not be above 25 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is in conflict only so far as it limits the amount?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes. They can not go above 25 cents for each passenger.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee wherein this bill differs from the bill that has expired by limitation of time?

Mr. ADAMSON. On the demand of the local authorities the committee incorporated in the bill a provision that the railroad should also construct a bridge for pedestrians and vehicles in order to accommodate the public. As the railroad did not find sufficient inducement to do that, it could not find capital to finance it, and the public authorities have withdrawn that demand. They have informed the committee through their representative that they do not demand that, but are willing for that bridge to be constructed for railroad purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is a very unusual thing to insert a specific toll provision in one of these bills, because under the general law the Secretary of War has authority.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir. They have that in the case of the Memphis bridge, and I think two or three bridges probably on the Mississippi River.

Mr. MANN. I do not think we put it in in the case of the Memphis bridge.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; it is in the Memphis bridge act, as there is a bill now pending to amend it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. The Memphis bridge was built under the general law.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is a bill now pending to amend that.

Mr. MANN. There may be a bill now pending, but we refused to insert in the McKellar bill for the Memphis bridge a provision in reference to tolls.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is not the one I speak of.

Mr. MANN. They may have had one before the general law was passed.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I think there should be some good reason why it should be done.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I do not insist on it. I am perfectly willing to risk the Secretary of War in that respect.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me as long as the committee recommended an amendment we have the right to assume it was the amended substitute that was likely to be up for consideration instead of the original bill, and the gentleman had better ask unanimous consent to pass it over, so that we will have a chance on the original bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. The author of the bill does not insist on a maximum at all. I do not object to eliminating it.

Mr. MANN. I examined the substitute bill in this case, as in many others, where the complete substitute is presented, and

if gentlemen who have bills drafted or reported then want to entirely change the matter when it comes before the House I think we should have a chance to examine the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman from Illinois understand that the committee now recedes from the amendment or substitute?

Mr. MANN. I understand they desire to recede, but I understand that I read the substitute and examined it, supposing it was coming up, and the committee now, as a matter of surprise, recedes from that and proposes to bring something else up. I think the House should have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman desire the bill should be passed over?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is perfectly satisfactory, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOUSTON). Is there objection to the request that the bill be passed on the calendar without prejudice? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER NEAR WELDON SPRINGS LANDING, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Let us have the bill reported, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, in St. Charles County, Mo., subject to the provisions of the act of March 23, 1906, be, and they are hereby, extended to permit construction of said bridge to begin within one year from the date of the approval of this act, and to extend for three years from the date of the approval of this act the time for the completion of said bridge.

With a committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, on page 1, and lines 1, 2, and 3, on page 2, and insert the following:

"That the time for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the St. Louis & Western Traction Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, in the State of Missouri,' approved March 4, 1913, is hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from March 4, 1914.

"SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] how far Weldon Springs Landing is from the mouth of the Missouri?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 miles. I think it is 30 miles or 25, the way the river runs, to the mouth of the river, and this Weldon Springs Landing is 8 or 10 or 15 miles above St. Charles.

Mr. MANN. Are there any springs there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Speaker know the depth of water in the Missouri River at this point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Missouri River at that point is deep enough to float the *Grand Republic*. There is plenty of water. The springs used to be considered medicinal springs. There is no town there that amounts to anything. This bill has been in here and has been renewed three or four times. That rose out of the fact that the company that undertook to build this electric road from Kansas City to St. Louis went out of business, and a new company has gotten hold of it, and I think they will build the road this time. It ought to be built.

Mr. MOORE. I am very much obliged to the Speaker for that information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE ARECIBO RIVER, P. R.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12117) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River, near the city of Arecibo, P. R.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12117) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River, near the city of Arecibo, P. R.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the government of Porto Rico be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate two bridges and approaches thereto across the Arecibo River, near the city of Arecibo, P. R., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what has become of the Senate bill?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not remember. I guess it is still in committee.

Mr. MANN. I guess it is up in the gentleman's committee room.

Mr. ADAMSON. I guess it is.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he had better pass this bill over momentarily and send up for it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman mean to pass the Senate bill instead of this one?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well——

Mr. MANN. The Senate has passed an identical bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think we had better pass this one.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it is not courtesy to the other body when they pass a bill for us to pass one just like it and send it over. They have to ask to have that bill returned to them. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask that this bill be laid over for a few minutes and send up for the other bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that this bill be passed over momentarily until I can send up to the committee room to get the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over momentarily. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION STATION AT BALTIMORE, MD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11625) to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11625) to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 29 of the public building act approved March 4, 1913, providing for an immigration station at Baltimore, Md., is hereby amended so as to increase the limit of cost from $280,000 to $600,000.

With a committee amendment as follows:

On line 7, strike out the figures "$600,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$550,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I am a member, had a public hearing in Baltimore on this bill providing for an immigration station there. While the committee was there a number of arguments were made before it in behalf of the bill, and several questions were asked by different members of the committee. Some questions asked by me have been made the subject of an editorial in the Louisville Times, one of the leading journals of Kentucky. This editorial wholly misstates my position on the important subject of immigration. I would like to address the House now, if I could, so that I might, as speedily as possible, correct in this public manner the injustice which the Times has done me, but, as you will observe, I am suffering from severe hoarseness, rendering it impossible for me to do that. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in order that I may state the facts as they are and explain my position.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purposes indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, during my public service, covering a period of a good many years, I have rarely made a reply to a newspaper criticism; and during my service of

nearly eight years in this body I do not recall that I have in a single instance taken any of its time to reply to anything that a newspaper has said about me. I recognize that it is the peculiar function of the newspapers to criticize the public acts of public officials, and I concede that they have rendered and are still rendering a great public service in that field. I want to say also that, as a general rule, I have found the great newspapers of the country, including the Louisville Times, just and accurate in their discussion of public servants, usually refraining from intentional misstatement of facts. But, Mr. Speaker, the Times editorial embodies such a gross misstatement of what has actually occurred that I feel that I owe it to myself and to my constituents to correct it in this manner.

I do not mean to say that this editorial is the outgrowth of malice. I do not know who wrote it, and I can not think of any event of the past or contingency of the future that might have inspired it. I have the pleasure of the personal acquaintance of some of the chief owners of that paper and hold them in the highest esteem, and I feel confident that nothing would appear in it by their direction that would be unjust or unfair to me, or to anyone else for that matter. If this had been the first editorial in the Times misrepresenting my position, I would perhaps have been less impressed by its injustice; but there was another one which appeared in the same paper early last month which was likewise a misrepresentation in part of what I had said. While I am about it, I want to straighten that out also. On the 4th of last February, while the Burnett immigration bill was pending in the House, and while the House was considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] relating to Asiatic immigration, I made a few remarks on the amendment. The next day the Times contained the following editorial:

"TOMMYROT."

It is comforting, at first glance, to learn from Mr. LANGLEY, of Kentucky, in his official capacity as a Representative in the Congress of the United States, that the "Japanese war scarce is all tommyrot." Some measure of this comfort disappears, however, when Mr. LANGLEY proceeds to the unfolding of the reasons responsible for this categorical, if not authoritative, utterance.

It was to be hoped that Mr. LANGLEY had knowledge, concealed apparently from the administration, that Japan, under no circumstances, can be induced to undertake war with the United States. Disappointingly enough, it is made clear from Mr. LANGLEY'S statement in full that he is not possessed of such knowledge, but of the phamdool and flamboyant belief that licking Japan will be the easiest proposition imaginable.

Mr. LANGLEY generously concedes that Japan might take the Philippines. Naturally enough, he outlines no plan by which they could be easily retaken, since better-informed students of military affairs than Mr. LANGLEY are devoid of such knowledge.

Japan, he is sure, will never land an army in this country, and, if she did, Mr. LANGLEY is certain that it would never get farther than Kentucky. It is to be inferred, though it is not asserted, that Mr. LANGLEY and his constituents would in that event run it into Bitter Creek, where all of its officers and men would perish miserably.

The American Navy, Mr. LANGLEY argues, is superior to Japan's. Which is a patriotic expression of opinion. It is yet to be demonstrated that it is an assertion of fact.

But, whether fact or not, this much is true: Japan, with its navy and transport service, can land an army of 200,000 men in this country before the Atlantic Fleet could reach Pacific waters. To oppose such an army there are some 30,000 Regular troops, the half-trained militia, and the untrained and unequipped volunteers. It might well be that Japan would see fit not to make such a move. If she did, there would be nothing to prevent its successful execution, and the Pacific coast would pay the penalty.

Assuming, however, that Japan did not invade America. What would there be to prevent her taking the Philippines, Hawaii, and Alaska?

To recover them, the United States would practically have to double the strength of its Navy, and to create both an army and a transport service, which would take years and millions, and which, when done, would leave the United States no better off than before, since Japan has neither the money nor the territory requisite for adequate reimbursement.

What Mr. LANGLEY has to say "listens" well until dissected. The action of the Democratic majority in the House on the same day that Mr. LANGLEY was being delivered of his oration "listens" better the more it is dissected.

If war with Japan should ever come, it will be something more than a practice cruise for the Navy and an all-day outing for the Regulars, the Militia, and the Volunteers. If it does come, this country will no doubt prepare itself to pay the full cost of success. But the part of statesmanship, which, in the last analysis, is but educated patriotism, demands that no unwarranted act on the part of this country shall make it possible. That was the view taken by the House majority and by such members of the minority as Mr. MANN. In the adoption of this view it is to be noted with satisfaction that another Kentuckian, SWAGAR SHERLEY, played a leading part. In this instance, at least, it may be ventured that Mr. SHERLEY is more nearly right than Mr. LANGLEY.

So much of this editorial is based on things that I did not say and the inferences to be drawn from it are so likely to cause my position to be misunderstood, that I am going to reproduce from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (See p. 2823) my entire remarks on that occasion, which were quite brief:

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES]—that is, I am opposed to ingrafting it on this bill—for two reasons. In the first place, those who are in a position to know, and in whose judgment I have the utmost confidence, say that the adoption of such an amendment will probably defeat the bill, and being anxious to see it enacted into law, and as speedily as possible, I shall vote against the amendment, although I am in favor of the purpose which the gentleman is seeking to accomplish and I would heartily support it as a separate proposition. I shall vote against it for the further reason that those who are in the confidence of the administration say that the adoption of such an amendment would embarrass the efforts that it is making for an amicable and honorable settlement of a perplexing international question. I am in hearty accord with the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished leader of the minority.

It is true that I belong to a political party not in sympathy with the domestic policies of the present administration, but, as the distinguished Secretary of the Navy recently said, it is the duty of every American citizen, regardless of politics, to sustain the head of our own Nation in any controversy with a foreign power. This is not a political duty, but a patriotic duty. Woodrow Wilson is a Democrat, but he is the President of all the people now, and William Jennings Bryan is the Secretary of State of all the people now, and we must assume that in dealing with this question they are actuated by the highest and most patriotic motives, and that they will handle it in a manner befitting the dignity, honor, and prestige of our Nation; and so long as they do, no partisan motive or advantage should be permitted to swerve us in the slightest from our duty to our country. [Applause.]

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I can not permit the opportunity to pass of saying that I for one am growing weary of side-stepping the Japanese question. I do not close my eyes to the ever-darkening shadow of this Asiatic peril. I do not mean the shadow of grim-visaged war, for I think that phase of the situation is much exaggerated. I mean rather the menace of the industrial war which, unless we take steps to prevent it, is inevitable as a result of the industrial awakening among the teeming millions in the Orient who are responding with alarming rapidity to the touch of the spirit of this progressive age. I hope the promise given here to-day by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and others, that a separate measure dealing with this question will be brought before us at an early date, will be faithfully kept; and when it is, I hope to have the privilege of discussing it further. I do not know how other gentlemen may feel about it, but, speaking for myself alone, I do not think we have anything to fear about a war with Japan. Gentlemen who are alarmed on that question should remember that Japan is in no financial condition for such a conflict, and that we have a much more powerful Navy and many more people. Therefore they could not hope to cope with us either upon the sea or upon the land. I do not think there is the slightest danger of them sending an army of invasion into the United States; but if they should, and if the line of march should happen to extend through Kentucky, I think I can safely promise you that the army will never get any nearer to Washington. [Laughter and applause.]

It will be observed that I said nothing about the "Japanese war scare" being "all tommyrot." However, if what I did say about growing weary of so much side-stepping of the "Japanese question," and so much exaggeration of the probability of a war with Japan amounts to saying what the Times says I said, I am willing to let it go at that. I said nothing whatever about the Philippines. I did not even hint at them; so that a considerable portion of the criticism of me in this editorial is based upon the assertion that I said something which I did not say. At first it occurred to me that the editorial might have been based upon an inaccurate press report of my remarks, but, upon reading the editorial more carefully, and especially this language:

It was to be hoped that Mr. LANGLEY had knowledge, concealed apparently from the administration, that Japan under no circumstances can be induced to undertake war with the United States. Disappointingly enough, it is made clear from Mr. LANGLEY'S statement in full that he is not possessed of such knowledge, but of the phamdool and flamboyant belief that licking Japan will be the easiest proposition imaginable.

I must conclude that the writer of the editorial was familiar with my "full statement." And that makes out pretty nearly a prima facie case of intentional misrepresentation.

With some of this editorial I do not desire to take issue. Indeed, I concur in the logic of a part of it, and if its statement of facts and its inferences had been fair and accurate, I should probably have no criticism to offer to any of it, although I think the editor's estimate of what he terms "the half-trained militia and the untrained and unequipped volunteers" is wholly at variance with the splendid history of our citizen soldiery, for their intrepidity and valor constitute the real bulwark of our liberties. Let but a single bugle call sound the warning of danger to our country from a foreign foe and they would rise up by the millions from our hills and valleys and plains until even 200,000 Japanese, if the Times is correct about their ability to send that many, would look in comparison like a detachment of Texas Rangers on dress parade. The editor evidently does not understand that our standing Army is merely the nucleus of our military establishment and is not, even in a nominal degree, the measure of our military power. But, Mr. Speaker, Japan knows these things; and that is why I said what I did. The editorial pays a deserved tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and to my colleague, Mr. SHERLEY, and commends the House majority for the action taken upon the amendment, but it seeks, by innuendo at least, to make it appear that I opposed their view and the action of that majority, when quite the contrary was true, as my vote and my language quoted above conclusively show. Of course my statement that an invading Japanese army would not get nearer Washington than Kentucky was only a pleasantry. The House so understood it at the time

and, so far as I am advised, everybody else so understood it except the writer of this editorial.

Although I spoke facetiously, I really felt, as I happen to know that many others feel, that there has been too much truckling and concession and not enough genuine Americanism practiced in handling our diplomatic affairs with Japan. I would also have been well within the truth if I had said that whenever Japan decides to make war upon this country—a thing which, in my humble judgment, she will never dare to do—the people of Kentucky will be found ready, as they have ever been in our country's wars, to do their full share in maintaining the honor of its flag. And if I had spoken frankly the sentiments that were in my heart I would have gone further and said that millions and millions of patriotic American citizens, proud of the traditions, conscious of the power and jealous of the prestige of our great Republic, were growing weary of the un-American policy of "watchful waiting" in handling matters "of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence," as our President puts it. I might also have said that a great majority of our people were longing for a return to the good old days of Republican American administration, and to have some one again at the helm of the ship of state with the indomitable courage and patriotic Americanism of a McKinley or a Roosevelt, or of some of the other matchless commanders in chief of our Army and Navy which the Grand Old Party has furnished the Nation, so that outrages upon our citizens would be swiftly redressed, rendering it unnecessary for the Texas Rangers to go upon foreign soil and bring back to his heartbroken family the mutilated remains of an American citizen, or for our ambassadors to make apologetic speeches in foreign courts, or for us to trucklingly yield up to the avarice of a rival foreign power the benefit of America's incomparable achievement, costing $400,000,000 of our people's treasure. But I refrained from doing this for the reasons stated at the time. Whether I did my duty then I shall leave for others to decide.

But, Mr. Speaker, returning to the main question, I would have allowed this editorial, incorrect and unfair as it was, to pass without notice if the Times had stopped there. It did not do so, however. On March 13 it contained the following editorial:

A KENTUCKY BOYCOTT.

Congressman JOHN W. LANGLEY reports the discovery that a secret organization in Europe has boycotted Kentucky. He says that in Austria and several other countries a warning bulletin has been issued and spread broadcast bearing the caption, "Don't go to Kentucky." He says maps are being distributed throughout Europe with certain States printed in black, and that Kentucky is sable-hued on the aforesaid map.

Mr. LANGLEY is considerably peeved over the prospect of losing the citizenship of such persons as might come to Kentucky if they were not influenced by these warning posters to stay away. He says it is a notorious fact that too many immigrants remain in the cities where they arrive—New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. He deplores the fact that the immigrants do not hasten to Kentucky.

Kentucky has been fortunate in the class of immigrants that have sought homes within her borders. It is doubtful if there is another State in the Union which can boast of so clean a record in the matter of immigration. The immigrants who have settled on Kentucky soil have in the main been of honest, thrifty, and sturdy stock, and they have distinguished themselves as good citizens.

There is a class of people, however, which contributes nothing to the welfare of a State, and Mr. LANGLEY might curb his impetuosity while he takes a look at the riffraff which drifts in from southwestern Europe. If these people are the object of his commiseration, then it might be said that the Kentucky boycott is a blessing.

I am sure that everyone who reads these remarks will be surprised to learn that this rather remarkable editorial had alone for its foundation the following: The mayor of the city and several other prominent gentlemen delivered short addresses to our committee at Baltimore. One of these was Mr. W. H. Manss, vice president and general manager of the Southern Settlement and Development Organization. I quote the following excerpts from the printed report of his address (see printed hearings No. 13) containing a reference to the matter which has been made the subject of this editorial:

Mr. MANSS. * * * Our organization is not for private purposes. We have nothing to sell and nothing to buy. We simply want to advance the interests of the South. The question was asked by my friend from Grand Rapids as to why the immigrants did not go on farms. There are two reasons, perhaps, condensed into one. The first is that there is a map circulating throughout this country showing all States southeast of the Mississippi River printed in the blackest ink of the printer, and at the end of the map are these words: "Do not locate here; they are unfair and unjust, and you do it to your disadvantage."

Mr. LANGLEY. Who does that?

Mr. MANSS. I am not here to state publicly; but that map exists, and I think Mr. Powderly has one in his possession, and those maps are circulated amongst the people of Europe. Consequently the people of Europe, as well as the people of the United States—and I say this for shame, because I should know something about the work—do not know what the resources of the South are. * * *

Mr. LANGLEY. Could you get me one of those black maps?

Mr. MANSS. You can get one from Mr. Powderly.

Mr. EAGAN. You are not for the literacy test?

Mr. MANSS. No; I do not think it is a true test. I think education is not the standard of morality.

Mr. BELL. What test would you prefer?

Mr. MANSS. I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. PRESTON. Let everyone come in who is healthy.

Mr. KREIDER. You do not believe in spending several million dollars in building a railroad in Alaska?

Mr. MANSS. I think there is something in that, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. LANGLEY. Let them build a railroad down South.

* * * * * * *

Mr. LANGLEY. But the question is, Do you think a new immigration building will help the agricultural development of the State?

Mr. BELL. What about the Japanese? Would you want them to come in?

Mr. MANSS. No; you can keep them in California. Now, the tendency is to take the immigrants out into the congested cities, when we ought to send them into the South to settle on those 188,000,000 acres of land which can be bought at a very low price. We need more people to work our farms, and we ought to have such facilities as will induce the boats to come here with their passengers and freight, and we need such facilities of rail and water as to enable these people to go into the South, Southwest, and Southeast portions of the country. Baltimore is the natural port of entry for immigrants. Unless we have adequate facilities for landing immigrants the steamship companies will not bring their passengers here.

Mr. SMITH. What percentage of immigrants remain in the city after landing?

Mr. MANSS. In the year 1912, out of 135,000 immigrants who were booked as farmers, 2 per cent landed on farms, while 98 per cent went to cities.

Mr. SMITH. Why was that?

Mr. MANSS. Because they landed at ports where the call of the congested city was greater than the call of the farm, where they were grabbed hold of by speculators; and they remained in the cities rather than go to the farms. According to recent figures, less than 27 per cent of the total population of the United States is now on farms or in cities of 1,000 inhabitants or less.

Mr. BELL. Do you not think that some of these men are incorrectly booked at the point of embarkation?

Mr. MANSS. No; we find that the bookings are practically correct. Many of them come over here intending to go on farms, but they follow the call of the city. I wish you could see some of the letters that have been written by people who want to get back on the farms because of the misrepresentations and the inducements of work in the cities that were made to them when they arrived.

Mr. LANGLEY. You think there are greater advantages offered them in the cities than in the country, and therefore they choose the city?

Mr. MANSS. Yes, sir; and if we could show them the advantages of a farm life, they would go to the farms.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is, if somebody does not show them the advantages of Baltimore first.

From the foregoing it appears that the discussion took a rather wide range, and that both the membership of the committee and those who were addressing it were merely seeking to get at facts that were material to the general subject under consideration. My colleague, Mr. CANTRILL, and I were the only southern members of the committee who were in attendance. At the time Mr. Manss made the statement about the black map that he said was being circulated in Europe, warning immigrants against going to States southeast of the Mississippi River, my colleague was engaged in conversation with some one and apparently did not catch the remark. It struck me as a rather curious thing, and, as a southern Representative, I was naturally curious to know more about the matter, and feeling sure that the people of Kentucky would like to know the facts also, I asked the questions indicated. This is all that was said on the subject at that hearing except some friendly badinage of me on the part of my colleagues for being a Representative of "a black spot on the map," as they jokingly put it; and I have not at any time since then made a single statement regarding it that would warrant the comments in the Times editorial. Indeed, I have not given an interview on the subject at all, and if one has been published that justifies a single sentence in this editorial it is a fiction pure and simple. It is rather surprising, to say the least, that a Kentucky newspaper, and especially one with the standing of the Times, would so pervert the action of one of the State's Representatives in asking the questions I did about a matter that the people of the State would necessarily be interested in, as to put him in a false light, as this editorial does; and I shall be very glad indeed to learn that the Times has been misinformed as to the facts.

I can not expect a gentleman who is as busy as the editor of the Times must be to be familiar with what is contained in all the speeches of the delegation from his own State that appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the Times has contained on various occasions news items in its Washington dispatches showing that my position on this immigration question, ever since I have been a Member of the House, has been exactly the opposite of what this editorial represents it to be, and I think it would have been but fair for the editor to have made at least some inquiry before writing and publishing such an unfounded editorial. Only a little over a month before this editorial appeared I made some remarks in the House on this very question, and I am quite sure that some mention was made of it in the Kentucky papers, enough at least to make it certain that I did not entertain any such views as this editorial

states. I will insert these remarks here, as they are a complete refutation of the editorial:

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing the pending amendment. I am in favor of the paragraph as it stands. I voted against closing debate a few moments ago, however, although the motion was made by the gentleman in charge of the bill. I did this because I regard this paticular paragraph as embodying one of the most vital questions that has been considered in this Congress, and I am in favor of giving gentlemen on the other side of it full opportunity to be heard. It is a two-sided question, gentlemen, and we must concede that there is force in some of the arguments that are being presented against it. There is one thing that I am glad of, and that is that it is being treated as a nonpartisan measure, and I beg to suggest that perhaps the country might have been better off if such a rule of procedure had been adopted earlier in this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am as firm a believer as ever in the soundness of the fundamental tenets of the Republican Party, but I have never contended that it is free from error; and I question the eligibility to membership in this House of any gentleman who believes that his party is so constituted. If I were asked to point out what I regard as an error that my party committed while it was in power, I should reply that it was its failure, when erecting a tariff wall to restrict the coming in of the products of foreign labor, to also erect an immigration wall to restrict the coming in of the man on the job, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] would express it.

Mr. Chairman, the jewels of oratory have been quite abundant in this debate, but the jewels of consistency have been rare indeed. [Applause.] Some of the extreme protectionists have been the most vehement in their opposition to this bill. They want the products of foreign labor excluded, but they want the foreigners themselves brought in. On the other hand, some of the most vigorous enemies of protection who want competition with foreign products are just as vigorously opposed to competition with the foreign laborers themselves.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I can not yield. I have not time enough, even if I do not permit an interruption, to say all that I would like to say.

Mr. PLATT. Just one question.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, I will yield to my friend from New York for a short question.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman think it inconsistent for Democrats to want us to buy goods abroad and compel people to stay abroad and make them?

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, as to that, Mr Chairman, the gentleman knows that we do not often find Democrats consistent, anyway; but I will say that I do not think that we should admit either the goods made abroad or the men, women, and children who come here from abroad in greater quantities than we can assimilate with advantage to our own people. It should be remembered that most of them who come here cut wages to get a chance to make the goods here; so that the opportunities of our own people for employment are reduced whether the foreigners come here or stay on the other side and send the products of their labor over here. Consistency requires that if we give protection to the man who pays the wages we should also give protection to the man who earns the wages, which means, of course, restriction of imports as well as of immigration. If the one proposition is sound economically, the other is also. I could give many illustrations of the inconsistency of gentlemen on both sides of the House on these two propositions. For example, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is an ardent Republican and an orthodox protectionist. He never misses an opportunity to oppose competition with the products of cheap foreign labor, and yet he wants the cheap foreign laborer himself brought in.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is perfectly consistent——

Mr. LANGLEY. I think it is the height of inconsistency and that the gentleman is one of the brightest jewels in this crown of inconsistency.

Mr. BARTHOLDT (continuing). Because I want to make the newcomer a consumer in this country.

Mr. LANGLEY. Ah, but he becomes a competitive producer as well, and our experience has been that he produces more than he consumes, or, rather, that he takes more employment away from our own people than he furnishes employment to them by reason of what he consumes, and, besides, he must work to get wages to pay for what he consumes; so that we get the worst of it on that score, even if all the immigrants became desirable and ideal citizens of our country But, Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. On the other hand, there is my friend and colleague, Mr. BARKLEY, the ardency of whose Democracy can not be questioned and who, although a new Member, has already impressed his strong mentality upon this House. He pitched his advocacy of this bill upon his desire to protect the opportunities of his own people against the competition of the foreigner, and yet he is opposed to the doctrine of protection and supported the Underwood tariff bill, which, by increasing imports, has already thrown thousands of our people out of employment and will do the same thing to thousands more.

Mr BARKLEY. Will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly, since I have referred to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman know that imports have not increased since the Underwood tariff bill went into operation, and therefore that no one has been thrown out of employment on account of increased imports under that law?

Mr. LANGLEY. I have not the figures before me, and indeed I do not think enough of them are available yet upon which a comparable statement for any considerable period can be based. It is true that the revenues derived from imports since the bill went into effect are less than they were before, because the duties were lowered, but it is my understanding that the value of our imports since the bill became effective is greater than before for the same period. I have not seen the figures, but I have been told that taking the imports and exports for the months of December, 1912, and December, 1913, the balance of trade in our favor for the latter month was forty-five or fifty millions less than it was for the same month in 1912. In other words, we bought more and sold less abroad in last December under your Democratic tariff than we did during the preceding December under a Republican tariff, and that must mean diminishing employment and decreasing prosperity for our own people. But my friend and I will have an opportunity to discuss that more fully and more accurately at a later date.

Mr. Chairman, these inconsistencies to which I have been referring constitute, to my mind, a political paradox that I am unable to fathom. [Laughter.]

It was once the boasted shibboleth of a great party that "the gates of Castle Garden swing inward." Then it was pointed to as an evidence of prosperity, but the gates have swung so far inward and so wide as to create a national menace that calls for a drastic remedy. Instead of proving national prosperity as it did then, it now threatens denationalization. The enormous increase of immigration in recent years has already been fully discussed in this debate, and I would not go over the ground again even if my time permitted. A friend of mine who recently visited New York City, and who has made some investigation of this question, tells me that there appear to be more Jews there than there ever were in Jerusalem, aye, even in Palestine, in the days when that God-favored people were at the zenith of their ancient glory, and more Italians than there were in Rome when the Roman legions were conquerors of the earth. I do not mean to leave the inference that they are not all good citizens, but I mention this as an evidence of how liberal our Government has been upon this question of immigration and of the growing importance of it to our people.

It has been repeatedly charged in this debate that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and his followers are actuated by motives that are anything but patriotic and that they are seeking to force this measure through by appeals to prejudice. Mr. Chairman, I can not persuade myself into the belief that a monopoly of patriotism and pure, impartial motives is enjoyed by gentlemen whose districts include immigration ports or large cities or other territory where the foreign vote predominates or is potent, or who for other manifest reasons share the sentiments of that class of voters. Why not let us be perfectly frank and fair with one another and concede that, primarily, each of us is endeavoring to carry out the wishes and promote the interests of his constituents?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will permit me to proceed for two or three minutes longer. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I freely admit that I want these restrictions because a large majority of the people of my district want them and because I believe it will be to their interest to have them, and I concede the same high purpose to those who oppose the bill.

I hope I do not underestimate the weight of the arguments on the other side. I was greatly impressed with the eloquent appeal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] and the fervent words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I have listened with interest and profit to the arguments of many other gentlemen on that side of the question, but I remain unconvinced, for I still believe that, everything considered, the literacy test is the wisest and most effective method of dealing with the serious situation that confronts us.

Many gentlemen opposed to this bill have contended that there is no demand for such legislation, but none of them have undertaken to explain why, if that be true, that there is such an overwhelming majority of this great body, fresh from the people, in favor of it. My observation has uniformly been that when such a situation exists it is responsive to the demands of the people who sent them here.

That this literacy test will work hardships in individual cases, and will sometimes exclude those who would make desirable citizens, must be admitted; but we must also remember that oftentimes in the administration of the affairs of government such considerations must give way to the higher one of national expediency.

Of course, I had rather admit an illiterate patriot than an educated anarchist or disturber, and I wish it were practicable to segregate them on that basis, but it is not.

I would not in the least disparage the good influences that have been wrought by, nor minimize the deeds of valor and of patriotism that are recorded in the history of, the achievements of many of our foreign-born citizens. Many of them have written their names high upon the Nation's honor roll. All honor to these, and thrice welcome to those yet to come whose histories in their native lands give promise of such achievements here.

These are not the ones we seek to exclude, but rather those who come not here to stay, who have no sympathy with our institutions, who do not cherish and can not learn to cherish the sacred traditions of the Republic, who do not love and honor its flag, and who can not feel or comprehend the emotions in the bosom of the poet when he wrote:

> Breathes there the man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land!

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

In view of what I said on this and previous occasions, it is utterly beyond my comprehension how the editor can find warrant for his statement that I am "considerably peeved over the prospect of losing the citizenship of such persons as might come to Kentucky if they were not influenced by these posters to stay away," or, for the further statement, that "he (I) deplore the fact that the immigrants do not hasten to Kentucky"; and when the editor says, or seeks to leave the impression, as he does, that I want Kentucky to get "the riffraff which drifts in from southwestern Europe" he simply makes a gratuitous misrepresentation of my attitude, and for the protection of their friends and the public generally, I trust that his employers will insist hereafter that he either keep posted on current events or make some inquiry as to the facts before delivering himself of such wild and reckless comments, that are utterly without foundation in fact.

I welcome criticism of my views and actions as a representative of the people, because such criticisms are oftentimes helpful to public men, but there is a vast difference between criticism actuated by honorable motives and a desire to be truthful and fair and that which masquerades as criticism, but which is in reality bald misrepresentation. The one is commendable, the other contemptible. The one accomplishes good, the other is fraught with evil. The one is instructive to the people and is

welcomed by them, while the other is destructive of their best interests. Unfortunately, there is sometimes too much of the latter resorted to in the discussion of public men and measures, and particularly if there are political considerations involved. Such a disposition was manifested in the recent discussion of the immigration bill. I could cite instances where gentlemen, instead of submitting legitimate arguments, resorted to misrepresentation, abuse, and ridicule, which are the favorite weapons of those who can not sustain their position by argument. Sometimes they even sought to question the motives of those who disagreed with them, and went so far as to cast unwarranted reflections upon certain sections of the country whence those with whom they disagreed came.

An echo of this disposition is found in the reference of the Times editorial to "Bitter Creek," the writer evidently feeling that by the use of that term he was casting some opprobrium upon the section of country which I represent. And, Mr. Speaker, I could give other instances, if it were necessary, which illustrate the entirely erroneous estimate which people, because of their utter lack of knowledge of the truth, have of that rich and beautiful section of the country and of the noble, patriotic people who inhabit it. I do not feel called upon to defend them, because they do not need any defense, but I want to take advantage of this opportunity to say that we of the mountains have grown tired of the disposition of people in some other sections of the country to look upon ours as a missionary field, where opportunities for education and refinement are lacking and where ambition and stimulus for advancement do not exist. Locked up in its mountains are untold millions of wealth, now being rapidly developed, which will make it in the not distant future the greatest industrial section of the State. The country is dotted over with churches and schoolhouses and rare indeed is the case where opportunities for education and Christian teaching are not open wide to its people. And the people themselves are of that intrepid industrious stock who are God-fearing and law-abiding, and whose thoughts center in the welfare of their families and in devotion to State and Nation. They are mainly the descendants of those sturdy Saxon and Huguenot families who trekked across the Cumberland from Virginia, Tennessee, and North Carolina and settled there more than a hundred years ago, and who by their indomitable will and perseverance have changed it from the wilderness it was then to what it is to-day, one of the fairest and most prosperous sections of our great Commonwealth and soon to lead the vanguard of its progress.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me take occasion to say further that I resent the common practice of newspaper writers and novelists who after a brief visit to the mountains think they know all about them and their people, and drawing on their imaginations for most of their facts proceed to take up an isolated character which in their hurried trip they may have run across and whose counterpart can be found now and then in almost any section—even within the shadow of this Capitol—and proceed to feature that character as if a typical example of the average conditions existing there. To those of us who were born and reared there and who know all about the country and the people these performances would be extremely funny, not to say ridiculous, but for the injustice and harm they sometimes do.

In recent years thousands of former citizens of other States have established their homes and business in our midst. To those who are law-abiding, as most of them are, and who come with honest purpose to invest and live and thrive among us we have extended a cordial welcome. We have been glad to have that class of people come and stay, and there is room for still more like them. I want to repeat in this connection what I said in the House of Representatives more than six years ago:

> Far be it from me, Mr. Chairman, to raise my voice against the kind of immigration which helped and to-day is helping to make this country the wonder of the world. Let us welcome those who join us in the great work in which, under the providence of the Almighty, this Nation is engaged. Let all who will enter who earnestly prize the boon of American citizenship; whose labor, in whatever field, will make for the progress of our people and the greatness of our Republic. We have room here for many more millions of this kind. But let us put up the bars against the great hordes that come for what spoil they may find, and whose coming can but serve to make harder the lot and heavier the burden of the American workingman.

As I have already pointed out, the Times editorial seeks to leave the impression that I am complaining because what he terms the "Kentucky boycott" is keeping the immigration from southwestern Europe out of Kentucky. Fortunately, I am on record on that question. In discussing the subject of immigration in the House of Representatives on January 20, 1908 (see p. 1589 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that session) I used this language:

> We have not done enough as yet in the way of restricting immigration. Other measures must be devised to check this influx of undesirable people. Something more will have to be done to keep the pauper labor of other countries from invading this country. The Government has in its possession irrefutable proof that the invasion of the country by the hordes of unskilled and illiterate denizens of southern Europe is encouraged by their respective Governments, and in almost every instance the object of such classes is to accumulate all they can and return to their native land, but under no circumstances to acquire American citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, if the editor of the Times does not know it, he will find by examining the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I have voted in favor of restricting immigration every time this body has voted on it since I have been a Member of it. I voted for the Burnett bill in the last Congress, and I voted to pass it over President Taft's veto. I voted for the Burnett bill which recently passed the present House and which will shortly pass the Senate, according to present indications, and if President Wilson vetoes it, as current report has it that he will, I shall vote to pass it over his veto. I repeat that it must be conceded that the literacy test will work a hardship in some instances, but these will be nothing to compare with the hardships that will be spared our own people by its adoption. If there were a better test that would accomplish the desired result, so essential to the preservation of our standard of citizenship, I should be glad to vote for it as a substitute; but those who have made an exhaustive study of the whole situation say that none other is practicable, and I agree with them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. On this bill?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. No; not on this bill.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let us hear what the gentleman has to say to show why we should increase a building limit from $280,000 to $550,000.

Mr. BRYAN. It may be as an emergency.

Mr. MANN. It is not an emergency.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the Secretary of the Treasury or anybody connected with the financial end of this Government, or the Department of Commerce, made a report as to the necessity of this increase in the matter of expense?

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that question, if I have a chance.

This report is brought into the House after a personal investigation by almost the entire Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The committee went over to Baltimore and looked into the situation, and I think the committee is unanimous in the opinion that the conditions of affairs existing at Baltimore in the immigration station are a national disgrace, and should be speedily remedied.

The conditions existing in the hospital there are almost unspeakable. To require people coming into this country to be quartered as the immigrants are quartered at Baltimore when they arrive there sick is absolutely inhuman, and should no longer be tolerated in a civilized country like this.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much of the $280,000 has been expended?

Mr. CANTRILL. As I understand it, practically none of it; because it seems that the authorization made in the last bill was not nearly sufficient for this project.

Mr. MADDEN. Were the committee of the opinion that $280,000 would not be adequate for the work?

Mr. CANTRILL. The committee are of the opinion that that amount is not sufficient. The Supervising Architect accompanied the committee to Baltimore upon this trip, of which I spoke a while ago, and looked over the ground. Upon his advice, his suggestions, and his plans, the committee have brought in this report, without any diversity of opinion, so far as the committee are concerned.

I wish to say further to the House that the immigration station at Baltimore now is practically a monopoly of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The immigration pier there is controlled by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. No immigrant ship, no ship bearing immigrants, can land at that station without the consent of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and no railroad can get in to that pier to reload these immigrants and distribute them out over the country except to trains of the Baltimore & Ohio

Railroad. It is a Baltimore & Ohio monopoly, and it is the purpose of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds not only to provide suitable quarters for immigrants who come to this country, in order that they may have some fair conception on arrival of the country to which they are coming, but to break up this monopoly of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The station proposed in this bill is to be built upon Government ground. It is to be built upon a site on a portion of old Fort McHenry. A railroad is now being constructed by the city of Baltimore, and I have on file letters from the mayor of Baltimore in which it is stated that this urban railroad will have access to this station that we propose to build, so that every railroad going into Baltimore shall have the use of this urban road to put its trains into the immigration station.

Mr. MADDEN. Is Fort McHenry the ground that we turned over to the city of Baltimore for a public park the other day?

Mr. CANTRILL. I understand some action has been taken along that line. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] can answer that.

Mr. MADDEN. In view of the fact that we turned it over to the city of Baltimore for use as a public park, is it proposed now to take it away from public-park purposes and use it for other purposes?

Mr. CANTRILL. Only a very small portion of it, where this station is to be constructed, down on the bank, where a pier is to go out to the channel.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it proposed by the city of Baltimore to make a charge to the various railroads using this connecting link to the immigration building?

Mr. CANTRILL. I can not answer that. Of course, if a charge is made, it will apply to all railroads alike, whereas now it is absolutely a Baltimore & Ohio monopoly.

But I want to say to the House that, laying aside these financial considerations, every Member on this floor will agree with me that the present condition of affairs ought not to continue to exist. And if Members would go over there and look at this location I am sure no one would hesitate to make this appropriation for this immigration station.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what site and what proposal the Committee on the Public Buildings and Grounds had in mind when they reported to this House a little over a year ago, in the public-building bill, an appropriation of $280,000 for this purpose?

Mr. CANTRILL. The gentleman from Baltimore [Mr. LINTHICUM] is familiar with that situation, and I will ask him to answer that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. After the gentleman from Kentucky completes his remarks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will await the statement of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], but I will make this suggestion to the gentleman from Kentucky: Several bills have been reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in which there is an absence of any recommendation from the head of the department in the report. I do not find in this report any recommendation whatsoever from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury or any other departmental head.

Mr. CANTRILL. I will state that the report should have covered that, so far as this particular bill is concerned. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Commissioner of Immigration is heartily in favor of the construction of this station. The commissioner at Baltimore, Mr. Stumph, accompanied us on our trip over there, pointed out many of these troubles which I have mentioned, and there is absolutely no doubt that the department heads are heartily in favor of the construction of this station.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think the Members of the House have the right to have the departmental heads and the various Secretaries go on record on matters of this sort?

Mr. AUSTIN. They did go on record in this case and in the other cases mentioned.

Mr. MANN. We have a right to have their recommendations included in the report.

Mr. AUSTIN. It seems that they were omitted from this report.

Mr. MANN. We ought to have them. The committee ought to present them so that they can go into the RECORD in connection with this debate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I fully agree with the gentleman on that proposition.

Mr. MANN. I have known instances where the head of a department orally recommended some legislation, and then afterwards severely criticized Congress for enacting it. He probably forgot what his position was upon the point. It seems to me in all matters of this sort we ought to have in the record somewhere a statement from the head of the department.

Mr. AUSTIN. Those statements are in the custody of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and should have been included in the report. Why they were omitted I do not understand.

Mr. MANN. These bills are all referred to the Secretary of the Treasury for a report, are they not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly; and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury is returned with each one.

Mr. MANN. The committee does not ordinarily act on them until it gets the report?

Mr. AUSTIN. Never. Every bill referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is referred to the Treasury Department for a report. In this case there was a report from that department, and in the hearings a representative of the department appeared before the committee favoring the legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the Secretary of the Treasury made an estimate upon which such an appropriation can be based?

Mr. AUSTIN. He has made such an estimate, and that is the reason there is a change in the figures. They have decided there is a necessity for a hospital building at Baltimore, whereas the original program did not provide for anything except an administration office and a detention building.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no such estimate or recommendation embodied in the report.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; on the second page of the report in the printed hearings and in the letters on file in the committee room, which should have been embraced in the report.

Mr. MADDEN. It is against the rules of the House to make appropriations without estimates being made for them by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will say to the gentleman that there is an estimate in this case and in every other case reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Through the neglect of some one they do not appear in the report that accompanies the bill now under consideration and other similar bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to state that one reason for increasing the amount recommended by the committee last year was the necessity of erecting a hospital building. In the estimates printed on page 2 it is stated to be $110,000; but I notice in the last paragraph of the report it approves the plan and suggests that the hospital conditions sufficient to meet all requirements can be acquired for less than the amount stated by the Supervising Architect, and thereupon you cut down the total appropriation $50,000. It follows from a reasonable inference that you will cut down the allowance for the hospital building from $110,000 to $60,000. That only accounts for $60,000 out of the $270,000 increase.

Mr. AUSTIN. The original proposition carried with it the idea that 1,000 or 1,200 immigrants arrive per day at the Baltimore station. On investigation it was found that they unloaded as high sometimes as 3,000 immigrants a day. Under the rule requiring the examination of the entire shipload of immigrants in one day it was found necessary to enlarge the building. In addition to the cost of the immigration station, there was a necessity for the enlargement of the detention building and other buildings on account of the increase in the number of immigrats received at that port.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says there have been instances where they have brought in 2,000 immigrants a day.

Mr. AUSTIN. Three thousand.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it appears that there are only 23,596 arrivals in the entire year. The occasions must have been very rare when the ships brought in 3,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not a question of the number delivered at a port during 12 months. In fixing the size of the immigration station the maximum must be the total discharge in a single day, and that total, according to the hearings on page 13, quoting from the local immigrant agent at Baltimore, is that at the port of Baltimore as many as 3,000 immigrants have been landed in one day.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware that there is every prospect that the immigration bill passed by the House will be reported in the Senate this week and passed with the restrictive literacy clause in it. Is not the gentleman proceeding on the theory that there will be unlimited immigration as in the past? If the bill should become a law with the literacy test in it, does the gentleman think there will be any instance where Baltimore will have 3,000 immigrants landed in one day, or 2,000 or 1,000?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think so, because we see in the public papers that President Wilson will veto the immigration bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. GARDNER. I thought the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] asked unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. He did; but somebody reserved an objection, and the discussion has been going on since.

Mr. GARDNER. I am waiting for the gentleman from Kentucky to yield to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts in a moment.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman can not yield to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. I can if the Speaker says I am entitled to the floor; and I have it.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman can not yield the floor to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then I will give it up. Now, Mr. Speaker, on page 13 of the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the Supervising Architect, Mr. Wenderoth, made this statement:

Mr. WENDEROTH. Yes, sir. The first intention was to build a detention house for the accommodation of immigrants overnight. It would include a few rooms for the sick, but would not be a complete hospital. It would also include administration offices. When the last public bill was in the course of preparation, Mr. LINTHICUM asked the Supervising Architect if it would be possible to use a part of the Fort McHenry Reservation as a site and asked for a revised estimate. We continued to estimate on the previous basis—that is, to assume that the examination work would remain at the pier—and we merely estimated for the detention house with administrative offices. That was our mistake. The whole scheme, as then contemplated, was a mistake. The plan of Mr. Stump, the resident commissioner, was not to have a portion of the layout at Fort McHenry and the receiving station at the pier over a quarter of a mile away. As I say, we continued to estimate on the previous basis, except that we found it necessary to figure for a larger detention house. On taking up the sketches recently we visited Baltimore and made a personal inspection of the situation. Mr. Stump also made an inspection of the various immigration stations at Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. With Mr. Stump's assistance we laid out a scheme for an immigration station at Baltimore which embodies the experience of this Government in immigration work since the starting of the Ellis Island station. This scheme consists of an administration building; an examination and receiving building, with the necessary detention rooms; a hospital; power house and landing pier. Taking Mr. Stump's data, we found that it would require a layout, the cost of which, with the necessary filling and grading of the approaches, would come up to about $600,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. Including the pier?

Mr. WENDEROTH. Yes, sir; it also includes the original site and a right of way. The net amount, therefore, would be $600,000 less $33,250, or $566,750. The size of an immigration station is not determined by the total number of immigrants that are landed in one year, but by the total number that may be landed in one day. The policy of the Immigration Service is to put through in 24 hours all the immigrants who arrive in one vessel, or who are landed during 24 hours. Therefore it is the individual landing that fixes the size of the station rather than the total number of immigrants that are landed a year. If the port receives, or lands, at one time, say, 2,000 immigrants, the station must be larger if there is but one landing a week than the station which lands 1,000 immigrants twice a week. The immigration port at Baltimore, Mr. Stump informs me, has landed as many as 3,000 immigrants in one day. Of course, if they had a landing every day as large as that it would bring the yearly total up to that of the Ellis Island station, or 900,000 immigrants. At the present Baltimore has three landings a week, I believe.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Sometimes two and sometimes three.

Mr. WENDEROTH. The first of the schemes we laid out recently was on the basis of a maximum capacity of 1,200 immigrants at one landing. That is rather small. It does not allow sufficiently for the normal increase in arrivals at the port. We feel that the receiving and examination building should be large enough to handle in 24 hours from 1,800 to 2,000 immigrants. That, of course, means a certain relative size for the hospital building, the detention quarters, and the other accommodations.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky some questions. How long has there been an immigration station at Baltimore?

Mr. CANTRILL. I can not answer the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. Since about 1906?

Mr. COADY. There is no immigration station there now controlled by the Government.

Mr. GARDNER. There is no public building there, of course. Can the gentleman tell me how many immigrants come into Boston?

Mr. CANTRILL. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman tell me the value of the plant in Boston?

Mr. CANTRILL. I can not.

Mr. GARDNER. Has the gentleman ever been there?

Mr. CANTRILL. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not profess to be a walking encyclopedia of these immigration facts.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but the gentleman reported the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What was the question the gentleman wanted to have answered?

Mr. GARDNER. "Mr. CANTRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submits the following report," and so forth.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARDNER. Very well. When was the immigration station founded in Baltimore?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not remember exactly how many years ago; but Mr. John W. Garrett, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, began the service there, I suppose, some 25 years ago.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman know how many immigrants come into Boston in a year?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I have it right here. I will give it to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. GARDNER. I say Boston, not Baltimore.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Sixty-six thousand three hundred and eighty-nine came in last year.

Mr. GARDNER. And does the gentleman suppose that the whole plant at Boston is worth $100,000—the whole immigrant station?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; I think not, but I think there has been about $375,000 appropriated for it there, and they will need about $75,000 more.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. Ever since they began to have a little immigration trickling into Baltimore there has been one continuous appeal for legislation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman recall how many bills we have had in reference to the Baltimore immigration station, and have passed within the last three or four years?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not remember, because the jurisdiction has changed from the Committee on Immigration to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. COADY. Does the gentleman know what position Baltimore occupies respecting the number of immigrants that come there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. COADY. Is it not about fourth or fifth?

Mr. GARDNER. About half the number land in Baltimore that land in Boston, and Boston is second. New York has about 1,000,000 and Boston 75,000 and Baltimore about 35,000.

Mr. COADY. Is not our position about fourth on the list?

Mr. GARDNER. Third, I think.

Mr. MOORE. No; Philadelphia is third.

Mr. MANN. What did the immigration station cost at Philadelphia?

Mr. MOORE. Originally $250,000 plus $105,000 which we obtained subsequently, or $355,000 in all; and now we want $15,000 more, which we can not get at this time. But I do not urge this if Baltimore needs it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. The gentleman says that Philadelphia is asking for $15,000 more?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is to complete the inspection building?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But that does not give a hospital or hospital facilities of any kind?

Mr. MOORE. No. We have a detention house and a main administration building.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That does not include any hospital?

Mr. MOORE. No.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I merely want to suggest to the gentleman, so that the committee will have the full information, that the appropriations made two years ago did not include any hospital facilities, nor did they put up there a new administration building, as we are compelled to do in Baltimore. They used an old residence which was transformed into an administration building at a cost of about $20,000, so if they can get the additional $15,000 it will make about $370,000, and then they will not have hospital facilities and will not have a complete plant.

Mr. MOORE. I want the gentleman to clearly understand that I do not in any way want to set up any competition as between the stations in Philadelphia and Baltimore. Baltimore badly needs a station. There is no question about that. The original appropriation of $250,000 in Philadelphia was made to cover buildings and grounds. We could not get through with $250,000 and subsequently there was an appropriation of $105,000 to cover what we have to-day. That is to say, we bought grounds with a building on it, which building has been turned into an administration building, and we have since erected with

the additional money a detention house, but we need this little house out on the pier, which will cost $15,000.

Mr. GARDNER. This Baltimore immigration station question has been going on for some years. The Immigration Committee used to consider bills of this sort. Finally the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee took jurisdiction. Our committee was perfectly willing, because Mr. BURNETT, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, was also acting chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He looked into the matter very carefully; he looked into it from his knowledge of the immigration situation; and he decided that $280,000 was sufficient.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I ask the gentleman to wait until I get through with my statement. Here is what is bound to happen in the Baltimore immigration station: Officials are busy three days a week and for three days a week they have little to do. For pretty nearly half the year work is mighty slack down there in Baltimore. That, at all events, is my recollection of the situation down there. I do not say that they do not now and then have an enormous crowd come in there.

The fact that the present immigrant station is on the Baltimore & Ohio tracks has nothing whatever to do with the question. Either the immigrant's destination is Baltimore or else he comes with a through ticket to his destination, wherever it may be. It happened that originally the station was placed on Baltimore & Ohio land. Now, obviously, they ought to have new buildings; but $280,000 for buildings to take care of an immigration of only 33,000 a year is amply sufficient. I think that it is more in proportion than Boston has ever had and more in proportion than Philadelphia has ever had. What excuse does the committee give for this increase to $550,000? Because there is need for a hospital, they say. But a hospital will not cost $270,000, Mr. Speaker. The committee only allows $60,000 for the hospital, anyway. The Government architect's estimate for the hospital was $110,000. The committee thinks that it can be built cheaper than the estimate. They have cut down the gross appropriation by $50,000, because, as they tell us, the hospital can be built for less money. That leaves $60,000 as the estimate for the hospital. Yet they come before Congress asking for an increase of $270,000, just about double the amount which last year we decided to be sufficient. Think of spending $550,000 for buildings to take care of a trifle of 33,000 immigrants per year.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] I desire to say this amount of $550,000 is reported upon the recommendation of Mr. BURNETT, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and chairman of the Committee on Immigration. In the last discussion before the committee, after the committee had in person inspected this station at Baltimore and found the condition of affairs there inhuman and a disgrace to this country, when we came back and discussed it in committee Mr. BURNETT stated to the committee that he thought $550,000 should be recommended for the construction of this station. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, so far as I am concerned as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, if evils exist in your city similar to the conditions we saw at Baltimore, there will be no trouble whatever in securing my recommendation and support to get an increased appropriation for your city, because I believe that those people, strangers and foreigners, coming into this country, that it is important that their first conception of our country should be favorable. We stood there and saw a ship unload, and I want to say to this House that it was a high class of citizenship that came in a few weeks ago that are deserving of the protection of this Nation; at least they are human beings and are entitled to be treated better than we treat our horses and cattle on the farms, which treatment they do not secure under present conditions. Now, gentlemen, read this report, and I am frank to admit that this report is not as full as it should be, but I do say this as a Member of this House that I would rather have the recommendation of Members of Congress who as Members have gone in their official capacity to look over this proposition—I would rather have their recommendation upon which to base my vote for legislation than the report that can be secured through a department that has this matter in charge.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Would the gentleman set his opinion up as to the cost of improvements against that of the Supervising Architect's Office?

Mr. CANTRILL. The statement has already been made upon the floor that the Supervising Architect accompanied the committee upon this tour of inspection, and in a report he calls for $600,000, which is all set out in an itemized report. We desired to have the Commissioner of Immigration go over there with us, but when we got there we received a telegram from Commissioner General Caminetti saying that he was in favor of the proposition, but he could not attend on account of other business. I am frank to admit the gentleman from Illinois is correct in saying that these facts ought to be set out in the report, but as a Member of this House I would pay more attention to recommendations by the Members of this House when they go in person to look over a proposition and come back and report as to what the facts are than to any report that may be made by a chief clerk or the head of a department down here. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen, read this report here. It is a question of humanity; it is not a question of dollars and cents entirely:

> The present facilities are totally inadequate, a reproach to the Government, and offer no basis for comparison.

I see upon the floor of this House gentlemen who investigated this proposition—the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Kentucky, and other gentlemen who went over there and who know that this condition of affairs is a disgrace to this country.

As a result, during 1913 the contagious hospital connected with the present station treated 294 cases of measles, of which number there were 47 deaths. There were 47 deaths in that hospital out of 294 cases. Treated under proper conditions, treated under the conditions that would exist in your home and mine, and in the homes of the people of this country, the deaths would have amounted to practically nothing, and yet 47 out of 294 people died there in the year 1913 from the disease of measles alone. And with a condition of affairs like that existing, should we stand here and haggle about the expenditure of a few thousand, or a few hundred thousand, dollars to make this receiving station in accordance with the dignity of this Government, and to give these people, these high-class immigrants who come through this station to help us build and develop the country, a favorable impression of the country? Of course the gentleman from Massachusetts has the right to object, and I am not complaining about that, but I want to say to him that if he has conditions that need remedying, or these other gentlemen who have immigration stations in their districts have such conditions, let us bring them up to the point where they will be remedied. That is what the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is trying to do in this district and in other places of the country. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] said the other day, in connection with this subject, the people in this district are working in buildings that are inhuman, unfair, and unjust, and it is the purpose of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as fast as we can, to build great department buildings in order to take these people out of their cramped and unhealthy quarters, where they are subject to loss of life by fire, to health conditions that are unfair and unjust to any American citizen; and it is the purpose of our committee to remedy these conditions as far as possible. And I want to say to the gentleman that I would be glad to cooperate with him to remedy conditions in his city if there are conditions similar to those which exist at Baltimore.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman argues as if the only question at issue was whether we are to leave conditions as they are now in Baltimore or go to this enormous expense. That is not the proposition at all. We have already appropriated an adequate sum of money to remedy the situation in Baltimore. We gave $280,000 to take care of that little stream of immigration which comes trickling into that port. Two hundred and eighty thousand dollars is more in proportion than is given to the great ports of Philadelphia and Boston to take care of their immigrants. Oh, conditions may be bad, gentlemen. They may be very bad when a man has only one meal a day. That may be reason for giving him two more meals a day, but when you have given him three meals a day that is no reason for giving him six. We have appropriated very handsomely to take care of that trivial immigration of 33,000 that comes into Baltimore every year, with half of the year none coming in at all to speak of. Three days a week the inspectors will sit in the administrative building and twiddle their thumbs and contemplate this magnificent building. For $280,000 we can give them leather-armed chairs and as handsome a building as you would wish to see. I admit that the accommodations for immigrants in Baltimore is insufficient. We have appropriated liberally to cure that condition. To say that for the trivial immigration which enters that port this Government must spend the gigantic

sum of $550,000 is like offering a bareheaded man two hats at the same time to keep his head warm.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. No; I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland, if he wants to explain this matter.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say in reference to this bill that I took this matter up with the Secretary of Labor and told him of the deplorable condition at the Baltimore immigration station. He took the matter up with the Secretary of the Treasury, and then the Secretary of the Treasury directed the Supervising Architect to take action in this matter.

I then went before the Supervising Architect and asked him to prepare drawings for these buildings, and he went to Baltimore and looked the situation over. He came back and said that he could not prepare drawings for the necessary buildings in Baltimore for any such sum as $280,000. I then asked him to figure on the very lowest he could build the immigration station for, and he sent in this estimate, which it took him some little time to prepare. It has been prepared with great care, and it sets forth that it will take $600,000 to build that immigration station complete. And let me say in this connection that there is not an immigration station on the Atlantic seaboard that is complete. The one at Philadelphia is not complete, the one at Boston is not complete, nor is the one at New York complete, although they have spent a great deal of money. This will be the first immigration station that will be built within the appropriation and complete. Every time they have had to come back and ask for more money.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman how he knows this station will be built within the appropriation?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Because the Supervising Architect assures me that he proposes to make the drawings, and no contracts will be given out except they are within the appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. They do that every day, and yet they exceed the appropriations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I can only say what the Supervising Architect tells me. I am not an architect, of course. Now, the gentleman from Illinois asked if we knew how many bills had been introduced. Yes; there have been three bills. The first bill was $130,000. They went to Baltimore without consulting the immigration commissioner there at all, or his assistant, who is now immigration commissioner, and they bought a lot adjoining a fertilizer factory, a lumber mill, and a railroad switch, and they proposed to put a detention hospital for these immigrants there. The matter was taken up with the architect, and he said that he had no idea that we had not other accommodations there. He had thought we had everything else we needed except a detention station. And then we took the matter up, and it was referred to Mr. Taylor, the Supervising Architect, who told us what it would require to build a proper immigration station. And he seemed to have gone on the old basis that all we wanted was a detention house and heating plant, and for that he estimated $280,000. Then we had the present architect go there and look over the ground and get down to the making of the drawings, which seems to be the test in these matters. Merely telling you what it will cost does not seem to amount to anything. When they get down to make the drawings they are compelled to come up to the captain's office and tell you what it will actually cost.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What has become of this lot that the gentleman described?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that. That lot is to be sold, and the amount—$13,250—covered into the Treasury. That is taken out of this appropriation. Therefore this appropriation is lessened by just that amount.

Mr. MANN. As I recall it, the original authorization was $130,000 for the site and the building.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is right.

Mr. MANN. While they spent a small amount of money to purchase a site, we, since then, have presented to the Immigration Service a fine site without expense to them. The Government has done that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Except for the right of way out through some private land, which will cost not to exceed $20,000.

Mr. MANN. We have given them a fine site.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think it is an admirable site.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think it was rather a mistake to give them such a fine site, so they would then want to construct a monumental building there, and have an administration building to cost $50,000, a hospital to cost $110,000, and a detention building to cost $275,000, in order to comport with the surrounding park?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to say to the gentleman that there is nothing at all monumental or ornamental about these buildings. They are to be built of brick, concrete, and steel. You can not put up a monumental building for any such sum of money. The gentleman from Illinois knows that.

Mr. MANN. Quite the contrary. I should say, for the administration work they have over there it is entirely useless to have an administration building that will cost $50,000; but then I do not set up to be an expert.

Mr. LINTHICUM. You can not construct a very fine building for $50,000; not a building of any size.

Mr. MANN. You can construct a much finer one than I can afford.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The object is to have a complete immigration station that will take care of immigrants for years to come.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for one more question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How many men are to be employed in the administration building?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know how many men.

Mr. MADDEN. How many have they in the immigration service in Baltimore?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know. I presume they have a great many when the immigrants are coming in, and when they are not coming in I do not suppose they have so many.

Mr. MADDEN. What would be the maximum number of men employed there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Not knowing, I would not like to say. It would be merely guesswork on my part.

Mr. MADDEN. You can put up a building about four stories high, 150 feet long, and 50 feet wide, of the best kind of construction, for about $35,000 to $40,000; and if they have not a very large number of men there, I submit that an administration building of that size would be totally too large for the work that is to be done there.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It seems to me that the gentleman must be wrong in his estimate as to the cost of the building.

Mr. MADDEN. I am a builder, and I have built a great many buildings.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have had some experience in the building line myself.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me, if there are not more than 25 men—and it looks to me as if 25 men would be a large number of men to have employed regularly at this station—a building to accommodate 25 men for office work could be erected for $10,000, and it would be all the building that ought to be constructed and as monumental as it ought to be.

Mr. COADY. The cost of construction there is much greater than at the places the gentleman has in mind, for the reason that it is right on the water front, and no doubt a lot of piling will have to be done.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know what you can construct for $10,000, but I do know that the rough brick building here—not so very large, either—would cost $10,000, and that about as ordinary as anything can be. I am the chairman of a commission that is putting up a school building in Maryland, and that building, 300 feet long and 150 feet wide, will cost $400,000. I think the architect ought to decide the matter of cost. It is merely guesswork on our part.

Mr. MADDEN. The whole question to be decided in my mind is whether you have a sufficient number of men to be housed in an office to justify a large expenditure of money for the construction of an office. That is the whole story.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The architect went into this very thoroughly, and he thinks he is right.

Mr. MADDEN. Somebody ought to know how many men you have employed in this service over there.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Probably we ought to know, but we do not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to make at least an observation or two.

When the Baltimore immigration station was authorized a few years ago, they subsequently came before Congress and asked for an appropriation for the building for the station, and after working themselves up to fever heat they arrived at the

idea that they could ask for as much as $130,000 for the site and the building, and that was granted. Well, Baltimore is so near, and the terrapin and the canvasback duck are so good—I have been over to Baltimore with some of these gentlemen and I know what you get when you go there—that in course of time they got to the point where they concluded they could ask for an increase from $130,000 to $280,000, and that was not hard to get. It got into a public building bill and it went through without any difficulty. And yet gentlemen saw that the limit was not reached.

Mr. MADDEN. The terrapin was better.

Mr. MANN. The terrapin was still good, and the canvasback duck was still good. So they reached the conclusion that they might get $600,000. First, there was an increase from $130,000 to $280,000—something more than double—and they thought they could double it again, and now they ask an increase from $280,000 to $600,000. I congratulate the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on the fact that, after going over to Baltimore and viewing the surroundings and taking dinner and luncheon at the club, they were able in an economical streak to insist upon cutting the amount down from $600,000 to $550,000, which only makes it an increase from $280,000 to $550,000—a little less than twice as much.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COADY. I just want to say to the gentleman that the bill of fare did not contain any terrapin or canvasback duck.

Mr. MANN. Then the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will have a great grievance against the gentleman who took them over there.

Mr. COADY. According to the gentleman we might have got a million dollars if we had done that.

Mr. MANN. They would have a grievance if, when these Baltimore gentlemen take their friends over to Baltimore, they do not give them the best that Baltimore possesses. I have been on some of these trips. The Government lost a lighthouse station once by taking me over there. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not my colleague think, in view of the fact that this amount has increased all the way up from $130,000 to $280,000 and up to $550,000, that if the bill were allowed to rest for a few months we would get it up to a million dollars? It might be wise to let it rest, so that when the building is constructed you will in the end have a monumental building. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. If we could pass the bill and put in an appropriation that was irrepealable, a provision requiring that this appropriation should stand, the quicker we do it at $650,000 or $750,000 the better we would be off. But whenever we pass one of these bills the canvasback duck and the terrapin will remain, and that, you know, will in a short time double the amount. My complaint is not that my friends interested in this legislation went over to Baltimore to view the sights, but that the rest of us were not invited. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to something here in this report. The gentleman should notice that all of this money does not go into buildings.

Mr. MANN. Which report is the gentleman reading from—the one which he filed or the one that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] filed?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is hardly fair for the gentleman to say that about a matter of misprint.

Mr. MANN. Here, I came into the House with a report upon this bill, filed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], and find after we get into the House and the bill is under consideration that the gentleman from Maryland did not file a report at all, although the RECORD indicates that he did.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I can not help it if I am so popular with the Public Printer that he attaches my name to a report when I did not make it.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman was fair to call it up before the House without explaining about it.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman from Baltimore to say some time ago that the city of Baltimore was going to build this industrial railroad.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. We are to build a belt-line railroad.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, I understand the road is to be built by the Government of the United States.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is now talking about the belt line, not this industrial railway.

Mr. MADDEN. What is this?

Mr. LINTHICUM. This is a little railway to bring baggage, and so forth, from the pier to the station.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, the United States Government is going to enter upon the building of another railroad. Not satisfied with the railroad in Alaska, it is going to build a railroad in Baltimore.

Mr. LINTHICUM. One hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars of this appropriation does not go into the buildings at all.

Mr. GORDON. Where does it go?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about this matter.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman where this $165,000 goes? Will the gentleman from Florida be kind enough to tell me where this $165,000 goes that the gentleman from Maryland refers to?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will, if the gentleman will contain his soul in patience.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not anything else but patience. That is the cheapest thing around there. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. One hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars, not $75,000, of this money does not go into buildings at all. It goes into incidentals that must be built if this immigration station is to be worth anything at all. Now, I will call the gentleman's attention to those items.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MANN. When we changed the site, was it not stated on the floor of the House that the new site would not be any more expensive to the Government than the old site?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not remember about that. If the gentleman says so, I will accept that statement as true.

Mr. MANN. Here is $165,000 suggested——

Mr. PAYNE. You might have called that up several weeks ago.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor? These gentlemen are going on with their conversation while I am attempting to speak. Here are the items: Limit for right of way, $20,000; site, $13,250; dredging and incidentals, $10,000; approach work and conduits, $25,000; wood sidewalk shelter, $4,250; industry railway, $2,500; steel and concrete pier, $50,000; power house, $40,000; making a total of $165,000. In addition to that the committee struck $50,000 from the estimate of the Supervising Architect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that anyone sitting in the gallery and not conversant with affairs on this floor might think that we had an aggregation of builders and supervising architects here. The Government has provided at some considerable expense an institution known as the Supervising Architect's Office of the Treasury Department.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not just now. That outfit has been charged with the duty of rendering estimates to Congress for buildings of various character. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is quite an expensive establishment. If committees can not put any confidence at all in the estimates of this bureau, or if Congress can not repose any confidence at all in the estimates of this bureau, we ought to abolish it.

We ought to do something with it, and we ought not to be paying out the hundreds of thousands of dollars a year that it takes to maintain the Supervising Architect's establishment.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would not preclude the membership of the House from questioning the recommendations?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all; but I would like to ask this question: Does the gentleman believe that a hospital building suitable for the purposes over there can be built for less than $110,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I would have to make a thorough investigation in order to determine that question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Exactly; and the Supervising Architect has made the investigation and has reported to the committee and to Congress that, in his judgment, it requires that much money.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asked my colleague if he believed that a suitable hospital could be built for less than $110,000. I ask him if he believes that it can be built for less than that?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am not an architect and not a builder. I would not for a moment set my judgment up against

the judgment of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. If I had believed it, I would not have voted to report this bill to Congress.

Mr. MANN. If that is true, why did the gentleman's committee make this report: Your committee approves the plan suggested, but believes that hospital accommodations sufficient to meet all requirements can be constructed for less than the amount named by the Supervising Architect. Why should gentlemen on the committee who know nothing about it overrule the recommendation of the Supervising Architect?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, we have members on the committee who do know something about building.

Mr. MANN. Produce them some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has had a great deal of experience; he made a suggestion and the committee adopted it. The committee thought that $60,000 would be ample. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he thinks that a receiving building such as is needed there—is he so conversant with the conditions, does he know the situation so well that he is willing to say that a building suitable for that purpose and for the necessities of the business can be constructed for less than $275,000?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman is addressing his question to me, I will answer that in a Yankee manner. Does the gentleman believe that the Supervising Architect's Office, which only a few years ago recommended a site and building be constructed at a cost of $130,000, afterwards gave an opinion that a full station would cost $280,000, is entitled to undue deference when it now says $600,000, all within a space of half the time that the gentleman and I have served in the House?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say that it is the idea of the Department of Labor and the idea of the immigration commissioner and those persons charged with the administration of the immigration laws to build at Baltimore a model immigrant station; to build there all the necessary appurtenances belonging to an immigration station; and this committee, after considerable inquiry and investigation, after a number of the committee—I think 10 or 12—made a visit to Baltimore and a personal investigation—and I will say to the gentleman that I did not go and did not get any of the terrapin that he talks about, which I regret—after these gentlemen made this investigation they reported unanimously that this building ought to be constructed, that it is a disgrace to this country, that it is a shame upon the civilization of this Republic that these conditions should be allowed to continue there any longer; and for that reason, acting upon the best information we have, upon the personal inspection of a majority of the committee, upon the statement of Government officials under oath to properly discharge their duties, and under the estimate of the building organization of the Government, your committee saw fit to report this bill. Of course, if Congress does not think the station ought to be built, it is for Congress to determine. We have done what we esteem to be our duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. I object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether he will let it go over without prejudice?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not see the gentleman on the Democratic side who said that he was going to object if I did not, and I told him that I should. I do not see how I can let it go over without prejudice under those circumstances.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to have the bill passed without prejudice.

Mr. GARDNER. I think I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

### BRIDGES OVER THE ARECIBO RIVER, P. R.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the bill H. R. 12117, to construct bridges across the Arecibo River, P. R., which was passed momentarily, I have now the Senate bill. I find that the Senate bill went to the committee after the committee had reported the House bill. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill S. 4145 and consider it in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 4145 and consider it in lieu of the House bill of a similar tenor. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 4145) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the government of Porto Rico be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate two bridges and approaches thereto across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: Line 5, page 1, after the word "river," insert the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, by inserting after the word "river," in line 5, the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 12117 was laid on the table.

### PATENTED LANDS IN YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to restore to the calendar the bill (H. R. 12533) to amend section 1 of an act of Congress approved April 9, 1912 (37 Stats., 80), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes," which was stricken from the calendar this afternoon on the objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The gentleman from Illinois is present, and has no objection to having the bill restored to the calendar at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12533 be restored to the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman has the privilege of restoring it himself.

Mr. RAKER. No; this is the second time the bill has been objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### PUBLIC BUILDING AT MEMPHIS, TENN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11747) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction of a public building at Memphis, Tenn.

The Clerk proceeded to report the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### PUBLIC BUILDING AT MONROE, N. C.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12169) providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000 for the completion of a post-office building now under construction in the city of Monroe, N. C., this same being necessary to carry out the original design for said building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. But we have not yet reached that point. As the gentleman from North Carolina is an expert grammarian, I would ask him whether he thinks the language "this same being necessary" is very good construction?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I think that language might be improved. I hope the gentleman has no objection other than that to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina is not only a distinguished and able member of the Committee on Appropriations, but he is a distinguished and able Member of the House. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Appropriations has consistently for many years fought the authority of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to make an appropriation or consider a bill making an appropriation, insisting in season and out of season that while the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has jurisdiction over bills authorizing an appropriation, it must be left to the Committee on Appropriations to bring in a bill making an appropriation. I want to ask the gentleman now if he is ready to reverse himself in other cases as well as in his own case?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that if a situation parallel to the one presented in this bill should come to the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina he would.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think if this bill passes that it would be possible for a bill to come before him which would present a parallel case?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not know. I would say in introducing this bill I had considerable difficulty in convincing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the emergency situation existing, and other gentlemen might find the same difficulty.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, is not the real difficulty this, that after a Member of the House becomes a member of the Committee on Appropriations it is impossible for him to get anything into an appropriation bill for his own district and he has to throw himself thereafter on the mercy of the other committee to obtain an appropriation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That observation does not apply to this gentleman, I would like to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think he is unduly modest in bringing this matter before the House, where the House can vote upon it instead of pursuing the usual method of members of the Committee on Appropriations, which is to have the bill pass the House and then go over to the Senate and have the item inserted in the Senate, where they will pass anything, and then have the House conferees agree upon it? [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have no purpose of doing anything of that sort.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is doing exactly the reverse, and I am seeking to compliment him on his leaving it to the mercies of the House. I think out of compliment to the gentleman there ought to be no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, how much is this additional appropriation?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Three thousand dollars.

Mr. MURDOCK. How much was it originally?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Sixty thousand dollars for building and site.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

### ARMY AVIATION SERVICE.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5304) to increase the efficiency of the aviation service of the Army, and for other purposes, with committee amendments, and with committee amendments amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5304 as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk proceeded to report the bill as amended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 44, noes 9.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 17, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to providing a building for use of said commission (H. Doc. No. 831); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting an item of legislation for sundry civil appropriation bill relative to the acquisition of square 143, Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. No. 832); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of bill to provide for publicity in the making of Government contracts (H. Doc. No. 833); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of channel to East Pass from Apalachicola River, Fla., by way of Crooked Channel, with a view to providing suitable ship channel (H. Doc. No. 834); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Keweenaw Waterway, Portage Lake Ship Canal, Mich., with a view to making a cut-off at Princess Point (H. Doc. No. 835); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10845) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend the proceeds arising from the sale and disposition of surplus agricultural lands and timber on surplus timber lands of the Spokane Indian Reservation, Wash., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 394), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10848) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 395), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10834) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 396), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10505) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made to Indians belonging and having tribal rights on the Morongo Indian Reservation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 397), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13581) for the relief of the landowners on the east bank of the Mississippi River

in the counties of Warren, Claiborne, Jefferson, Adams, and Wilkinson, in the State of Mississippi, and in the parish of West Feliciana, State of Louisiana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 390), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Ormond M. Lissak, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 391), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1005) to reimburse William Van Derveer, of Millboro, Va., for excess revenue taxes assessed against and collected from him, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 392), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6367) for the relief of the heirs of Edgar H. Bates, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 393), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 14660) permitting the Wisconsin Central Railway Co. and the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., its lessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Chippewa River at Chippewa Falls, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14661) to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 14662) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a major general in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 14663) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 14664) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14665) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: Resolution (H. Res. 444) providing for the inspection as to safety from fire of certain buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 14666) granting a pension to Clyde S. Houltry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14667) granting a pension to Lizzie Nichols Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14668) granting a pension to Martha J. Waldo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 14669) granting a pension to Celia Bulger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 14670) granting a pension to Annie Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14671) granting a pension to Rudolph Weidman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14672) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees of the Mare Island Navy Yard by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 14673) to waive for one year the age limit for the appointment as assistant paymaster in the United States Navy in the case of Chief Commissary Steward Carl H. Haggard, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 14674) granting an increase of pension to Calvin E. Boynton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 14675) granting a pension to Mary L. Alverson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GERRY: A bill (H. R. 14676) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Herbert O. Dunn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 14677) granting a pension to Lida Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14678) granting a pension to Christiana Oetting; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 14679) for the relief of Clarence L. George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 14680) for the relief of Daniel O'Riley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 14681) for the relief of Frances L. Snell; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 14682) granting an increase of pension to John Goodmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 14683) granting an increase of pension to Sophie M. Kinnicutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 14684) for the relief of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14685) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 14686) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14687) to appropriate a sum of money to Herman Rehn for injuries sustained while in the employ of the naval authorities of the United States at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14688) granting a pension to Charles B. McCoon; to the Commitete on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14689) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf; to the Committee on War Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorials of the South Easton (Mass.) Branch and the Matthew Thornton Branch, of Philadelphia, Pa., American Continental League, protesting against the repeal of the canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of the ninth congressional district of Missouri, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of the Women's Baptist Missionary Union, favoring amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of the St. Patrick's Alliance, of Passaic, N. J., and the George Washington Branch of the American Continental League, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 472 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of the Norwegian Luther League of Waseca, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Leipsic Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Ohio City, Ohio, and the Melbern Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Melburn, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War of the State of Illinois, protesting against amendment to Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay for retired volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-second district of Illinois, praying that the right of entry as second-class mail matter granted to a certain paper be investigated; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 353, International Association of Machinists, of Belleville, Ill., favoring passage of House bill 12740, the machinists' wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Frank Amschl and other citizens of St. Clair and Madison Counties, Ill., and of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Diehm Grocer Co., of East St. Louis, Ill., relative to fixing prices by the manufacturer on trade-marked articles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of the Waiters' Union and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Local No. 257, both of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of William H. Butler, Hugh T. McNeal, and Edward Woodson, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 13044, widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Colcord-Wright Machinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the bill to prohibit exclusive agency arrangements between manufacturers and dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles J. Mitchell, of Pine Lawn, Mo., and sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Warner Jenkinson Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 12303, exempting extract manufacturers from special tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against amendment to Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of the German Methodist Church and sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal-tools exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of A. Leland Straag and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Petitions of 20 citizens of Guntown, 75 citizens of Saltillo, and 40 citizens of Booneville, all in the State of Mississippi, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of sundry citizens of Fayette and Somerset Counties, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX: Petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, favoring rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of California, protesting against passage of Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of California, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of the American Trading Co. and the China & Japan Trading Co., of New York City, favoring passage of House joint resolution No. 173, relative to accounts of American citizens proving their losses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. E. Bong, of Corning, N. Y., favoring passage of Owen-Goeke bill to eliminate the time guaranty on gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rudolf Wenzel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, protesting against amendment to Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay for retired Volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the Irish-American Club of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against amending Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay for retired Volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of 765 residents of Providence and Cranston, R. I., and Local Union No. 421, Bartenders, of Newport, R. I., protesting against House joint resolution No. 168 and Senate joint resolutions Nos. 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Quonocontaug Grange, No. 48, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westerly, R. I., urging the passage of House bill 11897, known as the Bathrick bill, relative to rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial of the Roxboro (Mass.) Board of Trade, relative to New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. continuing ownership, etc., of Sound line service between New England ports and New York City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the International Molders' Union of North America, of Norwood, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War of Chicago, Ill., protesting against amending Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay for retired officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Boston Association of Photo-Engravers, protesting against passage of Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers, against Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the New York Navy Yard Painters' Association, relative to labor conditions at New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of various Spanish War veterans of New York, favoring House bill 13044, relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: Memorial of the meat inspectors at Cleveland (Ohio) Station, favoring amendment to Lobeck bill (H. R. 9292) relative to fixing maximum salaries of meat inspectors; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of the Hamill bill for retirement of aged Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Jacob Iller, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, of the State of Illinois, protesting against amendment to Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay for retired volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of sundry citizens of Vernon Center, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, favoring volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Maine Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring a bill to prevent the pollution of the water in lakes and streams; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Col. Augustus R. Rawham, of Bangor, Me., and other volunteer officers of the Civil War, favoring passage of volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of 315 citizens of Oil City, 55 citizens of Russell, 200 citizens of Warren, 150 citizens of Marienville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various manufacturers and jobbers of Keokuk, Iowa, favoring an amendment to Sherman antitrust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of the Presbyterian Advance, of Nashville, Tenn., protesting against increase of postal rates on religious publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of L. H. Crandall, of Ashaway, R. I., favoring increase of rates on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Laurel Grange, No. 40, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, favoring House bill 11897, the rural farms credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of F. Riedeen and others, against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of E. C. Johnson, A. O. Hassensall, J. Cadden, B. J. Bussing, W. J. Stahlschmidt, Philip W. Frey, C. C. Schreeder, Frank Elmendorf, Anthony Dietrich, W. E. Stilwell, John R. Brill, Conrad Haase, P. B. Fellwock, Peter Heberer, and A. W. Hartig, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut (Inc.), protesting against unlimited deposits in postal saving banks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Illinois & Chicago Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, of Chicago, Ill., opposing Senate bill 392, relative to pensions for Civil War soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Channing and Menominee, Mich., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Women's Jewish Club of Detroit, Mich., favoring legislation for prevention of floods; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of Frank W. Lane, of 1301 Waller Street, San Francisco, Cal., and 26 other citizens of San Francisco, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of E. T. Colton, of Providence, R. I., favoring House bill 13305; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of District Grand Lodge No. 1, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Swedish Lutheran Church of Newport, R. I., favoring erection of a monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, favoring rural-credit bill (H. R. 11897); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of J. W. Davis, of Providence, R. I., favoring House bill 12471; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of F. H. Peckham, of Providence, R. I., favoring House bill 7775, relative to Federal regulation of taking migratory fish; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the General Putnam Branch of the American Continental League, of Pawtucket, R. I., against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Diamond Machine Co., of Providence, R. I., relative to "Five-brothers bill"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. E. Putney, of Johnston, R. I., favoring change of law governing bank directors so as to allow cumulative voting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of various veterans of the Spanish War, of Rhode Island, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Lyons Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., against Underwood anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Tennessee and the German National Society of America, of Hohenwald, Tenn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from Robert Skudamore, of Sonora, Cal., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Sheet Metal Workers' Union, No. 307, of Meriden, Conn., and Peter J. McNerney and others, of New Haven, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Nathan Hale Camp, No. 1, Connecticut Division, Sons of Veterans of the United States of America, of New Haven, Conn., protesting against any change in the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Memorial of the Socialist Party of Dayton, Ky., indorsing policy of the President on the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of various Spanish War veterans of Illinois, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Washington Branch of the American Continental League of Perth Amboy, N. J., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of 10 business firms of Hailey, Idaho, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Moorhead, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the North Side Commercial Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland (by request): Petitions of 406 citizens of Baltimore, Md., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of J. A. Belcher and others, of Richlieu, Ky., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Alliance, Ohio, against House bill 12928, relative to compensatory time to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring a constitutional amendment forbidding polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Local No. 307, of Massillon, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14659) granting a pension to Emanuel Garber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of O. H. McAdams and 20 other citizens of Ada, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jerome Fisher and other citizens of Kirby, Ohio, against House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. W. R. Arnold and other citizens of Dunkirk and Kenton, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. C. Gibson and 24 other citizens of Marysville, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 17, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast set us very narrow limits of time. Thou dost require a great outcome of stewardship from our lives. Thou dost bring in immediate, striking, and startling contrast the demands of life. As the night and the day, so near together are the right and the wrong. We are in the midst of the perplexing problems of life; we feel our limitations, our weakness, our sin; we lament the strange lethargy that takes possession of our spiritual powers and holds us in bondage unto sin.

We lift our hearts to Thee, the author of life, the giver of every good and perfect gift. We pray that Thou wilt speak to us this day. May we hear the music of heaven in our hearts, and with glad wills may we turn to obey Thy will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 4019. An act to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky.; and

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4145) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11245. An act extending to the port of Providence, R. I., the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;

H. R. 12169. An act providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C.;

H. R. 12594. An act to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across Swinomish Slough opposite the town of La Conner;

H. R. 13133. An act for the approving and payment of the drainage assessments on Indian lands in Salt Creek drainage district No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla.; and

H. R. 13771. An act extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 746) for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Tarentum, and New Castle, in the State of Pennsylvania, and of sundry citizens of Struthers, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Byron, Brownsville, and South Byron, Wis., remonstrating against an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Matthew Thornton Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of Local Branch, St. Patrick's Alliance of America, of Passaic, N. J., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Rocky Mount, N. C., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fayetteville, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national park in the southern Appalachian Mountains, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Houston, Sunset Heights, Dallas, and El Paso, and of Local Union No. 750, Bartenders' League, of Houston, all in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Deu, Tex., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Riviera, Tex., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of the California Wholesale Grocers' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination in prices, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation of $500,000 be made for the erection of a marine-hospital building at San Francisco, Cal., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Glasco and Maplehill, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tyro and Topeka, in the State of Kansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hugo, Elizabeth, Denver, Idaho Springs, Redcliff, Durango, Trinidad, Leadville, Las Animas, and Fort Collins, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Palisades; the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Colorado Springs; and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Arvada; and of sundry citizens of Montrose, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Grand Junction, Ignacio, Denver, Collbran, and Cedar, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of Local Union No. 498, Bartenders' Union, of Lewiston, Mont., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Lewiston, Mont., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Congregational Sunday School of Roundup, Mont., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Beaulieu, Moorhead, St. Paul, and Brainerd, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Morgenstjernan Lodge, No. 17, International Order of Good Templars, of Duluth; of Vikingolftet Lodge, No. 65, International Order of Good Templars, of Viking; and of the congregation of the Swedish Mission Church of Viking, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manu-

facture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, American Continental League, of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against intervention in Mexico on the part of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of East Rochester, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Thomas Laughlin, of Portsmouth, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oakdale, Spring Lake, Nevada, Koszta, and Iowa City, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Davenport, Lyons, Clinton, Chancey, and Council Bluffs, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., and a memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 93, of Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of the faculty and students of the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the board of directors of the Bridgeport Savings Bank, of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the proposed dismemberment of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad system, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Irish-American Societies, of Ansonia, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of Custer Post, No. 1, Department of Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, of Laramie, Wyo., remonstrating against any change being made in the United States flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Custer Relief Corps, No. 20, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union, No. 92, of Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Middletown, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling employees in the Postal Service to work on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Leeds Council, No. 16, Order United American Mechanics, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Nathan Hale Camp, No. 1, Connecticut Division, Sons of Veterans, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against any change being made in the American flag, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Federated Church of Willington; of Connecticut State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Glastonbury; and of sundry citizens of Willington, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN (for Mr. SIMMONS):

A bill (S. 4922) for the relief of D. C. Whittington, heir of D. D. Whittington, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4923) for the relief of W. H. McFarland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4924) granting a pension to Thomas E. Sims (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4925) granting a pension to Frances M. Dumenil (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4926) granting an increase of pension to Amelia L. Love (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4927) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ogden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4928) granting a pension to Lettie Viloth; and

A bill (S. 4929) granting a pension to Sue C. Tozier; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4930) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 4931) granting an increase of pension to Simona G. de Quintana; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4932) granting a pension to Sadie Winters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4933) granting a pension to Mary J. Neary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4934) providing for an investigation of the feasibility of irrigation by the reservoir system or plan in Texas in connection with a similar investigation heretofore proposed for Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4935) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 4936) granting an increase of pension to James J. Hasson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4937) providing for the retirement and rank of certain men formerly composing the corps of general service clerks and general service messengers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4938) granting a pension to Josephine Green; and

A bill (S. 4939) granting a pension to Jennie Farley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4940) granting a pension to Margaret Cecilia Donovan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 127) providing for an American commission for the investigation of civic problems in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to amend sections 1580 and 1581 of the Revised Statutes and the act of March 3, 1907, relating to rations in the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that hereafter no officer or enlisted man in active service in the Navy or Marine Corps who shall be incapacitated for duty on account of disease

resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors, etc., shall receive pay for the period of such incapacity, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that in case of emergency arising subsequent to and unforeseen at the time of submitting the annual estimates to Congress 10 per cent of the annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment, exclusive of the public works and increase of the Navy, shall be available, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL CO.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 304), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey or any subcommittee thereof chosen by said committee be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate, ascertain, and report by whom the stock, bonds, and obligations of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. are owned, the value thereof, so far as the value of the said securities can be ascertained; the value, income, gross and net, and expenses of said canal; by whom and in whose interest the said canal is operated, owned, and controlled, and who is chiefly benefited by the manner of its operation; with authority to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, and to sit during the sessions of the Senate; the expense of said investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

### IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

On motion of Mr. BORAH, it was

*Ordered*, That 5,000 copies of Senate Document No. 301, Sixty-second Congress, second session, being a summary of the wages and hours of labor from the report on conditions of employment in the iron and steel industry of the United States, prepared under the direction of Charles P. Neill, Commissioner of Labor, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

### SENATOR TILLMAN ON PHYSICAL CULTURE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have received so many letters asking for my speech on the antismoking resolution and making inquiry about what I have done to bring myself back from the grave, as it were, that I have had that speech printed for distribution to the letter writers.

I ask unanimous consent to have read an article I wrote for the Physical Culture Magazine, of New York City, some time ago, my purpose being to send this along with my speech to those who are making inquiry. I commend it to the careful and prayerful consideration of my brother Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The simultaneous deaths within the recent past of two of the most distinguished captains of industry in the South are very lamentable. Both of these men started at the bottom and worked their way to the very top of their profession—railroading. Neither ought to have died so young. One was 63 years of age, while the other was only 60. Had they known the value of self-control in eating and the use of hot water, they would have lived at least 10 years longer to serve their country and be with their families. Indeed, it may be said that just at the period when experience and study made them capable of doing their best work they were cut down. When the world loses such men the gap is not easily filled, although there are many who think they can fill it and are anxious to try.

Since I was paralyzed three years and a half ago for the second time I have learned a great deal about my own body, because during that time I have studied it more than all the balance of my life put together.

In the hope that my own personal experience may benefit others and save precious lives, I am going to recite briefly as possible how I now live and what I have done and am doing every day to restore and preserve my health. It is by no means fully restored, but my recovery is indeed marvelous to those who have watched its progress.

Most men will be skeptical and not believe what I say. The overwhelming number will not have the self-control to do what I advise, though it is neither hard nor painful. The trouble will be skepticism and the unwillingness to control their appetites.

I owe a great deal to suggestions from unknown friends, who have written me personal letters telling what they had discovered about themselves. I tried these, and have learned much in this way. The balance of my "system," if it may be called a system, has been evolved from my own study and experience. Of one thing I am sure—nothing contained in these hints will injure any normal man or woman.

Remember, I was never entirely helpless, although very nearly so, and it was only after several months of treatment at sanitariums that I grew strong enough to begin physical-culture exercises. But after I began them I steadily improved. The man who perseveres will thank me, for the result will immediately be good. The man who has mere curiosity and not will power enough to keep on had better not begin.

I passed my sixty-sixth birthday last August, and am therefore not very far from the Biblical limit of three score years and ten. But had I learned how to take care of my body in early manhood, I might have been likely to reach the age of 85 or 90, perhaps a hundred, because I inherited from my father and mother a very strong constitution.

The main idea I have had in devising this scheme to restore my health by the use of physical-culture exercises has been to increase the circulation and drive the blood to the brain and keep down rheumatism by working the joints and preventing calcareous deposits.

These calcareous deposits are like iron rust, and when allowed to accumulate they cause a great deal of pain and trouble. Hot water flushes the kidneys and washes these poisons out. Like any other machine, the human body should be kept in good order by constant exercise. Physical culture affords both the exercise and the lubricant to keep the hinges from creaking.

The following are the exercises I take on my bed each morning:

Before getting up in the morning take the head off the pillow and stretch out straight. Draw in a deep breath and begin by kicking the buttock with the heel of one foot fifteen times; then exhale. Draw in the breath again and kick with the heel of the other foot fifteen times, holding the breath until the movement is finished. Then let the air out and draw in a fresh breath and kick with both feet fifteen times. Draw in a fresh breath to the limit after each movement.

Next drop the heels on the bed with the knees drawn up. Then throw the knees as far apart as they can be carried and repeat movement twenty times.

Then throw first one foot and then the other toward the headboard with vigor, keeping the knee joints as straight as you can. A different set of muscles are brought into play by doing this with the knees drawn up and the knee joints limber.

Now kick out with both feet as wide apart as possible and kick with emphasis, as though you were kicking off a vicious dog.

Next place the hands under the small of the back, using these as a lever, elevate both feet at once and the lower part of the body toward the headboard, using the abdominal muscles to pull up the lower extremities. If in an iron bed, this movement can be facilitated by grasping the railing or round above the head with the hands, pulling up the legs and feet. This and the next movement are intended to reduce the paunch by changing the fat on the abdomen to muscle.

Then fasten the feet under something and pull the trunk to a sitting posture. Young, healthy people do not need to fasten the feet, but old and fat ones must do it. One ought to go about it cautiously until the muscles have become accustomed to the strain. Repeat four or five times.

Finally throw the head back with the feet on the bed and lift the body clear so that the shoulders do not touch, forming an arch. Repeat this as often as you wish.

I then take a cold bath, beginning with the water tepid and ending with it as cold as I can stand. I rub down briskly, put on undershirt and drawers, and get a light pair of iron dumb-bells—3½ pounds. These are to give momentum to the movements and bring the muscles into better play.

First stand erect with the dumb-bells firmly clinched. Throw the arms downward and backward, passing by the thighs. Repeat fifteen times. Continuing, bend the trunk forward as nearly horizontal as you can, and let the arms swing as near the floor as they can go, straightening up between each swing and repeating until you have bent down ten times.

Then, keeping the knees stiff, try to punch the big toe of each foot with both fists. Repeat as often as desired, straightening up between punches.

Next, using the dumb-bells, drop the hands full length of the arms a little to the front. Then begin by swinging the arms in unison first to the right and then to the left. As one goes up let the other come down, swaying the body from side to side as the movements are made. Elevate the hand that goes up as high above the head as possible, and put the other as near the floor as you can. This is called the "liver squeezer," and is very fine for stimulating that organ.

Then throw both arms behind the back hard so as to bring the back of the hands as near together as possible while holding the dumb-bells clinched.

Still holding the dumb-bells, throw one to the rear and the other to the front, looking first over one shoulder and then over the other, twisting the spine as far as possible and loosening the vertebræ.

Using one hand at a time, swing the dumb-bells upward, backward, downward, and forward, forming a circle with the armpit as a center. Then reverse and swing the other way.

Standing flat-footedly, elevate the hands above the head and bend forward and try to touch the floor while the knees are held stiff. Straighten up and repeat. Continue to do this until you succeed in reaching the floor. I usually reach it the third effort. At first I could hardly get lower than my knees.

Take hold of the bed and squat as low as you can. Straighten up and bend backward as far as you can. Then squat and repeat, straightening up and bending backward. This will loosen the vertebræ of the spine and relieve the pressure on the nerves inside the trunk. This to me is my most valuable exercise, as it enables me to mount my horse from the ground without assistance.

Caution: Never do any of these movements to the point of fatigue.

I practice these exercises morning and night before and after undressing. It takes about 10 minutes, not including the bath. I have found that deep breathing adds very much to my strength and has facilitated my return to health. Many do not know what this means. So I will describe my method.

First compress the diaphragm, driving all the breath out of the body you can. This is what the doctors call dead or residual air, and it remains in the lungs all the time unless it is expelled by will power. After you have cleaned out the lungs draw in all the fresh air you can. Hold it in the lungs while you count 10.

Then exhale slowly. One can increase the quantity more than he had supposed possible at first. This is the best thing I have ever found for insomnia, as almost before I know it, as I am counting the inhalations, I am asleep. I never remember to have done it more than ten times without going to sleep.

Another great blessing to me has been hot water. I drink it as hot as I can (about 160° F. in my case), using at least 3 quarts a day. Tepid water is rejected by some stomachs as it produces nausea. But hot water becomes acceptable to most people. I have gotten so I do not want any other kind. It cleanses the stomach in readiness for food. It aids digestion, taken at the right time—shortly after eating. It assists in keeping the bowels regular, and is a specific for indigestion, acute or otherwise. Indeed I can not say too much for it.

I have learned to aid the movement of the bowels by commencing with both hands on the right side above the groin, where the colon begins, and slowly kneading with inward pressure following the colon upward and across, then downward toward the rectum. It is of vital importance to paralytics especially to have the bowels move freely once a day. Fruit, both raw and cooked, will assist materially in this matter. I have to assist nature by the use of aloes once a day.

The four things which have contributed most to my restoration to health are careful diet, deep breathing, physical-culture exercises, and drinking hot water. All these working together have brought about the result so far attained. If I were to name them in the order of importance, they would come as above given. Without the physical culture I would now be tortured by rheumatism and perhaps be bedridden. I have literally kicked it out of bed. I am constantly reminded of my rheumatic condition by twinges of sciatica.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will pardon me for a personal observation. I see many Senators smiling at what has just been read, and no doubt they think this is a fad of mine. But when they recall the fact that 23 men who worked in this Chamber with me four years ago have gone to their long account it ought to make them pause and consider things more seriously. I am afraid I will see many of you go to your graves yet before I myself am called.

ARECIBO RIVER BRIDGES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4145) to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R., which was, in line 5, after "River," to insert "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 11245. An act extending to the port of Providence, R. I., the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 12169. An act providing for an additional appropriation for a public building in the city of Monroe, N. C., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 13133. An act for the approving and payment of the drainage assessments on Indian lands in Salt Creek drainage district No. 2, in Pottawatomie County, Okla., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 13771. An act extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before morning business is closed I wish to inquire if it will be in order to ask to take from the table Senate resolution 288, submitted by me, being a resolution calling on the President for information as to what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can move to take from the table the resolution to which he refers.

Mr. JONES. I have no desire to do so this morning, because the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] is anxious to conclude his remarks; but I wish to state that I have been expecting for several days to call up the resolution to which I refer, and I shall endeavor to get it up on to-morrow at the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I hope to conclude my remarks to-day in from one-half to three-quarters of an hour.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I ask that Senate bill 120 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate. It will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire now to conclude my discussion of the evidence in this case. I can not close, however, without quoting the concluding remarks of Mr. J. W. Brafford, the State grain inspector, of Kansas City, Kans. In a letter Mr. Brafford says:

> The markets should be compelled to take their hands off of the throat of the business, as far as manipulating the inspection of grain, regardless of what it is; and to be prevented from so manipulating it that it matters not whether the market breaks or raises if they are able to order the grades tightened or loosened; they can make good on any feature of speculation they desire, and the balance of the trade, especially the producer and some more, are entirely at their mercy. There is no more justice, no more reason, or excuse for the great grain markets to dictate the different standards of grain and then construe the rules in grading it than there would be to permit these same markets to change the length of the yardstick, to increase or diminish the size of the standard bushel to suit their own conveniences and to make good on bad guessing of the markets.

There are some sections of our country that are not affected so much as others by the foreign demand. But that foreign demand has a great influence upon our home prices over the greater portion of the United States. If that demand is strong, if the trade is freed from contention and disappointment, if our grain grades can be relied upon, no one can deny that it will add to the value of our grain and the consequent legitimate profits of all persons interested in grain. But more important to us is the secondary effect of lack of confidence in our grades. The great effort of European buyers in the last few years has been to develop the Argentine grain trade, the grain trade from Russia and other sections and to avoid the American trade.

We have seen some result of this effort on the part of foreign dealers in grain to develop the Argentine production in the fact that their grain is being shipped as far into the interior of this country as Indianapolis itself. I am informed that Argentine corn has actually come into Indiana in competition with the home product.

For years all of our consular reports have been filled with bitter complaints made by foreign purchasers. They all sound the same note of warning, and declare that the grain trade in many sections has been declining, and that if such dissatisfaction, which is becoming general, is not overcome our export trade will be entirely destroyed at many points. The universal complaint there is that the grading is not up to the standard fixed by the rules at any of these great terminals, either in kind or quality; that the conditions are growing worse; that the purchaser there does not receive what he buys. The result is that the miller has ceased to buy American grain for his mill and the farmer for his stock, and European and other foreign grain is taking its place. It is useless to attempt to minimize or to attempt to explain away the universal dissatisfaction on the part of European buyers. So universal and so intense have these complaints grown that the whole European trade has organized a commission or association to deal with American grades, and, if possible, to secure some action on the part of our Government which will mitigate the evils which follow from fraudulent and improper certification of grain shipped abroad. Letters have been written by the head of this association to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States asking for some legislation which will remove the present incumbrance on our grain trade in Europe, due to the worse than uncertainties in our system of inspection and grading.

If there were little in these complaints, if they were imaginative only, still good business judgment would demand such change in the system as would eliminate them. If they are justified, as every report will clearly demonstrate, then a remedy is imperatively demanded. There never will be absolute confidence in our grain grading so long as the grades are established and controlled by those who are interested as purchasers only. If our grain is to be sold by grades—and no one will deny that under present conditions it must be so sold—then it follows that those grades should be established and fixed by an unbiased, independent, and competent authority.

This most forceful arraignment and condemnation of the American grades by European importers compelled the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to take cognizance of the chaotic conditions of our foreign grain trade. One of the best experts from the Agricultural Department was sent to Europe to investigate the complaints made by the European buyers and to ascertain what might be done to meet their just requirements. This agent spent a good part of a year abroad, visiting all of the European grain markets and making a most thorough and comprehensive examination of the whole subject of our grain export trade. He found that the complaints were well founded; that the whole trouble was due to improper certification of grades; that grain unfit for use was certified at a high grade; that in consequence enormous losses had been suffered by purchasers throughout Europe; and that the influence of all the exchanges was hostile to American grain. He also found that American wheat and corn, when in proper condition and measuring up to the standards certified, were considered better than the wheat and corn of any other country in the world; but by reason of the adulteration of the grades and the very considerable practice of attempting to foist damaged and inferior grain upon the European purchaser, our wheat and corn of certain grade was bought on the markets at considerably lower figures

than the same grade and character of grain from other countries. The president of the Hamburg Grain Dealers' Association informed the agent that the price of American wheat actually fell 5 per cent in that market immediately upon the arrival of the first of the season's shipment, because it did not measure up to its certification; that the delivery of this wheat on wheat contracts was condemned, and the European grain interests were warned against further purchases in a circular letter sent out by the Hamburg association, which was copied generally and freely commented upon by the press. Thus the insatiate greed of a few American exporters, who seek to work off a low grade of grain, purchased from the farmers at a low price, upon a high-grade certificate results not only in immediate diminution of the price of all our American grain and the loss of millions of dollars annually to the American producer, but also is a potent factor in diminishing and destroying our future export trade.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to some of these letters from foreign importers. I desire first to quote from a letter from Robert S. Patterson, chairman of the European International Committee on Grain Certificates. I have heretofore called attention to the fact that our grading has been done so carelessly or so unjustly that an organization has been established in Europe for the purpose of dealing with American grades. The chairman of this international committee was Mr. Robert S. Patterson, who writes:

European buyers have lost confidence in the reliability of United States certificates, and American grain consequently suffers in price, buyers giving a preference whenever possible to other grain, and only buying yours when compelled to do so or at a reduction in price sufficient, in their opinion, to compensate them for risks they run in buying certificate final.

I now quote from a letter from Mr. Patterson to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he says:

By direction of the European international committee on American certificates I have the honor to inclose a copy of a letter I have addressed to His Excellency the President, which I think explains itself, and I have only to add that my committee, representing the European grain trade, desire me to say that they gladly welcome and warmly support such as measure as that now before Congress—

The same measure which I am pressing on the attention of Congress now—

by which the grading and certificating of grain, now in the hands of a number of various authorities, partly public and partly private, or, at any rate, in some cases open to the interference of private interests, will be transferred to a Government department where we consider we may rely not only on its thorough impartiality, but on such complete uniformity of administration at all ports that European importers will get in future a thoroughly trustworthy certificate.

In this belief my committee hope that you will succeed in getting your proposals accepted and that the results will prove generally acceptable to all honest dealers in grain.

That, Mr. President, is the sentiment of the foreign purchasers. I have a letter from the Rotterdam Corn Association, signed by the president of that association, in which he says:

During many years already the American grain-inspection certificates have been very unsatisfactory, and immense losses were caused to the buyers on this side by the careless inspection of American grain shipped for export.

* * * * * * *

Many important firms in the importing centers on this side have absolutely given up importing American corn, taught by the experience of several years, when a single parcel of this article, certified No. 2 mixed, sail mixed, etc., and still showing 30 to 90 per cent damage on arrival, caused a loss greater than the small gain made on many shipments together; they preferred to buy from Argentina, Russia, and the Danube. A better inspection, however, and certificates which give sufficient guaranty that the grade has really been given in accordance with the grain's quality and condition will induce these firms to take up the import of American corn again.

We don't object to the export of inferior grain, but to the fact that the grades are not given according to the condition of the grain, so that the certificates are entirely unreliable. Perhaps some buyers on this side want the inferior grain, but those who deal in the better qualities want to be sure that when they pay a better price for the higher grade the certificate gives them the guaranty to get this grade.

Mr. President, every one of these letters is an argument in itself in favor of Federal inspection. Our consul general at Marseille, France, Robert P. Skinner, took the matter up, and I now quote from a report made by him to the Department of Commerce and Labor:

It is highly desirable that certain facts in regard to American grain-selling methods be given immediate and wide circulation and that something be done, either by action of Congress or by the concerted action of American commercial bodies, to reform or, rather, standardize the system under which the great cereal-exporting business has been created.

There is little popular knowledge in the United States in regard to the fact that wheat, corn, grease, and similar products of American origin are not now sold abroad by sample, but by nominal grade. The European buyer knows nothing of the merchandise whatever before it reaches his possession. He imports and resells various classes of merchandise the quality or grade of which is certified to him not by the merchant who has sold him the article, but by the official inspector of a board of trade or other equivalent body at the port of shipment. He pays for the goods before he receives them, and when the exporter in the United States delivers to him a certificate of inspection, declaring the goods to be of a given grade, he has no alternative but to honor the drafts. The bargain is absolutely final upon the production to him of this certificate of inspection.

Although no two ports in the United States may absolutely agree as to the descriptive terms to be applied to a given grade of wheat, although previous shipments may have been of obviously different quality, if the certificate delivered conforms to the grade ordered, the buyer must accept delivery. These are "American conditions." The fact that for many years we have exported nearly all our surplus agricultural products under these conditions speaks well for American business methods, and the fact that these methods are generally acceptable is of advantage to the people of the United States.

Of late years the murmurs against this system have been increasing in Europe, and whereas a short time ago they took the form of isolated private complaints that goods did not always conform to the certified grade, they now take the form of organized protests. I have before me not merely private correspondence running through a number of years, but the recent proceedings of the London Corn Trade Association and the proceedings of a delegate conference held on December 12 at the Berlin Bourse, the general tenor of which is that foreign importers are vexed with prevailing conditions in the United States and are determined to force an improvement. At these two conferences a great many harsh things were said in regard to American certificates, and specific instances of irregularities were mentioned which I need not now repeat. The vital point which it will be well to separate from so much context is this.

Then he quotes a statement from Mr. Friedberg. He says:

Mr. FRIEDBERG (Hamburg). It is perfectly clear that if an American inspector certifies, we have no right to doubt, or if we do, we are asked, "Why do you go on buying?" I may assure this meeting that a good many of us are not going on buying. We have none of this trouble in South America. For the general trade I think that there are respectable people enough in America and I am wondering why they do not stop the glaring abuses that are complained of.

Why is it necessary, Mr. President, that these complaints should all be made against the North American exporter and none of them against the South American exporter?

I shall ask to insert the balance of the report of the consul general, which I have marked, without stopping to read it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

It was the fact that not many years ago the vast bulk of our grain exportations went forward from New York and that every year standard samples of cereals were sent out to European buyers, bearing the seal of the New York commercial bodies which issued certificates of inspection. Under such circumstances, when European buyers received a certificate from New York stating that a certain cargo afloat was of X quality they could refer to their sample of this X grain, and there was at least a moral guaranty that sample and cargo would be alike. The practice of sending out standard samples is no longer followed, while grain is being shipped under certificates of inspection from Duluth, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, Galveston, and probably elsewhere. In each port or place a commercial organization assumes the right to issue certificates of grade and yet no two ports or places have agreed upon the text of the terms which they use to describe the standard grades, let alone upon the grain itself. Nor is this all. I quote from the printed rules of a great board of trade:

"The committee on grain shall have full power and authority to establish grades of grains and to alter and amend the same as may be deemed necessary or expedient."

This instability is naturally one of the conditions of American business that is least acceptable to foreign importers, and what with rivalry between ports for export business it has created not only bitter feeling abroad, but definite differences in the prices at which grain of the same nominal grade is offered for sale at the different ports of shipment. There are "easy ports" and "good ports," and sometimes the "easy ports" are penalized, as thus explained in a recent letter from an importer to an officer of an American commercial organization:

"As you know, at present exporters have great difficulty selling on certificates, but where quality is reasonably assured they are willing to pay a premium over lower inspections. Newport News and Norfolk were excluded on the London and Liverpool contracts because of last year's No. 2 corn shipments, while, as you know, your inspection maintained a premium all last season over the Atlantic."

No wheat importers desire to pay a premium here, or to exact a penalty there, based upon their appreciation of inspection methods. Wheat will fix its own price readily enough, and what the importer wishes to know and has a right to know with as much certainty as attaches to any human transaction is that No. 1 white winter wheat, for example, is the same kind of grain, whether it be inspected at Duluth or New Orleans. The importer insists that if the American Government, commercial bodies, and individual exporters have not agreed upon the qualifications of various grains necessary that they may receive specific gradings, it is the result of their own negligence, very possibly encouraged in certain quarters by those who profit by this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The remedy sought is so easy of application and the demand for its application is so entirely reasonable that to the importer protracted resistance is incomprehensible. The proper remedy may be applied either by our Government or by the cooperation of our trade bodies. The starting point of the reform would be naturally the establishment of standard descriptions by law. This done, if the Government were charged with the issuance of inspection certificates, the service would be removed from local influences, and our so-called official certificates would be rehabilitated. If this very rational proposition be objected to, the surest means of effectively combating it would be the holding of a conference of American grain-inspecting bodies for the adoption of grain standards and for the adoption of ways and means of drawing standard samples, to be deposited in American consulates at great European ports or to be issued upon demand to importers, and to provide for a board of inspectors, the members thereof to be transferred at intervals and liberated from every form of local pressure.

Mr. McCUMBER. I again call attention to a report from Consul General Thomas R. Wallace, from Crefeld, Germany. He says:

The grain dealers in northern and western Europe have been holding meetings, the principal purpose of which seems to be to take united action with regard to a change in the rules and methods of transacting

business with the United States in their line and to correct abuses now existing in the same.

The grain trade from the United States with this district has been declining for some time, and if such dissatisfaction becomes general throughout Europe the losses to the people of America in this important branch of their export trade will be enormous. To gain some idea of the causes of the complaints regarding the grain exported from the United States I have made personal inquiry among the millers and dealers in these products, and am told that the conditions complained of here are the same all over Europe.

A resolution of international committee in regard to American certificates, January 24, 1907, resolved to call upon boards of trade and commercial exchanges of United States and Canada to draw up uniform rules for the grading of grain for export; that should certificating authority refuse or neglect to issue and act upon such rules this committee shall report to the European associations with a view to exclusion of certificates of said authority.

Mr. President, I have covered much of the foreign complaint. There is a great deal more that I do not care to cite at this time.

I want to take up now, for a short time, the complaints in the different States of the Union, and cite but a few from each State. I want to show under this division that there is not a State in the Union where there are purchasers of grain from any of these terminals that do not plead for some relief from the uncertainty of the grades.

I will start in my own State by reading a resolution adopted by the Tri-State Grain Dealers' Association, whose members come from the three States of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. This resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the McCumber Federal grain bill meets the hearty approval of this convention. Present system of juggling with grades and excessive dockage, of mixing hard wheat with inferior grades, calls for inspection far removed from local or State interests and from political manipulation. Demand that wheat shall sell in the markets of world upon its merits and that farmer shall receive for his product its full value, less reasonable commission for handling and transportation.

This is from the grain-trade producers of three States.

The North Dakota Bankers' Association, which took up this subject for the relief of our people, passed a resolution, from which I will quote only a sentence:

Your committee is of the opinion that the reforms outlined will be of material benefit to the grain growers of the State and will be a stepping-stone to a better system of inspection, viz, Federal inspection, which would do away entirely with the many conflicting inspections established in the various States.

I take now the Independent Grain Shippers' Association of North Dakota. They passed a resolution which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That this association is in favor of passing a bill for Federal inspection of grain; that we favor the passage of a bill prohibiting the dockage of grain; that we favor a national law changing our present system of measuring grain by bushel to the hundredweight.

I take now an extract from a commission firm in Minneapolis doing business under this same system, and I especially call what they say to the attention of those Senators who claim that the people and the boards themselves are all satisfied with their own conditions. This is what they say:

They have certainly tightened up on grades here, but on account of the grades being so uneven there isn't a man living really could tell whether this sample of wheat would grade No. 3 or whether it would grade No. 4. To show you how uneven the grades are here we had a sample of wheat from one of our shippers a few days ago. We took the sample to the inspectors; one called it No. 1, another called it No. 2, and the board of appeal called it No. 3, and therefore there isn't a man living could tell what they are liable to grade your wheat when it arrives here.

And this is from a wheat-purchasing firm in the city of Minneapolis.

I now quote a letter from Charles D. Jones, of Memphis, Tenn. He says:

* * * My greatest fear about this whole proposition is that too many Senators and Representatives will listen to the wail that will be raised by the big exchanges of this country, who are enjoying such great privileges under the present inspection system, and in listening to them will agree on compromise, which will not give this country relief to which we are entitled.

To my mind few things in way of legislation have been offered in our National Congress for years which would as directly benefit as many thousand people as will the administration of your proposed law. It is impossible for me to buy from any large center a No. 3 white oat and have accurate idea of what real quality I will get under that inspection. One imposition on buyer is that often they do not get a certificate of inspection, and it is an acknowledged fact that a great many shippers will quote, for instance, No. 2 white corn and have no idea of shipping anything but No. 3 white corn.

Since last letter to you I have had great deal of correspondence with dealers all over the South, and they all seem enthusiastic over your bill, and know that the Senators and Representatives from Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee have been written to regarding your bill and asked to support the measure.

I have here another from Minnesota. This is a resolution from the Minnesota Farmers' Eleva.or Association:

*Resolved*, That we recommend the enactment of a Federal-inspection law, as introduced in Congress by Senator MCCUMBER, * * * and that we specially call upon the Members of the Minnesota delegation in Congress to assist in the passage of such laws.

I quote one now from the Farmers' Cooperative Grain & Supply Co., of Minden, Nebr.:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this board that all grain should be inspected and graded by the Federal Government, and when exported should carry with it the seal and proper authority, so that it should have with it absolute confidence in every grain market of the world: *Resolved further*, That we heartily indorse Federal inspection and call upon our Representatives in Congress to do everything possible in their power to assist in passing such a bill.

I now go to the State of Illinois, and read a resolution from the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of Illinois:

*Resolved*, That we favor the inauguration of a system of Federal grain inspection and grading of grain along the lines provided for in the McCumber bill, and we call upon the Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois to bend every effort toward securing the enactment of such legislation by Congress at an early date.

I have communications from the Kansas Board of Trade, of Kansas City, Kans., and the Farmers' Terminal Grain Co., both of which favor Federal grain inspection.

We then drop down to Alabama. W. C. Agee, of Birmingham, Ala., writes that—

the present system of inspecting grain throughout this country is corrupt and crooked as it can be, and it is a notorious fact that at practically no grain centers can we find an honest inspection of grain. We are sure that all reputable grain dealers and the farmers will welcome the passage of such a bill (Federal inspection bill).

A letter from Baker & Holmes Co., in Florida, says:

We wish to state emphatically that we will do whatever we can to aid you in the passage of this bill, and if we can be of any service to you, let us know the nature of same.

We think this is a move in the right direction and it will be of great benefit to those in the grain business, and we wish to assure you that you have our sympathy in every respect.

From Mississippi, from the Gibson Grocery Co.:

We take pleasure in recommending and indorsing your bill in reference to the uniform system of grading grain, and believe it should have the encouragement of every honest buyer and seller. There is not one average buyer in ten in this section of the country but that has at some time been imposed upon in this respect and with no recourse whatever.

Another letter from Threefoot Bros., Meridian, Miss.:

We note the bill offered in regard to grain inspection and wish to commend you for this, and hope it will become a law, as the present condition of grain is very unfavorable and detrimental to the dealers, as it is only occasionally that we get justice in accepting grain shipped by present certificates of inspection.

From the Sanford Grocery Co., of Sanford, N. C.:

We feel that the passing of this bill—Federal inspection bill—would be one of the greatest improvements for the grain receivers in the various sections of the United States, and especially in Southern States, that has ever happened, and we desire to express our deep and lasting appreciation, etc. As a rule the grain received by southern dealers has fallen far short of the grade at which it was billed, and as grain receivers we are always at a loss to know how to quote our trade here until we have received the grain and inspected it ourselves. We feel that the passage of the bill would greatly relieve the present situation, for if all grain is inspected by Federal inspectors we are confident we will get what our invoices call for. Under this law there will be less partiality and fewer discriminations in favor of the shippers and fairer and better treatment to the receivers at large, and will place competition amongst shippers on a level.

Here is another one from Missouri, which I think I have already quoted. It is from the Merchants' Exchange at St. Louis, which at that time favored the enactment of this measure.

I now go down to Georgia. I have several letters from that State, but I will cite one only, from the Bainbridge Grocery Co., of Bainbridge, Ga.:

Are glad to note that you have introduced a bill requiring Federal inspection of all grain. We wish to extend to you our hearty appreciation of your interest in this matter and urge that you use every effort to get such bill passed, as it has been a great imposition on the South for the past several years. All the northern and western shippers seem to have the idea that they can dump anything they please on the South and force them to accept it.

A letter from South Carolina:

We have read with interest notice of your bill and wish to say with reference thereto that in our opinion the enactment of this bill means much to the South. We hope that you will become more and more determined to push this matter through, as you shall not only deserve our commendation but of the whole South.

I have a letter here from Kansas. It is a little longer than I desire to read, and I will ask that it may be included in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done.

The letter referred to is as follows:

KANSAS.

From letter of D. W. Troup, secretary of the Kansas Board of Trade, to Congressman Charles F. Scott, January 30, 1908:

"* * * We can readily see that the adoption of Federal inspection of grain would take away from the interests that now dominate the grain trade of our country a weapon that gives them almost absolute control of the business, and that under the present system they enjoy advantages which they would not obtain under Federal inspection of grain, and which is worth to them the difference between the value of the grain now arriving at the market centers and the value of grain after having been received at market centers by these interests of at least 3 to 5 cents per bushel. You understand that the

value of grain under the present system into a central market must be at least 3 to 5 cents per bushel higher than that required by the same inspection department when it is loaded out of terminal elevators, and after having come in possession of the aforesaid interests.

"It is the simplest matter possible to have uniform inspection of grain.

"The only influence that is fighting Federal inspection of grain today, so far as I can find out—and I have been going into this matter very thoroughly—is the boards of trade, who are profiting by the manipulation of the grain products of this country. That is, I mean to say, the boards of trade hereinbefore mentioned, all line-house concerns and their adherents, and the different grain dealers' associations, such as the Kansas Grain Dealers' Association, of this State, and we sincerely hope you are not lined up and allied with these interests and will not use your influence for the defeat of one of the greatest bills that has ever been introduced in Congress for the benefit of the producer and to rehabilitate the grain trade between this country and Europe, and to raise our standard of value of Kansas No. 2 'hard' wheat abroad, where it has been discredited by manipulation to such an extent that to-day it is almost impossible to sell our wheat abroad so long as the foreigner is able to buy from South America, Russia, and other competing countries.

"It is just as important that we should have uniform inspection of grain and some guarantee from the inspection department after a car of grain is inspected that the certificate will carry in somewhere as it is that we have uniform weights, and that when we sell a bushel of wheat in Kansas we understand that we have to deliver 60 pounds, no matter whether it is in New York State, Missouri, Kentucky, or Florida."

From the Grain Dealers' Association of Kansas, E. J. Smiley, secretary, December 9, 1907:

"The writer has given Federal inspection deep study and is almost convinced that such a measure will be necessary to secure unifrom grades throughout the country. He has discussed the question of Federal inspection with the official members of this association and they agree that Federal inspection must come in order to protect the producer and local grain dealer against imposition by the large elevator owners."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have read, possibly some will say at great length, quotations from the testimony taken in this matter. I have done so that I may bring together the important portions of that testimony upon a very important feature of the case. This evidence clearly established two facts, first, that all the grain producers favor this bill; second, that all the grain consumers favor it. There is therefore only the little coterie of grain dealers at the terminals who oppose it.

The present method is inefficient as well as unjust. I wish to call attention to only another little portion of the testimony, without quoting it. There is evidence in these hearings that a single inspector in the city of Chicago, at a time when there was more or less congestion, actually reported that he had inspected 250 cars in one-half of a day. That required him to travel 2½ miles down one side of the train loads of cars and 2½ miles back, open every car on the one side and on the other, and make the test. You can see that it would be a physical impossibility for him to have properly investigated and certified 25 cars in that length of time. All he could have done would have been to have made a very wild guess; and as all this grain must be sold upon his guess and upon the certificates that he would attach to each car you can see very easily the confusion that would naturally follow when the people who bought those carloads upon those certificates should open the cars.

Mr. President, we have here a new bill that is to take the place of the one introduced by me. This new bill is known as the Lever bill. Who drew the bill? That is an important question. The Agricultural Department admits that it was drawn by the trade. The trade in their statements to Senators state that they agreed upon a bill, and they had one that would be satisfactory to themselves. In other words, since 1890 we have been attempting to rid ourselves of the rules and regulations of these trades. Finally the trades themselves have drawn up a bill under which we are supposed to free ourselves from their clutches. The same power that made the rules that we are complaining of now fix a law for us. What reason have we to assume that they will be more liberal, more generous to the public and less selfish to themselves in a bill which they would draw than they would be in the rules which they established?

Mr. President, there is one good thing in the new bill, the Lever bill. It does provide for Federal standardization. That is practically all it does do. It provides for Federal supervision, but the provisions are such that the Federal supervision will be ineffective, just exactly as the board wants it to be. Then, under an ineffective Federal supervision, with the same control they have now of the individual inspectors, they can go on with the same nefarious practices that they have been indulging in for more than 30 years.

That bill, I understand, has been introduced here. I thought I had a copy of the bill with me, but I evidently have not. However, the principal feature that I note about the bill is that the Agricultural Department seems to know something of the nature of these exchanges. It has carefully guarded, in section 8, its employees by providing that the boards of exchange are prohibited from assaulting the employees who go there to make an inspection, and imposing a heavy penalty upon them if they do. I had supposed that the State laws were sufficient to protect all alike, but the Agricultural Department seems to think that they are not sufficient.

Mr. President, in closing I want again to ask this question, because I want an honest answer from any of those who oppose Federal inspection: What objection is there to the Government doing the inspecting itself? Why do the boards of trade want to employ the inspectors? These boards admit that the Government should have supervision, they admit that they should have people who are qualified to supervise the inspection, but they do not want the Government to inspect. If you admit, as they admit, that the Government should fix the grade and should fix the standard, then what objection is there that the Government employees who are to pass upon the grades should do the grading themselves?

It is stated with some force that the Agricultural Department have now changed front, and while in the evidence of the officers of that department before the committee they not only spoke in favor of Federal supervision but also Federal inspection, that they are now supporting a proposition which will call for Federal supervision only. I was therefore compelled to write to the department to ascertain if there was any reason that department could give why they should not have also the power of Federal inspection as well as supervision, and what reason there was, if any, for a change. In answer to my inquiry I received a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, I quote only a sentence from it:

In connection with our investigations relating to the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, it has been found that with but few exceptions the grain inspectors in the important markets are fully competent to inspect and grade grain if left free to exercise their own judgment as to the grade of the grain under normal movements.

Mr. President, I assume that, and that is the reason I assumed they were competent under Government employment.

I then wrote again to secure, if I could, any reason why the Department of Agriculture at the present time did not agree with its previous contention that we should have inspection as well as grading, and I received a reply. I will read both my letter and the reply. It was addressed to Hon. B. T. Galloway, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, on March 10:

MARCH 10, 1914.

Hon. B. T. GALLOWAY,
*Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your favor of the 6th instant in answer to my inquiry concerning investigations of the department relative to the handling, transporting, and grading of grain and the fixing of definite grades, etc.

You say:

"As a result of the investigations carried on under this project the department has arrived at the conclusion that effective Government supervision of the inspecting and grading of grain, together with the use of standard grades as fixed by the department, will solve the difficulties which are continuously arising in transactions in grain when bought and sold by grade."

I think both yourself and the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, gave testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry some few years ago in which, if I remember correctly, both of you stated in substance that you would have no difficulty in taking over the inspectors at the various points of inspection and carrying on the grading and inspection under Government control.

I agree with you entirely that "with few exceptions grain inspectors in the important markets are fully competent to inspect and grade grain if left free to exercise their own judgment as to the grade of the grain under normal movements." All these inspectors need to understand is that they can use their own judgment and not the judgment of those to whom they are beholden for their positions. Just and competent inspection can be accomplished only by actual Government inspection unless the Government has one supervisor appointed for every wheat inspector, and if the supervisor so to be appointed is capable of supervising the work he certainly must be capable of doing the work.

If, as you have previously stated, the Federal Government could do the inspecting properly and efficiently, that they could take, for instance, the same force which are inspecting to-day under the divers systems and could use them under a uniform system, why do the various boards of trade oppose it? If these boards of trade really wish supervision for the purpose of enforcing correct inspection and certifying, and if the Government could insure such just and correct inspecting and handling, why do the boards oppose it? They would be relieved of all responsibility and all the labor now necessary to get the grain on the market by grades and could proceed to confine their business to buying and selling wheat. Their reasons for opposing Federal inspection by Federal inspectors are clear to me. I should be glad, however, if you would give me what you deem to be any legitimate reason on their part.

Very truly, yours,

PORTER J. McCUMBER.

That was addressed to the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain if the department knew of any legitimate reason why these boards should object to Government inspection, and I will read the reply. He says:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, March 12, 1914.*

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR McCUMBER: I have your favor of March 10, relating further to the inspection and grading of grain by the Federal Government, or under the supervision of the Federal Government, in which you make inquiry as to any legitimate reason why the grain exchanges

should oppose Federal inspection. In reply, I have to advise that while various objections have been raised by the grain exchanges in opposition to Federal inspection, the results of the investigations of this department do not indicate that either Federal inspection or Federal supervision would in any way be detrimental to the legitimate transactions in grain on any of the exchanges.

That is the complete answer, Mr. President, to those who are claiming that the Department of Agriculture desires to support a different character of bill. Further, he says:

It is clearly evident that there is urgent need—

I especially want to call the attention of Senators to that—

It is clearly evident that there is urgent need for some legislation which will bring about uniformity and reliability in the grading of grain in all markets, so that the producer will have some incentive to grow and market grain of better quality and that the consumer will get the grade that he buys. The investigations of this department during the past two or three years have led to the conclusion that a system of rigid Federal supervision will be equally as effective as Federal inspection, and likewise simpler in its operation. The department, however, stands ready to undertake the enforcement of whatever measure may be enacted by Congress to insure uniformity in the grading of grain entering into interstate and foreign commerce.

Very respectfully,

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary.*

"It is clearly evident that there is urgent need for some legislation." That is the key to the whole situation. The Department of Agriculture has been for years in favor of Government supervision and Government inspection. They have been in favor of it from the days of the first Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Rusk, who reported in favor of it. The power of the grain trade has been sufficient to prevent any legislation on this subject until the present time. Now the grain trade has come over sufficiently to indicate its willingness to allow a bill to go through that will provide for Federal supervision, and undoubtedly the Agricultural Department is certain that if we can proceed thus far and get a bill of that kind through, the inspection will follow in a very short time, as I am certain that it will; but it is evident the Department of Agriculture would favor this other only because it thinks that there is a greater opportunity of getting it through at the present time.

But, Mr. President, there is no reason in the world why, if we have Federal supervision, those same supervisors can not do the inspecting; and, as is stated by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, there can be no legitimate reason on the part of the boards of trade against Federal inspection.

## WATERWAY FROM GREAT LAKES TO ATLANTIC OCEAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, my excuse for occupying a few minutes of the Senate's time to-day in discussing the proposition of an ocean waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic by way of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River is not alone to call attention to the theoretical value of such a project, but because it is a peculiarly live question in Canada now, and the highest interests of both countries demand a thorough knowledge of present conditions.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me on this occasion to occupy any time in demonstrating the fact and importance of transportation. The history of its development has been the history of civilization. From the time when man produced more than he consumed and desired other than what he himself created the means of transportation became necessary to commerce. Indeed, so intimately are transportation and commerce related that they can not exist separately. Commerce thrives only where transportation facilities are adequate, and transportation exists only where commerce is possible. This coordinate relation has been so inseparable that it sometimes seems as if the two were of equal primal importance. The great truth is, however, no matter how it may be involved, that commerce is the principal thing, but transportation is a necessary incident thereto. It is one of the main objects of government to promote commerce, and inasmuch as suitable and sufficient means for facilitating it are essential, transportation becomes the legitimate object of governmental concern and action.

The profits and losses of business have a direct relation to means of transportation. If these means are reasonable and adequate, there is likely to be a profit; if they are unreasonable and inadequate, there will always be unprofitable business, if there is any at all.

In what I may say I shall have in mind at all times the fact that transportation is the servant of commerce, but a necessary one, and entitled to proper compensation. The better the servant the greater compensation to which it is entitled; and, reversely, the greater the compensation the more efficient the servant should be. I shall not attempt to demonstrate at this time whether it is over or under paid. I shall briefly show what compensation it receives in comparison with other charges paid by the people whom it serves, and with the sole object of demonstrating the need of its development in the river and harbor branch. For some tables and statistical statements I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to a monograph issued by the River and Harbor Congress, through Mr. S. A. Thompson. Its accuracy is vouched for by that distinguished and reliable waterway authority, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], so I quote liberally and confidently from it.

In order that the figures I shall give may be understood in their application to improved transportation facilities it is well to bear in mind that the cost of transportation enters into the cost of everything that is bought and sold. Into what we eat and what we wear. Into the construction of our homes and into everything which decorates or furnishes or preserves them. Little of commercial value exists that is not enhanced in cost to the user or consumer by the element of transportation. This cost can not be accurately segregated from the cost of production and from the profits of merchant and middleman. It must be paid, and though payment is made unconsciously and involuntarily it is nevertheless made and in the aggregate the sum is stupendous. It is to the interest of the people that such cost be as small as possible consistent with the most efficient service.

According to the Thirteenth Census, compiled under its competent director, E. Dana Durand, there was collected in duties and customs upon imported merchandise by the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, $3.84 per capita for all the people of the United States. During that same year the per capita payment for railroad transportation on merchandise alone was $30.96. The Government receipts from all sources in 1907, save from the sale of bonds, were $9.84 per capita. The people paid the railroads more than three times as much money for transporting merchandise as was received by the Government from all sources, less the receipts from bond sales.

During the 15 years from 1894 to 1908, both inclusive, the railroad transportation tax upon the people was $16,711,000,000 more than the total receipts of the Government outside of bonds.

From the census report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, we learn that the total receipts of the United States and of all the States and subdivisions thereof from all sources was as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| National Government | $684,526,289 |
| States and Territories | 189,165,667 |
| Counties | 199,119,468 |
| Cities | 499,080,445 |
| All other minor subdivisions | 219,304,262 |
| Total | 1,791,895,522 |

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the same period shows that the gross receipts of the railroads of the United States were $130,808,374 more than all public receipts, or a total of $1,922,703,896.

In the year of 1906–7 the railroads of the United States were paid only $5,268,812 less than the total revenues of France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and the Netherlands combined.

I have thus far spoken only of rail transportation. The census report shows that for the calendar year of 1906 the amount paid for water transportation in the coastwise, lake, canal, and river service in the United States was $294,854,532. This amount does not include lighterage and harbor work nor the amount paid for ocean traffic to and from foreign ports. It is estimated the latter amounts to $300,000,000, and thus we have in round numbers a total cost of water transportation of about $600,000,000.

It is impossible to obtain the exact cost of the transportation of the country's merchandise over wagon roads. It is known that the total tonnage handled by rail and water was, in 1907, about 1,100,000,000 tons. At least 600,000,000 tons of this traffic was hauled by wagons to rail and water, and at least 200,000,000 tons more found its way to market by wagons without passing over either rail or water. This would make a total of 800,000,000 tons of traffic handled by wagons. The average haul was 8 miles. It has been stated on seemingly good authority that the cost of wagon traffic is 25 cents per ton-mile. Applying this price, we have $1,600,000,000 as the total transportation cost of wagon-hauled merchandise.

Tabulating this we have:

| | |
|---|---|
| Railway transportation in United States in 1906–7 | $2,875,689,520 |
| Wagon transportation in United States in 1906–7 | 1,600,000,000 |
| Water transportation in United States in 1906–7 | 600,000,000 |
| Total | 5,075,689,520 |

From this I deduce that the per capita cost for supporting every form of government in the United States, from the road districts in a township to the National Government, in 1906–7 was less than $20, while the per capita cost for transportation for that fiscal year was about $60. So that, measured in terms of taxation, the transportation problem is by far the largest one imposed upon the people.

But perhaps the most illuminating comparison that can be made is that between the cost of transportation and the value of the things transported. Unfortunately I can not find statistics for exactly the same years. The cost of transportation which I have given is for the fiscal year 1906–7, while the merchandise value is for the census year 1909, the nearest date to 1907 for which I can obtain values. My determination of farm products sold is, I desire to admit, only an estimate, but I have given transportation the benefit of any doubt, and my figures of the actual amount of such products sold are possibly too high.

| | |
|---|---|
| The value of all farm products sold in 1909 was | $6,373,748,560 |
| The value of all American manufactures | 20,672,052,000 |
| The value of all mining products | 1,238,410,322 |
| The value of all imports | 1,311,920,224 |
| Total value of all articles transported | 29,596,131,106 |

We have found that the total transportation cost to the people of the United States was $5,075,689,520. Now, it is fair to assume that this cost in 1909 was at least $6,000,000,000. By comparison it is discovered that for every dollar's worth of merchandise marketed more than 20 cents is consumed by transportation.

I have said this much as a preface to the special plea I propose to make for the improvement of waterways, and particularly for the speedy and intelligent improvement of the natural watercourse extending from the head of the Great Lakes to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, an improvement having for its object the enlargement of that waterway to accommodate ocean-going vessels in their voyage from lake ports to foreign ports and for the benefit of transportation.

To the Great Lakes the greatest commerce of the world is tributary. The fertile fields, the exhaustless mines, the largest manufactories, and the mighty forests of the most productive regions of the United States and Canada would find their natural outlet to market over this waterway. The commerce possible to this course would exceed in one year the total commerce which the most optimistic estimator predicts will pass through the Panama Canal in 10 years. Last year there was locked through the Soo Canal more than 79,000,000 tons of freight. Much of that tonnage was destined for foreign shipment and much for consumption on or near the Atlantic seaboard. This had to be loaded onto the lake boats and carried to Buffalo or other Lake Erie ports and there transferred through elevators to rail cars or to the Erie Canal boats, and hauled to New York or other seaports where it was again transferred either for shipment abroad or to vehicles engaged in the domestic trade. The cost of handling in these transshipments was either destructive of reasonable profits to production or, what is more likely in many cases, both consumption and production were unwisely burdened.

It does not require a professional economist or an expert traffic man to show the economy which would result to the stupendous industry of the Middle West of the United States and Canada if the burdens of reshipment were removed and cargoes could be loaded at lake ports and unloaded at the ultimate point of destination, and this benefit would be increased by the similar advantages resulting to inbound freight from the near Atlantic coast and from foreign ports.

We are about to open the Panama Canal, and by it we have shortened the distance between our two seaboards by 8,000 miles. With the Welland-St. Lawrence oceanway completed, the center of population and production of the United States and Canada will have easy and favorable water communication not only with the far West, which will have been dissolved into the Far East, but with the Pacific States and Provinces as well, and those States and Provinces, which even now are looking for greater markets and wider opportunities, will load their argosies for ports on the Great Lakes, whence their cargoes will be distributed throughout the Central West.

But these benefits, coming directly from the actual use of the ocean waterway, would not be the only ones enjoyed by industry. Such a waterway would produce the result which has always flowed and which always will flow from the creation of water transportation, viz, it will cause a reduction of rail rates and an improvement of rail facilities from all points on even remotely competitive rail lines.

One of the great benefits which will be derived from the Panama Canal and which would flow from the project I propose would be a proper distribution of freight between rail and water. The railroads are hauling freight which can and ought to be carried by water. It can be more economically handled by boat, and by hauling such freight over the railroads much tonnage which can be profitably handled by rail is retarded and an economic waste is entailed upon industry. A natural division of freight will occur; better results not only to business but to the carriers will ensue.

In order to impress with practical effect the financial benefit to Lake and coast-bound shipping flowing from such an ocean waterway—for this would be making ocean ports of Lake ports—let us see what are the actual Lake and rail rates today. The Lake rates on freight passing through the Soo locks in 1907 was eight-tenths of 1 mill per ton-mile, while the average rail rate of the United States in that year was 7.82 mills per ton-mile. In other words, the rail rate was more than nine times higher than the Lake rate. Think of the possibilities for saving to producers and consumers resulting from the reduction, approximately to water rates, of the freight on the vast tonnage now charged with the rail rate. That this amount of saving would grow no one acquainted with the industrial and commercial possibilities of the United States and Canada would dispute. Not only would rail rates be reduced, but water rates on such a waterway would also be lowered. Many Lake boats which now run half the year and then tie up for the closed-navigation season would go down to sea and engage in the coastwise trade, and thus benefit the coast and intercoast shipping. Some of the present Lake boats are not fitted for ocean traffic, but every boat built after the waterway is decided upon would be constructed for ocean service. Thus not only will Lake carriers be benefited, but the carrying charge will be reduced through competition. But these benefits are not all that would come from this project.

The Middle West has fuel, the bulk of the Nation's raw material, and it contains the center of the population of Canada and the United States. The Lakes are within an hour of that center to-day. Why should not the regions of the Lakes be the very center of manufacture and distribution? When ocean vessels dock at Lake ports those ports will become what natural conditions will compel them to become, viz, such centers of production and distribution. Economy enormous would thus be effected, and every section of the country would thereby be benefited. This is not an idle vision of an enthusiast. It is but the statement of an invariable rule, demonstrated by every community which has had the superior advantages of ocean transportation. River and lake transportation are of great value to any city, but ocean transportation is of the very greatest importance, and the plan I advocate means, of course, the conversion of the Great Lakes into the ocean so far as shipping is concerned.

If a demonstration of this fact is necessary, I invite your attention to the map of the United States. Almost without exception, the most prosperous, thriving, and growing cities and sections of our country are those on and adjacent to great waterways. Along the Erie Canal are more great cities than are found in a dozen of the inland States combined. Can I well overstate the tremendous impetus that will be given to the Middle West by the construction of this ocean way?

I believe that such ocean way would have a beneficial effect upon our merchant marine. Our reconstructed Lake fleets would naturally add to the number of ships on the ocean, and certainly every thoughtful, patriotic American desires the restoration of the Stars and Stripes upon the sea. Many of our Lake boats could readily be converted into colliers. Why, the expense for colliers in our naval program could be largely avoided and the money thus saved would go far to construct this waterway.

I have already consumed too much time in demonstrating the axiom that an ocean way for the largest ocean vessels between Duluth and Montreal would be of almost inestimable value to the industry and commerce of the United States and Canada.

I will now discuss the plan itself, its probability, and feasibility.

That such a waterway will be constructed in time, either by Canada alone or by Canada and the United States, I have no doubt. Inasmuch as it must be for the mutual use and benefit of both nations, inasmuch as the waters to be improved and used are international, I hope that this great work may be performed at the joint expense of both and under such plans as will result in the greatest good to both.

Canada and the United States, with only an imaginary dividing line for 4,000 miles between them, inhabited by people from the same race, possessed of the same ideals for the general good, the habitable portions of both lying in the same zone and bounded on the east and west by the same oceans, these two great nations are equally interested in the extension of the Atlantic to the Lakes. At a time when the cost of living is so high these nations are alike interested in reducing to the minimum the expense of transferring products from the producer to

the consumer. Canada and the United States are or should be vitally interested in connecting their most abundant resources with their best possible markets.

So believing I introduced into the Senate at its last session a resolution authorizing the President to enter into treaty relations with Great Britain or the Dominion for the purpose of converting the boundary waters between the United States and Canada into ocean waterways. The resolution passed the Senate unanimously and went to the President. He referred it to the Secretary of State, who, under the act of January 11, 1909, creating the International Joint Commission, submitted certain questions relating to the proposed project to the Canadian Government, and if that Government approves these questions, either as they are or as they may be amended by the two Governments, they will be given to the said commission for investigation and report. If such report is favorable I shall hope and believe that this great enterprise will be undertaken and completed. I trust that the matter will be given the attention its importance deserves.

The Dominion of Canada is alive to the needs of ocean connection with the Lakes, and several projects are under consideration, and whether the United States acts in the matter or not, Canada probably will construct such a connection.

One Canadian project is from the Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River and thence to the St. Lawrence. Another is by canal from the lower end of Lake Huron to Lake Erie, and thence through the enlarged Welland Canal to Lake Ontario, and thence through locks and dams down the St. Lawrence to Montreal. I am not an engineer, but my investigation and study of reports of distinguished engineers who have reported on these projects compels me to believe that these two routes taken each in its entirety are unwise and the former route is also impracticable. The cost to construct the Georgian Bay project would be not less than $200,000,000 and if, after construction, its operation should prove impracticable the injury to Canada would be almost irreparable, and the ocean way would be postponed indefinitely. I am clear that this project would prove unwise. Almost the whole distance from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence the course of this proposed way would be restricted.

According to a Canadian Government report on this project made in 1908 it would require three days for a boat to go from Georgian Bay to Montreal. According to such report this course would contain 116 curves, 77 of which would be of a 1-mile radius, while the route following the natural flow of the water from the head of the Lakes to Montreal would contain but one short curve, and that is at Neebish, in the Soo River. Sharp curves are a menace to navigation, and when they occur in narrow channels they are prohibitive. Furthermore, the water supply available for the summit of this route as proposed is inadequate, and probably no expert will be heard to claim that sufficient of such water can be obtained to meet the demands of the commerce which the people of Canada have a right to expect would seek this way to market. It at best would be but a limited course and could not be made to meet the great possible demands of the Dominion's commerce, let alone the needs of the United States, and its open season would be much shorter than that of the natural course.

I know of no man who has given more intelligent study to this great question than Mr. D. B. Detweiler, a gentleman of great experience and ability at Berlin, Ontario. He has been instrumental in securing for its consideration the most eminent engineers of Canada and the consensus of his and their opinion is adverse to the Georgian Bay project.

It appears that this route is advocated principally by promoters of private enterprise, and yet this improvement is one that private interests should not make nor control. It is not even small enough for national control. It is of international importance, and ambitious speculators should not be permitted to traffic in a matter so vital to the interests of a continent.

A canal from Lake Huron across to Lake Erie would be unwise. Already a 22-foot channel exists from Lake Huron to Lake Erie, and for the greater part of its course the sailing is open water and without sharp curves. This course could be enlarged into a 35-foot channel for less expense than the Huron-Erie Canal could be constructed, and the time required to travel the natural course improved would be less than that which would be required to make the all-canal route. Furthermore, Detroit and Toledo are of sufficient importance commercially to retain their positions on the chartered ocean route.

I have criticized these two projects not because I am improperly prejudiced against them or for any other reason than the belief that they are impracticable and that a practicable and feasible route can be established. The Great Lakes, as I have stated, constitute the basin into which the commerce of the great middle Northwest can naturally be drained. Any ocean waterway should include every one of these Lakes. To every one of them vast possibilities of commerce are tributary. They all have a common outlet to the sea. That outlet is the St. Lawrence River, with its actual source in Lakes Michigan and Superior. At various places in it there are shoals and rapids and falls. All of these obstructions have been overcome for the passage of boats drawing not to exceed 14 feet of water; some for the passage of 22-foot-draft boats and some for 25-foot boats. What has been done for boats of small draft can be done for the largest ships. The water is there and money back of engineering ability can convert that outlet into an ocean waterway without disturbing the lake levels. It is highly important, as I have suggested, that the level of the Lakes should not be disturbed. With proper compensating works this proposed plan would not affect that level. A deepening of the outlet of Lake Huron into Lake Erie to 35 feet would, in my judgment, reduce slightly the waters in Lakes Michigan and Huron, but this effect could easily be overcome by compensation sills constructed at reasonable cost in the upper St. Clair River and at the head of the rapids in the Niagara River above the Falls. The water now going to waste can be utilized to float a greater commerce than enters and clears at our entire seaboard to-day; greater than all that will lock through the Panama Canal plus all that passes in and out of Suez. That this project is possible, that it is more practicable than any other proposed plan, no properly informed man will deny. Then what stands in the way of its completion?

There are four great possible obstacles to overcome: The railroads, international complications, the cost, and sentiment. I will discuss these briefly in their order.

It is a strange fact that certain railroad interests seem to have opposed practically every great proposition to improve water transportation facilities. I say "strange," for history has demonstrated over and over again that improved waterways have increased traffic not only on the water improved but also on the competing railroads. Improved transportation facilities have created traffic. Have railroads suffered from the improvement of our rivers and harbors? On the contrary they have profited by such improvements. Even the electric lines which have paralleled our steam roads have not as a whole had a bad effect upon the income of the latter. The Panama Canal, if it shall carry all the tonnage which its advocates claim, will not, in my judgment, lessen the legitimate rail profits. And yet it is my honest opinion that the railroads oppose river improvements; they gave no aid to the Panama Canal project; they will not encourage the Welland-St. Lawrence ocean waterway. The railroad-owned boats on the Lakes will not ask that this course be constructed; but with no malice toward them and with no desire to injure them, I still insist that the waterway shall be constructed. It will be constructed. I hope that railroad men will recognize the inevitable, including its final benefit to them, and lend a hand.

There are international difficulties to overcome. Unfortunately, as it seems to me, there is not a universal good feeling for the United States in Canada. Political divisions among our neighbors at the north are made on the question of closer relations with us. The treaty of 1854, known as the Elgin treaty, was in force at a time when the conditions in both Canada and the United States were most abnormal. This country was in the throes of a great civil war, and Canada became the asylum for southern slaves, northern bounty jumpers, and slavery sympathizers. The bitterness engendered by the Revolutionary and 1812 Wars between England and the United States was not yet extinct. The termination of the Elgin treaty came at the close of the American rebellion and the relations between Canada and the United States were greatly strained. The feeling against the United States has been kept alive to some extent, and it is still conjured with by some politicians. When all other arguments fail a suggestion is made that the United States desires to dominate the Dominion and eventually to annex it. Of course, no sensible man believes that. Commercially the interests of the two countries are practically identical. Politically they are separate entities, and should remain so. I know there is absolutely no desire on the part of the United States or of any considerable number of its people to acquire Canadian territory or to secure any advantage over that country. It is strange that any party in any country can make political capital out of such shadows. The Great Lakes, their connecting waters, and to a great extent the St. Lawrence River are international. Their development would be equally beneficial to both countries. They can not be improved to the extent of their highest usefulness without the mutual consent and cooperation of both. That consent and cooperation should be secured and established at the beginning. Let the two nations work together as sane, intelligent, honest business men would do and the result will be of untold benefit to both.

It is probably true that the most expensive part of the construction of this project would be in territory wholly Canadian, and I would like to see some equitable arrangement made whereby the United States would materially contribute to this cost; but whether such an arrangement can and will be made, it is also true that great power-developing possibilities lie in wholly Canadian waters, and these can reduce if they can not be made entirely to cover the cost of the improvement. I shall speak of this again presently.

Whatever feeling there is antagonistic to the closest international relations between these two great English-speaking neighbors should be allayed, and, with the class of patriots on both sides of the boundary line who are working for the common good of both countries in earnest, it will be allayed, and all petty politics and unworthy prejudice will be submerged in the general demand for one of the greatest material benefits which ever has or ever can come to these sister nations.

The great practical question which will confront this project will be its cost. This will be a business proposition almost exclusively, and it is clear that the project must fail unless it can be demonstrated in advance that it will pay, measured by dollars and cents.

The United States has, by surveys and exact estimates, shown that to improve all the waters of the Great Lakes, from their heads to Buffalo, so as to accommodate boats drawing 25 feet of water, would cost $25,938,367. Increase this amount threefold and we would have more than the cost of a 35-foot channel. Of this estimated amount eleven and one-half millions were to be spent in improving the Detroit River, and since such estimate was reported that improvement has been made.

Already the Canadian Government has provided by way of appropriation or authorization for $50,000,000 to be expended in enlarging the Welland Canal locks to accommodate vessels of 30-foot draft, and I trust the report is true that it has wisely provided such improvement shall be made with a view to ultimate enlargement to a 35-foot depth.

What the improvement of the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario to Montreal will cost I have no means of telling. An accurate survey should be made to determine that question. I do know, however, that a conservative estimate of the potential energy which could be developed by improving this stream is 4,000,000 horsepower. This power could be sold for at least $15,000,000 a year, and this would mean a 5 per cent return on a $300,000,000 investment. The St. Lawrence improvement will not cost $300,000,000. I do not believe it will cost two-thirds of that amount, but whatever the cost is it can be largely recouped in power value.

A few years ago a private corporation came to the American Congress for a permit to construct a power dam at the long Sault Rapids, and proposed not only to construct this dam in the interest of ocean navigation by building and operating adequate locks but was even willing to pay something for each horsepower of energy developed. The construction of these power dams would create deep pools or lakes over the shoals and rapids which would permit free open sailing for deep-water boats and all without expense to the Government, and the locks of such dams would be fewer and less expensive than those of any other route.

I have stated that these waters proposed to be improved are subject to the joint control of Canada and the United States. No change in them by either nation detrimental to the other can be permitted. The effect on lake levels, on power possibilities, on navigation, on the comity of the nations themselves must be observed and scrupulously regarded. Is it not clear, therefore, that the first great step to be taken is in the direction of closer and better relations between these two countries? With united harmonious action on this great plan all opposition of any importance would disappear and the greatest industrial and commercial project of the world would be consummated.

In the meanwhile, and until such joint action is secured, every improvement along this waterway should be made having in view the ultimate construction of a 35-foot channel from Duluth and Chicago to Montreal. The construction of great public works without due regard to inevitable future development is the folly of nations. It is certainly so in the United States, as witness our ordinary river and harbor improvements and our public-building construction. We scarcely complete a project before the needs for which it was built demand an enlargement, and this is secured at unreasonable expense. It will be economy to build for the future, for that future contains an unobstructed waterway for ocean leviathans from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic over nature's natural course.

Finally the element of sentiment exists, and it is by no means the least obstacle to overcome. Fortunately for highest civilization the sense of beauty, natural and artificial, exists in man. Throughout the civilized world there are found societies organized for the preservation and improvement of natural objects of beauty. In many places these objects have been capitalized by business genius and made the source of personal and corporate income. The marvelously beautiful scenery of the St. Lawrence River has attracted annually thousands of people, and steamboat companies have found the intricate navigation of that stream most profitable. These companies will not favor any project to utilize the St. Lawrence for commercial purposes, lest their profits should be disturbed. Many tourists who have been thrilled with the wonderful rapids and falls of that great river will see in this improvement only the desecration of nature's handiwork for financial gain.

No man to the extent of his ability has a higher appreciation or greater admiration for natural beauty than I have. I would not lay mercenary hands on any object of great natural beauty which is within the reach of the people if that object is the only one of its kind or if the reasonable ethical benefits which can be derived from it equal or outweigh the good which can come from its practical commercial use.

I want to preserve the Niagara Falls because there is but one Niagara. I voted to preserve the Hetch-Hetchy Valley because I thought that San Francisco could get a sufficient supply of equally pure water elsewhere; but, sir, when I measure the good that would come to the millions of the people in the United States and Canada through the development of an ocean way down the St. Lawrence and contrast that with the pleasure which would come to the comparatively few who are financially able to purchase a ticket on a St. Lawrence steamer; when I realize that reasonable prosperity is the prerequisite to the highest ethical enjoyment; when I understand also that this proposed improvement can be made and still preserve the most beautiful natural scenery in this river, as witness the fact that the Sault scenery was undisturbed by the construction of the Sault Canal and locks; when I realize that with this constructed improvement tourists can travel the river both ways, up as well as down; when, in fact, I consider the project as it really will be, I unhesitatingly commend it.

Throughout the United States and Canada are found as beautiful falls and rapids as those of the St. Lawrence, and they are not necessarily related to mighty possibilities for real practical industrial and commercial good.

Let nature lovers view this matter in all of its phases, and it seems to me that but one conclusion can be reached, and that is the one which recognizes an improvement that promises a degree of comfort and prosperity to the people unequaled by any other proposition of the times.

Mr. President, I have called the attention of the Senate to this great project because it is great. Greater than the Panama Canal, which, however, will supplement it; as great as the improvement of all the navigable rivers of the United States and Canada combined, because it furnishes a necessary, cheap, and efficient highway to and from the greatest center of natural resources of the world. It removes to a great extent the barriers between production and consumption and makes it possible for productive genius and constructive enterprise to enrich and bless the people of these two great countries. If by calling the attention of the Congress and the country to this matter I shall have induced thought and discussion, I shall be content, for it seems to me that an intelligent understanding will compel the improvement and use of a facility which for a century has been neglected for lesser things but which has greater possibilities for trade and commerce than all others.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANSDELL in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate joint resolution No. 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN].

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Chamberlain | James | Oliver |
| Borah | Chilton | Jones | Overman |
| Bradley | Clapp | Kern | Page |
| Brady | Clark, Wyo. | Lane | Perkins |
| Brandegee | Dillingham | Lea, Tenn. | Pittman |
| Bristow | Gallinger | Lee, Md. | Poindexter |
| Bryan | Gronna | McCumber | Ransdell |
| Burton | Hollis | Myers | Reed |
| Catron | Hughes | Norris | Robinson |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shafroth | Smith, S. C. | Thomas | Vardaman |
| Sheppard | Smoot | Thompson | West |
| Shields | Stephenson | Thornton | Williams |
| Smith, Ariz. | Sutherland | Tillman | |
| Smith, Ga. | Swanson | Townsend | |

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. REED. I announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE] on account of illness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON], and will state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEST in the chair). Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to have the Secretary read the letter I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE NATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C., March 16, 1914.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of the fact that a number of telegrams have been sent to various Senators with reference to the time of taking a vote on joint resolution No. 1, will you permit me to say it has not been the policy of my committee, representing an organization of approximately half a million women, to ask these half a million individuals to wire you their ideas with reference to your method of procedure? We feel that it would be unfair to ask women in distant States who are not closely in touch with the situation here to decide when the Senate should vote. We feel such requests would be manifestly unfair to you.

We are legally authorized by our organization to represent that organization at Washington, and the matter of advising with you upon the management of the pending resolution is entirely in our hands, and, with the exception of having asked a few of the State presidents whom we have fully advised from day to day to communicate with their Senators, we have sent out no request that you be deluged with telegrams or letters.

Will you permit me to say to you again that I believe it is my duty to urge that our measure be voted upon at the conclusion of the speeches, for if it should happen that we should pass this opportunity and a vote should not be taken at this session the cause of suffrage would suffer an irrevocable setback, and we do not feel that this chance should be taken when the only gain would be added publicity for suffrage demonstrations to be given in May. Those demonstrations will be given throughout the United States under the direction of our own State organizations, but they will serve their purpose without the sacrifice of one jot of advantage gained here at Washington.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration of the views of my committee upon this matter, I am,

Yours, most sincerely, RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK,
*Chairman.*

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram I have received from the president of the Texas Woman Suffrage Association, and I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Senator SHEPPARD,
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*

We wish a vote on suffrage question promptly.

ELEANOR BRECKENRIDGE,
*President Texas Woman Suffrage Association.*

Mr. LANE. The joint resolution is now before the Senate and open to discussion, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LANE. I wish to make a few remarks. In what I am going to advance I will not state anything which I have not often said before. The State in which I live has already adopted woman suffrage, and women vote there now on full equality with men. We have learned to have no fear of their participation in matters of public concern. In fact, we find that the women are as intelligent as are the men in their consideration of public affairs. We find that their interest is as great as that of the men, and that it arises from the same motives. I do not see, as a matter of fact, how anyone can make any question concerning the right of women to vote or their ability to do so if they care to exercise the franchise.

I have jotted down a few remarks, that they might be consecutive and in order that they might not consume too much time. They are principles in which I fully believe, and of which I myself have no doubt. I do not blame anyone, nor do I question his right to differ with me; and there are problems in certain portions of this country with which I am not familiar and upon which I make no criticism and acknowledge the superior information of those who have had a greater experience than mine. Yet I can not see, in the large way as I view it, that the same right given there to women would not inure to the general benefit the same as in every other section of the country; but, as I said, that is a matter upon which I do not make any criticism, nor do I wish to offer any advice. I shall refrain from doing so.

I believe that woman is man's full and equal partner in life and by right is justly entitled to a full and free participation with him in all of its affairs. By her we come into this world, and for aught I know, again dependent upon her willingness to undergo suffering for us, the measure of our gratitude for what she has already done for us may in part lie our best hope for future happiness. Having nourished us into being by parting with the very blood of her blood and bone of her bone, and having done so lovingly and with the prayer in her heart that we profit thereby to the fullest extent, what manner of creatures would we be or what hope of reward ought we to expect in the hereafter if we deny her the enjoyment of every privilege of which we avail ourselves? I have not the slightest fear that in rendering unto her the right to a voice in the conduct of public affairs that we incur any risk whatever. Nor would I be afraid, for that matter, to trust all legislative business to her. In some respects she is even better fitted for the work than we are. She possesses by Divine dispensation, for instance, the first and greatest requisite which would qualify her for a seat in the Senate, which is the use of the tongue and vocal cords, and I believe she could hold her own with the most verbose Member of this body, although I am willing to concede that her physical endurance might not be equal to the strain. I do not believe that the affairs of the people would suffer from any lack of judgment on her part, nor do I believe that she would make any more mistakes in legislation than we do, for the reason that it can not be done; it is not possible.

If after having secured the right to vote, however, it should prove that woman does not use it as wisely as we, I would be willing to assist in taking it away from her.

I do not consider that we, in granting her this franchise, confer any favor upon her at all, it being my opinion that she is now and always has been as much entitled to it as man ever was. Her interest in the management of Government affairs is as great as any man's can possibly be. In many ways, from her very nature, it is even greater.

A woman's love for and her interest in the welfare of her offspring exceeds that of man; for that reason if for no other she would work to secure the best conditions possible to obtain for their benefit.

Man's interest in his offspring is not so great as woman's, nor can it be, nor will it ever be, nor has it ever been in the past.

Into the world she brings them, frequently at the cost of her happiness or even her life.

Her great mother love will be a bar to bad legislation if she is allowed a voice in passing upon it. No being who has given of her life to nourish another into existence is going to do anything or assist in doing anything which will bring harm or suffering upon it after she has created it.

For these if for no other reasons I would not fear the votes of women on any question of public concern.

Some have expressed a doubt of her ability to master the duties which would devolve upon her. In answer I would say that ever since "this old round world began" she has stood elbow to elbow with man and helped him without stint to make it habitable; in war, in peace, in famine, through drought and flood.

In the heat of the desert and in the deathly stillness of the life-extracting cold of the north she goes with him, lives with him, and fights and lives or fights and dies with him and for him.

I was reading an account in the papers yesterday that after the battles which they are having in Mexico among those found among the dead were women who had been fighting by the side of husband, brother, father, or friend, willing to die or to go anywhere with them. To dive down into hades, farther than man has the nerve to go, or ever will, a woman will go for her offspring, and the question arises whether, with that love in her bosom, that unselfishness, it does not seem to be too small an affair for men to stand here and argue against granting her every right that he obtains.

We have not outgrown the ideas of our ancestors. Along in the sixth century our forebears, the early fathers of the Chris-

tian church, debated with great gravity and much dignity as to whether or not woman had a soul. At the council held at Macon, after much discussion such as has been indulged in here, it was voted upon, and woman won out by a majority of one vote. That was a great concession for man to make, was it not? It was quite an event in the sixth century; and now here in this day we are questioning her right to participate with ourselves upon full equality in the affairs of men. Whether we will decide it by one vote or not I do not know. I rather suspect that we will not be quite up to the mark set by the old fathers at Macon.

It has been urged that contact with political affairs would degrade woman and rob her of some of her charming womanly qualities. In answer to this argument I would say that when politics are carried on in a manner which will bring a blush of shame to the cheek of a modest woman, they are to the bad, not alone for her but for the men and the country as well, and for the sake of decency they can not be changed too quickly. Anyone who questions woman's fitness to legislate as well as men should in justice be compelled to come here and "sit out" some of the debates such as those upon the tariff or currency questions or some other economic problem affecting the interest of the people. He would find one side of the Chamber engaged in prophecies dire, which seem to be founded on the fond hope that the devil will bring a blight on the prosperity of the country in punishment for its not longer following their leadership, the while upon the other side there is exhibited a confiding trust in God and good luck that measures which carefully hobble many issues of vital importance and partially relieve others less so will prove a panacea for deep-grounded economic errors of the past long endured, which they will not. He would conclude, I think, that if a suffragette convention was turned loose on the scene it would not hurt and might, at least, add interest to the proceedings, if nothing else.

When it comes to a question of cool nerve and endurance of pain, woman will be found to be the superior of man. This fact is known to every surgeon.

It is my opinion that the fear of the southern Senators of women's votes is groundless. Indeed, I believe that they can and will prove of the greatest help to the men, and I have every confidence in their intelligence, their patriotism, and their ability to help solve a vexing and momentous question.

I am not one of those who fear that women can not fill positions of public trust, for I had the honor at one time to appoint two women, one as the head of an important department and the other in a most difficult position to fill. In both cases the services rendered by them were of the highest type and successful in every respect. If the conduct of all of the other departments of that city had been equally as well conducted, the people would have been saved much money and a higher type of municipal management would have been established.

In regard to the granting of the right to vote causing an increase of divorces, I have to say that divorces are increasing all over the world and marriages and births growing fewer in countries not only where women do not vote but where men are restricted in their suffrage as well. This is recognized to be due to economic conditions to a large degree, and to some extent to the restrictions and double standard of morals and living which is applied between the sexes. Divorces will no doubt continue to increase whether women vote or not, but the cause for the condition must be sought in some other source than suffrage.

I could urge many reasons for bestowing the ballot on women, but will not do so. Recognizing her, as I do, as my full partner in life—and, I hope, in the hereafter—I am bespeaking for her an equal share in the common property, as I feel it my duty to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a number of Senators have informed me of their desire to address the Senate upon the pending resolution before a final vote shall be taken either upon the resolution or the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. Inasmuch as I observe the absence of all of those Senators from the Chamber, and as I feel it incumbent upon myself as chairman of the committee to say something upon the measure, perhaps it is as well that I should discuss it now as to reserve the right to close the debate upon it.

I may say, Mr. President, by way of preliminary, that this resolution has been made the subject of consideration through the persistent effort of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], acting in behalf of and with my full support as the chairman of the committee, and actuated by the almost universal request of those directly interested for its disposition at the earliest possible moment. Acting upon this general and continued expression, he has frequently attempted to make this joint resolution the subject matter of discussion, and finally succeeded. The fact, therefore, that it is now up for final consideration is due both to the outside demand for it and to the persistence of the Senator heretofore having the measure in charge.

It is true, as the record abundantly discloses, that a very large and organized portion of the equal suffragists of the Nation have more recently suggested the expediency or propriety of the postponement of a final vote until some time in the ensuing spring; and, in justice to the Senator from Arizona, it should be said that his own view has to some extent recently concurred with that desire, while I, as the chairman of the committee, think otherwise. My belief is—and in saying this I voice the sentiment of the National Suffrage Association—that it is better to press the matter to an early determination, without reference to the result, inasmuch as it has been made the pending business of this body. I believe, Mr. President, in this policy because I think it is the policy which should be pursued in promoting any great question in which a large body of the people are directly interested. There never has been a change in existing conditions or an addition to a given régime which succeeded immediately or which did not succeed only after and because of its continued and persistent advocacy. I know of no other way in which to push to success any great political question, or, for that matter, any other object affecting us in any department of life.

For more than a quarter of a century, Mr. President, those who were behind the movement for the election of Senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people were constantly pressing its consideration. It was not at first successful; indeed, the initial lack of success was so conspicuous that it would not have been surprising if complete discouragement had resulted instead of those renewed efforts, which were finally crowned with success. So this movement, Mr. President, beginning more than half a century ago and growing slowly at first, but growing, nevertheless, overcoming an obstacle here, overriding a supposed argument there, marching always forward and onward to that goal of success which is ultimately to crown the movement, as it has crowned all other movements having for their purpose and object the establishment of an essential political right.

Therefore, Mr. President, so far as this joint resolution is concerned, it is my deliberate judgment that the committee has acted wisely, and that the consensus of public opinion will so determine in the near future, both in pressing in season and out of season for a consideration of the joint resolution, and in pressing it, after reaching the proper place upon the calendar, for a vote which will make some present disposition of it. When I say that I mean some disposition of the measure in its present form, not expecting that the battle will have been won or lost until other struggles shall have followed this one in swift and active succession. So believing, Mr. President, I shall for a short space of time refer to some of the statements and arguments that have here been presented by the opponents of this measure and to give some reasons which, in my judgment, are conclusive both as to the expediency and as to the justice of female suffrage.

This joint resolution is in itself a simple thing; by which I mean that it clearly, concisely, and briefly embodies the proposition in the shape of a constitutional amendment providing that hereafter sex shall not be an obstacle or an impediment to suffrage in the Nation. It has been modeled after another amendment, which years ago was the subject of as serious and bitter controversy as any amendment that has ever been or that ever will be made to the Constitution of the United States. It has been so modeled, not because of any advocacy of or opposition to that amendment, but simply because the phraseology there outlined can not very well be improved upon in the effort to accomplish a similar end.

The purpose, as I have said, of this amendment, Mr. President, is so obvious that it certainly needs no elaboration. I shall therefore proceed directly to the consideration of the question itself in connection with some of the things that have been urged here against its adoption.

It has been suggested with much force that we should not impose suffrage upon States which do not want it; that each State should be permitted within itself to determine questions of this and kindred import, and that the remaining States should not by sheer force of numbers change conditions that are not desirable or welcome to States objecting.

As a matter of abstract justice, Mr. President, we can all recognize the force of that argument; but, unfortunately, it proves too much, since, if we are to accept it in its entirety, it would be and would have been an insuperable objection to any change in our organic law; for, with the possible exception of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, I do not believe it would have been possible to have made any other, by the unanimous action of all of the States composing the Union; and the

very fact of its impossibility is doubtless the reason why we find the Constitution written as it is, the machinery of which is designed to clothe a defined majority with the power, by mutual action, of overcoming the objections of a small minority in the interest of what the majority believes to be for the general welfare and the general good.

Take the last amendment, Mr. President, to which I have already referred, and which makes a fundamental change in the method of selecting Members of this body. A number of States opposed, and doubtless at this time dissent, from the new method of selecting United States Senators; but it is a part of our organic law, nevertheless, for the simple reason that it was enacted under the forms and through the processes of the Constitution itself. If this proposed amendment is adopted, it must be adopted by the same processes, through the operation of the same machinery, working in the same direction, and unless, therefore, we depart from the scheme of the Constitution itself, we must recognize the right of three-fourths of the States of the Union to impose their will upon the other fourth whenever in the constitutionally expressed judgment of three-fourths that right is crystallized into an amendment to the organic law. So, here, when two-thirds of the Members of both branches of Congress shall say that a change should be submitted to the consideration of the States, that submission must follow, notwithstanding the opposition, however implacable, of the small minority opposing it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I rise, Mr. President, to make a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] has an important engagement this evening at Philadelphia, and is compelled to leave. He desires to be present when the vote is taken upon the joint resolution; and I rise to ask the Senator from Colorado if he will not, provided no other Senator desires to speak after he gets through, ask that the measure be laid aside until to-morrow, in order that the Senator from Arizona may be present when the vote is taken?

Mr. THOMAS. I have already given the Senator from Arizona the assurance, so far as any influence I may have goes, that the vote should not take place to-day if it could be avoided, and I will be very glad, if necessary, to follow that course.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS. I have been informed, however, by a number of Members of the Senate that they desire to discuss this proposition, among others the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who is now in his seat; and if a small proportion of the Senators who have so notified me shall respond, it is to some extent improbable that we can reach a vote to-morrow.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. I was about to ask unanimous consent for a vote on the joint resolution before 6 o'clock this evening. It was urged by friends of the measure on yesterday that on account of the absence of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] it would be unfair to take up the joint resolution and vote on it on that day, and because of his absence a request for unanimous consent for a vote was not urged. It was desired to take the vote on yesterday because several Senators were obliged to leave the city yesterday, and others, including myself, are compelled to leave to-day. It seems the friends of this measure do not desire a vote to-day, but I think it would be manifestly unfair to a number of Senators who are compelled to go away to-day, in view of what occurred on yesterday, when the vote was postponed on account of the absence of one Senator, to postpone it to a time when a number of Senators can not be present. Referring to the proposition——

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KERN. In a moment. Referring to the suggestion that certain Senators desire to speak, I wish to say that there has been nothing in the world to prevent those Senators from speaking on any day for the past several days had they so desired, and I hope an arrangement can be made by which a vote may be taken on the pending amendment and on the joint resolution itself before adjournment to-day, otherwise several Senators will be deprived of the opportunity of voting thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KERN. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] first requested recognition, but I have finished and yield the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to say, Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to say that I am perfectly willing to vote to-day, and if there is any assurance that there will be a vote to-day I shall remain, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will pardon me, it is, of course, the fault of no Senator that the vote has been postponed, but I think it would be very unfair to have the vote to-day unless it were to be taken almost immediately, and even then it is now almost too late to take it. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], and several other Senators have to leave town at 3 o'clock to keep engagements for various St. Patrick's Day celebrations in New Jersey and elsewhere, where they are expected to make speeches, and some of the rest of us will be obliged to leave at 5 o'clock and some at 6. All of us are anxious for our votes to be recorded when the roll is called on the pending joint resolution, and I should like to secure unanimous consent that a vote shall not be taken to-day, so that Senators who have been compelled to leave town—and some of them have left the Chamber already to take the 3 o'clock train and others will have to leave soon—may have an opportunity to vote when the measure is disposed of.

Mr. KERN. A number of Senators will not be able to return to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of the Senators who are leaving, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] suggests, he himself amongst others, because he has to journey all the way to Indiana, will not be able to return to-morrow.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I will say that my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] has already left for Indiana; that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is compelled to leave for Nebraska; and that I am also obliged to go to Indiana.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if we could get a vote to-day, I would suspend my remarks right now and not say another word upon the subject, but I was informed this morning when trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement that it would be impossible to do so, because of the objection of some Senators who are opposed to the immediate consideration of this matter and who, I feel very sure, would have prevented a vote if an attempt had been made to take one yesterday.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I think if the Senator is in that frame of mind, if he will allow the roll to be called we can close this matter out mighty quick.

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly willing to do that, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I wanted to say something on this question, but I will not do so if we can get a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (to Mr. THOMAS). Why not ask unanimous consent for a vote now, and see if that will be agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS. Very well; I ask unanimous consent to take a vote on this matter now.

Mr. HUGHES. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. I am willing to do anything that is agreeable, but it seems to me it is impossible to please everybody.

Mr. HUGHES. Regular order, Mr. President. As I understand, the regular order is the calling of the roll on the joint resolution, if no one desires to speak. I understand the Senator from Colorado is willing to have that course pursued.

Mr. THOMAS. One or two Senators not now present expected to discuss this matter, and I am in honor bound to inform them if we are going to have a vote right off. I think that they should be present.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I hardly think, if there are Senators who wish to be heard upon this question, that it ought to be forced right now. Why can it not be agreed that no vote shall be taken to-day? Then Senators can fill their engagements and be back here to-morrow. I ask unanimous consent that no vote be taken to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, if no vote is to be taken to-day, but a vote is to be taken to-morrow, that will disfranchise a number of Senators who can not be here to-morrow.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator from Indiana know when they can be here?

Mr. KERN. If the Senator will allow me, would he object to allowing the matter to go over until there can be a full vote in the Senate?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to see the matter take that course.

Mr. KERN. I suggested yesterday that, if a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote yesterday could not be reached, a date be fixed for a vote next week, say, on Monday, so that all Senators could have ample time to return.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. THOMAS. That would be agreeable to me, but I am satisfied that it can not and will not be done.

Mr. KERN. What can not be done?

Mr. THOMAS. The entering into of a unanimous-consent agreement fixing the time for a vote.

Mr. VARDAMAN. We can test the matter by asking unanimous consent that a vote be taken at 4 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator for that purpose, with the understanding that I still have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hughes | Perkins | Stephenson |
| Bankhead | Johnson | Pittman | Sterling |
| Borah | Jones | Poindexter | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Kern | Ransdell | Thomas |
| Bristow | Lane | Reed | Thompson |
| Bryan | Lea, Tenn. | Robinson | Thornton |
| Burton | Lee, Md. | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | McCumber | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Chilton | Martin, Va. | Sheppard | West |
| Clark, Wyo. | Nelson | Shields | Williams |
| Dillingham | Norris | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| du Pont | Oliver | Smith, Ga. | |
| Gallinger | Overman | Smith, S. C. | |
| Gore | Page | Smoot | |

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] are absent on the business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, in order that there may be a full attendance of Senators when the vote is taken upon this measure, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the vote on the joint resolution and amendments be taken at 4 o'clock Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I object. It will be impossible for me to be present here on Monday, or for several days thereafter, and I want to vote on this resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will Saturday be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. CATRON. Yes, sir; any time between now and adjournment on Saturday evening.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall object to Saturday. I am ready to vote now.

Mr. SMOOT. If a unanimous-consent agreement is going to be asked, it seems to me the roll should be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll has just been called.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall object to voting at any other time than to-day during the present week.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Make it Wednesday.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will ask if next Tuesday will be satisfactory, or Wednesday or Thursday or Friday?

Mr. CATRON. No; I do not think I shall be here at any time during next week.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I see that I can not satisfy the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CATRON. You can satisfy me by voting at any time between now and Saturday night.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will Monday week be satisfactory to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CATRON. Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES. How about the 2d of May?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from New Mexico consent to vote at this time?

Mr. CATRON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest that the roll be called, and we proceed to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I had not intended or desired to speak upon this joint resolution; but the friends of the resolution are desirous that certain things shall be put into the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to print, without reading it, as a part of my remarks, an article prepared by a woman, which contains some interesting matter bearing upon one phase of this subject—the State rights question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE STATE RIGHTS SHIBBOLETH.

[By Mary Beard.]

Women who are asking for a Federal amendment abolishing sex discrimination in the suffrage provisions of the Constitution are informed that the determination of the qualifications for voting is purely a State matter. They are dismissed with an air of finality not unlike that which follows a mathematic demonstration. The suffrage is a matter of State, not national, interest, and that is the end of the discussion.

There are some simple-minded persons who accept this dictum as the final word on the subject, but those women who have studied even a little American history and politics know very well that the border line between national and State matters can not be settled by a mathematical process or by an ipse dixit of some interested politician. They know that neither the Republican Party, the champion of nationalism, nor the Democratic Party, the champion of State rights, has been consistent in its attitude toward national and State rights. They know that each of them has leaned toward National or State Governments exactly whenever it has suited the party and economic interests.

Did not Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, founders of the Democratic Party, rend the air with cries of State rights against Federal usurpation when the Federalists chartered the first United States bank in 1791, and when the Federalist court, under the leadership of John Marshall, rendered one ringing nationalist decision after another upholding the rights of the Nation against the claims of the States? Yet Jefferson, as President, acquired the Louisiana Territory in what was admitted by him to be open violation of the Constitution, and the same James Madison who opposed the Federalist bank in 1790 as a violation of the Constitution and State rights cheerfully signed the bill rechartering that bank when it became useful to the fiscal interests of the Democratic Party. Jefferson was ready to nullify the alien and sedition laws and the Constitution of the United States in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798; the very Federalists who fought him in that day and denounced him as a traitor and nullifier lived to proclaim and practice doctrines of nullification in behalf of State rights during the War of 1812.

In the administration of Thomas Jefferson the National Government began the construction of the great national road without any express authority from the Constitution, and notwithstanding the fact that the construction of highways was admittedly a State matter. Eighteen years later a Democratic President, James Monroe, vetoed an act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road and labored to prove that the whole venture was a violation of the Constitution and an invasion of rights reserved to the States. On August 24, 1912, the Congress of the United States, then controlled by the Democratic Party, voted $500,000 for the construction of experimental and rural delivery routes and to aid the States in highway construction. From high in the councils of that party we now have the advocacy of national ownership of railways, telegraph, and telephone lines. In the early days of the Republic the Democratic Party protested even in armed insurrection in Pennsylvania against the inquisitorial excise tax which, to use the language of the day, "penetrated a sphere of taxation reserved to the States"; to-day the Democratic Party places upon the statute books the most inquisitorial tax ever laid in the history of our country, and a wise and just tax, too, many believe. That same party, by an act of April 9, 1912, laid a tax on white phosphorus matches, not for the purpose of raising revenues, for which the taxing power is conferred, but admittedly for the purpose of destroying an industry which it could not touch otherwise. The match industry was found to be injurious to a few hundred working people; the Democratic Party wisely and justly cast to the four winds all talk about the right of States, made the match industry a national matter, and destroyed the dangerous features of the business. Men and women all over the country rose up and pronounced this a noble achievement. Republicans joined with Democrats in claiming the honor of that great humane service. Shades of departed Democrats! A taxing power which, according to Calhoun, could not be used for the purpose of protecting industries, may be used to destroy them. Consistency, where is thy virtue, and State rights, where is thy victory?

The State had the right to nullify Federal law in 1798—so Jefferson taught and Kentucky practiced. Half a century elapses. The State of Wisconsin, rock-ribbed Republican Wisconsin, nullified the fugitive-slave law, and in its pronunciamento of nullification quoted the very words which Jefferson had used in 1798. A Democratic Supreme Court at Washington, presided over by Chief Justice Taney, the arch apostle of State rights, answered Wisconsin in the very language of the Federalists of 1798, whom Jefferson despised and contemned: "The Constitution and laws of the United States are supreme, and the Supreme Court is the only and final arbiter of disputes between the State and National Governments. A few more years elapse. South Carolina declares the right of the State to nullify, and Wisconsin answers on the field of battle: 'The Constitution and laws of the National Government are supreme, so help us God.'"

At the close of that ever-to-be-regretted war the Nation wrote into the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the fundamental principle that the suffrage is a national matter. Those amendments were intended to establish forever adult male suffrage throughout the American empire. It is true that those amendments are in many respects nullified by ingenious provisions. But there they stand. You are confronted by this dilemma: Either you must openly flaunt and scorn them, and thus virtually say to the Nation, We will obey just as much of the Constitution as we please, which is the doctrine of the anarchist; or you must say suffrage is by the Constitution a national matter and we abide by the Constitution.

All reasonably sophisticated persons know that anything is a State matter which we think is a State matter, and anything is a national matter that we think is a national matter. The women of this country—the women of the enfranchised States and the women of the States not yet enfranchised—think suffrage a national matter. Men may turn aside those women who expect to simper their way to the suffrage by saying, "Just one moment, please," or "Kindly step the other way,

please"; but they can not thus dismiss those who have read the long and inconsistent history of all parties.

From history women appeal to political science, and here they cite the example of the only great independent federation that deserves to be compared with the United States—the German Empire. The constitution of that confederation does not leave the determination of the qualifications for voters for the Reichstag to the mercies of the States; but solemnly and emphatically prescribes that every adult male German citizen shall vote for members of the Imperial Congress, whatever may be the qualifications for voters in the several States. The German constitution was made in the full light of modern political science and suffrage was there treated as a national matter.

If we turn to the other great federations of the world—Switzerland, Canada, and Australia—we find that their constitutions treat the suffrage for Federal offices as a national matter by empowering the Federal Parliaments to make uniform regulations with regard to qualifications for voters. The constitution of the Australian Commonwealth provides that the qualifications imposed on voters by the States shall remain until the (Federal) Parliament otherwise provides; and in 1902 the Federal Parliament established uniform qualifications throughout the Commonwealth as far as Federal elections were concerned, and enfranchised women in spite of the opposition in some of the States.

A study of the constitutional law shows, therefore, that in no federation is the suffrage regarded as a purely State matter. The Constitution of the United States does not allow the States to provide any qualifications they please for voters for Members of the House of Representatives or Senators, as is the rule in the case of the choice of presidential electors, where the State legislatures may make any qualifications they see fit. The constitution of Germany established universal manhood suffrage for Reichstag elections; the constitutions of Switzerland and Canada empower the Federal Parliaments to make uniform regulations whenever they see fit; the constitution of the Australian Commonwealth authorizes the Federal Parliament to make uniform qualifications, and the Federal Parliament almost immediately after the adoption of the constitution swept away sex discriminations in Federal elections.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, we are slaves to custom. We boast of freedom, and yet are bound on every side by superstitions which have survived from the Dark Ages. We think we are free, and yet we are such intellectual bondsmen that the term "free thinker" is looked on with opprobrium. Nearly every action of our lives is governed by precedent and convention. Our age-old forms of law are, many of them, mere mummery; our civilized regalia, the pomp and heraldry of state, as absurd and childish as the trappings of a Zulu tribe. Habit is the most powerful factor governing the actions of men. The mind as well as the body is plastic and turns in sympathy to its familiars, and to those things to which it has been trained. For every man who has the initiative to leave the habitual path to seek a higher and a better way of life, a million insist on planting their feet exactly in the track of the myriads who have gone before. The old road seems easier, and, to most, it seems best. Not only do most of us, as a race, content ourselves with established forms and customs, but will resist to the utmost any change.

So it is that mankind has required a hundred thousand years to attain its present improved condition. Every step of the way has been a war against precedent. Every intellectual advance has had its martyrs to the cause of progress. Every man who dared to oppose the established order has been marked as a despised thing apart. The imprisonment of a Galileo, the excommunication of a Luther, the chains of a Columbus, the rebel's price upon the head of Washington, are but the protests of privilege against the enfranchisement of the human mind. In the suffering of heroes blooms the flower of progress.

Many are against the political emancipation of women solely because they do not want to change custom and the established order. If some among their ancestors had not the initiative to break away from the fixed routine, in generation upon generation, these opponents of change would have been savages in the forests of Europe, clad in the skins of wild beasts and feeding on raw meat. Because some dared and some aspired they are the heirs of genius and citizens of the American Republic. But why does convention, precedent, and custom deny to women the most precious privilege of citizenship? We have set in the law the tests of fitness of a man to participate in this primary and fundamental function of self-government. He shall be 21 years of age. A woman may hesitate to say so, but she can be 21 years of age. In some States it is required that he shall be able to read and write. Women in larger percentage than men can read and write. It is said that men are required to support the family. That is often true; but without woman he would not have any family to support; and many times the woman not only supplies the family, but supports it and the man as well. And in every home which affords a haven of peace and rest to those who enter its sacred door a woman's toiling hands or a woman's loving heart makes it so. Can he who is opposed to this resolution turn away for a moment from the heartlessness and the busy affairs of this forum and rest his mind's eyes upon the blessed features of his mother? What has she been to you? She gave you being. She gave you sustenance, and in your puny helplessness nurtured you with that unspeakable tenderness, the holy mystery of God's love upon this earth. She gave you instruction, and with love and sympathy guided your feeble and erring steps. She dreamed dreams for you, prayed for you, it may be, toiled for you. Her hopes and pride were the best incentive of your ambition. Now, in the seats of power, can you deny to her and to other mothers of a great people the right of franchise which the Constitution guarantees to every race and color of men? I have looked upon the heroic and noble face of my mother when the hand of God had smoothed from it all the cares and sufferings of this mortal life. I thought in grief too deep and intimate for any confidant of her labors and love for her children, of that rich legacy of loving instruction which she gave. I know how truly her heart and mind would have guided her in all the duties of citizenship, and rather that I should never announce another vote from this high place than that I should use its power to deny political freedom to such as she.

And to those other women who opened the gates of Paradise to you in the young morning of manhood and taught you the way of tenderness in the gardens of the Hesperides, can you deny the rights of citizens to them?

Qualifications for the franchise should be moral, spiritual, and intellectual fitness. Our own observation and the experience of history prove that in all these respects woman can meet any test men can satisfy. In literature, as in art, the inspiration of women has lightened the burdens of the world. The antisuffragists themselves have compiled data showing the good works of women. In this useful public service can the added power and influence of the ballot in any way lessen her efficiency? Some women say they do not want the ballot. They have organized against it as though anyone sought to force it upon them. No such proposition has ever been made. It is true the use of the ballot is a civic duty as well as a political right, but this resolution is intended for those women who appreciate that duty and who desire that right. Others will be left free to keep away from the contaminating touch of the voting precinct, if they so desire, just as millions of male citizens now do. It is said polling places are not suitable for women. There is no higher function of men than voting, and the polling place can be made as respectable as a school and, if need be, as holy as a church.

In view of her ability to comply with every test, why has custom, tradition, the law denied political equality to woman? For the same reason that she was formerly and still is, in many places, denied social and civil equality. It is only a few generations since woman had no individual status in this our society. She was a feme covert, a mere appanage of the man who owned her. He was in very truth her lord and master, and held over her the power of life and death. There was no law for her but the will of her lord. There are still some Tories, and strange to say, some women, who regret the departure of those good old times. And what was the reason for this personal chattel slavery of women? Physical force! All the institutions of society were then based on the law of force. A man was entitled to what he could take and hold. That was why it was necessary to build so many castles. Feudalism may have been a fine thing for the physically strong, but it was a hard and cruel law for the weak. It is always so, because the possessors of material power are often cruel, lustful, ignorant, and brutal. A state based upon such principles is in a stage of barbarism. With the Renaissance, the birth and progress of learning in the West, enlightened States have slowly evolved new and better principles of government. The growth of religious liberty, the consequent spread of the knowledge of the real teachings of Jesus Christ, have been most potent in this amelioration of the world. The discovery of America, doubling the opportunities, resources, and multiplying the comforts of mankind, has accelerated this advance. We have freed woman from personal bondage and given her an equal place of dignity and honor in the home. We have stricken from her the shackles of civil slavery, and have given her a standing in the courts as to all personal and property rights. No one can be heard nowadays to complain openly of this. On the contrary, we look upon this evolution of the status of woman as a wise, benign, and just policy.

Yet she remains in political slavery. This can only be explained as in geology the presence of certain rocks, apparently out of place, is the work of a glacial age, long disappeared, or as a rudimentary organ in the body whose functions have long since ceased. The difference is that this survival of feudalism in the twentieth century is positively injurious not only to women but to the entire State.

But it is said that this physical test is correct, because war requires physical prowess and women can not go to war. Men seem to be afraid that women, if vested with political power, would send men to war too freely. We can picture, in the vision of the mind, this future state controlled by women sending the

men to war, all the women remaining at home to hold carnival and revel. Wars are fought by boys. Can we imagine the mothers of the land too prone to send their smooth-faced sons to feed the hungry god of war, or wives and sweethearts careless of war because they themselves may not be soldiers? As a matter of fact, increased political power for women would afford the greatest force for peace that statesmanship can devise. But how as to war itself? All the army is not on the firing line. In hospitals and even on the field the ministering care of women comforts the wounded and blesses the dying. Where does war get its support but from the homes of the land, and upon whom does it levy a greater tribute, both of wealth and suffering, than upon the women of these homes? Women can not go to war, it is said. And yet this Nation now proposes to erect in this Capital a mighty monument to the sacrifices and devotion of the women of the North and South in the greatest war of our history. But for the courage, patriotism, and fortitude of women in war our independence could never have been won; and in every crisis of our history the high marks of daring and fame were reached through the encouragement, the love, and inspiration of heroic women. And can not women go to war? When at rare intervals the Divine Spirit incarnates itself in mortal flesh, it does not always choose a man as its medium. Women have been inspired—and it was a woman, a chaste maiden of less than 20 years of age, who came from her simple country life and gave hope, if she could not give courage, to her craven king. Joan of Arc, as pure and noble a figure as time has seen, led where there was no man to lead. She broke the power of the invader and led victorious armies for her country's freedom. She shed her blood in battle at the gates of Paris and made men of laggards and cowards. And yet she died the cruel death of fire—neglected by an ingrate king, the victim of ignorant and brutal men. Years after her body had been destroyed the same forces which urged her execution attempted to capitalize her sainted memory.

Free government means self-government. That selfishness which is a predominant trait of human nature can not be trusted, unrestrained, to use benevolently exclusive power. The only possible agency by which any class can secure justice from the Government is the vesting in that class a part in the control of the Government. If women have no voice in the Government, they are political slaves, and it is within the unrestricted power of another class to make them social and personal slaves. If their interests are to be protected, the only guaranty is to give them the means by which to protect themselves. It is upon this axiom that all the new agencies of popular government have been found necessary—that the people can not have just laws, justly enforced, unless the people themselves have political power. Free government means a free party, and so the movement has grown to put the party under the direct control of the people.

But it is not for women alone that their political liberation is sought. It is for the good of all. It is not a question of sex. It is a question of virtue. It is a wise philosophy that in this humane and enlightened age the humane impulses and the intelligent minds of women should have free play in solving the human problems of society. Some say woman's enfranchisement should be left to the States. But why? We have deemed it of sufficient importance to provide in the Federal Constitution that race or color should not stand in the way of the ballot. Why not write into this clause one other word and prevent the far more unwise and cruel discrimination against sex alone?

It is pertinent to observe, sir, that we are not seeking to take anything away from anybody, but to give the highest privilege of citizenship to a class which has been denied it. No man can oppose this resolution on the ground that anyone will lose a privilege they now enjoy. It is perfectly proper for the Democratic Party to oppose this resolution if the administration or the party see fit to do so. They are laboring under no compulsion. But it is likewise necessary and proper that both party and administration shall be held accountable before the country for their attitude. The President has declined to support it. Other agencies in the control of that party have acted adversely upon it. It is our contention that in doing so they are opposing the extension of free institutions and the political liberation of one-half of our people. The time to stand for woman suffrage is whenever the opportunity is offered, and the means to be used are whatever lawful means are available. This resolution affords such an opportunity and such a means. The men of our land will be better men if they are born of mothers who are politically free.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I represent in part in this body a State which has enjoyed equal suffrage for a period of nearly 20 years. We have had an opportunity to observe its effect upon society and upon the politics of the State, and we are satisfied with the effect of woman suffrage. We have not observed that there is any neglect of the home by reason of it. If there are indications of that kind, or if there are to be, they have not yet in any outward sense developed. We do not believe any such thing will result from woman suffrage. We have never discovered any tendency toward what some people think will be the result of woman suffrage, and that is of masculinity, as it were, women departing from the avenues and walks of life for which they are particularly fitted and entering into other walks of life and engaging in a mode of life not in harmony with the highest ideals of womanhood. That condition has not yet developed in our State under woman suffrage. We do not believe it ever will develop.

We have never discovered either that there is any tendency on the part of women to abandon their particular sphere and engage exclusively in political duties, such as office holding, and so forth. The fact is that there is very little disposition upon the part of the women of my State apparently to hold office. They take an interest in politics; they take an interest in public questions; they are interested in public discussions; and I think the figures, if they could be gathered, would show that the percentage of votes upon the part of the women is practically as large as that upon the part of the men; but they have shown a keener interest in the things which have to do with molding public opinion than in enjoying the spoils of office. My own judgment is, from observations which I have made, that upon some questions, what might be called quasi-moral questions, the vote is larger and the interest greater upon the part of women than upon the part of men. In many of the most important questions which now concern the welfare of society their influence is controlling and always for the good.

Women do vote. They continue to vote, year by year and election after election. It is not a fad, it is not a fancy satisfied by an experience of one or two occasions, but they continue to take an interest in political affairs.

There is a great object lesson to everyone who has had the experience of campaigning where women vote and in a State where they do not. You will seldom speak to an audience in my State which is not composed of as many women as men, and perhaps more. You will find them active in all the different phases of political life, so far as those phases which go to make up public opinion and control and direct and shape and mold public opinion are concerned.

I say candidly and earnestly that after an observation of nearly 20 years, I am thoroughly in favor of equal suffrage. I believe it is to the benefit of society; I believe it is to the benefit of the body politic; I do not believe it is to the detriment of womankind; and therefore I have been and am an advocate of it. I began its advocacy 22 years ago and have never had cause to regret the humble part I had in securing the right of women to vote in my State.

There is one feature of woman's presence in politics which is not sufficiently accentuated, and that is what might be called her potential influence. Even if the women seldom went to the polls, even if they seldom took part in the more active phases of political activity, I would still be in favor of woman suffrage, for the reason that her presence in the political forum, the possibility of her taking part in political matters, the possibility that she may take an interest in a question or a candidate, has a potential and beneficial influence in politics which, to my mind, is even as great as that of her actual influence. I would not disparage my sex, but man is prone to be more careful when he knows his acts are to come under the surveillance of mother, wife, sister, or daughter.

Those who have attended political conventions and political gatherings before and after the advent of woman suffrage in a State will testify to the fact that no platform is ever written and no question advocated, no candidate's nomination sought, without some regard, more or less, as to how the women will view the candidate or the platform. I recall one instance in particular in my State, where there were only two women in the convention. It was during the old convention days, when the things were agreed upon mostly before the convention met. A platform and the candidates, or what was called a slate in "prehistoric times," had been agreed upon. There were not sufficient women in the convention or in touch with the convention to control the situation, but it was made known that a particular feature of the program of that convention would in all probability incur the displeasure and the opposition of the women vote of the State, and the slate was changed as promptly as if the votes had been in the convention to break it. This is the potential influence of woman, because no man knows what a woman will do when she is offended.

So I say, Mr. President, that the potential influence of woman, the knowledge that she has the power to enforce her

view of a particular question and that it can be made effective, is a powerful instrument and quality for good in political affairs.

I am, therefore, not particularly concerned with that argument which says that woman does not or should not attend political conventions or political gatherings, and so forth, for I repeat that if she exercise no other influence than the fact that she might become an effective censor of the action of a political party it would be a sufficient justification for giving her the vote.

We have had during all time certain arguments in favor of woman suffrage and arguments against woman suffrage. I am not going to undertake to review them to-day. They have been discussed here pro and con. I can only say that after nearly 20 years of observation and experience in the State of Idaho the arguments, so far as they are arguments, against woman suffrage have, in my judgment, been met. They have been met by actual experience, by actual fact, by the effect which it has had for the betterment of politics and political conditions.

I am not one of those, Mr. President, however, who claim that woman suffrage is a panacea for all the evils which afflict the body politic. Like all other reforms, those who advocate it expect too much of it, and those who oppose it attribute entirely too much to it in the way of fault. It is simply one of the important steps toward better politics and a better condition of affairs in political concerns. In my judgment, its entire tendency is for the good. Whether it is great or small, less than some might expect or more than others, the tendency of the presence of women in the political arena is for the good. Of that I entertain no doubt.

Mr. President, I have at different times throughout the East advocated equal suffrage, and I am going to insert in the RECORD some views which I have heretofore expressed. They may be of possible interest to those engaged in the cause of woman suffrage in the different States. At Newark, N. J., last October, at a woman-suffrage gathering, I said:

> There are no doubt those who truly believe that if woman is to vote, that if she is to consider of those questions which underlie and support the whole moral fabric of life, and, having considered of them, is to record her convictions, that she is to lose some of that charm which is exclusively hers. Let us be fair with ourselves and look with our eyes and not with our prejudices. I do not know of a nobler, more effectual, a more respected and refined power in the whole arena of social forces, and a more womanly woman, than the woman of to-day who is giving of her thought and her purpose, her invincible moral courage, in dealing with the social problems and social reforms with which we now have to deal, with which in the future we must contend more and more. Is she less respected by father, husband, and brother than the woman whose tastes lead her along other lines? And why withhold from this woman engaged in so noble an enterprise the instrumentality by which she can effectuate what her brain and purpose have planned and outlined? No woman can ever become less womanly from thinking and acting upon and in regard to those things which would protect the home, which would protect the child, which would protect society, and which would ameliorate and soften the harsh struggles of the countless thousands who are in earnest contest with adversity, but whose children must finally assume the duties and obligations which rest upon all the citizens of our blessed Republic.

Speaking later at Baltimore, I made this observation:

> I informed your committee when asked to speak upon this occasion that I would be glad to take part in this meeting, provided it did not commit me to the proposition of the proposed amendment to the Constitution now pending before Congress. I am an earnest advocate of woman suffrage, but I believe it to be both inexpedient and unwise to attempt to secure it otherwise than through the respective States.
> * * *
>
> Those of us who have had an opportunity to observe woman suffrage in actual practice through the course of years believe in it. We do not believe in it as a fad or a fancy, nor as an exigency in a national campaign, nor yet as a thing about which women should forfeit their poise and judgment, their sense of order, and their regard for law—we believe in it because we think it founded both in political justice and economic expediency, we think its tendency is all for the good, for cleaner and higher politics.
> * * * * * * *
>
> I think the campaign for woman suffrage has been carried on in this country with remarkable judgment and poise. It has been carried on in the States as it should be, through argument and reason, through discussion most ably conducted. It is bound to win. The continued appeal to the conscience and minds of the American people in an orderly and lawful way will win your cause and win it far more quickly and satisfactorily than it can be won in any other way. Two things those who are conducting truly great reforms ought at all times to bear in mind: First, that this is a government of order and law; and, secondly, that the people will in the end, and when fully informed, do the wise and just thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Idaho how long woman suffrage has existed in the State of Idaho?

Mr. BORAH. My remembrance is that it is 18 years, but I may be mistaken two years either way.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know that in the New England States men who are said to reside in the so-called woman-suffrage States on occasion say that it is working badly in those States. Now, the Senator represents a State where woman suffrage has existed for 15 years or more, and I will ask the Senator in all frankness whether or not he, from his observation and experience, is of the opinion that it is beneficial rather than otherwise?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt about the fact that it is beneficial. I may say that I have never in my observation discovered what I thought was an evil tendency of woman suffrage. I have, on the other hand, discovered many constant and persistent tendencies which I consider to be altogether for the good upon the part and by the reason of woman suffrage.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that I am for woman suffrage, I must say that I am against this joint resolution. That requires some further remarks upon my part, because I will, of course, immediately be charged with being underzealous in regard to the cause. If the proposition presented were only and alone the question of woman suffrage, if there were no other propositions inhering in this controversy, if there were no other precedents to be set and no other consequences to follow, I would unhesitatingly give my vote for the joint resolution. But there are other things necessarily associated with it which, to my mind, must be controlling, so far as my vote is concerned.

I can not permit myself to overlook the fact that while woman suffrage may be obtained through the States, a precedent which we are about to establish here would be one which would appertain and relate to other questions and be controlling in my judgment with reference to other matters, and for that among other reasons I am not satisfied to vote for the joint resolution.

When I informed one of the good women who was advocating this cause some time ago that I could not vote for the resolution she stated that they had been wondering why it was, why one who was in favor of woman suffrage was not in favor of this proposition. I answered her that the first reason why I was against this resolution and in favor of woman suffrage was because this is the most impracticable, impossible way by which to get woman suffrage in this country.

If we adopt this resolution, it will require 36 States to be carried for woman suffrage before an additional woman is permitted to vote so far as her right to vote depends upon this amendment. You may carry 20 States, you may carry 25 States, you may carry 30 States, you may carry 35 States, and the energy and the time and the effort and the money which you put forth in trying to carry those 35 States will have been wholly lost unless you are able to carry one other State. In my judgment you will never carry for woman suffrage in this country 36 States in the Union until you repeal the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution. You have taken on the suffrage cause the heavy burden of race prejudice.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. For my personal enlightenment, if the resolution as it stands before us to-day is agreed to—I do not expect it is going to be agreed to, but if it should be agreed to—would it not still be a fact that the individual State could confer suffrage upon the women?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suppose the Senator's idea is that they would rest on their oars if this should prevail. Is that the idea?

Mr. BORAH. No; not exactly that; but you must take into consideration that you can not conduct a campaign for the legislature in 36 States of the Union without a vast amount of additional expenditure, a vast amount of additional time and energy, at the same time that you are conducting a campaign for the submission of a constitutional amendment in your own State or in a particular State. For instance, if you could have all the 36 States of the Union submit the proposition of woman suffrage in the State at the same time that you were fighting for the legislature to ratify this amendment you might conduct the campaign with some degree of success from the same headquarters and with the same amount of energy, time, and money, but while conducting a campaign in a certain State for woman suffrage, like Michigan, direct by the vote of the people, if you are making any headway at all you must be carrying on a campaign in 35 other States of the Union for the purpose of ratification, and in my judgment dividing your forces and dissipating your power. I think it requisite to success that all effort and power should be concentrated and directed along lines where ultimate results can be finally had.

The thing which confronts me as a practical proposition in regard to this method is the insurmountable and impassable

barrier which stands between the women and suffrage so long as the negro vote in this country is as it is. There are 16 States in the Union that will never ratify this amendment so long as the fifteenth amendment is in the Constitution of the United States. We had just as well be candid and fair and open about this proposition. The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a dead letter. It is not enforced in a single State of the Union by reason of the fact that it is the fifteenth amendment. Wherever the negro votes he would vote without the amendment and by reason of the action of the State. Fifty years ago we extended to the negroes of this country the right of suffrage and to-day they are as completely disfranchised as if the fifteenth amendment was out of the Constitution. There it is in the fundamental law ignored and defied and evaded, not by the action of the South alone but by consent of a whole Nation.

Now do we suppose that those people, feeling as they do the necessity of acting upon that premise, will enfranchise 2,000,000 additional voters of the same class? Are we to suppose that they will add to and accentuate the strength of Federal control over elections until that question in some way is settled, so that they are relieved of their fear of negro domination? Those States against such a proposition will stand as solid as a Macedonian phalanx.

Permit me to say to the women of this country that the moment they leave the campaign in the individual States for the enfranchisement of woman and take on the campaign from a national standpoint they load down the woman-suffrage question with the race question, which is far more difficult to handle and goes up against more insurmountable barriers and more uncontrollable passion by far than the question of woman suffrage. I have never been able to understand why they should court such a contest.

Why should the women in this country who want to vote take upon their shoulders the race question in their fight for enfranchisement? The energy, the money, the time, and the ability which would be spent in undertaking to carry those 16 States would put 10 States of the North into the Union for woman suffrage.

Therefore, Mr. President, as one who believes that in time women will vote, except in those cases where the insurmountable barrier of race prejudice prevents it, and should be permitted to vote, I would be opposed to this proposition as a practical

Let me say without challenging the good faith or the courage of any Senator who sits here with me I do not think there is a Senator in this Chamber who believes that 15 or 16 States of the Union will ever ratify this amendment so long as the fifteenth amendment is unrepealed. Therefore that will happen which happened the other day when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi rose in his place and, as an amendment to this constitutional provision, proposed a repeal of the fifteenth amendment. Whenever this constitutional amendment, if it is adopted by the Congress, passes a certain border line of States that amendment will not be attached to it by the Congress of the United States, but it will be attached to it by every State in which the vote is being sought; that is to say, it will never receive the approval of those States until you make this a white amendment. I can not encourage the women of this country to enter that fight. I would be insincere and hypocritical to them and false to the cause to encourage such a course.

There is another reason, Mr. President, kindred to that proposition, which is a strong and controlling reason with me. It may be a sentimental proposition, but I do not look at it that way. I am opposed, even if we could secure ratification, to putting into the Constitution of the United States a provision of the Constitution which is going to be violated 365 days out of the year. A great fundamental law, the incarnation and the crystallization of the public sentiment and the moral force of 90,000,000 people should be a law which is in force and to be in force in its every line and letter so long as it remains the law. The violation of law is bad of itself. It is demoralizing to the community, the State, and the Nation. For a people to live in open defiance of their fundamental law, for a whole nation to witness day after day and year after year and decade after decade the flagrant evasion of their charter of government is to breed that contempt for order, that disregard for authority, that defiance of law, that indifference to the rights of others which now curses with a withering, consuming curse some of the so-called Republics to the south. We of the North are quick to vote these things upon the South, to vex and complicate their tremendous burden more and more. But we neither offer to the South a remedy nor offer to the negro anything more than lip service for the realization of its constitutional right.

I do not stand here to-day to criticize those of the South who have to deal with this question, but I do say that it can not be otherwise than demoralizing to be constantly placing in the Constitution of the United States provisions which every Senator knows will not be enforced or be made protective to the entire people of the United States.

What must the other race of which we are not members think as they look up to the Constitution of the United States and hear it eulogized here year by year, as they look up to the flag under which they live, supposing that it represents the highest form of civilization and the perfection of human justice? What must they think when day after day, year after year, they know that in violation of that supreme law they are deprived of the privilege of casting their vote according to the guaranty of the Constitution? The Constitution may not be a sacred thing, but the duty, the obligation, and good faith of a superior and dominant race toward an inferior and dependent race are sacred things. No promise should be made that is not to be kept.

I am one of those, Mr. President, who has never hesitated to say that the writing into the Constitution of the United States of the fifteenth amendment at the time it was written there was a mistake. It was a serious mistake. It came before the hot passions of the Civil War had cooled and judgment had time to resume its sway, while the engendered feelings which had been accumulating through years of strife and conflict still prevailed. It came in a large measure as a sort of retaliation and revenge. The idea of taking a people and lifting them out of a thousand years of savagery and barbarism, of 300 years of slavery, and placing them in a position where they are required to perform all the duties and obligations of citizenship of a highly civilized Republic! No race in the history of the world has ever been equal to such a thing and no race in the history of the world could do such a thing. And then, when they did not measure up to the task we either turned upon them or left them to their political fate. Men rise to the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in a great republic under years of stress and strain and under years of tutelage and education. Yet we took and placed upon those men the right and obligation of civilization, stepping immediately from the brink of savagery and slavery. It was a mistake. There is no doubt about that.

What has been the result? The result has been that after the first fever was over we of the North consented and connived at the South in violating the Constitution, and the North to-day is just as much a party to the violation of that Constitution as the South.

Mr. President, until the time shall arrive when through some mode, which is not by any means clear to my vision, we shall devise a scheme by which to protect the colored man in his vote, when the time shall arrive when we shall devise a method by which he shall exercise the right of suffrage, so far as I am concerned, let the consequences be what they may, I shall not vote to write into the Constitution another provision which is to be constantly violated for the next 50 years. I will not vote to aggravate or accentuate that condition there existing until we devise some method to relieve it and disclose sufficient courage to put the method thus devised into execution. I will not help to put another false and deluding promise into the Constitution with which to tantalize and demoralize a race, a promise which we of the North have no intention of enforcing and which those of the South have every intention, and as they believe from necessity, of evading.

No, sir; until we devise some plan, some scheme by which to carry out the letter and execute the spirit of the Constitution as it is now written, I will not consent, so far as I am concerned, to play the hypocrite any further.

Mr. President, those are what I consider the practical objections to the impossibility of securing this right through this method.

But there is another reason—and it is even a more controlling reason to me, because it goes to what I conceive the very foundation principles of the Republic—and that is the old doctrine, discarded and worn, but vital and indispensable—the doctrine of State rights for local affairs. I can not conceive of a State, or anything of sufficient dignity to be called a State, which has lost the right to say who shall vote for its State officer.

Mr. President, at the time of the organization of this Government and during the first years of its existence there lived two of the most remarkable men in the history of politics—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. Seldom, if ever, have two men of the same era exerted so marked an influence upon their own times, and never has it been the lot of two men of the same period to extend their influence side by side so far into the future. Some would compare the lives of Fox

and Pitt, of Disraeli and Gladstone, but Jefferson and Hamilton stood about the creation of a new government, and their services were not only more effective in the days they were rendered, but more profound and momentous, more lasting and far-reaching in their import. Both were among the first to be associated with the arousing of the American colonies to an open breach with the mother country; both were loyal and active agents in the success of the cause; both men of personal probity, of unusual energy, of singularly powerful intellects, and both exerted their great influence in and about the building of the Government, and each sought to build in the integrity of his own convictions.

I have never, since I have been able and sufficiently tolerant to ascertain and measure the worth of these two men, to comprehend their theories of government, to measure the influence and effect of the work of the one upon the other, doubted that it was anything else than a providential blessing that both lived and wrought in those vital, formative days of the Republic. It was most fortunate that the advocates of a strong government did not in all their fullness prevail. It was equally fortunate that the advocates of State rights did not succeed in incorporating their doctrine in all its fullness into our dual form of government. The marvel, sir, in the building of this Government was the combining of powers sufficiently strong to insure and to enforce the guaranties which it proposed to give as a nation together with those principles of local self-government and individual initiative and personal freedom without which a free government could not long endure. This was the combined work of Hamilton and Jefferson more than any two other men. Nowhere in all this mighty structure is greater wisdom disclosed than in the matter of reserving and granting powers between the local and the General Government, thus adjusting with a singular mechanism the principles of local rule and of a representative agency to carry the expression of that local power into national affairs.

The strength of the Republic arises not out of the policies of Hamilton and not out of the policies of Jefferson, but out of that combination of policies which are everywhere interwoven into our system. The maintenance of these principles of government are essential. "Any serious departure," declared the late Justice Harlan, "from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system." And if you would know the secret of the sublime strength of Lincoln, the broad and comprehensive grasp of his statecraft you will find it here—in his fidelity to these principles embodied in our theory of government.

We forget in this day, both as Hamiltonians and as Jeffersonians, that the Government was not framed by Mr. Hamilton and that the Government was not framed by Mr. Jefferson. It represents neither the full view of Mr. Hamilton nor the full view of Mr. Jefferson. It is the result, the combination, the composite work of two of the most powerful and puissant minds that have ever lived in the tide of time. It is the Government as Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton made it, one of them believing in a government strong enough to guarantee all the blessings to the individual which it proposes to give, stable enough and powerful enough to protect them, and the other believing in the principle of local self-government, in the initiative upon the part of the individual citizen, and in reserving to the State everything of a local nature; it is such a government to which I give my allegiance. I believe the composite work of these men is infinitely stronger than either would be standing alone.

It is that government with its strong central power and its local initiative which constitutes the strength and makes this Government the insuperable barrier, if we retain those principles to time, as it is our duty to do, Mr. President, and to preserve those principles just as much as it was the duty of those who began in the first days of the Republic.

Mr. President, we are not a homogeneous people yet by any means. We have the oriental question on the Pacific slope, we have the negro question in the South, and we have the countless thousands of immigrants crowding to this country from southern Europe, who are yet to become acquainted with our theory of government and the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

If I say to the State of New York what the measure of her electorate shall be, if I say to the State of Massachusetts what the measure of her electorate shall be, what argument shall I present to the State of Massachusetts and the State of New York when New York and Massachusetts say to Idaho, "We want to determine who shall own real estate in your State"? If I say to those people that we propose to take away from the States the right to control and determine the question of franchise, which has always been a question belonging to the State, what shall I say to New York when New York says, in order to lull the disturbance with Japan, in order that this Government may have power to settle all difficulties at Washington or that California and Idaho and Washington shall not disturb the situation by reason of the Japanese question, what argument can I urge when they say to me, "We want an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which says that you shall not discriminate as to who shall own your land or enter your schools"?

Suppose, in other words, Mr. President, that instead of the provision of the Constitution which we have we had this provision, and it would only take a word or two to change it, and it would not be upon any different principles, upon any different policy or interfere with any different States rights from that which it does now; suppose we should say, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote or to acquire real property shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, sex, or nationality"; what would the men of the Pacific slope say, who justly feel nervous over the fact that there is constantly crowding to our shores an aggressive and subtle and powerful nation, tormented with fatalism, desiring to take possession of the civilization upon the Pacific slope? If we begin to tear away the most vital things of State sovereignty, first the control of the franchise, next the control of real property, who shall call a halt and when? I believe in a great Federal Union and a Federal Union can not exist without strong, powerful, and dignified States upon which to rest.

Before some men now in this Chamber leave the Senate this country will have to meet the question whether the National Government shall control such a situation as that or whether the State shall be permitted to deal with it. There are 1000 Japanese and Chinese women in those States, and I have no particular desire to bestow suffrage upon them; I have not any desire to yield up to them a voice in deciding the question how we shall control our schools on the Pacific slope. With reference to those questions, so far as I am concerned, I would count myself derelict not only in my duty to the Pacific slope, but in my obligations to the very framework and foundation of this Government, if I should assist in establishing a precedent which could be invoked in favor of the National Government saying who should own the property of my State.

So, Mr. President, this joint resolution does not stand upon the question of woman suffrage. The minute you leave the States and thrust the campaign for equal suffrage into the national domain the women of this country take upon themselves the race question; they take upon themselves these complicated problems which arise by reason of conditions upon the Pacific slope; they take upon themselves numerous propositions wholly dissociated and divorced from the woman-suffrage question itself. Why do so?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho if the prejudice in California, where the Japanese are located, is not as intense as the race feeling which exists in the Southern States, where the negro is located?

Mr. BORAH. I think it is.

Mr. President, when the matter of the election of Senators by popular vote was before the Senate it will be recalled that there was a provision in the amendment as originally proposed by which the control of the elections of the Senators was taken from under the control of Congress. As my colleagues will remember, I advocated a change in the National Constitution so that each State might control the question of elections. The question here involved is not precisely the same as that, but it is kindred to it. I was in favor of leaving to the States the determination not only of the question as to who should vote, but I was in favor of leaving to the States the control of the election and the manner in which the vote should be cast and counted, because, say what you may and argue as you will, if the virtue has departed from the people at home, if the patriotism of those in the States has departed, or if their intelligence does not measure up, there is no salvation for the situation in Washington; in other words, if we can not trust the people in the respective States, among themselves, to settle these questions which are local, which are indigenous to their community—if they have not sufficient patriotism or breadth of mind to settle those questions, we may be assured that the representatives whom they send to Congress will not in the long run have any different or any higher capacity than the men who are at home.

In that debate I said:

Under this system, Mr. President—and I will state here now my exact opposition to and my reason for opposing the Sutherland amendment—under this system, in my judgment, Congress could of its own motion interfere with our entire election machinery, our system of registration, our primary law, our ballot, and the entire mechanism of conducting elections. When you have said that, in my judgment, you have

fixed the boundary line between what the Government may do under section 4 and the line beyond which they may do all that has been claimed that ought to be done without section 4.

I am not willing to concede for my own State that our system of holding elections or the manner of conducting them shall be prescribed by any others than those who are directly interested in the matter. I do not want a different time fixed; I do not want a different ballot; I do not want a different registration system; I do not want a different set of primary laws. These matters are matters of prime concern to the people who must elect all their officers and conduct all their elections and see that they are all clean, and they and they alone can best work out this matter in accordance with the local condition and situation which pertain to each individual State. This is a matter with which the people are familiar, which they are bound to take an interest in by reason of their State elections, and which to say they can not efficiently perform is to challenge their capacity for the discharge of the ordinary duties of civil life.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln said upon an important occasion:

To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control, under the Constitution, their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential for the preservation of the balance of power on which our institutions rest.

Mr. Lincoln passed through the terrific strain of four years of civil war. No man was ever tempted more than he to draw to himself all the power of an autocrat and dictator; no man was ever tempted more than he to doubt the efficiency and the strength of the Republic and of the Constitution of the United States. He was in the midst of a strife which involved, if successful, the dissolution of this Government. He was not only burdened with the strife at home, but most of the great civilized nations of the earth believed in and sympathized with the possibility of the downfall of the Republic.

I call upon those in this day who think it necessary to digress from the fundamental principles upon which this Republic was founded to remember that in the midst of such a strife he never for a moment lost faith either in the ultimate preservation and triumph of the Republic or the efficiency and the strength of the Constitution. I invite those who have studied his works and are familiar with his life to bring before us a word falling from the lips of the sainted martyr in all the struggle through which he passed indicating that he thought it was necessary to change the fundamental principles upon which the Republic was founded. In the very midst of that contest, at the time when it was raging most severely, he said that local affairs for the State government and national affairs for the National Government were essential to the preservation of the Union. Upon that principle he fought and won; and the people of this country owe to Abraham Lincoln a debt of gratitude commensurate with the debt of gratitude which they owe to him for his patience and his love; for the faith which he had in this old Republic and the Constitution of the United States; for the unswerving fidelity to our institutions with which he fought the fight to the end. Are we wiser than he? Is our task more tremendous or much different than the task which in the providence of God was assigned to him?

Mr. President, this is not a new subject or a new impression with me. I have thought over it much, and from my first knowledge of the Government I have felt that the distribution of power between the State and the National Governments upon the principles of the Constitution was and is indispensable to the preservation of the Government. In speaking before the Hamilton Club of Chicago in 1909 I took occasion to say:

Nowhere in their work was greater wisdom disclosed, a more searching and judicious knowledge of the great truths of history revealed than in this matter of reserving and granting powers between the local or State and the General Governments. With the utmost care and caution there was reserved for the States the control of all matters of domestic concern, of local interests, while there was granted to the General Government those great and general powers which encompass the welfare of all. We must not assume, we must not permit ourselves to believe that the reservation is of less moment or less beneficial to the American people than the grant. I am well aware that the phrase "State rights" has been discredited in our history. It is associated with unhappy days. It is a kind of intellectual tramp recognized for the last 50 years, mainly at the back door of the American statesman.

But the misuse or abuse of the term should not blind us to the great and inviolate political truth that upon the integrity of the States alone all rests the integrity and permanency of the Union, that upon the principle of local self-government rests the perpetuity of republican institutions. In this way and in this way alone the people may retain those rights and keep alive that public spirit which furnishes the brain power and the moral force to run the entire machinery of government, keep alive and strong and healthy the principle of the New England town meeting, expanded and fashioned on a larger scale, a principle born of a complete faith in the integrity and judgment and self-governing capacity of the masses. God pity this Government in the hour in which we shall look to Washington for that economy in public expenditures, that comprehension of the common needs, that devotion to the general interests, the power and the willingness to correct abuses and distribute justice, all so essential to a democratic form of government, rather than to enlighten public opinion gathered up and crystallized into law through those agencies of government which reach back and down to the great body of the people, the sole sovereignty of the Republic.

The makers of the Constitution did not grant to the General Government any powers which it is dangerous to exercise to the fullest constitutional limit. Moreover, I have a profound admiration for the men who would exercise these powers fully and completely in the interest of the Nation. But while extending and developing and building at the top, I would keep sound and safe and sure the foundation upon which the whole structure rests. For what shall it profit to enact laws, create commissions, and unfold the ambitious schemes of men who dream of international prestige and power unless we know what the electorate yonder in the field, factory, and mine is doing or is willing to do, unless we know the measure of its ability, the worth of its patriotism? Responsibility alone gives strength and initiative to citizenship, contact with government fosters public spirit, and local rule is the great school in which is reared and trained and equipped the kind of statesmen who take care that no harm comes to the Republic.

But, Mr. President, let me recall the words of those whose wisdom no one will question and the words of those who were and are known as the advocates of a strong government. Justice Miller, one of our greatest jurists, gave expression to the following view:

While the pendulum of public opinion has swung with force away from the extreme point of the State rights doctrine, there may be danger of its reaching an extreme point on the other side. In my opinion the just and equal observance of the rights of the States and of the General Government as defined by the Constitution is as necessary to the permanent prosperity of our country and to its existence for another century as it has been for the one whose close we are now celebrating.

Justice Harlan has represented as liberal a view toward the powers of the National Government as any man who has sat upon the bench at any time in its history. He rendered the dissenting opinion in the Civil Rights case and in the Knight case and wrote the majority opinion in the Securities case. In one of the last public utterances which he made this splendid old Roman said:

A National Government for national affairs and State governments for State affairs is the foundation rock upon which our institutions rest. Any serious departure from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system of free government.

But the fact is not as the pessimist alleges it to be. The American people are more determined than at any time in their history to maintain both National and State rights as those rights exist under the Union ordained by the Constitution. I say the people of the United States, for although the Constitution was accepted by the separate action of the people in their respective States, they moved together, in a collective capacity, as one people, in creating a Nation for certain specified objects of general concern. They will not patiently consider any suggestion or scheme that involves a Union upon any other basis. They will maintain, at whatever cost and in all their integrity, both National and State rights.

The best friends of State rights, permit me to say, are not those who habitually denounce as illegal everything done by the General Government, but those who recognize the Government of the Union as possessing all the powers granted to it in the Constitution, either expressly or by necessary implication; for without a General Government possessing controlling power in relation to matters of national concern, the States would have no prestige before the world and would be in perpetual conflict with one another. With equal truth it may be said that the best friends of the Union are those who hold that the States possess all governmental powers not granted to the General Government and that are not inconsistent with their own constitutions or with the Constitution of the United States or with a republican form of government. The people of the United States cherish, and will compel adherence to, the fundamental doctrine that the States are vital parts of the American system of government; and they will insist with no less determination upon the recognition of the just powers of the States—to be exerted always in subordination to the supreme law of the land—as essential to the preservation of our liberties. The Supreme Court of the United States has again and again declared, upon full consideration, that a close and firm Union is necessary for the happiness of the American people, and that "without the States in union there could be no such political body as the United States."

If, then, the matchless Government devised by the fathers and ordained by the people of the United States is to be preserved and handed down intact to posterity, National power and State power must go hand in hand in harmony with the Constitution.

No, Mr. President, the wisest have understood that there are certain principles indispensable to a Federal Union—a representative Republic and local self-government for local affairs is one of them.

There are those in these days who are fond of teaching the people of this country that our fathers who built this Government did not trust the people. I have just finished reading a wholly misleading book by a no doubt highly educated professor, who was greatly interested in proving that our fathers were in a conspiracy against popular government. These men err and greatly err by reason of the fact that they themselves have but an inadequate and vulgar conception of the real intelligence and the true self-governing power of the people, of their capacity to deal with great problems and measure up to great tasks. They have themselves but a faint and unsteady grasp of that firm and vital belief which enables a great soul to risk all upon the proposition that that which is permanent and enduring and wise will in the end meet their approving judgment. I believe in the utmost freedom of thought; that truth should be unrestrained, but the libeler of the dead, the slanderer of the patriots of the Republic, are just the same to me whether fumbling with a bomb or hiding under the name of an honored university the learned and solemn ignorance of anarchy.

At the time this Government was framed and submitted to the people for approval free government was looked upon as

the dream of enthusiasts. To transfer sovereignty from the rulers to the people was in itself regarded as the folly of madmen. The task, the gigantic task of building up and putting into operation against the world's prejudices and beliefs, and in the face of countless centuries of disaster and ruin, a government whose sole sovereignty was to be in the people, in whose power and glory the humblest might share and at the same time strong enough and stable enough to insure the individual citizen the fruits of the blessed guarantees which it professed to give, was the task of these men. It required something of the courage, something of the foresight, something of the wisdom which the sparing hand of Providence seldom bestows upon the children of men. What they did was so far in advance of anything which had gone before, so popular in its conception, that it met on every hand with doubt and discredit, if not with mockery and derision. And never until its seasoned timbers had withstood the deluge of civil war, until the people against whom it is said this conspiracy had been organized came from the farm and factory and mine tendering limb and life in its defense, never until the tragic figure of that fearful conflict had triumphantly foretold that this Government of the people by the people for the people should not perish from the earth did the world at large believe that the work of the fathers could endure; rather did it believe that amid dissension and discord it would pass on with the other Republics of the earth. To my way of thinking, no higher faith in the patriotism and self-governing capacity of the people was ever exhibited by any body of men than by those who calmly said this is the wisest and best that we can do, and it is submitted to you for approval; and no higher or greater proof of the self-governing capacity of the people could be given or will ever be recorded than was found in the approval which they gave.

The corner stone of that fabric, the indispensable element and principle which sheathes it with strength and bids it endure through the ages, is the right of local self-government as to affairs which are local. When you take away from the people the initiative, the right to determine for themselves such questions as are local, when you remove from their shoulders responsibility, you ultimately take from the people all interest in public questions, and you have what has been exemplified in the history of every republic that ever existed on the face of the earth, a republic in name only, governed and controlled at Washington, while the masses of the people look on and assume that they are enjoying the great fundamental rights of a republic, although the republic, in fact, has passed away. I am in favor of preserving intact every principle of local self-government. I am in favor of it, because I am in favor of popular government; I am in favor of it, because I believe that down there is the initiative and the patriotism and the intelligence to decide and settle every question. Popular government is a delusion, a pretense, without the principle of local self-government.

Let me say to the good women of this country that I believe after they have fought for 15 or 20 years for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and for its ratification, in the end they will come back and make their appeal to the individual States, to the direct vote of the people, and in all those States where it is not met with the insuperable barrier of race conditions women will be given the right to vote.

For, Mr. President, woman suffrage is to prevail, equal suffrage is yet to obtain throughout the Republic. Honest prejudices entertained by great and noble men from St. Paul to the present hour, ancient customs and settled habits of mind more difficult to change than constitutions or forms of government, together with the sinister interests which dread her presence in the political forum, will not be sufficient to stay the sometimes slow but always certain movement toward that consummation when there will be called into council upon all affairs of state all the intelligence, all the virtue, and all the patriotism of the Commonwealth.

Neither expediency nor a false view of her sphere will be able to keep woman from that council board where more and more are to be considered the interests of the child, the integrity of the home, the moral and physical well-being of the citizen; where more and more are to be discussed and determined all those movements which reach down and take hold of those things upon which her sympathy, her intuition, her vision, and, above all, her optimism are at least equal in worth to the experience and the reasoning of men.

Free and untrammeled with an unoccupied world of opportunities before him, the time was when the State had need to look little into the personal affairs of the citizen—the 8-hour day, the employers' liability law, and the workmen's compensation act would have been wholly without a condition upon which to operate. But it is different now. The State dare not leave the child to the mercies of organized capitalism; the State dare not leave the home to contend alone against the intrusion of disease and poisoned food; the State dare not leave the laborer to contend against those powerful corporations which the State has endowed with all the powers of sovereignty; the State, in short, must meet the responsibilities of the hour and expand in scope and purposes with the expanding forces of industry. I ask you, whose judgment, whose force of character, whose miraculous power to detect the forces of right and wrong, would you prefer to have than hers who, in every great crisis of the world, has borne in full in camp, in hospital, in secret council, and in courts her due portion of the burden of the race? And why deprive her in this work of the most effective instrument for good in modern warfare—the ballot? Why withhold from her the effective instrument by which she can more surely effectuate her purposes and make permanent in the laws of her country her plans? No; equal suffrage will come. It will come through the votes of the respective States, as it should come, as the expressed will of the people. It will come like all the great reforms, not in a night, not before the people have lived up to it and seen the need of it, but through and by means of public opinion built up from year to year; it will come in harmony with the great fundamental principles upon which this Government is built, recognizing the indispensable principle of the distribution of powers between the State and the National Government. I think it was Dr. Lowell, of Harvard, who so wisely and delightfully said:

> A slow progress under the gradual pressure of a growing public sentiment does more for the advancement of civilization than a rapid movement followed by reaction. * * * The most valuable institution is not that which bears the earliest but that which bears the best fruit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hamsphire?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator consider the right of suffrage a local matter that the States should govern absolutely?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the meaning of Article IV, section 1, of the Constitution? How far does that go toward interfering with the rights of the States? I will read the first clause of it to the Senator:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

What is the exact meaning of that language? I ask the Senator for his interpretation of it.

Mr. BORAH. It would be impossible for me to say in all particulars what is a republican form of government in the view of that clause, because there are a thousand things, more or less, which enter into the question; but suffice it to say that at the time the fathers put into the Constitution of the United States the provision that the National Government should guarantee a republican form of government they sought just as earnestly for the right of the States to determine the question of franchise as they did with reference to this other proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. At the time they put that into the Constitution of the United States in a great many States of the Union there was no such thing as manhood suffrage at all. In most of the States of the Union men were permitted to vote by reason of property rights or property holdings or qualifications of that kind; yet it was a matter which they conceived to be for the local authorities to settle, and they believed, as I believe, that if there is no republican form of government at home there will not be any republican form of government at Washington. That clause had reference to matters wholly separate and apart from the question of suffrage, although, of course, such a condition can be conceived of that the question of suffrage might enter into it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has stated, with his accustomed vigor, his belief in the principle of woman suffrage, and also that, in his judgment, it will ultimately prevail in the States of the Union, except in those States where the race question is imminent, and that it will not prevail there because of that fact. The Senator believes in woman suffrage, and, therefore, in the benefit of its extension everywhere. I will therefore ask the Senator whether, either for the purpose of promoting this great cause or for any other reason, he would be willing to vote for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I say very frankly that if woman suffrage in this country depended upon the repeal of the fifteenth amendment, if there were no way to get woman suffrage except to get it through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and I believed that in order to get it the fifteenth amendment would have to be repealed, I would vote to repeal the fifteenth amendment. But no such necessity can ever arise; there is a wiser and easier way to get woman suffrage.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has stated, in substance, that suffrage is a local question and that our predecessors erred in the adoption of the fifteenth amendment in attempting to accomplish the impossible, of course interfering with the right of the States locally to control the elective suffrage. My question is whether, for the purpose of restoring prior conditions, the Senator would vote to repeal the fifteenth amendment?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not at all afraid of the logic of my position, and I want to say to the Senator that if there is to be found no way in which to enforce the fifteenth amendment I would unhesitatingly vote to repeal it. It is a certainty now that it is a delusion and a snare; it misleads one race and it imposes upon another race a condition which ought not to be imposed upon them unless some good result flows from it. Mr. President, it is 50 years since that amendment was adopted.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment—50 years ago that amendment was adopted, and I have not a particle of doubt that the consensus of opinion of the country is, if it had the courage to say so, that it was a mistake at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. But 50 years have passed; the negro has made great strides in development, notwithstanding the conditions under which he has lived; and it would be a wholly different thing to put upon him the discouragement which would follow from its repeal. It would have been better for him to have passed through a probation and earned his franchise; and I conceive a repeal after 50 years a wholly different thing from its original enactment.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I think I have yielded to the Senator from Colorado. Afterwards I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS. I only desire to ask the Senator one more question. The Senator has stated that in its operation the effect of the fifteenth amendment on the colored vote has been a delusion and a snare. Is it not equally true that, so far as that vote is concerned, based upon the same logic, the amendment now proposed would be a delusion and a snare?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and I do not propose to be a party to a delusion and a snare. The Senator is quite right in his inference.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to state to the Senator from Idaho that the right of the negroes to vote in the South was not so violently antagonized by the white man in the South until it was discovered that the negro was wholly unfit for and incapable of performing properly the supreme function of citizenship and of understanding the genius of this Government. The white man endeavored honestly and sincerely to induce the negro to share with him in the government of the country. The negro declined to do so, and his domination was submitted to until the civilization of the South was simply vanishing, the public domain was squandered, the Public Treasury looted, and the civilization of the fathers passing away. Time has not, I submit to the Senator from Idaho, shown the negro's capacity for self-government, and as the negro has demonstrated no capacity for the government of himself, it follows as a logical sequence that he is incapable of governing the white man.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. VARDAMAN. While the negro has made some progress in the acquisition of property, as a matter of fact, with all the assistance that has been rendered him by the white man, by the schools, by the churches, by the colleges, and by all the other agencies and instrumentalities provided by the white man, he is to-day as incompetent and unreliable not only in the South but in the North as he was 50 years ago.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course I would have to differ from my friend from Mississippi in the ultimate conclusion which he reaches. I have been discussing this matter as a question of fact and a question of history. I do not believe that you will find in the history of the world a race which has developed and proven itself so rapidly as the negro race has when you take into consideration——

Mr. VARDAMAN. In what respect does the Senator refer to his improvement?

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. VARDAMAN. He is more criminal to-day as a race than he was in 1861.

Mr. BORAH. That is true of the white man in this country, too.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, it is not.

Mr. BORAH. I do not mean the white man in the South, but the ratio of crime along certain lines is greater now than it has ever been in the history of this country. We are in some matters a lawless people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, the negro has increased in crime, and the records will show that as a race he is more criminal to-day than he was in 1861. That is the case in Pennsylvania and in Idaho, as it is the case in Mississippi.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have not the statistics with me with reference to the figures, and it may be that I am in error; but I have been of the opinion, and I entertain that opinion now, that the negro has advanced in many ways, not only in reference to the accumulation of property but with reference to acquiring those habits of settled vocation, of love of home and family, and so forth, which make for good citizenship; but, in my judgment, he has advanced most remarkably in his conception of government. I want to say, Mr. President, for the negro—and I say it in all sincerity—that while the negro may not understand the workings of our Government as the Senator from Mississippi and the anglo-Saxon generally understand them, there is no one who is more loyal as a matter of sentiment and as a matter of intuition to the flag which floats over him than is the black man.

Mr. VARDAMAN. On what does the Senator base that statement?

Mr. BORAH. This old Government and its flag are his religion. He may, by reason of the conditions under which he has lived for years, do many things which the white man criticizes, but when you come to talk to the negro about this Government and to ascertain what he thinks about it and what he is willing to do for it, you never hear a disloyal word from the lips of the negro; at least, I never have. The one vice, the one curse of this age—constant disparagement of government—that vice does not belong to his race. He is loyal as he understands it, and that is the basis of good citizenship.

Mr. VARDAMAN. You may not hear a disloyal word, but the Senator from Idaho very well understands that he has no idea whatever of loyalty to his obligations of citizenship. The Senator knows the negro in politics, and he knows his record in the national conventions, and he has never known one in his life whose vote could not be influenced by a very few dollars.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, my observation has been different.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will cite the Senator the example at Chicago at the last Republican convention.

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President, that argument is no compliment to the white man, because no negro ever bribed himself. It takes a white man to do it, and there are generally about 50 white men attempting to bribe 1 negro. So far as convention matters are concerned, if it were gone into it would be shown that the negro has withstood temptation with remarkable strength.

Mr. GALLINGER. And a great many white men have yielded.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. President, I have been talking about the negro with reference to his treatment under the fifteenth amendment. I am not going into the other question at this time, but, so far as concerns the views which the Senator has expressed with reference to the negro's development, and so forth, I should have to disagree with him, although I do not propose at this time to discuss the matter. The time will come when the negro will have rights according to his developments. He will enjoy rights according to the faith which is in him and which he has proven to be in him.

I had intended to discuss one other feature of this matter, but——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to that, I should like to ask him a question in order that I may understand exactly his theory of the relation of the Federal Government to the States with reference to the franchise.

The Senator from Idaho very eloquently and very accurately described the conflict of the rival views of Hamilton and Jefferson in the formation of the Constitution, and emphasized the

importance of preserving to the States their rights; and the Senator eulogized in the most eloquent way the great influence of Abraham Lincoln in preserving those rights. Am I correct in inferring from that and from the Senator's connecting that with the resolution now before the Senate, that the Senator from Idaho maintains that this resolution would involve any change in the theory or system upon which the respective powers of the State and the Federal Governments are maintained? Is it not simply a question of degree? And did not the Constitution as it was originally framed and before any of the amendments were adopted contain numerous inhibitions upon the powers of the States? The States were prevented from doing a great number of things which it might be desired by some particular States to do. Then the amendments to the Constitution, which were readily adopted almost at the first session of Congress after the Constitution was ratified, placed a number of other prohibitions upon the States. No State may issue a bill of attainder nor pass an ex post facto law. No State may pass any law which violates the obligation of contracts. No State may maintain troops or ships of war without the consent of the Federal Government.

Abraham Lincoln himself, in the great work of his life, was the leader in this country of the movement to destroy what had been one of the great central claims as to State rights, that negro slavery was a domestic State institution, with which the Federal Government had nothing to do, and the result of his efforts in that direction was that slavery in the States was prohibited by the Constitution of the United States.

If this resolution is adopted, of course it still leaves discretion in the States as to the qualification of the franchise, with the single exception, so far as this resolution is concerned, that woman shall not be prohibited from voting merely because of her sex. Does it not leave the entire framework and system which the Senator has described as being so essential to the perpetuity of our institutions the same as it was before?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, Mr. Lincoln during his entire career, until it became necessary as a war measure, always contended that the question of slavery was a domestic matter and should be left entirely to the States. He said in his debate with Mr. Douglas, and he said repeatedly, that he had no intention of interfering with the affairs of the Southern States with reference to slavery; and he was against slavery from his boyhood days. He denounced it early in his legislative career in the Legislature of Illinois. He was the man who offered in the Illinois Legislature a resolution against it; but he repeatedly stated in his public utterances and in his debate with Douglas and in his messages, that it never was his intention to interfere with it in the respective States; that it was a matter for them to settle; and he never did so until it became necessary, in his opinion and in the opinion of his Cabinet, to make the proclamation which resulted in the freedom of the slaves as a war measure for the preservation of the Union as a whole. Had Mr. Lincoln been permitted to pursue his way without the difficulties of war, he never would have interfered with slavery in the respective States, according to his declaration.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Idaho is absolutely correct in his statement. Mr. Lincoln said, "The time has arrived when we must know whether the black man is for us or against us." It was purely a war measure; and the purpose was that the emancipation of the negro might so disorganize conditions in the South that it would bring about demoralization in the Southern Army. He thought that an insurrection among the negroes would follow the emancipation proclamation and that the Confederate soldier would be forced to lay down his arms and go back home to protect his family. It was purely a war measure. He stated in all of his addresses and in all of his campaigns that he knew he had no right to interfere with slavery in the States where it was recognized by law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment. The qualification which the Senator from Mississippi attached to his statement in the very last words he used destroys the force of the contention which he is making on this particular question. He said, "where it was recognized by law." Lincoln did not propose to abolish slavery in the States, but Lincoln proposed to change the law. I do not think it can be found in the writings of Lincoln that he was opposed to an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Washington can not find an utterance in any of Mr. Lincoln's speeches or writings where that is stated. His purpose was to prevent its being carried into new States or Territories; but he maintained in all of his debates with Douglas that he had no right to interfere with it in the States where it was established.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why, he did interfere with it in the States. He was opposed to the Dred Scott decision. He was opposed to Douglas's idea of squatter sovereignty; and his fame and reputation as a leader of his party in the United States, which finally brought him the Presidency, was based on his proposition that the new States should not set up the domestic institution of slavery within their borders. I do not know that he intended to interfere with those States where it was already established.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is greatly in error. Mr. Lincoln never criticized the Dred Scott decision because he believed the National Government should interfere with slavery in the States, but for the reason that he believed that the effect of the decision was to take away from the State the right to determine whether or not it should have freedom for the slave or slavery for the slave. Mr. Lincoln said: Kansas has the right to say, when the negro comes within the lines of Kansas, that he shall be free, and that the National Government shall not send a slave into the State of Kansas and keep him a slave. Kansas may free him the moment he crosses the line, and then Illinois may welcome the slave from the South and give him his freedom when he crosses the line. He contended that the Dred Scott decision had the effect of saying that Illinois was deprived of her power to declare that proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What distinction does the Senator draw between this proposed amendment, from the standpoint of the principle of local self-government, and the national prohibition amendment?

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator from Texas is very anxious that no argument shall be made here against the national prohibition amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator that the national prohibition amendment might be justified upon the theory that it would be dealing with a national question—interstate traffic—and that it is not local and can not be controlled as a local question; that the States can not deal with it, as it permeates and extends throughout the Union, disregardful of State lines. And here let me say that the doctrine of local self-government does not oppose the taking over by the National Government of those things once local but which through industrial and economic changes have become national in scope. If a subject really becomes national in scope and effect, the National Government should not hesitate to take hold of it. But the right to vote can never, in the very nature of things, be other than a local question, for upon it rests the very integrity and sovereignty of the State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. By reason of our industrial development a business matter which was local 50 years ago may be interstate or national at this time, and may be national in its scope. A commercial affair which was local at the time they did business with wheelbarrows and covered wagons may not have been national in its scope, but it may become so when you build railroads, and commerce thereby broadens the proposition. The only thing I have sought to contend for is that that which is local in its nature, as I conceive this matter to be, should be permitted to remain local, and that that which is national or becomes national by reason of industrial and commercial development may properly come under control of the National Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has passed from the point about which I wanted to ask him. He said, in answer to the Senator from Texas, that the proposed amendment on the prohibition question might be justified because it dealt with interstate commerce. In the first place, let me say that I do not understand that in making an amendment to the Constitution it is necessary that any authority for it shall be found in the existing Constitution. We may adopt an entirely new thing. Passing by that point, however, how does the Senator think the manufacture of intoxicating liquors is a matter of interstate commerce? I understand the manufacture is included within this bill.

Mr. BORAH. I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the prohibition question. I do not want all problems on my hands at once. I will say, however, that I have never accepted the doctrine of the Knight case, that the manufacture of goods intended to be exported and put into commerce was purely a local concern of the State. I think that is interstate commerce,

when it is manufactured and being put into interstate commerce. I think the act of manufacturing itself is part and parcel of the conduct of the business of interstate commerce when it is manufactured with a view of being shipped in interstate trade.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the proposed amendment would prohibit the manufacture of liquor to be used wholly within a State.

Mr. BORAH. That might be a result of prohibiting its manufacture for the purpose of shipping it between States. That would be an incident, however, and not the prime design.

Mr. President, in conclusion, very briefly, I will say that I have not a doubt that woman suffrage is going to prevail in this country. I have not any doubt that when it does prevail it will prevail through the action of the respective States in voting upon the proposition. I have not any doubt that that is the way in which it ought to prevail.

I have from the beginning, from the very first agitation of this question, earnestly supported the proposition of permitting the States to pass upon it. When I first came to Congress a proposed amendment to the Constitution was brought to me. I was told at that time that it was for educational purposes; that the design was to present it before the Congress and have it discussed, in order that it might have its educational effect in many States of the Union. I had no objection to that. I was thoroughly in favor of the proposition as an educational matter which by its reflex action would assist in the States. It was a desirable thing to do.

I have no criticism to make of those who are urging this resolution for the purpose of getting the matter before the Nation and calling attention to it in order that they may have a better means of reaching the public mind, in order that they may have the views of public men more directly carried to the people as an educational proposition. When, however, you turn from the educational phase of the matter and ask me to vote for an amendment to the Constitution which, in my judgment, never will be adopted, and which, if it were adopted, would be futile and a delusion in a number of the States of the Union, I feel that I am unable to concede the proposition.

### USE OF WATERS OF RIO GRANDE, COLO.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to renew the notice I have given for March 18, and to state that I shall address the Senate on Monday, March 23, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, upon Senate joint resolution 117.

### PANAMA EXPOSITION (H. DOC. NO. 840).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the invitation from the Government of Panama to this Government to participate in an exposition which is to open at the city of Panama on November 3, 1914, and I join with the Secretary of State in strongly recommending the authority of Congress for the acceptance of the invitation and an appropriation of $100,000 to enable suitable participation by the United States.

As the exposition will open as early as November 3 next, prompt action by Congress on the recommendation is essential to proper and adequate preparation for the participation.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1914.*

### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914, and for prior years, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 350) thereon. I give notice that to-morrow at some convenient time I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1914.*

### ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Charles B. Strecker, of Boston, Mass., to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Boston, Mass., in place of Charles H. Doty, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

### JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE CANAL ZONE.

William H. Jackson, of Ancon, Canal Zone, to be judge of the district court of the Canal Zone.

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William N. Spence, of Camilla, Ga., to be United States attorney, District of Alaska, division No. 3, vice George R. Walker, resigned.

### MEMBER OF THE EXCISE BOARD.

Cotter T. Bride, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Excise Board for the District of Columbia, to fill the unexpired term of Joseph C. Sheehy, resigned. (Term expires June 30, 1914.)

### POSTMASTERS.

#### ALABAMA.

Nannie S. Coleman to be postmaster at Jasper, Ala., in place of Nannie S. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

#### ARIZONA.

Alberta M. Fulghum to be postmaster at Willcox, Ariz., in place of Kasper Hauser. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Wilson T. Wright to be postmaster at Globe, Ariz., in place of Frank P. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

#### CALIFORNIA.

Ruth E. Dempsey to be postmaster at Colusa, Cal., in place of Byron D. Beckwith, resigned.

Kathleen M. Fleming to be postmaster at Lincoln, Cal., in place of William D. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. D. McClellan to be postmaster at Lordsburg, Cal., in place of Hobart M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

Josephine Montgomery to be postmaster at Randsburg, Cal., in place of Josephine Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expires April 12, 1914.

Frank L. Powell to be postmaster at Lemoore, Cal., in place of Frank L. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

#### COLORADO.

C. C. McWilliams to be postmaster at Marble, Colo., in place of John A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

A. F. Reeves to be postmaster at Montrose, Colo., in place of G. A. Herrington, deceased.

#### FLORIDA.

Malcolm J. McMullen to be postmaster at Largo, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

#### GEORGIA.

William F. Boone to be postmaster at Baxley, Ga., in place of William F. Boone. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Robert D. Brown to be postmaster at Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of William E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1914.

William H. McMillion to be postmaster at Demorest, Ga., in place of George W. Pease. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

L. S. Peterson to be postmaster at Douglas, Ga., in place of James F. Overstreet. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

W. J. Roberts to be postmaster at Arlington, Ga., in place of W. J. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

John P. Turner to be postmaster at Columbus, Ga., in place of Charles L. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

#### ILLINOIS.

Charles A. Brandenburg to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of Robert E. Little. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Clement L. Butler to be postmaster at Sheldon, Ill., in place of Samuel W. Holloway. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

James J. Dougherty to be postmaster at Ottawa, Ill., in place of Henry Mayo. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Charles E. Duvall to be postmaster at Aledo, Ill., in place of Joseph H. Abercrombie. Incumbent's commission expires April 29, 1914.

Chauncey M. Gilmore to be postmaster at Colfax, Ill., in place of Zachary Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Perry F. Hathaway to be postmaster at Menard, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

John E. Maekin to be postmaster at Lockport, Ill., in place of John A. Walter. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

J. Ross Mickey to be postmaster at Macomb, Ill., in place of William H. Hainline, removed.

John A. O'Neil to be postmaster at Chatsworth, Ill., in place of Homer S. Sanford. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

James L. Parks to be postmaster at Carbondale, Ill., in place of William P. Slack. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Luther E. Robertson to be postmaster at Carterville, Ill., in place of James A. Lauder, resigned.

F. J. Schmitz to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of Jacob G. Reul. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

Charles B. Taylor to be postmaster at Tuscola, Ill., in place of Alonzo C. Sluss. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles M. Webber to be postmaster at Urbana, Ill., in place of Walter W. Lindley, removed.

INDIANA.

Miles Baxter to be postmaster at Auburn, Ind., in place of Isaac N. Zent. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

James H. Collins to be postmaster at Farmersburg, Ind., in place of James F. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

Vincent E. Craig to be postmaster at Darlington, Ind., in place of William C. Woody. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

George D. Gaby to be postmaster at Sigonier, Ind., in place of Henry Jeanneret. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

Cornelius Lumaree to be postmaster at Wabash, Ind., in place of Lindley A. Dawes. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Otto McMahan to be postmaster at Rochester, Ind., in place of William Wright. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Albert R. Mulkins to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ind., in place of Walter L. Neible. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

Henry F. Schaal to be postmaster at Michigan City, Ind., in place of Minard A. Schutt. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

Thomas J. Shelburn to be postmaster at Zionsville, Ind., in place of T. P. Mills. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Louis Zoercher to be postmaster at Tell City, Ind., in place of Lee Herr. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

IOWA.

T. D. Bellinger to be postmaster at Laurens, Iowa, in place of Benjamin E. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

J. S. Blair to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, Iowa, in place of Wayne E. Whitestine, removed.

J. M. Bricker to be postmaster at Nevada, Iowa, in place of Fred C. McCall. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

W. S. Clark to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Iowa, in place of Denison O. Blake. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

J. W. Floerchinger to be postmaster at Oxford, Iowa, in place of George W. Sies. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

A. E. Jackson to be postmaster at Tama, Iowa, in place of James H. Willett. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Samuel W. Koster to be postmaster at West Liberty, Iowa, in place of A. W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

Albert Lille to be postmaster at Lakeview, Iowa, in place of Frederick H. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

E. C. McMeel to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of John W. Donley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

R. B. McSwiggin to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of Harry E. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

A. R. Miller to be postmaster at Washington, Iowa, in place of John M. Lytle. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Kate C. Warner to be postmaster at Dayton, Iowa, in place of Kate C. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

KANSAS.

J. H. Burnett to be postmaster at Blue Mound, Kans., in place of Charles W. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

Emery W. Caywood to be postmaster at Clifton, Kans., in place of Nathan B. Needham. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Ida McCann to be postmaster at Macksville, Kans., in place of Edgar B. Dykes, resigned.

William Reedy to be postmaster at Yates Center, Kans., in place of William E. Hogueland. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

John I. Saunders to be postmaster at Cheney, Kans., in place of John A. Hartley. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

KENTUCKY.

Gilbert Adams to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of William H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expires April 12, 1914.

R. L. Brown to be postmaster at Somerset, Ky., in place of Thomas M. Scott, removed.

George R. Hughes to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ky., in place of George L. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Mark F. Kehoe to be postmaster at Maysville, Ky., in place of Clarence Mathews, removed.

E. C. K. Robertson to be postmaster at Murray, Ky., in place of Abithel Downs. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

LOUISIANA.

Samuel J. Gandy to be postmaster at Westlake, La., in place of Ector R. Gammage. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

MAINE.

Monroe V. Curtis to be postmaster at Freeport, Me., in place of Winthrop C. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

Minnie M. Holland to be postmaster at Dixfield, Me., in place of Willis W. Wait. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Percy E. Storer to be postmaster at Waldoboro, Me., in place of Walter E. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

MARYLAND.

Henry C. Lawder to be postmaster at Havre de Grace, Md., in place of Harry A. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

Michael J. Tighe to be postmaster at Laurel, Md., in place of G. B. Timanus. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Millard H. Weer to be postmaster at Sykesville, Md., in place of Asa Hepner. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Edward F. Delaney to be postmaster at Brookfield, Mass., in place of Edwin D. Goodell. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

Thomas J. Drummey to be postmaster at East Pepperell, Mass., in place of Arthur P. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1914.

Elmer E. Landers to be postmaster at Oak Bluffs, Mass., in place of Charles L. Scranton, deceased.

Henry L. Pierce to be postmaster at Barre, Mass., in place of Benjamin F. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

MICHIGAN.

Edmund L. Ashworth to be postmaster at Shepherd, Mich., in place of Kenneth E. Struble. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Roy C. Blackburn to be postmaster at Cedar Springs, Mich., in place of L. M. Sellers, resigned.

John H. Brewer to be postmaster at Imlay City, Mich., in place of George W. Jones, removed.

Willis F. Bricker to be postmaster at Belding, Mich., in place of George W. Moulton. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

John Burns to be postmaster at St. Louis, Mich., in place of Aaron Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

F. S. Byrne to be postmaster at Marquette, Mich., in place of John D. Mangum. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Vincent P. Cash to be postmaster at Alma, Mich., in place of Charles F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

George F. Catton to be postmaster at Constantine, Mich., in place of J. Mark Harvey, jr. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Matthew W. Doyle to be postmaster at Stephenson, Mich., in place of Frederick W. Woessner. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

Percy D. Edsall to be postmaster at Greenville, Mich., in place of J. C. Newbrough. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

J. H. Gallery to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of Henry C. Minnie. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Frederic M. Hall to be postmaster at Mason, Mich., in place of Charles W. Browne. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Frank P. Hilbourn to be postmaster at Hart, Mich., in place of Lewis S. Platt. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Charles E. Lown to be postmaster at Saginaw, Mich., in place of William S. Linton. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

Amon C. Sprau to be postmaster at Otsego, Mich., in place of A Brink Tucker. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Harris E. Thomas to be postmaster at Lansing, Mich., in place of Seymour Foster. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles E. Utley to be postmaster at Stanton, Mich., in place of Elliott O. Bellows. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Prescott L. Varnum to be postmaster at Vassar, Mich., in place of James A. Trotter. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

MINNESOTA.

Martin J. Casey to be postmaster at Jordan, Minn., in place of Frank H. Juergens. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Christian Hunsinger to be postmaster at Wadena, Minn., in place of William Dower. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Clemens A. Lauterbach to be postmaster at Redwood Falls, Minn., in place of Almon E. King. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

William E. McEwen to be postmaster at Duluth, Minn., in place of Arthur P. Cook, removed.

Stephen M. Quigley to be postmaster at Wabasha, Minn., in place of C. O. Lund. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Harry D. Smith to be postmaster at Plainview, Minn., in place of George R. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sybil Q. Stratton to be postmaster at Liberty, Miss., in place of Sybil Q. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

MISSOURI.

Clay Adair to be postmaster at Clinton, Mo., in place of Frank P. Kitchen. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

Andrew E. Doerr to be postmaster at Perryville, Mo., in place of Samuel B. Kiefner. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Casper Ehrhard to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mo., in place of William F. Bloebaum. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

S. T. Jeffries to be postmaster at Salem, Mo., in place of William C. Askin. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Elijah E. Johnston to be postmaster at Sedalia, Mo., in place of E. E. Codding. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

H. V. Merritt to be postmaster at Campbell, Mo., in place of Jasper L. Geer. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

J. G. Moutier to be postmaster at Union, Mo., in place of Clark Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1914.

Charles F. Newman to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mo., in place of Phil S. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires April 29, 1914.

Simeon W. Ragland to be postmaster at Webb City, Mo., in place of Walter Tholborn. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

James E. Williams to be postmaster at Butler, Mo., in place of C. A. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

MONTANA.

John P. Bowen to be postmaster as Libby, Mont., in place of Don E. Schanck, resigned.

George R. Fisk to be postmaster at Hamilton, Mont., in place of Campbell C. Chaffin. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

E. H. McDowell to be postmaster at Terry, Mont., in place of C. V. Schwindt. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

NEBRASKA.

Stephen C. Lynde to be postmaster at Hartington, Nebr., in place of Fred W. Barnhart. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

Joseph E. Newsom to be postmaster at North Bend, Nebr., in place of John Cusack. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

Thomas A. Sharp to be postmaster at Stanton, Nebr., in place of James Peters. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Stephen E. Bates to be postmaster at Suncook, N. H., in place of Eugene Lane. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

William Hayes to be postmaster at Groveton, N. H., in place of Addison H. Frizzell. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Herbert A. Taylor to be postmaster at Winchester, N. H., in place of Charles E. Slate. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

Eugene M. Ware to be postmaster at Peterboro, N. H., in place of Thomas D. Winch, resigned.

NEW JERSEY.

William H. Cook to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. J., in place of George N. Wimer, removed.

Walter D. Finch to be postmaster at Mahwah, N. J., in place of Henry B. Hagerman. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Joseph V. D. Field to be postmaster at Boundbrook, N. J., in place of William B. R. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

Charles H. Hitchner to be postmaster at Elmer, N. J., in place of Adam Kandle, deceased.

Thomas F. Watson to be postmaster at Florence, N. J., in place of James E. Jones, resigned.

NEW MEXICO.

J. L. Lovelace to be postmaster at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., in place of Adelina Jaramillo, removed.

NEW YORK.

Frank D. Ball to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of Archibald K. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1913.

William H. Barry to be postmaster at Carthage, N. Y., in place of Michael Gleason. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

L. B. Bennett to be postmaster at Schenevus, N. Y., in place of Melvin J. Esmay. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Ephriam J. Fisk to be postmaster at Fairport, N. Y., in place of John H. Stebbins. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Michael J. Flaherty to be postmaster at Corfu, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William J. McVay to be postmaster at Far Rockaway, N. Y., in place of George F. Vreeland. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1914.

F. J. Land to be postmaster at Cohocton, N. Y., in place of Henry P. Wilcox, resigned.

Clarence E. Palmer to be postmaster at Willard, N. Y., in place of John J. Mahoney. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

John G. Rose to be postmaster at Sinclairville, N. Y., in place of William Mansfield, resigned.

Wesley J. Springstead to be postmaster at Haverstraw, N. Y., in place of Stephen G. Newman. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

C. E. Thompson to be postmaster at Trumansburg, N. Y., in place of Edwin P. Bouton. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

George S. Vroman to be postmaster at Altamont, N. Y., in place of Dayton H. Whipple. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1914.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Kate S. Dunn to be postmaster at Scotland Neck, N. C., in place of Elizabeth H. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Redding M. Harper to be postmaster at La Grange, N. C., in place of Albert Miller. Incumbent's commission expires April 4, 1914.

Wilson D. Leggett to be postmaster at Tarboro, N. C., in place of J. F. Liles. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

Emma L. Vaughan to be postmaster at Whitakers, N. C., in place of Otto S. Woody. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. F. McMenamy to be postmaster at Reynolds, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Walter Priest to be postmaster at New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of William E. Biggs. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1914.

OHIO.

J. R. Alexander to be postmaster at Zanesville, Ohio, in place of George H. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

Wilbur M. Carpenter to be postmaster at Geneva, Ohio, in place of Ansel T. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charless P. Dunn to be postmaster at Springfield, Ohio, in place of William F. Bevitt. Incumbent's commission expires April 6, 1914.

George L. Higby to be postmaster at Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of Edward L. Davis, resigned.

James Martin McNamara to be postmaster at Barberton, Ohio, in place of Thomas J. Davies. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Raymond J. Neel to be postmaster at Thornville, Ohio, in place of Robert T. Whitmer, deceased.

H. J. Spitler to be postmaster at Brookville, Ohio, in place of Allen W. Somers. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1914.

Thurman Spriggs to be postmaster at Woodsfield, Ohio, in place of Frank M. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

William Zahn to be postmaster at Carey, Ohio, in place of Herbert Newhard. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

OKLAHOMA.

L. K. Bingham to be postmaster at Minco, Okla., in place of Nelson L. Eggleston. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Walter B. Hensley to be postmaster at Checotah, Okla., in place of James D. Faulkner. Incumbent's commission expires April 19, 1914.

Ida Per Lee Pugsley to be postmaster at Morris, Okla., in place of A. L. Denton, resigned.

George P. Rollow to be postmaster at Wynne Wood, Okla., in place of Elijah E. Norvell. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

George Stone to be postmaster at Tecumseh, Okla., in place of William E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

D. G. Woodworth to be postmaster at Kingfisher, Okla., in place of John A. Banker, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Llewellyn Angstadt to be postmaster at Kutztown, Pa., in place of John P. S. Fenstermacher. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

R. E. Burket to be postmaster at Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of Charles W. Zook. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1914.

Fisk Goodyear to be postmaster at Carlisle, Pa., in place of Caleb S. Brinton, resigned.

J. H. McGee to be postmaster at South Bethlehem, Pa., in place of Harry W. Thatcher. Incumbent's commission expired March 14, 1914.

Henry J. Norris to be postmaster at Hatboro, Pa., in place of Jesse N. Watson. Incumbent's commission expires April 26, 1914.

Frank Snyder to be postmaster at Minersville, Pa., in place of J. E. Laubenstein. Incumbent's commission expires April 29, 1914.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George B. Bailey to be postmaster at Greenwood, S. C., in place of F. H. Fetzer. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Francis M. Cross to be postmaster at Westminster, S. C., in place of Ira S. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Arthur R. Garner to be postmaster at Timmonsville, S. C., in place of Arthur R. Garner. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Luther McLaurin to be postmaster at McColl, S. C., in place of Luther McLaurin. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1914.

Peter T. Sapoch to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of Rufus C. Gettys, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

P. J. Donohue to be postmaster at Bonesteel, S. Dak., in place of Sherman F. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1914.

John T. Doyle to be postmaster at Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of John E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Frank P. Gannoway to be postmaster at Chamberlain, S. Dak., in place of William H. Ochsner, removed.

Frank Junge to be postmaster at Leola, S. Dak., in place of Frank D. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

T. J. Ryan to be postmaster at Bridgewater, S. Dak., in place of Charles E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1914.

TENNESSEE.

John S. Gilbreath to be postmaster at Pulaski, Tenn., in place of Emmett G. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1914.

J. W. McGlathery to be postmaster at Humboldt, Tenn., in place of Robert H. McNeely, resigned.

James C. Springer to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, Tenn., in place of Daniel W. Starnes. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

TEXAS.

S. R. Brown to be postmaster at McGregor, Tex., in place of Augustus S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joe F. Coffey to be postmaster at Eddy, Tex., in place of Henry C. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

S. H. Gardner to be postmaster at Honey Grove, Tex., in place of Thomas D. Bloys, deceased.

C. V. Gates to be postmaster at Gorman, Tex., in place of Robert F. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

George N. Gentry to be postmaster at Pecos, Tex., in place of George E. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

Reuben J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Whitesboro, Tex., in place of Frank W. Reast. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

J. F. Kunkel to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tex., in place of Robert J. King. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

William R. McAdams to be postmaster at Lorena, Tex., in place of Joe B. Ferrell. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

W. H. McCurdy to be postmaster at Moody, Tex., in place of W. James Gilmore. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joseph B. Patty to be postmaster at Brookshire, Tex., in place of Lee D. Ford, removed.

J. R. Ransone, jr., to be postmaster at Cleburne, Tex., in place of Carlton A. Dickson. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

F. J. Reese to be postmaster at Comanche, Tex., in place of George L. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

J. P. Rodgers to be postmaster at Hico, Tex., in place of Milton O. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

E. W. Sharman to be postmaster at Liberty, Tex., in place of Thomas F. Calhoon. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1914.

J. S. Spradley to be postmaster at Van Alstyne, Tex., in place of Gaines L. Burk, resigned.

UTAH.

George W. Young to be postmaster at Coalville, Utah, in place of E. A. Northcott. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

VERMONT.

Robert H. Royce to be postmaster at Johnson, Vt., in place of Max A. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1914.

VIRGINIA.

Richard P. Barham to be postmaster at Petersburg, Va., in place of Stith Bolling. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

W. C. Lauck to be postmaster at Luray, Va., in place of Charles T. Holtzman. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1914.

John B. Norfleet to be postmaster at Suffolk, Va., in place of Edwin M. C. Quimby. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1914.

L. E. Stephenson to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of Emmet W. Brittle. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

John S. White to be postmaster at Charlottesville, Va., in place of William S. Humbert. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

WASHINGTON.

Mae O. Gray to be postmaster at Stevenson, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Anna P. Hanley to be postmaster at Enumclaw, Wash., in place of William F. Koenig. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Charles O. Jackson to be postmaster at Eatonville, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Charles H. Runkel to be postmaster at Arlington, Wash., in place of Charles H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harvey Ewart to be postmaster at Hinton, W. Va., in place of Sira W. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

J. K. Kerwood to be postmaster at Ripley, W. Va., in place of Henry W. Deem. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

Buckner F. Scott to be postmaster at Terra Alta, W. Va., in place of William T. White, resigned.

Joseph F. Thompson to be postmaster at Martinsburg, W. Va., in place of E. C. Henshaw. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

A. H. Wiedebusch to be postmaster at Wheeling, W. Va., in place of Robert Hazlett, resigned.

James W. Wilson to be postmaster at Barboursville, W. Va., in place of James Brady, resigned.

WISCONSIN.

Lyle I. Daigneau to be postmaster at Boyceville, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

WYOMING.

C. W. Dow to be postmaster at Newcastle, Wyo., in place of Frank B. Fawcett. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1914.*

POSTMASTERS.

MICHIGAN.

Charles E. Adair, Utica.
Edgar E. Bedell, Bellaire.
George L. Belcher, Leslie.
Samuel D. Bonner, Newaygo.
Ernest J. Dubé, Houghton.
Thomas G. Finucan, Charlevoix.
Michael Hoban, St. Ignace.
James L. Klett, Whitehall.
Christopher Lowney, Laurium.
Charles F. Parker, Middleville.
Jacob C. Rough, Buchanan.
John E. Shekell, Jackson.
N. C. Sutherland, Romeo.

VIRGINIA.

John S. White, Charlottesville.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### TUESDAY, *March 17, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Crooker, of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, infinitely fatherly, a Friend forever friendly, we honor and glorify Thy high and holy name, and we thank Thee for the blessings of life that come to us from day to day; we thank Thee for our country, its schools, and courts, and churches; we thank Thee for the American home, woman's kingdom and man's paradise; we invoke Thy blessing, we seek Thy grace, we crave Thy forgiveness, we would learn Thy truth, we would obey Thy law, we would establish Thy kingdom on earth, and now we give Thee praise from grateful hearts evermore. In the name of our common Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CLERK PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE:

Desiring to be absent from my office for a short period of time, I hereby designate the Chief Clerk, J. C. South, Esq., to sign all papers that may require my official signature, and to do all other acts under the rules and practice of the House required to be done by the Clerk of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
*Clerk of the House.*

MARCH 17, 1914.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing some letters I have pertaining to the proposition of the increase in the freight rates in the eastern district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing some letters on the subject of the increase in freight rates in the eastern division. Is there objection?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PENSIONS.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider pension bills on the Private Calendar; and, pending that, I want to ask unanimous consent that H. R. 14234 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering pension bills on the Private Calendar; and, pending that, he asks unanimous consent that H. R. 14234 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman understands, of course, that provides for no general debate.

Mr. HELVERING. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I understand there is no desire for general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman if this is the only bill he has?

Mr. HELVERING. This is the only bill reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions. There is one from the Pensions Committee to be taken up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection that the bill H. R. 14234 be considered in the Committee of the Whole House? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The question now is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of pension bills.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of hydroelectric power by printing a petition from the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on hydroelectric power. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the first bill.

PENSIONS.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14234) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Members will bear in mind that this bill is being read for amendment, section by section.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of James Chambers, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move, page 21, lines 21 to 24, to strike out the name of "James Chambers."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, on page 21, lines 21, 22, 23, and 24.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Eastlick, late of Company G, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, page 28, line 3, by striking out "forty" and inserting "fifty."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 28, line 3, by striking out "$40" and inserting "$50."

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I had brought this to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, Gen. SHERWOOD, and he agreed with me that under the circumstances this was a mistake, and that he would offer this amendment to-day. Now, the circumstances are very peculiar in this case. This man has served about four years, as will be seen by the report on page 60 of the report of the committee, and $40 will scarcely pay the physician's attendance, which he requires two or three times every day. The man is blind, totally helpless, has no revenues except the pension that he is now getting of $15 per month, and I would like to bring that to the attention of the House and have this amendment made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIFENDERFER). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is not present to-day. I know nothing about this arrangement between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] and the gentleman from Ohio. Of course, if Gen. SHERWOOD has agreed to offer this amendment himself as a member of the committee, I would not want to resist it, because I know that in all cases he, as chairman of the committee, tries to do that which he believes to be equitable and just to the soldiers of the country. This appears to be a very fair case, under our rules, for a $50 allowance. Why it was allowed for $40 I do not know. However, I do not feel disposed to support this motion, and I do not like under the circumstances to oppose it. I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is not here. I shall not support this amendment and do not like to oppose it, as I have said, under the circumstances.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] if he regards this as a case that should have been placed at $50, why the committee put it at $40?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no personal recollection of it. The presumption would be with me that the examiner who wrote up and recommended this bill thought it was a $40 case and therefore allowed that amount. And in all probability the attention of the committee was not specifically called to this bill and therefore the amount was not increased. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS], as I understand, did not appear before the committee, but says that he had a conversation with Gen. SHERWOOD, which I have no occasion to doubt, and that Gen. SHERWOOD said it ought to be a $50 case, and that he himself would make a motion on the floor to increase it. Of course, I know nothing about that. I am told that the soldier is entirely blind and that he served four years. It would seem to be a good case for a $50 pension.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has not the chairman of the committee informed you? Of course, I would take the word of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. RUSSELL. Gen. SHERWOOD went home to bury his wife, and therefore is not here to-day.

Mr. LANGLEY. If I correctly understand the facts, there is no question but what it is a $50 case under the rules of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would appear to be such. I imagine now that it was reduced to $40, because of this statement which I see in the report:

Claimant has real estate assessed at $900.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for just a statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was present when this bill was up for consideration, and it was agreed by the committee that an amendment should be offered by some one on the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think this is the bill. I think the gentleman is mistaken about this being the case.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Perhaps I am mistaken about the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the gentleman from Nebraska is mistaken about the case. I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] that he did not appear before the committee.

Mr. HULINGS. The facts about the case are pretty well stated in the report of the committee. But the committee, I think, did not fully consider that this man, who served four years, suffered from gunshot wounds, from rheumatism and heart disease, contracted in the service, and is now receiving a pension of $15 a month, had become totally blind, and requires a constant attendant, and requires the attention of a physician two or three times every day in order that he may be catheterized. It is a very distressing case, and $40 a month will barely pay his physician's charges.

Mr. RUSSELL. The report also states that this gentleman is almost blind. It does not show he is totally blind.

Mr. HULINGS. He is totally blind to the extent that while able to distinguish between night and day he requires somebody to be with him all the time. He can not see for any practical purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. And then this report states that he has $900 worth of property. It has been a rule of the committee to reduce the amount of pension where they have property.

Mr. HULINGS. He has a little bit of a place there, about $900 worth, a lot and a little house in which he lives, but he has no revenue except his pension.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HULINGS. I will.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me ask the gentleman if he will consent to let this item be stricken out of this bill and present it to the committee again when Gen. SHERWOOD returns?

Mr. HULINGS. Is there a probability of another bill being introduced in time, in order to get action at this session?

Mr. RUSSELL. Two weeks from to-day there will be another bill.

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. SIMS. Recommit it, in other words.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph of the bill be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] asks unanimous consent that this section in the bill be stricken out. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the amount shall be reported in the next bill at $50.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 2, 1914:

H. R. 10258. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Lawton, Okla., a tract of land to be used for watershed and water-supply purposes.

On March 9, 1914:

H. R. 11338. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11331. An act to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio; and

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.

On March 11, 1914:

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.

## PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of James D. Gloud, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend line 19, on page 32, by striking out the word "Gloud" and inserting the word "Gload."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 32, in line 19, by striking out the name "Gloud" and inserting the name "Gload."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HELVERING, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 958. John H. Stone.
H. R. 1254. Maria A. Ryburn.
H. R. 1317. Moses King, jr.
H. R. 1630. Lemuel H. Mahan.
H. R. 2045. Edwin B. Force.
H. R. 2084. William G. Irwin.
H. R. 2085. James S. Armstrong.
H. R. 2292. William F. Knisell.
H. R. 2341. Thomas R. Irons.
H. R. 2716. Mary E. Bousman.
H. R. 3029. Susan Querry.
H. R. 3037. Daniel C. Boswell.
H. R. 3045. James L. Spencer.
H. R. 3046. Ellen M. Cutler.
H. R. 3236. Robert C. Stanley.
H. R. 3245. Charles W. Botkin.
H. R. 3248. Francis M. Marsh.
H. R. 3254. Jonathan Colyar.
H. R. 3484. Mary A. Parker.
H. R. 3611. Kate R. Harner.
H. R. 3821. Jacob Smith.
H. R. 3959. Henry R. Miller.
H. R. 4093. Carrie A. Hollenbeck (now Knopple).
H. R. 4333. Julia A. Smith.
H. R. 4590. Hebron B. Miller.
H. R. 4599. James M. Dilley.
H. R. 4840. Michael Weber.
H. R. 4856. Henry Smith.
H. R. 5254. Thompson Decker.
H. R. 5288. Theodore Strunk.
H. R. 5411. Johanna Scully.
H. R. 5435. James A. Fossit.
H. R. 5455. William Foltz.
H. R. 6054. Ferdinand Walser.
H. R. 6078. John Bean.
H. R. 6121. Alfred A. Trover.
H. R. 6246. William Bales, alias William Shaffer.
H. R. 6249. William Syers.
H. R. 6253. Orin McCreedy.
H. R. 6274. Charles H. Hines.
H. R. 6430. Jennette A. Wickham.
H. R. 6547. Christianne C. Mentzer.
H. R. 6844. James B. Miller.
H. R. 6872. Josiah Summers.
H. R. 6900. Rebecca A. Libbey.
H. R. 6980. John Barbeau.
H. R. 7143. David S. Trent.
H. R. 7555. Ford Cusey.
H. R. 7815. Alfred Gordon.
H. R. 7844. Edward Lichtenstein.
H. R. 7907. Anna Windmeister.
H. R. 7930. Jeremiah Laughlin.
H. R. 8091. Jennie Saylor.
H. R. 8127. Louisa M. Carothers.
H. R. 8328. Elizabeth Mellady.
H. R. 8445. Charles S. Swineford.
H. R. 8884. Hattie Dannels.
H. R. 8929. Charles Dailey.
H. R. 8982. Jennie E. Miller.
H. R. 8706. Maria J. Burnham.
H. R. 8721. Joseph C. Bell.
H. R. 8774. Mary U. Hull.
H. R. 8860. Allen Rosebery.
H. R. 8916. James Aitken.
H. R. 9005. Hiram H. Rudd.
H. R. 9085. Solomon R. Beam.
H. R. 9152. Delia R. Goss.
H. R. 9357. Lenora Lathrop.
H. R. 9370. Narcisse Menard.
H. R. 9409. Frank M. Fry.
H. R. 9447. John Levingston.
H. R. 9504. Martha Jane B. Phillips.
H. R. 9611. Edgar H. Sampson.
H. R. 9627. Chester W. Lynds.
H. R. 9746. John M. Dodd.
H. R. 9775. Augustine M. Adams.
H. R. 9846. Samuel Faust.
H. R. 9868. Jane M. Brown.
H. R. 9939. Carrie Sheldon.
H. R. 10042. John S. Hall.
H. R. 10123. Mary M. Evans.
H. R. 10184. David C. Brown.
H. R. 10262. Michael Cavanagh.
H. R. 10264. John P. Bischoff.
H. R. 10288. Geneva Beha.
H. R. 10389. John W. Hendershott.
H. R. 10410. Cecilia Cochran.
H. R. 10412. Carolina Apfel.
H. R. 10450. Leander Chapman.
H. R. 10603. William M. King.
H. R. 10658. Robert H. Fields.
H. R. 10661. Pauline Kerr (incapable).
H. R. 10689. Sarah E. Freed.
H. R. 10692. Henry Lemke.
H. R. 10699. Levi M. Winchell.
H. R. 10701. Isaac N. Baker.
H. R. 10705. Joel H. Towner.
H. R. 10706. David S. Peters.
H. R. 10716. Seth Clark.
H. R. 10755. Andrew Sutton.
H. R. 10803. Allen S. Thatcher.
H. R. 10818. Helen G. Davis.
H. R. 10819. Theodore Walker.
H. R. 10882. Jeremiah Holcomb.
H. R. 10896. Edward Varley.
H. R. 10902. Jay Cobb.
H. R. 11036. Mary Hanson.
H. R. 11072. William Spotts.
H. R. 11125. Emanuel Sheese.
H. R. 11126. William F. Bailey.
H. R. 11127. Simeon Mick.
H. R. 11149. Frederick H. Rix.
H. R. 11162. Margaret Gallagher.
H. R. 11184. Nancy Bates.
H. R. 11190. Robert N. Scott.
H. R. 11360. Nathan J. Kilby.
H. R. 11410. Peter Risban.
H. R. 11453. Adam R. Zimmerle.
H. R. 11454. James Chambers.
H. R. 11567. Daniel B. Huddle.
H. R. 11584. Sinnary Bohner.
H. R. 11587. George S. Tilson.
H. R. 11655. George S. Merritt.
H. R. 11710. Julia A. Thornton.
H. R. 11776. Georgiana W. Sampson.
H. R. 11832. Charles W. Peet.
H. R. 11835. James E. Waters.
H. R. 11863. Thomas Eversole.
H. R. 11924. Clement Waldron.
H. R. 11958. Samuel Reinhart.
H. R. 11990. Charles H. Dart.
H. R. 12074. Maria Antonia Martinez de Mink.
H. R. 12083. William R. Zook.
H. R. 12135. Axie Eads.
H. R. 12199. Francis Reynolds.
H. R. 12162. Allen T. Hodge.
H. R. 12202. Samuel M. Wakley.
H. R. 12224. Manuel H. Campbell.
H. R. 12262. Mary A. Bond.
H. R. 12318. Leo Blubaugh.
H. R. 12356. Benjamin F. Overton.
H. R. 12374. Peter N. Hardman.
H. R. 12459. Frederick R. J. Wren.
H. R. 12554. Isabella Cordia.
H. R. 12558. Joseph F. Wheeler.
H. R. 12615. Florence V. Roth.
H. R. 12680. James Hickman.
H. R. 12685. Elizabeth Beach.
H. R. 12713. Lewis L. Bean.
H. R. 12763. Nancy J. Steward.
H. R. 12775. George W. Hutchison.
H. R. 12777. William Eastlick.
H. R. 12825. Dennis W. Palmer.
H. R. 12828. Henry Boitger.
H. R. 12833. Henry A. Walters.
H. R. 12835. Theodore Metcalf.
H. R. 12861. Robert F. McCurdy.
H. R. 12888. John Phillips.
H. R. 12889. Isaac Wyckoff.
H. R. 12893. Frances M. Gooding.
H. R. 12939. Anna M. Stroessinger.
H. R. 12957. Jonathan Greely.
H. R. 12961. Jane H. Crofut.
H. R. 12962. Ellen L. Kneller.
H. R. 12971. Herbert Wadsworth.
H. R. 13007. Jerome B. Secrest.
H. R. 13008. William Zegenfus.
H. R. 13022. Webster Benner.
H. R. 13027. Lyman Mosier.
H. R. 13030. William F. Mosier.
H. R. 13057. George Vandegrift.
H. R. 13100. Albert Rine.
H. R. 13119. Susan A. Smith.
H. R. 13140. Letitia A. Turner.
H. R. 13146. Henry C. Elliott.
H. R. 13149. Caroline Kirman.
H. R. 13160. Robert Myers.
H. R. 13165. Joseph Bailey.
H. R. 13209. John Right.
H. R. 13210. Charlotte R. Thornton.
H. R. 13215. James D. Gloud.
H. R. 13255. Wallace Barnes.
H. R. 13259. Alexander Mattison.
H. R. 13261. Ruben Riley.
H. R. 13283. James R. Sage.
H. R. 13337. Myron T. Spencer.
H. R. 13345. Justus N. Stillman.
H. R. 13348. Charles F. Goodwin.
H. R. 13353. Julius R. Bruce.
H. R. 13375. Hubbard D. Carr.
H. R. 13376. Thomas H. Hancock.
H. R. 13379. Elizabeth J. Peckham.
H. R. 13385. Smiley W. Hamilton.
H. R. 13393. Henry T. Howell.
H. R. 13409. Michael D. C. Staner.
H. R. 13424. John Michel.
H. R. 13433. Jane Cramer.
H. R. 13473. Adeline Waskey.
H. R. 13480. Elisha P. Graham.
H. R. 13506. Alexander Powell.
H. R. 13586. Josiah J. Waffle.
H. R. 13931. William H. Knapp.
H. R. 13936. Montgomery Patton.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House——

The SPEAKER. That has already been done. The House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] in the chair.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Pending that, I ask that an agreement for two hours' general debate on this bill, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and the other hour to be controlled by myself.

Mr. MANN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MANN. The House has not voted to go into Committee of the Whole yet.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken. The way that came about was that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] moved to go into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing this pension bill, and he asked, pending that, that this particular bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. But the motion was not put.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The motion was put. The Reporter has it in his notes. But it will take less time to put it again than to hunt up the record. And pending that motion, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] asks to consider what?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. To agree upon a division of time, whereby general debate shall be for two hours, one hour to be controlled by myself and the other by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Very well.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Has the gentleman from Oklahoma charge of this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. They authorized my name to be attached to the report.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he has had his attention called to the bill introduced by myself for one Robert Wilson, who is paralyzed?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No; I do not remember that I have had.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does the gentleman recall the case where one of the officers in command of a company swore in these papers——

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No; I do not recall the case.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Maybe the gentleman will recall the case when I have asked him the question.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I am sure I did not, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman presented it to me privately a while ago.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Well, if the gentleman will allow me to ask him the question, he can answer it. One affidavit by one of his officers, by the name of Marcus B. Brewer, alleges that Robert Wilson was stricken with sunstroke at Chickamauga Park while in rank and was picked up and carried out of line. He testifies that he did have a sunstroke while in the service in line of duty. In this same case there are allegations of doctors who testify that this man is a paralytic and unable to do any work whatever, and they connect this paralysis with the sunstroke. Does the gentleman remember that case?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Has the committee considered this case?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I do not really know.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then I will say to the gentleman before I consent to any agreement I must have a promise from this committee to reconsider this case.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that the committee has considered the particular cases contained in this bill, but there are a number of other bills pending before the committee which constitute a good many more than are here. We have not had time yet to consider them. I will state to the gentleman that I have several bills myself before this committee, and not one has been reported to this House at this session. As soon as we get to the bills we will be able to do it. We have considered these bills that are embodied in the pending bill.

Now I will yield to the gentleman's question.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if I did not write him a letter about two weeks ago, asking the committee to con-

sider this case? I now ask the gentleman if the committee did not refuse to consider it?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I do not remember.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to state, for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], that that case was before the committee, and the committee saw fit to lay the case on the table.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will you reconsider the action?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The committee did consider it, and laid it on the table.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will you give me a hearing on the case, and will you give my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BELL] a hearing?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I think that would be fair.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I think it would be necessary that the matter be taken up by a vote of the full committee. If the gentleman desires to appear before the committee he can appear before the subcommittee having that bill in charge.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then with that understanding I will not object, Mr. Speaker, to further proceeding on the bill now before the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma ask anything about the division of time in his request?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes. One-half of the time to be controlled by myself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask is the debate intended to be confined to the bill?

Mr. DIES. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that my part of it is to be confined to the bill.

Mr. MANN. To this bill?

Mr. DIES. To this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. So far as I am concerned I do not care for any time at all.

Mr. MANN. We might want some time. I suppose in that event we could get it.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] asks that the debate on House bill No. 14546 be limited to two hours; one half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14546, with Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of H. R. 14546, the title of which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 14546) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the first formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 821. Clarence B. Brown.
H. R. 917. Roy E. Knight.
H. R. 1255. Edward C. McDowell.
H. R. 1268. Hilda Furbom.
H. R. 1295. Walter E. Harris.
H. R. 1304. Rosie Scott.
H. R. 1437. Parmelia R. Parris.
H. R. 1544. Daniel A. Millard.
H. R. 1545. Charles Voos.
H. R. 1601. James M. Pauley.
H. R. 2007. James Turner.
H. R. 2511. Virginia M. Mills.
H. R. 2643. Louis K. Turner.
H. R. 2750. Stanley S. Stout.
H. R. 2813. Della A. Cooter.
H. R. 3030. Mary A. Barber.
H. R. 3063. Charlie L. Pennington.
H. R. 3082. James H. Kampo.
H. R. 3092. James H. George.
H. R. 3311. Martella M. George.
H. R. 3315. James E. Hooks.
H. R. 4567. William Feavel.
H. R. 4968. Daniel Lawlor.
H. R. 5129. Edward C. Franklin.
H. R. 5175. Emma J. Crocker.
H. R. 6549. Elizabeth A. Shull.
H. R. 6593. Crowell Lisenby.
H. R. 6627. Oscar E. Harper.
H. R. 6943. Charles F. Pandorf.
H. R. 6952. Hale F. Hamilton.
H. R. 7053. John D. Ashley.
H. R. 7830. Emma Fox.
H. R. 7977. George Oatten.
H. R. 8435. William Miller.
H. R. 8452. James H. Martin.
H. R. 8490. Gambo C. Villines.
H. R. 8653. Marian E. Keyes.
H. R. 9064. Andrew J. Wallace.
H. R. 9201. Peter H. Strumsky.
H. R. 9973. Samuel P. Shupe.
H. R. 10169. Edward F. Smith.
H. R. 10173. George B. Weesner.
H. R. 10193. William H. Franks.
H. R. 10357. John Hodges.
H. R. 10952. Otho E. Gepler.
H. R. 11057. Addison B. Burroughs.
H. R. 11260. James C. Hudson.
H. R. 11434. Wiley Gullett.
H. R. 11639. Ernest W. Hilliard.
H. R. 12964. Martha R. Allwein.
H. R. 13328. Mary A. Dow.
H. R. 13518. Catherean Mihalak.
H. R. 13933. Pawil Wiczlas.
H. R. 13947. William E. Howell.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say about this bill is that we have considered these particular cases, and we have held pretty strictly to the line of the rules laid down for the guidance of the committee. Wherever we have found a case that in equity entitles the claimant to a pension we have tried to give it. We feel that the Pensions Committee in the House is similar to a court of equity, to supply the defects wherein the law is deficient. The department in many instances, because of the strictness of the statute, is unable to grant a pension and dismisses the application, when an examination shows that the applicant, by reason of destitute condition, in spite of inability to meet the cold letter of the law, is as much entitled to a pension as any person upon the roll. In all these cases, and especially the Spanish War cases, we have tried to ascertain the financial condition of the claimant and to grant pensions where, by reason of poverty, it was necessary to take care either of the soldier or his widow or children.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the attention of the committee ought to be called to this legislation. If I did not believe that this bill was made up of a lot of cases that are wholly out of proportion not only to the law but to the pensions that are paid to soldiers of the Civil War, I would not take up the time of the committee to call their attention to the matter. I do not know but you can label any injustice under the sun a pension and so pass it through Congress. I am told by a gentleman who has been here many years longer than I have that you can pass any sort of an appropriation under heaven for anybody on earth if you will label it a pension.

If that is true, of course, it is not worth while to call your attention to the manifest injustice of this bill. It is not only an injustice to the taxpayers of this country, but it is an injustice to the old soldiers of the Civil War who are outclassed and outpaid by these younger men of the Spanish-American War. I warn you now that you are laying up trouble for yourselves by giving large pensions to healthy, able-bodied young men in this country who are going to walk along the same side of the street as the old, crippled, worn-out veterans of the Civil War; and those old veterans are going to take you to task, and they are going to ask you, "Why did you give this husky young fellow a greater pension than you gave to me? He is a young man who never smelled powder, and I am an old man tottering to my final fall, who went through one of the bloodiest wars in the annals of all history."

Moreover, this bill is the beginning of an old-age pension system in this country. I know many Members of Congress are in favor of old-age pensions, poverty pensions, if you please; indigent pensions. In a great many of its items this bill has nothing upon which to base a pension except the statement that the person needs it.

With this prefatory remark I want to call attention to certain specific cases. I want them to go into the RECORD. I want the people of this country to understand with what lavish hand we give from the Federal Treasury. When a case goes into the RECORD and is sent out into the country, very few people will see it this week. A few more will see it next week or week after next, because these bills come every two weeks, and if I live I purpose to call the attention of the committee to these legislative monstrosities every two weeks, as long as I am here; and at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill I am going to ask for a roll call. I probably will not get it, but I am going to ask for it in the House. I am going to ask for tellers in the committee, and I am going to ask for a roll call in the House, because I do believe that while there is no justification for a private pension bill in any case, even as to the Civil War, for we ought to have one law for all men alike, I do maintain that a system of private pensions every two weeks for the soldiers of the Regular Army and for the soldiers of the Spanish War ought to outrage the sense of justice of every Member of this body.

The first case to which I want to call attention is on page 5 of the report, in which case they propose to give the pensioner $50 a month.

Mr. KEATING. What case is that?

Mr. DIES. That is H. R. 917.

When you give a young man who was in the Spanish-American War a pension for life you give him from ten to twenty times as much money value as you give to a soldier of the Civil War to whom you give the same pension. Why? Because the actuarial value of a $10 pension to a soldier who is now 37 years old is from ten to twenty times the actuarial value of a pension to a soldier who is 70 years old. And in starting out now to take the soldiers of the Regular Army and the soldiers of the Spanish-American War and put them on the pension roll, is to do it with the knowledge before us that we are writing a debit

against the Government even more tremendous than that involved in special pension bills for the soldiers of the Civil War.

In this case the pensioner is to get $50 a month as long as he lives. He is now a young man 37 years old.

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was ever in the hospital for medical treatment, but do show he was reported as sick in quarters upon several occasions for a day or so, the nature of the illness not being stated. * * *

The soldier's rate of pension was increased to $24 per month from June 18, 1906, under a special act of Congress approved that date. He still receives pension at said rate.

Here is a Spanish War veteran, 37 years old, who has already had the benefit of one private pension bill increasing his pension to $24 a month, and here comes another to give him $50 a month.

The next case is on page 6 of the report, and this man is not entitled to a pension.

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was treated during his service for any disability, and they also show no physical examination was made at the date of his discharge.

No evidence has ever been given in this claim, and no medical examination by a board of surgeons was ever had.

There is no claim here in the record that he is entitled to a pension. The only statement upon which a pension could be based is this:

And that he had an honorable service in the Confederate Army—

Did you get that?

Mr. KEATING. What case is that?

Mr. DIES. This is H. R. 1255.

Mr. KEATING. On what page of the report?

Mr. DIES. It is on page 6 of the report—

And that he had an honorable service in the Confederate Army, and afterwards in the United States Army during the War with Spain.

But in the War with Spain he shows nothing that would entitle him to a pension. He did not go through the form of a physical examination; he made no pretense of any disability. Therefore he is to be pensioned as a Confederate solder, which is charitable, I admit. I know there were no braver soldiers in the world than the soldiers in the Confederate Army. Many believe that they are entitled to receive a pension. I myself never have believed that they ought to receive pensions at the hands of the Federal Government. It has always been my hope and belief that they will never apply to the Federal Government for a pension.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. How old is this pensioner?

Mr. DIES. Seventy-four years of age.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does my friend feel that at that age, with the man in his present condition, the fact that he has served his country as he thought right during the Civil War, and then in the Spanish War, that he ought not to receive a pension?

Mr. DIES. There are a great many Confederate soldiers who served as this man did, 74 years old. If you want to pension Confederate soldiers, why take one and give him a pension when there are a long line of them who served under Johnson, who served under Lee, who served under Beauregard, who are just as deserving as this man; why single him out to give him a pension?

Mr. GOULDEN. We are not pensioning him for his services in the Confederate Army.

Mr. DIES. He is not pensionable for his service in the Spanish War.

Mr. GOULDEN. The committee find him pensionable.

Mr. DIES. The committee says that the record shows that no physical examination was made at the date of discharge, and no evidence has ever been given in this claim, and no medical examination by a board of surgeons was ever had. There is no evidence at all upon which to base a pension for services during the Spanish War, and the only claim is that he is 74 years old and served in the Confederate Army.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman from Texas evidently knows that at the close of the Spanish-American War, when they were mustered out, the men were asked if they were suffering from any wound or disability because of their service, and out of a spirit of patriotism and pride lots of men answered "no." I had a nephew who served in the Spanish-American War, very sick at the time, who answered this way.

Mr. DIES. I do not know why men when they were mustered out should make a false statement about it. If somebody asked him if he was sick, I do not see why he should not acknowledge it. If they asked him if he had lost a leg, I do not see why he should not admit it. If they asked him if he had malarial fever, I do not see why he could not say "yes" without reflecting upon his patriotism.

Mr. GOULDEN. They thought that in doing that it was not patriotic.

Mr. DIES. No; they knew in that day that they did not deserve a pension, and it is only after Congress allows it to be used for political purposes that they come and ask for pensions.

Now, the next case is on page 7 of the report.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. For a question.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he referred to the case of Roy E. Knight?

Mr. DIES. I want to call the attention of the committee to a number of cases and the facts under those cases.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I wanted to call the gentleman's attention that he objected to the case of Roy E. Knight.

Mr. DIES. I am not objecting to anything; I am simply calling attention to these cases.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Why did not the gentleman call attention to the fact that the man is almost totally blind?

Mr. DIES. Oh, I can not read all these reports in full. I call the committee's attention to the cases, and it is the Members' duty to read the report in full. The gentleman would not wait for me to read all these reports.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. But the gentleman picks out one particular point and does not go through the case. As I say, this soldier is almost totally blind.

Mr. DIES. I can not yield to the gentleman further. As I say, I can not read all of the reports in these cases or in any case. I give you the salient facts, and you can rely upon it that what I tell you about a case is true.

Now, the next case is, on page 7, the case of Hilda Fardom, of Kalmar, Kingdom of Sweden. The record shows that on February 17, 1902, the widow filed a claim relating the death of the soldier due to military service. This claim was rejected April 26, 1902, on the ground that the evidence on file does not establish the cause of the soldier's death or of its connection with the military service, and the claimant declares her inability to furnish additional evidence.

This is just another case where you are generous and tax the people of the United States for a pension unauthorized by law to some good woman who lives in the Kingdom of Sweden.

The next case is on page 11 of the report H. R. 1304. This is a beautiful case. This is the case of Rosie Scott, who is the widow of Robert Scott, who served in the United States Navy from April 6, 1872, to November 11, 1873, one year and 7 months. He drew from the Federal Government the sum of $1,698 in pensions. He had been drawing pensions of some sort for 37 years for that service, and this bill provides to pension his widow.

You will find on page 13 H. R. 1437. In this case the pensioner drew two pensions for many years. Under the law one person can not draw two pensions. The Bureau of Pensions dropped one pension, because no person can lawfully draw two. Now the committee proposes to leave her drawing the pension as a mother and to give her $30 per month as a widow. I call your attention to the fact that that which is a penitentiary offense under the pension laws of the country is written into the bill, and she is given two pensions for one person.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Is that the case of Parmelia R. Parris, of Hutchinson, Kans.?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. She is a widow of a Mexican War veteran.

Mr. DIES. Yes. She is an old woman and had a son in the Civil War and a husband in the Mexican War. She drew two pensions for many years, and one of them was dropped. And you now go outside of the law to give her $30 per month and give her two pensions, which the law does not countenance. I do not know of a case under the great Civil War where any person, whether a general or the humblest soldier, or his wife, has ever been allowed lawfully to draw two pensions or is now drawing two pensions.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. For a question.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman certain that his statement is correct, that this claimant is to draw two pensions?

Mr. DIES. I am taking the report of the committee.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does this pension not take the place of a previous pension?

Mr. DIES. No.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. DIES. No. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. KEATING. I am anxious that the gentleman answer it correctly.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman can not help me to do that.

Mr. KEATING. It will enable the gentleman to answer it correctly if he will read the bill, because the bill says that she shall be granted a pension at the rate of $30 a month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and when the gentleman says we grant her two pensions he is simply endeavoring to mislead the House.

Mr. DIES. I can not yield further. Here is the language of the committee. I will read it, and then we will see whether I am trying to mislead the House:

H. R. 1437. Parmelia R. Parris, Hutchinson, Kans., widow of Bennett Parris, deceased, who served during the War with Mexico in Company D, First Regiment United States Dragoons, from September 27, 1847, to August 12, 1848. (W. C. 807.)

The soldier died in 1866, and a pension was, on June 30, 1887, allowed to the petitioner as his widow from January 29, 1887, under the act of Congress approved that date, at $8 per month.

The petitioner was the mother of James L. Parris, who enlisted January 26, 1864, in Company H, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and was killed in battle October 5, 1864, and she was granted a pension of $8 per month as his mother from the day following the soldier's death. She was receiving this pension when she applied for and was allowed a pension as the widow of her husband, who had served during the War with Mexico. She continued to draw the two pensions until 1896, and it was clearly shown she was innocent of any intent to defraud, and believed she was entitled to receive both pensions at one and the same time. She was given the right to elect which pension she wished to retain, and selected that as mother—they were the same rate, $8—and recovery was made of all erroneous payments and pension as widow was terminated. Under the act of April 19, 1908, the rate was increased in each class to $12, and she now receives pension as the mother at $12 per month.

She could, if she so elected, surrender the pension she draws as a mother and be restored to the rolls as a pensioner at the same rate—$12 per month—as widow of a Mexican War soldier.

I submit, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KEATING. Finish the reading of the report.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, if the committee had not intelligence enough to say what they mean, then they ought not to be unfair enough to challenge my motives, to impugn my motives for following the language of the report.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. For a question.

Mr. KEATING. For a suggestion.

Mr. DIES. I decline, Mr. Chairman, to yield for a suggestion.

Mr. KEATING. Then I will ask the gentleman a question. I will ask the gentleman if he will read to the committee the concluding paragraphs of this report?

Mr. DIES. I will read that:

The pending bill treats with the Mexican War claim, and the case is prepared to be considered as if she were now pensioned as the widow of a Mexican War soldier.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she is very old—she is over 80 years of age—and very feeble and has no property and no income other than her pension of $12 per month.

It is shown by competent testimony of several lay witnesses that the petitioner is the widow of the deceased Mexican War soldier, is very old and feeble, and possesses no property and has no income except her pension of $12 per month.

From the evidence submitted, your committee believe that an increase from $12 to $30 per month is warranted in this case, and it is so recommended.

What case? As the wife of a Mexican soldier. It is stated specifically that they do not deal with her pension that she is receiving now under the Civil War, but they are dealing with the Mexican War, and under that she is entitled to draw both pensions, according to my construction.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIES. I decline to yield further.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman read the bill?

Mr. DIES. I decline to yield further. The gentleman has said that I am trying to deceive the committee, and if that is the opinion he has of me he ought not to ask me to yield to him.

Mr. KEATING. When the gentleman gets through——

Mr. DIES. Yes; when I get through just eat me up. Gentlemen who are in the habit of eating up the Public Treasury and the funds from the taxpayers of the country ought not to have much trouble in eating me up. I think if they will just eat me up and quit eating up the tax money for illegitimate pensions it will be a good thing for the country. I think the people who pay the taxes in this country could dispense with me a good better than they could with their hard-earned cash.

The first thing a man learns when he comes to Congress is how to get a private pension bill through. He learns to loot the Treasury under a private pension bill long before he learns the fundamental rules of the House of Representatives.

Let us take up the next case, on page 16 of the report, the case of James Pauley, of Carbondale, Colo. He served in the Regular establishment, in Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, from October 29, 1868, to April 18, 1869, when he was honorably discharged. I read from the report:

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was ever reported as sick or received medical treatment for any cause.

September 22, 1891, he filed a claim for pension based on hernia (rupture) of both sides, which he alleged was incurred in the service and line of duty. After a most thorough special examination the claim was rejected June 22, 1898, on the ground of no record and the claimant's inability, even though aided by a special examination, to furnish evidence necessary to show that the double hernia was incurred in the service and line of duty. No appeal was taken.

Yet this Committee on Pensions winds up their statement as follows:

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service, and they therefore respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The next case to which I wish to invite the attention of the committee is on page 31 of the report (H. R. 4567), the case of William Feavel. This is the pension of a soldier from the Regular establishment who served his country a little while, was then paid all that the country agreed to pay him, and 30 years after his discharge he filed his first application for a pension, due no doubt to the fact that we no longer consider pension bills—we just pass them and give everyone what he asks for. We have a case here of a pension based upon service rendered more than 50 years ago by a man who never asked for a pension in his life.

Well, the very next case in page 33, H. R. 4968, Daniel Lawlor, Albany, N. Y. He served in the Regular Army, and for 40 years after he was paid off and duly discharged, he made no claim for a pension, no disability, not entitled to it under the law, and he comes now and is to receive a pension for having served in the Regular Army. Now, in that case to which I have just referred, where the man made no claim for a pension for 40 years, here is what the record shows:

The soldier, as shown by the records of the War Department, was 18 years of age at enlistment and a bartender by occupation. He was treated for a disease in October, 1866; for vulnus incis (incised wound), March 6 to April 5, 1867; for a disease in January and July, 1868; January, June, and December, 1869; and May and June, 1870; for "lacerated wound, altercation," July 18 and 19, 1870; and for disease in February, 1871. Nothing in the records, the War Department reports, specifically shows whether the disability treated March 6 to April 5, 1867, was incurred in line of duty.

No evidence was filed prior to the rejection of the claim, and no medical examination has been made.

And yet the committee reports:

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The next case is H. R. 5129, page 34. This is the case of a man who served in the War with Spain, and the records of the War Department fail to show that he was during the service ever reported as sick or received medical treatment for any cause. When discharged he claimed to be suffering from no disability, and the medical officer who then examined him certified he could find none existing. However, he claimed that he had been sick in the service, and here is what the testimony shows:

The military records show that he was on furlough from October 8, 1898, to November 6, 1898, and on November 7, 1898, was examined at Wilmington, Del., preliminary to muster out. He was then asked whether he had any reason to believe that he was suffering from the effects of any wound, injury, or disease, or had any disability or impairment of health, and answered "No." The surgeon who examined him certified that he found no disability.

The claimant, being confronted with his own signed statement that he was free from disability on November 7, 1898, had no explanation to offer except that he did not recall making such a statement. He acknowledged that the signature was genuine.

That is the testimony, and from the testimony the Pensions Committee think that he is entitled to receive a pension.

The next is H. R. 5175, page 37 of the report. This soldier served 3 months and 8 days. After he served that time in the Spanish-American War he got married. The report says:

The records of the Navy Department fail to show any sickness or treatment of the soldier during his service.

He never filed any claim for a pension. Now the widow is to be pensioned, and the committee says:

From the evidence submitted in this case, your committee is of the opinion that a pension of $12 per month, with $2 additional for each of the two minor children until they, respectively, reach the age of 16 years, is fully justified and so recommend.

On page 38 you will find the case where a man 54 years ago, or, rather, this is the application of a widow of a man who 54 years ago did something. Nobody seems to know what, because the evidence shows that he did not do anything in the service of the United States, but he did something in California for 4 months and 20 days. The State of California filed a claim against the Federal Government, and the Government, as usual and always, paid the claim and California paid the soldier for his 4 months and 20 days' work, or whatever it was. Now, remember, that has been 54 years ago. Thirteen years after he did this 4 months and 20 days' work he got married, and at

this late date his widow applies for a pension, and the committee says:

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted, and so recommends.

The next is the case of H. R. 6593, page 38. This good person comes from Georgia, served in the War with Spain, and he has filed a claim for a pension. The claim was rejected on the ground of no disability May 2, 1908, and again February 15, 1910, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence shown incurrent in service or existent at discharge of the alleged injury. The report goes on to say:

Reopening has been several times denied.

The soldier, as shown by the War Department records, was 23½ years of age at enlistment. The records of physical examination at enlistment show:

"Chills and fever at 21 years of age. Gonorrhea in 1898. One molar gone."

He was treated for causes other than the alleged injury of back—

I want to call attention to that "alleged injury to back"—

among which was preputial chancroids, multiple, not in line of duty, from January 26 to February 1, 1901. There is no record of treatment for injury of back, but he was treated October 25 to 28, 1901, for acute lumbago, both sides, cause unknown, in line of duty.

The claimant was examined by a board of surgeons at Macon, Ga., April 1, 1908. They reported his height as 5 feet 10½ inches, weight 160 pounds. The board said he was "well nourished. Heart and lungs negative. Urine negative. No evidence of injury to back except his word that he suffers pain there. He does regular work of farm hand daily. No evidence of specific disease."

And yet the committee say—

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate $12 per month.

If not, why not? [Laughter.] Here is a young man doing regular farm work, lively and husky, who led a dissolute life probably and occasionally has the backache as a result from it, but he is doing regular farm work, though, drawing a stipend every month, and this committee finds that he ought to go down into the Public Treasury and take out an annuity of $144 a year to be paid as long as this young man lives, contributed by the toiling millions of this country, an annuity to him, probably to aid him to buy a farm, I do not know.

On page 50—I will have to hurry along because I can only call attention to a few of these cases—here is a case, H. R. 7977, beginning page 49 of the report, and the report says:

The special examination disclosed the fact that the claimant had borne a pretty bad character prior to his enlistment, having been prosecuted for and convicted of larceny, but that since his discharge he has married and been a steady worker and kept out of trouble. He has always been a very thin man, and before and since service has gone by nickname "Skinny." It is not shown that he was ever ill prior to the service, and it is not shown that he has been sick to any very marked extent since his recovery from malarial fever, from which he was suffering very severely at the time of his discharge. In fact, he worked for some time prior to enlistment for two brothers—J. Fred and Chauncey Tyler—and has worked for them most of the time since his service, and these brothers both state that they can see no difference in his health since service from that he enjoyed prior thereto. He had lost practically no time from work after his recovery from malarial fever until 1909, when the special examination was had, and he turned in on an average about as much work since his service as he was accustomed to do prior thereto.

And yet—

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I will.

Mr. QUIN. Does not the gentleman think he is doing good service in working the Government?

Mr. DIES. Yes; he is a young man; he is getting a larger pension now than the old soldiers of the Civil War got when they were his age. He will be getting it when he dies. He will be getting it for injuries in the service long before he gets old, but of course these records will be all wiped out and the fact that the claim is allowed here and made will be prima facie evidence that he is an old soldier, a veteran in the service of his country, and who had a broken back in the service. [Laughter.]

Over on page 51 is the bill H. R. 8435, the case of William Miller. He is now in the National Home at Milwaukee, and being taken care of in good shape, no doubt. He was discharged 32 years ago, but he was neglected. It never occurred to him until this bill was introduced to ask the Government to give him a pension, and to give you some little idea now of what we may expect in regard to it, the soldier was examined by a board of surgeons on June 1, 1910, and they report that he ought to have $72 a month as a pension.

And then there is the case, on page 53, H. R. 8490, of Gambo C. Villines. He served a few years—from 1881 to 1886—in the Regular Army 28 years ago. He was paid off by his employer. Of course we all know that the Regular soldiers have to do an awful lot of hard work, but after he got through for Uncle Sam as a Regular soldier he was paid off. Twenty-eight years had gone by, and he heard, Mr. Chairman, that everybody got a pension who asked for it, and he asked for one, and gets it in this bimonthly bill.

And then there is the case over here, on page 55, H. R. 8653, where the man's troubles, according to the records of the Navy Department, were debauch, excessive use of alcoholics, and venereal disease. That is a claim, however, for a pension for his widow. He was married three times, and there is no record to show the death of but one of his three wives, and this allowance is for $12 per month, with an additional pension for each of the two minor children. We will have to pay three, or four, or five, or six pensions for this man who served his country principally in the canteen.

I am just skipping over these cases, but I will take the most glaring ones, although they are all glaring; they are all in violation of the general law; most of them unmeritorious, and none of them should be passed. This is a case, H. R. 11057, on page 71 of the report. This man is yet a young man. He is 37 years old. I want you to get this, members of the committee. He served a whole month and 18 days in the War with Spain, that bloody conflict. However, he never got into the bloody part of it. The records of the War Department fail to show that he ever reported as sick or ever received medical treatment while in the service. When discharged he claimed he was suffering from malaria. The medical officer by whom he was examined certified that no evidence of disability could be found to exist. Your committee says:

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in the service, and we respectfully recommend the allowance of the pension at the rate of $12 a month.

On page 76, H. R. 12964, is the case of a lady who wants to be pensioned as a nurse. She was not in the war, but probably in the Philippine Islands. She is not entitled to be pensioned under the general law. If she had served with Grant in his campaign against Lee and had administered to the needs of the dying soldiers on the battle fields between here and Richmond, she would be entitled to $12 a month, but not having been in that war or any war, your committee allows her $50 a month. It is true the good woman has lost her eyesight, but when she was examined before entering the service the report of the examination, dated December 20, 1905, shows that her left eye had a convergent squint, cloudiness of vitreous humor, and so forth, and that she had practically no vision in the left eye. She was in that condition when she went to work, but the Government paid a fair wage—better than she could get outside of the Government. She nursed one year or two years, I forget which, and then she left the service. Now, you are going to give her an annuity of $600 a year for life, just for a few months of service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no prejudice against those who served in the Regular Army. I have no sort of prejudice against those who served in the War with Spain. It was not a war to be compared with the War between the States. I believe there were between 300 and 400 men killed in the Spanish War and probably between 1,000 and 2,000 wounded. I am not sure. The figures are very small, at any rate. I know that around El Caney and San Juan we lost between 200 and 300 men, and we had 1,100 or 1,200 wounded, and I believe that is about all the loss we sustained in the War with Spain.

I want to tell you that if you allow this thing to continue, long before the Civil War pension roll begins to decrease the 500,000 men entitled to consideration by this committee will have raised the pension expenditure hundreds of millions of dollars. You know that there are about 500,000 men who at some time or other are going to ask for a pension under these various demands, and their widows, their children, and the first, second, third, and fourth generations. They give it to a wife while she lives, and when the wife dies the mother inherits it. When the mother dies, there will be some child. There are always some children in the family of a pensioner. It would make a person disabled to know that by being disabled they could get a pension for being disabled. You are going to have disabled children and disabled members of the families of every soldier and sailor in the Regular Establishment and every soldier and sailor who was in the Spanish-American War. And you are going to ride this country down with pensions that are a thousand times worse than the old-age pensions. If you want to give old men and old women pensions without regard to service to this country, as an act of generosity, do not give one of them $10 and another $12 and

another $20. If you want to give an old-age pension in this country, give a small pension, as they do in England, to the old men and old worn outs throughout the country. I am opposed to that, because I know when you put a premium on pauperism, when you open the public crib that paupers may come in and feed, and every man can look to the Treasury in his old age, you will breed more paupers and indigents in this country than all the saloons and all the wars and all the pestilences have bred for a hundred years.

About this bill I have nothing but the kindest feelings for the magnificent gentlemen who are in charge of it. They are on the Pensions Committee, and all are good men and just as patriotic as I am. They are a part of the system, and that system you and I and all others are responsible for, namely, the private-pension system of this country. While they are on that committee they are compelled to report these bills. They are no more to blame for it than the Speaker of the House, or Mr. UNDERWOOD, or you, or myself. And I only say to you that you and I and all others ought to put a stop to all these private pension bills, and if we can not stop them all along the line, let us stop them for everything except the Civil War. Put a stop to them. Give them all fair and equal justice under the law and let that be an end of it, because we are laying up trouble for our Government and laying up trouble for ourselves if we do otherwise.

I want to say to the committee that I shall want a roll call on this bill. I want a record made in this committee by tellers, or by roll call in the House, whichever body we happen to be in when the time comes when we can get it. I want to get a record of whether in respect to this almost bloodless war we are going to start out to do what we did with reference to the bloody Civil War; whether we are going to pension nurses at $50 and whether we are going to give men large pensions who never saw actual service; whether we are going to pad this service with respect to the Regular Establishment. I want to give every man a chance to help me to get a roll call, and after we get it to help me vote against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to state these cases fairly, but as some gentlemen think I have failed to do so, I insert the report of the Committee on Pensions, which speaks for itself.

[House Report No. 370, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE REGULAR ARMY AND NAVY, ETC.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 14546:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred sundry bills granting pensions and increase of pensions for certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, etc., submit the following report:

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 821. Clarence B. Brown.
H. R. 917. Roy E. Knight.
H. R. 1255. Edward C. McDowell.
H. R. 1268. Hilda Furbom.
H. R. 1295. Walter E. Harris.
H. R. 1304. Rosie Scott.
H. R. 1437. Parmelia R. Parris.
H. R. 1544. Daniel A. Millard.
H. R. 1545. Charles Voos.
H. R. 1601. James M. Pauley.
H. R. 2007. James Turner.
H. R. 2511. Virginia M. Mills.
H. R. 2643. Louis K. Turner.
H. R. 2750. Stanley S. Stout.
H. R. 2813. Della A. Cooter.
H. R. 3030. Mary A. Barber.
H. R. 3063. Charlie L. Pennington.
H. R. 3082. James H. Kampo.
H. R. 3092. James H. George.
H. R. 3311. Martella M. George.
H. R. 3315. James E. Hooks.
H. R. 4567. William Feavel.
H. R. 4968. Daniel Lawlor.
H. R. 5129. Edward C. Franklin.
H. R. 5175. Emma J. Crocker.
H. R. 6549. Elizabeth A. Shull.
H. R. 6593. Crowell Lisenby.
H. R. 6627. Oscar E. Harper.
H. R. 6943. Charles F. Pandorf.
H. R. 6952. Hale F. Hamilton.
H. R. 7053. John D. Asbley.
H. R. 7830. Emma Fox.
H. R. 7977. George Oatten.
H. R. 8435. William Miller.
H. R. 8452. James H. Martin.
H. R. 8490. Gambo C. Villines.
H. R. 8653. Marian E. Keyes.
H. R. 9064. Andrew J. Wallace.
H. R. 9201. Peter H. Strumsky.
H. R. 9973. Samuel P. Shupe.
H. R. 10169. Edward F. Smith.
H. R. 10173. George B. Weesner.
H. R. 10193. William H. Franks.
H. R. 10357. John Hodges.
H. R. 10952. Otho E. Gepler.
H. R. 11057. Addison B. Burroughs.
H. R. 11260. James C. Hudson.
H. R. 11434. Wiley Gullett.
H. R. 11639. Ernest W. Hilliard.
H. R. 12964. Martha R. Allwein.
H. R. 13328. Mary A. Dow.
H. R. 13518. Catherean Mihalak.
H. R. 13933. Pawil Wiczias.
H. R. 13947. William E. Howell.

The following are the facts ascertained by the committee concerning the case of each beneficiary in said bills and the conclusions of the committee as to the proper amount of pension or increase of pension which should be granted:

H. R. 821. Clarence B. Brown, of Macon, Ga., served as a private in Company B, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, during the War with Spain, from July 14, 1898, to April 22, 1899, when mustered out with the company; in Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, from July 8, 1899, to April 26, 1902, when transferred to Company B, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, from which he was discharged July 25, 1902, by expiration of his term of enlistment. He also served from September 28, 1904, in the Twentieth Battery, Field Artillery, United States Army, to February 6, 1905, when transferred to Troop K, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, from which he was discharged September 27, 1907, a cook, upon expiration of his term of enlistment. (I. O., 1288901.)

He applied for pension August 2, 1902, alleging that in the Philippine Islands in March, 1900, while in Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, he contracted stomach and bowel trouble, diarrhea, and dysentery, alternating with constipation; that in February, 1902, in same company, he incurred injury to back and resulting lumbago, caused by horse falling on him; also, that on October 16, 1899, while a member of Company B, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, and in the Philippines, he incurred severe deafness of right ear, caused by concussion, and also varicose veins of right leg.

He filed another declaration for pension March 9, 1909, alleging that on or about the 1st or 15th of November, 1905, in the Philippine Islands (while in Troop K, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry), he incurred a swollen instep, caused from varicose veins, and that he was twice operated on for such disability by a contract surgeon, Dr. George Clayton.

September 3, 1909, he filed another application, stating that about October 15 or November 15, 1906, while in Troop K, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, in the Philippines, he contracted a fibrous tumor; that he was also treated in 1906 for tuberculosis and has ever since been troubled with lung disease.

The first two claims were rejected May 24, 1909—for piles—on the ground that such disease existed before enlistment in Company B, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, as shown by the records of the War Department; for varicose veins of right leg and swollen right instep, affection of right foot and leg, alleged as result of operation for varicose veins of right leg, on the ground that varicose veins existed prior to enlistment in Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, as shown by the records of the War Department; for diarrhea, dysentery, disease of bowels, stomach, and rectum, exclusive of piles, and constipation, injury of back and alleged resulting lumbago, and deafness of right ear, on the ground that a ratable degree of disability had not been shown since date of application.

From that action appeal was taken, and under date of August 20, 1909, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior affirmed the rejection.

The claim filed September 3, 1909, was rejected January 25, 1911, because a ratable degree of disability had not been shown from date of application from disease of lungs or bronchial trouble. The claim for varicose veins, realleged as fibrous tumors, was not reopened.

The War Department records show the soldier 22 years of age at his first enlistment and that he then had "small external piles." There is no record of medical treatment during that service, but he is reported on the company muster-out roll as sick in hospital August 12 and 13, in quarters August 19 to 25, 1898. Upon examination preliminary to discharge from first service he said he then had no disability and was corroborated by his captain, James M. Kimbrough, jr., and a surgeon.

The record of physical examination at enlistment (second) in Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, July 8, 1899, shows "slight varicose veins, both legs, below knees."

During this service he was treated for malarial fever December 19 to 21, 1899; January 17 and 18, February 10 to 18, and March 4 and 5, 1900; for acute diarrhea, March 27 and May 31 to ——— —, 1900; for acute external hemorrhoids, March 27 to 30, 1900, and November 23 to 27, 1901; for dental caries—teeth filled—June 2 to 5, 1900; for acute coryza (cold in head), January 18 to 28, 1901; for acute bronchitis, February 26 to March 5, 1901; for acute hepatitis, March 19 to 24, 1901; and for acute orchitis, right testicle, gonorrheal, April 19 to 30, 1901.

The record of physical examination at the third enlistment, September 28, 1904, showed:

"Varicosities both lower legs. Measles, mumps, whooping cough at 5 or 6 years of age. Dysentery at 25 years. Sore eyes at 10 years of age. Gonorrhea, sore on penis, and circumcision at 24 years of age."

He was treated during this service as follows: For fibromato, etc. (fibrous tumor of lower left leg or ankle), cause undetermined, but attributed to local irritation from legging or ill-fitting shoe. Complication. Fibromato removed, skin sutured under cocaine anesthesia January 16, 1906; from January 10 to February 6, 1906, for varicose veins internal surface right leg. Complication, March 3 to May 28, 1906. May 1, 1906, suspected tuberculosis of lungs, under observation and treatment since January 10, 1906. Tertiary syphilis manifested by general glandular enlargement of lymphatic glands, not in line of duty; multiple fibromato, right ankle, June 8 to August 5, 1906; intestinal colic, acute, October 23 and 24, 1906, and gastritis, acute, April 20 to 26, 1907.

The claimant was examined by a board of surgeons at Macon, Ga., February 18, 1903. They reported height 5 feet 6 inches, weight 125 pounds; that he had no dysentery; hemorrhoids, rated six-eighteenths; no sign of injury of back; no evidence of pain in small of back; no disease of ear nor deafness; varicose veins of right leg of moderate degree, no ulceration, rated two-eighteenths; no edema, or heart signs, cyanosis, or any sign of dyspnea; no lung disease, chest measures 33–37; no kidney disease; does not seem robust and strong; he is evidently suffering from syphilis.

He was examined by another board at the same place December 7, 1910. They reported weight 129 pounds; general appearance healthy; heart negative (rapid); urine negative; lungs 33½, 35½, left side does not expand as well as right, percussion negative. Posterior bronchovesic breathing along lower border of scapula left side. Coughed constantly during examination. No sign of cavity; pile tumors protrude on bearing down; no tumor on foot; scar anterior right ankle from operation; varicose veins right leg and thigh; pharynx congested—no disease of larynx; nose normal; slight enlargement of glands of body; no other sign of syphilis. No evidence of vicious habits. Rate, ten-eighteenths for varicose veins of leg and thigh.

Clarence H. Kelly, of Company M, Eighth Cavalry, testified that he was in hospital with the claimant in the Philippines; that the latter had an operation performed on his foot at that time and was also being treated for his lungs, both contracted, so far as he knew, in the Army.

William Castlen and J. L. Swint testified, jointly, March 2, 1909, that the claimant was then "more or less disabled" for manual labor; that they had noticed his leg was badly swollen ever since he came out of the Army; and that they had seen his foot and considered it in very bad shape.

M. V. Means and M. P. Weston testified, December 8, 1910, that they had known the claimant for three years and had noticed that he suffers with a severe cough, which causes him great trouble, which, they believe, renders him unable to do any manual labor. Also that he suffers from a crippled foot.

S. H. Smith, M. D., testified, May 8, 1903, that the claimant was in a low state of health on August 4, 1902, and has improved but little since; that he treated him in September, 1902, for chronic cystitis; that he had also treated him for chronic bronchitis (when not stated); and that he is suffering with varicose veins of right ankle which disable him from walking at times, and with internal and external hemorrhoids, which bleed profusely at times; that he was called to see claimant March 30, 1903, and found him suffering with colic, caused by indigestion; that he has such spells ever four or five weeks, which disable him for a week or 10 days at a time; that he considers claimant one-half disabled.

In another affidavit, made February 12, 1909, this witness said he met the claimant about October 15, 1907; that he had varicose veins of right leg and three scars from operation, foot and leg tender; that he has treated him off and on ever since, and he has not been able for manual labor half the time.

In an affidavit executed November 9, 1910, he said he had been the claimant's physician about three years; that he finds him troubled with catarrhal condition of stomach and bowels, varicose veins of right leg from thigh to foot, and that he is not able to do enough manual labor to earn a living for himself and family.

June 5, 1909, this witness testified that the claimant was suffering with catarrhal condition of stomach and bowels in the spring of 1903 and has so suffered ever since; that he has had several attacks of acute indigestion in the last 18 months; that he is almost deaf in right ear and has a weak back.

In an affidavit accompanying the bill the petitioner states that he is partially disabled by injury of right foot, by swelling of foot, and lung trouble; that he owns no property of any kind, and that his income from all sources is $300 a year.

Two lay witnesses state that he is in bad health and has been for two years, and has no means of support except from his daily labor, which is a very small amount owing to his physical condition.

The gentleman who introduced the bill states that the petitioner is in feeble health; has no means of support except his daily labor; is unable to engage in any steady or continuous employment, which facts he knows from acquaintance with the applicant and familiarity with his affairs.

Dr. James M. Gallargy testifies that he is examining officer for the United States Army at Macon, Ga., and on July 1, 1913, he examined the petitioner for entrance to the Army and rejected him because he is suffering from varicose veins.

Another affidavit has been filed by the soldier dated January 19, 1914, setting forth practically the same facts, circumstances, and conditions as outlined in his previous affidavit.

From the evidence submitted it is believed that a pension of $17 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 947. Roy E. Knight, of Aurora, Ill., served during the War with Spain, in Company I, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, from April 26, 1898, to January 18, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. C. 1077301.)

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was ever in the hospital for medical treatment, but do show he was reported as sick in quarters upon several occasions for a day or so, the nature of the illness not being stated.

When discharged he claimed to be suffering from diarrhea and cramps, but the medical officers by whom he was then examined could find no evidence of any disability existing and so certified.

He filed a claim for pension December 8, 1905, based on malarial poisoning, dysentery, and resulting disease of the rectum. He also alleged nearly total blindness of the left eye and impaired vision of the right eye, and claimed it was a result of malaria and rectum trouble. This claim was allowed from date of filing at the rate of $10 per month for malarial poisoning, dysentery, and resulting disease of the rectum, but blindness of the left eye and impaired vision of the right eye was not accepted as a result of said diseases.

The soldier's rate of pension was increased to $24 per month from June 18, 1906, under a special act of Congress approved that date. He still receives pension at said rate.

On March 9, 1912, he filed a claim in the Bureau of Pensions in which he stated that he had lost the sight of both eyes and believed same was due to malaria and rectum disease for which he was formerly pensioned, and asked to be allowed a pension at the rate for total blindness ($100 per month). This claim was approved for malarial poisoning and dysentery and resulting disease of the rectum at $10 per month, but the Pension Bureau refused to accept total blindness as a result of said disease.

An appeal was taken, and in a decision of December 18, 1912, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior sustained the adverse action of the Bureau of Pensions. In this decision it is admitted that in a few rare instances there has been found cases where blindness followed, and was due to malarial infection.

Dr. Thomas A. Woodruff, a very prominent surgeon of Chicago, Ill., who is in charge of the ophthalmic department of St. Luke's and St. Anthony's Hospitals of that city, states in an affidavit executed November 23, 1911, that he has examined the soldier and finds total blindness of both eyes, and a history of malarial poisoning, and disease of the rectum following dysentery, and that in affiant's opinion the blindness of this soldier is due to the malarial poisoning, diarrhea, dysentery, and resulting rectum disease contracted in the service. This eminent specialist goes into detail in describing the several forms of glaucoma (blindness), and the specific type from which the soldier suffers, and gives several citations of high medical authorities showing that this type of glaucoma can and does result in blindness by atrophy of the optic nerves, from which he states the soldier suffers. He cites Knies, Relations of the Eye to General Disease, page 401; Datzmann, Wien, page 514; Vachi, page 634; Kastowsky, page 281; Webster Fox, textbook, page 419 and page 412.

With the bill is filed a letter from the Member who introduced same, who states that he has filed an affidavit of the soldier with the office of this committee, in which it is stated by the soldier that he is totally blind and possesses no property, and that he also filed affidavits of lay witnesses showing the soldier has no property, and of a doctor showing he is totally blind. Such affidavits can not be found in the committee rooms, but were doubtless filed, as alleged, although a careful search has been made for same. However, as this Member (Mr Copley) states in a letter to the committee that the soldier is totally blind and possesses no property and no income except his pension of $24 per month, and his wife is forced to work as a bookkeeper.

The medical testimony recently filed in the Bureau of Pensions, which has been hereinbefore cited, shows the soldier is totally blind, and in the opinion of the doctor the blindness is the result of malaria and rectum troubles.

From the evidence submitted in this case your committee is of the opinion that an increase from $24 to $50 per month is fully warranted, and it so recommends.

H. R. 1255. Edward C. McDowell, Hanford, Wash., served as a captain, acting quartermaster, United States Volunteers, during the War with Spain, from May 31, 1898, until honorably discharged June 30, 1901. Served in the United States and Cuba. (I. O. 1407524.)

He applied for pension December 30, 1912, alleging that in Cuba in June, 1899, he contracted disease of the kidneys; same became normal and gave no trouble for years, but now affects him again and paralysis of left arm has resulted therefrom. The claim was rejected on January 31, 1913, on the ground of claimant's manifest inability to connect the alleged disabilities with his military service as shown by his sworn statement. No appeal was taken and no effort was made to reopen the claim.

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was treated during his service for any disability, and they also show no physical examination was made at the date of his discharge.

No evidence has ever been given in this claim and no medical examination by a board of surgeons was ever had.

With the bill, your petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is 74 years of age; suffers from rheumatism in legs and arms and partial paralysis of left shoulder and arm; that he does not know that these disabilities had their origin in the military service; that he is unable to perform any manual labor and has no property except about $50 worth of clothes and a trunk.

There is filed a certificate of the United States surgeon, of the transport vessel upon which the soldier served, in which it is set forth that the soldier was under this surgeon's professional care and treatment for several weeks during March, 1901, during service, suffering from gastric irritation and intestinal indigestion to an extent to sensibly impair his health and strength. The surgeon states that in his opinion these disabilities were due to the long service of the soldier upon transports and thus being exposed to contrasts of temperature met with between New York and the West Indies. Much of the soldier's service was rendered upon transports upon these waters.

Two witnesses testify that the soldier is 75 years of age, feeble and infirm in health, and unable to perform any manual labor, and is now without means; possesses no property of any kind; and that he had an honorable service in the Confederate Army, and afterwards in the United States Army during the War with Spain.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that a pension of $24 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 1268. Hilda Furbom, city of Kalmar, Kingdom of Sweden, is the widow of Charles O. Furbom, deceased, who served during the War with Spain, in Company H, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, from April 26, to November 17, 1898, when he was honorably discharged. Some of his service was rendered in Cuba. He was 25 years of age at enlistment. (W. O. 756843.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment: "August 20 to 22, 1898, diagnosis not stated, but in line of duty; August 31 to September 5, 1898, malaria in line of duty."

When discharged he alleged he was suffering from malarial poisoning and the medical officer by whom he was examined certified he was then suffering from "temporary malarial weakness."

April 1, 1901, the soldier filed a claim for pension based upon malarial poisoning which he also claimed had resulted in disease of the lungs. This claim was allowed at $6 per month from date of filing to January 13, 1902, the date of the soldier's death, for malarial poisoning. Disease of the lungs was rejected as it is not accepted by the Bureau of Pensions as a result of malarial poisoning. As the soldier had died prior to allowance of his claim payment of the pension was made to his widow.

February 17, 1902, the widow filed a claim alleging the death of the soldier was due to his military service. This claim was rejected April 26, 1902, on the ground "the evidence on file does not establish the cause of the soldier's death or of its connection with the military service, and the claimant declares her inability to furnish additional evidence."

The evidence in the claim of the widow clearly shows her to be the lawful widow of the soldier who died January 13, 1902. In her claim the widow contends the death of the soldier was due to the malarial poisoning that had been accepted as of service origin.

The evidence does not clearly and positively show what was the fatal disease from which the soldier died. There is record of treatment in the service for malaria, and when he was examined June 26, 1901, by a board of surgeons it found he was markedly emaciated and his general appearance was bad. He was then 28 years of age, 6 feet in height, and weighed only 120 pounds, and while there was some evidence of malarial poisoning the main disability the board found him suffering from was pulmonary tuberculosis, and they state as to this as follows:

"This claimant is so disabled from phthisis pulmonalis as to be incapacitated for the performance of any manual labor and is entitled to $30 per month."

Dr. W. C. Ward, of Chicago, testifies that he treated the soldier in January, 1890, for "a functional disturbance of the heart," and in January, February, and March, 1901, for phthisis pulmonalis, and then advised him to go to Colorado, California, or New Mexico. Affiant further states that he has no sort of doubt phthisis pulmonalis caused his death.

Shortly after March, 1901, the soldier took up his residence in Texas and came under the medical treatment of Dr. W. M. Gallaher, who testifies in April, 1902, that he treated the soldier in September and afterwards for malaria, stomatitis, and bronchitis, but did not see him for some time prior to the date of his death; that he was called to see him the day of his death, but arrived after he died. In a subsequent affidavit this witness states that in his opinion that "malarial poisoning was the true origin of his disease and death."

The widow appealed from the rejection of her claim, and in a decision of March 12, 1904, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior sustained the adverse action and held that all of the evidence pointed to pulmonary tuberculosis as the cause of the soldier's death, and that disease could not be accepted as a result of malarial poisoning. This decision will be found attached to the brief in the Pension Bureau file.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating the soldier was strong and well before service; that he contracted malarial poisoning in the service, which so weakened him that he fell a prey to pulmonary troubles from which he died, and she thus believes his death due to his service; that she is the lawful widow of the soldier and has no property or income except that derived from her own labor. This statement was made July 8, 1911.

Two lay witnesses on July 3, 1911, swear that the petitioner has not remarried since the death of the soldier, and is his lawful widow, and possesses no property or income except that which she earns by her own labor.

Another lay witness on April 8, 1913, swears to the same facts concerning lawful widowhood and possession of no property.

Dr. W. M. Gallaher swears that he believes the soldier's death was due to tuberculosis with malarial complications.

From the evidence submitted, your committee believes that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted and so recommended.

H. R. 1295. Walter E. Harris, of Damariscotta Mills, Lincoln County, Me., served during the War with Spain from May 26, 1898, to October

5, 1898, as a landsman on the United States ships *Wabash*, *Frolic*, and *Franklin*. He was honorably discharged upon recommendation of a medical board survey by reason of physical disability. Chief part of service in waters about Porto Rico and Key West. He was 35 years of age at time of enlistment. (I. O. 44240.)

On December 6, 1898, the petitioner filed a claim for pension on account of gastric catarrh contracted between Porto Rico and Key West, Fla., in September, 1898.

The claim was rejected January 15, 1901, on the ground of no ratable disability since the date of filing.

Another claim was filed on December 14, 1910, and rejected April 18, 1912, on the same ground. Reopening was denied twice, June 10, 1912, and August 14, 1912, for the same cause.

The sailor served 58 days on the *Wabash* and was not reported sick at all. He served 54 days on the *Frolic* and was carried 11 days on the sick list. He was treated September 13, 1898, on the *Frolic* for "gastritis—acute—duty." Discharged September 14, 1898, to naval hospital New York (?). The hospital ticket states:

"Catarrhus gastricus acutus. There is good evidence that it was in line of duty, the man becoming debilitated while serving on this ship, and was complaining for several days prior to September 3, 1898, when he was placed on sick list, being unable to retain food on his stomach and unfit for duty. He has been very nervous for past two weeks and has been troubled by insomnia. Soups have been retained at times in stomach, but solid food has usually caused vomiting. For the past few nights man has had night sweats and chilly sensations. I have heard slightly prolonged and harsh breathing at right apex. Sputum has not been examined. Urine examined and found negative. Man at times seems to lose presence of mind and worries excessively. Case paper states: 'Catarrhus gastricus acutus. Origin, duty, incident to naval service. Stomach very irritable. Has slight cough. September 23, 1898, special duty, mild exercise. September 26, improving slowly. October 3, discharged to *Franklin* for discharge from service. Surveyed September 23, 1898.'"

The medical survey of September 23, 1898, states:

"Unfit for service; defective teeth, permanent; recommended that he be discharged from service. Origin, not in line of duty."

The petitioner swears he was strong and well before enlistment; that he contracted disease of stomach during service while near Porto Rico in September, 1898, and has never recovered from the disease, and is unable to perform manual labor as result thereof.

The only testimony in the claims proper, other than that of the sailor, is that of Dr. A. M. Card, of Head Lide, Lincoln County, Me.

In affidavits executed November 2, 1899; August 16, 1900; January 25, 1901; March 28, 1902; and January 25, 1912, he sets forth, under oath, that he has known the sailor since about 1885; was his family physician; that he was strong, rugged, and well prior to enlistment; that he returned from the service suffering from gastric catarrh of stomach and bowels in a very bad condition; that he has treated him as family physician all this time, as he did prior to his enlistment, and he has steadily grown worse from said disease until he is now a physical wreck and unable to do any kind of manual labor, and in his opinion he will never be able to earn his living; that his physical condition is entirely due to gastric catarrh of stomach and bowels, which he contracted in the United States service.

In connection with the application for reopening of the claims affidavits of Dr. Card, executed on May 14, 1912, and James E. Mulligan and Ruel T. York executed July 25, 1912, were filed. Dr. Card states that he had that day examined the sailor and found him suffering from disease of stomach, the objective and subjective symptoms of which were as follows:

"Pain and stricture in stomach, fullness of stomach, most of the time, caused by gas, loss of appetite, great distress in taking food, vomiting and chills, loss of strength and flesh, the coughing up of daily quantities of his meals, daily attended by pain."

Mulligan and York state that they knew the sailor prior to his enlistment, at date of his discharge, and ever since; that since discharge he has suffered from stomach disease every month, all of the time, and is, in their opinion, disabled one-half from earning his living by manual labor.

The claimant was first examined by a board of surgeons November 22, 1899, at Bath, Me. The board reported:

"Body well nourished, skin normal, tongue not coated, red, and indented by teeth. Throat and lungs normal, as evidenced by a careful examination. Inspiration 25, expiration 33. Heart: Cardiac dullness, action weak, sounds normal. No areus, senlles, or edema. Gastric catarrh: We find marked tenderness over the stomach and excessive tympany on percussion over an increased area; equals six-eighteenths. Hepatic dullness, medium line 3; nipple line 3½; ancillary line 4. Splenic dullness from eighth to twelfth ribs, increased forward; equals two-eighteenths. Spleen tender on percussion and palpation. No other disabilities found. No vicious habits."

On February 21, 1912, he was again examined, this time by board of surgeons at Augusta, Me. They reported:

"Urine: Acid, yellow, clear, ten-twentieths, no sugar or albumen. No evidence of disease of urinary organs. Rate, 0/18.

"Heart: Apex beat fifth space nipple line. Area dullness, fourth to sixth ribs. Heart action weak, regular, hurried; there is a deferred murmur, heard with greatest intesity over tricuspid area, general cyanosis, no edema, extremities cold, dyspnea on exercise. Rate, twelve-eighteenths.

"Lungs: Muscles soft, fairly nourished, form erect, chest full, expansion 35–38. Rate, 0/18.

"Disease of stomach: Eyes yellow, skin sallow, tongue red, fissured, liver dullness fourth space to 2½ inches below free costal border and 2 inches left of medium line, tender. Spleen extends forward to anterior axiliary line, sixth rib to crest of illum and tender, abdomen tender, epigastrium full tender, rectum normal. Rate, twelve-eighteenths.

"This claimant gives a clear history of chills and fever since service; says he has them every two or three weeks, and has since being discharged from the Navy. No other disabilities. No vicious habits."

Filed with the bill is an affidavit of the petitioner in which he says he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor by reason of disease of stomach, malaria, and heart trouble, and has no income or means of support and owns no property of any kind, and is a charge upon charity of friends.

There is an affidavit of Dr. Card, executed February 18, 1913, in which he states that petitioner is suffering from inflammation of stomach and bowels, chronic; also has malarial poisoning and hernia of stomach; that he has treated him for those diseases since he returned from his naval service, and he has suffered constantly from same; that he is unable to perform any manual labor; that he knows the petitioner was a sound and well man prior to his enlistment.

Two lay witnesses, Ruel T. York and George A. Tomlinson, testify that they have known the petitioner for 30 years; lived close neighbors to him; that since his discharge from the Navy he has suffered from some kind of stomach trouble constantly, under care of a physician a large part of this time, and is not able to perform any sort of manual labor; that he is without means, and is partly supported by charity.

Two other lay witneses, C. Joel Rankin and Fred W. Newcomb, upon the same date testified to the same facts, with the exception that they have only known petitioner for 15 years, or since his discharge from naval service.

From the evidence submitted it is believed that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 1304. Rosie Scott, of Greene, Me., is the widow of Ribert Scott, who served in the United States Navy from April 6, 1872, to November 11, 1873, when discharged on medical survey. He served in the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, *Vermont* to April 17, 1872, on the *Portsmouth* to June 27, 1872, on the *Lancaster* to March, 1873, and on the *Vermont* to date of discharge. (W. O. 967264.)

The sailor was pensioned as a landsman, U. S. S. *Lancaster*, January 21, 1874, at the rate of $3 per month from November 12, 1873, for the "effects of pleurisy."

On June 8, 1907, the name of disability was changed to disease of right lung, and the rate was increased to $8 per month from May 6, 1906. The rate was subsequently increased to $10 per month from December 15, 1909, and to $12 per month from October 19, 1910.

The pensioner died May 25, 1911, of disease of heart.

The widow applied for pension June 21, 1911, alleging the sailor's death from disease contracted on the *Lancaster*, United States Navy. The claim was rejected June 8, 1912, on the ground that the sailor's death from disease of heart was not a result of disease of right lung, for which he was pensioned, nor accepted as having been otherwise due to his naval service which ended 37 years before. Reopening was denied in July, 1912.

The sailor's original claim for pension was filed November 15, 1873, and was based on "disease of heart and pulmonary consumption."

The naval records show by medical survey made November 3, 1873, that he was then wholly disabled by disease of heart and pulmonary consumption due to exposure to atmospheric changes and dampness of ship doing duty on the U. S. S. *Lancaster* in the South Atlantic Fleet prior to August, 1872.

A medical survey made March 14, 1873, showed him unfit for service by valvular disease of heart, of indefinite future duration, which originated in line of duty from exposure to constant dampness of ship and atmospheric changes; that he had an attack of pleuritis in line of duty and has had trouble with his heart since then. First admitted to sick list August 27, 1872.

He was treated April 28, 1873, for rude respiration all over chest, slight crackles at apex of the left, posteriorly, and over the lower part of left chest, posteriorly.

An official medical examination made in the pension claim December 1873, disclosed no evidence of consumption or heart disease. The board said:

"The movements of the chest are limited to 1½ inches, with evident dullness on percussion over right lung, the result of pleuritis. The body is poorly nourished. General health impaired.

"Disability, one-half."

He was next examined September 6, 1877. The surgeon said he found no indication of disease of heart, but found some dullness on percussion on the right side; general health good. Rate, $3.

He was examined by a board September 24, 1877. They found no decided dullness over chest on percussion, but some heart trouble—action acceleration and some dyspnea on effort.

The next examination was made by a board on May 16, 1906. They reported:

"Age, 70 years; height, 5 feet 6 inches; weight, 160 pounds. Fairly well nourished.

"Lungs: Normal percussion resonance, no rales on pleuritis, friction sounds, though deep breathing excites a cough. Chest measures 33½, 35.

"Heart: Apex beat in fifth space and one-half inch to left of line of nipple. Area of dullness extends 2 inches to left of nipple. He is considerably cyanotic, which is increased by exertion; a good deal of dyspnœa after slight exertion. Heart's action very feeble, no arteriosclerosis, heart dilated.

"Rating, effects of pleurisy, $24."

He was examined by another board May 15, 1907. They reported six-eighteenths for effects of pleurisy, twelve-eighteenths for disease of heart.

Another board rated, October 19, 1910, seventeen-eighteenths for disease of right lung and ten-eighteenths for heart disease.

C. C. and Mary E. Stetson testified in April, 1912, that they had known the sailor since 1886; that he was affected by a shortness of breath and at times by a cough, which to them denoted heart and lung trouble.

The public death record shows death May 25, 1911, from valvular disease of heart; age 75 years 9 months and 13 days.

Dr. D. F. D. Russell testified that the sailor died May 25, 1911, of valvular disease of heart; that he dropped dead in church; that his right lung was diseased and he was weak and run down; that the duration of his last illness was from April 1910; that he had a severe cough, was short of breath, unable to walk a great deal, was very feeble, and would fall to the floor at times; that the remote or contributary cause of death was weakness following degeneration of lung and cardiac weakness.

In another affidavit this witness said the sailor had no valvular lesion, but a very weak heart and weak lungs.

In an affidavit filed with the bill the petitioner states that she is 68 years of age; that she owns no property and is supported by charity.

The petitioner in affidavit of January 6, 1913, again states that she has no means of support and is destitute. This is supported by affidavits of Everett L. Mower and O. E. Hanscom, recently filed.

In an affidavit executed January 19, 1914, the petitioner states that she is 69 years of age, and that all of the property possessed by her consists of household goods worth not more than $50.

Dr. O. E. Hannan testifies January 22, 1914, that the petitioner suffers from valvular disease of the heart, Bright's disease in chronic form, is feeble, and requires the constant attendance of another person.

Two lay witnesses testify January 22, 1914, that the widow is old and feeble and helpless, and has no property and depends upon charity for a living.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that a pension of $12 per month is fully justified, and so recommend.

H. R. 1437. Parmelia R. Parris, Hutchinson, Kans., widow of Bennett Parris, deceased, who served during the War with Mexico in Company D, First Regiment United States Dragoons, from September 27, 1847, to August 12, 1848. (W. C. 807.)

The soldier died in 1866, and a pension was, on June 30, 1887, allowed to the petitioner as his widow from January 29, 1887, under the act of Congress approved that date, at $8 per month.

The petitioner was the mother of James L. Parris, who enlisted January 26, 1864, in Company H, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and was killed in battle October 5, 1864, and she was granted a pension of $8 per month as his mother from the day following the soldier's death. She was receiving this pension when she applied for and was allowed a pension as the widow of her husband, who had served during the War with Mexico. She continued to draw the two pensions until 1896, and it was clearly shown she was innocent of any intent to defraud and believed she was entitled to receive both pensions at one and the same time. She was given the right to elect which pension she wished to retain and selected that as mother—they were the same rate, $8—and recovery was made of all erroneous payments and pension as widow was terminated. Under the act of April 19, 1908, the rate was increased in each class to $12, and she now receives pension as the mother at $12 per month.

She could, if she so elected, surrender the pension she draws as a mother and be restored to the rolls as a pensioner at the same rate—$12 per month—as widow of a Mexican War soldier. The pending bill treats with the Mexican War claim, and the case is prepared to be considered as if she were now pensioned as the widow of a Mexican War soldier.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she is very old—she is over 80 years of age—and very feeble and has no property and no income other than her pension of $12 per month.

It is shown by competent testimony of several lay witnesses that the petitioner is the widow of the deceased Mexican War soldier, is very old and feeble, and possesses no property and has no income except her pension of $12 per month.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $12 to $30 per month is warranted in this case, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 1544. Daniel A. Millard, of Gaylor Farm Sanitarium, Wallingford, Conn., served during the War with Spain in Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, from June 18, 1898, to January 22, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 23 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1398267.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment: "July 14 to 19, 1898, abrasion of both knees; July 28 to 31, 1898, fever; August 2 to 27, 1898, typhoid fever; August 29 to October 12, 1898, typhoid fever, constipation, pains in limbs, and diarrhea. He was furloughed from October 12 to November 10, 1898, because of sickness. No additional record found."

He filed a claim for pension July 28, 1911, based on malarial poisoning and disease of stomach, which he claimed was the result of the malarial and typhoid fever which he suffered from in the service. This claim was rejected December 15, 1911, on the ground of no disability in a ratable degree from same since date of filing the claim. The claim was reopened September 17, 1912, and again rejected November 11, 1912, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence of origin in service, of the alleged disabilities and continuance of same from date of discharge until date of filing the claim. No appeal was taken.

James B. Randall testified, December 6, 1911, that he has known the soldier 17 years; that he returned from the service suffering from typhoid-malarial fever and in a terribly run-down condition, which continued until it resulted in some kind of stomach disease, which has so incapacitated him that the soldier has been unable to earn a living and has for some time been on the poor farm as a result.

John Harrington and Mrs. Myra Broodhead and Mrs. Katheryn Mitchell, all in 1911 and 1912, testified to substantially the same effect as does James B. Randall.

Dr. Daniel R. Lyman testified, July, 1912, that the soldier is suffering from an advanced case of tuberculosis of the lungs; that the soldier is now in a public institution and a hopeless invalid; that the soldier suffers from disease of the stomach. This affiant states that he believes the condition of the soldier is due to and the result of the severe typhoid-malarial fever from which he suffered during the service.

He was examined by a board of surgeons October 4, 1911, who report his age as 37 years, height 5 feet 7 inches, and weighing 117 pounds (skeleton). They found him suffering from disease of the lungs (tuberculosis), and rated same at six-eighteenths. They found he suffered from disease of the stomach, liver, and bowels and rectum, all treated as being due to disease of the stomach, and rated six-eighteenths. No other disabilities were found and no evidence of past or present vicious habits.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor; that prior to his service he never had a sick day; during service he had a prolonged attack of typhoid-malarial fever and has never recovered; that stomach disease and tuberculosis have resulted; and that he is absolutely penniless, and he and his wife and children are supported by charity, he being an inmate of a public institution.

Two lay witnesses testify that the soldier is wholly unable to do any kind of work, is sick and feeble all the time, and an inmate of a public institution, and that he has no property, and he and his wife and five children are supported by charity.

Dr. D. R. Lyman testifies that the soldier now suffers from tuberculosis and malaria and stomach trouble and is an inmate of a public institution on charity basis and is wholly unable to do any work.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $24 per month.

H. R. 1545. Charles Voos, of the National Soldiers' Home, Tenn., served during the War with Spain in Company D, Third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, from June 29, 1898, to March 20, 1899, when honorably discharged. He afterwards served from October 6, 1899, to July 1, 1901, in Company I, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry. He was 26 years of age at the date of the first enlistment. (I. O. 1375149.)

Service treatment:

"September 22 to October 3, 1898, malaria; November 29 to December 10, 1898, sprain of left ankle; October 25 and 26, 1899, and March 31, 1900, intercostal neuralgia. No additional record found."

When mustered out from each service he stated that he was suffering from no disability, and none was found to exist by the medical officers by whom he was examined upon these occasions.

He filed a claim for pension June 25, 1908, based on malarial poisoning (chills and fever). This claim was rejected April 26, 1910, on the ground of the claimant's inability to prove by medical or other satisfactory evidence that the disability existed at date of discharge and continually thereafter. No appeal was taken, but two efforts were made to have the claim reopened, and each was denied because evidence offered failed to warrant such action.

George Hennes and David Conner testify in 1910 that they were comrades of the soldier in the service, and know he, while in service, suffered from malaria and an attack of what they thought typhoid fever.

George F. Voos testifies in 1908 that he is a brother of the soldier and knows when the soldier came home from the service in the Philippines he was suffering from chills and fever and has since suffered from same constantly.

Dr. Frank Webb testifies in 1908 that the soldier has been under his professional care since 1902 until the date of the execution of the affidavit, suffering from a chronic form of malaria, which has weakened his heart, and he is unable to perform hard labor as a result thereof.

The soldier was examined by a board of surgeons August 19, 1908, who report that he is 36 years of age, 5 feet 7½ inches in height, and weighing 129 pounds. They found him suffering from malarial poisoning, with usual results of disordered stomach, liver, and spleen; rate, eight-eighteenths. They could find no disease of the heart or any disability not covered by the rate for malarial poisoning.

In the efforts to have the claim reopened other testimony was filed, but it is cumulative in its character and adds nothing to the merits of the case.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit, in which he states that he is wholly unable to earn a living by manual labor and possesses no property. He further states that he contracted a cough in the service, which continued after discharge and finally developed into tuberculosis, from which he now suffers.

Several witnesses testify that the soldier had a cough after his return from the service, and that he later began to suffer from tuberculosis, from which he is now a sufferer.

It is shown by lay testimony that the soldier possesses no property.

Three physicians testify that the soldier is a sufferer from tuberculosis, malaria, and disease of the heart, and not able to perform any manual labor.

The surgeon of the soldier's home certifies, November 27, 1913, that the soldier suffers severely from pulmonary tuberculosis, varicose veins, hemorrhoids, kyphosis, and diarrhea, and is unable to perform any kind of labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to his service, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 1601. James M. Pauley, of Carbondale, Colo., served in the Regular Establishment, in Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, from October 29, 1868, to April 18, 1869, when honorably discharged. (I. O. 942223.)

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was ever reported as sick or received medical treatment for any cause.

September 22, 1891, he filed a claim for pension based on hernia (rupture) of both sides, which he alleged was incurred in the service and line of duty. After a most thorough special examination the claim was rejected June 22, 1898, on the ground of no record and the claimant's inability, even though aided by a special examination, to furnish evidence necessary to show that the double hernia was incurred in the service and line of duty. No appeal was taken.

The claimant swears that he incurred double hernia as a result of loading heavy wood on a wagon, in line of duty.

James Hurst, who was second lieutenant of the soldier's company, testifies while in line of duty in 1868 or 1869 the soldier, in lifting heavy wood and loading it upon a wagon, was seriously injured in both groins—ruptured.

Charles M. Priddy, who was a comrade in arms, testifies that about December, 1868, the soldier incurred an injury in service and line of duty which resulted in a serious hernia, and affiant saw same at that time.

This same witness states that prior to enlistment of the soldier, affiant was his neighbor, and often employed him and knows that he was not then ruptured, but was able to and did perform hard labor.

W. H. Jack testifies to the fact that prior to his enlistment the soldier was a well and strong man and free from rupture; that when he came home after service he was ruptured severely and has been sick ever since.

N. W. Titus testifies that when the soldier came home from the service he was ruptured, and has been ever since.

The special examination, while exhaustive, adds very little to the claim. It shows that prior to enlistment the soldier was known as a strong and well man and no one knew of any rupture, and that after his return home from the service, or very shortly thereafter, it became generally known that he suffered from a severe rupture of both groins (double hernia), from which he has since continued to suffer. The soldier and all but one or two of the many witnesses seen by the special examiners are rated as people of good character and standing.

He was examined April 6, 1892, by a board of surgeons who found him to be suffering from double inguinal hernia, and rated the disability from same at fourteen-eighteenths. They also found him suffering from rheumatism and rated it at six-eighteenths.

Anyone familiar with the character of service rendered by the Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and the purpose for which the organization was mustered into the service, will not be at all surprised at the lack of medical treatment recorded. This regiment was mustered in for the purpose of fighting Indians, and the short campaign in which they engaged (about six months) was filled with most grave and serious hardships in a severe winter, and filled with hard fighting, and it is not to be expected that much attention was paid to medical records in such a campaign as this regiment underwent.

With the bill the petitioner filed an affidavit stating he is unable to perform manual labor because of double hernia, and possesses no property or income. He is now 65 years of age.

His allegations are fully sustained by the testimony of lay witnesses.

A physician testified December 14, 1913, that the soldier suffers from double inguinal hernia, and is unable, as a result of same, to perform any manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service, and they therefore respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $24 per month.

H. R. 2007. James Turner, of the State soldiers' home, Erie County, Ohio, served in the Regular Establishment in Company A, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, from May 31, 1867, to May 31, 1870, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. (Certificate 407068.)

The records of the War Department show the soldier was treated on three occasions during the service; for brief attacks of diarrhea once and constipation twice.

He is now pensioned at $8 per month for gunshot wound of the right thigh and disease of the eyes. He was first pensioned at $4 per month from July 18, 1888, for said disabilities. The rate was increased February 6, 1889, to $6, and October 9, 1895, to $8, which he now receives. He has filed many claims for increase of rate since 1895, all of which have been rejected, the last action of this character having been taken November 5, 1913, and is based on the ground that the present rate of $8 is adequate to cover present disability from said gunshot wound and disease of the eyes.

Some medical testimony was filed in 1906 and prior to that time to the effect that the soldier's right leg is very stiff as a result of his gunshot wound, and that his sight is seriously affected by the disease of the eyes.

The board of surgeons that examined him January 30, 1907, is the last board to suggest a specific rate for each disability. They state that he is entitled to a rate of $8 for gunshot wound of the right thigh and $6 for disease of the eyes.

He was examined by two experts on eye diseases since, to wit, July 11, 1910, and October 15, 1913, and while in each case disease of the eyes is found to exist, and also gunshot wound of the right thigh, no specific rate is suggested for same. The last expert states simply that he would not suggest a change in rate. Whether he believed $8 for disease of eyes alone was proper does not appear; as he is an oculist, that is doubtless his meaning; if so, then he makes no provision for additional disability due to gunshot wound, which a former board of surgeons rated at $8.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor by reason of gunshot wound of the right thigh, disease of the eyes, and rheumatism, and resulting disease of the heart; that he is 72 years of age and possesses no property and has no income aside from the $8 per month pension with which to support his wife.

Two lay witnesses testify the soldier is unable to earn a support by any labor for himself and wife and has no property.

A physician testifies, January 30, 1914, that the soldier is now suffering to such an extent from gunshot wound of the right thigh and disease of eyes and rheumatism, and disease of the heart, liver, and spleen as to be unable to perform any kind of labor.

From the evidence submitted it is believed by your committee that an increase from $8 to $20 per month is fully warranted in this case, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 2511. Virginia M. Mills, of Leavenworth, Kans., is the widow of Frank H. Mills, deceased, who served in the Regular Establishment, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, from October 1, 1873, to July 4, 1892, when he was retired. He held the rank of second lieutenant from October 1, 1873, to August 20, 1878, and first lieutenant from that date until November 1, 1882, and regimental quartermaster from then until April 18, 1887, and captain until July 4, 1892, when retired. He died July 29, 1899. (W. C. 528638.)

The widow filed a claim for pension February 8, 1900, which was granted at $17 per month from July 30, 1899, the day following the soldier's death from chronic rheumatism, which resulted in disease of the heart. This pension she now receives.

The records of the War Department show that the soldier contracted his fatal disease—chronic rheumatism—in 1880, at which time he held the rank of first lieutenant, and the general law fixes the rate of pension to which his widow is entitled at $17 per month. These records show that after contracting chronic rheumatism in 1880 the soldier continued to constantly suffer therefrom until his death as a result thereof. He held the rank of captain for five years prior to his being retired. The pending bill proposes to increase the rate of his widow's pension.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that her only support is her monthly pension of $17, in addition to which all of the property she owns consists of $321 in cash and a note for $479; that she is unable to earn a support; and there is no one legally bound for her support.

The allegations of the widow as to being unable to earn a support and the amount of property she possesses and her income from all sources are sustained by the testimony of two lay witnesses.

From the evidence submitted, your committee believe that an increase from $17 to $25 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 2643. Louis K. Turner, of Mauston, Juneau County, Wis., served during the War with Spain in Company D, Third Wisconsin Infantry, from June 22, 1898, to January 16, 1899, and unassigned Thirty-fourth United States Infantry and Company I, Thirty-ninth United States Infantry, from August 12, 1899, until February 15, 1901, when honorably discharged upon surgeon's certificate of disability. He was 42 years of age when he enlisted in 1898. Service was chiefly in the Philippine Islands. (I. C. 1079265.)

On February 25, 1901, he filed a claim for pension based upon right inguinal hernia, which was allowed at $10 per month.

On May 18, 1911, he filed a claim based upon right inguinal hernia, diarrhea, malarial poisoning (chills and fever), alleging piles, disease of lungs, and tuberculosis as results.

On September 27, 1911, he was allowed a rate of $14 for complete right inguinal hernia and piles, result of diarrhea.

That part of the claim based upon diarrhea and malarial poisoning was rejected on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from same since date of filing. That part alleging disease of lungs and tuberculosis as results was rejected because these disabilities are not accepted as results, and are not shown to have otherwise been due to or connected with the service.

The records of the War Department show treatment for diarrhea and malarial fever upon several occasions and for right inguinal hernia, all in line of duty. He was discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability for inguinal hernia. These records show no treatment for any other disability.

It is shown by medical testimony that the soldier was suffering from diarrhea, malarial poisoning, and right inguinal hernia at discharge, and has suffered from same constantly since that date. Piles are shown to have resulted from the diarrhea during recent years.

He was examined June 26, 1901, by a board of surgeons at Mauston, Wis., who rated him ten-eighteenths for the right inguinal hernia and eight-eighteenths for the malarial poisoning. They found no other disability existing.

On July 5, 1911, he was examined by a board of surgeons at Baraboo, Wis., who rated ten-eighteenths for right inguinal hernia, 0/18 for diarrhea, six-eighteenths for piles, 0/18 for malarial poisoning, and eight-eighteenths for disease of heart. The board found some disease of lungs, but did not rate therefor.

With the bill the petitioner states in an affidavit that by reason of diarrhea, piles, hernia, malarial poisoning, and tuberculosis he is unable to perform any manual labor, and that he possesses no property.

One lay witness testifies that the soldier possesses no property of any kind, and is unable to perform any manual labor.

Two physicians testify that the petitioner is wholly unable to perform any manual labor; that he is suffering from tuberculosis, having had first hemorrhage in August, 1910, and the disease has rapidly progressed; that the soldier also has complete right inguinal hernia and a small hernia also upon left side.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $10 to $24 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 2750. Stanley S. Stout, of Neva, Johnson County, Tenn., served during the War with Spain in Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, from July 1, 1898, to March 18, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age when he enlisted. Served some in Cuba. (I. O. 1254805.)

On September 25, 1900, he applied for pension, alleging as disabilities rheumatism and affection of the left side. This claim was rejected on July 12, 1901, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability since date of filing.

On August 13, 1902, he again filed a claim for pension, this time alleging gravel as the only disability. This claim was also rejected because no ratable degree of disability from gravel was found to exist.

On March 13, 1908, he again applied for a pension, alleging as disabilities rheumatism, jaundice, malaria, pleurisy of side, diarrhea, and gravel. This claim was rejected also as no ratable degree of disability was found to exist from any of the causes alleged.

He filed some testimony after the first rejection together with a request for reopening and reconsideration of the claim. This request was denied on February 24, 1909. He appealed the claim, and in a decision of April 30, 1909, the Secretary of the Interior sustained all of the adverse actions of the bureau. This decision is full, and sets forth all of the facts. It is attached to brief, and attention is invited to same by your examiner.

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"August 18, 1898, to ——— ——— (no diagnosis). Nothing additional found."

When mustered out the soldier claimed not to be suffering from any disability, and the officers by whom he was then examined certify that none existed.

The claimant has filed testimony of comrades and officers in which it is set forth that the soldier did suffer during September, 1898, in Cuba, from the several disabilities alleged, and the Bureau of Pensions in its several adverse actions in connection with the three claims did not question origin in service of any disability alleged.

Several physicians and several lay witnesses testify the soldier suffered from rheumatism, pain in left side, malarial poisoning, gravel, and diarrhea when he returned home from the service, and has suffered from same to more or less extent during the years since discharge until 1909.

The board of surgeons at Mountain City, Tenn., who examined the soldier, January 2, 1901, report as follows:

"We find no evidence of rheumatism or affection of left side. This claimant is, as far as we are able to ascertain, in sound physical condition and a proper subject for life insurance.

"This claimant's heart and lungs are in good shape."

He was examined by a board of surgeons at Elizabethton, Tenn., February 8, 1906, who report a slight stricture which causes at times a stopping of the flow of urine and necessitates use of the catheter; that the stricture is due to prostatic causes about the membranes of the urethra—rate six-eighteenths. This board finds no evidence of any other disabilities—reports all vital organs normal and in good condition and the soldier in a well-nourished, strong, and healthy physical condition.

The board of surgeons at Mountain City, Tenn., again examined the soldier, May 6, 1908, and report that they find a little rheumatism of the shoulders, hips, and knees, for which they rate four-eighteenths, and some malarial poisoning rated at two-eighteenths. The board states that after careful search for evidence of jaundice, pleurisy, diarrhea, and gravel they are unable to find any existing.

All of the boards state there is no evidence of any venereal disease or vicious habits.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating that by reason of rheumatism and malaria he is unable to earn a living by manual labor; that all of the property owned by him consists of 10 acres of land in Johnson County, Tenn., which is worth about $50.

Two comrades testify to the fact that the soldier was a well and strong man before enlistment, suffered during service from rheumatism, jaundice, and malaria, and has suffered ever since his discharge from said diseases.

Two lay witnesses testify that the soldier is without means of support, and all the property he owns consists of a few acres of land, worth about $50, and that he has five small children and an invalid wife.

Two physicians testify that the soldier suffers constantly from rheumatism and pleurisy and pains in left side and malarial poisoning to such an extent as to render him unable to earn a support by manual labor, and that the soldier's wife is an invalid.

Stanley S. Stout, the soldier, testifies, January 10, 1914, that on or about four months after return from the service he was taken down, and sent for Dr. J. G. Butler, who stated he was suffering from rheumatism and malaria. The doctor now claims he has no such record and no recollection of it.

J. M. Stout testifies, January 10, 1914, that about four months after his return from the service the soldier suffered from an attack of something from which he was "bad off," and Dr. J. C. Butler treated him, but has forgotten this and has no record of it.

January 10, 1914, J. L. Stout testifies that the soldier was very sick about four months after his return from the service and was

treated by Dr. J. G. Butler, and affiant has often since heard soldier complain.

January 10, 1914, J. B. Kidd testifies that about four months after return from service the soldier was very sick and treated by Dr. J. G. Butler.

None of these witnesses state the nature of the soldier's illness or how long it continued, and the physician, it is said, has no record of it and fails to recall same at all.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 2813. Della A. Cooter, of Greeneville, Tenn., served in the Regular Establishment, Sixty-ninth Company, United States Coast Artillery, from March 19, 1904, to March 18, 1907, when honorably discharged. He was 31 years 2 months of age at enlistment. (I. Ctf. 1147264.)

September 5, 1907, he filed a claim for pension, alleging sore eyes contracted in October, 1905, and rheumatism contracted in April, 1906, and piles, at Fort Monroe, Va. His claim for sore eyes was allowed June 8, 1908, at the rate of $6 per month from the date of filing. That part of the claim based upon rheumatism and piles was held in abeyance pending special examination as to origin in service of these disabilities. After the special examination the claim was rejected as to rheumatism and piles, on the ground of no record, and the best obtainable evidence is not deemed sufficient to satisfactorily establish origin in the service and line of duty. Rheumatism was also rejected upon the further ground of no ratable degree of disability from same since date of filing the claim.

Upon three occasions—August 31, 1909; October 13, 1909; and December 7, 1909—the Bureau of Pensions declined to reopen the claim on the ground of insufficiency of the evidence offered to warrant such action. No appeal was ever taken.

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"April 14 to 21, 1904, vaccinia in line of duty; January 20 to 30, 1907, eye strain, astigmatism, in line of duty. No aditional record found."

Comrade L. R. Williamson testifies that the soldier suffered from piles during the service, and that affiant gave him some ointment for use upon the piles. This witness, who is rated "good," sustained his testimony when seen by a special examiner.

Comrades George W. Pool, George Morris, and N. S. Lowe testify that the soldier suffered during the service from piles, rheumatism, and sore eyes. Before a special examiner they sustain their former testimony fairly well. They are rated "good" as to two of them and "fair" as to the other.

Dr. F. C. Britton, in affidavits filed in November, 1907, and January, 1908, states he treated the soldier from early in the fall of 1907 for rheumatism, piles, and disease of the eyes.

Three witnesses testified before a special examiner that the soldier was a well and strong man, free from disease of any kind, before his service, but that when he returned home he appeared to be and claimed that he was suffering from rheumatism, piles, and sore eyes, and has suffered from same ever since.

When examined by a board of surgeons November 6, 1907, the soldier was found to be suffering from sore or diseased eyes, for which they rated six-thirtieths; rheumatism, rated four-eighteenths; and piles, rated at six-eighteenths.

No other disability was found to exist, and no evidence of any vicious habits.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is unable to perform any manual labor because of disease of the eyes, rheumatism, and piles, and owns no property of any kind and has no income other than his pension.

Several lay witnesses testify that the soldier can not do more than one-fourth of a day's manual labor and possesses no property and has no income aside from his pension.

Two physicians testify that they have examined the soldier and find him suffering from rheumatism, piles, and disease of the eyes. One of these witnesses further states the disabilities are of a permanent nature and prevent the soldier from doing more than one-half a day's work by manual labor.

Since this report was prepared an affidavit has been filed, executed by Dr. G. S. Hays, eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist, who testifies that on February 3, 1914, he examined the soldier and found him suffering from conjunctivitis in each eye. He is also suffering from astigmatism of each eye; he wears A + 100, ax 90, R. E. + 100, ax 1.80, L. E., for constant wear. Ophthalmantic examination reveals a very red retina with dark spots. Retinal vessels dilated. I am of the opinion that the condition of the retina is due to rheumatism.

Dr. F. C. Britton testifies February 3, 1914, that he that day examined the soldier and found him suffering from rheumatism of both shoulders and arms; the right arm is badly swollen at the elbow joint. He also has protuding piles, which are at times aggravated by constipation. He also has disease of eyes, and they are in bad condition and constantly grow worse. All of these disabilities are now chronic in character and incapacitate him for labor fully three-fourths.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that an increase from $6 to $17 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 3030. Mary A. Barber, Sapulpa, Okla., widow of Lafayette E. Barber, deceased, who served during the War with Spain in Company K, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from August 15, 1899, to April 17, 1901, when honorably discharged. He was 25 years of age at date of his enlistment. (W. O. 938106.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"February 9 to 11, 1900, malarial fever, also termed intermittent tertian fever, in line of duty. No additional record found."

The records show he was reported as sick in quarters April 30 to May 10, 1900, June 5 to 12, and 16 to 20, 1900. The nature of this illness not stated.

When mustered out he claimed to be suffering from catarrh of head, rheumatism, and loss of smell. The medical officer who examined him certified he could find no evidence of said disabilities.

The soldier filed a claim for pension April 29, 1903, based on malarial poisoning, catarrh, rheumatism, disease of stomach and bowels, and diarrhea alternating with constipation. This claim was rejected February 6, 1906, as to malarial poisoning diarrhea, constipation, and disease of the stomach, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability therefrom since date of filing; and as to the other disabilities, on ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence that the same were contracted in service and line of duty and existed at date of discharge.

The widow filed a claim March 16, 1910, which was rejected on the ground that the soldier's death on December 6, 1909, from typhoid fever was in no way connected with or due to his military service.

In the widow's claim the only evidence filed was an affidavit of attending physician showing the soldier died of typhoid fever December 6, 1909, with a history of having been a chronic sufferer from indigestion and diarrhea.

No evidence was filed in soldier's claim. He was twice examined by board of surgeons—August 7, 1901, and February 1, 1905. In each instance the only disability found to exist was catarrh of head, and both boards rated this at $6 per month. The first board stated the disability, in their opinion, was due to syphilitic causes; the second board did not agree in this view, and states that venereal disease has no connection with the catarrh. The evidence that soldier ever had syphilis consists of condition of his hair, nose, and penis, which the first board states looks as if he had had syphilis; and he said to them that he had had this disease.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit, in which she states that she is the widow of the deceased soldier; that she believes his death from typhoid fever was a result of the stomach and bowel trouble he contracted in military service, and from which he continued to suffer from date of his discharge until his death; that she has two small minor children and possesses no property or income.

Two lay witnesses testify the widow possesses no property and depends on her daily labor for support of herself and two small children.

A transcript of marriage record filed with the bill shows soldier and petitioner were duly married July 19, 1902.

Sherman S. Whiting and Mrs. Lizzie Buffington testify in affidavits filed with the bill that the soldier and the widow had never been married prior to their marriage to each other; that they lived continually together and were never divorced, and the widow has not remarried and has two minor children to support, and possesses no property.

Mrs. Cora A. Meeker and Mrs. Mollie L. Whiting testify in affidavits filed before the committee that the soldier left two minor children, born as follows: Bernice E. Barber, born October 19, 1905, and Basil E. H. Barber, born January 2, 1908. That the affiants have personal knowledge of the correct dates of birth of these two children, and that they are now living.

From the evidence submitted, your committee is of the opinion that a pension of $12 per month and $2 additional for each of the two minor children until they, respectively, reach the age of 16 years is fully warranted in this case, and so recommend.

H. R. 3063. Charlie L. Pennington, of Milledgeville, Ga., served in the Regular Establishment, in the Eighteenth Battery United States Field Artillery, from January 8, 1902, to December 28, 1904, when honorably discharged. He was 25 years and 9 months of age at enlistment. (I. C. 1156097.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"April 10 to 14, 1902, acute tonsillitis; February 14 to 25, 1903, subacute catarrhal appendicitis; April 24 to 28, 1903, wound contused right patella, kicked by a mule during drill, April 24, 1903, accidental; August 4 to 9, 1903, dengue, acute; September 18 to 20, 1903, indigestion, intestinal, acute; November 13 to 22, 1903, fracture, simple, anterior portion right rib, accidentally thrown from a mule in the field October 26, 1903; November 27 and 28, 1903, diarrhea. All in line of duty. No additional record found."

He filed a claim for pension March 27, 1909, based upon injury and fracture of the eighth rib on the right side. This claim was allowed at $6 per month, July 6, 1909, from date of filing, and he now receives a pension at that rate.

August 16, 1911, he again filed a claim for pension. This time basing it upon disease of the heart incurred in line of duty. This claim was rejected October 3, 1911, on the ground of no disability from disease of the heart in a ratable degree since date of filing the claim. He did not appeal, but did file some evidence in an effort to have the claim reopened, and such action was denied October 21, 1911, on the ground that the testimony offered did not warrant same.

The soldier had a rib or two broken in service, and is now receiving $6 per month pension for same, which, in the opinion of the Bureau of Pensions, is as high a rate as the evidence justifies for the disability resulting from said injury. In several sworn statements he alleges that the disease of the heart from which he now suffers was incurred in line of duty in service from exposure. In support of this allegation, he furnished testimony of Dr. J. H. Trout, who, in an affidavit of October 10, 1911, states that he treated the soldier for heart disease on January 10, 1905—about a month after discharge from service—February 7 and July 19, 1905, and he was, by reason of the same, then incapacitated for manual labor. He also furnished an affidavit of Dr. T. B. Perry, executed October 19, 1911, in which he states that he treated the soldier in August, 1911, for mitral disease of the heart which appeared to be of a chronic or long-standing nature and incurbale, and incapacitates him for the performance of manual labor. In addition to this medical testimony, one lay witness, in an affidavit executed September 19, 1911, states that the soldier was suffering from disease of the heart when he returned from the service in January, 1905, and has always since suffered from same, and is unable to perform manual labor by reason of the said disease.

The soldier was examined by boards of surgeons June 2, 1909; September 6, 1911; and November 1, 1911. The first board found him suffering only from the fracture of rib on the right side. They reported him as slight in build and very unhealthy in appearance, but they found no disease of the heart or any other disease save broken rib. The second board found about the same physical condition, except they report heart as very rapid in action, but no evidence of disease of the heart. They reported some slight trouble with the lungs—cough and spitting—and trouble in breathing. The last board states that the only disability they found which would warrant a rate of pension was that from injury—broken ninth and tenth rib of the right side—and suggested $6 per month as a proper rate therefor. As to disease of the heart they state:

"Apex beat of heart visible in fifth interspace on nipple line, impulse diffused over epigastrium area of dullness increased slightly downward and left to nipple line; second sound accentuated and sharp; no murmurs; pulse hard and rapid, irregular, and irritable; no intermission; no cyanosis or edema or dyspnea on exertion."

All of these boards report the soldier as anemic, being 5 feet 11 inches in height, and weighing from 128 to 135 pounds. He is only 37 years of age now. Each board certifies that there is no evidence of venereal disease past or present, and no vicious habits.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is in part unable to earn a living by manual labor because of the disease of heart and fracture of the ribs, both incurred in his military service, and that he possesses no property of any kind.

Two lay witnesses testify that the soldier owns no property and is unable to earn a living by manual labor, and has a wife and minor child, both of whom are in feeble health.

Dr. T. M. Hall testifies November 8, 1913, that the soldier has an enlarged heart with serious valvular lesion, a deformity of the chest due to fracture of rib, and recurring dysentery. He also states that the soldier's wife is an invalid, suffering from pellagra, and a minor child is partially paralyzed from an injury received at its birth. He states the soldier is a very poor man, but a man of most excellent habits.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that an increase from $6 to $24 per month is fully warranted in this case, and so recommend.

H. R. 3082. James H. Kampo, of Oconto, Oconto County, Wis., served during the War with Spain in First Battery United States Field Artillery, from April 26, 1898, to March 1, 1899, when he was honorably discharged at Tybee Island, Ga. He was 21 years of age at enlistment.

On March 26, 1904, he filed a claim (Inv. Clf., 1146333) for pension based upon disease of stomach and bowels, result of fever and measles contracted in May, 1898, at Tybee Island, Ga. He was examined by two boards of surgeons July 20, 1904, at Marionette, Wis., and April 1, 1908, at Green Bay, Wis. Both boards rated his disabilities disease of stomach and bowels at four-eighteenths. He was pensioned May 4, 1908, at $6 per month for these disabilities.

On June 6, 1912, he applied for an increase of pension, alleging increased disability from disease of bowels and stomach. July 10, 1912, he was examined by a board of surgeons at Shawano, Wis., who reported that he was entitled to only six-eighteenths for the disability due to disease of bowels and stomach, and six-eighteenths for disability due to disease of heart. No evidence of vicious habits. This claim was rejected on August 15, 1912, as far as disease of bowels and stomach was concerned, on the ground of no increase of disability therefrom. Disease of heart has never been claimed for, and there is no evidence upon file to show same due to the service. No appeal taken, and no effort made to reopen the rejected claim.

"May 4 to 6, 1898, acute indigestion; May 9 to 13, 1898, acute diarrhea; August 21 to 31, 1898, measles; September 27 to 28, 1898, acute diarrhea; November 25 to 26, 1898, acute indigestion; January 28 to 29, 1899, acute diarrhea. Returned to duty."

All the foregoing in line of duty.

With the bill your petitioner files an affidavit, executed January 13, 1913, in which he alleges that he is wholly unable to earn a support by manual labor by reason of disease of bowels, stomach, and heart, due to malarial fever and measles, which he contracted during his service; that all of the property owned by him is not worth over $200 and consists entirely of personal property.

Dr. C. W. Stoelting, in affidavit of January 8, 1913, states that he that day examined petitioner and found he suffered from a weak and dilated heart; that the condition of heart was first noticed by him on June 23, 1903, when he formerly examined soldier, and he thinks same due to exposure undergone by soldier during military service while convalescing from malarial fever, measles, and protracted siege of diarrhea; that he is also suffering from gastro-enteralgia, described by soldier as "cramps," which are the initial symptoms of a posterior spinal sclerosis, and at this date the deep patellar reflexes are greatly diminished; the coordination of muscle movements appear to be perfect, indicating the absence of Bomberg sign, and also the pupils respond very lively to light, showing absence of the Argyle-Robertson pupil. The affiant declares the petitioner, by reason of the foregoing disabilities, is wholly unable to earn a support by manual labor.

Two witnesses state the petitioner is without means of support and owns only a few household goods.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $6 to $12 per month is fully warranted in this case and so recommend.

H. R. 3092. James H. George, of Blairsville, Ind., served during the War with Spain in Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from September 20, 1899, to July 2, 1901, when honorably discharged on surgeon's certificate of disability. He also served in Company D, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, April 27, 1898, to November 7, 1898. He was 24 years of age at the first enlistment. (I. Clf. 1090388.)

The records of the War Department fail to show he was ever reported as sick or received any treatment during the first service. He was treated as follows during the second service:

"June 23 to 26, 1901, for mental observation, no fixed delusions, disconnected ideas and speech, no previous history in line of duty; June 26 to July 10, 1901, mania, acute with delusions of grandeur, in line of duty. Delusions violent, raves constantly day and night, and injures himself when not under restraint, in line of duty. Transferred to Government Hospital for the Insane, Washington, D. C., September 10, 1901. No additional record found."

He filed a claim for pension March 9, 1903, based on acute insanity which was allowed at $17 per month from date of filing to terminate September 24, 1902, the disability—insanity—having ceased.

On October 7, 1904, he again filed a claim asking his name be restored to the roll for insanity from date of dropping, and also alleging chronic diarrhea as an additional disability which he had contracted in service. This claim was rejected February 12, 1906, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability shown from said causes since date of filing.

Another claim filed December 23, 1907, with the same allegations was rejected April 20, 1908, on the same medical grounds. And one more claim with same allegations, filed June 19, 1908, was rejected May 27, 1909, on the same medical grounds.

March 4, 1911, he again filed a claim; this time based on chronic diarrhea alone, which was rejected April 28, 1911, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability therefrom since date of filing the claim.

The evidence, of course, shows incurrence in service and existence at discharge of insanity. As to chronic diarrhea two comrades, James B. Lucksinger and Samuel S. Reager, testify, in 1904 that the soldier was well known to them prior to his enlistment, and they know he was a well and strong man, free from any disease; that he suffered during the service with diarrhea and was suffering from same at discharge and has continued to suffer therefrom since. They also testify to the sudden attack of insanity the soldier incurred in the service.

Robert G. Johnson, Samuel A. Crawford, George W. Crede, J. G. Baldrige, and A. T. Rutledge, lay witnesses, testify, in 1905 and 1906, to the fact that the soldier was a well man prior to service, but when he came home after discharge he was insane and had to be confined for a long time in an asylum for the insane at Washington, D. C., and though now out of an asylum, in their opinion, is feeble in mind; they further testify he was suffering from diarrhea when he returned from the service and has continued since to suffer so from same as to render him unable to perform full manual labor or anything like full labor.

The claim was sent to the field for special examination, and sworn statements were obtained for the soldier, and 10 or 12 witnesses, all of whom were found to be people of good character and standing. The net result of this special examination shows that the soldier has lived all of his life in the same locality; that he was free from disease or disability prior to enlistment; that he returned home from final service suffering from acute mania and was sent to the insane asylum at Washington, D. C., where he remained until September 24, 1902, when discharged as "cured"; that he was regarded as more or less feeble-minded afterwards, and was so regarded when this investigation was held in 1904, and there was every indication of this mental condition being permanent; that the soldier had suffered more or less ever since his discharge and up to the time of the special examination from diarrhea of a chronic form and was prevented to a large extent by that and his mental condition from earning a living by manual labor.

The soldier was first examined by a board of surgeons July 1, 1902, who report him as 29 years of age, 5 feet 6 inches in height, and weighing 145 pounds. This board confined its examination to mental condition, concerning which they state:

"Claimant has a downcast, evasive expression of face. Has not returned to his usual occupation. Shows mental depression and has no desire for self-support. According to this own statement he has secluded himself from society and his former associates. When asked why he had done so, states that he does not know, except that he has no desire to be with former associates. Shows no evidence of delusions or hallucinations at this examination, but his condition is rather that of apathy. It is the opinion of this board that the claimant is suffering from chronic mania."

He was examined by other boards of surgeons November 23, 1904, May 16, 1906, and April 5, 1911. All of these boards found and reported the soldier's mental condition was weak, and most of them found chronic diarrhea actually existing at time of the examination, or evidence that the soldier does suffer from same from time to time. They rate from four-eighteenths to twelve-eighteenths for each of these disabilities, with the exception of the last board, which simply states conditions found as to said disabilities and is silent as to the proper rates therefor.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states he is wholly disabled by reason of diarrhea and mental trouble for performance of manual labor, and in possession of no property and no income.

Lay witnesses and the Member who introduced the bill state the soldier possesses no property and has no income and is regarded as feeble-minded and unable to earn a living by his own efforts.

Dr. A. T. Rutledge testifies, January 1, 1914, that the soldier is now and has been since discharge from the service physically unable to do any manual labor; that he suffers from pains in the head, and his mental condition is such that he can not concentrate his mind upon anything of any importance, becomes confused when he tries to do so; that he suffers now and has since discharge from diarrhea; that the only work he can do is light routine work about a pool room, and from his mental condition he is incapable of doing anything which requires any thought, except when told by others to do so and how to do it.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that the disability from which the soldier now suffers (mental feebleness bordering upon imbecility) is due to the service, and a pension of $24 per month is fully justified, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 3311. Martella M. George, of Vandervoort, Ark., is the widow of Wallace E. George, deceased, who served during the War with Spain in Company D, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, from June 14, 1898, to August 28, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (W. O. 922268.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"July 5 to 24, 1898, acute gonorrhea; September 10 to 23, 1898, gonorrhea; December 11 to 21, 1898, gonorrhea; December 23, 1898, to March 5, 1899, phimosis gonorrheal. Gonorrheal chancroidal adenitis, both groins, chancroids on penis and syphilis; May 10 to June 5, 1899, syphilitic rheumatism, shoulders, back, and legs; June 9 to August 2, 1899, secondary syphilis, mucous patches mouth and throat; August 2 to 28, 1899, syphilis, secondary, mucous patches in mouth and throat. None of these in line of duty. Discharged August 28, 1899, services no longer required."

September 14, 1899, the soldier filed a claim for pension, based on rheumatism, bronchitis, and disease of the heart and lungs, which he claimed were contracted in the service in July, 1898. This claim was rejected April 30, 1902, on the ground of no disability in a ratable degree from causes alleged, independent of the result of the venereal disease from which he suffered during the service.

The widow filed a claim June 19, 1909, alleging her husband's death, August 17, 1908, from typhoid fever was a result of disabilities incurred by him during his military service. This claim was rejected September 7, 1909, on the ground that the soldier's death from typhoid fever nine years after his discharge can not be accepted as a result of any disability shown to have existed in the service, nor is it believed to be susceptible of proof that said fatal disease was in any wise due to the soldier's military service.

In the widow's claim the only evidence filed consists of the testimony of a physician, who attended the soldier in his fatal illness and some time before, who states that the soldier suffered from constipation and chronic bronchitis prior to the attack of typhoid fever that proved fatal, and, in the opinion of this physician, the bronchitis contributed to the soldier's cause of death.

In the claim of the soldier the only evidence to base any action upon consists of the report of the board of surgeons, by whom the soldier was examined on January 29, 1902, who report him as 25 years of age, 5 feet 8¼ inches in height, and weighing 145 pounds. This board made a careful examination and reported that all of the vital organs were normal and no disability of any kind could be found to exist which would warrant a rate of pension, and no rate for any cause was suggested by the board.

As to venereal disease, the board reported that they found evidence of gonorrhea in the past, but that if soldier had ever had syphilis a good recovery had been made, as no evidence thereof could be found to exist.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she believes her husband's death was due to his military service, that she is not strong, and that all of the property she owns consists of some land worth $600, and from which there is an income of $40 per annum.

Her statements are sustained by testimony of lay witnesses.

A physician testifies that the widow is a feeble woman and now suffers from appendicitis.

The original marriage certificate showing the soldier and the petitioner were married May 30, 1900, was filed with the committee. A copy thereof was made by your examiner and kept with the case, and the original returned, as it was highly prized by the widow.

The petitioner in an affidavit executed February 28, 1914, states the minor children of herself and soldier were born on the following dates: Wallace M. George, born October 11, 1901. Howard L. George, born September 12, 1904. Frances S. George, born February 24, 1906. Wayne E. George, born September 10, 1908.

The notary before whom this paper was executed certifies over her seal that she personally knows the dates of birth as given are correct from long personal acquaintance with the widow and her deceased husband.

Howard O. George and F. M. Usher testify, March 4, 1914, that they know from personal knowledge that the soldier and the petitioner were married May 30, 1900; that neither had been married before; that they were never divorced and lived constantly together, and she has not again married since his death; that the soldier left surviving four minor children born upon the dates set forth in a sworn statement of the petitioner, the correctness of which is personally known to affiants.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that a pension of $12 per month and $2 additional for each minor child until same reaches the age of 16 years is justified, and so recommends.

H. R. 3315. James E. Hooks, of Foreman, Ark., is pensioned under the general law at the rate of $6 per month on account of disease of lungs incurred as a private in Company E, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, during the War with Spain. He enlisted May 16, and was mustered out with the company October 25, 1898.

The War Department records show that the soldier was treated for measles during service, and the testimony of a surgeon and others show that his hearing was impaired in service, and has been since discharge, but it is not shown that the hearing of both ears was impaired while the soldier was still in service. On the contrary, the pensioner himself states that it was a year or a year and a half after discharge before his left ear became affected. He claims impaired hearing of both ears as a result of the measles and pneumonia which the testimony shows he had during service.

The original claim was filed December 1, 1906, and allowed at $6 per month from that date, for disease of lungs. That action was taken July 14, 1910, after special examination, and at the same time the claim for impaired hearing was rejected for right ear because a ratable degree of disability was not shown and for left ear because not shown to have existed during service.

A claim for increase filed November 19, 1910, was rejected March 31, 1911, on the ground that a higher rate than $6 for disease of lungs was not warranted by the evidence, and impaired hearing of both ears was not shown due to service.

The pensioner was last examined before his pension was allowed by a board of surgeons at Texarkana, Ark., June 13, 1910. The board said they found no objective evidence of disease of lungs, but found—"chronic catarrhal condition of large bronchides, larynx, and pharynx, bronchial rales, looseness, cough, and hypertrophy of tonsils. Rating, 12/18."

Under the claim for increase he was examined at the same place January 28, 1911, by an expert, who said:

"An examination of his ears shows a slight thickening of drum membrane. Eustachian tubes are pervious. The nose and nasopharynx are normal. With a tuning fork this man denies hearing it either by bone conduction or when held away from right ear. In his left ear he says he hears slightly by bone conduction and when held away from ear. He is a shrewd malingerer, for he sat in my reception room and talked with a gentleman in ordinary conversation for half an hour when he thought I was not watching him. This I know, as I passed through the room frequently and heard parts of the conversation.

"His nose, nasopharynx, ears, and lungs are normal in other respects, save as noted above.

"He has a slight deafness in left ear; hears ordinary conversation at 5 feet.

"He also has slight deafness in right ear; he hears loud conversation at 3½ feet. He does not claim total deafness in either ear."

The degree of disability found from the evidence by the medical officers of the Pension Bureau entitled the pensioner to a rating of 2/18, or $2, under the official schedule of ratings, but under the act of March 2, 1895, the minimum rate allowed under the law is $6, so that rate was continued.

In an affidavit filed with the bill the petitioner states that he has practically no property, has a wife and two children to support, which he has much difficulty in doing, and that he is greatly debilitated and seriously afflicted by infirmities contracted as a soldier.

J. S. Ham, M. D., states that the petitioner is now seriously afflicted with ear affection—deafness—is a deserving and worthy citizen, and in view of his infirmities and financial condition is greatly in need of a pension.

Two other witnesses state that he is very deaf and "afflicted with physical infirmities" and is in very meager circumstances.

Sixty-nine persons have signed a petition setting forth that the pensioner is afflicted as a result of sickness contracted in service and that his present pension is wholly inadequate to requite him for such condition.

In affidavits executed December 5, 1913, T. B. Arnett, Frank Horner, and J. O. Linesay state that the soldier returned from service suffering from deafness and has constantly since suffered therefrom, and that now his lungs are affected, and he is much of the time unable to perform any manual labor as a result of these disabilities. They further state that the soldier is now and has always been a man of good, upright character with no vicious habits.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $6 to $12 per month is fully warranted and so recommend.

H. R. 4567. William Feavel, 311 East Foster Street, Ludington, Mich., served in the Regular Establishment, in Company E, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, from September 28, 1866, to September 28, 1869, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1239699.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment: "February 1 to March 1, 1867, rheumatism; February 2 and 3, 1868, otitis. No additional record found."

November 24, 1899, he filed a claim for pension based on malarial poisoning and rheumatism and resulting disease of the heart. That part of the claim based on rheumatism and resulting disease of the heart was rejected on the ground of the claimant's inability to furnish satisfactory evidence to show continuance of same from date of discharge until the date of filing the claim. That part based on malarial poisoning was rejected on the ground of no disability therefrom since date of filing the claim.

He again filed a claim September 12, 1910, based on the same alleged disabilities. The former rejection as to rheumatism and disease of heart was adhered to and malarial poisoning was this time rejected on the ground of no record or satisfactory evidence showing origin of same in the service. No appeal was taken.

One comrade, James Armstrong, testifies that the soldier suffered severely during the service from rheumatism.

Abram Kilburn testifies that he knows the soldier suffered in 1873 from rheumatism.

William R. Gore testifies the soldier suffered from rheumatism in 1875.

Willard Cates testifies the soldier suffered from rheumatism in 1878 and 1879.

Mrs. D. C. Cates testified that she knows the soldier suffered from rheumatism in the years 1879, 1880, 1899, and 1902, when she saw and knew him well.

Albert Bartlett testifies that he knew the soldier from 1878 to 1888, and during that period knows he suffered from rheumatism.

Jessie M. Ward testifies that affiant knows the soldier has suffered from rheumatism from 1888 to 1906 and also from disease of the heart.

Dr. E. N. Dundass testifies, in 1906, that he knows the soldier has suffered since 1893 from articular rheumatism and resulting heart disease.

Dr. Louis Pelletin testifies, in 1906, that he knows the soldier has suffered since 1901 from articular rheumatism and is totally disabled for any kind of work by same.

He was examined by a board of surgeons October 18, 1905, who report that he is 60 years of age, 5 feet 6 inches in height, and weighs 145 pounds. They found all joints tender and enlarged by rheumatism and the soldier stiffened thereby—rate, twelve-eighteenths. They found a severe derangement of the functions of the heart due to rheumatism—rate, seventeen-eighteenths. They found no evidence of any malarial poisoning or results of any other disability except the rheumatism and resulting disease of the heart.

With the bill the petitioner has filed an affidavit in which he states that he is 68 years of age and is wholly disabled by rheumatism and disease of the heart and possesses no property and has no income.

His allegations are sustained by testimony of lay witnesses.

Two physicians testify that the soldier is so crippled by articular rheumatism and resulting disease of the heart as to not only be rendered unable to perform any kind of work but to actually require the aid and attendance of another person in the ordinary daily affairs of life.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 4968. Daniel Lawlor, of Albany, N. Y., served as a private, corporal, and sergeant in Troop C, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, from September 15, 1866, to September 15, 1871, when discharged upon the expiration of his term of enlistment, a first sergeant. (I. O. 1397182.)

He applied for pension May 23, 1911, alleging that while—

"in line of duty at Fort Vancouver, Wash., on or about the 1st day of February, 1867, he, from stab wound on right side over the lung, another stab wound close to left groin—that the aforementioned wound near the left groin being the cause of varicose veins in the left leg; that he also is suffering with double hernia."

In subsequent affidavits he stated that he was going from the fort toward the town of Vancouver under verbal instructions from his captain to ascertain whether any of the troop were in town without authority, and that while questioning a member of the troop he was attacked without warning by Pvt. Kennedy, of another regiment, the alleged wounds being the result.

The claim was rejected October 11, 1911, for stab wound over right lung and left groin, causing varicose veins of left leg, on the ground that the claimant was apparently unable to furnish satisfactory evidence showing that the wounds were incurred in line of duty; for double hernia, because of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, showing incurrence in service and line of duty.

The soldier, as shown by the records of the War Department, was 18 years of age at enlistment and a bartender by occupation. He was treated for a disease in October, 1866; for vulnus incis (incised wound), March 6 to April 5, 1867; for a disease in January and July, 1868; January, June, and December, 1869; and May and June, 1870; for "lacerated wound, altercation," July 18 and 19, 1870; and for disease in February, 1871. Nothing in the records, the War Department reports, specifically shows whether the disability treated March 6 to April 5, 1867, was incurred in line of duty.

No evidence was filed prior to the rejection of the claim, and no medical examination has been made.

Reopening has twice been denied since the evidence hereinafter noted was filed.

Henry Firth, private and wagoner of the claimant's troop, testified December 12, 1911, that—

"I am thoroughly familiar with and recall the circumstances leading up to the time of he, Daniel Lawlor, receiving the wounds for which he claimed pension. That it was myself who received orders from the captain of my company to summon the aforesaid Daniel Lawlor to appear before him, and remember the soldier aforesaid, Daniel Lawlor, got instructions from the captain of his company to proceed to the town of Vancouver and to see if there was any members of his company in town who had not received the necessary permission from the proper authorities. That while in the act of performing his duty he was attacked by one of the soldiers, who at that time belonged to another regiment, and who at that time was on detached duty."

That affidavit was executed in Branch County, Mich.

John Brinson, private of the claimant's troop, made a similar affidavit December 30, 1911, executed in Hill County, Tex.

These affidavits are in the same handwriting, except as to the signatures and jurats, and in the same handwriting as affidavits executed by the claimant.

In a sworn statement filed with the bill the petitioner states that he is wholly disabled for manual labor by reason of stab wound on right side over the lung, and stab wound on left leg near the groin, double hernia, and rheumatism; that he owns no property, and that his annual income is $96, "as outdoor releave from National Home."

Reliable evidence shows that he has received assistance from the department of charities, city of Albany, N. Y., during the past three years.

Dr. W. J. Wansboro testifies that he has known the petitioner for three years, and on examination found an atrophy of left thigh, scar about the size of a silver half dollar on anterior surface right thigh about 4 inches below Poupart's ligament, and another scar size of silver quarter about 3 inches below the first one described, the veins of left leg much enlarged, and the varicosed condition is secondary to injuries which caused the scars; right thigh measures 19½ inches between extremities of femur, the left 18 inches; a scar 1½ by ½ inches along posterior axillary line at eighth rib; a double hernia, the scars resulting from radical operation of which are visible; chronic sciatica left side, causing atrophy and permanent deformity, causing impairment of left lower leg, which will probably grow worse; that he is not able to do any work nor to dress himself without help; disability complete.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 5129. Edward C. Franklin, of 335 London Street, Buffalo, N. Y., served during the War with Spain in Company L, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, from May 16, 1898, to November 16, 1898, when he was honorably discharged. He was 32 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1386666.)

The records of the War Department fail to show he was during the service ever reported as sick or received medical treatment for any cause.

When discharged he claimed to be suffering from no disability and the medical officer who then examined him certified he could find none existing.

September 23, 1909, he filed a claim based on disease of the heart, stomach, and liver, which he claimed were results of typhoid fever he suffered from in the service. This claim was rejected December 10, 1910, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, that the soldier suffered and was treated for typhoid fever or any of the alleged results in the service or that they existed at discharge and continually thereafter.

Considerable testimony was filed in the case to show the soldier did suffer from typhoid fever in service and from alleged results thereafter, and a thorough special examination was held for the purpose of ascertaining the true merits of the claim. A medical examination by a board of surgeons, November 3, 1909, shows the soldier was at that time suffering from disease of the heart, for which a rate of twelve-eighteenths was given, and from disease of the stomach and liver, rated at four-eighteenths. No other disabilities were found to exist.

After rejection of the claim the soldier appealed, and in a decision of February 25, 1911, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior sustained the adverse action, and in doing so stated as follows:

"The claimant's statement is that while at Camp Meade, Pa., shortly before the regiment was ordered to Wilmington, Del., he began to have severe headache, with loss of appetite and disorder of the stomach and bowels; that after reaching Wilmington, where the regiment was furloughed for 30 days, he went to the house of friends, Mr. and Mrs. William Carter, and on arriving there was so sick that he was compelled to go to bed; that his wife, then at his home at Middletown, Del., and a physician were sent for, the physician being Dr. Jakes, the surgeon of his regiment; that Dr. Jakes diagnosed the case as typhoid fever and treated him for about three weeks and at the end of which time he was convalescent; that he then went to his home at Middletown, where he was treated for some time by his family physician, Dr. Charles A. Ritchie; that while he was attended by Dr. Jakes he had stomach trouble (vomiting and pain), and brown spots appeared on his body and limbs, which the doctor said were due to affection of the liver; that Dr. Jakes also told him, after an examination, that his heart was slightly affected; and that these organs—the heart, stomach, and liver—have never recovered their normal condition. When mustered out he says he was so weak that he could not walk any distance.

"The military records show that he was on furlough from October 8, 1898, to November 6, 1898, and on November 7, 1898, was examined at Wilmington, Del., preliminary to muster out. He was then asked whether he had any reason to believe that he was suffering from the effects of any wound, injury, or disease, or had any disability or impairment of health, and answered "No." The surgeon who examined him certified that he found no disability.

"The claimant, being confronted with his own signed statement that he was free from disability on November 7, 1898, had no explanation to offer except that he did not recall making such a statement. He acknowledged that the signature was genuine.

"Dr. Jakes is dead. The case, so far as service origin of the alleged disease is concerned, rests mainly upon the testimony of Florence M. and William Carter and Dr. Ritchie, the only other material witness being the claimant's wife.

"The Carters made a joint affidavit on November 9, 1910, to the effect that they were well and personally acquainted with the claimant, he and his wife having boarded with them for about a year from some time in February, 1893; that about the middle of October, 1898, the claimant came to their house sick and the next day was compelled to take to his bed, and Dr. Jakes was called in and pronounced his case typhoid fever; that he remained there about a month and then returned to his regiment to be mustered out; and that during the last two weeks of his sickness he suffered from difficulty in breathing and weak heart action and was very yellow, his stomach and liver being affected.

"On special examination, Mrs. Carter, who had taken the precaution to retain a copy of her former affidavit and referred to it to refresh her memory before beginning her testimony, could not add anything to what was therein stated and, in fact, appeared to have very little independent recollection of the claimant's illness. Being asked whether he had rheumatism, liver or bowel trouble, heart disease, or indigestion she stated:

"'I know he was complaining, and it seems it may have been some one or all of these troubles he had, but I myself was sick all of this time and had little time to think of the ailments of others.'

"Her husband, William Carter, who stated that he had been advised by his wife to look over the copy of their affidavit but had been too busy to do so, could not recall the nature of the claimant's alleged sickness at his house, nor how long he was sick, 'nor anything about it,' even when questioned specifically in regard to typhoid fever, heart disease, liver disease, etc., but after hearing his affidavit read stated that he was willing to 'stick by' it, as he consulted with his wife at the time of making it.

"Dr. Charles A. Ritchie testified, by affidavit dated December 8, 1909, that he treated the claimant from November 7, 1898, to November 23, 1898, for disease of the heart, liver, and stomach, resulting from typhoid fever, from which he was then just recovering. On special examination he testified that the only treatment shown by his records was on November 11, 1898, when he gave him some tablets to act on his bowels and liver. Claimant told him that he had had typhoid fever in the service, but witness could not recall that he exhibited any marked symptoms of a recent attack of typhoid fever, and his impression at the time was that it was malarial.

"'I can not recall,' said witness, 'anything definite about his symptoms in detail further than I have stated; that is, he had some temperature, and I gave him remedies for his liver and bowels, as I would in an ordinary malarial or bilious attack. * * * As to the condition of his heart, liver, or digestion while under my care I do not recall.'

"The evidence is clearly insufficient to show that the claimant had typhoid fever while in the service, or that he was afflicted with disease of the heart, liver, or stomach at the time of his discharge. It is incredible that a man just out of bed after an attack of typhoid fever and scarcely able to walk should have declared that he had no disability or impairment of health from any cause, and that a surgeon should have so reported after physical examination.

"The special examiner took the testimony of several of his comrades who had not previously testified. None of them could recall that he was sick or ailing in any way while at Camp Meade, or at the time of muster out, and had no recollection of ever hearing that he had typhoid fever while on furlough. 'They remembered seeing him occasionally after discharge, but could not recall that he appeared to be otherwise than in good health or that he made any complaint.

"John W. Dickerson, a resident of Middletown, Del., testified:

"'I became acquainted with him about a year before the War with Spain. * * * After his muster out he returned here; remained only a few weeks, then left, and I have had no personal knowledge of him since. While he was here he lived just across the street from me; often came to my house and sat and talked with me. His health was good while he was here, both before and after his service while I knew him. Yes; I remember his being here after his discharge from the Army, for in November, 1898, we went partridge hunting. This was after the 15th of the month, when the hunting season begins. No; I do not remember that after his discharge I heard he had been sick in service, or that he was sick or ailing while here after discharge.'

"From a careful examination of all the evidence it is believed that the claim was properly rejected, and the rejection is accordingly affirmed."

This decision gives such a fair view of the material facts that it has been quoted.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly unable to earn a living by manual labor because of disease of the heart, liver, and stomach, and believes same was due to his military service, in which he contracted typhoid fever, from which same resulted. He further states that he possesses no property or income for support of himself and wife.

Many lay witnesses sustain the allegations of the soldier as to inability to perform manual labor and possessing no property. Some of these are comrades, who testify that he did suffer from the alleged typhoid fever in service with results as claimed of disease of the stomach, heart, and liver. Some are friends, who also testify to the same effect. The typhoid fever is alleged to have developed while the soldier was on furlough, it will be noted.

Two physicians testify that the soldier does suffer from a severe form of disease of the heart, liver, and stomach, and same could result from typhoid fever. They state he is unable to perform manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to his service, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 5175. Emma J. Crocker, of Rockville Center, N. Y., is the widow of Frank H. Crocker, deceased, who served during the War with Spain in the United States Navy from June 9, 1898, to September 17, 1898, when honorably discharged because his services were no longer needed. He was 25 years of age at enlistment. (W. O. 29027.)

The records of the Navy Department fail to show any sickness or medical treatment of the soldier during his service.

The sailor never filed a claim for pension. The widow filed a claim on May 11, 1910, which was rejected June 23, 1910, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, of service origin of any disability, and the inability of the widow to furnish necessary evidence to connect the cause of the sailor's death (cerebral hemorrhage) with his naval service.

The transcript from the death records show the sailor died August 2, 1909, from cerebral hemorrhage.

Dr. D. N. Bulson, the attending physician, testifies that he was the family physician of the soldier for years, and knows his condition of health was good prior to service; that after service he constantly complained of pains in his head, defective vision, and rheumatism until his death from hemorrhage of the brain, which the affiant believes was due to these causes.

Dr. Arthus D. Jaques testifies to same effect as Dr. Bulson, and Dr. Jaques was the attending physician at death, according to the death record.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she believes the sailor's death was due to his naval service; that she has no property and no income aside from that which she earns by her own labor, and has two minor children to support.

That the widow has no property is shown by testimony of several lay witnesses.

Frank L. Wisner and C. R. Ankers testify that from personal knowledge they know the sailor and the petitioner were never married until they married each other in 1900; that they were never divorced, but lived together until his death, and that the widow has not married again since his death and is now his lawful widow.

John Watts, a notary public, certifies over his seal that the widow presented to him her family Bible and he found entered therein the following entries: Frank H. Crocker, born February 16, 1901; William F. Crocker, born October 10, 1905; and said entries show no erasures and appear genuine.

It is shown by testimony of lay witnesses that said minor children are now living.

Several lay witnesses testify that the sailor was a strong and well man before service, but since discharge had suffered constantly from pains in his head, defective eyesight, and rheumatism, and gradually lost his health completely until he died August 2, 1909.

From the evidence submitted in this case, your committee is of the opinion that a pension of $12 per month, with $2 additional for each of the two minor children until they, respectively, reach the age of 16 years, is fully justified, and so recommend.

H. R. 6549. Elizabeth A. Shull, of Pendleton, Oreg., is the widow of A. P. Shull, deceased, who served in the Kibbe Rangers, Capt. William Byrne's company, First Brigade, Sixth Division, California Militia, Indian wars, from August 16, 1859, to January 4, 1860. (W. O. 8407.)

The soldier died about May 28, 1897. He never applied for a pension. The widow filed a claim August 9, 1902, which was rejected on May 20, 1903, on the ground of no title, as the soldier's service was rendered subsequent to the period of any of the Indian wars pensionable under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902.

The records of the War Department fail to show the organization in which the soldier served was mustered into the service of the United States. The records of the Auditor for the War Department, however, show said organization did render service as a State organization and the State of California was afterwards reimbursed by the United States for the expense of said service, and the soldier was paid for the period of 4 months and 20 days.

The evidence on file shows the soldier was first married in 1866 to one Florence Schub, who died in the year 1872; that on January 1, 1873, he married the petitioner, who had never been previously married, and lived with him until his death, about May 28, 1897, and that she has not remarried and is now his lawful widow.

The service alleged was rendered by the soldier and the petitioner is his lawful widow. Her claim in the Pension Bureau was rejected simply because there is no existing law providing pension for soldiers and their widows who rendered such service—it was in connection with none of the Indian wars for which pensions are provided by the several acts of Congress relative to Indian war service.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating she is 61 years of age and has no property or income and is unable to earn a living.

A physician testifies that the widow is a sufferer from chronic lumbago, rheumatism, and bronchitis, and not able to earn a living and has no property.

That she has no property is amply shown by other lay testimony.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 6593. Crowell Lisenby, of Pinehurst, R. F. D., Dooley County, Ga., was, during the War with Spain, a private in Company G, Third Regiment United States Infantry, from July 19, 1899, to July 18, 1902, when discharged upon the expiration of his term of enlistment.

He applied for pension February 6, 1908, stating that in October, 1901, while in the Philippines he was riding as an escort on an Army wagon going for wood; that the wagon fell through a bridge a distance of 7 feet, and that in the fall his back was struck with great force by the back of the seat, causing a permanent injury of the back, for which he was treated in hospital.

The claim was rejected on the ground of no disability May 2, 1908, and again February 15, 1910, on the ground of no record, medical, or other satisfactory evidence showing incurrence in service or existence at discharge of the alleged injury.

Reopening has been several times denied.

The soldier, as shown by the War Department records, was 23⅝ years of age at enlistment. The records of physical examination at enlistment show:

"Chills and fever at 21 years of age. Gonorrhea in 1898. One molar gone."

He was treated for causes other than the alleged injury of back, among which was preputial chancroids, multiple, not in line of duty, from January 26 to February 1, 1901. There is no record of treatment for injury of back, but he was treated October 25 to 28, 1901, for acute lumbago, both sides, cause unknown, in line of duty.

The claimant was examined by a board of surgeons at Macon, Ga., April 1, 1908. They reported his height as 5 feet 10¼ inches, weight 160 pounds. The board said he was "well nourished. Heart and lungs negative. Urine negative. No evidence of injury to back except his word that he suffers pain there. He does regular work of farm hand daily. No evidence of specific disease."

One comrade stated in 1910 that the soldier was thrown from a wagon and injured his back in October, 1901, and that he gained his knowledge of the matter by talking to the soldier shortly after the alleged injury was received.

Another stated at the same time that the soldier was thrown from an escort wagon in October, 1901, and that his information was derived by his knowing he was in hospital for injury of back.

Laymen state that the claimant has complained of his back and has not been able to do much continued labor since service.

One physician testified in November, 1908, that he did not find any objective evidence of disability, but that the claimant complained of pains, soreness, and weakness in left lumbar region of back.

Another said there was a tender spot on the left of spinal column in region of third and fourth lumbar vertebræ and that he was then totally disabled, judging from subjective symptoms.

Another said there was tenderness in region of third and fourth lumbar vertebræ which impaired ability for manual labor, and a month later in 1908 he said the condition was worse and that he constantly complained.

In an affidavit accompanying the bill the petitioner states that he is wholly disabled by injury of back and general debility; that he owns no property, and has no income.

Two laymen corroborate his statement as to financial condition, and a physician testifies that he examined the claimant March 25, 1912, and "find him unable to do manual labor owing to an organic heart lesion and kidney troubles."

Two comrades swear this soldier was injured in the back while in the service and line of duty, as he alleges; four lay witnesses and the soldier himself swear he has been disabled by pain and weakness of the back ever since discharge; and other lay witnesses and physicians testify he has suffered more or less from a disabled back from a short while after his discharge until the present time. The physicians also state he has some heart trouble.

After the final refusal to reopen the claim at the Pension Bureau an appeal was taken, and in a decision of October 4, 1913, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior sustained the rejection of the claim and refusal to reopen same. This decision will be found attached to the brief and gives the view of the bureau and the department regarding the merits of the claim, and attention is invited thereto by your examiner.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 6627. Oscar E. Harper, of Posen, Mich., served during the War with Spain in Company C, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, from April 25, 1898, until honorably discharged February 10, 1899. He was 20 years of age at enlistment. Service was chiefly in Georgia. (I. O. 1261363.)

He filed a claim January 30, 1901, based on typhoid-malarial poisoning and ulceration of skin and general debility. This claim was rejected October 14, 1901, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from any of the alleged disabilities since the date of filing the claim.

On June 6, 1908, he filed another claim for pension based on weakened physical condition and varicose veins of both legs, all of which are alleged to be results of typhoid fever, from which he suffered during his service. The claim was rejected on April 23, 1910, on the ground of no record of the alleged varicose veins of both legs below the knees, no medical or other evidence showing existence of the same in service, and the claimant's failure and evident inability to furnish the evidence necessary to establish the claim.

No appeal was taken and no effort made to reopen the claim.

The records of the War Department show treatment as follows:

"July 20, 1898, malarial fever, tertian, also shown by diagnosis typhoid fever, in line of duty. Returned to duty September 13, 1898. Nothing additional found."

When discharged he claimed to be suffering from no disability, and those by whom he was examined found none, save slight left varicocele, which soldier said had existed prior to service.

Capt. Frank H. Bell, in affidavit of March 18, 1909, states that the soldier suffered during the service from a severe attack of typhoid fever; that he knew the soldier prior to enlistment, and he was a strong and healthy man, free from any disability; that the soldier's health has been very bad since his discharge.

Dr. L. Bigler testified, November 27, 1901, that he had treated the soldier since July, 1901, and found him suffering from disease of liver and spleen and heart and eczema of both legs below knees.

Dr. L. D. Applewhite testified, December 21, 1907, that he had treated the soldier from 1904 for varicose veins and eczema of both legs; that affiant believes disease of legs to be result of typhoid fever the soldier suffered from during service.

He was examined by a board of surgeons at Sandusky, Ohio, April 3, 1901, who reported that, aside from some ulceration of left leg below knee of 7 by 4 inches, for which they state no rate was warranted, they found soldier suffering from no disability at all and not entitled to any rate.

February 10, 1909, he was examined by a board of surgeons at Chicago, Ill., who reported all organs normal, except both legs. They found varicose veins of both legs below knees of a very severe nature and equal to loss of use of wrist or one ankle in preventing manual labor. Rate, ten-eighteenths.

With the bill the petitioner files two affidavits in which he alleges that he was strong and well prior to enlistment; that he contracted typhoid fever of severe form in the service, which has resulted in varicose veins of both legs below the knees so bad as to require removal of some of the veins of left leg by operation; the resulting varicose veins came on gradually after his service; that he is unfitted for any kind of manual labor; that he possesses no property except a few household goods.

Three lay witnesses by their testimony sustain the soldier's allegations as to owning no property. One of these also testifies that the soldier suffered from typhoid fever in service, has had disease of both legs since as a result, and has not been able to perform any manual labor for some years because of the diseased legs.

Dr. J. M. Jones testifies, January 9, 1913, that he has treated the soldier for the past two years for varicose veins of both legs; one limb has been operated upon and the other must be soon; that he is unable to perform manual labor and owns no property.

Dr. V. H. Dumond in an affidavit states substantially the same thing as Dr. Jones.

Dr. Alex W. Campbell, on March 6, 1913, testifies that he has attended the soldier at various times for the past year or so; that the soldier has varicose veins of both legs below knees, and the left leg shows scar 16 inches long made by an operation to remove veins, and right leg will require a similar operation; that the diseased condition of both legs prevents manual labor to at least 50 per cent.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 6943. Charles F. Pandorf, of the National Military Home, Montgomery County, Ohio, served during the War with Spain, in Company I, Third Ohio Volunteer Infantry, from June 21, 1898, to October 26, 1898, when honorably discharged. He was 19 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1354178.)

November 19, 1906, he applied for pension based on rheumatism, disease of the kidneys, and malarial poisoning, alleged to have been contracted in the service. This claim was rejected on February 17, 1908, as to disease of the kidneys and malarial poisoning on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from same since date of filing, and as to rheumatism on the ground of no record evidence of origin or treatment therefor in the service, and the claimant's statement on file declaring that said disability did not originate until after the soldier's discharge from the service.

April 28, 1909, he filed a claim for pension alleging malarial poisoning and disease of the kidneys, contracted at Huntsville, Ala., in the fall of 1898. This claim was rejected on October 21, 1909, as to disease of the kidneys on the ground of no record and the claimant's manifest inability to show origin in service and continuance from discharge by satisfactory evidence, and as to malarial poisoning on the ground of no ratable degree of disability therefrom since date of filing the claim.

The claimant appealed after the second rejection of his claim and stated that subsequent to filing these claims he had undergone treatment at the Mercy Hospital, Baltimore, Md., where it was found his greatest disability was tuberculosis of the spine, and that it is shown by medical science tuberculosis of the spine can and does result from malarial poisoning. The Secretary of the Interior, November 25, 1910, gave a decision sustaining the former actions of rejection and holding the claimant must file a new declaration amending the former declarations, if he desired tuberculosis of the spine considered as a result of malarial fever from which he suffered in the service. After this decision the claimant filed an amendatory declaration December 22, 1910, alleging the spinal tuberculosis was due to malarial fever from which he suffered during the service. This claim was rejected January 7, 1911, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, showing origin of spinal tuberculosis in the service, or

continuance thereof from discharge, and the claimant's evident inability to connect the origin of the same with his military service, as a result of the malarial poisoning, or otherwise.

No appeal has been taken to this last action of rejection, and no effort was made to reopen the claim for reconsideration, although this was a legal rejection, and thus cut off the medical authorities from passing upon the question as to whether or not tuberculosis of the spine could or would be accepted as a result of the malarial fever.

The records of the War Department show the soldier was treated for remittent fever from July 31 to August 3, 1898 (diagnosis also as myalgia). These records also show he was on furlough from September 15 to October 15, 1898, and furlough was extended from October 15 to October 26, 1898, on a physician's certificate.

When mustered out the soldier claimed to be suffering from kidney disease and malarial fever. The medical officer who then examined him states:

"Soldier is emaciated and anemic and asthenic, probably due to a recent attack of some continued fever of which he gives a history (possibly typhoid). Urinary disturbance probably due to disturbance of digestion and a febrile temperature."

This surgeon regarded the soldier's physical condition as temporary, stating that with care he should be well again in a month or six weeks. He stated that the soldier was then, however, totally disabled physically.

Capt. and Asst. Surg. F. C. Weaver testifies that the soldier was ill in the service in October, 1898, with malarial fever; that since the service during 1905 and 1906 affiant treated him for rheumatism.

Capt. B. F. Boyer testifies that the soldier became ill with malarial fever and kidney disease about September 7, 1898, in line of duty; that the hammocks were turned in and the soldiers had to sleep on the ground with only a blanket in September, 1898; that since service the soldier has suffered from rheumatism, and he is now misshapen and unable to work.

Charles Bobb testifies that the soldier has suffered since December, 1898, with rheumatism, and once so badly he had to go to Hot Springs, Ark., for it.

James Taylor testifies that the soldier has suffered since 1901 with rheumatism.

George L. Hussman testifies that the soldier was well and strong before service, but came home from same a physical wreck and has constantly since suffered from malarial poisoning and kidney trouble.

R. A. Caples testifies that the soldier has suffered from malarial poisoning and kidney trouble since 1898, after his discharge.

George L. Pumphrey testifies that the soldier has suffered ever since affiant met him in 1901 with kidney trouble and malarial poisoning.

J. F. Flanigan testifies the soldier went to Hot Springs, Ark., in February, 1899, and March, 1904, for baths for rheumatism.

Dr. C. L. Patterson testifies he treated the soldier from October 10 to November 7, 1898, for malarial fever.

Dr. W. M. Blaine testifies that he treated the soldier from August, 1903, to June, 1904, for severe articular rheumatism, and he suffered so severely from same as to be wholly unable to do any work.

The board of surgeons at Columbus, Ohio, who examined the soldier December 26, 1906, states as to rheumatism:

"Rheumatic crepitus in both shoulders, with pain in these joints on elevating arms above 110°. Passive elevation restricted to 135°. Considerable atrophy of lumbar muscles. Marked posterior kyphosis involving dorsal vertebra, the curvature being somewhat regular throughout upper three-fourths costal vertebræ. No evidence of disease of any vertebræ further than the deformity above described. No tender joints. No pronounced prominence of any one vertebræ. The curvature seems too pronounced and inflexible to have resulted from position or occupation. No evidence in any other joints, muscles, or tendons of rheumatism. Eight-eighteenths rheumatism, including curvature of spine."

They found no disease of the kidneys, and as to malarial poisoning state:

"Area of hepatic dullness normal, extending from seventh rib to three-fourths inch below costal border. Spleen in normal position and can not be felt beneath border of ribs. Skin normal. Conjunctive clear. No icterus. No special tenderness over liver, spleen, or stomach. No evidence of malarial poisoning. No rate."

They find no other disability of any kind except a very irritable heart, rate six-eighteenths, and no evidence of venereal disease or vicious habits.

This board treats curvature of the spine as result of the rheumatism, it will be noted.

He was examined by a board of surgeons at Washington, D. C., July 23, 1909, who report they could find no evidence of rheumatism, malarial poisoning, or disease of the heart. This board found the soldier to be suffering from only one disease, to wit, acute nephritis, for which they rate him ten-eighteenths. This board makes no mention of curvature of the spine.

With the bill you petitioner files an affidavit stating that by reason of rheumatism, spinal tuberculosis, and malarial poisoning he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor, and that he possesses no property or income.

Three lay witnesses testify that the soldier is unable to perform any manual labor and owns no property at all.

The surgeon of the Soldiers' Home certifies that the soldier is now suffering from Potts' disease, tuberculosis of the spine, pulmonary tuberculosis, and chronic articular rheumatism, and marked kyphosis of dorsal region of spine.

The soldier is now in the hospital of the Soldiers' Home.

With the bill will be found two photographs of the soldier recently taken, from which it will be seen that he is in a horrible physical condition, and, of course, unable to do any kind of work.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may safely be accepted as due to service, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 6952. Hale F. Hamilton, of the National Military Home (Company 19), Montgomery County, Ohio, served in the War with Spain from April 25, 1898, to November 5, 1898, as a private in Company N, Fifth Ohio Infantry, and from January 4 to May 31, 1900, in Company E, Twelfth United States Infantry, when honorably discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability. Service chiefly in the Philippine Islands. Age 25 at last enlistment. (Invalid certificate 1055697.)

June 7, 1900, he filed a claim for pension alleging chronic diarrhea, dysentery, and malarial fever, resulting in disease of kidneys, impaired sight, and gastritis; loss of teeth, general debility, and cold resulting in catarrh, all contracted in the Philippines. He was allowed a pension of $8 per month March 5, 1903, from date of filing, for chronic diarrhea and loss of part of teeth. This approval and rate to cover all disability from dysentery and gastritis. No disability shown since date of filing from malarial fever, chills and fever, disease of kidneys, and impaired sight.

Under an exhaustive special examination evidence was secured showing that the loss of claimant's teeth was not due to his military service, but due to disease of teeth and gums which existed prior to his enlistment. June 2, 1904, he was pensioned for chronic diarrhea at $6 per month, and the pension on account of loss of part of teeth was discontinued.

A claim for increase of pension was rejected February 17, 1910. December 9, 1910, he was granted an increase of rate to $10 per month for chronic diarrhea, but the claim for restoration for loss of part of teeth was rejected, as the evidence failed to show that this disability was due to service and line of duty. A request to reopen the rejected part of the claim was denied March 20, 1912. No appeal was taken.

"May 29 and 30, 1899, intermittent malarial fever in line of duty; June 22 to July 2, 1899, acute diarrhea; July 3 to 9, 1899, acute diarrhea; August 6 to 14, 1899, acute diarrhea; August 15 to November 16, 1899, chronic gastroenteritis; November 17 to December 27, 1899, chronic gastroenteritis; December 27, 1899, to February 13, 1900, chronic dysentery, complicated with spine; February 13 to May 31, 1900, chronic dysentery, complicated with loss of teeth and inability to masticate food; in line of duty. Discharged May 31, 1900, on surgeon's certificate of disability."

No testimony was filed in the original claim, it being adjudicated upon the record evidence. November 7, 1900, the board of surgeons at Youngstown, Ohio, examined the claimant and reported that he was suffering from chronic diarrhea and that 13 teeth were missing. They also found disease of liver and stomach, result of malarial fever, and rated eight-eighteenths for same and three-eighteenths for loss of teeth; catarrh, two-eighteenths; and disease of heart, one-eighteenth. The board of surgeons at Warren, Ohio, on June 19, 1901, report that he is entitled to twelve-eighteenths for chronic diarrhea, six-eighteenths for disease of lungs, four-eighteenths for loss of teeth, and two-eighteenths for catarrh. The board of surgeons at Columbus, Ohio, January 26, 1910, state that he has slight diarrhea, but not enough for them to rate; two-eighteenths for loss of teeth, four eighteenths for rheumatism, and no other disability found. On November 16, 1910, the board at Marion, Ohio, report that he is entitled to twelve-eighteenths for chronic diarrhea, six-eighteenths for disease of heart, and that eight upper and eight lower teeth are missing. The board at the National Military Home, Ohio, on January 10, 1912, find his appearance anemic, heart enlarged, lungs in good shape, stomach and rectum inflamed and tender, urine in good order, and rate ten-eighteenths for chronic diarrhea and four-eighteenths for disease of heart.

During the special examination several comrades and an officer testified that when claimant joined the regiment he had bad and diseased teeth and also had lost a good many of the most important teeth. A dentist who had treated his teeth also stated that his teeth had always been brittle, diseased, and bad. This dentist is very old, and upon cross-examination repudiated some of his testimony as to bad teeth to such an extent as to cast some doubt over the question as to the real value which should be placed upon his testimony as a whole. However, taken with the other adverse testimony, it would appear to show he is correct in stating the claimant's teeth were bad from boyhood days and in no sense due to service and line of duty.

With the bill your petitioner files an affidavit in which he states he is unable, by reason of diarrhea and resulting constipation, to earn a living by manual labor, and that he owns no property of any sort.

Two lay witnesses, in affidavits, sustain the allegations of the petitioner as to owning no property.

Dr. C. G. Rogers testifies he has examined the petitioner, August 5, 1913, and finds he is suffering from chronic diarrhea and resulting periodical constipation and intestinal trouble, and is wholly unable to perform manual labor.

Dr. J. W. McKinney testifies, November 7, 1913, that he had that day examined the petitioner and found him suffering from chronic diarrhea, alternating with constipation, with resulting prostitis and pain and distress in the intestines; some involuntary bowel evacuation which caused continual soiling of clothes (was soiled at examination); chronic gastritis with distention of stomach, causing palpitation and dyspnea and vertigo; diarrhea and pain marked over stomach and intestines upon exercise, and because of these disabilities he is wholly disabled for performance of manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $10 to $12 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 7053. John D. Ashley, of 1115 Twelfth Street, Pueblo, Colo., served during the War with Spain in Troop A, Second United States Cavalry, from May 1, 1898, to October 24, 1898, when honorably discharged. He was 35 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1388000.)

On January 17, 1900, he applied for pension, based upon rheumatism, alleged to have been contracted in Jacksonville, Fla., in July, 1898. The claim was rejected December 22, 1911, on the ground that the rheumatism existed prior to enlistment, as shown by the evidence on file. No appeal was taken and no effort, beyond some correspondence without any testimony, was made to reopen the rejected claim.

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"July 11 to 25, 1898, acute articular rheumatism in both knees and feet, in line of duty; July 25 to September 3, 1898, rheumatic fever, in line of duty. Returned to duty. Furloughed September 4, 1898. No additional record of disability found."

When discharged he claimed to be suffering from inflammatory rheumatism and stomach trouble. The officers by whom he was then examined certified that the soldier was then suffering from subacute articular rheumatism, which was contracted in the service and line of duty.

In support of his claim the soldier filed affidavits of two physicians, who testified to treating him for rheumatism from about 1907 on to 1910, and affidavits of two lay witnesses testifying to the fact that for about 10 years prior to 1910 the soldier had suffered from rheumatism.

He was examined by a board of surgeons at Pueblo, Colo., April 6, 1910, who reported him to be then suffering from general rheumatism and rated 8/18. This board found no other disability existing.

The claim underwent a thorough special examination for the purpose of ascertaining if the soldier had been free from rheumatism prior to his enlistment. This action was due to the fact that before and after enlistment the soldier's occupation was that of a miner working far underneath the ground, and such people are very apt to, and usually do, contract rheumatism, and also because he so soon after enlistment suffered so severely and so persistently from rheumatism.

A vast array of testimony and evidence was secured by this special examination from witnesses who are rated as good men and women, which can be briefly summarized as follows.

The soldier's father and mother, two sisters, and a brother-in-law state that he was a peculiarly strong and well man prior to enlistment, free from any physical disability; that he returned to their home immediately after discharge, when he was suffering very severely with rheumatism of both knees, ankles, legs, and shoulders and back, from which he has continued to suffer.

Five lay witnesses who knew the soldier for periods of from seven months to several years before his enlistment state that he never suffered from rheumatism prior to the service.

One comrade and three lay witnesses testify that the soldier never suffered from rheumatism prior to enlistment, but did suffer from same immediately after discharge and ever since that date.

Five lay witnesses testify that the soldier has suffered from rheumatism during the period of their acquaintance with him, which covered the time from date of discharge until 1910.

Five physicians testify to treating the soldier for rheumatism since his discharge. Their treatment pretty well covers the period of from date of discharge to 1910.

So much for the evidence which is favorable to the claim.

The adverse testimony and that which affords the basis for action of rejection of the claim is substantially as follows:

William H. Rose states that he knew the soldier very well for years before enlistment; that the soldier lived in affiant's home; that at one time the soldier went on crutches and appeared to be suffering severely from rheumatism of the legs, knees, and back, and did, in fact, tell the affiant that he was then suffering from rheumatism.

Subsequently to giving this testimony and after the rejection of the claim, this witness repudiated, as far as a disavowal of the former sworn statement could be repudiated, his statement to the special examiner as to the soldier's suffering from rheumatism prior to enlistment and being on crutches from that disease. In doing this the witness claims his memory of facts was at fault, and that the cause for use of crutches was an accidental injury of one of the soldier's knees and not rheumatism, and so far as he knows the soldier never suffered from rheumatism before enlistment. This witness alleges the special examiner was overzealous in an effort to show that the rheumatism did exist prior to service, and then caused the witness to seemingly swear to things he had no intention of testifying concerning. The Commissioner of Pensions refused to accept the repudiation of said adverse testimony. (See copies of letters attached to brief.)

Two lay witnesses testified that the soldier did go upon crutches for some time at the time Mr. Rose had stated, but these witnesses told the special examiner they did not know the cause for using crutches, and they also stated they never knew the soldier to suffer from rheumatism before his enlistment.

All of the medical officers by whom the soldier has been examined report no evidence of venereal disease.

The soldier explains the use of the crutches at the time alleged, and upon at least one other occasion, by stating that he had then injured one of his knees and upon these other occasions he had suffered injuries to the other knee and to both ankles. The evidence shows that one knee and perhaps both ankles of the soldier have been injured at various times in his life.

With the bill your petitioner files an affidavit stating that by reason of rheumatism, which he firmly believes due to his military service, he is wholly unable to earn a support by manual labor; that he owns no property and has no income from any source.

Two lay witnesses by their testimony sustain the allegations of the soldier as to his inability to perform manual labor and possession of no property.

Dr. W. D. Borland testifies the soldier suffers from chronic rheumatism of hips, knees, and feet; that he suffers great pain from same and the joints are enlarged, and he is totally unable to perform any ordinary manual labor.

From the evidence submitted it is believed that a pension of $24 per month is fully warranted and it is so recommended.

H. R. 7830. Emma Fox, of 97 Mulberry Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, is the widow of Fred L. Fox, who served during the War with Spain in Troop F, Seventh United States Cavalry, from August 8, 1898, to May 12, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 19½ years of age at enlistment. (Wid. Orig. 996699.)

The widow filed a claim for pension November 20, 1912, alleging the soldier's death, on September 24, 1912, was due to his military service. This claim was rejected February 14, 1913, on the ground of the claimant's inability to furnish competent evidence to connect the cause of the soldier's death (abscess of the brain and meningitis due to disease of left ear) with his military service. No appeal was taken and no effort was made to reopen the claim.

The records of the War Department show treatment as follows:

"September 2 to 27, 1898, acute tonsilitis, both sides; November 22 to 23, 1898, coryza, acute; December 2 to 4, 1898, malaria, acute fever; December 3 to 20, 1898, malaria, remittent; December 22 to 25, 1898, bronchitis, acute; December 30, 1898, to January 4, 1899, malaria, intermittent; returned to duty. All the foregoing in line of duty. No additional record of disability found."

The death records show the soldier died September 24, 1912, from abscess of the brain and meningitis, with mastoid disease as a contributing cause, and Dr. Victor Ray as attending physician.

Dr. Victor Ray testifies, December 10, 1912, that the soldier came under affiant's treatment September, 1912, for chronic inflammation of the left ear; that the soldier told affiant the ear had been discharging ever since his discharge from the military service; that this disease of ear resulted in an abscess of the brain and meningitis which caused death; that the disease of ear when affiant first treated same in September, 1912, gave every evidence of having existed for a long time, as alleged by the soldier.

Elizabeth Shiner testifies that she knew the soldier well for a number of years, and when he returned from his service he was deaf in the left ear, and informed the affiant this deafness was due to typhoid fever he had in the service.

The other evidence on file relates only to the lawful widowhood of the claimant and dates of birth of minor children for whom pension is claimed.

The soldier never filed a claim for pension and was never examined by a board of surgeons.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating that she is without means of any kind, owning no property of any description; that she is an invalid and is forced to live with and depend upon her parents for support of herself and children.

Two lay witnesses testify that the petitioner is the widow of the deceased soldier and is absolutely without means of support, as she possesses no property at all, and that she is physically unable to perform any manual labor.

Dr. Henry Buchanan testifies, May 3, 1913, that the petitioner is under his treatment and is unable to perform any kind of manual labor, as she is subject to epileptic attacks, in one of which she fell upon a stove and sustained very severe burns from which she was months recovering.

It is shown by record evidence that two minor children, born August 30, 1901, and December 1, 1903, are now living.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that a pension of $12 per month, with $2 additional for each of the two minor children, is fully warranted and so recommend.

H. R. 7977. George Oatten, of Saginaw, West Side, Mich., served during the War with Spain in Company E, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, from April 26, 1898, to December 22, 1898. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. Much of the service was performed in Cuba. (I. O. 1345470.)

The military records of the War Department show he was sick in the hospital at Siboney, Cuba, from July 15 to August 16, 1898. The medical records show as follows:

"* * * to July 29, 1898, malaria; July 29 to August 2, 1898, malarial remittent fever; August 10 to 11, 1898, malaria; August 11 to 15, 1898, insolation (sunstroke) complication, malarial remittent fever—in line of duty. No additional record found."

February 16, 1906, he applied for pension based upon malarial poisoning, which he alleged had resulted in disease of the stomach, bowels, liver, spleen, heart, nervous debility, intolerance of heat, and dizziness. This claim was rejected January 27, 1908, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from the causes alleged.

He again filed a claim March 3, 1908, and this time based it upon malarial poisoning, resulting disease of the stomach, bowels, liver, spleen, and that sunstroke has resulted in nervous debility, vertigo, intolerance of heat, and dizzy spells. This claim was rejected on May 17, 1909, as to sunstroke and results, on the ground that the best obtainable testimony fails to show existence of the alleged disabilities at the date of discharge and continuance thereafter.

He again filed a claim June 7, 1909, realleging same disabilities, and this was rejected November 10, 1910, as to malarial poisoning to cover disease of stomach, bowels, liver, and spleen, on the ground of the claimant's evident inability to furnish medical or other satisfactory evidence of the continuance thereof since the date of discharge. That part of the claim based upon alleged results of sunstroke was not considered, having been rejected and not reopened. No appeal was taken, but four efforts have been made to have the claim reopened, and all were denied on the ground of insufficiency of the testimony offered to warrant such action.

The claimant, in all papers executed and filed by him, and also in a sworn statement before a special examiner, alleges he suffered during the service from but two disabilities, to wit, malarial fever and sunstroke. He claims disease of stomach, bowels, liver, heart, and spleen resulted from the malarial fever, and the sunstroke resulted in nervous debility, vertigo, intolerance of heat, and dizzy spells, from which he has suffered constantly since his discharge.

Several officers and half a dozen comrades have testified in affidavits or before the special examiners to the fact that the soldier was very ill in the summer of 1898 in Cuba with malarial fever and returned home in terrible physical condition, having to be placed in a hospital in Detroit, Mich., for a day or so while en route home, and was ill for a long while afterwards from malarial fever. When he was discharged he claimed he was then suffering from chills and fever, and the surgeon by whom he was examined certified he was then suffering from malarial poisoning.

None of these officers or comrades have any personal knowledge of any sunstroke the claimant suffered from in the service, and he himself can not and will not swear he was ever unconscious from sunstroke or collapsed from overheat during the service. However, there is the record of treatment in the service from sunstroke.

Many lay witnesses testify that the soldier returned home from service suffering from malarial fever, was confined to bed with same for some time, and has constantly suffered since that time from malarial troubles—that is, with disease of stomach, bowels, liver, heart, and spleen.

Three doctors testify to the fact that the soldier has suffered since about 1904 from malarial poisoning and its usual results. Two of these physicians and several lay witnesses testify to a spell of temporary insanity from which soldier suffered in July, 1905, that lasted for a week or more. He was confined in jail and underwent official examination at that time for the mental trouble.

He was examined by a board of surgeons at Saginaw, Mich., April 18, 1906, who report him as 27 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches in height, and weighs 127 pounds. This board found he was suffering from malarial poisoning and rated same at eight-eighteenths. They state he suffered from no other disability and there was no disability of vicious habits. They found no evidence of any results from sunstroke.

The special examination disclosed the fact that the claimant had borne a pretty bad character prior to his enlistment, having been prosecuted for and convicted of larceny, but that since his discharge he has married and been a steady worker and kept out of trouble. He has always been a very thin man, and before and since service has gone by nickname "Skinny." It is not shown that he was ever ill prior to the service, and it is not shown that he has been sick to any very marked extent since his recovery from malarial fever, from which he was suffering very severely at the time of his discharge. In fact, he worked for some time prior to enlistment for two brothers—J. Fred and Chauncey Tyler—and has worked for them most of the time since his service, and these brothers both state that they can see no difference in his health since service from that he enjoyed prior thereto. He had lost practically no time from work after his recovery from malarial fever until 1909, when the special examination was had, and he turned in on an average about as much work since his service as he was accustomed to do prior thereto.

With the bill your petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor because of sunstroke and malarial poisoning and the results of same and that he posseses no property and has no income.

His allegations are sustained by testimony of two lay witnesses.

Dr. S. C. J. Ostrom, a member of the board of surgeons of the Pension Bureau, certifies on September 22, 1913, that he finds the soldier suffering from malarial poisoning, with diseased liver and spleen, and pains of back and shoulders, and upon several occasions he has attended the soldier for chills and fever; that he is 36 years old, 5 feet 9½ inches in height, and weighs 130 pounds; is listless, weak, and anemic; and has dyspnea after exercise; his stomach is out of order and the digestive organs do not work properly; that he does not use alcohol; and is unfit for manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 8435. William Miller, of the National Home, Milwaukee, Wis., served in the Regular Establishment in Company H, Second United States Cavalry, from November 25, 1873, until November 25, 1878, when he was honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. He was 24 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1389423.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"January 28 to February 23, 1878, punctured wound of the right thigh by sharp point of blacksmith's anvil on January 27, 1878; April 1 and 2, 1878, sprained back on March 31, 1878; July 16 and 17, 1878, catarrh. No additional record found."

March 22, 1910, the soldier filed a claim for pension based upon injury of stomach, which he alleged he received by being kicked in the stomach by a horse in 1875. This claim was rejected October 17, 1910, on the ground that no disability in a ratable degree was shown to exist from the alleged injury of stomach. No appeal was taken, but the claimant twice attempted to have the claim reopened, and each time such action was refused by the Pension Bureau because the evidence offered was not deemed sufficient to warrant same.

The claimant swears that while shoeing a horse in the service (in discharge of the duties assigned him) he was kicked in the stomach by the horse and received an injury from which he has suffered ever since; that he is unable to furnish testimony of but one comrade as to incurrence of said injury, as the officers, surgeons, and all other comrades who knew of the same are dead or in parts unknown to him.

Comrade Thomas B. Gilmore testifies, November 9, 1910, that prior to being kicked by a horse in the service the claimant was well and strong, but afterwards suffered from the results of this injury and never was well again as long as affiant knew him; that the soldier suffered from stomach trouble and claimed same was due to the injury from the horse kicking him; that he was confined for a time in the hospital and underwent medical treatment after the horse kicked him.

Three lay witnesses, who testify that they have known the soldier for periods ranging from 1881, 1885, and 1893, state he has always since they knew him suffered from some trouble or disease of the stomach, and claimed same was the result of having been kicked by a horse when in the military service.

Dr. H. F. Smith testified December 27, 1910, that he that day examined the soldier and found him suffering from disease of the stomach, which claimant alleged was the result of having been kicked by a horse in the military service; that the stomach is painful and after meals there is nausea and as a physician he suspects there may be carcinoma of the stomach. This physician states he had never before this examination treated the soldier.

The soldier was examined by a board of surgeons June 1, 1910, who reported him 61 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches in height, and weighing 145 pounds. Pulse, 76, 84, 96; respiration, 20, 21, 22, and temperature, 98⅘. This board reports both of soldier's eyes are badly impaired as to sight; that there is marked general senile decay of the man; and that he is wholly unable to do any manual labor. The board does not specifically state or give a rate for any especial disability. They simply describe him as an old worn-out man, and say he is entitled to $72 per month pension.

He was again examined by a board of surgeons on March 1, 1911, who state that they find no scars or other signs of the alleged injury to the stomach, but do find enlarged liver, sallow skin, enlarged and tender spleen, and a small pile, and that the prostate is enlarged. They find cataract of the left eye and impaired sight of the right eye. They suggest a rate of $18 per month for disease of the stomach and bowels and twelve-eighteenths for impaired sight.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is wholly unable to earn a living by labor by reason of disease of the stomach, due to a horse kicking him during his military service, and that he is totally blind now, having lost the sight of both eyes; that he is without means or income of any kind and unable to earn a support for himself and his wife.

It is shown by the testimony of several lay witnesses that the soldier is totally blind and suffers from stomach trouble and owns no property and has no income.

Dr. F. A. Stratton testifies, June 7, 1913, that the soldier is totally blind in both eyes and suffers from rheumatism and cystitis, both in chronic form, and wholly unable to perform any kind of manual labor.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that the disability of the soldier was due to the service. In view of that fact the committee respectfully recommend the rate of pension of $12 per month.

H. R. 8452. James H. Martin, Oronton, Mo., served in the Regular Establishment, United States Navy, from October 10, 1902, to October 9, 1906, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. He was 24 years of age at enlistment. (I. C. 38958.)

The records of the Navy Department show that during his service he was treated for appendicitis on two occasions, hernia (rupture), and bowel trouble, all in line of duty.

On December 7, 1906, he filed a claim for pension based on right hernia and rheumatism. This claim was allowed as to hernia at $10 per month from date of filing, which is the maximum rate provided by law for that disability. That part of the claim based on rheumatism was rejected on both the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, showing it was contracted in the service, and because there was no disability shown to exist from same since the date of filing.

There is no evidence to show origin in the service of the alleged rheumatism.

When examined by a board of surgeons on May 1, 1907, they reported that the only evidence they could find of rheumatism was a general tenderness of the muscles and a slight stiffness of some joints, which would not warrant a rate. They did find some slight derangement of the functions of the heart that could result from rheumatism and rated it at six-eighteenths. The only real disability they found was complete right inguinal hernia, for which they rated fourteen-eighteenths.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is unable to earn a living by manual labor, and the only property he owns is a small house and lot worth about $400 which is mortgaged for $300, and he is unable to support his wife and children.

Lay witnesses by their testimony sustain the sailor's allegations as to property he owns, debts he owes, and his inability to perform manual labor.

A physician testifies the sailor suffers so severely from right inguinal hernia and "other physical disabilities" as to be unable to earn a support by any ordinary occupation.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $10 to $17 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 8490. Gambo C. Villines, of Cross Prairie, Tenn., served in the Regular Establishment in Company B, Fifteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from January 18, 1881, to January 17, 1886, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. He also afterwards served in Company E, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from September 13, 1886, to June 4, 1890, when honorably discharged by favor, and in Company B, Fifteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from August 24, 1891, to August 24, 1892, when again honorably discharged by favor, and in Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from March 12, 1894, to December 16, 1895, when transferred to Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from which he was finally honorably discharged June 11, 1897. He was 25½ years of age at the first enlistment. (I. O. 1238555.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment in each service:

First service—

"March 3 to 6, 1881, neuralgia; March 27 to April 2, 1881, fever; April 10 to 17, 1881, inflammation of pleura; April 24, 1881, catarrh; November 4 to 6, 1882, contusion of scalp; November 17 to 23, 1882, contusion of scalp, right side of head, caused by beer bottle; May 18 to 21, 1883, acute bronchitis; January 11 to February 9, 1884, acute rheumatism."

Second service—

"August 5 and 6, 1887, acute diarrhea."

Third service—

"January 4 to 21, 1882, slight contused wound of the right hand, hit a man in the teeth, not in line of duty; April 6 to 8, 1892, chronic inflammation of the mediastinum, was overheated while rescuing a drowning person, in line of duty; July 6 to 25, 1892, acute gonorrhea, not in line of duty. Nothing additional found."

He was not reported sick and received no medical treatment at all during his final service from March 12, 1894, to June 11, 1897, according to the War Department.

On November 4, 1899, he filed a claim for pension based upon rheumatism, which he alleged he had contracted during his first service in Company B, Fifteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, about January, 1884. This claim was first rejected June 25, 1901, on the ground of no disability in a ratable degree from rheumatism since date of filing.

He again filed a claim May 26, 1906, realleging the same disability and same time and place of contracting it. This claim was rejected May 15, 1913, on the ground that the evidence on file, the best obtainable, fails to satisfactorily show that rheumatism has continued since January 17, 1886, the date of the discharge from the first service, or to connect any now existing disability therefrom with the claimant's military service. No appeal was taken, and no effort has been made to reopen the claim.

The soldier states that he contracted this rheumatism during his first service; was suffering from same when discharged from the service; and has constantly since suffered therefrom. He furnished testimony of several lay witnesses to the effect that when he came home in 1886 from the first service he was suffering from rheumatism, and these witnesses state that when they saw and knew him in 1890, 1893, 1897, and 1899 he continued to suffer from same. There is a record of treatment in the service for rheumatism in January and February, 1884.

There is both lay and medical testimony showing he has suffered from rheumatism from about 1900, in addition to the lay testimony before mentioned. The soldier explains his inability to furnish medical evidence showing treatment for rheumatism prior to about 1900 by saying the physician who treated him has since died.

The claim was sent to the field for special examination, but this action resulted in throwing little, if any, light upon its merits beyond showing the character of soldier and his witnesses are good and the facts to which they have testified true, and one witness, a comrade in the final service, was found who testified the soldier did suffer during this final service from rheumatism, and that he had no disability of any kind prior to the first service.

The Bureau of Pensions rejected this claim because of the fact that after being discharged from the service in 1886 in which the soldier claims he contracted rheumatism he three times again enlisted and served continuously practically from 1886 until 1897 and never was treated in any of these subsequent services for rheumatism, nor in any one of the medical examinations when he enlisted for same was rheumatism discovered to exist and so noted.

When he was examined by a board of surgeons November 28, 1900, they reported as to rheumatism as follows:

"No objective marks of rheumatism in any muscle, tendon, or joint, and all movements normal. No other disability alleged or found. No signs of gonorrhea or other venereal disease. No ratable disability found."

When he was examined by another board of surgeons July 18, 1906, they reported:

"Rheumatism: Crepitation in all joints; pain on motion in all joints; motion limited one-third in all joints; lumbar muscles involved; no atrophy of muscles or contraction of tendons; rate, eight-eighteenths. Heart: No murmur; no hypertrophy; no dilation; there is dyspnea; heart irritable; no edema; no cyanosis; no rate."

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is unable to earn a living by manual labor because of rheumatism and results contracted in the service, and that he has no property or income.

It is shown by lay testimony that the soldier has no property and suffers so from rheumatism as to be unable to earn a living.

Dr. A. C. Moore testifies that he has treated the soldier for years now for typical case of articular rheumatism, and the remedies for same have caused stomach trouble to result so as to make it at times almost impossible for him to retain food sufficient to keep him alive; that the soldier is a man of good habits and character and is unable because of articular rheumatism and its results to do any manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to the service, and respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 8653. Marian E. Keyes, of 637 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C., is the widow of Charles H. Keyes, deceased, who served in the Regular Establishment, United States Marine Corps, from June 3, 1885, to June 2, 1890; June 10, 1890, to June 9, 1895; June 17, 1897, to

June 23, 1900; August 4, 1900, to August 3, 1905; August 4, 1906, to July 10, 1911, when retired honorably. (W. O. 988051.)

The records of the Navy Department show the following treatment: "October 10 to 12, 1886, debauch, excessive use of alcoholics; April 30 to May 4, 1888, tonsillitis; May 29 to June 1, 1891, catarrhus epidemicus; December 6 to 9, 1892, alcoholism; January 1 to 13, 1893, chancroids, venereal; June 17 to 29, 1895, alcoholism; December 25, 1898, catarrh; January 9, 1899, catarrh; June 20 to June 24, 1903, gastric catarrh, due to excessive use of alcohol. He died April 13, 1912, from catarrhus epidemicus."

All of the foregoing were of line of duty origin except those due to syphilis and alcoholism.

The widow filed a claim for pension June 10, 1912, which was rejected August 19, 1912, on the ground that the marine's death from pneumonia nearly six years after his retirement can not be accepted as a result of any disease for which he was treated while in active service, and the claimant is manifestly unable to furnish medical or other evidence which would connect his fatal illness with his marine service.

Nothing but the declaration and the transcript from official records of the Navy Department were filed in the claim in the Bureau of Pensions.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating she possesses no property at all and that she has no income.

Two lay witnesses sustain the claimant's statements that she has no property or income.

Marian L. Kerr testifies that she knew Charles H. Keyes well, and said Keyes often told affiant that he had been married in 1879 or 1880, and that this wife died in childbirth about one year thereafter; that afterwards he married one Josephine Grace, who died to affiant's knowledge on September 5, 1905; that he afterwards married Marian E. Kerr, with whom he lived until his death, and who is now his widow, and who has two minor children, by the soldier, now living.

E. B. Hesse testifies that the petitioner was never married prior to marrying Charles H. Keyes, with whom she lived until his death, and whose widow she now is, and that she has two minor children to support. This affiant always understood the said Keyes had two former wives, both of whom had died prior to his marriage to the petitioner.

Record evidence of the death of the second wife, "Josie," on September 5, 1905, is furnished.

Record evidence of the marriage of Charles H. Keyes and the petitioner on July 12, 1906, is filed.

Record evidence of the death of Charles H. Keyes on April 13, 1912, is furnished.

J. D. Cummings testifies that he knows the wife of the said Charles H. Keyes died in Sidney, Ohio. (Note: The second wife of the soldier died in Washington, D. C., and the third wife is living now, so this must refer to the first wife and is in keeping with other testimony.)

Record evidence is filed showing the birth of the following children of said Keyes: Elsie Miller Keyes, born May 6, 1907; Mary Louise Keyes, born March 12, 1912.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that the petitioner is the lawful widow of the deceased marine, and as such is entitled to a pension of $12 per month, with $2 additional for each of the two minor children until they become 16 years of age, and so recommend.

H. R. 9064. Andrew J. Wallace, of Coal Creek, Tenn., served during the War with Spain in Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from July 2, 1898, to March 15, 1899, when he was honorably discharged. He was 38 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1264931.)

The records of the War Department show the soldier was treated August 16, 1898, and October 26, 1898; nature of illness not given. He is also reported as absent from duty from November 30 to December 3, 1898, as sick; nature of same not given.

When mustered out he claimed to be suffering from an injury to his breast. The medical officer by whom he was then examined certified that the soldier was then spitting up blood and claimed same was a result of an injury received in October, 1898.

He filed a claim for pension March 26, 1901, based on an injury to the right breast received in service which had fractured the right collar bone and caused hemorrhage of the lungs. This claim was rejected November 25, 1901, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability since date of filing the claim.

On January 17, 1907, he again filed a claim which was based on piles, which he claimed to have contracted from becoming overheated in Knoxville, Tenn., July 15, 1898, and that in Porto Rico in line of duty unloading a car of supplies, a box of guns fell upon him, breaking his right collar bone and two of his left ribs and his left side of jawbone, from which injuries he had always since suffered from diseased lungs, which caused hemorrhages. This claim was rejected December 5, 1908, as to piles, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, showing origin in service, existence at date of discharge or for some time thereafter; and as to alleged injury to right collar bone, left ribs, and left side jawbone, on the ground that there was no disability shown therefrom in a ratable degree since filing the claim.

On July 26, 1909, he once more filed a claim, based on piles and disease of the lungs, which he alleges resulted from the injury in service that had broken his right collar bone, two left ribs, and left jawbone. This claim was rejected August 17, 1909, on the ground of no record or satisfactory evidence of medical treatment or other satisfactory evidence showing origin or existence in service, or at date of discharge, and the evident inability of the claimant to furnish such evidence. No appeal was taken, but there have been several attempts made to have the claim reopened, all of which were declined by the Bureau of Pensions on the ground that the evidence offered failed to warrant such action.

The soldier, in several sworn statements, alleges that in the fall of 1898, in Porto Rico, while in line of duty unloading supplies from cars, a heavy box of guns fell on him and broke his right collar bone, two left ribs, and left side of jawbone, and as a result his lungs were injured by this accident, and soon afterwards began bleeding and have continued ever since to bleed and are diseased; he also swears that he contracted piles in the service in July, 1898, at Knoxville, Tenn., and has suffered ever since therefrom.

On December 9, 1907, the soldier visited Dr. Z. D. Massy, who was the surgeon of his command, and who recognized him at once and made an affidavit in which the doctor testifies that in Porto Rico, in the fall of 1898, he treated the soldier for hemorrhage of the lungs, and the soldier then informed affiant that hemorrhage of the lungs was the result of an accident he had received while unloading supplies a short time before, when a box of guns had fallen upon him, breaking some of his ribs.

Cary F. Spence, who was captain of the soldier's company, testifies, May 17, 1904, that in Porto Rico in the fall of 1898 the soldier was injured by lifting a heavy box of guns and was off duty for quite a while as a result of the injury, and several months afterwards when mustered out the soldier complained to affiant that his lungs had become diseased as a result of said injury and were constantly bleeding.

Six comrades have testified, in addition to the surgeon and captain, that the soldier suffered during the service from bleeding of the lungs, and claimed to them that same was the result of an injury received while he was engaged in unloading supplies and a heavy box of guns fell on him. Some of these comrades state that the soldier informed them that he preferred to receive treatment in quarters to going to the hospital.

One comrade alone testifies that the soldier suffered from piles in the service, and he states that he never saw the piles, and only had the soldier's word for it that he did suffer from same.

There is both lay and medical evidence to show that the soldier was well and strong prior to enlistment, but that when he came home after discharge he had a broken collar bone and claimed to have broken two left ribs and left side of jawbone, and was spitting up blood, and claimed that his lungs had been bleeding ever since the injury which he alleged he had received when a box of guns fell on him while unloading supplies in Porto Rico. The medical evidence shows the ribs were broken, as well as the collar bone and jawbone, and that the lungs are and have been diseased since the soldier's return from the service.

The soldier never alleged piles as a disability until 1907, nearly 10 years after discharge, and the medical evidence only shows existence of piles since about 1907.

The claim underwent a thorough special examination, with the result that all of the witnesses who had testified were persons of fair and good reputations as to truth, and they substantially sustained the testimony previously given by them in the claim.

Not one of the comrades who testified was present and saw the accident when the box fell on the soldier, and he was not able to give the name of one who was then present, but all of those who testified knew his lungs were bleeding in the service and they were bleeding when he was discharged therefrom.

The special examination resulted in the soldier's failure to produce witnesses who could testify to the existence of piles prior to about 1906 or 1907 from personal knowledge. One comrade and one or two witnesses here and there can and do state that the soldier said he had piles in the service and after discharge, but his wife is the only person who swears they existed and who saw them prior to 1906.

The soldier was examined by a board of surgeons June 12, 1901, who report him as 39 years of age, 5 feet 10 inches in height, and weighing 159 pounds. This board states that the soldier's right collar bone had been broken, but that they could find no evidence of any broken ribs of either side, or any disease of the lungs or any other disease or disability. They further state that they could find no disability of any character which would warrant their suggesting any rate therefor, and they therefore suggested no rating.

He was again examined by a board of surgeons March 20, 1907, who found him weighing 165 pounds, 47 years of age, and 5 feet 10 inches in height. His tongue was coated and he suffered from alternating constipation and diarrhea, and there was one large internal pile. They rated this 6/18. This board did find that not only had the right collar bone been broken, as found by the first board, but also two of the left ribs and the left side of the jawbone had been fractured, and rated injuries and results at 2/18. They found the heart and other organs in normal condition and no disabilities existing other than piles, constipation, diarrhea, and fractures as noted. There were no indications of vicious habits. The board failed to find anything wrong with the lungs of a serious enough nature to mention, other than the soldier alleged they had been injured by the box falling on him.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is in part incapacitated for performance of manual labor by injuries to the left side and piles and has no property or income.

Two lay witnesses sustain the soldier's allegations as to owning no property and being unable to perform manual labor much of the time.

Two comrades testify in affidavits before the committee that the soldier's lungs were bleeding in the service, and he claimed same was due to being injured by a box of guns falling upon him.

A physician testifies, November 25, 1913, that he has treated the soldier at various times since 1901 and for broken right collar bone and injuries to the left side, which soldier claims he received as a result of a box falling on him in the service in Porto Rico in 1898; that the soldier suffers from repeated and oft-occurring hemorrhages from the lungs as a result of these injuries, and that he also suffers from severe form of piles and hemorrhoids and is disabled at least half of the time for the performance of any kind of labor.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to the service, and a pension of $12 per month is recommended.

H. R. 9201. Peter H. Strumsky, 2518 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md., served in the Regular Establishment in Company A, First United States Cavalry, from October 10, 1899, to March 29, 1900, when transferred to Hospital Corps, United States Army, from which he was discharged October 25, 1902. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1335819.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment: "November 2 to 26, 1900, malarial fever; November 16, 1900, gastritis, due to lead poisoning prior to enlistment, not in line of duty. No additional record found."

In several efforts which have been made by the soldier to have the claim reopened, all of which have been denied by the bureau, testimony of many witnesses has been filed by him. It is all of a similar character to that filed herein, and only cumulative.

Peter H. Strumsky, a private in the Hospital Corps, United States Army, from October 10, 1899, to October 22, 1902, filed a claim for pension under the general law November 1, 1906, alleging that while at Santa Mesa, P. I., in November, 1900, he contracted chronic diarrhea and constipation, affecting rectum. He asked a reconsideration of his original application for pension on account of rheumatism, disease of heart and stomach, which he claims to have contracted in July, August, and September, 1902.

On April 19, 1909, that part of the claim based on disease of heart was rejected on the ground of no record and claimant's inability to furnish satisfactory evidence of origin in service or existence at dis-

charge, and diarrhea, constipation, and disease of rectum on the ground of no record, no medical or other satisfactory evidence of origin in service or at discharge, and claimant's inability to furnish same, and on the further medical ground that a ratable degree of disability had not been shown since filing of claim.

May 15, 1909, rheumatism was rejected on the ground of no medical or other satisfactory evidence of treatment or existence of said disability since discharge prior to October, 1905, and claimant's inability to obtain such evidence.

In an appeal filed June 1, 1909, it is contended that the action of the bureau is contrary to the evidence.

Dr. H. C. Moses says, in affidavit filed July 30, 1907, that while on the way from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Cal., in September, 1902, he treated claimant for rheumatism, with probable heart complications, and that rheumatism was incurred in line of duty. Dr. Moses was acting assistant surgeon on board transport *Sherman*.

Comrade J. F. Sprinkle says in affidavit filed May 18, 1907, that he has been with claimant almost daily since November, 1902, and that he has suffered from rheumatism, heart trouble, and diarrhea.

Affidavit of William J. Marshall, filed May 18, 1907, is to the same effect as that of affiant Sprinkle, except he says he first heard soldier complain of the alleged disabilities in August, 1903.

Dr. Wilfred M. Barton says, in affidavit filed February 6, 1907, that he has treated claimant at intervals during the last three years for chronic gastritis, constipation, and diarrhea.

Dr. Charles C. McDowell states in affidavit filed March 11, 1907, that he prescribed for claimant November 4, 1903, for constipation and indigestion.

Soldier was examined by a board January 31, 1907, which reported as follows:

"Age, 27 years; height, 5 feet 11 inches; weight, 156 pounds; pulse rate, 85, 95, 120; respiration, 18, 20, 24; and temperature normal.

"Tongue slightly coated and indented. Teeth sufficient. Liver extends from sixth rib to costal margin and not tender. Stomach normal in size and otherwise. Spleen extends from ninth to eleventh rib; not tender or palpable. General abdominal tenderness, with great tenderness over descending colon and sigmoid; some tympany; no piles, fissures, or fistula. No diarrhea at present.

"Heart: Beats seen, felt, and heard, fifth space, nipple line. Three systolic murmurs heard at apex and transmitted to left. Another heard at second right interspace; third heard junction of fourth rib on both sides with the sternum, marked epigastric pulsation; increase of cardiac over right and systolic venous pulsation in the jugulars; action regular but heaving. There is cyanosis of chest and hands. No edema or dyspnea.

"Rheumatism: Slight stiffness in shoulders and stiffness and crepitus in knees and ankles. No atrophy, contraction, or limitation of motion.

"Urine: 1016, clear, acid, amber. No albumin or sugar."

A special examination was held, at which claimant and others testified. Claimant's testimony of May 25, 1908, and August 5 and 28, 1908, is a reiteration of the allegations contained in his declarations. He explained, however, that by stomach trouble he meant dysentery.

In supplemental deposition dated March 15, 1909, claimant says he received treatment at Santa Mesa Hospital, P. I., for malarial fever and dysentery or diarrhea, and that, while his heart was weak during the latter part of his service in the Philippine Islands, it was while on the transport *Sherman* "that the rheumatism actually developed with heart complications."

William J. Marshall testified August 10, 1908, that he first heard soldier complain of rheumatism, stomach trouble, and diarrhea in March, 1904, and of heart trouble in August, 1904.

Louis Strumsky, father of soldier, testified August 11, 1908, that when he returned from the Army his health was bad and he was suffering from chills and fever and stomach trouble, and that since his return he has suffered from said causes, and that he had diarrhea when he came home after discharge. Also, that he first knew of soldier using liniments for rheumatism about three or four years ago.

The evidence of William L. Strumsky, a brother of claimant, taken August 11, 1908, is to the same effect as that of Louis Strumsky, except he says soldier had rheumatism when he returned from the Army; that about a year ago soldier "took Swamproot for his kidneys" and that he complained of piles several years ago. Both these deponents say claimant was healthy when he enlisted.

Mary Strumsky, mother of claimant, testified August 7, 1908, that he was healthy when he enlisted and that when he returned he was pale and did not look well, but that she did not know what was the matter with him, as he did not tell her.

On March 13, 1908, Howard W. Rowe testified that he has been acquainted with soldier practically all his life; that when he returned from the Army he complained of chills and fever and rheumatism, and that his health was good when he entered the service. Deponent adds that he has not heard soldier complain of chills or fever since the expiration of about one year after discharge.

H. C. Conrad testified, August 18, 1908, that when claimant returned from the Army he complained of rheumatism and stomach trouble; that he has seen soldier once or twice each week since discharge, and that he has complained of rheumatism and stomach trouble all that period, but that he did not hear him complain of heart trouble for a year or so after he returned from the Army.

Edward H. Koch testified, August 6, 1908, that he knew of no ailment with which claimant was suffering until several months prior to the date of his testimony, when soldier told deponent "his stomach bothered him."

On August 14, 1908, Louis Bayer testified that so far as he knew claimant had never suffered from any of the alleged disabilities.

Stephen C. Hess testified, August 27, 1908, to filling two prescriptions for a man representing himself to be the claimant. The ingredients of one indicate it was for indigestion, and the other seems to have been for nervous trouble.

Dr. C. C. McDowell says in deposition of August 6, 1908, that he treated soldier November 4 and 7, 1903, for "indigestion, constipation, etc.," and that he does not remember of having treated him for any other trouble.

Dr. W. L. Nicholls testified, August 25, 1908, that he had known soldier about one year, and that he treated him twice for stomach trouble, nervous indigestion, or nervous dyspepsia. He also testified that soldier had a weak and irregular heart from anemia.

Dr. John G. Hollyday testified, August 22, 1908, that he treated claimant shortly after he returned from the Army, but that he had no definite recollection of what the treatment was for.

Dr. H. C. Moses testified, September 14, 1908, that he was acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, from 1898 to 1903, and that on return from Manila to San Francisco, aboard transport *Sherman*, about September, 1902, he treated claimant for rheumatism and heart complications.

Dr. Wilfred M. Barton testified, December 15, 1908, that in 1903 he treated claimant for heart trouble, diarrhea, and dysentery; that he did not have valvular disease of the heart, "but the pulse was weak, rapid, and irregular"; that he treated him in October and November, 1905, July and August and October and November, 1906, January, 1907, and March, 1908, for rheumatism, which deponent attributes to diarrhea; that soldier had trouble with his bowels, and there were remnants of dysentery during 1907 and 1908. Deponent also says he treated soldier in 1903 and 1904 for hemorrhoids, and that he is not sure whether he treated claimant for heart trouble after 1904.

Fred J. Koch testified, December 14, 1908, that soldier complained of rheumatism, diarrhea, or dysentery when he returned from the Army, and that he walked with a cane.

A. Engle says in deposition of December 14, 1908, that he first met claimant in 1903 or 1904, at which time he complained of suffering with his back and stomach and also rheumatism.

Fred W. Schulz says in deposition of December 15, 1908, that he knew claimant from boyhood to the time he enlisted; that he met him about six months after he returned from the Army, and that up to about a year ago he had seen soldier quite often. Deponent also says soldier's health was good when he enlisted; that when he met him after discharge "his stomach was all out of gear" and he complained of stomach trouble, rheumatism, and diarrhea.

Andrew Roden testified, March 13, 1909, he first met claimant during the summer of 1901 at San Francisco; that deponent was in the general hospital and met claimant on the grounds; that there were several hospitals, and he does not know which one claimant was in; that he did not know what was the matter with claimant, but that he limped, which indicated he had rheumatism; that when he next met soldier, in 1905, he still limped and "complained of one leg" and of rheumatism, also of stomach trouble and chills and fever.

John J. Carlin testified, March 15, 1909, that he first met claimant in 1899 in the Philippine Islands at Santa Mesa Hospital; that claimant was in the surgical and fever ward; and that while deponent does not remember what was the matter with him, cases of dysentery and typhoid malaria were sent to one section of said ward, and "his ailment must have been for some stomach or bowel trouble or some malarial fever condition."

Comrade William T. Baker testified, March 15, 1909, that soldier suffered from rheumatism and stomach trouble while in the service, and that he was in the hospital because of stomach trouble.

Dr. Frank Huwatcheck testified, March 27, 1909, that he was a member of the Hospital Corps from 1899 to 1902, and that claimant was sick in the hospital at Santa Mesa, P. I., in 1901, with malarial fever and complained of stomach trouble.

The records of the War Department do not show that claimant was treated for rheumatism while in the service, or that he was suffering therefrom at discharge. Alleged diarrhea, constipation, and disease of rectum have not been shown to exist in a ratable degree of disability since claim was filed. Claimant is only 10 pounds under standard weight.

Although Dr. H. C. Moses testified that claimant was treated in September, 1902, on transport *Sherman* for rheumatism and heart complications, there is no record showing treatment for either while in the service or since discharge until 1903, for heart trouble, and October, 1905, for rheumatism.

With the bill petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly incapacitated for performance of manual labor and possesses no property of any kind and has no income.

The allegations of the soldier are fully sustained by the testimony of many lay witnesses.

Dr. F. K. Nichols testifies, February 3, 1914, that upon examination of the soldier that day he finds him to be suffering from severe form of disease of heart, and the action and functions of the heart are deranged materially, and, further, that he suffers from arthritis, which has seriously affected the left knee.

Several other doctors have testified that the soldier suffers from rheumatism and a resulting disease of the heart and is wholly unable to perform manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 9973. Samuel P. Shupe, R. F. D. No. 2, Hagan, Va., served during the War with Spain in Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from July 10, 1898, to March 15, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1279307.)

The records of the War Department fail to show he was ever reported as being sick or received any medical treatment for any cause. When discharged he claimed to be suffering from no disability. The medical officer by whom he was examined certified that an enlarged left testicle was all the disability found to then exist.

On January 9, 1902, he filed a claim for pension based on rupture from fall in the service. He also alleged that a very slight varicocele, which had existed prior to enlistment, had been made a great deal worse by service. This claim was rejected May 28, 1903, on the ground the rupture or varicocele existed prior to enlistment, as shown by the statements of the soldier.

He again filed a claim April 10, 1907, based on rupture, diabetes, disease of the stomach, and general debility. This claim was rejected as to diabetes and disease of stomach on the ground of no disability in a ratable degree since date of filing the claim. Former rejection as to rupture was adhered to. The claim was reopened by order of the Commissioner of Pensions September 25, 1912, as to diabetes and disease of the stomach, for the purpose of a test medical examination. The claim was again rejected after this test examination, because there was no ratable degree of disability shown from diabetes and disease of stomach, the former rejection as to rupture being still adhered to, and not reopened. No appeal was taken.

The claimant alleges that he did contract diabetes and disease of the stomach while in the service and still suffers from same. He further alleges that he incurred rupture in the service, and maintains that he never stated, or at least never intended to state, that rupture existed prior to enlistment; that what he stated in regard to same was that if it existed prior to his enlistment it was so slight as to be unknown to him, for he never knew it; and he believes the rupture was incurred in service and line of duty as a result of the fall.

Comrade G. R. Hylen testifies, May 1, 1912, that in Porto Rico the soldier was sick and suffering for at least two months with diabetes and stomach trouble; that the corporal wished the soldier to go to a hospital, but he would not do so; that affiant knows it was disease of stomach, because he could not eat and retain food, and he was in this condition at discharge.

M. G. Ely and William H. Kinser testify, November 29, 1907, that they knew the soldier before enlistment, and he was then well and strong and free from disease, but when he came home from the service he appeared to be sickly and complained of rupture and something wrong with his "waterworks," and he has never been stout and strong since service, and is not able to do much work.

Dr. W. L. Spencer testifies, December 21, 1907, that he treated the soldier in July and August, 1903, for varicocele; that he knows the soldier was well and strong prior to service, but since service has given indication of one suffering from nervous trouble and he has been unable to do very much manual labor; that affiant advised an operation for varicocele, but the soldier refused to have one.

The soldier was examined by a board of surgeons September 3, 1902, who reported him as 24 years of age, 5 feet 6 inches in height, and weighing 130 pounds. General appearance, fairly good; rupture or varicocele present on left side; tumor 2 inches in diameter; wears no truss. Rate, ten-eighteenths. Diabetes as shown by urine. Rate, eight-eighteenths. No other disease or disability.

Another board, who examined him June 5, 1907, found physical condition about the same and suggested six-eighteenths for rupture and four-eighteenths for disease of the stomach.

The last board to examine him, September 4, 1912, stated that they could find no disability existing except a small varicocele, for which they rated two-eighteenths.

With the bill the petitioner states in an affidavit that he is in part unable to earn a living by manual labor because of liver and stomach disease and diabetes, rupture, and varicocele, and that he possesses no property and no income.

Dr. J. S. Ewing testifies that the soldier suffers from an enlarged liver and indigestion.

The soldier, in an additional affidavit, states that he suffers constantly from some chronic form of stomach disorder, which doctors have treated him for since discharge, but without giving him relief, and that he also suffers from rupture which he contracted in the service.

The Member who introduced the pending bill has written two letters to the committee. In one he states that he has known the soldier for years and knows he has no property or income. In the other he states that the soldier is a man of good character, who would make no statement which was not true; that the soldier had good health prior to his service and ever since his discharge has been in poor health, and the boards of surgeons who have examined the soldier have so found in connection with his claim for pension.

From the evidence submitted to your committee in this claim it is believed that it is safe to accept the disability from which the soldier now suffers as due to service, and a pension of $12 per month is therefore recommended.

H. R. 10169. Edward F. Smith, of Washington, D. C., served during the War with Spain in Company H, Third Regiment United States Artillery, from March 12, 1900, to January 25, 1901, when transferred to Company C, which afterwards became the Fifth Battery, United States Field Artillery, from which he was honorably discharged March 11, 1903, at the expiration of his term of enlistment. Prior to this the soldier had served from February 14, 1892, in Companies B and F, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, to February 3, 1897, and from March 11, 1897, to March 10, 1900, in Companies A and L, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry. He also served from June 11, 1903, to October 20, 1904, in Company K, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, and was honorably discharged under the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 16, 1890. (I. Ctf. 1148609.)

The records of the War Department show that during his several services the soldier suffered from several attacks of malarial fever, two of which were severe and resulted in anemia; that he repeatedly was treated for diarrhea, bronchitis, and gastritis, rheumatism, dyspepsia, some bruises, and slight injuries. He was a victim of constantly recurring boils and stomach disease. All were incurred in line of duty. The only sickness he suffered from during the whole time which was not due to line of duty was an acute attack of gonorrhea in 1892, for which he was treated several days.

He first filed a claim for pension May 2, 1905, based on malarial poisoning, rheumatism, gastritis, indigestion, cramps, and bloating, which was rejected on March 16, 1907, on the ground of no disability in a ratable degree therefrom. The claim was reopened and allowed July 30, 1908, from date of filing at $6 per month for gastritis. The rejection of other disabilities was adhered to.

A claim for increase filed May 10, 1909, was rejected October 19, 1909, on the ground that no increase in disability was shown to exist.

He again filed a claim for increase August 13, 1912, and also claimed for disease of the stomach and intestines, as results of gastritis. This claim was rejected on October 23, 1912, on the ground of no increase in disability from gastritis, for which pensioned, and that disease of the stomach was covered by the rate for gastritis. As to disease of the intestines, that was held not to be a result of gastritis, and not otherwise shown to be due to service origin. An effort to have the claim reopened was denied November 16, 1912.

The record in the War Department is sufficient to show any disability the soldier may have suffered from since discharge from malarial poisoning, rheumatism, diarrhea, disease of the stomach, and gastritis could safely be accepted as having been due to the service.

Dr. Joseph S. Wall testifies, August 10, 1907, that during the previous two years the soldier had been under affiant's professional care for chronic gastritis and malaria, the malaria being of a severe and stubborn form, and that during these two years the soldier has been incapacitated for the performance of any manual labor. This doctor, in 1909, again certifies to about the same physical condition of the soldier from same disabilities.

Dr. Louis Kolipinski testifies, November 5, 1912, that from May, 1912, to date, the soldier has been under his professional care, and during that time suffered from repeated attacks of diarrhea, flatulence, tenderness of the stomach and bowels, vomiting, and inability at times to evacuate the bowels, and is now confined to bed and unable to perform any kind of manual labor.

The soldier has been examined by four boards of surgeons. The first, July 10, 1905, reported aged 38, height 6 feet, weight 172 pounds. They found no evidence of any rheumatism; no rate. No evidence of malaria or malarial poisoning; no rate. They found liver and spleen enlarged and tender, and rated eight-eighteenths for disease of digestive organs (gastritis). No disease of rectum or any other disability, and no vicious habit.

The next board, July 15, 1908, found substantially the same physical condition and rated six-eighteenths for gastritis and nothing for anything else.

The board that examined him October 1, 1909, found the only disabilities existing were those due to gastritis and intestinal catarrh, and rated ten-eighteenths for those two together and treated them as one and the same. The Bureau of Pensions refused to regard them as one and the same.

The last board to examine the soldier, September 25, 1912, found enlarged liver and spleen, with tenderness of same and stomach, but otherwise the digestive organs were in normal condition; rate eight-eighteenths. They found no other disability existing and specifically refused to rate for anything except gastritis.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that by reason of gastritis of the stomach he is wholly unable to perform any manual labor and owns no property except about $500 worth of household goods, and no income other than the $6 per months pension.

The testimony of lay witnesses and statement of the Member who introduced the bill sustain the soldier's allegations as to property, and the Member further states that he is informed the soldier is now confined to bed in hospital.

Dr. Charles H. Waters testifies, December 15, 1913, that the soldier is under his professional care and treatment for chronic gastritis, thickening of the walls of the stomach, and such obstruction of bowels that an operation seems advisable, and affiant believes there can be no doubt the present condition is due to disease contracted in his military service.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $6 to $17 per month is fully warranted in this case, and so recommended.

H. R. 10173. George B. Wessner, of Emporia, Kans., served during the War with Spain in Company D, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from August 5, 1899, to May 8, 1901, when he was honorably discharged. He was 18 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1407069.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"August 29 and 30, 1899, diarrhea; October 9 to 14, 1899, diarrhea; December 17 and 18, 1899, lumbago; December 18 to 30, 1899, gastro-enteritis and malarial fever; December 30, 1899, to January 9, 1900, malarial cachexia; January 10 and 11, 1900, diarrhea; January 26 to 31, 1900, diarrhea; July 5 to 8, 1900, diarrhea; August 7 to 9, 1900, diarrhea. No additional record found."

When discharged he claimed to be suffering from no disability, and the medical officer who then examined him certified no disability or disease existed.

He filed a claim for pension November 19, 1912, based on malarial poisoning and diarrhea, and alleged that tubercular disease of the spine had resulted from these diseases, and all were due to his service. This claim was rejected on March 12, 1913, as to malarial poisoning and diarrhea on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from the same since date of filing the claim; and as to affection of the spine, on the ground that the same is not due to service origin, as shown by the claimant's own statements that it first appeared in 1912. No appeal was taken.

Dr. William Muffet testifies he treated the soldier during July, August, and September, 1901, for malaria and diarrhea.

Dr. J. F. Osborn testifies he treated the soldier in the years 1902 and 1903 for malaria and diarrhea.

Dr. G. W. Smith testifies he treated the soldier in the year 1904 for chronic form of malaria, with enlarged spleen and liver and other symptoms and results of that disease.

Dr. F. A. Endall testifies he treated the soldier during the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911 for chronic malaria, and that during this time the soldier began to suffer severe pain in his back, which finally resulted in tubercular trouble of the spine, and he now suffers from this, and from all of the said diseases he is wholly disabled, as far as any manual labor is concerned.

Dr. J. P. Kaster testifies that the records of the hospital of which he is surgeon show the soldier came there in August, 1912, complaining of great pain in the back and side, and upon examination it was found that he was suffering from curvature of the spine, produced by tuberculosis, and affiant is not able to state the cause or origin of same, but that it wholly disabled him for all manual labor.

The soldier was examined January 15, 1913, by a board of surgeons, who report him as 31 years of age, 5 feet 11 inches in height, weight 175 pounds. They found chronic form of malarial poisoning with its usual results, enlarged spleen and liver—rate six-eighteenths. They found history of a chronic form of diarrhea which had resulted in chronic constipation, with inflamed rectum and piles—rate six-eighteenths. They found a pretty severe curvature of the spine, due to tuberculosis of the spine, and rated this disability alone at $24. All other vital organs were normal. No vicious habits. They state in conclusion:

"This claimant is so disabled from malarial poisoning, rectum disease, result of chronic diarrhea, and curvature of spine as to be incapacitated for the performance of any manual labor, and is entitled to $30 per month."

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that by reason of malarial poisoning, diarrhea, and its results, and curvature of the spine, all of which he believes are due to his service, he is wholly unable to earn a living by any kind of manual labor for himself, wife, and three small children, and that he possesses no property and is in debt and has to ask help of his relatives.

The testimony of several witnesses sustains the petitioner's allegations as to owning no property, having to ask help of relatives, and being unable to earn a living.

The physical condition of the soldier is clearly shown by the report of the board of surgeons of the Bureau of Pensions and medical testimony on file in his claim, which has hereinbefore been referred to.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that a pension of $30 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 10193. William H. Franks, of Laurence, S. C., served in the Regular Establishment, Troop F, First Regiment United States Cavalry, from September 18, 1855, to September 18, 1860, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. He was 18 years of age when he enlisted. (I. O. 6343.)

It does not appear from the records of the War Department that the soldier was ever reported sick or received medical treatment for any cause during his service.

The first and only claim filed by the soldier in the Bureau of Pensions was filed August 27, 1902, under the acts of July 27, 1892, and

June 27, 1902, which relate to Indian wars. This claim was rejected March 18, 1903, on the ground the soldier rendered no service in any of the Indian wars covered by the provisions of said laws.

The records of the War Department do show that the organization of which soldier was a member did serve from May to September, 1860, in campaigns against the Indians in Kansas and Indian Territory. Such service is not, however, covered by the Indian wars pension acts cited.

The soldier is manifestly unable to establish a claim for pension under the general laws, and consideration of the pending bill is requested under the committee rule relating to such cases.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is eighty-odd years of age, very feeble wholly unable to perform any manual labor, and believes his disabilities, particularly piles, are the result of his five years' service in the United States Cavalry. He further states that he has no property or income.

Several witnesses testify the soldier is very old and very feeble, and is wholly unable to perform any kind of labor, and that he possesses no property or income.

The Member who introduced this bill (Mr. J. T. Johnson) writes the committee that he personally knows the soldier is so old and feeble as to be unable to perform any labor, and is a great sufferer, and can not possibly live but a short while, and possesses no property or income. Mr. Johnson invites attention to a letter of February 16, 1914, from a Mr. R. C. Grat, stating the soldier is fast growing more and more feeble and suffers so from piles that much of the time he can not sit down and is liable to die now at any time.

From the evidence submitted in this case it is believed that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 10357. John Hodges, of Pascola, Mo., served in the Regular Establishment in Company B, First Regiment United States Infantry, from February 6, 1867, to February 6, 1870, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. (I. O. 731425.)

The records of the War Department show that during his service the soldier suffered from an attack of yellow fever and another attack intermittent fever, and also diarrhea.

September 30, 1889, the soldier filed a claim for pension based on yellow fever, rheumatism, and disease of the lungs. This claim was rejected June 12, 1900, on the ground of no ratable disability from alleged diseases since date of filing.

He again filed a claim August 3, 1912, based on the same disabilities, and also bronchitis, as an additional disability. This claim was rejected as to rheumatism and bronchitis and disease of the lungs on May 28, 1913, on the ground of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, showing origin of said disabilities in the service at discharge, or for about nine years thereafter, and the inability of the claimant to furnish competent evidence to connect any disability from which he now suffers with his military service, either as a result of yellow fever or otherwise. No appeal was taken.

Three comrades testify the soldier suffered from yellow fever during the service, but mention no other disability. The record shows he did have an attack of yellow fever.

S. Russell testifies he has known the soldier since before his service; that when he came home from the service he was suffering from rheumatism and has since continually suffered therefrom.

Elizabeth Greenwell and Maria Hodges testify the soldier suffered from time of his discharge until 1891, when they ceased to see him, with rheumatism, and much of the time he was rendered almost helpless thereby.

Carroll Allen testifies that he knows the soldier suffered from 1871 to 1884 from rheumatism and disease of the lungs.

Dr. W. C. Moxey testifies he treated the soldier in 1879 and 1880 for rheumatism and pneumonia.

Dr. E. J. Ganse testifies he treated the soldier from 1884 to 1887 for rheumatism and disease of the lungs.

Dr. J. L. Curd testifies to treatment in 1891 for rheumatism and chronic bronchitis.

Dr. A. F. Bugg testifies to treating the soldier in 1903 and afterwards for rheumatism and disease of the heart and lungs. He also later testifies again to the same effect.

Dr. C. A. Wells testifies that when he examined the soldier in 1907 he found him suffering from articular and muscular rheumatism and disease of the heart and lungs.

When the soldier was examined by a board of surgeons January 15, 1890, the only disease or disability that they could find from which he then suffered was disease of the lungs, for which they rated four-eighteenths.

He was again examined, and for the last time, by a board of surgeons November 1, 1899, who report him as 53 years of age, 5 feet 5 inches in height, and weighing 136 pounds. This board states that the soldier appears to be in good physical condition; they could find no evidence of rheumatism, disease of the heart or lungs, or any other disease or disability, and state that he is not entitled to any rate of pension.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is 67 years of age and wholly unable to do any kind of work because of rheumatism and bronchial or lung disease, and possesses no property other than $50 worth of personal property.

His statements are sustained by testimony of lay witnesses.

A physician testifies, February 14, 1914, that the soldier suffers from articular rheumatism and bronchial and lung disease to such an extent as to be unable to perform any manual labor and is very poor financially.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 10952. Otho E. Gepler, of Albany, Ind., served during the War with Spain in Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, from April 29, 1898, to October 23, 1898, when honorably discharged. He afterwards again served in the band, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from July 14, 1899, to June 18, 1901. He was 33 years of age at enlistment. (I. O. 1321575.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment during the first service:

"May 25 to 29, 1898, exhaustion, fatigue; June 27 to 30, 1898, adenitis right inguinal glands; July 7 to 13, 1898, bubo d'embles (no urethritis); July 18 to 20, 1898, urticaria. All foregoing in line of duty. Nothing additional found."

He was not recorded as sick and received no medical treatment for any cause during the second and final service.

When discharged from the first service he claimed to be suffering from bruised groin. The medical officer who examined him states:

"I find an open ulcer resulting from an abscess in right inguinal region, the result of saddle bruise; a scar below this shows a former opening. The wound discharges pus. No other disability found. This not caused by venereal disease."

When discharged from the final service the soldier claimed to be suffering from no disability, and none was found to exist by the officers by whom he was examined.

July 27, 1904, he filed a claim for pension based on injury to the right groin, resulting in an abscess, caused by a horse falling on him while in drill, and nasal catarrh contracted in the Philippines. This claim was rejected February 3, 1906, as to abscess of groin on the ground of inability of claimant to show continuance from date of discharge from the first service and through period of second service and since; and as to catarrh on ground of no record or medical evidence showing existence in service, at date of discharge, and since. Both disabilities were also rejected on the further ground of no disability therefrom since date of filing the claim. No appeal was taken and no effort was made to reopen the claim.

Byron L. Bargar, who was captain of the soldier's company—D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—testifies July 24, 1904, that at Camp Thomas, Ga., the soldier was lame and appeared to have been in some way injured about the hips. Affiant did not see the accident when he was hurt.

Comrade Fremont Kipp testifies, July 28, 1904, that the soldier's horse fell on him in drill at Camp Thomas, Ga., in June, 1898, and he was for some time on sick list as a result thereof.

W. G. White, who was captain of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, testifies, July 28, 1904, that he knew the soldier before his enlistment in Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry; that affiant recalls the fact that the soldier, during the service in Georgia, came to see him and was then lame and used a cane, and said he was excused from duty because of this disability.

John E. Stick, who was a comrade of the soldier in the last service, in band, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, testifies, October 28, 1904, that the soldier during this final service suffered from catarrh, as shown by sniffling and repeated headache, and trouble with his ears, complaining of sensation of thumping in same.

Mark M. Young, who was also a comrade in the soldier's final service, testifies, October 24, 1904, that the soldier during this service suffered from catarrh, which was shown by his red nose and sniffling and bad breath.

He was examined by a board of surgeons October 26, 1904, who reported him as 40 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches in height, and weighing 180 pounds. The board states as follows:

"In right groin are two small scars, one about 1 inch above and the other three-quarters of an inch below Ponpart's ligament, each being about one-half inch in diameter, considerably depressed, slightly adherent but slightly dragging. No evidence that spermatic cords or other important structures in groin were injured. No special tenderness of cords or testicles. Testicles normal in size. No limitation in motion of right leg and no atrophy. No evidence of disability from injury of right groin. No rating.

"Nasal catarrh: Mucous membrane of nasal fossæ and also of the pharynx slightly inflamed, hypertrophied, with slight catarrhal exudate evident. Eustachian tubes pervious. Hearing normal. But slight disability from catarrh of nose and pharynx; rate two-eighteenths."

The board found all other vital organs in normal shape except the heart, which was somewhat dull, a little weak, and irritable. They rated this four-eighteenths. No vicious habits, past or present.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating that by reason of piles, fistula, and disease of the rectum he is partially disabled for the performance of any manual labor, and that he has no property and no income.

John B. Stick, who was a comrade in service with the soldier, testifies that the soldier suffers from bowel and rectum diseases to such an extent as to often confine him to his home, and that in the service he complained of stomach disease.

There is lay testimony showing the soldier has no property and suffers from disease of the stomach and rectum.

Two physicians testify that the soldier is now and has been for several years suffering so severely from disease of the stomach, bowels, and rectum, with piles, hemorrhoids, and fistula, as to be much of the time unable to do any kind of manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers were incurred in service and line of duty, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 11057. Addison B. Burroughs, of Hackensack, N. J., served during the War with Spain in Company G, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, from May 2, 1898, to June 29, 1898, when transferred to the Second Battalion, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, from which he was honorably discharged November 17, 1898. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. O., 1352041.)

The records of the War Department fail to show he was ever reported as sick or ever received medical treatment while in the service.

When discharged he claimed he was suffering from malaria. The medical officer by whom he was then examined certified no evidence of any disability could be found to then exist.

He filed a claim September 5, 1906, based on malaria which he claimed he had contracted in August, 1898, in the service. This claim was rejected November 14, 1913, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability shown to exist since date of filing from malaria. No appeal was taken.

Aside from the statement of the soldier that he had contracted malaria in the service, no evidence was filed.

He was examined by a board of surgeons July 2, 1913, who reported him as 36 years of age, 5 feet 10 inches in height, and weighing 157 pounds. The board found the heart, bowels, and stomach normal, except some evidence of constipation. They found the skin a little pale and spleen enlarged, and he was then having chills and fever. They rated malarial poisoning at six-eighteenths. They also found joints somewhat enlarged and some rheumatism, rate six-eighteenths. No other disability found, and no evidence of vicious habits.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is in part incapacitated for the performance of manual labor by malarial poisoning, and the only property he owns is wearing apparel worth $50.

A. T. Holley, who was first lieutenant of the soldier's command, testified February 2, 1914, that he has known the soldier for years and has been in almost daily contact with him since his discharge, and knows he has suffered from constipation and what doctors called malaria, and has been often disabled thereby, some of the time in bed from same, and still suffers from the said disease.

Dr. Frank H. White testified January 31, 1914, that the soldier returned from the service in 1898 suffering from malaria; soon had fever

which ran into typhoid form; and after this the malaria became chronic and returned every spring up to 1906, when he applied for pension for said disability; that the teeth became decayed from this disease and mastication of food was not proper and digestive organs thus became affected; in 1907 chills did not return, but constipation and piles continued, and in 1908 chills returned and returned each year up until 1912, when affiant ceased to be the soldier's attending physician; that the soldier is not able to earn a living, and is a sufferer from chronic malarial poisoning and also suffers from rheumatism.

Dr. J. V. Bergie testifies, February 5, 1914, that he treated the soldier during 1911 and 1912 for chronic malarial poisoning and rheumatism and general weakness, and he is unable to do any real hard work because of said disease.

Dr. Frank Hopkins testifies, January 24, 1913, that the soldier was under his treatment at Hot Springs, Va., from March 5 to April 8, 1913, for chronic rheumatism.

While none of the witnesses specifically so state in terms, yet the tenor of their testimony indicates that the soldier has no property or income.

From the evidence submitted, your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

H. R. 11269. James C. Hudson, of the Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C., served in the Regular Establishment, in Company C, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, from August 27, 1890, to December 14, 1891, when honorably discharged. Prior to this term of service he had served continuously in the Regular Establishment from July 12, 1875. (I. C. 870687.)

It is shown by the records of the War Department that during his long service the soldier was treated for rheumatism, abscess, diarrhea, dislocation of the shoulder, wound of the right finger, sprain of the right leg, headache, dyspepsia, deafness, disturbed vision, and vertigo. This disturbed vision and vertigo finally developed into Menier's disease. The rheumatism was constant and became chronic while he was in the service.

He filed a claim for pension December 18, 1891, based on vertigo, disturbed vision, numbness, and weakness. This claim was allowed at $24 per month from date of filing for Menier's disease to cover all of the disabilities alleged. He now receives a pension of $24.

Four claims for increase in rate have been rejected on the ground the rate of $24 per month fully covers the degree of disability existing. The last rejection was September 29, 1913, on medical ground in which the medical examination was denied.

A board of surgeons which examined the soldier on March 10, 1892, states that he is so disabled by Menier's disease (vertigo and disturbed vision) as to be entitled to $24 per month, and from rheumatism as to warrant two-eighteenths. No other disability was found to exist. It was upon the strength of this report that a pension of $24 was allowed.

A board of surgeons, March 21, 1894, reported about the same physical condition of the soldier.

June 7, 1905, a board states that the soldier should have $30 per month for pension cause—Menier's disease—and that he was totally incapacitated for any manual labor.

On January 31, 1911, a board reports that the soldier was so incapacitated by Menier's disease as to require attendance of another person and recommended the rate allowed by law for persons in such condition. This rate is $50 per month when attendance, as in this case, is periodically required.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit, in which he states that he is totally disabled for any kind of labor and has no property.

The Member who introduced the bill assures the committee that the soldier has no property and his only income consists of his $24 per month pension.

A physician testified, August 18, 1913, in the claim in the Pension Bureau, that he has treated the soldier for the last 15 years, and all of that time he has suffered so from Menier's disease as to be unable to perform any kind of labor, and the disease is constantly growing worse and will continue to do so.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that an increase from $24 to $30 per month is fully justified, and so recommend.

H. R. 11434. Wiley Gullett, of Sallyersville, Ky., served during the War with Spain in Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, from April 23, 1901, to April 22, 1904, when honorably discharged at the expiration of his term of enlistment. (I. C. 1161920.)

The records show that during the service he was treated at various times for constipation, measles, vaccinia, rheumatism, mumps, orchitis (of nonspecific or venereal cause), and malarial fever.

He filed a claim for a pension January 29, 1908, based on left varicocele and impaired vision of the left eye. The claim was allowed for left varicocele at $6 per month from date of filing, which he now receives. That part of the claim based on impaired vision of the left eye was rejected on the ground that the evidence fails to show same was due to service origin.

He filed a claim for increase of pension April 30, 1912, which was rejected September 12, 1912, on the ground of no increase in the disability.

Dr. Cisco testified, June 7, 1912, that the varicocele of the left testicle was causing constant enlargement thereof with great pain and tenderness and to a great extent prevented manual labor of any kind—in his opinion fully two-thirds.

A board of surgeons who examined him, August 14, 1912, states as follows as to varicocele:

"Varicocele: Marked varicocele of left side, rate four-eighteenths; small varicocele of right side, rate two-eighteenths."

This board states that they found no other disability existing of any kind.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly unable to earn a living by manual labor by reason of varicocele of the left and right sides, and all the property he possesses consists of about $100 worth of personal property, and his only income is the $6 per month pension he receives.

Lay witnesses sustain his allegations.

Dr. Dixon testifies, January 20, 1914, that the soldier suffers from a left varicocele, which is in such enlarged condition as to prevent manual labor.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that an increase from $6 to $12 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 11639. Ernest W. Hilliard, of Bristow, Okla., served during the War with Spain in Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, from June 17, 1898, to January 31, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (I. C. 1296664.)

The records of the War Department fail to show the soldier was ever in the hospital for medical treatment during his service, but do show he was reported as sick in quarters July 16 to 20 and August 6 to 11 and 15 to 31, 1898, the nature of illness not stated.

When mustered out he stated that he was not suffering from any disability, and the medical officer who examined him certified he could find none existing.

He filed a claim for pension February 17, 1903, based on rheumatism, malarial poisoning, and alleged resulting disease of the spine. This claim was rejected February 1, 1904, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability since filing the claim from rheumatism and malarial poisoning; and as to disease of the spine, on the ground it is not accepted as a result of rheumatism or malarial poisoning.

After filing considerable testimony seeking to have the claim reopened, and being denied such action, an appeal was taken, and in a decision of February 28, 1905, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior sustained the bureau action.

The soldier was examined at his home by a board of surgeons (composed of one physician) July 13, 1903, who reported: Age, 27 years; height, 5 feet 8 inches; weight, 125 pounds. As to rheumatism, this physician stated there was no evidence thereof except a stiffened and tender condition of some of the muscles of the back about the spinal column. As to malarial poisoning, he states:

"Skin pale and sallow, tongue coated and fissured, tender over gastric region, spleen normal, liver extends up to sixth rib and slightly below costal cartilage, and he claims to suffer from bowels being constipated and then lax; much diarrhea."

As to disease of the spine, he states:

"No history or evidence of vicious habits (venereal disease). This claimant is so disabled by caries of spine (tuberculosis), the probable result of exposure in military service, as to require the frequent and periodical attendance of another person and is entitled to $50 per month."

A great deal of evidence was filed in the claim and secured by means of special examination to show the soldier contracted rheumatism and malarial poisoning in the service and suffered from same until he filed the claim for pension. A great deal of this evidence related to the fact that the soldier soon after service began to suffer from trouble with his spine and has since suffered from same. It is shown the spinal disease is tubercular and disables the soldier completely, as far as any kind of labor is concerned. He does not claim same was contracted in the service per se, but alleges it is a result of either rheumatism or malarial poisoning or both, and that they were contracted in the service.

The Pension Bureau rejected the claim as to rheumatism and malarial poisoning, not because they were not contracted in the service but because no disability from same was shown to exist. The tuberculosis of the spine was alleged as a result of the other disabilities and was rejected because it could not be accepted as a result of either.

In appealing the soldier did not appeal as to stand taken as to spinal trouble not being a result, but confined his appeal to the fact that a ratable degree of disability did exist from rheumatism and malarial poisoning.

The material portion of this decision is herewith set forth, as it so clearly shows the view of the claim taken by officials of the Interior Department:

"While this claim was pending considerable testimony was taken on special examination, and there was also considerable evidence offered by the appellant's attorney in the form of ex parte affidavits. These, however, refer to soldier's condition due to the cause not here considered and the soldier's condition prior to his enlistment.

"Under the claim in question soldier was examined at his home by the president of the Butler (Pa.) board of examining surgeons July 13, 1903, less than five months after the date of filing the claim under consideration. The certificate of this examination, while it shows that soldier was then totally disabled, also clearly shows that his condition was not due to the causes alleged, except the cause which is not here considered. There was no evidence whatever of the existence of rheumatism, and, except for the statement that soldier was sallow, that his tongue was coated and fissured, there was no evidence of the existence of malarial poisoning either at the date of this examination or previous to said date. The certificate shows that soldier's spleen at the date of this examination was apparently normal, as was also his liver. Claimant alleged that his bowels were constipated and lax alternately, which, however, is not necessarily a result of the cause alleged, but in the present case, the soldier being confined to his bed, it is probably due to this fact.

"The only evidence offered to show the existence of the causes here considered consists of the affidavit of one of the soldier's attending physicians, in which he stated that subsequent to the soldier's return from the service he (affiant) treated the soldier for the alleged causes. This affiant in the same affidavit, however, stated that later the trouble for which he was treating soldier developed to be tubercular.

"The question of continuance of the alleged disabilities since soldier's discharge, however, need not be here considered under the grounds assigned for the action appealed from. The certificate of examination upon which said action was based clearly shows that a ratable degree of disability from these causes had not existed since the date of same."

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating he is wholly disabled for the performance of any labor by reason of tuberculosis of the spine and bones of right leg and hip, and that he possesses no property or income.

Several lay witnesses testify the soldier is now confined to his bed all of the time by tuberculosis of the spine and leg, and has no property and is a public charge, and physicians state his case is hopeless and incurable; that he has been in bed since February, 1912, and has a wife, who owns a small house which is not worth, with the lot upon which it stands, over $250, and she, with her own labor and the $10 per month given by the county, supports herself and soldier.

Two doctors testify the soldier is now, and has been for over two years, bedridden and will never recover, as his disease (tuberculosis of spine and hip and leg) is incurable; that he is totally helpless, and these physicians state it as their belief that the disease is a result of his exposure in tropical climate in his military service.

From the evidence submitted it is believed that a pension of $24 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 12964. Martha R. Aliwein, Lebanon, Pa., served as a nurse in the Regular Establishment, United States Army, from December 1, 1904, to April 14, 1908, when discharged at her own request. She is spoken of by the Surgeon General of the United States Army as a com-

petent woman, who gave satisfactory service in every respect. She served at San Francisco, Cal., from 1904 to January, 1906, and in the Philippines from January, 1906, to October, 1907, and again at San Francisco, Cal., from October, 1907, until her discharge.

As there is no law by which she could be pensioned as a nurse for service rendered by her (the only law as to pensions for nurses is limited to those who served during the Civil War), she has filed no claim in the Pension Bureau, and consideration of the pending bill is requested under the committee rule (No. 2) as to cases where it is manifest that no pensionable status under existing law exists.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she served from December, 1904, to April, 1908, and of this time she served for nearly two years in the Philippines, and that she finally was discharged because her sight had become so impaired that her eyes required treatment.

Drs. Glininger and Gerberich and 16 other witnesses state that prior to her service in the United States Army the petitioner was a woman of good health, but since discharge she has constantly suffered from some impairment of sight until now she is totally blind.

Maj. Slact states that during 1906 and 1907 the petitioner served under him in the United States Army Hospital in Manila, P. I., and was most efficient and faithful in the performance of her duties.

Brig. Gen. W. S. Edwards states that the petitioner nursed his wife in sickness in the Philippines and was a most competent, faithful, and efficient Army nurse and was so esteemed by all who knew her.

"JANUARY 23, 1914.

"This is to certify that I first saw Miss Martha Allwein, of Lebanon, Pa., on May 2, 1908. She then gave the following history: Age, about 30; occupation, trained nurse on service in the United States medical service in the Philippines, but home on leave. She was referred to me by my colleague, Dr. Francis M. Perkins, of 1428 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa., who stated that eight years previously he had treated her at St. Agnes Hospital (Philadelphia) for an intraocular inflammation of the left eye, that left her without useful vision in that eye."

During 1906 she went out to the Philippines, and soon after noticed that what vision she had previously had had begun to grow dim, and that the pupil of the left eye had begun to take on a grayish hue. Since then the left eye has become entirely blind and the pupil became a whitish gray. The condition at the time I saw her was one of complete mature cataract in the left eye, the pupil being 5 mm. in diameter and showing no reaction to light. There was not even light preception in the left eye at this time. The tension of the eye was normal. There were no inflammatory adhesions between the iris and the lens. The right eye was normal in all respects. She consulted me in reference to the removal of the cataract in the left eye, and I informed her that there was some slight risk that in the healing of the left eye the right one might become compromised and even seriously infected, but that the risk was a slight one.

She decided to accept the risk, and on May 20, 1908, Dr. Perkins and I did an extraction of the cataract in the left eye under local anesthesia. The cataract came away easily but left behind it a dense opaque capsule, which was finally drawn out through the wound by means of very gentle traction. Atropia was immediately instilled and the eye closed. Two days later she was ordered a course of calomel (usual treatment) and the atropin used three times a day, as the eye was red and angry and not healing properly. On June 1, 1908 (10 days later), the eye was fairly quiet, and she was allowed to go home to keep up her treatment. Ten days later she returned with signs of beginning sympathetic opthalmia in the right (normal) eye.

In spite of vigorous treatment from the start with mercury, iodides, soda salicylate (1 grain for every pound of body weight in 24 hours=170 grains daily), sweats, inoculations (and enucleation of the offending left eye at the Polyclinic Hospital on June 17, 1908), the vitreous humor of the right eye clouded up and the right optic nerve inflamed and swelled up frighffully (4 D). She was seen in consultation with Dr. de Schweinitz, but all the suggestions as to additional treatment were unavailing. She gradually lost the major portion of the vision in her right (remaining) eye, and when last seen, August 22, 1908, could count hand movements at 2 meters.

In our judgment Miss Allwein's left eye developed its cataract because of the exposure to the unusual glare of the sunlight in that region. Moreover, we believe the resistance of her right eye was also somewhat compromised by the same circumstances, and that in consequence of her residence there for almost two years she was much more liable to develop the horrible postoperative sequalæ that presented in her case.

To-day, despite good surgery and most thoroughgoing exhaustive treatment, she is a blind woman, and that in all likelihood because of the debilitating effect of the Philippine climate upon her health.

WENDELL REBER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of January, A. D. 1914.

CHAS. IRWIN, Jr., *Notary Public.*

The Member who introduces this bill (Mr. KREIDER) assures the committee, by letter, that the petitioner is absolutely without property and dependent on charity.

The Surgeon General of the United States Army reports, March 2, 1914, as follows in this case:

"Prior to her appointment she was examined, on September 15, 1904, by a civilian physician in Philadelphia, who reported her free from disability. She was examined by an Army surgeon at the general hospital, San Francisco, on December 4, 1904 (eight days after her appointment), and a report of this examination shows that she had practically no vision in her left eye, and also shows a mitral systolic heart murmur. A report from the hospital, dated December 31, 1904, shows 'vitreous opacities in left eye of seven years' standing.' A report of examination, dated December 20, 1905, shows 'left eye has convergent squint, cloudiness of vitreous humor. Vision, counts fingers at distance of 2 feet.' Her examination, made November 26, 1907, by an Army surgeon at the general hospital, Presidio, San Francisco, shows a complete cataract left eye; only perception of light."

From the evidence submitted, your committee is of the opinion that the disabilities from which this nurse now suffers may be safely accepted as due to the service, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $50 per month.

H. R. 13328. Mary A. Dow, Haverhill, Mass., mother of William C. Dow, deceased, who served during the War with Spain as captain, Forty-third Regiment United States Infantry. He was appointed first lieutenant, to date from August 17, 1898, promoted to the rank of captain on November 8, 1899, and discharged because of disability December 31, 1900. He had prior to this service served in Company F, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, from April 28, 1898, to April 28, 1899. He was 33 years of age at the first enlistment. (M. O. 1018359.)

The soldier died March 26, 1901, of disease of the lungs, which the evidence shows was contracted in the service. He had a claim for pension pending at the date of his death, which was allowed from date of filing until date of death, and payment under same was made to his widow at the same time as first payment to her in her own claim as the soldier's widow, which was allowed from date of the soldier's death, and which she received until her own death on December 16, 1906.

After the death of the widow the mother of the deceased soldier filed a claim for pension, November 25, 1913, which was rejected on the ground of no title, as the soldier left no widow surviving him.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit stating that she is 74 years of age; that her husband is dead; that she possesses no property and has no income; that she is the mother of the deceased soldier; that the soldier left a widow, who died December 16, 1906; and that the soldier left no minor child.

The evidence filed with the committee shows the husband of the petitioner died on October 5, 1913; that the widow of the soldier died December 16, 1906; that the soldier left no minor child; that the petitioner is the mother of the deceased soldier; and that she possesses no property or income.

The fact that the soldier obtained two life insurance policies in favor of his mother may be accepted as evidence of his desire to contribute to her support. His father lived until after the soldier died, and actual support of his mother by the soldier was not necessary.

The mother never received any money from the life insurance policies, as the widow survived the soldier.

From the evidence submitted it is believed that a pension of $12 per month is fully warranted, and it is so recommended.

H. R. 13518. Catherean Mihalak, Grand Rapids, Mich., widow of Frank Mihalak, deceased, who served during the War with Spain in Troop M, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, from May 14, 1898, to April 30, 1899, when honorably discharged. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (W. O. 963423.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"August 24 to 30, 1898, fever; no additional record found."

It is shown that he was reported as sick in quarters October 31, 1898. He was furloughed for 30 days, and it was extended for an additional 30 days because he was sick, the nature of the illness not being given.

The soldier applied for a pension March 22, 1910, based on malarial poisoning and disease of the kidneys and bladder. He was allowed a pension from date of filing the claim for malarial poisoning at $10 per month. That part of the claim based on disease of kidneys and bladder was rejected on the ground of no ratable degree of disability therefrom since date of filing the claim.

The soldier died on January 22, 1911, from tuberculosis, and his widow filed a claim for pension April 22, 1911, that was rejected May 27, 1911, on the ground that the fatal tuberculosis of the soldier was not a result of malarial poisoning, for which he was pensioned, and there was no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence, to show origin of same in the service and continuance thereof since his discharge.

The soldier never alleged tuberculosis as a disability in his own claim filed about one year before his death from that disease. The evidence and testimony filed by him does not seek to show tuberculosis was contracted in the service, existed at the date of his discharge, and continued to exist thereafter. He was examined by a board of surgeons May 4, 1910, who reported his lungs were normal and free from disease. They, however, stated that he appeared to be in poor health and weakened physical condition, but they attributed this to malarial poisoning and its resulting disease of stomach, liver, and spleen; rated at fourteen-eighteenths. They also found disease of nose and throat; rated at eight-eighteenths.

The widow attempts, by the testimony filed in her claim, to show that the soldier was suffering from tuberculosis when he was discharged, and from then to his death. This testimony, however, like that in the claim of the soldier, simply shows that the soldier was never, after his discharge, a well and strong man, and that his health gradually gave way, but there is no convincing testimony that would show origin in the service of tuberculosis, unless the medical witnesses who testify diagnosed as malarial poisoning the disability which was in truth not malarial poisoning, but tuberculosis. This has happened in cases where no test was taken of sputa or blood bacilli.

The evidence shows the petitioner is the lawful widow of the deceased soldier, and that she has two minor children, born April 19, 1901, and July 23, 1906.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which she states that she possesses no property and has to earn her own living and that of the two minor children by working in a factory.

Several lay witnesses sustain her allegations as to owning no property and working in a factory to support herself and two little children.

A physician testifies that since the death of the soldier the widow has had to undergo an operation for removal of diseased ovary and suffers now from nervous disorder following this trouble, and is really not able to perform any work, although she has to do so for support of herself and two small children.

From the evidence submitted your committee is of the opinion that a pension of $12 per month and $2 additional for each of two minor children until they reach the age of 16 years is fully warranted, and they so recommend.

H. R. 13933. Pawil Wiczlas, of 217 Berry Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., served during the War with Spain in Companies D and C, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, from June 20, 1894, to June 19, 1899, when honorably discharged from Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, to which he had been transferred, on surgeon's certificate of disability. He was 21 years of age at enlistment. (C. Cff. 1064304.)

The records of the War Department show the following treatment:

"October 11 to 14, 1894, abrasion right foot; September 29 to 30, 1897, myalgia; January 27 to February 8, 1898, under observation suspected mental aberration, no evidence of same discovered; November 18 to December 7, 1898, malaria; January 5 to 11, 1899, malaria; January 22 to February 2, 1899, malaria; April 26 to May 3, 1899, malaria; May 23 to June 20, 1899, malaria; discharged June 20, 1899, on surgeon's certificate of disability, due to malarial poisoning. No additional record found."

He filed a claim for pension on June 24, 1899, based on deafness of the left ear, malarial fever, rheumatism, disease of the heart and stomach, dysentery, and typhoid fever. This claim was rejected May 14, 1900, on the ground of no ratable degree of disability from any of the alleged disabilities since the date of filing the claim. The claim was reopened as to malarial poisoning and allowed at $6 per month therefor from date of filing, to terminate August 14, 1900, the dis-

ability having ceased to exist. Former rejections as to all other alleged disabilities were adhered to.

His name was restored to the rolls June 24, 1904, at $6 per month from date of dropping for malarial poisoning, and he is now pensioned at that rate.

On November 21, 1913, he filed another claim, this time based on ruptured and varicosed veins of the right leg and deafness of the right ear, the result of sunstroke. This claim was rejected February 16, 1914, as to rupture of the veins of the leg on the ground that same was not incurred in service, but according to the soldier's own statement was developed some time after his discharge. Former rejection as to deafness was adhered to.

The claim for malarial poisoning was filed only a few days after discharge because of said disability, and was allowed for same, and he now receives pension therefor.

Dr. H. S. Shlevin testifies, August 17, 1901, that he has treated the soldier since about the time of his discharge, and he has suffered from malarial poisoning, rheumatism, disease of the heart and stomach, dysentery, and deafness of the right ear so as to be unable to do any manual labor. This physician states substantially the same thing in an affidavit in September, 1903, and May, 1904, showing medical treatment for said disabilities up to May, 1904.

Three lay witnesses in affidavits executed in August, 1901, state the soldier has suffered since his discharge from all of the disabilities alleged by him. These affidavits are of the machine-made type, as shown by the fact that the language in each is exactly the same, and the writing is that of one person.

He was examined by a board of surgeons August 14, 1900, who report him as 28 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches in height, and weighing 154 pounds. This board could find no disability from which the soldier suffered, other than deafness of the right ear, for which they rate six-thirtieths.

Another board of surgeons March 25, 1902, could find no disability other than a slight tenderness of the muscles (rheumatism), for which they rated two-eighteenths, and some emaciation and slight indication of malarial poisoning, rated at four-eighteenths, and slight deafness of the right ear, no rate.

A board on November 18, 1903, found malarial poisoning warranted a rating of six-eighteenths, and deafness of the right ear rated at six-eighteenths. No other disability found. They state that the soldier has the appearance of being a sick man—malarial poisoning and its results.

The last board, which examined him May 20, 1904, states that they found chronic malarial poisoning and resulting disease of the liver and stomach, and rated it at eight-eighteenths; and rheumatism for which they rated eight-eighteenths. They found no other disabilities.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states that he is wholly disabled for the performance of manual labor, possesses no property, and has no income other than his pension of $6 per month.

Lay witnesses sustain his allegations.

A physician testifies March 2, 1914, that the soldier suffers from chronic malarial poisoning, varicose veins, deafness of the right ear, neurasthenia, and severe headaches, and is unable to earn any wages by labor of any kind.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that an increase from $6 to $24 per month is fully warranted, and so recommend.

H. R. 15947. William E. Howell, 312 South Grier Street, Williamsport, Pa., served in Regular Establishment, in Company H, Thirteenth United States Infantry, from July 20, 1894, to October 19, 1897, when honorably discharged. He also served during the War with Spain from April 27, 1898, to October 29, 1898, in Company B, Twelfth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. He was 21 years of age at first enlistment. (I. O. 1211717.)

The records of the War Department show he was sick in hospital in first service from December 10, 1894, to January 9, 1895; nature of illness not given, but it is stated that it was contracted in line of duty. In second service it is shown he was treated for opthalmia of right eye, headache, and chronic nicotine poisoning, due to excessive use of cigarettes and not in line of duty.

When discharged from the last service he claimed he was suffering from rheumatism of right knee. The medical officer by whom he was then examined certifies he could find no evidence of rheumatism.

On November 11, 1898, he filed a claim for pension based on rheumatism contracted while in final service during War with Spain, and disease of eyes contracted during the first service in Regular Establishment, United States Army. This claim was rejected July 20, 1902, on grounds of no record, medical or other satisfactory evidence of origin in service of rheumatism. He waived the claim as to disease of eyes prior to this adverse action.

August 11, 1902, he filed a claim based on disease of eyes, which he claims he contracted during first service in the Regular Establishment, United States Army. This claim was rejected January 5, 1904, on ground of no ratable degree of disability shown since date of filing the claim. No appeal has been taken to either action of rejection, but one effort was made to reopen the last claim rejected, but this effort was denied on ground evidence offered failed to warrant such action.

Milton Tharp, who was second lieutenant of soldier's company during the War with Spain, testifies the soldier suffered from rheumatism during that service, and also complained of heart trouble.

Comrade J. L. L. Hill testifies that during service in War with Spain soldier complained of trouble with his eyes, which were inflamed.

W. H. Spangler testifies that he is a druggist, and that since 1898 he has continually sold the soldier remedies for the disabilities he complained of, particularly disease of heart and rheumatism.

Dr. B. F. Waggenseller testifies, in 1899, that soldier was then suffering from rheumatism and disease of the heart, and had suffered from same since discharge from the United States Army a short while before.

The soldier was examined August 16, 1899, by a board of surgeons, who reported age 25 years, 5 feet 6½ inches in height, weighing 149 pounds. This board found he was suffering from chronic rheumatism, with tender and stiffened muscles, tendons, and joints, and rated it six-eighteenths. They also found disease of heart existed, and rated it six-eighteenths.

Another board, on November 1, 1899, reported soldier suffering from rheumatism and rated it at eight-eighteenths; disease of heart, rated eight-eighteenths; and disease of eyes, eight-eighteenths. They found no other disability existing.

The soldier files an affidavit with the committee, in which he states that he is partially disabled for performance of manual labor by disease of eyes, heart, and rheumatism, and that he owns no property except household goods worth less than $100.

The Member who introduced the bill, Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania, assures the committee in a letter that he knows the soldier possesses no property.

The following medical evidence has been filed with your committee:

"This is to certify that William E. Howell, of Williamsport, Pa., is suffering from the following ailments: Rheumatism, right side affected; cause probably due to exposure, as change in weather affects him. Dampness or rain much worse, causing chill followed by slight rise in temperature.

"Inflammation of joints especially worse at time of rain or dampness. Unable to work at that time; too much pain.

"Myopia, right eye prominent and pupil enlarged; can not see object at a distance with right eye; probable cause, concentration of vision of right eye.

"Have been Mr. Howell's attendant for past seven years. Graduated, Chicago, Ill., 1901.

"D. W. LONGWELL, M. D."

The foregoing was duly executed before an authorized notary public.

From the evidence submitted your committee believe that the disabilities from which the soldier now suffers may be safely accepted as due to service, and recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of $12 per month.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WILLIAMS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4023. An act to correct the military record of Waldo H. Coffman.

The message from the Senate also announced that the President of the United States had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 9, 1914:

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property.

On March 12, 1914:

S. 48. An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

On March 13, 1914:

S. 3742. An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York.

On March 14, 1914:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon; and

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56).

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4145) to authorize the Government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R.

## PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I want to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was on objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Now I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. LANGLEY. And I the same, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOULDEN. And I make the same request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, there are some remarks which I had intended to submit when the river and harbor bill would be considered by the House. But finding that there would be much demand for time then, my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY]

very kindly reserved 10 minutes of the time now under control by him. I shall therefore submit those remarks now.

I am reminded of the fact that whenever a Member or Senator says anything in behalf of good roads there are people who say: "Oh, yes; of course he is a good-roads man. Everybody is for it. Therefore he is for it." Now there is a state of affairs which may well engage the attention of every Member of this body at this time. It is this: The people of the United States not very much longer will submit quietly to the appropriation of such stupendous sums of money as are being carried by bills which we are from time to time passing, almost to the entire neglect of the good-roads system of the United States. I went into the room of the Committee on Appropriations a while ago and asked for a document, Senate document 382, of the Sixty-second Congress. A resolution was introduced a year or two ago in the Senate asking that the Secretary of the Treasury furnish a statement of all the expenditures of the Government for river and harbor work up to that time, and it turns out that up to March 6, 1912, $627,098,236.05 had been appropriated by this Government for rivers and harbors, exclusive of the Panama Canal.

Now, we are proposing to authorize the expenditure of $25,000,000 to improve our roads system. There is just as much sense, Mr. Chairman, in appropriating $627,000,000 in digging out rivers and harbors and $25,000,000 for the improvement of public roads as there would be if one of the States in the Union should appropriate $627,000,000 for the building of a great university in that State and $25,000,000 for a public-school system. [Applause.] We have got the system reversed. The larger of these appropriations should be devoted to the improvement of our public-roads system, and we should then decide what we ought to do by way of river and harbor improvement.

Now, within the next few days we are going to vote $43,000,000 to dig out rivers and harbors, and, speaking for myself alone, I will say now if there is a roll call, I am going to vote against the pending river and harbor bill. [Applause.] I will do that, not because I am opposing the improvement of the river and harbor system of the United States, but I am going to vote against the bill as a protest, because I believe we are appropriating entirely too much money for that purpose, compared with the amount we are hoping will go to improve our road system.

I find also in this document that we have appropriated up to that date $241,165,000 in digging the Panama Canal. That is all right. Every American is proud of that great achievement. But think how many Americans would have received direct benefit if we had taken that $241,000,000 and distributed that amount among the States to be used in cooperation with the States in the improvement of the good-roads system of the entire United States.

Now, the keynote of the Wilson administration was sounded when that great man—and I use the term "great man" advisedly—went before the American people and told them that if given the power, we proposed to try to subserve the interest of the average man. Too long, he said, have powerful special interests engaged the attention of the committees of Congress. In no better way can we carry out that pledge to subserve the interests of the average man—the man, for instance, who lives on the rural free-delivery route in the country—than to address ourselves to this great task of first improving the rural postal highways throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

I suppose, of course, I shall be charged wtih demagoguery in making this speech here to-day, but I care not the snap of a finger if the charge is made. I am absolutely in earnest, Mr. Chairman, in the efforts that I make here to draw the attention of this House and of the country to this great problem. I have lived in the country and know what bad roads mean. You may talk about the trust problem, Mr. Chairman, you may talk about the tariff problem, and you may talk about all these other problems that are engaging the attention of the House, but there is no problem of greater importance than the one I am speaking of here and now.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I heartily agree with the gentleman in what he is saying. He is making a splendid speech. I have been making the same line of argument for good roads for about 10 years down in Kentucky, and some of the Democrats laughed at me when I contended that the Government of the United States ought to help build good roads and predicted that it would finally do so.

Mr. POU. I am sorry that there was any Democrat in Kentucky who laughed at the gentleman when he made that sort of an argument. They should have applauded him. There was a Roman orator, Mr. Chairman, who kept crying, "Cartago delenda est," and there came a time when Carthage was destroyed. We shall keep up the fight for this legislation until we win. I do not know why this little pittance of $25,000,000 is being held up in the Senate. I hope the bill will pass; but sooner or later the men who are indifferent about this great question will find that the people are thinking about it, and if they do not fall in line and help, the time will come when the people will make them fall in line or send somebody here who will, because I believe they are in dead earnest about this great question. [Applause.] Of course I could stand here and talk all day on this proposition. At any rate, I imagine I could. I do not propose to take up more time of the House. I merely want to announce that I am against the river and harbor bill, and shall vote against the one which we are soon to consider, and shall vote against the next one, and shall keep on voting against all subsequent river and harbor bills so long as I am a Member of this House, until at least a corresponding amount of money is expended in the building up of a good-roads system in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from North Carolina yield?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think that both rivers and harbors and roads should be improved?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think the Government is able and that the people are willing to do both within reasonable limits?

Mr. POU. I do. I believe that heartily, and I believe that more money is going to be yielded by the income-tax law than the experts in the beginning thought would be yielded. But the point I am making is this, that we are beginning at the top, whereas we ought to begin at the bottom; that when we appropriate $43,000,000 for the digging out of rivers and harbors, the benefit that the average man gets from it is so remote that it is almost impossible to calculate it. The great railroad arteries that lead to the cities, first of all, are fed by the country roads. The country road goes to the railroad. Then the railroad goes to the city, and the great trunk line goes to the seaport. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I hope that gentlemen will consider this question very earnestly. We may as well be candid. The advocates of Government aid for good roads, if necessary, will perfect an organization here which may block the passage of future river and harbor bills unless justice is done on this great question. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the Shackleford good-roads bill, as we call it, has not been already passed by the Senate. I wish I did know. I hope they are hard at work over there trying to make it a better bill; but this I do know, if some good-roads bill is not passed by this Congress there are a lot of people in the United States who are going to demand to know why.

Of course, this is not a party question, but I want to see my party make an honest effort to subserve the interest of the greatest number of people, and, in my judgment, the best way to do this at this time is to send the Shackleford bill to the President for his signature, and then follow it up in the next Congress with a similar bill carrying an appropriation twice as large. Talk is cheap, Mr. Chairman. The time for action has come. When many of you go back home to your constituents asking for nomination or election you will find a lot of people who are going to ask you what you did to promote the building of good roads. Let us be in a position to tell them that we did something more than talk for it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we are wasting half a billion every year killing stock and tearing up vehicles forcing them over bad mud roads. This huge sum, which would dig the Panama Canal almost twice, could be saved to the American people every year if we would provide for improving our roads system. A bad road is the most expensive luxury a people ever indulged in. And a small sum, comparatively speaking, will save this half billion every year.

I am afraid somebody is at work against the Shackleford bill. Earnest is my hope that any effort to sidetrack that measure will not be successful.

When this Congress has passed into history and we recall the list of great measures which have been written on the pages of our law books, when we contemplate that list of measures not excelled by the record of any Congress since the foundation of the Government, there will be no law which will so directly benefit the great army of toilers who live outside the towns as

the legislation for which I am pleading here and now. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, every time a pension bill has come before this body it has been the signal for bombardment all along the line of the southern Democracy. Every man who has introduced a bill for or cast his ballot in favor of a pension bill has been accused of doing so to curry favor with his soldier constituency, and yet these same Representatives would wish you to believe that they were not playing politics and did not make these speeches opposing every pension bill to be circulated in their districts as the most toothsome campaign diet that could be placed before their constituency.

These long speeches of the opponents of these pension bills have no influence upon me and will not deter me in the least from doing what I believe to be my duty.

I come from a State that had only been admitted to the Union 12 years before the war; a State whose sturdy citizenship is, and was at that time, composed of many nationalities—English, German, Scandinavian, Irish, French, and Pole, but all Americans in the broad sense of loyalty to a common country.

Wisconsin did nobly in the war for the preservation of the Union, and the part she took in it is deserving of the gratitude of every citizen of the Republic, North or South. She was nobly and honorably represented in every important battle; her soldiers were conspicuous in every campaign; nearly every fleet carried them to the assault, every southern prison confined and starved her sons, and every hospital nursed her sick and wounded troops. She sent forth nearly 100,000 of her patriotic citizens in the pride and strength of their young manhood to breast the storm which threatened to disrupt and destroy the Union of our States.

Many of this valiant army never returned to home and loved ones. They sealed their devotion to country with the crimson current of their lives. They fell on mountain tops and in the valleys, on the oceans and the rivers.

The men that returned to their homes found the flourishing business that they left destroyed, the farm grown up to weeds, their former vigorous health impaired.

I have heard eminent doctors say that the health of every man who remained any great time in the service was more or less impaired by the hardships he was obliged to encounter.

As old age creeps on the old wounds and disabilities weigh heavier, the fight for life becomes harder. God pity the man or woman that in their old age has to battle with poverty in addition to the disability of poor health.

When these men enlisted at their country's call, the property owners of this country made a solemn pledge that the soldiers, their widows and orphans, should be the chosen wards of this Government. This Government has tried to keep this sacred pledge, but nevertheless, with the high cost of living, with the infirmities of age, there are many of the most meritorious cases where the pensions received are wholly inadequate.

The State of Wisconsin has been very generous with its soldiers. It has established a beautiful home near Waupaca, Wis., where the veterans and their wives can live. The National Government contributes $3 per capita for the soldiers in this home in addition to what the State contributes, but this has been inadequate, so that the trustees of this home have been obliged to make a rule that every inmate, as a condition for entrance, has to give up a portion of his pension to the support of this home.

I believe that this Government should make a sufficiently large appropriation so that every soldier could retain his pension to use for those things that are necessary for his happiness in his old age. I believe that every soldier that enlisted has made a sufficient sacrifice to entitle him decent and comfortable support during his declining years.

I do not believe that the Committee on Pensions will be intimidated by the attacks upon it made on this floor, and will continue to report favorably upon all meritorious pension bills, and will be generous with those men who have made such a sacrifice for their country.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the case of Parmelia I. Parris, widow of a veteran of the Mexican War, whose pension has been increased by this bill from $12 to $30 a month.

Mr. CALLAWAY. On what page of the report is that case?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. On page 13.

Mr. KEATING. A few minutes ago, while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was addressing the House, I endeavored to interrupt him in order that the facts concerning this case might be laid before the House, and during the colloquy that ensued I suggested that the gentleman was misleading the committee. I made that statement because I take it for granted that before a gentleman consumes the time of this House in discussing a measure before the House he has given that measure some consideration; and I could not understand how anyone who had read this bill and the accompanying report could make the statement that the gentleman made, that under this bill we were granting this woman two pensions. The fact is, as the bill makes very clear, the pension of $30 per month is in lieu of what she is now receiving.

She is now on the pension roll as the mother of a Civil War soldier and is receiving $12 a month. This bill will increase her pension to $30 a month.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman from Colorado explain this language of the report of the committee:

> The pending bill treats with the Mexican War claims, and the case is prepared to be considered as if she were now pensioned as the widow of a Mexican War soldier.

Mr. KEATING. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas has served too long in this House to imagine that we are about to pass the report. The House is considering the bill, and the language of the bill can not be misunderstood and should not be misconstrued.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will not criticize me very severely for following so distinguished a committee as the Committee on Pensions in their report.

Mr. KEATING. I wish the gentleman would always follow the Committee on Pensions; and when the gentleman reads from a report of the Committee on Pensions I wish he would do that committee the justice to read all of the report, which he did not do in this instance.

But now as to the facts in this case. This woman is the widow of a Mexican War veteran. She is entitled, under the general law, to $12 a month. It has been the practice of your Committee on Pensions to increase the pensions of widows of veterans of the Mexican War to $20 per month, providing the necessity for such increase could be shown to the satisfaction of the committee. We have made no attempt to conceal that fact. It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of this House. I stated it only a few weeks ago in response to a question propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS], and I assured him that if a bill which he was then discussing was referred to the committee, the pension of his claimant would in all probability be increased from $12 to $20.

In this case we are giving the woman $30 a month, and why? Because she not only gave her husband to his country in the Mexican War, but she gave her son to his country in the Civil War. The records show that her husband fought in the Mexican War, and that her boy died in the Civil War. Those facts were taken into consideration by the committee when it was passing on this bill. We felt that a woman who is now past 80 years of age, in straitened circumstances, whose husband fought under the colors in the Mexican War and whose boy died under the colors in the Civil War, was entitled to $30 a month from this great Government. I do not know how the constituents of the gentleman from Texas may feel about the matter, but I am quite willing to submit this case to my constituents in Colorado, and I know they will not criticize me and they will not charge me with an attempt to put my hand into the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Does any other gentleman want time?

Mr. DIES. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to discuss these pension cases in detail. I want to discuss this matter from the standpoint of the principle of legislation. I think, however, that the Congress of the United States has about abandoned principles of legislation and has gone into the question of distributing benefits to the different interests and organizations and individuals of this country who are sufficiently fortunate as to get the ears of Members of Congress who are willing to put in their time raiding the Federal Treasury.

I discussed the system of pensions for the soldiers in the Civil War and the Mexican War heretofore, and I would not come back to the House to discuss them now but for the fact that we are about to embark on a different system of pension legislation. We are now taking in those who served in the Spanish

War. Looking at the record of this, I see that there are 436,000 of those people, most of whom are now living. The bulk of them have wives or widows, or will have wives or widows, and we can depend on at least 436,000 of these people sooner or later to come for pensions.

Mr. Chairman, under the present law every man who was injured in the service during the Spanish War receives a pension. Every man whose health was impaired by service in the Spanish War receives a pension. The widow of every man who has died on account of injury from service in the Spanish War receives a pension, and the widow of every man who shall die from injury received during the Spanish War will receive a pension. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is as far as we should go.

But here is a proposition to pick out individuals in different localities and grant them pensions, while those with less gall or less political pull or less affidavit ability, though in the same condition, fail to connect with the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been my understanding that Democrats believe in equal laws, benefits, and opportunities for all the people. Here is a proposition to pick out Tom, Dick, and Harry from different sections of the country and grant them special benefits out of the Federal Treasury. I can not see any justification in that.

But that is not the only evil in it. Here are inducements held out to 436,000 people scattered from one end of the country to the other to besiege the Representatives in Congress to get a special benefit.

What will they do to get them? Get certificates from a doctor? Yes. There may be laymen that do not know that you can get certificates from doctors, but there is no lawyer who has had any considerable practice who does not know that doctors can be found that will give certificates. There is no man who has had experience in the courts of the country who does not know that you can get evidence that you have been injured in the service. They have got them in this bill, and there is not a member of the committee that will not say that they have not had certificates and affidavits that are false and claimants before the committee with perjured testimony. There is not a member of the committee who will say that they believe all the certificates of the doctors and all the evidence that have come before that committee.

It makes me sick to look at the pension rolls of the Civil War. I know there is perjury in the list. I know there are many men getting pensions who are not entitled to them.

Another proposition: Congressmen put in all their time in the distribution of special benefits, and they come in here every other Friday and take up the time of this House distributing special benefits. One-twelfth of the time of this House is taken up in determining whether Dick, Tom, Bill, Bob, and Sally shall have their allowance raised. It is a damnable outrage on the Federal Treasury, on the intelligent electorate of this land, on our time and energies, and it is a continuous strain on the resources of the country. [Applause.]

That is not all. The system by which this Government is distributing these benefits is all wrong. How do you get them? You get at the Congressman, get him to introduce a special bill, and drive him before the committee that distributes the special benefits. The committee determines whether or not that particular Congressman is asking for too many or too few bills. It is not a question of doing justice to the men who are claimants for pensions. Oh, no; it is not a question of the justice of granting a pension to the claimant. It is a question of whether the Congressman has a right to the pension.

Mr. Chairman, sooner or later this system must be abandoned, and then no man will be so poor as to do it reverence.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] was conducting one of these petty peculations through the House, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] was much wrought up because he had not been getting as many bills as had members of the committee. They never do. [Laughter.] He says: "Will the gentleman from Missouri explain how it is and why it is that the members of this committee have had 25 or 30 bills during the Congress while I have had only 5 or 6?" The gentleman from Missouri said if the gentleman from Kentucky would possess his soul in patience to the end of Congress they would do even-handed justice to him, because they were expecting to distribute these things equitably to all Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma to yield me some time.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes; I will give the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. On last pension day, when we had this question up, and we were complaining about this grievous outrage on the Federal Treasury, the morals of the country, and the time of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] said that he would like to have had some more pensions, but they said he had all he was entitled to.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me——

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; I will not pardon the gentleman. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I can not pardon a man who is one of these pension grabbers. I do not believe the Lord will ever pardon him, and I believe if the people understood this system of legislation they would not pardon him.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman did not let me finish my request. Then, if the gentleman will not pardon me, will he yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman did not correctly state what I said. I said I had secured the passage of all of the bills that I had been able to get considered by the committee, and I want to say now that I would have gotten more through if I could, and that I will get through all I can——

Mr. CALLAWAY. Why did not the committee allow the gentleman more?

Mr. LANGLEY. Because I do not expect to get more than my share of consideration. There are more than 400 other Members who have to be considered.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman probably got his share.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I did. And while I have the floor, if I have the voice—for it is evident that my throat is in such condition that I can scarcely make myself heard—I desire to say I thank God that I have had the privilege of passing as many pension bills through this House for the soldiers and their dependents as I have, and I am glad that I do not feel about these pension matters as does the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; the gentleman does not feel about it as I do, for I believe one old soldier is as good as another old soldier. I believe one man 80 years old is as good as another man 80 years old. I believe that one man penniless is as good as another man penniless, and I believe that if one man 80 years old and penniless, who served in the war, is entitled to a pension of $40 a month, every other man under this flag, under the same circumstances, is entitled to $40 a month. I believe if one nurse, as they have in this bill, blind from some cause, is entitled to a pension of $50 a month—a nurse during the Spanish War—every other nurse should have it. A nurse in the Spanish War is no more than a nurse in a hospital; they serve the sick as best they can, they usually give their entire time and energy, and they are usually devoted to the service in which they are engaged—if one nurse who is blind is entitled to a pension of $50 a month, every nurse who is blind is entitled to a pension of $50 a month.

They are going to propose pensions for all widows of these fellows who served in the Spanish War. I want to give you an instance that came under my direct observation. A fellow served in the Spanish War, went out at 21. He was gone in that service about 18 months. He never got out of the State of Texas. I have heard him say time and again that he appreciated that service of 18 months more than he did any other 18 months of his life; it was a great education to him; it was of great benefit to him. He traveled more than he ever traveled before or since in his life. He married about a year and a half ago, and about six months ago he died. Is there any reason why that woman should have a pension? There was never any danger to that man from the time he went into the service of the United States Government until he went out. He said himself that it was worth more to him than any other 18 months of his life. He traveled further than he ever traveled before, and he wore better clothes and ate better grub than he ever ate before or since, and he earned more money per month on an average than he had ever earned before or since. He lived for a time and then died, and here is a proposition to pension his widow—pension, pension, pension. Is there any equity in that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me five more minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Very well, I will yield the gentleman five minutes, but I ask him not to ruin us in those five minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, if we get these Spanish War veterans and their widows on the pension rolls, no man in this House will have children who will live to see the end of that list. The last pensioner of the Revolutionary War, I be-

lieve, played out year before last. [Laughter.] It will be at least 125 years from the end of the Civil War before we will see the last Civil War pension, and, Mr. Chairman, if we put these Spanish War veterans on in the same kind of way, it will be 150 years, because they are more learned in ways of holding on to pensions. You corrupt the electorate, you corrupt the citizenship. You hold out a temptation by providing, if they make a showing they can get a pension and they have got to have certificates from doctors, and you corrupt the doctors. They must have affidavits from their fellows, and you corrupt their fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am in hopes this House will not embark on this new scheme of legislation which will add to the enormous raid on the Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this observation with reference to the granting of pensions. The matter of the distribution of pensions is of economic value to the country. There have been times in this country when but for the pensions financial troubles would have arisen, but beyond and above that is a broader reason for them—that is, reward for services to the country. You know it is a general expression that "republics are ungrateful," and sometimes they have been so. I feel ashamed when I read the history of the American Revolution that the man who financed it, who put his name and his property behind that great cause and made it possible to keep the patriots in the field, died in prison for debt. I also feel ashamed when I read the history of George Rogers Clark, who gave to this country an empire, and in his declining years someone in Congress remembered his distinguished services and moved to give him a sword, and when the committee went to wait upon him he kept his seat, and the committee asked him if he did not have some response to make. He said, "No; take the trinket back and tell Congress when I needed a sword for my country I found one, but now I need bread"; and I want to say to this House the men who fought in the wars of this country should have a reward in their declining years. [Applause.] Every country that offers these rewards in any line prospers by those rewards. Napoleon recognized that when he instituted the Legion of Honor, a system of rewards to his soldiers for great achievements. Nor did he confine these rewards to the soldiery, but extended them to all pursuits in life. The fact that we have put into our Constitution a reward for inventions has given to the American people an inventive genius nowhere else to be found in all the governments of the world in any age in any clime. A system of rewards is wholesome for any country; it makes no difference what it costs. I was taught to believe like the gentleman who has preceded me, but when I understood the other side of the question bravely I have told those with whom I have stood in the past that I was mistaken, and I believe them to be mistaken as I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] is mistaken. We must give rewards to the old heroes who have fought for this Republic, and we must continue to give rewards for the old heroes who will fight in all the battles of its future. [Applause.]

I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been so much interested, especially in the distinguished oratory of our friends from Texas, that I concluded I would not say anything upon this subject, but my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], with his usual eloquence, has presented the matter in such a light that I thought it but right and proper that perhaps I should express myself upon this subject. This is my excuse for taking up the time of the committee.

First, allow me to say that I have no bills before the committee from my district and am not a member of it, but I want to compliment the members not only for this report but the care which they have shown in the others that have been submitted to this House. And I desire to compliment the committee upon doing an act that should meet the approval of every Member of this House. Less than two years ago they pensioned the widow of that brave and heroic Confederate officer who at Gettysburg on July 3, 1863, led that famous charge, Gen. George E. Pickett. He was also a veteran of the Mexican War, and what the distinguished gentlemen from Texas have said would apply to the aged widow of a most distinguished officer not only of the Confederate service but of the Mexican War. No one appreciates her pension more than that bright, noble woman. The committee undoubtedly in many other cases have had similar applications for pensions to consider.

This bill has 54 cases in it. It carries the enormous sum—and I know my friend from Texas will be somewhat surprised at this—the enormous sum of $9,228 yearly increase. I am sure it will not affect any of the good people in Texas or elsewhere to pay their proportionate share of this munificent sum.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is the first 50. Every two weeks there will be another bill to come in here.

Mr. GOULDEN. No; not every two weeks. The custom in the past has been one in a month or six weeks.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And when the news goes out over the country that there are 436,000 that are eligible and may get in, will they not increase until it will be $500,000 or $600,000?

Mr. GOULDEN. Not one bit of it. I think I can speak for the stirring patriotism of the young men of America, our sons, who so gallantly volunteered to carry the flag into Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, and say that they will answer now, as they did when they were mustered out of the service, the great majority of them at least, namely, "There is not a single thing the matter with us," although some of them were scarcely able to walk at the time they did so.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. With pleasure, always.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you not think that 90 per cent of the 436,000 would get pensions if they could get them.

Mr. GOULDEN. No. Emphatically no. I should hate to believe that of the brave young men who went to the front at the call of their country in 1898 that they so lacked in civic pride and patriotism. I should feel ashamed of the young men of the American people if they could be guilty of any such thing as that. [Applause.]

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GOULDEN. I yield to my friend always with pleasure.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you think that these brave young heroes that went to the Spanish War, or any of them, would present false affidavits, or perjured affidavits, and perjured certificates to the committee at present?

Mr. GOULDEN. No. Most emphatically no. I would not believe it. It is incredible.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would say to the gentleman that a member of the committee told me they looked with very grave suspicion on many of them.

Mr. GOULDEN. That might be true. If the gentleman from Texas, who perhaps was a Spanish-American War veteran, or should have been, would present affidavits to the Pension Committee, I have no doubt, even though he might happen to be a Member of Congress, they might look with suspicion on them. I would not, I can assure the gentleman of that fact.

Now, the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has alluded to a number of cases, and I have time to take up only two or three to which he called attention. The first of them is that of the brave Capt. Edward C. McDowell.

Mr. DIES. On what page is that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. How much more time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. About 18 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the chairman. In that case the man served more than three years not only in the Spanish-American War but in other places of the volunteer forces of the country.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thought the war lasted only about 30 days.

Mr. GOULDEN. Oh, no. The gentleman is evidently mistaken about that. I can very readily see the reason why he did not volunteer—because the war was too short to distinguish himself. It lasted more than a year, taking in the Philippine insurrection and Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. Four years.

Mr. GOULDEN. My friend from Colorado says four years; and as he was one of the brave boys at the time, he knows. This is the case of an old Confederate soldier who had courage enough and patriotism enough to volunteer in that war and to follow the old flag for one year and one month, and now, because he is over 75 years of age and in need, the committee recommend giving him a pension of $24 per month. My friend from Texas thinks it is an undeserving case. Now, I really do not believe he thinks that.

There are one or two other cases I wish to refer to. Here is one of a widow, over 80 years old, of a Mexican War veteran. Her son was a volunteer in the Civil War and was killed in battle October 5, 1864. And this is simply changing the amount which she has been receiving from a Civil War pension of $12 a month to that of a Mexican War pension of $30 a month, following the death of her husband in 1887. Now, objection is made. I do not know why, because my friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] is usually accurate on everything except on pensions.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The only reason for pensioning this lady is that she is 80 years old, the mother of a fellow who died in the Civil War, and the widow of a person who died in the Mexican War.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is right. Do you not think that is sufficient claim on a grateful people?

Mr. CALLAWAY. If it is, every woman who is the mother of a boy who died in the Civil War and the widow of a man who died in the Mexican War ought to have a pension of $12 a month, had she not?

Mr. GOULDEN. By all means. Every one of this class should be pensioned if in needy circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I have only time and the desire to occupy the attention of the committee for the consideration of just one more case, and that is to be found on page 76.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look on page 29, he will find another case.

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I suggest to the gentleman to look at page 29, H. R. 3311, the case of Martella M. George. Does the gentleman think under any conceivable rule that could possibly be adopted by the committee a man that had the war record that this man had in the Spanish-American War could leave a widow or a mother or children or anybody else who ought to have a pension on his account?

Mr. GOULDEN. In this and other cases I yield to the superior wisdom and judgment of the Committee on Pensions, without going into a long history of that and other items in this bill.

Mr. HOWARD. That is a very fine way of dodging.

Mr. GOULDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will refer to the case on page 76, as my time will not permit me to enter into a discussion with my friend from Georgia. It was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] as H. R. 12964. This is a most meritorious case, and I happen to know something personally about the case. I have not the time now to read the history of it, but here is a woman completely blind, whose blindness undoubtedly originated in the Philippine Islands, where she served as a trained nurse under the Government. She was a trained nurse there for four years, and I know, as a fact, that she returned from the Philippines practically blind. I know further that she is blind to-day and that she is in need. Therefore I want to say that this is a most worthy case and one that I congratulate the committee on having reported favorably.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. When this good woman went into the service she was examined, and the report shows that she had practically no vision in her left eye, and her right eye was seriously affected. Yet my friend thinks she lost her sight in the service.

Mr. GOULDEN. I do. I knew her before she went to the Philippines.

Mr. GORDON. Was she blind?

Mr. GOULDEN. No; not before she went to the Philippines.

Mr. DIES. I understand she lost her sight long after she returned from the Philippines by reason of an operation.

Mr. GOULDEN. She was not blind when she went into the service, but practically so when she was sent home.

Mr. DIES. The evidence shows she was not blind when she returned until after she had undergone an operation.

Mr. GOULDEN. I take my own personal knowledge of this case as being superior even to the report of the Surgeon General.

Now, taking it all in all, this bill presents a list of cases of men and women whom this House can very well indorse. I believe it to be in the interest not only of good government, but also in the interest of rewarding those who have so faithfully served the Government in the past, and I believe if this Nation is to be preserved and our institutions are to be maintained we must show proper appreciation of those who are willing to sacrifice their lives on the altar of their country. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to make any remarks upon the pending bill, but as a member of the Committee on Pensions I feel that I should say something regarding the work of that committee and, in a way, defend its action and defend this bill.

I do not claim for the Committee on Pensions that it is infallible. In fact, no committee is infallible. I do say, however, after close association with my colleagues on the committee, that no body of men are more earnest in their work or more anxious to do the right thing, and when there is any doubt we naturally sympathize with the applicant. As you all know, the cases which we take up are those that do not come under the general pension laws. These are cases where soldiers or widows can not entirely prove their claim to the satisfaction of the Pension Department.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. I decline to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. I have only five minutes. The evidence filed in support of these private pension bills is carefully examined, and, I believe, taken as a whole, the committee needs no apology for the bills that are reported favorably. Many claims that are unjust are refused. Certainly not all the bills that are introduced and that come before the Committee on Pensions are passed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not hold any brief for doctors and nurses, but I want to say here that there is no class of people that I have more confidence in and hold in higher regard than the physicians and nurses of this country. And, speaking for my own people and for the doctors of Pennsylvania, I do not believe that our doctors would give perjured or false testimony to enable anyone to get a pension. As for the doctors of Texas, I can not speak. In fact, I know very little about Texas, but I am learning some things from the men who are sent here to represent that great State. It has been my former experience in a legislative body, and it is borne out here in Washington, that the men who are crying the loudest about the raids on the Treasury and the amount of money that is expended are the same men who are wasting hours and days of the valuable time of this great Congress in a useless discussion of unimportant matters. As for me, instead of continually speaking on the floor of this House, I am willing to save that time, which is at a great expense to the country, and allow the money to go to soldiers and sailors who fought for their country and to their widows. [Applause.]

I agree fully with the remarks that were made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], and I know that I am representing the wishes of my constituents when I advocate just and fair pensions to the men who enlisted in the service of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in view of the fact that H. R. 12964, granting a pension to Martha R. Allwein, has been mentioned a number of times in these discussions, I think it is only right and proper that I should make a statement regarding it.

In the first place, reasons have been given by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as to why these pension bills are brought here. As to those charges I want to plead "not guilty." There is absolutely no politics, no farming out, in this proposition, whatever. Miss Martha R. Allwein, the beneficiary of this bill—and I say this frankly—has no connection with me in any way, political or otherwise. As far as I know the people of her entire relationship are Democrats.

Mr. GOULDEN. Correct,

Mr. KREIDER. I do not think there is one in the entire family that supported me for Congress, and if I should run again I know of no one in her entire family relationship who would support me.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will permit, right there, I wish to say that when they failed to support the gentleman they did not know him, but now that they know him and know he is capable of representing a great district in Congress, I think I am quite safe in saying that they will favor him hereafter. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. I want to say that I think the gentleman is incorrect when he states that this woman's eyesight was defective when she entered the service.

Mr. DIES. That fact is stated on page 77 of the report.

Mr. KREIDER. I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman who makes that affidavit on page 77 swears that the first time he saw this woman was in 1898. I want to call attention to the fact that she volunteered and entered the service in 1904; that she was four years in the service—two years of which was spent in the Philippine Islands, during which time this cataract in the eye developed; and this operation was performed after she had been honorably discharged from the service at her own request for the express purpose of having an operation performed on the eyes, with the hope and belief that the other eye might be saved; and this affidavit to which the gentleman has referred shows that the party making it swears he did not see her until the 2d day of May, 1908.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, my friend is talking about one thing, and I am talking about another. I am talking about the report of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, in which he says that a report of this examination shows that she had practically no vision in her left eye, and also she had a mitral systolic heart murmur.

Mr. KREIDER. When was that?

Mr. DIES. This report is dated March 2, 1914.

Mr. KREIDER. It shows that she had no vision practically when she left the Army.

Mr. DIES. If my friend will indulge me, the full report says:

Prior to her appointment she was examined, on September 15, 1904, by a civilian physician in Philadelphia, who reported her free from disability. She was examined by an Army surgeon at the general hospital, San Francisco, on December 4, 1904 (eight days after her appointment), and a report of this examination shows that she had practically no vision in her left eye.

Mr. KREIDER. I am not questioning the good faith in which the report was made, but I think there is a mistake in that report. It is not reasonable to suppose that any Army officer would accept as a nurse for the United States Army a woman whose eyesight was so defective "that she had practically no vision in her left eye," or that after it had been discovered she would be kept in the service for four years and sent to the Philippine Islands, probably the worst place on earth for anyone with defective eyesight. Nor would anyone with defective eyesight accept service in these islands.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Only for a moment. I have only five minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I wish to ask him the same question that I desired to ask the gentleman who preceded him, whose name I do not know, and no one around me seems to know.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS].

Mr. THOMAS. There are about 50 pensions granted in this bill. I wish to ask how many of those go to members of the Pension Committee?

Mr. KREIDER. I do not know. I am not a member of the Pension Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. KREIDER. I want to say——

Mr. GORDON. Will you answer this——

Mr. KREIDER. No; I refuse to yield now. I want to say that this pension business should not be looked upon from the standpoint of politics or favors. The Government is to-day soliciting men to enter its service; and I, as a private individual, want to go on record as being in favor of Government liability as well as employers' liability. I have favored such a law all my life, and I believe the Government ought to take care of those who are injured while in the service of the Government or who from any cause lose their earning capacity while in the employ of the Government, whether it be in the Army or elsewhere. I believe it is no more than right that the Government should take care of its employees the same as private individuals or corporations. This woman has been made the object of an attack which is altogether due to the fact that the gentlemen are not familiar and do not understand the facts in the case. She is a woman as honest as the day; a bright, keen, intelligent woman, who is absolutely blind, and blind as the result of her service to her country. She is helpless. Her father and mother are both dead. She is without a cent to live on, and is being supported by her sister, whose husband earns his living by manual labor. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS], I have asked the members of the Pension Committee sitting around me if they have any claims in this bill. I wish to say that I have not had in this Congress a report of a pension claim from this committee. Mr. KIRKPATRICK has none in this bill; neither RICHARDSON, KEY of Ohio, DERSHEM, GRIEST of Iowa, AVIS, WALTERS, nor MACDONALD. Four of the committee—KEATING, SMITH, KIESS of Pennsylvania, and DALE—have one each in this bill. Mr. SELLS has two. I make this statement in justice to the committee, because of the insinuations made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I decline to yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Those are all the Members whom I know anything about, and only five members of the committee have claims in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we are ready to yield up the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Louis K. Turner, late of Company D, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am as sure as I live that neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] nor any other gentleman wishes to do me an injustice with respect to this case of Martha R. Allwein, and I feel just as sure for myself that I wish only to state the facts. Because of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] has said, I wish to state that what I have said in all these cases I have taken from the official reports and not from lay witnesses. The report of the Surgeon General of the United States Army is as follows:

Prior to her appointment she was examined, on September 15, 1904, by a civilian physician in Philadelphia, who reported her free from disability. She was examined by an Army surgeon at the general hospital, San Francisco, on December 4, 1904 (eight days after her appointment), and a report of this examination shows that she had practically no vision in her left eye.

Now, after her service to the Government was over for some time, when she was no better and probably in a little worse condition, she consulted a physician with reference to the removal of that cataract from the left eye. The doctor very frankly told her that it might cost her the sight of the other eye. The report of the physician—a Government physician, I suppose—sums up the whole matter and says she decided to accept the risk, and on May 28, 1908, they extracted, and so forth.

Boiled down, it means that she went into the service with her vision impaired—practically no vision in the left eye—served through several years as a nurse, principally in the officer's family, came out of it in a little worse condition than she went in, and then consulted the physician. She accepted the risk, the operation was performed, and she went blind. I say it had no connection with the service, and that $50 a month is out of all proportion to the amount allowed for nurses in the Civil War, which is $12 a month.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Martella M. George, widow of W. E. George, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 additional for each of four minor children until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the report on this case of Martella M. George, widow of W. E. George, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I object, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that all the evidence was not put in by the clerk. I can explain why the report was written in that way. It was due to an oversight by the clerk, and in no way belongs to the committee. I object.

Mr. CALLAWAY. May I ask the gentleman a question about it?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did not the committee make up the report?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The gentleman will understand that we have to leave some things to be put in by the clerk.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do we not understand that the report comes from the committee?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The committee is ready to defend its report.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman says the report is not correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. All the evidence that we have is not in it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The part that I want to insert in the RECORD is in the report.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edward F. Smith, late of Battery H, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I made inquiry as to the number of pensions in this bill which go to the constituents of the Pensions Committee. I made that inquiry in perfect good faith, for the reason that I had heard it stated that 27 of the 50 pensions in the bill go to States represented by members of the Pensions Committee. I asked the question because I desired information upon that subject, as I know that Members of this House, many of them, who have bills before the Pensions Committee have not received a single pension for their constituents.

I asked the gentleman from Oklahoma to yield to me, and he refused and yielded back his time to the chairman. He made the statement that he has not received or his constituents have not received or asked for any pensions. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the first time that I ever knew that there was no one from the gentleman's district who fought in the Spanish-American War, because if there had been any volunteers from the gentleman's district he would have been trying to get them a pension, and doubtless would have got them all one before now from his committee, which is so generous to its own members.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of pension bills. I have always voted for every pension bill that has been presented to this House. I do not know whether these pensions have been properly distributed over the country or not, but that was what I was seeking information about. I am entitled to the information.

Mr. Chairman, I think that these pensions ought to be properly distributed among the Members. Of course this committee can not pension everybody. I have never had a pension reported by this committee. I have bills before it for people who should receive pensions, and the proof has been filed, and I think that I and other Members of this House should receive the same consideration at the hands of the committee as they apparently so generously accord to themselves.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George B. Weesner, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a special pension at the rate of $30 per month.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want one word more, and I am not going to try the patience of the committee much longer. My friend from Pennsylvania complimented himself that he did not take up any time of Congress, but was disposed to criticize me for taking up so much valuable time on pension matters. I say to the committee that if it sincerely believes that Congress does not want these monstrosities pointed out to it, and if it was not my duty to point them out, representing 300,000 people, I would not take up the time of the committee. I do not care to make speeches as much as that. I have some information on some things of this kind, and I feel that it is my duty to point them out. Unless you indicate that you want the matters covered up so that the people will not reach the right idea, I shall continue to call attention to what I believe is the wrongful use of the power of taxation and of appropriation of the public money.

Now, with reference to what my friend said about none of the members of the committee having more bills than other Members. There is no use to get behind the bush about it; we all know the members of the committee give themselves more in the run of time than they do other Members of Congress. There is no use to talk about that. In this bill I do not know what each individual Member got, but I know that the members of the committee represent 13 States, and these 13 States got 27 bills and the balance of the States got 27. In the bill passed a little while ago the committee represented 15 States, and they got 140 bills and the balance of the United States got 63. I just throw that in because it keeps the record straight and we will know what we are doing.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to make just a few observations on this particular bill, because this is one pension bill about which I can talk and no one can accuse me of being prejudiced in my views about it. I happen to have in my possession an honorable discharge as a private soldier in the Spanish-American War [applause], and I do not possess any one thing that I prize more than I do that discharge as a private soldier in the Volunteer Army of the United States in the War with Spain. But I want to say now that under no conceivable law can I ever expect the Government of the United States to pension me or my wife or my children by virtue of that service. I will say why I do not believe they ought to do it, and I hope that if ever I apply for a pension from my Government the record that I am now making will be used against me, or if any that are near and dear to me ever make application for a pension by virtue of my humble service to my country when it needed me, that this record will be used against them, because of the fact that I did nothing but my duty as an American citizen and volunteered my service to help save my country. As was once said by Georgia's immortal Hill, "He who lets his country die, lets all things die, and all things dying curse him; but he who lets his country live, lets all things live, and all things living bless him." That is the reason I volunteered my services at the call. I wanted to help preserve with my humble services the greatest Republic that the sun of God ever shone upon, because the Government of this Republic has protected me and I wanted to contribute my mite to its protection when it called me. [Applause.]

Outside of the graft that is going on in the matter of these pensions, which is creeping into the Spanish-American pension and which has crept into this bill to-day, if I had been upon the floor and my attention had not been diverted from the bill at the time, I would have called attention to a precedent that this committee has set to-day. I have no criticism to make of the membership of this committee or anything which in their wisdom they may do, but they have set a precedent to-day in the passage of this bill which, as has been said by distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the House, will let the camel's nose into the tent, and as a result this Government will be plundered out of hundreds of thousands of dollars in the future because of the fact that you have set this precedent; and in doing so, you, gentlemen, kind hearted, big hearted, generous, and liberal, let your heart run away with your head. I refer to the case of Martella M. George, being H. R. 3311, appearing on page 29 of the report, and when you gave that woman a pension for herself and her minor children you set a precedent that is going to cost this Government hundreds of thousands of dollars, because her husband was a worthless, trifling, immoral, and licentious man.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. DIES. Is that the case which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], in charge of the bill, declined to let the report of go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; and I do not blame him for being ashamed to let it go into the RECORD. The case ought to be stricken from this bill, and had I been in the Chamber to assert my rights at the particular moment this item was reached, I would have made the motion to strike it out—not because I have no sympathy with that woman, not because I do not sympathize with those fatherless children, but because of the fact that you open the gate for all of the worthless men that ever enlisted for what they could get out of it to come in here and draw a pension from the Government of the United States alongside of the man who did actual service, prompted by patriotic motives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more, and I shall not consume any more time than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, as was said by my distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], the only reason on earth for the existence of an Invalid Pension Committee and a Committee on Pensions is the fact that in a great many cases these committees are called upon to do equity, equity to mete out a competency to some particular soldier or the widow of some particular soldier in a case where the law covering a great class generally is deficient—a worthy and meritorious case—and these cases are based on equity, and when you deal with a case in the Committee on Pensions you should deal with it on the basis of absolute equity and nothing else, because there is no particular rule upon which you can grant a pension under the private-pension laws——

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Did this soldier marry subsequent to the Spanish-American War?

Mr. HOWARD. I have not looked into that, but I think he did.

Mr. DIES. Yes; he did.

Mr. HOWARD. I think the record shows that he married subsequent to the war.

Mr. DIES. He married in 1900.

Mr. HOWARD. He married in 1900 and he enlisted in 1898, and went out of the service shortly thereafter for disability not incident to service. I am not criticizing the committee, because if there is anyone on earth for whom I have sympathy it is a widow and little children, but we must be heartless in some things to protect the taxpayers of this country from the enormous burden that is resting upon them by virtue of the indiscriminate granting of pensions to people who really, in a great many instances, do not deserve them. Mr. Chairman, I ate hardtack until I was afraid to go out in the rain, for fear if I got wet spontaneous combustion would take place. I ate embalmed beef, and I fought mosquitoes, and that is all I had to fight. The Government did the best it could, I expect, under the circumstances, to feed me. The Government gave me shoes and good clothes to wear, and I have no hospital record save the contraction of a bad cold. But here is a man who went into the service with a disease, an awful disease, an unmentionable disease. He knew he had that disease when he went into the service, and he stayed there as long as he could hang around, and they discharged him because he was unfit for the service. Ten years after he died from typhoid fever, and an attempt is made to show that that typhoid fever was an incident to his service. They could not do that, and now they come in here and give his wife this pension for herself and these children without any evidence to support, while many worthy widows and innocent little children of worthy soldiers are alone in their penury and destitution, because they have not the ear of their Congressman. There are enough worthy cases to consume all the time this committee can devote to its duties.

Let me suggest this by way of conclusion: There is going to be a new order of things in this country from now on, and you gentlemen are going to see it. A great many of the influential citizens of this country—and I say that it is just that they should do it—are not going to pay any more money into the till indirectly, but they are going down into their pockets, and they are going to pull out the coin of the realm, and they are going to lay it on the internal collectors' table in hard cash, and then, when they commence to put down $100,000,000 or more a year out of their pockets that they ought to have put down years ago to contribute to the upkeep of this Government, these men, who know something about business methods, who have been prosperous, are going to see that the administration of this Government is administered along the lines of business principles and that it is economical and judicious in expenditures. Now, you mark my prediction.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I think what the gentleman says would be true but for the fact that the bill to which he refers affects only one-half of 1 per cent of the people of the United States.

Mr. HOWARD. Well, under Democratic rule from now on the people are going to make so much money that 90 per cent of them will pay this income in a few years.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman is sure of that, it is about time they started to make the money, because they have had several months' opportunity and they have not made any headway in that direction under this Democratic administration.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that; he has acquired the habit that many gentlemen of faith have of joining the calamity howlers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary A. Dow, dependent mother of William C. Dow, late captain, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, a while ago I stated that I had never got a pension through this Pension Committee for any of my constituents, but I did get one passed in the House over the protest of the committee. That was for the widow of a Mexican soldier, Mrs. Ross. She was in the county poorhouse of Edmonson County at the time the bill was passed. Since then she has died. The bill has not yet been reported in the Senate. She was between 85 and 90 years of age. She died in a county poorhouse. She was a good old Christian woman, and I am confident has gone to a better land, where there is neither poverty nor pension committees.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the bill before the House or any bill before the House.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is not before the House. [Laughter.]

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 14546, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIES. I want to make the point of no quorum at such point as will secure a roll call on the bill. What time do I make it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can make that on the vote.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is not a quorum present and the Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 50, answered "Present" 6, not voting 146, as follows:

YEAS—230.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Evans | Kettner | Rogers |
| Allen | Fergusson | Key, Ohio | Rothermel |
| Anderson | Ferris | Kiess, Pa. | Rouse |
| Ansberry | Fields | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Rubey |
| Anthony | FitzHenry | Kirkpatrick | Rucker |
| Ashbrook | Fordney | Knowland, J. R. | Rupley |
| Austin | Foster | Konop | Russell |
| Avis | Fowler | Kreider | Sabath |
| Baker | Francis | Lafferty | Scott |
| Baltz | Frear | La Follette | Seldomridge |
| Barton | French | Langham | Sells |
| Bathrick | Gallagher | Langley | Shreve |
| Beakes | Gard | Lazaro | Sinnott |
| Bell, Cal. | Gardner | Lee, Pa. | Sloan |
| Booher | Gerry | Lenroot | Smith, Idaho |
| Borchers | Gillett | Levy | Smith, Minn. |
| Borland | Gilmore | Lewis, Pa. | Smith, N. Y. |
| Bowdle | Gittins | Lieb | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Britten | Glass | Lindbergh | Sparkman |
| Brockson | Goeke | Lindquist | Steenerson |
| Brown, N. Y. | Goulden | McAndrews | Stephens, Cal. |
| Browne, Wis. | Graham, Ill. | McDermott | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Bruckner | Graham, Pa. | McGillicuddy | Stevens, N. H. |
| Brumbaugh | Gray | McKenzie | Stone |
| Bryan | Green, Iowa | McLaughlin | Stout |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Greene, Mass. | MacDonald | Sutherland |
| Bulkley | Greene, Vt. | Madden | Switzer |
| Burke, Wis. | Gudger | Maguire, Nebr. | Taggart |
| Bryns, Tenn. | Guernsey | Maban | Talbott, Md. |
| Cantor | Hamilton, N. Y. | Mann | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Cantrill | Hammond | Mapes | Tavenner |
| Carr | Hardwick | Metz | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cary | Hart | Miller | Taylor, N. Y. |
| Casey | Haugen | Mondell | Temple |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Hawley | Montague | Ten Eyck |
| Church | Hayes | Moon | Thacher |
| Claypool | Helgesen | Morgan, La. | Thomas |
| Cline | Helm | Morgan, Okla. | Thompson, Okla. |
| Connelly, Kans. | Helvering | Mott | Thomson, Ill. |
| Connolly, Iowa | Hensley | Murdock | Towner |
| Conry | Hill | Murray, Mass. | Treadway |
| Cramton | Hinds | Murray, Okla. | Underhill |
| Crosser | Hinebaugh | Neeley, Kans. | Underwood |
| Curry | Holland | Nelson | Vare |
| Danforth | Houston | Nolan, J. I. | Vollmer |
| Davis | Hughes, Ga. | Norton | Volstead |
| Deitrick | Hulings | Padgett | Waffin |
| Dershem | Humphrey, Wash. | Parker | Walters |
| Difenderfer | Humphreys, Miss. | Patten, N. Y. | Watkins |
| Donohoe | Igoe | Patton, Pa. | Weaver |
| Donovan | Johnson, S. C. | Payne | Whitacre |
| Doolittle | Johnson, Utah | Peters, Mass. | White |
| Doremus | Johnson, Wash. | Phelan | Williams |
| Doughton | Kahn | Platt | Willis |
| Driscoll | Keating | Powers | Woodruff |
| Dupré | Kelley, Mich. | Rauch | Young, N. Dak. |
| Dyer | Kelly, Pa. | Reed | |
| Esch | Kennedy, Iowa | Reilly, Wis. | |

NAYS—50.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Eagle | Howard | Stephens, Tex. |
| Aiken | Edwards | Jacoway | Summers |
| Bartlett | Elder | Lever | Taylor, Ark. |
| Beall, Tex. | Faison | Page, N. C. | Tribble |
| Buchanan, Tex. | Flood, Va. | Park | Vaughan |
| Burgess | Floyd, Ark. | Quin | Watson |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Garner | Rayburn | Webb |
| Callaway | Garrett, Tex. | Sherley | Wilson, Fla. |
| Candler, Miss. | Gordon | Sisson | Wingo |
| Caraway | Gregg | Slayden | Witherspoon |
| Clayton | Hardy | Small | Young, Tex. |
| Dent | Harrison | Smith, Tex. | |
| Dies | Henry | Stephens, Miss. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hay | Lee, Ga. | Scully | Stevens, Minn. |
| Kindel | Pou | | |

NOT VOTING—146.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adair | Dickinson | Kennedy, R. I. | Peters, Me. |
| Adamson | Dillon | Kent | Peterson |
| Ainey | Dixon | Kinkead, N. J. | Plumley |
| Aswell | Dooling | Kitchin | Porter |
| Bailey | Dunn | Korbly | Post |
| Barchfeld | Eagan | L'Engle | Prouty |
| Barkley | Edmonds | Lesher | Ragsdale |
| Barnhart | Estopinal | Lewis, Md. | Rainey |
| Bartholdt | Fairchild | Linthicum | Raker |
| Bell, Ga. | Falconer | Lloyd | Reilly, Conn. |
| Blackmon | Farr | Lobeck | Richardson |
| Brodbeck | Fess | Loft | Riordan |
| Broussard | Finley | Logue | Roberts, Mass. |
| Brown, W. Va. | Fitzgerald | Lonergan | Roberts, Nev. |
| Browning | Garrett, Tenn. | McClellan | Saunders |
| Burke, Pa. | George | McCoy | Shackleford |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Godwin, N. C. | McGuire, Okla. | Sharp |
| Burnett | Goldfogle | McKellar | Sherwood |
| Butler | Good | Maher | Sims |
| Calder | Goodwin, Ark. | Manahan | Slemp |
| Campbell | Gorman | Martin | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Carew | Griest | Merritt | Smith, Md. |
| Carlin | Griffin | Mitchell | Stafford |
| Carter | Hamill | Moore | Stanley |
| Clancy | Hamilton, Mich. | Morin | Stedman |
| Clark, Fla. | Hamlin | Morrison | Stringer |
| Condy | Hayden | Moss, Ind. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Collier | Heflin | Moss, W. Va. | Townsend |
| Cooper | Hobson | Neely, W. Va. | Tuttle |
| Copley | Howell | O'Brien | Walker |
| Covington | Hoxworth | Oglesby | Walsh |
| Cox | Hughes, W. Va. | O'Hair | Whaley |
| Crisp | Hull | Oldfield | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Cullop | Johnson, Ky. | O'Leary | Winslow |
| Dale | Jones | O'Shaunessy | Woods |
| Davenport | Keister | Paige, Mass. | |
| Decker | Kennedy, Conn. | Palmer | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Until further notice:

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. FESS.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. BAILEY with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. DILLON.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DIXON with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. KENT.

Mr. HAY with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. KINDEL with Mr. Moss of West Virginia.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. LLOYD with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. LONERGAN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. MITCHELL with Mr. PETERS of Maine.

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. PETERSON with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. SCULLY. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BROWNING, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. SCULLY. I have a pair with the gentleman. I voted "yea," and I wish to withdraw that vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. SCULLY was called, and he voted "Present."

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I understood that I was paired with somebody, so I leave it with the pair and vote "present."

The name of Mr. KINDEL was called, and he voted "Present."

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 231, nays 49, voting "present" 6. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## EXPOSITION AT PANAMA (H. DOC. NO. 840).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to the invitation from the Government of Panama to this Government to participate in an exposition which is to open at the city of Panama on November 3, 1914, and I join with the Secretary of State in strongly recommending the authority of Congress for the acceptance of the invitation and an appropriation of $100,000 to enable suitable participation by the United States.

As the exposition will open as early as November 3 next, prompt action by Congress on the recommendation is essential to proper and adequate preparation for the participation.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1914.*

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for an indefinite period of time, on account of illness.

## RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13811, being the rivers and harbors bill; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that six hours be devoted to general debate, one half of the time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can not yield more time? I have had requests for more, and I feel I must ask that we have four hours on this side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will four hours, then, be satisfactory on that side?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think we can get along with four hours, and I do not see how we can get along with any less.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I change the request to eight hours instead of six, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13811; and, pending that, asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to eight hours, four hours to be controlled by himself and four hours by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not allow those who are opposed to the bill to have any time? I understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is in favor of the report. Now, that is giving all the time to one side. I asked the gentleman the other day to give me a few minutes, and he declined. I saw the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I asked him if he was in favor of the bill, and he said he was, and he refused to give me time. Now, here is the situation: A bill comes up here carrying some $40,000,000, and the time is taken up by those who are in favor of the measure. I suggest to the chairman that such an unfair proposition should not be tolerated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say for the benefit of the gentleman that there was no intention whatever on my part to discriminate against him. As I recall, he came to me asking for time after it had all been, practically, parceled out or promised to other parties. And I will say, further, that I did not know at the time, nor do I know yet, on which side of the

question all the parties to whom I have agreed to yield time will speak; or, in other words, whether any of them are opposed to the bill or whether all are in favor of the measure. If I can find time to allot the gentleman I will be very glad to yield him such time as I may be able to spare. I will say this, however, to him, that under the five-minute rule he can no doubt get all the time he may need.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] admitted to me that he was in favor of the bill. Now, the point is, the time is wholly closed up. They refused to give me a few minutes. Why, the other day there was a $600,000 appropriation bill, and I believe they allowed the opposition 3 minutes. I took 37 minutes. The Agriculture bill came along, and every moment of the time they took themselves and nothing for the opposition. Now, those things smack of the way they do in Russia. This is a free country. I am only a four-hundred-and-thirty-third part of this body, but I am opposed to the bill. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] gleefully gloated over the fact that he was in favor of the bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to insist on 15 minutes, or I am going to object.

Mr. MANN. Maybe the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] will modify his request so as to give 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request so as to give the gentleman 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to 8 hours and 15 minutes, 4 hours of it to be controlled by himself and 4 by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN]. [Laughter.] Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if I may have some time to present a proposition for the Ohio River?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why, I will say to the gentleman that I have understood for some time that he desired to make a motion, possibly, to amend the bill so as to embrace some proposition on the Ohio River, which he must do, of course, under the five-minute rule if at all, when he can doubtless get all the time he may desire. So far as I am concerned, I will see that he does get whatever reasonable time he may wish.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; but I want to get my proposition before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union before we commence to read the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will 10 minutes suffice for the gentleman?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I do not think I can do it in 10 minutes. I want 30 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are many requests for time. I would like to accommodate everybody if I could see my way clear to do so. If we had it, I would like to yield time to everyone who may desire to address the House on this or any kindred subject, but we have to draw the line somewhere. If 10 minutes will suffice for the gentleman from Illinois, I will see that he gets that much time.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not make your request for nine hours, and give Members of the House who have propositions they would like to get before the House an opportunity to do so, so that they may be fairly understood?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, there is a great desire to get this bill through and out of the way of other important matters that are to follow.

Mr. FOWLER. I am anxious to expedite the transaction of business, because I want Congress to adjourn, but this is an important matter to me. It is a matter of life and death to my people.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there ought to be some provision made for a division of time to men who want to get something out of the bill instead of all the time being given to those who want to get something into it. [Laughter.] I speak for the former class.

Mr. MADDEN. Did they not let in the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN]?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; for 15 minutes. But that is only 15 minutes out of 8 hours. There are others who desire to eliminate some features of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague knows, as everybody else in the House knows, that general debate on any one of these bills is not confined ordinarily to the bill, and most of the debate that relates to the bill is had during the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule, where time is usually graciously extended.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we ought to strike out a lot of this time occupied in the delivery of speeches that do not refer to the bill at all.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps so; but the right of Members to make speeches in the House has not been abridged heretofore, and will not be right away. I think probably my colleague [Mr. FOSTER] has a good case and ought to have some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I can add to that that my other colleague is a very bright debater under the five-minute rule and very persuasive, and generally gets what he wants; and I commend him in the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule, for I know that he will be able to present his case so forcibly that he will get what he wants.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman evidently does not refer to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I refer to both of my colleagues, for that matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It is as difficult a matter to get something out of a bill as it is to get something in.

Mr. MANN. Both are impossible. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to object, but I would like to get the opportunity to present my proposition to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I hope my friend from Florida will give my colleague [Mr. FOWLER] that extra half hour, even if the time has to be extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Florida will agree to that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Say eight hours and a half.

Mr. MANN. Make it eight hours and a half and give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] 15 minutes extra. That will be all right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will do the best I can.

Mr. FOWLER. If I can get 30 minutes, that will do. I suggest that the gentleman from Florida make his request for eight hours and three-quarters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I change my request, then, to eight hours and three-quarters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to 8 hours and 45 minutes; 4 hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], 4 hours to be controlled by himself, 15 minutes by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. HULINGS. I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the general debate on this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to inform the gentleman that the Committee on Rules has arranged to report the Panama Canal bill at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as long as the matter is before the House, I would suggest that, in view of the division of time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania should have 30 minutes during the debate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. I make that request—that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] have 30 minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. During the general debate on this bill?

Mr. MANN. Yes; during the general debate on the river and harbor bill, in addition to the time already specified.

Mr. EDWARDS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. EDWARDS. To reserve the right to object.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman object?

Mr. EDWARDS. I reserved the right to object.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought that the gentleman withdrew his request.

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman from Illinois made another request.

Mr. MANN. To give the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] 30 minutes in general debate, in addition to the time already allotted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would not that extend the general debate until nine hours and a quarter?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what it would do.

Mr. MANN. After all, Mr. Speaker, no provision was made directly for any member of the Progressive Party in the House. I think the request is a modest request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] shall have 30 minutes in addition to this eight hours and three-quarters of general debate on the river and harbor bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] on what subject he is going to address the House?

Mr. HULINGS. I propose to address the House on the Mexican question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I object.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was on my feet asking for recognition, Mr. Speaker, at the time the Chair announced.

The SPEAKER. The Chair put the question fairly, and the gentleman had plenty of time. The Chair thinks the objection comes too late.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair did not hear the gentleman. He was on his feet.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Kentucky was on his feet seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was going to reserve the right to object for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on what subject he intended to address the House.

Mr. HULINGS. I have already answered that question. Mr. Speaker, I have not occupied much of the time of this House. I have some observations to make which I think will come in play upon this subject—the river and harbor bill—if the House will indulge me.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman does not intend to make an inflammatory speech on that subject, does he?

Mr. GOULDEN. He would not be guilty of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULINGS. I do not know just exactly how the spirit may move me. I hope it will be a speech worth listening to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will withdraw my objection and trust to luck. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. KAHN. The matter is adjusted. I was going to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and was not here when the debate on the Army bill took place.

The SPEAKER. He has already got his 30 minutes. The House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] will take the chair. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 13811, the river and harbor appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to ask as a favor of the committee that I be not interrupted until I have finished the statement I desire to make touching some of the leading features of the bill, when I will be glad indeed to yield to interruptions, and to undertake to answer any questions that Members may see proper to ask.

We have spent a great deal of time upon the bill, and have given careful consideration to its preparation; and while it may not be perfect, we nevertheless consider it a good measure, and invite the closest scrutiny, together with the severest analysis, of each and all of its provisions.

The bill appropriates in cash $39,227,504, and authorizes $4,061,500 in addition, the whole aggregating $43,289,004. The authorizations are $3,000,000 for the Ohio River; $1,000,000 for the Delaware River from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea; and $61,500 for Beverly Harbor, Mass. The $3,000,000 for the Ohio River is a part of the $5,000,000 required to be furnished annually under a declaration in the rivers and harbors bill passed in 1910 of an intention to complete the improvement in 12 years, the provision having been construed by the committee to mean that the amount necessary to complete the project shall be appropriated within that period.

The estimates submitted by the Chief of Engineers for the prosecution of works under way and for maintenance amount to $34,016,395, to be applied to 245 works, approximately $4,000,000 being for maintenance. The balance is to carry on projects already begun but not completed. To this amount should be added $250,000 for examinations, surveys, and contingencies, making a total of original estimates reaching $34,266,395. By carefully going over the estimates some of these items were reduced by the committee, the whole of such reductions amounting to $1,031,000. But against these reductions are quite a number of increases, aggregating $4,260,780, the chief items being $1,000,000 for the Mississippi River between Head of the Passes and the mouth of the Ohio River; $1,185,000 for Galveston Harbor, or Galveston Channel, as it is called; $125,000 for Pollock Rip Channel, Mass.; $273,380 for Harbor Beach harbor of refuge, Michigan; $167,400 for Racine Harbor, Wis.; $100,000 for Columbia River at The Dalles, Oreg. and Wash.; and an authorization of $1,000,000 for the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea. I wish to say, however, that this $1,000,000 is not, strictly speaking, an increase, as it is an authorization recommended by the engineers in their estimates for the bill, in addition to $1,000,000 in cash, which the measure carries for that stretch of the river.

The $1,000,000 increase for the Mississippi River was thought advisable, in view of a desire on the part of the engineers and the Mississippi River Commission to carry on the work of levee construction and revetment of the banks of the Mississippi River between the Head of Passes and the mouth of the Ohio more expeditiously than heretofore. The Mississippi River Commission had recommended an appropriation of $7,000,000, but the Chief of Engineers cut the estimate down to $6,000,000.

A much larger amount, however, was requested by local interests. A bill had been introduced during the first session of this Congress asking for $12,000,000 in cash and an authorization of $48,000,000 for the improvement of that stretch of the river, the whole to be appropriated within five years at the rate of $12,000,000 a year. An extensive hearing was had early in the session on this bill but no action has yet been taken by the committee on the measure. In the meantime there was quite an insistent demand by parties interested that, in addition to the $6,000,000 recommended by the Chief of Engineers for this bill, contract authorizations be provided for $18,000,000 more. The committee, however, concluded to only allow $7,000,000, or one million in addition to the six millions called for by the Chief. Whatever views a majority of the committee might otherwise have entertained regarding this demand for a contract authorization, it is believed the seven millions is all that could or should be allowed in the present bill, especially in view of the demand of other sections of the country for river and harbor work. Besides, seven millions is quite as much as will be expended on the work by the 4th of next March, when another bill will doubtless be passed.

In further justification of the action of the committee in allowing the additional million, I would like to call attention to the fact that the committee has inserted in the present bill a provision extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission over levee building from the mouth of the Ohio River to Rock Island, Ill. It will be remembered that the bill of 1913 as it passed the House contained a similar provision, but this was changed in the Senate so as to authorize only a survey, which has since been had and a report thereon made to Congress by the War Department; though, in view of the act creating the Mississippi River Commission, together with subsequent legislation, I do not consider the survey a necessary basis for our action. It will be noted that the language used confines the expenditure of money above the mouth of the Ohio within the limit of authority under which levees may be constructed below the Ohio River, and that expenditures, if made at all for that purpose, must be in the interest of navigation.

The claim was made by those advocating the extension of the jurisdiction of the commission to Rock Island, Ill., that there was no just or logical way of differentiating the two stretches, and that if the activities of the Government were to be directed toward the building of levees between the Head of Passes and the mouth of the Ohio, in the interest of navigation it

should do the same thing to the section between Rock Island and the Ohio, where serious overflows are also experienced. The committee considered the two stretches very much alike, and hence extended the jurisdiction of the commission to cover both; and I can see no great harm likely to come from its action, for if the commission and the Chief of Engineers follow the provision in the bill, no money can be expended except in the interest of navigation; and if there is no such demand, none will be expended.

It has been the policy of the committee, as well as of the House, for many years to confine levee construction and revetment work to the requirements of navigation, a policy to which it has adhered in the face of strong pressure at times for appropriations to protect private property and that of municipalities from floods. I trust the House will continue to sustain the committee in its efforts to enforce this policy, for if we depart from that safe and salutary rule we will not only increase enormously our expenditures for waterway improvement, but seriously endanger our river and harbor bills. If, however, we are to embark on the policy of protecting private property against damages from floods, the task should only be entered upon after a thorough examination and survey of the work to be done, in order that the country and Congress may know in advance what the cost will be. Even then the necessary legislation should not, in my judgment, be carried in the regular river and harbor bills, but in some separate measure or measures. The former should deal alone with the matter of furnishing navigable channels for the accommodation of our commerce.

In addition to caring for the old or existing projects, 76 new projects have been adopted, requiring in all to complete $38,684,700, but of this sum we have only appropriated or authorized $5,786,829.

Among the larger items are those for East River, N. Y.; Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; Norfolk Harbor, Va.; New London Harbor, Conn.; Willapa Harbor, Wash.; Oklawaha River, Fla.; Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn; the Sacramento and Feather Rivers and Richmond Harbor, Cal.

The most expensive are: The East River, to cost $13,400,000; Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, $6,785,710; Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, $586,000; and the upper Cumberland, $4,500,000. The work on the East River, being a class of work not requiring expeditious treatment, is, if the suggestions of the engineers should be followed, to run over a long period of years, something above 25, though, of course, if the demands of commerce should require greater haste, the work may, and no doubt will, be prosecuted more rapidly.

I wish to direct special attention to the project for the improvement of the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, Cal. This is a very expensive piece of work as a whole and will cost, when completed, it is estimated something over $33,000,000, the greater part of which is for flood protection and land reclamation. The engineers, however, fixed the amount to be expended by the Government in the interest of navigation at $5,800,000, which the committee thought was not out of proportion to the benefits likely to accrue to commerce, present and prospective; and hence have recommended that it be undertaken, appropriating, however, only $200,000 in this bill, and that on condition that the State of California furnish a like amount. In fact, we have adopted the project on the conditions imposed by the engineers to the effect that the State contribute an amount equal to that which the Government may be required to expend in the interest of navigation, which is fixed, as just stated, at a sum not to exceed $5,800,000. This is one of the most comprehensive and well-considered plans of river regulation and improvement that have come before our committee for many years, little, apparently, having been left to chance or for future consideration that it was possible for engineering skill to make definite and certain.

The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal connecting the waters of those two bays, is another project which the committee thought of great importance and which received favorable consideration at its hands. The connecting of these two bays by the Government has been under consideration for quite a while. Many years ago the present Chesapeake & Delaware Canal was constructed, and has since been owned and operated as a toll canal by a corporation chartered, I believe, under the laws of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware. In 1906 Congress desiring to take steps either to purchase that canal and to enlarge and operate it as a free waterway or to construct one through the same territory but over a different route, passed a joint resolution for the appointment of a commission to examine and appraise the value of the works and franchises of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, and also to examine and investigate the feasibility of a waterway over what is known as the Sassafras route, which traverses the narrow neck of land between the two bays a little to the southward of the present canal. Under this provision a commission was appointed known as the Agnus commission, which, having made an examination, submitted quite a voluminous report to Congress, recommending the purchase of the canal at a cost of $2,154,289.70; but the report also showed the feasibility of the Sassafras route, along which a canal can be constructed at a cost which it is estimated by the engineers will be only a little more than that estimated for the purchase of the present Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and its enlargement to the required depth and width.

Later the Secretary of War, under the provision of the rivers and harbors bill of 1909, which called for a survey of an intracoastal system from Boston, Mass., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., including the section between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, caused an examination to be made of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and other possible routes across the intervening land, reports on which are embodied in House Document No. 391, Sixty-first Congress, second session, and in House Document No. 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session. In both of these reports the purchase of the canal was recommended, and in the last the cost, including the purchase of the existing canal, together with its enlargement to a depth of 12 feet, was placed at $8,000,000, the purchase price of the canal being fixed at $2,514,290, as was recommended by the Agnus commission. The committee, however, not agreeing with the engineers as to the amount that should be paid for the canal, but believing its actual value to be much less than the sum fixed by them, have authorized its purchase at a cost not to exceed $1,300,000, which it is believed is all it is worth.

It will be noted by anyone who has examined or who will take the trouble to examine the Agnus report that the officers of the canal company gave but little information to the members of the commission as to the value of the canal or the price at which its owners would be willing to sell. It was ascertained, however, that the canal was bonded at something like $2,600,000, which bonds were valued at about 50 cents on the dollar. Furthermore, the Government, it seems, originally contributed to the construction of the canal $450,000, for which it yet holds stock in the company. This stock, together with stock dividends received, now aggregate 14,625 shares, of the par value of $50, or $731,250 in all; besides, the canal company has owed the Government something like $51,187.50 since 1877 for cash dividends, which, together with interest, amounts now to about $150,000. It further appears that no dividends have been paid to anyone subsequent to that date.

I wish also to say that according to the Agnus report there seem to be some engineering difficulties in the way of any further deepening of the present canal; difficulties that would not, it is thought, be encountered along the Sassafras route, and which might make it advisable to adopt this latter route. I only throw this out as a suggestion, for we would doubtless in the end follow whatever recommendations the engineers may make; at least that is the usual course.

In addition to the authority to purchase the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, the committee has recommended the adoption of two other links in the intracoastal system from Boston to Key West as extended by later surveys, the one from McClellansville to Winyah Bay, S. C., and that from Charleston to Savannah, Ga., the former to cost $20,000, the latter $100,000. The bill also adopts three other links in the intracoastal system from St. George Sound, Fla., to the Rio Grande, Tex., these being sections 5, 7, and 12, to cost, respectively, $227,000, $475,000, and $80,000. Likewise a short link or cut-off between Vermilion River and Schooner Bayou, La., to cost $37,500. Section 5 extends from Mobile Bay to the Mississippi River, a distance of 125 miles; section 7, from the Sabine River to Galveston Bay, Tex., a distance of 68 miles; and section 12, from Brazos Santiago, Tex., to Rio Grande, a distance of 9 miles. This system comprises 12 links, numbered consecutively from 1 to 12, inclusive, the whole covering a distance of 1,038 miles. Provision has heretofore been made for sections 1, 3, 8, 9, and 10, costing $1,015,335. Section 2, from St. Andrews Bay to Choctawhatchee Bay, estimated to cost $3,000,000, has not yet been recommended. The uncompleted sections from 4 to 7 and 11 to 12, inclusive, are estimated to cost $3,632,910. I desire and ask permission to submit with my remarks statements showing the different links in the proposed intracoastal waterway from Boston to Key West, showing distances, cost, proposed depths, and sections recommended, together with those unrecommended. Also a like statement of the system from St. George Sound to the Rio Grande.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

*Report on survey of route for intracoastal waterway on the Atlantic coast.*

| | Proposed depth. | Distance. | Cost. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boston-Key West: | *Feet.* | *Miles.* | |
| Boston-Narragansett Bay | 18 | 113 | $17,453,000 |
| Narragansett Bay-Long Island | 18 | 23 | 12,322,000 |
| Open-water channel | ..... | 147 | ..... |
| Raritan Bay-Delaware River | 12 | 35 | 20,000,000 |
| Open-water channel | ..... | 40 | ..... |
| Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay | 12 | 13 | 8,000,000 |
| Open-water channel | ..... | 206 | ..... |
| Norfolk-Beaufort | 12 | 190 | 5,400,000 |
| Beaufort-Cape Fear River | 7 | 105 | 2,872,111 |
| Cape Fear River-Little River | 7 | 106 | 3,724,219 |
| Little River-Winyah Bay | 7 | | 5,677,800 |
| Winyah Bay-Charleston | 7 | 64 | 1,227,800 |
| Charleston-Savannah | 7 | 59 | 427,400 |
| Savannah-Fernandina | 7 | 128 | 195,000 |
| Fernandina-St. Johns River | 7 | 58 | 251,726 |
| St. Johns River-Indian River | 7 | 380 | 2,491,056 |
| Indian River-Key West | 7 | [1]253 | 2,127,950 |
| | ..... | 1,920 | $82,170,063 |
| Recommended sections: | | | |
| Raritan Bay-Delaware River[2] | 12 | 35 | 20,000,000 |
| Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay | 12 | 13 | 8,000,000 |
| Norfolk-Beaufort | 12 | 190 | 5,400,000 |
| Beaufort-Cape Fear River | 7 | 105 | 2,872,111 |
| Cape Fear-Little River | 7 | 106 | 3,724,219 |
| Little River-Winyah Bay | 7 | | 5,677,800 |
| Winyah Bay-Charleston | 7 | 64 | 1,227,800 |
| Charleston-Savannah | 7 | 59 | 427,400 |
| Savannah-Fernandina | 7 | 128 | 195,000 |
| Fernandina-St. Johns River | 7 | 58 | 251,726 |
| | ..... | 758 | 47,760,056 |
| Unrecommended sections: | | | |
| Boston-Raritan Bay | 18 | 283 | 20,775,000 |
| St. Johns River-Key West | 7 | 633 | 4,619,006 |
| | ..... | 916 | 34,394,006 |

[1] Of Indian River-Key West stretch 197 miles is open-water channel.
[2] Provided a right of way, as described in House Document No. 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, be immediately secured.

*Report on survey of intracoastal waterway, St. George Sound to Rio Grande.*

SECTIONS.

| No. | Extent. | Distance. | Cost. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | St. George Sound-St. Andrews Bay | 60 | (1) |
| 2 | St. Andrews Bay-Choctawhatchee Bay | 53 | $3,000,000 |
| 3 | Choctawhatchee Bay-Pensacola Bay | 52 | (1) |
| 4 | Pensacola Bay-Mobile Bay | 46.5 | 339,338 |
| 5 | Mobile Bay-Mississippi River | 121 | 227,000 |
| 6a | Mississippi River-Bayou Teche | 132 | 826,000 |
| 6b | Bayou Teche-Mermentau River | 94 | 477,125 |
| 6c | Mermentau River-Sabine River | 60.5 | 453,660 |
| 7 | Sabine River-Galveston Bay (C. D. 7) | 95 | 475,000 |
| 8 | Galveston Bay-Brazos River | 45.5 | (2) |
| 9 | Brazos River-Pass Cavallo | 77 | (2) |
| 10 | Pass Cavallo-Aransas Pass | 59.5 | (2) |
| 11 | Aransas Pass-Brazos Santiago | 134 | 765,194 |
| 12 | Brazos Santiago-Rio Grande | 8 | 78,593 |
| | | 1,038 | 6,632,910 |

[1] Already provided for. [2] Not recommended.

Sections 4 to 12, inclusive, $3,632,910 (recommended).
Sections 5, 7, 12, $780,593 (adopted).

Mr. SPARKMAN. From the first statement it will be seen that the sections of the Atlantic intracoastal system favorably reported cover the stretch from Raritan Bay, New York Harbor, to St. Johns River, Fla. It is recommended, however, by the Board and Chief of Engineers that work on the section between Raritan Bay and the Delaware River be only undertaken when compliance has been had with certain conditions. These are, in substance, that a right of way with certain specified characteristics shall be furnished. I may add that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no information as yet that these requirements have been or will be met, but I assume that if the advantages likely to accrue from the construction of the canal are such as have been outlined by its proponents the right of way required will be furnished.

Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to overestimate the value of these intracoastal waterways. Of course some of the links are of more importance than others, but each, in my opinion, is of sufficient value to commerce to justify its improvement by the Government in accordance with the plans outlined by the engineers. Connecting the rivers flowing into the Atlantic and the Gulf they will, when completed, furnish a system of navigable waterways more than 20,000 miles in extent and reaching nearly every section of the country east of the Rocky Mountains. Of course this work can not all be undertaken at once, nor is there any necessity for its so being undertaken. The policy should be to provide for the different sections from time to time in the order of their relative importance considering the commerce to be accommodated by them, and that, I may add, is the present intention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. Chairman, of course I know that the amount carried in this bill will appear large, especially to one not familiar with the advantages accruing to the people of the country from water transportation or who is not conversant with the great demand for river and harbor improvement growing out of the rapid progress we are making along every line of material development. We are all familiar in a general way with this wonderful growth. I wish to call attention, however, to some features of this development which will illustrate the point I am making. From 1902 to 1914 the population of this country increased 27 per cent, farm products 70 per cent, products of the mine more than 67 per cent, imports of merchandise upward of 113 per cent, and exports of merchandise more than 76 per cent. Similarly and as a result of all this a marked increase occurred in freight tonnage both by rail and by water. The tonnage of the railroads during the past decade grew from 1,340,394,000 tons to 1,844,977,000 tons, an increase of more than 540,000,000 tons. But the most remarkable increase has been in our water-borne commerce. In 1910 the engineers reported this commerce, foreign and domestic, including duplication, at 625,901,653 tons, while the reports for 1913 fixed the amount at 1,002,759,000 tons, an increase in three years of more than 375,000,000 tons. But there has been no such increase, Mr. Chairman, during that period in expenditures on rivers and harbors. I will file with my remarks a statement showing the expenditures for that class of work covering the fiscal years from 1904 to 1913, inclusive, from which it will be seen that the percentage of increase during that decade has been only 23 per cent, while the increase in water-borne commerce for the past three years has been more than 60 per cent. This, Mr. Chairman, is the statement:

*Expenditures for rivers and harbors during the fiscal year ending June 30 (not including expenditures under permanent and indefinite appropriations).*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1904 | $22,320,469.15 |
| 1905 | 23,054,497.08 |
| 1906 | 22,513,605.99 |
| 1907 | 21,513,471.54 |
| 1908 | 26,176,651.06 |
| 1909 | 34,577,751.65 |
| 1910 | 27,353,328.06 |
| 1911 | 30,062,082.02 |
| 1912 | 32,464,724.79 |
| 1913 | 36,813,778.79 |
| Total | 276,850,360.77 |
| Average per year for 10 years | 27,685,036.00 |

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I prefer the gentleman would let me finish my statement.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I just want to ask one question with respect to this water-borne commerce, as to what the character of the water-borne commerce is, whether that applies to rivers and canals or to ocean-borne commerce?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It applies to all kinds of water-borne commerce, canals, rivers, harbors, coastwise, and foreign, and I may as well explain just here what I mean by duplications. By this I mean commerce carried over two or more waterways or into two or more harbors where it is counted more than once.

Another matter to which I wish to direct attention is that the amount expended in 1913 is only a little upward of $2,000,000 more than the amount expended in 1909, the year before we embarked upon the annual-bill policy, and this increase is more than covered by the amounts added to the rivers and harbors bills as a result of the floods on the lower Mississippi River in 1912 and 1913.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of course I know that increase of water-borne tonnage does not necessarily mean an increase of expenditures for river and harbor improvement. The pertinent question is, Has there been a legitimate commercial demand for the improvements making the expenditures necessary? The answer to that must be in the affirmative. There has not been a harbor developed or a river improved which has not been preceded by a demand for the work based upon the necessities of commerce. The development of the country along the rivers has made this improvement a necessity, while the increase in the dimensions and draft of ocean-going craft, in obedience to an inexorable law of economics, has made it necessary to also increase the dimensions of harbor channels on our lake shores and seacoast. Nor, Mr. Chairman, has this growth in the dimensions and draft of vessels been confined to the lume-

diate past, but has been going on for many decades and is likely to continue for many more. But I would like to call attention to this increase—to the regularity of its growth. Half a century ago an ocean-going vessel of more than 300 feet in length or more than 40 feet in width was not in existence. The bulk of the Atlantic Ocean traffic was then carried on in ships drawing less than 20 feet of water, with not a single vessel at that time exceeding 24 feet in draft, while to-day, Mr. Chairman, we have vessels more than 900 feet long, nearly 100 feet beam, and several more than 38 feet of draft. It is to this increase in the dimensions and draft of the vessels using our harbors that we have had to accommodate ourselves, and, as I have said, the end is not yet.

It is the opinion of experts, men who have given much thought to this question, that in another half a century or perhaps less ocean-going vessels will have increased 50 per cent in length, 60 per cent in width, 33⅓ per cent in draft. So it would seem that this work must go on yet awhile. So impressed have been engineers with this growth that they are now advising the governments of the world to begin now and build for the future; to lay out plans for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, especially the latter, on a basis sufficiently broad and comprehensive to accommodate this anticipated increase in the dimensions and draft of vessels. In this connection I wish to read from the remarks of Mr. J. Foster King, chief surveyor to the British Corporation for the Registry of Shipping, Glasgow, in an address delivered by him before the Twelfth International Congress of Navigation, in Philadelphia, 1912. He closed that interesting and instructive address in this language:

> Authorities responsible for the development of shipbuilding, rivers, maritime canals, and harbors of all kinds who desire to maintain their present relative position in the world will have to face the problem of meeting continuous expansion in the dimensions of future seagoing vessels at rates not less rapid than those indicated either by improvement in existing accommodations or by the creation of new deep-water ports.

To the same effect were the remarks of others at that convention, notably those of Mr. Elmer L. Corthell, of New York, a distinguished engineer, who in the course of his address said:

> That the facilities for navigation must be greatly enlarged and improved and that the engineers who design, construct, and enlarge canals and ports should fully appreciate the situation and use their important influence with the governments of the world to build wisely and amply for the future ships of the world, both commercial and naval.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what we have been doing and what we must continue to do if we are to keep step with the progress of the age.

But what of the cost? That is another pertinent question. Of course it is difficult, Mr. Chairman, for us to determine now or for anyone to say just what the future cost will be, and yet I believe that unless we are to embark upon some wild scheme of waterway improvement not connected—or, if connected at all, very remotely—with legitimate river and harbor work—I say unless we are to embark upon some such wild scheme I believe it is possible to approximate within reasonable bounds the cost of river and harbor improvement in this country within the next 25 years. Of course, if we enter upon other works having no direct or necessary relation to navigation, there is no telling where we will land. Why, there are propositions advanced, some of them now before Congress, advocated and supported by men of national repute, the adoption and the carrying out of which, it is said by competent engineers, would cost billions of dollars. But assuming we are to pursue a safe and sane policy such as we have been pursuing for the past several decades, then I believe it is easy, or at least it is not very difficult, to approximate within reasonable bounds as to what the Government will be called upon to expend in the near future, by which I mean in the next quarter of a century.

We have on the books to-day, including those taken on in this bill, about $300,000,000 of projects. One hundred and fifty million dollars in round figures, or half of it, being for four rivers—the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, and the East River in New York, the last named, however, only requiring about $13,000,000 to complete. The work on these four streams, if the plans laid down by the engineers are followed, is to extend over a period ranging from 8 to 25 years; perhaps a little beyond that. The other $150,000,000 will likely be required during the next 8 years; that is, if the plans of the engineers are carried out. Of course there will be other projects. There were before our committee about $50,000,000 of projects submitted within the past two years besides the $38,000,000 we have adopted in this bill. I do not know that all of those will meet with favorable consideration in the future; the chances are they will not; but if they should all be adopted, the amount, including those adopted and those recommended in this bill, will reach $350,000,000.

Others will be coming in from time to time—are coming in now—but looking into the future, with the information I have been able to gain as a result of my 17 years of experience in that class of work, I believe it is safe to say that not exceeding $100,000,000 more will be required during the next 25 years. That would make the total, including the amount of the projects already recommended and adopted, $450,000,000. If I am correct in this, the House can now see about what the burden will be. You say, however, those are no small figures; and they are not. But let me tell you they are not large when compared with the appropriations we have been making for some other branches of the public service—the Army and Navy, for instance.

Now, I am not one who is opposed to an efficient Army or an adequate Navy. They are, unfortunately, necessary. But there is no harm in calling attention to them and their cost; in fact, I believe that attention can not be directed too often to the great cost of the military arm of this Government. I will submit with my remarks a statement showing the appropriations for rivers and harbors during the past 10 years, as well as the appropriations for several other branches:

*Appropriations for rivers and harbors and six other branches of the public service, 1903–1914.*

| Year. | Rivers and harbors. | Post Office. | Navy. | Army. | Fortifications. | Agriculture. | Indian. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1903 | $32,540,199.50 | $138,416,598.75 | $78,856,363.13 | $91,730,136.41 | $7,298,955.00 | $5,208,960.00 | $8,985,028.10 |
| 1904 | 20,233,150.00 | 153,511,549.75 | 81,876,791.43 | 77,888,752.83 | 7,188,416.22 | 5,978,160.00 | 8,540,405.77 |
| 1905 | 10,872,200.00 | 172,545,998.75 | 97,505,140.94 | 77,070,300.88 | 7,518,192.09 | 5,902,040.00 | 9,447,961.40 |
| 1906 | 28,726,007.41 | 181,022,093.75 | 100,336,679.94 | 70,396,631.64 | 6,747,883.00 | 6,882,690.00 | 7,923,814.34 |
| 1907 | 17,254,050.04 | 191,695,998.75 | 102,091,670.27 | 71,817,165.08 | 5,053,993.00 | 9,930,440.00 | 9,260,589.98 |
| 1908 | 43,500,813.00 | 212,091,193.00 | 98,958,907.50 | 78,634,582.75 | 6,898,011.00 | 9,447,220.00 | 10,125,076.15 |
| 1909 | 18,092,945.00 | 222,970,892.00 | 122,663,885.47 | 95,382,247.61 | 9,316,745.00 | 11,672,106.00 | 9,253,347.87 |
| 1910 | 20,190,264.00 | 234,602,370.00 | 136,935,199.65 | 101,195,883.34 | 8,170,111.00 | 12,995,635.00 | 11,864,982.48 |
| 1911 | 49,380,541.50 | 243,907,020.00 | 131,350,854.38 | 95,449,567.55 | 5,617,200.00 | 13,487,659.00 | 9,206,528.00 |
| 1912 | 30,883,419.00 | 259,134,463.00 | 126,478,338.24 | 93,374,755.97 | 5,473,707.00 | 16,900,015.00 | 8,842,136.37 |
| 1913 | 40,559,370.50 | 271,429,599.00 | 123,225,607.76 | 90,958,712.98 | 4,036,235.00 | 16,851,486.00 | 8,929,970.66 |
| 1914 | 51,118,889.00 | 285,370,271.00 | 140,860,643.53 | 94,266,145.51 | 5,218,259.00 | 17,985,945.00 | 9,486,819.67 |
| Total | 372,351,848.95 | 2,566,704,047.75 | 1,341,079,481.64 | 1,038,155,882.55 | 78,537,708.22 | 132,042,315.00 | 111,258,671.79 |

From this statement it will be seen that during the past 10 years we have appropriated for rivers and harbors $372,351,000, while for the Army and the Navy we have furnished $2,200,000,000, more than six times as much for the Army and the Navy as for rivers and harbors. If we continue that for the next 25 years, as we are likely to do—even assuming that it will not be increased, and it is likely to be increased—the sum will aggregate nearly $6,000,000,000, as against $450,000,000 fixed by me as the probable limit of river and harbor requirements during that period. And what do we get, Mr. Chairman, for the larger amount? Protection, security, perhaps; but with that great expenditure there will be no monuments erected, unless it be to military heroes, while the improvements in our rivers and harbors, to be made by the smaller expenditure, will, with relatively small amounts from year to year for maintenance, endure for the use of our growing commerce as the centuries come and go. [Applause.] The billions poured into this great sea of military preparation will be swallowed up with not a single physical monument erected on its shores for the benefit of mankind, while with the money we may expend on our rivers and harbors we will furnish the country and its commerce 30,000 miles of inland waterways, rivers, canals, and intracoastal channels, besides more than 300 harbors, large and small, the whole making the grandest system of navigable waterways in the world, and accommodating by that time perhaps more than 2,000,000,000 tons of commerce. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, but few object, I think, to the Army or the Navy and the provisions that we are making for them. We need both, and will continue to need them, perhaps, to protect our flag from insult and our shores from hostile invasion. But whilst we are contributing billions for the Army and the

Navy and in the preparation for possible wars let us not begrudge the relatively few millions necessary to fit our rivers and harbors for the growing commerce of our country. [Applause.] We have been repaid many times over for the money we have expended on our navigable waterways. I have heard it said that for every net ton of water-borne commerce in this country there is a saving of $1 to the shippers, the producers, and the consumers throughout the land. Now, consider, Mr. Chairman, that not a single river or harbor in its natural state would have been capable of accommodating modern commerce, and that many of them even now can not fully meet modern commercial requirements, and it is easy to appreciate the great benefits that have accrued, and will continue to accrue, to the people by reason of this great work. Why, Mr. Chairman, with three years of such a saving and estimating this tonnage at 300,000,000, a conservative figure, the American people would be more than repaid the $700,000,000 expended on waterway improvement since the beginning of our Government. Let us then, Mr. Chairman, not strike down, or even retard, this great work; but rather let us carry it on conservatively but steadily to completion, assured as we may well be of the approval of an intelligent and progressive constituency. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad now to yield for any questions gentlemen of the committee may see proper to propound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. MANN. In reference to the Mississippi River improvement, which the gentleman has explained so fully, what benefit is there to anybody by making the improvement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Mississippi River?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To what part does the gentleman refer? Does he refer to any particular part, or to the river as a whole?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to the expenditure of $150,000 within the next eight years, and $100,000,000 more after a while. That is the improvement I am referring to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the people will reap a very great advantage from the improvement of that river.

Mr. MANN. What people?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The whole people. There are several stretches of that river. I suppose it is the lower reaches to which my friend is referring more particularly?

Mr. MANN. No. I am referring to the whole river. Will it be an improvement to commerce, or is it a local improvement for the benefit of the people?

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as the Government is concerned, the improvement is solely in the interest of navigation, because in the item for the improvement of the lower river, which is under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, extended by a provision in this bill to Rock Island, Ill., there is a provision prohibiting the engineers from spending any money on levees or revetments unless they are satisfied it will be in the interest of navigation.

Mr. MANN. If we are to spend $250,000,000 or $350,000,000 on the Mississippi River for the benefit of navigation, does the gentleman think we ought to pass tolls for the benefit of the river?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will remember that later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe we should charge tolls on any harbor or waterway on the Continent of America.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is not necessary now to go into another discussion in regard to that matter, and——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated "on the Continent of America." I suppose he understands that the Isthmus of Panama is included in that designation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said "the Continent of America." I meant by that the continental domain of the United States.

Mr. MANN. There is no distinction in principle, so far as commerce is concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has a proposition up for consideration that involves the question whether we shall spend $250,000,000 on the Mississippi River in the interest of commerce, yet everybody knows that the interest on the money would pay the freight on every ton of commerce that will go on the Mississippi River, or you could send it by rail. The question is whether or not we should do that and charge tolls. I do not think we ought to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman know what the tonnage on the Mississippi River is?

Mr. MANN. No; I do not know just what it is, but I know it is now far less than it used to be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is about 6,000,000 tons on the lower river, and——

Mr. MANN. That is about half as much as comes into a little harbor in my district.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And with 2,000,000 tons more on the upper reach makes eight or nine million in all. That is a very respectable tonnage.

Mr. MANN. I say that is half as much as comes into a harbor in my district.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chariman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Would not that tonnage on the Mississippi River be many times multiplied if the railroads were forbidden by a statutory law from adopting cutthroat competitive methods and if that river were allowed to carry its natural tonnage?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that would make considerable difference.

Mr. MANN. That would raise the freight rates. However, I believe in the principle of improving the Mississippi River.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. No tolls are charged on the commerce that navigates the Mississippi River?

Mr. SPARKMAN. None.

Mr. MOORE. And none, I believe, are charged anywhere else, except on the Delaware & Raritan Canal, which is owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, which is owned by a private corporation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is little tonnage on the Raritan Canal, but a good deal on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD. There are a good many papers I wanted to read here, but time will not permit. I would like to include them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 47 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] use some of his time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

AGAINST REPEAL OF CANAL-TOLLS EXEMPTION.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, on March 5, just a year and a day after his inauguration, the President appeared before a joint session of Congress in this Chamber and made an astounding plea for the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls. In fact, it was not a plea—it was a supplication.

In that address he used this remarkable language:

> We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.
>
> I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

Mr. Chairman, the President and his official advisers in the Department of State alone are responsible for the foreign policy of the administration. They alone have formulated and administered that policy. If there has been any ineptitude in the administration of that policy, they alone are responsible. What have been the fruits of that policy? Misunderstanding, distrust, vacillation, humiliation. This greatest of all the world's Republics has grown to be, in one brief year of Democratic administration, the pariah of the nations. [Applause on the Republican side.] Under the blight of its foreign policy we stand to-day isolated, deserted, alone. It is a humiliating confession, but its truth can not be gainsaid.

We are calmly told not to consider whether we be right or wrong in our interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. As

a matter of expediency, and in order to save the face of the administration, we ought to forego our rights—so says the President—no matter what great economic or governmental principles may be involved—principles that may vitally affect the prosperity and the welfare of the American people.

We have expended $375,000,000 and sacrificed many lives in the accomplishment of the greatest of the world's engineering feats; but, according to the President, we should be generous and abjectly yield our rights in support of the foreign policy of the administration. We ought not to exercise rights of ownership; we should be content to become a simple caretaker, a mere guardian.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that no people on earth that have a due regard for the opinions of mankind would be willing to sell their birthright for such an unpalatable mess of pottage. England herself would not do it. Her history is replete with instances in which she has firmly and vigorously refused to yield her inalienable rights. Let me cite two concrete cases which illustrate that fact. In 1815, at the city of London, she entered into a convention with us to regulate the commerce and navigation between our respective countries, territories, and people, in such a manner as to render them reciprocally beneficial and satisfactory.

A paragraph of article 2 of that convention provides:

No higher or other duties or charges shall be imposed in any of the ports of the United States on British vessels than those payable in the same ports by vessels of the United States; nor in the ports of any of the Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe on the vessels of the United States than shall be payable in the same ports on British vessels.

That language is certainly clear and unequivocal, and yet neither England nor the United States ever held that provision to apply to the coastwise trade of the respective countries. Thus the port charges at Bristol, England, for an American ship entering and departing is 56 cents per ton, while a British ship in the coastwise trade of that country pays only 20 cents a ton for such charges. At Liverpool the harbor rates for entering and leaving port to an American ship in the oversea trade are 33 cents per ton, while for British coastwise vessels the charges are 9 cents per ton. At the port of London the tonnage dues for entering and clearing are likewise in favor of British coastwise vessels and against trans-Atlantic vessels. In fact, every maritime country in the world gives a preference to its own nationals engaged in its coastwise trade. And not alone have we acquiesced in England's construction of the rule under the treaty of 1815, but England on her part has never challenged our right to differentiate in favor of our coastwise vessels, notwithstanding the mandatory language used in the paragraph of article 2 of that convention which I have quoted. And comparatively recently our rights in that behalf have been distinctly and positively upheld in the case of Olsen *v.* Smith (195 U. S., 344), Mr. Justice White, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, having rendered the opinion of the court. I will not trespass upon your time by reading that decision. The principles involved in that case are similar in character to the principles involved in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. So much for the convention or treaty of 1815.

But there is another instance that exhibits England's unyielding attitude when the rights of her citizens in the shipping industry are involved. In his note to Ambassador Bryce, dated November 14, 1912, Sir Edward Grey, the secretary of state for foreign affairs of Great Britain, refers to article 27 of the treaty of Washington, 1871, and says:

Your excellency will no doubt remember how strenuously the United States protested, as a violation of equal rights, against a system which Canada had introduced of a rebate of a large portion of the tolls on certain freight on the Welland Canal, provided that such freight was taken as far as Montreal, and how in the face of that protest the system was abandoned.

And thereupon his excellency makes the statement that the principle of equality is repeated in article 3 of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is, Sir Edward Grey has forgotten or did not fully investigate the circumstances that compelled his Government to abandon the system of rebates that had been granted Canadian shippers and shipowners in violation of section 27 of the treaty of Washington. He is entirely mistaken when he asserts that the system was abandoned in the face of our protests. I shall show that it was retaliatory legislation on our part that compelled Great Britain to abandon her untenable position. And even in abandoning it, she reiterated her positive right to do what she had been doing under her construction of a reciprocal provision of a solemn treaty.

It is true that the Government of the United States had repeatedly protested against these rebates referred to by him in his note to the English ambassador. But did England yield, "right or wrong"? Did she exercise that spirit of generosity which our President commends so highly to our people? Did she abandon her policy "in the face of that protest," as Sir Edward claimed in his note to the British ambassador at Washington? Not at all. Let me recite briefly the facts that led to the change of heart that came over the British Government.

Under the treaty of 1871 certain canals in Canada and the United States were to be opened reciprocally to the ships and citizens of the two countries upon equal terms. The Canadian tolls were fixed annually by orders in council. Wheat and other grains passing through the Welland Canal paid a rate of 20 cents per ton. But for many years the Canadian Government allowed a rebate of 18 cents per ton when the wheat was carried eastward as far as Montreal. This made the net rate to the Canadian shipper only 2 cents per ton to that port, while the Oswego and Ogdensburg shippers paid the full 20-cent rate. These American ports naturally protested against the discrimination in favor of Montreal. Our Government sustained them and claimed it was a violation of the treaty, in that it was a denial of the equal treatment provided for therein. That was the principal cause of protest on the part of our Government, although there were several minor collateral discriminations that were also objected to.

On August 23, 1888, President Cleveland sent a powerful message to Congress upon the subject, in which he specifically called attention to Great Britain's constant discrimination against American shippers and shipowners. Did England yield and abandon her position in consequence of that message and our repeated protests? Did her Government advise Canada "we consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please"? Were the Canadians told that "the large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do—a voluntary withdrawal from a position questioned and misunderstood" by the people of the United States? Did England point out to her colony that whether "right or wrong," she ought to reverse her action without question, in order that she once more might deserve a reputation for generosity and the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation?

Sirs, she did none of these. She felt she was clearly within her rights under the treaty. She still continued to secure advantages for her own nationals. To our repeated demands she made repeated denials or shifted her position in some trifling particular. Nor was any attempt made by the British ministry to stampede the people of England into a withdrawal from their position on the score that the national honor was involved in her strained interpretation of the terms of the treaty. She simply allowed rebating to continue to the great detriment of American ships and shippers. For years we constantly claimed our rights. For years our claims were constantly denied.

And then Congress, in a spirit of retaliation, passed "an act to enforce reciprocal commercial relations between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes." This law, approved July 26, 1892, by President Benjamin Harrison, 21 years after the ratification of the treaty, enabled the President, because of the continued discrimination against citizens of the United States in the use of the Welland Canal, to issue his retaliatory proclamation of August 18, 1892, placing a toll of 20 cents per ton on all freight passing through the St. Marys Falls Canal in transit to any port of the Dominion of Canada. Up to that time the St. Marys Falls Canal had been free of tolls to the vessels of that country. Of course Canada could not stand the strain of this punitive legislation, and the former retaliatory proclamation was soon suspended by a second proclamation of President Harrison, dated February 21, 1893, in which he withdrew the tolls for use of the St. Marys Falls Canal upon satisfactory assurances having been given that equality with British subjects had been secured to the citizens of the United States in regard to the use of the Welland Canal. That is how the system of Canadian rebates under the treaty of 1871 was abandoned. It was not done, as Sir Edward Grey stated, in the face of our repeated protests.

Canada has never to this day admitted that her grant of rebates was inconsistent with her treaty obligations. Quite the contrary. For the British ambassador presented notes to our Secretary of State just prior to the close of the incident, and after the abandonment of the system of rebates by Canada, in which he claimed that "every obligation of the treaty has been fully and unreservedly met." His statement also holds firmly to their "contention that they were justified in adopting the tolls and rebates," and adds "the difference of opinion which exists as to the treaty rights of the two countries is to

be regretted, but it forms no ground for a charge that either country in maintaining its own views proceeds with a disregard of solemn obligations."

I commend that language to those among you who are so fearful that our national honor will be tarnished if we refuse to follow the lead of the President in abandoning an American policy adopted by a former Congress, approved by a former President of the United States, promulgated by a former Secretary of State, and fully justified by an overwhelming majority of our countrymen.

Mr. Chairman, the President himself, when he was pleading for the votes of his countrymen, approved the soundness of our position on the question of tolls exemption in the Panama Canal for American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade. Speaking to a gathering of New Jersey farmers at Washington Park in that State on August 15, 1912, he said:

> One of the great objects in cutting that great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports, to allow all the farmers on what I may, standing here, call this part of the continent, to find an outlet at ports of the Gulf or the ports of the Atlantic seaboard, and then have coastwise steamers carry their products down around through the canal and up the Pacific coast or down the coast of South America.
>
> Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it had passed the House—provides for free toll for American ships through that canal and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company. You see the object of that, don't you? [Applause.] We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.
>
> The farmers of this country are, in my judgment, just as much concerned in the policy of the United States with regard to that canal as any other class of citizens of the United States. Probably they are more concerned than any other one class, and what I am most desirous to see is the farmers of the country coming forward as partners in the great national undertakings and take a wide national, nay, international, view of these great matters, feeling all the pulses of the world that beat in the great arteries of their own life and prosperity. Everything that is done in the interest of cheap transportation is done directly for the farmer as well as for other men. So that you ought not to grudge the millions poured out for the deepening and opening of old and new waterways. * * *
>
> Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. It is the utterance of earnest and honest men, who intend to do business along those lines and who are not waiting to see whether they can catch votes with those promises before they determine whether they are going to act upon them or not.
>
> They know the American people are now taking notice in a way in which they never took notice before, and gentlemen who talk one way and vote another are going to be retired to very quiet and private retreat.

Surely he does not want his words to be understood as having been only "molasses to catch flies"? And yet when we contrast his preelection utterances upon this subject with his address of March 5 we can come to no other conclusion. Surely the President of the United States would not stoop to play the rôle of a mere opportunist? Surely he was sincere when, in speaking of the free-tolls plank of the last Democratic national platform, he said:

> Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. It is the utterance of earnest and honest men, who intend to do business along those lines and who are not waiting to see whether they can catch votes with those promises before they determine whether they are going to act upon them or not.
>
> They know the American people are now taking notice in a way in which they never took notice before, and gentlemen who talk one way and vote another are going to be retired to very quiet and private retreat.

And yet the manner in which the planks of that platform are being ripped up, one by one, might well give rise to the suspicion that they were indeed intended as "molasses to catch flies." We have seen the civil-service plank badly shattered in the provision in the urgent deficiency bill, approved by President Wilson October 22, 1913, exempting deputy internal-revenue collectors and deputy marshals from the civil-service laws and regulations. We have seen the plank compelling the publication of the names of indorsers of appointees to the Federal courts chopped into kindling wood. We are now witnessing the attempt of the President and his followers to completely destroy the plank for the exemption of coastwise ships from the tolls provision of the Panama Canal act. And all, all despite the fact that prior to the presidential election of 1912 the present Chief Executive emphatically and positively proclaimed that his party "platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. * * * And gentlemen who talk one way and vote another are going to be retired to very quiet and private retreat."

In his recent address to Congress the President said:

> Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much-debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

He is evidently forgetful or unmindful of the fact that some noted English authorities have asserted the absolute soundness of our position. But even if all the world held we were in the wrong and we still believed we were in the right, it ought to be our proud boast that knowing the right we dare maintain it. [Applause.]

Sirs, the principles of truth and right are eternal. They should not be discarded at the whim of those who occupy lofty stations. We can afford to be generous on occasion. We have always been generous in our treatment of the nations of the earth during all our history. As I pointed out when this exemption question was pending here in 1912, we have performed innumerable acts of altruism during our brief history. But no request of any President, based upon the mere matter of expediency, will ever deter me from doing my duty to my country in accordance with my own conception of duty to my country. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, if, in the past, men had sacrificed their honest convictions on great principles to expediency, the world's progress would have been seriously retarded.

The patriots of the Revolutionary period could have purchased their peace with England easily, if they had been content to pay a trifling tax on tea, just to acknowledge the right of the mother country to levy such a tax. But they believed in the soundness of their doctrine, that taxation without representation is tyranny, and pledged their lives and their sacred honor to the maintenance of that doctrine. If they had, in a spirit of generosity, and as a matter of expediency, withdrawn from their position, the world might never have known the true value and benefit and glory of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, generosity is one of the noblest attributes of man; but we are taught in equity we must be just before we are generous. Sirs, that is a good, a safe, a wise rule of action, not alone for individuals but also for nations. But the gift we are now asked to make to mankind is evidently not intended to be a voluntary offering. It is to be given under duress—under coercion. It is not even a gift; it is rather to be in the nature of a fee, a price to buy the friendship of England in order that the administration may have her support in its foreign policy. And we are plainly told that unless we give it in ungrudging measure the Chief Executive shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence. Sirs, friendship thus bought is never worth the cost, for it is never lasting. Does anyone believe that we will be bettering our standing before the rest of mankind by yielding to the President's importunities? Will our action not be a confession that we have heretofore been guilty of an act of national dishonor? I, for one, deny the imputation carried in the President's recommendation. Does he believe that by tamely submitting to the demands of a competing nation for the exaction of a toll from our vessels in the coastwise trade, with which vessels under our laws those of no other country in the world may compete, we will be adding luster to American achievement? Does he believe the relinquishment, "right or wrong," without even a chance to arbitrate the question before a proper tribunal, will tend to dignify us and raise us to a higher station in the family of nations than we have heretofore occupied? If he believes these things, he will awake to a realization of the fact that he has been indulging in fatuous delusions. The real effect of his policy will result in additional demands. "There shall be no fortification of the canal" will undoubtedly be the next command. If those who contend we have no right to exempt American vessels in the coastwise trade under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty be right, I do not see, under their contention, where we get the right to fortify the canal. Fortification is the corollary of exemption. And it will be contended that the Senate, having voted down an amendment to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty providing for fortifications, the action of our Government in constructing fortifications at either end of the canal is in violation of the principles of neutralization as contemplated by the treaty, and must be discontinued.

Mr. Chairman, it is true the Senate did vote down such an amendment. It is also true that the Senate voted down the Bard amendment for the free passage through the canal of American coastwise vessels. But practically every Senator who was present at that time and has discussed the matter admits that action to have been predicated on the understanding that no such amendment was necessary, as the United States had the undoubted right to legislate for such exemption. The late Cushman K. Davis, of Minnesota, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, so stated to his colleagues. He had the undoubted confidence of his fellow Senators. He had been one of the peace commissioners on the part of the United States in negotiating the treaty of Paris of 1898, after the War with Spain. He was regarded as

an expert in matters affecting our foreign relations, and his assurances that we had the right to legislate for free tolls for our coastwise vessels undoubtedly had the effect of causing the defeat of the Bard amendment. So it was in the matter of the canal's fortification. And to fail to properly fortify the approaches to the canal would, in my opinion, prove us guilty of criminal carelessness.

The Panama Canal will change the trade routes of the world, just as did the Suez Canal. The latter was a private enterprise, carried to a successful conclusion by Ferdinand de Lesseps, a French engineer, who had secured a concession for its construction from Saïd Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, in 1854. Subsequently England purchased the stock of Ismaïl Pasha, who had succeeded Saïd Pasha as Khedive, and thereby acquired an interest, though not a controlling one, in the Suez Canal. In 1882 a revolt against the then ruler of Egypt, Tewfik Pasha, was led by Arabi Pasha, an officer in the Egyptian Army. England sided with the Khedive, Tewfik Pasha. In the whirl of time we are apt to forget these incidents, and I deem it proper and timely to recall them at this moment, when we are nearing the completion of our Government's canal at Panama.

Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, at one time attached to the English diplomatic service, in his book entitled "Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt," contrasting the English diplomacy of the period immediately succeeding the Crimean War with English diplomacy of more recent date, says:

> It was essentially pacific, unaggressive, and devoid of those subtleties which have since earned it a reputation of astuteness at the cost of its honesty.

And I do not doubt that the overwhelming majority of my countrymen will not question English astuteness in that country's dealing with the Panama Canal question. She was equally astute in 1882 in dealing with the Suez Canal question. That great waterway was also supposed to have been neutralized. While there was no specific treaty on the subject in 1882, it was tacitly understood and agreed by all maritime nations that the canal should be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations on terms of entire equality. Arabi Pasha, in revolt against his sovereign, and claiming to be the rightful ruler of Egypt, had been urged by his confederates to seize the canal for strategic purposes. This Islamite chief, in response to de Lesseps's appeal against such action, replied:

> As I scrupulously respect the neutrality of the canal, especially in consideration of its being so remarkable a work, * * * I have the honor to inform you that the Egyptian Government will not violate that neutrality except at the last extremity and only in the case of the English having committed some act of hostility at Ismailia, Port Said, or some other point of the canal.

All honor to that Mohammedan chief, who respected the rights of its neutrality in refusing to attack or destroy the canal to gain even a military advantage.

England's officers also knew of the canal's neutrality. Capt. Gill, an English officer, kept a diary of his activities during the Egyptian insurrection in 1882. On August 5 he went down the canal with another officer to Suez, but stopped at Ismailia to discuss with a Mr. Pickard the best route to choose for cutting the telegraph. He learned there were three routes, one being from Gisr or Kantara, but scrupulously notes in his diary that this is objectionable as violating the neutrality of the canal. But did England eventually scruple about such a violation of neutrality? Oh, no. When it served her purpose to seize the canal for military purposes, she promptly did so. During Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, August 20, 21, and 22, respectively, she violently took possession of the Suez Canal, and for those three days refused all vessels, even those of the canal company itself, the right of entering or leaving that waterway. She ordered all shipping tied up at the gares or widenings in the canal, notwithstanding its avowed neutrality. Contrast England's action with that of the Islamite, Arabi Pasha, and ask yourselves whether we would be doing our duty to ourselves, our country, and its future generations if we were to recede from our determination to fortify the canal. The Government of the United States had detailed Lieut. Commander C. F. Goodrich, of our Navy, now rear admiral, retired, to observe the developments and progress of that campaign. He made a long and exhaustive report to the then Secretary of the Navy, Hon. William E. Chandler, in which he quotes a telegram from M. de Lesseps, dated at Ismailia, August 19, 1882. This telegram reads:

> The English admiral at Suez informs the company's chief traffic agent that in consequence of orders from his Government he forbids, until the receipt of further orders, any ship, large or small, even the company's boats, to enter the canal, and he will resort to force to prevent any attempt to contravene these orders. The admiral, moreover, has placed a gunboat at the mouth of the canal. I have protested against this act of violence and spoliation.

This telegram was sent on the day before Admiral Hoskins, of the British Navy, despite a vigorous circular of protest from the canal company, took possession of the canal and its dependencies. Lieut. Commander Goodrich, in his report to our Government, made this observation in commenting on England's action in this matter:

> The inference to Americans is obvious that the neutrality of any canal joining the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans will be maintained, if at all, by the nation which can place and keep the strongest ships at each extremity.

In order to impress our Navy Department with the importance of this suggestion our representative italicized every word embraced in this comment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our duty is plain. We must not recede from our position, either as to free tolls for American ships in the coastwise trade or as to the fortification of the canal.

It would be much easier and far more desirable for the administration to change its foreign policy than for us to abandon our undoubted rights in the canal which we have built without foreign assistance, financial or otherwise, for the benefit of the world's commerce. It is conceded by all that we have the undoubted right to pass our ships of war through the canal free of tolls, even though we charge tolls on the warships of every other nation. In my opinion, that concession determines the entire controversy. If we can, under the treaty, favor our own ships of war, we can also favor our own ships of commerce, for the very paragraph relied on by our opponents to uphold their position speaks jointly of "the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations."

We are manifesting our generosity by charging our vessels of commerce in the foreign trade identically the same tolls that we are charging the vessels of commerce of all the great maritime nations of the world. These nations, under existing law, can not compete with our ships engaged in our coastwise trade. They are therefore not injured financially or otherwise. But the citizens of the United States, in their desire to foster genuine and legitimate competition between the railroads and the waterways of our country are amply justified in demanding that the existing law be not repealed. There must be no abject surrender. There must be no subserviency. There must be no notice to the world that while the people of the United States have always stood for fair dealing and honesty in their international relations, they will not yield, under pressure, a principle which they believe to be absolutely right. As was said on another occasion when humiliating propositions were made to the accredited representatives of this Republic when she was but a weak and struggling member of the family of nations, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has asked Congress to repeal that paragraph of the Panama Canal act which provides for free tolls to American ships. In his address the President said, "I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure." It is evident the President's embarrassment arises from his interpretation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 and the carrying over of certain stipulations of that treaty into the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901. As the President reads these treaties the United States will suffer in good repute at home and abroad, if it shall permit the vessels of this country to pass through the canal free of tolls while tolls are levied against the vessels of other nations.

Without citing the findings of great minds that have undertaken to interpret the treaties at variance with the President's views, it is extremely difficult, in the light of such information as the President has submitted to the House, to agree that the Government has reached the limit of its resources in diplomacy and that all doubt is to be resolved in favor of Great Britain.

The United States has undertaken peacefully and with its own money to construct a canal at Panama for the welfare of the nations of the world. That all nations shall use the canal on equal terms may be conceded as the benevolent purpose of the people of the United States in constructing the canal. Are we now to vote them out of their right to regulate and manage their internal affairs through and upon the canal? This apparently will be the effect of favorable action on the question of repeal. Not this only, but we are to concede that it is also our duty to pay the maintenance cost of the canal for the benefit of other nations forever, no matter how great the tax upon our own people may become.

The administration's policy in this regard may be consistent in honor, but, unhappily, it is also consistent in this, that

whereas we appear to have assumed the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the people of Mexico by dictating who shall be their President, therefore Great Britain has the right to intervene in our internal affairs by dictating the kind of treatment the United States shall accord to its own ships. For one, I am not prepared to admit that either policy is right, nor do I believe that up to date, in either of these transactions, the honor of this country has any very great advantage over its humiliation.

What is the duty of Congress with respect to this repeal of the free-tolls provision? So far as the House of Representatives is concerned, it is brought unfairly into this controversy, for it had no part in making the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, nor in continuing its provisions in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Yet the House is told by the President that it ought to undo legislation it assisted in enacting for the people whom it directly represents, because a moral obligation was laid upon the Nation in 1850 by diplomatic and senatorial action and was renewed by the same agencies in 1901.

The moral obligation by which the American Nation is supposed to be bound, and in which the Members of the House of Representatives had no voice, appears now to have carried with it the right of Great Britain to estop the representatives of the American people from giving free passage to American merchant vessels and men-of-war through a canal which the people of the United States built with their own money and to whom in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty "the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal" was expressly conceded.

In trying to reach a solution of the question presented to us by the President, I do not intend to criticize the motives of Great Britain in holding fast to a good bargain, nor do I intend to concede that American diplomats made a bad one. The United States wanted to build the canal at Nicaragua, or Panama, and did finally build it at Panama with the acquiescence of Great Britain as expressed in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which "superseded" the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

We could not build the canal under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without the consent of Great Britain, but that embargo was lifted in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and it was agreed "that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States," and the United States "shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

Great Britain did not object to our "exclusive right" to provide for the regulation and management of the canal, which it agreed we should construct. To that extent it put the entire burden of construction, operation, and maintenance upon the United States. Nor did it object to the acquisition by the United States of the Panama Canal Zone for the purposes of the canal; but it now insists, in effect, that the Congress of the United States has no right to exempt American ships engaged in the coastwise trade from the tolls levied upon the ships of other nations using the canal. It is upon this ground the President invokes the repeal of the free-tolls clause.

What are we going to do about it? Great Britain stands upon the paragraph of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which says:

> The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation.

And so forth.

The President puts it up to Congress as a question of honor. It is contended by some that England had a "mortgage" on the United States by virtue of concessions made to the United States at the time of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty revived that "mortgage." In a memorandum to Lord Pauncefote, August 3, 1901, Lord Lansdowne, presenting Great Britain's objections to certain of Secretary Hay's amendments, referred to the Clayton-Bulwer convention as "an international compact of unquestionable validity," which he said "could not be abrogated or modified save with the consent of both parties to the contract." Further on in the same memorandum he said that while His Majesty's Government had an "earnest desire to meet the views of the United States, and would sincerely regret a failure to come to an amicable understanding," and so forth, they "preferred, as matters stood, to retain unmodified the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer convention."

In other words, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty would stand forever, as Great Britain viewed it, whether the canal was constructed or not.

Nevertheless the United States pressed its diplomatic negotiations, and notwithstanding the 50-year-old "mortgage" which Great Britain had recorded against the United States in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—a mortgage, by the way, which was just as effective against Great Britain as it was against us—Great Britain, in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, did finally concede to the United States not only the right to construct the canal but yielded to "the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

In making that concession, which was the one vital thing the United States contended for, Great Britain may be said to have accepted consideration for the alleged "mortgage" it held in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, in that it received assurance of the construction without cost to itself of a canal for which it had been waiting for centuries and from which it would derive tremendous benefit. Moreover it left the United States free to provide for the "regulation and management of the canal." It is true there was to be "no discrimination against any such nation," and so forth, but still the United States was to have "the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal."

Having thus withdrawn from or been relieved of participation in any expense of construction or operation, Great Britain conceded to the United States "the exclusive right" to regulate and manage the canal. We heard no complaint when the United States conceded to Panama by treaty the right of free passage for its vessels through the canal; neither was there complaint, so far as we know, that the United States had undertaken, at its own expense, to fortify the canal. The only question that has been raised is that of tolls, upon which the President has addressed the Congress.

Shall the bill that has been introduced for the repeal of the free-tolls paragraph be passed? For one I am not now prepared to vote for it. Valuing the honor of my country and believing it should keep its plighted word, I am not yet satisfied that my country is in the wrong or has not kept its word.

The United States in constructing the Panama Canal has accomplished the engineering marvel of the ages. It has expended its treasure and given up the lives of many of its patriotic sons in order that all the nations of the earth shall reap the advantage of it. In providing a canal from ocean to ocean the United States contributes to the commerce of the world a saving of thousands of miles of sailing delay and risk in treacherous seas. It has changed the map of the world so that the nations will be brought into closer relationship, and civilization generally will be vastly improved. In short, the United States, and the United States alone, has brought to a realization the dream of the ages in geography, in commerce, and in human achievement.

Great Britain, it is believed, will share in the advantages of this stupendous work more than will the United States. Germany also will doubtless be a greater beneficiary of commercial results. Germany and England and all other nations will have the protection of the United States in the use of the canal. They will pass through it at the expense of the United States, which constructed and owns it. Is it reasonable that any treaty drafted in the interest of universal peace, as the treaty of 1850 was supposed to have been, should be construed to bar the owner of this the world's greatest engineering undertaking from its own property?

Mr. Chairman, I do not plead for the exemption of American ships because they ought not to pay tolls; perhaps they might be made to aid in bearing the burden of operating the canal. That, however, is not the question. Shall the regulation of the American ships using the canal—ships that do not come into competition with Great Britain or any other nation—be regulated by the United States in its own way? Or, in spite of the "exclusive right of regulation and management" conceded to the United States in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, shall that right be interfered with or questioned by Great Britain or any other nation?

I do not see how, after giving Great Britain the use of the canal "on terms of entire equality" with those of all nations, we can go further in this instance without acknowledging the right of foreign interference with those ships of Uncle Sam which seek the use of his own great maritime highway. Nor do I believe the American people will tolerate the delegation of that right to any other nation. It is for us to regulate our own ships on our own territory.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the administration has not exhausted all the means at its command to settle this controversy without embarrassing Congress. Unless our diplomacy is entirely awry, there is still recourse by which a national humiliation may be avoided. There is something more than "the pound of flesh denominated in the bond."

We have given much to Great Britain as recompense for any consideration she may have yielded us in 1850. We have contributed to the peace of nations in Cuba and the Philippines. We have contented ourselves with home affairs, while Great

Britain and Germany have taken the trade of South America. We have kept the foreign nations from going to war against that business. We have lowered our American tariffs to their great advantage. And, lastly, we have built a canal to link up the Atlantic and the Pacific, more apparently, for their commercial benefit than for our own. Surely we have done something to earn the "exclusive right" to regulate and manage the canal. Surely we have done enough to induce the Department of State to make another effort to relieve the United States of the perpetual obligation it is asked to impose upon itself. If the canal is good for Great Britain or any other nation and is to be subject to the supervision of Great Britain, why should all the expense of construction and maintenance be borne by the United States alone? The best peace arrangement the world has ever known presents itself in the neutralization and joint operation of the Panama Canal. This should appeal to the Department of State as a cause for further diplomatic negotiations.

If the canal is to be a world's enterprise for the use of all nations, and the United States, which owns it at a cost of $375,000,000 and operates it an annual outlay on one account or another of $25,000,000, is not to have the use of it for the ships of its own fleet, would it be inconsistent with the honor of other nations who use it to assist in paying for it? Let the Department of State think this over.

Or, if the administration still reads the treaties as binding the United States only to perpetual servitude in a hazardous and expensive enterprise, what may be said of the power of Great Britain under either the Clayton-Bulwer or Hay-Pauncefote treaties to compel the United States to open and operate the canal if it chooses to keep it closed? Here is a phase of the diplomatic situation I have not seen discussed anywhere in the treaties or correspondence. Suppose the resources of the United States should some time be found inadequate to operate the canal. Or suppose, for some other reason, the Congress should determine to close it. Is there anything in the treaties to compel the United States to operate the canal?

Or suppose the United States should undertake to grant its rights in the canal to Germany or some other power having large interests in South America. Is there anything to stop it?

These and other questions that suggest themselves to the lay mind I leave for possible diplomatic consideration, even though it be determined by those who have the power so to do to vote away the one exclusive and patriotic right which most American citizens believed to have been reserved to the United States in its monumental world benefaction—the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 746. An act for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 4023. An act for the relief of Waldo H. Coffman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### USELESS PAPERS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the report of the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 104) and the report of the Postmaster General (H. Doc. No. 576), submitted a report (No. 398) thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COOPER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $400,000 for high-power radio stations (H. Doc. No. 837); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries, office of Auditor for the Interior Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 838); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, inviting attention to estimates for salaries, office of the Secretary, and recommending an appropriation for an executive clerk in the office of the Assistant Secretary for the fiscal year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 839); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1633) granting certain coal lands to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 399), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7048) making appropriation for the relief of C. Jensen for injuries sustained from forest team, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 400), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS of Maine, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12778) for the relief of W. D. Stoyer, administrator of the estate of Henry S. Stoyer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 401), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1138) for the relief of Helen Wakefield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 402), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7091) for the relief of C. E. Anderson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 403), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6420) for the relief of Ella M. Ewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 404), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of Marcus L. Pelham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 405), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4480) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 406), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2667) for the relief of the legal representatives of Parker S. Rouse, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 407), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS of Maine, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3920) for the relief of William E. Murray, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 408), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12166) for the relief of Jennie S. Sherman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 409), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4008) for the relief of Sandy Crawford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 410), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6014) for the relief of Serapio Romero, late postmaster at Las Vegas, N. Mex., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 411), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS of Maine, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 54) for the relief of George W. Hoyt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 412), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11218) for the relief of the Doremus Machine Co., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 413), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14690) to increase the limit of cost of Federal building at Fort Atkinson, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14691) to provide for the purchase and equipment of a mine rescue station and car, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 14692) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Mount Olive, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 14693) to regulate shipping between ports in the Canal Zone and the United States, certain of its insular possessions, and Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 14694) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 14695) to amend section 5234 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to permit the Comptroller of the Currency to deposit upon interest the assets of insolvent national banks in other national banks of the same or of an adjacent city or town; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) providing for a conference in the city of Washington to restore peace and order in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 445) directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to report by what authority the gaslight companies are furnishing gas to consumers outside of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14696) granting an increase of pension to John H. Woodruff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14697) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 14698) granting a pension to Anna Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14699) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Guy C. Pierce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14700) granting a pension to Crockett Parrent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 14701) granting an increase of pension to Charles Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 14702) granting an increase of pension to Charles Landon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 14703) granting a pension to Roscoe City; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14704) granting an increase of pension to James E. Speake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORTH: A bill (H. R. 14705) granting a pension to Sarah Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 14706) granting an increase of pension to Roscoe Caudill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 14707) granting a pension to Mrs. Robert S. Meil; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 14708) granting an increase of pension to Louise Bendel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14709) granting an increase of pension to Tolos Otis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14710) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14711) for the relief of Miles A. Hughes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 14712) granting an increase of pension to Charles Swarthout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 14713) granting an increase of pension to Caswell York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14714) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14715) granting a pension to Peter McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14716) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Linville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14717) granting an increase of pension to Charles Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14718) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 14719) for the relief of Newton Boughn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14720) granting a pension to Catharine Reiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14721) granting an increase of pension to David Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14722) for the relief of Ezra T. Vance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 14723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Chilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14724) granting a pension to Harry D. Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 14725) for the relief of John F. West; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 14726) granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 14727) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Demming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14728) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McCleery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 14729) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. S. Robertson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14730) to quiet title to lot No. 44 in square 172, in the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14731) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to Albert V. Conway, substituted trustee, for certain registered United States bonds redeemed or assigned by the Government upon forged assignments; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14732) for the relief of Clara M. Heaston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14733) for the relief of Silas Overmire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 14734) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Lederar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14735) granting an increase of pension to Salome A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 14736) granting an increase of pension to James A. Dowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14737) granting a pension to Anna Sorrells; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of 40 citizens of New York City, protesting against Dillingham-Lodge-Gardner bill, for literacy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petitions of citizens of Leslie, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of certain citizens of Struthers, Ohio, protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Pittsburgh Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the San Francisco Democratic Club, indorsing Government ownership of street railway systems in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of certain citizens of New Castle, Pa., protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of 35 citizens of Hamilton, 20 citizens of Maysville, 150 citizens of Union Star, and 80 citizens of Pattensburg, all in the State of Missouri, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Cincinnati Branch of the Railway Mail Association, favoring restoration in grade of certain railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the First Presbyterian Sabbath School, of Bryan, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Andrew Crawford Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, against any change in the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Coshocton, Ohio, against nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, evidence to accompany a bill (H. R. 13990) for the relief of Solomon Stricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petitions of various members of the First Baptish Church of Hubbard; the First Congregational Church of Newton Falls; the Wooster Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Akron; sundry citizens of Kenmore and Warren; 30 citizens of Farmdale; 22 citizens of Barberton; and 121 citizens of Burton, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Summit County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Association of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of the Ex-Union Volunteer Officers' Association, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring passage of Volunteer officers' retired list bill relative to three-fourths pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Kathryn Fellows Auxiliary No. 28, of David Wilson Camp No. 59, United Spanish War Veterans, and Theodore Roosevelt Camp No. 10, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Charles Bradhering, William M. Powers, Theodore Territy, Tim Keppel, Timothy Brenahan, Donald Joncas, Ed. Donovan, Martin Hansen, Thomas Mason, Charles Thilault, John Shara, and N. Zasmussen, all citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures, which will interfere in the most unwarranted manner with the liberties and privileges as men and citizens, by depriving them of the right and opportunity to habits as American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Boston Store, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 13660 relative to fixing sale price on manufactured goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Master Steam and Hot Water Fitters' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 14228, relative to separating contracts for heating, plumbing, etc.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petitions of J. H. Rathe and others, of Florida, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Bank of Ovedo, Fla., favoring change in income-tax law, relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of 150 citizens of Port Huron, Mich., and 318 citizens of Lum, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Michigan Society of California, protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Shabbona Grange of Michigan, favoring the rural-credits bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of F. M. Crouch, of New York City, favoring repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, of New York City, favoring passage of Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring passage of House bill 2966, relative to disposal of hydroelectric power developed by the dam between St. Paul and Minneapolis; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of the Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union, of Norwalk, Conn., and other citizens of Connecticut, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Brainard & Wilson Corporation, of Danbury, Conn., against Underwood anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petitions of 19 citizens of Harveyville, Kans., and 460 citizens of Emporia, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of the Georgetown (Mass.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring passage of Bathrick farm-credits bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Division 13, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hamilton, Mass., protesting against "One hundred years' peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petitions of sundry citizens of Staunton, William L. Ensel, of Springfield, and others of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Staunton, Ill., protesting against the present Federal game laws; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: Affidavits to accompany a bill (H. R. 10195) granting a pension to Francis M. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petitions of 26 citizens of Nutley, N. J., and the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Arlington, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the United Irish Societies of Newark and Essex County, N. J., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls

exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14681) for the relief of Francis L. Snell; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Mark N. Gross, Julius Niednagel, Henry W. Naas, William L. Berndt, David S. Bernstein, Isidor Kahn, J. P. Haymaker, George Andreae, Harry Joseph, Charles F. Artes, Arnold Elmendorf, F. W. Griese, John C. Weber, Aug. C. Wessel, Gotleib Wessel, and C. E. Schutz, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of R. D. Comstock, of Rockyhill, Conn., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mr. A. E. Wilson, of East Hartford, Conn., in favor of the passage of House bill 5139, the Hamill bill, relative to retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of the third Iowa district, protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. McCullough, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the Hot Springs (S. Dak.) Commercial Club, relative to considering the merits of the Angostura project for irrigation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Jack Foster Camp, No. 3, Department of South Dakota, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the passage of the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the South Dakota Society of California, protesting against the repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Hot Springs (S. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring passage of bill extending to settlers of South Dakota the privileges of the enlarged homestead; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of various members of Epworth League, Chapter No. 7428, of East Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Memorial of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 12743, for appropriation for erection of marine hospital at San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Cooks', Helpers', and Waitresses' Unions, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the second congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Wayne County, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the Sailors' Union of the Pacific of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 12743, appropriating $500,000 for the erecting of a marine hospital building in San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, letter from the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 11522, relative to increasing salaries of Federal civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut, protesting against Senate bill 2232, amending the postal savings bank law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petitions of various Spanish War veterans of Illinois, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of A. P. Haviland and others of Monmouth County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of various banks and trust companies of Twin Falls, the Bannock National Bank of Pocatello, Bank of Emmett, and Bank of Hansen, all in the State of Idaho, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petitions of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Xaver Wambach and other citizens of Mahnomen County, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition signed by members of the German Roman Catholic Benevolent Society, of Pierz, Minn., protesting against passage of House joint resolution 168, Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of various members of the Ninth Avenue United Presbyterian Church of Monmouth, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of C. M. Dean and others, of Steuben County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Petitions of 2,012 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 122 citizens of Iowa against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Memorial of various churches of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring law establishing a national board of censors for motion-picture films; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition signed by Mr. C. M. Donley, of 349 Woodlawn Avenue, Cambridge, Ohio, and 13 others, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Rev. C. E. Dickinson, of Belpre, Ohio, and some 80 others, favoring the adoption of the constitutional amendment for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of J. H. Streeb and other citizens of Wyandot County, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of N. M. Crawford and other citizens of Wyandot County, Ohio, against House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George W. Vorhis and 28 other citizens of Upper Sandusky, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of L. F. Dudley and 28 other citizens of Marengo, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. F. J. Reinbarth and 25 other citizens of Wharton, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### WEDNESDAY, *March 18, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for life, for the life that is more and more abundant, the life that has its center and source in Thyself. We bless Thee for the wild joy of just living, for Thou hast so adapted us in Thy providence to the world Thou hast given to us that there is joy and gladness in living the life that Thou hast committed to us. We thank Thee for intimations of the life beyond, so full, so rich, so abundant, and that so find answer in the universal heart, that there is the universal longing after immortality. We bless Thee that above all the ministries that come to us, luring us onward and upward, there is the final, highest revelation in Him who came that we might have life, and have it more abundantly. He hath said, As I live ye shall live also. So do Thou lead us to the fullest life. In His name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of Poaling Zion Branch, No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of Nationaler Arbeiter Verband, No. 1, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Bedford, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of Local Union No. 121, United Mine Workers of America, of Buffalo, Ohio, praying that an investigation be made of conditions existing in the mining district of Colorado, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Dick Lambert Post, No. 165, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ironton, Ohio, and a memorial of Tod Post, No. 29, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, of Youngstown, Ohio, remonstrating against any change being made in the American flag, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Toledo, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Portsmouth, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of local branch of the Railway Mail Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to reimburse certain railway postal clerks who have been demoted for service reasons only, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Medina, Seville, Bloomdale, Circleville, Columbus, Lakewood, Warsaw, Orville, Marshallville, Gloucester, Damascus, New Philadelphia, McConnelsville, Coshocton, Hicksville, Youngstown, Cleveland, Ashland, Flushing, and Middletown; of the congregations of Zion Evangelical Church of Kenmore; the Crystal Park Methodist Episcopal Church, of Canton; the Presbyterian Church of Frankfort; and the Presbyterian Church of Osborn, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THORNTON. In behalf of a large number of citizens of New Orleans, La., I present memorials remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Houston and Corpus Christi, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of East Rochester, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of various branches of the American Continental League of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of various patriotic orders of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of the Minnesota Turnbezirk of Minneapolis, and of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Red Wing, and Lake City, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 140, Patrons of Husbandry, of Plainfield, Conn., remonstrating against the free distribution of seeds by the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 8, Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Platers, of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, American Continental League, of Ansonia, Conn., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Leeds Council, No. 16, Order United American Mechanics, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DU PONT presented the memorial of John J. Dougherty, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the American Continental League, of South Boston, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Essex County, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," and also against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the Baptist Young People's Union, of Middleboro, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of Local Union No. 8, Metal Polishers, Buffers and Platers, of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, American Continental League, of Ansonia, Conn., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, Irish-American Societies of Connecticut, of Ansonia, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Plainfield Grange, No. 140, Patrons of Husbandry, of Plainfield, Conn., favoring a discontinuance of the free-seed distribution by the Federal Government, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSON presented memorials of citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Essex County, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of "One hundred years of

peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for compensation for mechanics, generally known as machinists and toolmakers, employed by the United States Government, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present 666 individual memorials from citizens of the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called Hobson bill or any other measure looking to national prohibition. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I also present memorials from 275 citizens of the third congressional district of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL CO.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 304, authorizing the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey to investigate and report on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co., submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on the 17th instant. I will ask instead of the resolution going to the calendar that it may be referred to the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey. It involves a question of expenditure from the contingent fund, but on account of the substantial legislation involved it has to go to the other committee. I ask that it may be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4942) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 4943) to amend section 1 of an act of Congress approved April 9, 1912 (37 Stat., 80), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4944) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Stone (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4945) to regulate the collection of special taxes now provided for by law against retail dealers in liquors and wholesale dealers in liquors, and the issuance of receipts and licenses to such dealers in such manner as to restrict the issuance of such receipts and licenses to persons proposing to engage in such business in localities in which, under the laws obtaining in said locality, such business is not prohibited; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4946) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. THORNTON:

A bill (S. 4947) for the relief of the estate of W. B. Knight, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 4948) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Hopkins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 4949) granting an increase of pension to John Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 4950) to authorize the award of medals for service in battle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4951) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bolster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4952) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Elwell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4953) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

### CENSORSHIP OF MOTION PICTURES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to introduce by request a bill providing for censorship of motion pictures. I ask unanimous consent, without having the bill read at length, that it may be printed in the RECORD. I am anxious that the people all over the country should know just what is in it and that we may have the benefit of any criticism its publicity may bring upon it. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 4941) to establish an official national censorship of motion pictures in interstate and foreign commerce and in the District of Columbia and the Territories and all other places under national jurisdiction was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 4941) to establish an official national censorship of motion pictures in interstate and foreign commerce and in the District of Columbia and the Territories and all other places under national jurisdiction.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That a Federal motion picture commission is hereby created, to be a part of the United States Bureau of Education and to be composed of five commissioners appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be of the same political party.

SEC. 2. No commissioner shall hold any other office or position under the United States Government. Each commissioner shall hold office for six years, except that when the commission is first constituted two commissioners shall be appointed for two years, two for four years, and one for six years. Each commissioner shall thereafter be appointed for full term of six years. Any vacancy shall be filled in same manner as an original appointment. The salary of the chairman shall be $3,500 a year and of each other commissioner $3,000 a year.

SEC. 3. The commission may appoint deputy commissioners and other assistants and fix the compensation of each. Actual and necessary traveling expenses shall be allowed to those who travel on the business of the commission, which shall be provided with necessary office furniture, stationery, supplies, projecting machines, and appliances necessary for inspection of films and for manufacture of film seals.

SEC. 4. The commission shall license every film submitted to it and intended for entrance into interstate commerce unless it finds that such film is obscene, indecent, immoral, or depicts a bull fight or a prize fight, or is of such a character that its exhibition would tend to corrupt the morals of children or adults or incite to crime. The commission may license any film subject to such excisions, amplifications, or alterations as the commission may direct and require to be made. The commission may, by unanimous vote, withdraw any license at any time for cause shown.

SEC. 5. The commission may appoint advisory commissioners to advise and assist in the examination and censoring of films, who shall hold office during the pleasure of the commission and serve without compensation. No person shall be appointed an advisory commissioner who directly or indirectly has any pecuniary interest in the exhibition of motion pictures or in any film exchange or firm or corporation engaged in manufacturing motion-picture films.

SEC. 6. The commission shall adopt an appropriate seal, which shall be affixed in such manner as the commission may direct to every film approved by it. Such seal shall not be attached to any film which has been approved by the commission subject to revision until after the required changes have been made, a record of which shall be kept, and portions objected to shall be delivered into the possession of the commission.

SEC. 7. When any film has been approved the commission shall issue a certificate in the form adopted by the commission. Each certificate shall describe the film and shall bear a serial number and shall state its title and description and the day upon which it was approved by the commission, and the number of linear feet contained therein. No copyright shall be issued for any film which has not previously received the certificate and seal of this commission.

SEC. 8. The commission may, if it has licensed a film, issue a seal and certificate for each duplicate thereof without an examination of such duplicate.

SEC. 9. No person, firm, or corporation shall carry or transport any film from or into any State in interstate commerce unless such film has been licensed by the commission and the seal of the commission has been attached thereto and a true copy of the certificate accompanies it.

SEC. 10. No moving-picture film that has not been licensed by the commission and does not bear its stamp shall be exhibited in any licensed place of amusement for pay or in connection with any business in the District of Columbia or the Territories or any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States Government.

SEC. 11. In places designated in section 10 the seal of the commission attached to the film shall be exhibited on the screen before and in the same manner as such film is exhibited, and the certificate granted for a film shall be posted at or near the entrance to the place where such film is being exhibited during the exhibition thereof.

SEC. 12. The fee for the examination of each film of 1,000 feet or less shall be $3. These fees shall be paid monthly into the United States Treasury.

SEC. 13. Any change or alteration in any picture on the film after it has been licensed shall be a violation of this act and shall also void the certificate and seal issued for or attached to such film, and it shall be unlawful to exhibit it as aforesaid or transport it in interstate commerce.

SEC. 14. The commission shall annually, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, submit a written report to the United States Commissioner of Education. In this report, and by other means, the commission shall make recommendations to importers and producers of films and to the public regarding the educational and recreational uses of motion pictures.

SEC. 15. The penalty for violation of this act shall be a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment not more than one year, or both, together with confiscation of films unlawfully changed or exhibited or transported.

SEC. 16. The sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of the salaries and expenses of the

commission, to be paid by the Treasurer upon the warrant of the United States Commissioner of Education, additional to what has been appropriated for the United States Bureau of Education.

SEC. 17. This act shall take effect immediately, except sections 9, 10, and 11, which shall take effect nine months from date of the approval of this act.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment providing that hereafter no officer or enlisted man on the active list of the Navy or Marine Corps, and no such officer not on the active list but who is under orders to perform active duty, who shall be unable to perform such active duty, or is absent therefrom, on account of physical unfitness of any character resulting from his own misconduct shall receive pay for the period of such absence or inability to perform active duty, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. LANE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

POWER OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 365), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That a pamphlet entitled "The Power of the Federal Judiciary to Declare Legislation Invalid which Conflicts with the Federal Constitution," by David K. Watson, be printed as a Senate document.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 366), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on the pending Indian appropriation bill, such stenographer to be paid at a rate not exceeding $1 per printed page; and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES. I ask leave to call up Senate resolution 288.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What is the resolution?

Mr. JONES. The Secretary may read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 288, submitted by Mr. JONES on the 6th instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Senate what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls, what representations have been made regarding the same, and copies of all communications received from foreign countries relating thereto, together with copies of answers submitted by the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. Before that is done I desire to take a few minutes of the Senate to submit some remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have refused to criticize the President's Mexican policy, even though I have thought and am now convinced that grave mistakes have been made in dealing with this delicate situation. The large responsibility is his, and I would not embarrass him in its solution, especially so long as his efforts are directed to preserving peace between the two countries and to keeping our armies out of Mexico. Intervention means war; war means battles and death. Battles can not be fought without men; men must come from the homes of the land, leaving sorrow, anguish, and pain. In the interest of the innocent people at home—husbands, sons, wives, mothers, and sweethearts—I have applauded every effort of the President in their behalf, and I earnestly hope that his efforts may be crowned with success, especially so long as they do not involve dishonor to our country.

As a Senator of the United States I am the representative of the people of my State and not the servant of the President. In matters of legislation and domestic concern I have as great, if not greater, responsibility than he, and I would be unfaithful to my trust if I should stifle my convictions of duty, disregard the interests of my people, and supinely follow his dictation.

Congress, by an overwhelming majority, in 1912 passed a law exempting American coastwise ships from paying tolls on going through the Panama Canal. This action was taken after long and full discussion. It was indorsed by and was in accordance with the party platform declaration of every great political party. It was expressly approved by Mr. Wilson as the candidate of the Democratic Party for President of the United States. He took particular pains to tell the farmers of the country that free tolls would be a great benefit to them in the regulation of transcontinental railroad rates, and assured them that "everything that is done in the interest of cheap transportation is done directly for the farmer as well as for other men"; and to impress them with the friendly attitude of the Democratic Party and its candidates he assured them that "our platform is not molasses to catch flies; it means business; and they who talk one way and vote another are going to be retired to a very quiet and private retreat." Our Democratic friends are most solicitous for the farmer during campaign, but he seems to be their special target in legislation.

The President must have thought then that our action in exempting coastwise ships was wise, just, beneficial, and honorable. He must have thought the meaning of the treaty clear and plain. He now urges us by special message to repeal this legislation. If we do so, it is an irrevocable act. The burden of tolls must rest forever on our coastwise ships, unless we see fit to relieve all vessels from tolls. What argument does he present; what reason does he offer for his change of view and for reversing our deliberate legislative action? Absolutely none. He says the "exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view." He gives no reason; he cites no facts upon which to base this assertion, so contrary to his public declaration in the last campaign. I assert that its repeal will be a great economic blunder, and will benefit the Canadian Pacific Railroad Co., Canadian interests, and the transcontinental railroad lines, and no others, and will injure more or less every other interest in this country. I shall present facts and argument proving this assertion when this proposed legislation comes up for consideration.

He says the law which we passed is "in plain contravention with the treaty with Great Britain," but presents no argument whatever sustaining that contention. It is a mere dogmatic, scholastic statement, contrary to the deliberate judgment of many of the greatest minds of the Republic and to the deliberate decision of this body by more than three-fourths majority. Had he not studied the treaty before he made his campaign speech? Was he not familiar with its "plain" terms then? Did he not then believe our action entirely consistent with our national honor? Surely so. A mere assertion to the contrary is not enough now; but he should present the reasons and the argument that has led him to change his mind and now assert that such exemption is contrary to the plain terms of the treaty.

This exemption contravenes no treaty obligations either in letter or in spirit, and therefore no question of national honor is involved. It is solely an economic one, and the interests of our own people are alone to be considered. Let me assert as positively as language will permit that those who favor this exemption are as jealous of the national honor as those who oppose it. Those who favor the repeal say that the national honor must be upheld. So do we. They confess the weakness of their position by urging the maintenance of the national honor, because no one would impair it, no matter what might be the consequences.

The Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast passed resolutions a short time ago with reference to this matter, and they set out our position in reference to our treaty obligations so clearly and succinctly that I desire to read the first resolution:

*Resolved by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast*, That we disclaim any intention or desire to avoid in the slightest degree any treaty obligation of the United States; that we claim for the people of the United States and for those of the Pacific coast as sensitive a regard for treaty obligations, or obligations of any other sort, as those held by the citizens of any other country, and particularly those of Great Britain, to whom we concede a high regard for all such obligations. Nevertheless, in a matter of such great importance as that under consideration, in which we feel that the interests of all the people of the Pacific coast are deeply involved, we can not concede to any foreign government the right to interpret a matter which we regard as being one entirely within the powers of the American Government, namely, that of prescribing the terms upon which American vessels may do business through an American-constructed canal with other American ports, in which business the vessels of no foreign country can or has engaged.

Again, the President says that, whatever may be our differences, the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty "is not debated outside the United States." He is mistaken. Eminent men and powerful publications in Great Britain have upheld our contention, and for 60 years Great Britain itself interpreted similar language exactly as we do in this case. It was then in her

interest, and was so interpreted. Her interest now lies in a different interpretation, and Great Britain has always been controlled, in her foreign policy especially, by the interests of her trade and her citizens. This construction also is sustained by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States itself. Is the meaning of the treaty debated outside the United States? In the London Law Review of November, 1912, a prominent jurist concludes an article on this question as follows. I desire to say that this article may be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 49, part 5, of the Sixty-second Congress, third session, at page 17. The article is by Edward S. Cox-Sinclair and was written after we had passed our legislation. It concludes as follows, after a very careful argument:

[From London Law Review, November, 1912.]

To sum up, it is reasonably arguable:
(a) That the United States can support its action—

That is, providing for exemption for the coastwise vessels—

on the precise words of the material articles of the treaty; that its case is strengthened by reference to the preamble and context; and that its case is difficult to challenge on ground of general justice;
(b) There is no international obligation to submit the construction of its legislative act to any process or arbitration; and
(c) That any aggrieved party has an appropriate and impartial and a competent tribunal in the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is also found in the same connection another article by a prominent English jurist, Mr. C. A. Hereshoff Bartlett, LL. B., and I desire to quote merely a few paragraphs from it. He says:

The passage of this act—

Referring to the legislation exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls—

and the affixing of his signature thereto by the President has raised such diversity of opinion, both at home and abroad, as to whether it is or is not in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty that it becomes proper to review this subject from an impartial and unprejudiced point of view, entirely aside from any question of nationality or politics.

So that, according to this writer, there seemed to be considerable debate with reference to this matter at home and abroad. As bearing upon our right to exempt our coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, I will read at this point two or three short paragraphs from this legal writer. He says:

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty, in mentioning vessels of commerce of all nations, never contemplated such an eventuality as the United States becoming the owner of the land covered by the waters of the canal and exercising sole and sovereign power thereover, and consequently it can not be held by any just construction to apply to conditions and circumstances so completely beyond the intention and design of the treaty.

Again, the same writer says:

The treaty could never have been intended to prevent the Federal Government from arranging and regulating its domestic or coastwise commerce, and in the use and enjoyment of its own property as it saw fit.

"On terms of entire equality" was intended to prevent the United States discriminating in favor of one foreign nation against another foreign nation. The Federal Government was laying down its own rules, not for the regulation of its own ships of war and of commerce but for the ships of war and of commerce of the stranger beyond its ports, and it unhesitatingly declared that the canal that might be built under its auspices should be free and open to them on terms of entire equality. No advantage should be obtained by one foreign nation over another foreign nation; there should be no favoritism, no special benefit or privilege extended to one that should not be open alike to all foreign nations. This is what the provision means and nothing more. It would require the interpolation of terms not contained in the treaty itself to sustain any other construction.

Mr. President, it is not dishonorable to assert your rights, and it is not an argument against the exemption to assert that the Nation's honor must be upheld. It must be shown clearly that such exemption is contrary to some treaty. This is not and can not be done.

Why should we reverse ourselves? No reason is given save that others make a different contention. "We ought to reverse our action without raising the question of whether we were right or wrong" because other nations insist upon a different interpretation of our treaty. This is a surprising doctrine and would lead to most disastrous consequences. No self-respecting nation with any regard for its independence and sovereignty could follow such a doctrine and exist. It will place us at the mercy of the selfishness of every nation with which we may have a treaty.

Follow it in this case and what excuse can we offer for fortifying the Panama Canal if objection is made? None.

Follow it and on what ground can we prevent the warships of an enemy from passing through it? None.

Follow it and on what ground would we refuse to send our warships from the harbors at the entrance of the canal within 24 hours in the face of an overwhelming force of the enemy? None.

Follow it and what excuse can we give for refusing to arbitrate the question of admitting to our shores citizens of other countries, however undesirable to us? None.

Follow it and how can we refuse to submit to a court of arbitration the question of the naturalization of undesirable citizens from other countries? None.

We have passed treaties under which other nations can set up just such claims, and the doctrine of the President would inevitably compel us to accept their construction of such treaties. If we accept this doctrine now, nations will never agree with us when their interests are adverse. They will always insist on a construction favorable to their interests and citizens, and we will have to "do the large thing" and accept their contention.

Mr. President, there is more at issue now than the matter of tolls. A larger question faces us—the integrity, the vital interests, the sovereignty of the Nation are involved. The fact that we are big and powerful does not require us to be craven. A just and firm insistance on our rights will command respect and honor and insure peace. A weak and puerile submission to selfish demands will bring ridicule, contempt, and dishonor and invite aggression.

The message of the President is not only remarkable for its lack of facts, dearth of reason, and for the sublime assurance of the schoolmaster that the boys will do what he wants, but it is more remarkable in its conclusion. He says:

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

The product of a master of English, these words mean something: "I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration." What does that mean? It is an appeal directed especially to Democrats. Can they resist the implied command, to be enforced, if need be, by the rewards and penalties of Federal patronage? It is not for them to "reason why"; it is for them to obey or politically die. I want to draw from these words a conclusion honorable to my country, but it is difficult to do so.

I again quote the President. He said:

I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

We are at peace with all the world. What serious troubles have we? What are the "other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence" if not the Mexican situation? That this legislation is a part of the price that this Nation must pay to get the help of a foreign power in the adjustment of the unfortunate Mexican situation is a humiliating conclusion, but I see no escape from it. That it is a part of an understanding expressed or tacitly implied relating to Mexico is shown by the words of the message and by the circumstances surrounding its delivery.

It has been repeatedly announced that no message would be sent to Congress on the tolls question. A British subject was murdered in Mexico by rebel authorities whom Great Britain does not recognize. Our position prevents Great Britain from entering Mexico. The British minister has a long conference with the President, and immediately the newspapers say:

President Wilson announced to-night immediately following the conference with Sir Lionel Carden that he will go before Congress on Thursday (this conference was Wednesday evening) and deliver a message urging the repeal of the Panama Canal tolls exemption section. The coupling of the White House announcement on Panama tolls with the visit of Sir Lionel Carden is explained on good authority as the culmination of a series of negotiations between the Government and Great Britain for the preservation of the Monroe doctrine, threatened by the Mexican situation.

A hint is declared to have been taken from the historical fact that the Monroe doctrine was originally inspired by England. The President is said to realize that the Mexican tangle has brought about almost a parallel situation with that which existed when President Monroe announced his policy. As a result an agreement is said to have been reached with Great Britain under which the two countries will stand together against any European attempt to test out the Monroe doctrine in Mexico.

The President's quid pro quo for England's aid is the pledge of the repeal of the Panama Canal tolls act, the ratification of the general arbitration treaty upon which the Senate has recently acted favorably, and other considerations of interest to England.

It is reported that as one of the conditions Great Britain will seek reparation for its losses through Confederate bonds issued during the Civil War by a plan sanctioned by this Government, under which, if successfully applied, the burden of reparation will fall on the Southern States.

These suggestions were almost unbelievable, but what immediately followed proves that there was a basis for them. We were called together in the House of Representatives like rebellious schoolboys, and while the ambassadors from nations interested in our humiliation sat in the galleries about an applauding Secretary of State, we were told, as from the throne, that we must do this thing in support of the foreign policy of the administration or the President would "not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence, if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure."

With no information we are expected, in schoolboy fashion, to do as we are told and ask no questions.

Mr. President, what is the foreign policy that requires such humiliating, cowardly, and craven action on our part? What are the delicate matters that demand this price? What nation is to be appeased by our hasty and ungrudging submission? Why is it necessary for us to repeal a law of great domestic concern in order that some foreign unknown policy may be brought to a successful issue? Is noninterference in Mexico by foreign powers to be bought at this price? Have we become so inert, so weak, so supine, so servile, that the Monroe doctrine must be sustained and invigorated by the very powers against which it was invoked?

Are we so weak or so entangled in the meshes of our own diplomacy that the demands of England, based upon the selfish interests of the Canadian Pacific Railroad Co., must be granted, right or wrong? Have any nations besides England objected to the legislation it is proposed to repeal?

These are questions that must be answered to the satisfaction of the American people. This resolution should be passed at once and a response full and clear be forthcoming.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I desire, without taking the time to read it, to ask the privilege of printing the resolutions of the Valley Central Grange, No. 343, Patrons of Husbandry, of my State, which I think present the contention with reference to the Panama tolls matter as clearly and concisely as any communication I have received. I also desire to print a telegram which I have received from several prominent citizens of Spokane with reference to this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Whereas the East and West alike demand the freedom from tolls for our coastwise ships passing through the Panama Canal, because we have long suffered from excessive transportation charges of transcontinental railroads, and it is obvious, should American coastwise ships be compelled to pay tolls, the possibilities of a competing line of commerce will be hampered and we shall still be at the mercy of railroad corporations and will be compelled to pay in the future the present maximum transportation charges, which have worked untold hardships upon us in the past; and

Whereas the repeal from the statute books of the United States of the law exempting American coastwise ships from tolls is demanded by Canadian railroads, which are supported by American transcontinental lines, who endeavor to accomplish through diplomacy what they failed to obtain in Congress; and

Whereas the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade having been indorsed at the polls two years ago by over 10,000,000 voters, a majority of the voting population of this Republic, is therefore the constitutionally expressed will of the American people; and

Whereas the Panama Canal is the achievement of the United States alone, being built entirely by American money, American effort and enterprise, it is therefore a domestic possession of the United States by virtue of property rights in the Canal Zone, fully established by purchase; and

Whereas the control of the canal is vital to the interests of the United States and involving the honor of the country since stipulation in treaty arrangements between this country and Panama, except matters in which a third nation is involved; and

Whereas it is inconceivable to the American people and highly incompatible to our honor and integrity as a nation to be called upon by pro-British pseudostatesmen to repeal a statute relating to our own domestic affairs at the behest of a foreign government: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Valley Central Grange, No. 343, Patrons of Husbandry, goes on record strenuously opposing the repeal of the statute granting American coastwise ships exemption from tolls in passing through the Panama Canal; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Agricultural Grange News, Kent Journal and Advertiser for publication.

C. S. FOLLETT, W. M.
VICTOR GONNOSON, *Secretary*.

[Telegram.]

SPOKANE, WASH., *March 6, 1914*.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We believe that conceding to England's contention on Panama Canal tolls would be a dangerous precedent, a pernicious interference with our own business, and treason to our own country.

W. D. SCOTT.
LLOYD GANDY.
GEO. W. SHAEFER.
E. H. ESHLEMAN.
H. S. CLELAND.
ZACK STEWART.
R. A. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I can see no reason why this resolution should not be passed. It simply calls for any representations or communications which have come from foreign countries with reference to this matter. It seems to me that Congress ought to have these communications and ought to have this information before taking up this very important question. I hope the resolution will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution offered by the Senator from Washington. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the resolution read. I was not in the Chamber when it was taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me the resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. It relates to legislation that comes before that committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the resolution involves our relations with foreign countries and calls for the transmission of communications from them. Unquestionably, it seems to me, the Committee on Foreign Relations is the proper committee to consider such resolutions, and my motion is that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Georgia why not pass the resolution? Why should not the information be furnished the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will reply to the Senator, Mr. President. I do not believe the Senate should pass upon resolutions of this character, involving our relations with foreign countries, involving investigations of this nature, without first permitting them to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would rather have the benefit of their opinion. They are familiar with facts connected with our foreign relations with which many Senators are not familiar. I do not believe in acting hastily upon any such resolution. I do not believe in acting hastily upon any resolution calling for information, and especially where it pertains to foreign matters. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for their report.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, this resolution simply inquires what nations have protested against the policy which Congress adopted of exempting American vessels in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I understand I was recognized, and that this debate is proceeding entirely against my right to the floor at this time. As I understand, the matter has been disposed of on the mere suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Georgia made a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I did not understand that the Senator from Washington in taking the floor intended to do away with the notice given by me that I would this morning endeavor to call up Senate bill 4628. I did not understand that it was expected that debate would be precipitated upon the resolution.

Mr. JONES. The resolution came up under the routine morning business.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I understood the Senator from Washington was going to take 5 or 10 minutes to address the Senate, but I did not understand that a debate would be precipitated which would preclude me from taking the floor under the notice I have heretofore given in connection with a matter of some importance to me.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere at all with the Senator from Arizona, and I therefore ask that the resolution go over without prejudice until to-morrow, as I desire to be heard upon the question of its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I make the suggestion out of consideration for the notice given by the Senator from Arizona, as I do not desire in any way to interfere with his convenience.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas that the resolution go over until to-morrow without prejudice?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the resolution will lie over without prejudice.

## PAYMENTS UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice given by me, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator to request unanimous consent to take up the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Such a request would force a roll call.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion will not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. SMOOT. Is morning business concluded?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Has morning business been closed, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4628) extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Land with amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that the bill may be read. I do not desire to detain the Senate at this time with any remarks on it.

The Secretary read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands was, in section 1, page 2, line 12, after the word "period," to insert:

*Provided further*, That entry may be made whenever water is available, and the initial payment be made when the charge per acre is established.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 19, after the word "charge," to insert "or the portion of the construction charge remaining unpaid," and on page 3, line 3, after the word "charge," to strike out "or the portion of the construction charge unpaid at the beginning of such installments," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That any person whose land or entry has heretofore become subject to the terms and conditions of the reclamation law shall pay the construction charge, or the portion of the construction charge remaining unpaid, in 20 annual installments, the first of which shall become due and payable on December 1 of the year in which the public notice affecting this land is issued under this act, and subsequent installments on December 1 of each year thereafter. The first 4 of such installments shall each be 2 per cent, the next 2 installments shall each be 4 per cent, and the next 14 each 6 per cent of the total construction charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 17, after the word "fund," to insert "but no homestead entry shall be subject to contest because of such default," so as to read:

If any such applicant or entryman shall be one year in default in the payment of any installment of the construction charges and penalties, or any part thereof, his water-right application, and if he be a homestead entryman his entry also, shall be subject to cancellation, and all payments made by him forfeited to the reclamation fund, but no homestead entry shall be subject to contest because of such default.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 4, line 8, after the word "charges," to insert:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may agree that such increased construction charge shall be paid in additional annual installments, each of which shall be at least equal to the amount of the largest installment as fixed for the project by the public notice theretofore issued. And such additional installments of the increased construction charge, as so agreed upon, shall become due and payable on December 1 of each year subsequent to the year when the final installment of the construction charge under such public notice is due and payable: *Provided further*, That all such increased construction charges shall be subject to the same conditions, penalties, and suit or action as provided in section 3 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 23, before the word "construction," to strike out "annual," and in line 24, before the word "every," to strike out "charges" and insert "charge," so as to read:

SEC. 5. That in addition to the construction charge, every water-right applicant, entryman, or landowner under or upon a reclamation project shall also pay, whenever water service is available for the irrigation of his land, an operation and maintenance charge based upon the total cost of operation and maintenance of the project, or each separate unit thereof, and such charge shall be made for each acre-foot of water delivered; but each acre of irrigable land, whether irrigated or not, shall be charged with a minimum maintenance and operation charge based upon the charge for delivery of not less than one acre-foot of water.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 7, line 16, after the words "cultivation of," to strike out "one-half" and insert "one-fourth," and after the words "cultivation of," at the end of line 19, to strike out "three-fourths" and insert "one-half," so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations governing the irrigation of the lands within any project, and may require the reclamation for agricultural purposes and the cultivation of one-fourth the irrigable area under each water-right application or entry within three full irrigation seasons after the filing of water-right application or entry, and the reclamation for agricultural purposes and the cultivation of one-half the irrigable area within five full irrigation seasons after the filing of the water-right application or entry, and shall provide for continued compliance with such requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate or to take its time further than to say that the purpose of the bill is merely to extend the time for payment of the charges on these reclamation projects that have gone far above any of the original proposals as to the amount that would be charged, coming sometimes to three or four times as much as those making the original investigation considered necessary. The bill extends the time and provides that all future reclamation projects shall come within the first provision, putting them all on an absolutely equal footing. The committee has not been able to see how any trouble whatever would be caused to the Government or to the Reclamation Service by the proposed change.

There is another suggestion I wish to make. For a good many months the chairman of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, the chairman of the House committee, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Reclamation Service have had this bill under the most careful scrutiny and consideration. After all these labors we have agreed upon the present measure. I trust no amendment will be offered to it, for I am free to say there is not a line or a suggestion in it that has not had the most careful scrutiny of the committees of the two Houses and the other persons already suggested.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the statement the Senator has just made really makes it unnecessary for me to ask him a question that I intended to ask.

I know the statement the Senator has made, with reference to the careful consideration of this bill, is in accordance with the facts. There was one amendment in which some of the people under some irrigation projects in my State, and I think in other States, were very much interested, and that is with reference to modifying to some extent the residence requirements of the reclamation law. I think that matter was given very careful consideration by the committee, and they considered it unwise to encumber this legislation with a provision of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Having only one purpose, and knowing that if at any time these conditions worked a hardship, with the present attitude of the department itself and of Congress we would have no difficulty in relieving that hardship, our purpose in this bill was simply to extend the time of these payments and to secure payment at that time.

Mr. JONES. In accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona, because I am as much interested in the passage of the bill as he is, I also shall not embarrass the bill by proposing that amendment at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is very gracious on the part of the Senator from Washington, and I thank him for it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 15. That the district courts of the United States in the several districts where the lands included within any reclamation project are situated shall have jurisdiction of all suits brought by the United States or the Secretary of the Interior for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and jurisdiction of all suits now pending or which may be hereafter instituted by any legally organized water users' association or irrigation district in behalf of the water users and settlers thereon for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and of the provisions of the reclamation law as referred to and defined in section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act or of said reclamation law shall be determined and adjudged by such court in a suit brought for that purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, before any homestead entry within such reclamation project shall be declared canceled and before any payments made thereon shall be declared forfeited.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] has said in regard to the care exhibited in the preparation and consideration of this bill. I think I can anticipate, and appreciate, too, any objections that may be made by the Senator from Arizona to the proposed amendment. Yet, Mr. President, neither in the original reclamation act nor in any act amendatory of that act is any provision made for the jurisdiction of the United States courts in suits or actions growing out of the reclamation law or the enforce-

ment of the provisions of that law, and there is some question as to whether or not such courts have jurisdiction.

I think in cases of this kind, arising under the reclamation act and other laws of the United States amendatory thereof, the United States district courts should have jurisdiction. This amendment so provides, and confers jurisdiction upon such courts in all cases instituted by the Government itself, or by the Secretary of the Interior in behalf of the Government, and in all cases brought by the water-users' associations, with this proviso at the end of the amendment:

That any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act or of said reclamation law shall be determined and adjudged by such court in a suit brought for that purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, before any homestead entry within such reclamation project shall be declared canceled and before any payments made thereon shall be declared forfeited.

I know of no reason why in this class of cases, as well as in other cases, there should not be a determination by a court of competent jurisdiction as to whether there has been any act or omission upon which a declaration of forfeiture may be based. I recall that in the case of the currency bill we were very careful to have a provision that in the event a national bank did not within a period of one year manifest its intention of coming into the system its charter should be forfeited, but only after a determination by a court of competent jurisdiction that there had been a violation of or a noncompliance with the act.

I know it has been urged that since national banks put their funds into the Federal reserve banks and are at the foundation of the system they should, therefore, have the right to go into court, or that there should be first a determination by a court that there had been the commission of an act or some failure or omission which would warrant forfeiture of the charter.

Mr. President, I think it will be found that the homestead settlers in reclamation projects have for the most part invested their all in the improvements made upon the lands which they have been permitted to take in those projects. I do not believe that on a mere declaration of the Secretary of the Interior or any other administrative officer such a settler's entry should be canceled and that any or all payments made should be forfeited. He may have rights and equities there which can be properly determined only in a court of competent jurisdiction. It should not be left to the Secretary of the Interior to say absolutely and without question, "This entry shall be canceled, upon which you have expended hundreds, perhaps thousands, of dollars, in building a home and in other improvements," or, "Any payment you have made shall now be declared forfeited, simply because you have defaulted in the payment of one or two installments, and that without any judicial inquiry or investigation as to what you have done or omitted to do and without regard to conditions."

I think this amendment should be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the Senator from South Dakota has said, and I am in favor of his amendment; but I wish to suggest to him a change in the phraseology of the first part.

The section begins:

That the district courts of the United States in the several districts where the lands included within any reclamation project are situated—

And so forth.

I think, expressed in that way, it is likely to result in some confusion. I suggest to the Senator that it would be better if the provision should read:

That the district court of the United States for the district where the lands or some portions of the lands included within any reclamation project are situated.

That would point out the particular district which should have jurisdiction in the given case.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the point made by the Senator from Utah a good one, and I will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment is accepted.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I trust the amendment will not be agreed to. This very question itself was considered time and time again. By adopting the amendment we would intrude into this bill a condition that absolutely does away with the principle on which it is constructed.

The bill now follows, and follows intentionally, in that particular the exact language of the original irrigation act. If we put on this bill the amendment suggested, any one gentleman who is strong enough to get up a dispute with a water-users' association can take and hold land that he never intends to use, but intends to keep in a monopolistic form until the unearned increment may possibly make him rich. He goes into court and puts up nothing; and after his dummies have held the land for two or three or four years under one of the provisions of this bill he comes in and buys from them at some particular price or they abandon the case.

The matter is always left in this bill, as it was not left in the other, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. This matter of taking the case to court is a thing that naturally appeals to all of us; but it is changing a bill the purpose of which is to do one thing only, and that is to extend the time. Now, it is proposed to ingraft on it new legislation that affects the whole irrigation system from the day it started up to this hour.

I sincerely hope the Senator from South Dakota will not press his amendment, and that the bill may pass in its present form.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I do not quite understand what particular provision of this amendment the Senator from Arizona objects to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I object to the provision for going into the Federal court for the purpose of suing on questions that can be and have been already settled whenever they arose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let us see. That is rather a broad statement.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I intended it to be broad.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The provision of the amendment is:

The district court of the United States for the district where the lands or some portion of the lands included within any reclamation project are situated shall have jurisdiction of all suits brought by the United States or the Secretary of the Interior for the enforcement of the provisions of this act—

Certainly the Senator would not object to that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not so much to that part. Go on with it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (reading):

and jurisdiction of all suits now pending or which may be hereafter instituted by any legally organized water users' association or irrigation district, in behalf of the water users and settlers thereon, for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and of the provisions of the reclamation law as referred to and defined in section 1 of this act.

That is the second branch of the provision. It does not attempt to confer any right to maintain a suit. It simply gives jurisdiction to the particular court.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Then why not just say that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me, it simply gives jurisdiction to a particular court over a class of cases with reference to which, of course, there must be a right of action. It does not confer it. Am I not correct about that?

I ask that question of the Senator from South Dakota. This amendment does not attempt to give a right of action where none exists?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It simply gives jurisdiction to a particular court over a class of cases in which it is assumed by the amendment a right of action now exists.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I know; but the Senator suggests that the suit has already been brought. We do not know that it has, and I do not know what question of jurisdiction may be involved in it. Be that as it may, however, I do not object to conferring the jurisdiction, if we can confer it in these particular cases, on the Federal court to try cases arising under this act in just that many words.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Then let us say it in those words, and I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what the amendment does say.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It takes a long time to say it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; it says it, in my judgment, rather briefly. It simply provides that the jurisdiction—describing it—shall be in the court over suits brought by the United States or the Secretary of the Interior for the enforcement of the provisions of the act; and, in addition to that, jurisdiction of all suits now pending or which may be hereafter instituted by a water-users' association, and so on, "for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and of the provisions of the reclamation law." It does not attempt to create a right of action in the water-users' associations, but assuming a right of action to exist in certain cases under the law it confers jurisdiction over them upon these courts.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And of all questions arising under this act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. "In all suits and actions in law or in equity authority is hereby conferred on the Federal court within that district." I have no objection to that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It does not say that the right of action shall exist in any particular at all.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have not the amendment before me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The proviso is as follows:

That any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act or of said reclamation law shall be determined and adjudged by such court in a suit brought for that purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, before any homestead entry within such reclamation project shall be declared canceled and before any payments made thereon shall be declared forfeited.

If I understand that, it simply reverses the procedure which would obtain now, namely, under the law as it exists now the Secretary would declare the forfeiture, whereupon the citizen against whom he would declare it would have a right to invoke the jurisdiction of the court to determine the question. It simply requires that the Secretary of the Interior shall bring the action in the first instance before the forfeiture can be declared.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is a right created there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; there is a right created.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. "Any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act." That means that anybody who can make a proper allegation can go into court and bring suit for noncompliance with this act. That is kept out of the court in most of these cases.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I understand the amendment it simply states that instead of the Secretary of the Interior being permitted to declare a forfeiture in the first instance the Secretary of the Interior shall himself invoke the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator that is the whole and only purpose of this proviso.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The reason the Senator gives is the very objection I have to the amendment. It opens the question of the whole status of the present Reclamation Service under the present law and under this proposed statute. These are not conditions where an honest man is making an effort to establish a home; it is against those who are attempting to get into these enterprises and monopolize the lands and do nothing with them except to wait for an increase of value. It is a common practice; there are many cases in my own State. It is a very ordinary case for persons to hold as much as four or five thousand acres. This is to prevent the bringing of a suit when they attempt to say you shall water this land or the water shall be carried from it to other lands. With that standing there it is a menace to the very enterprise itself.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Under what circumstances or conditions has a party secured even the shadow of a right to the amount of lands which the Senator has mentioned, four or five thousand acres? My understanding of the irrigation law is that it in substance makes the same limitation that the homestead law does, except that it reduces the amount of land which can be held under the law by a single individual. In other words, instead of allowing every individual to have 160 acres the project is divided into units, which may be 40 acres or 80 acres or 160 acres, depending upon the necessities of the particular project and plan. I do not understand that any man can enter any larger amount of that land than the reclamation law provides for.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is very easy to explain to the Senator and his question is very natural.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator proceeds, I will suggest that in a recent debate I raised that very question, and I was assured by some Senator from one of the States where irrigation is being practiced that the lands are in very small tracts, 40 or 60 or 80 acres, and I expressed gratification that that was the fact. I was quite astounded at the suggestion which the Senator made that a man might own three or four thousand acres.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The very bill that I am now trying to pass in this body provides absolutely the condition of which the Senator speaks as to all future projects. The earlier projects had already men within them with patented lands, homesteads. Some men had bought quite a number of homesteads and owned farms of seven or eight hundred acres. One man on the far side of the river had a very large holding of patented land. Those lands are held by patents that the Government can not affect at all except to require, as this bill requires, that they shall put water on it or shall dispose of it or else they do not get water. The object is to divide these tracts up into small homesteads of 50 or probably 160 acres. Those have nearly all been subdivided when they find one man can not work 160 acres.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator if the original reclamation law did not limit the amount of the holding, even under private ownership, of any man to not exceeding 160 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. One hundred and sixty acres.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But it applied to all projects thereafter.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. My recollection is that the irrigation law was passed solely for the purpose of irrigating land that had not been theretofore in private ownership. As a matter of fact the only constitutional way in which that law could be passed was in the matter of the Government's own land. Gradually there grew up, as there grows up in every bureau of the Government, an authority that never was conferred by law, so that now we have many projects under irrigation where the main purpose of the expenditure of public money was to irrigate private land. Of course we can not compel a man to irrigate his private farm if it comes under this irrigation project with the water from the project, neither can we take away the land that he holds by a good title within that project without due process of law.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator is in error in his conclusion that the original law did not contemplate taking in some tracts that were in private ownership that were in the water district. I think the original law did provide that they might come in upon the same conditions, because for the tracts that were irrigated they would in many instances have to run a ditch through private land; and there was a provision that the owner of the private land might also come under the project and have his land watered upon the same terms.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Perhaps the Senator is right. I was simply stating my recollection. Certainly a constitutional law never could have been passed with that purpose. It might have been incidental to it, but in no other way. Of course, in the case the Senator mentions a person had land originally, to which he held the title, but there is no way I can see, by this law or any other, by which we can divest that man of his title in the land which he now has.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will pardon me, we are drifting far afield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before we leave this subject I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question in reference to what he has said. The Senator may be quite right in saying that we could not legally provide for the irrigation of private lands by the expenditure of the funds of the General Government, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that after the original reclamation act was passed Congress adopted an amendment to it which brought Texas under the provisions of the law, and there never have been any public lands in Texas; they are all State or private lands.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am well aware of that and of many other laws we have passed affecting the irrigation proposition that were never contemplated or thought of; and if they had been contemplated and thought of, and stated on the floor of the Senate or House, the original act never could have been passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I called the Senator's attention to that for the purpose of indicating that Congress intended that private land should be brought under the operation of the law. Otherwise it would not have made its terms applicable to the State of Texas.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Not when the law was originally passed, I think the Senator will find.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have said nothing about the original purpose of the law, but only spoke of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] a question. I have not read over the bill very carefully, but I have read over his amendment. Let me put to the Senator an ordinary case. Suppose that the Senator's amendment should pass, and the Secretary of the Interior should institute an action and it should be found by the court that the party against whom the action was instituted had forfeited his rights, under the amendment would there be anything that would allow the court to relieve him from that forfeiture? I think the court should be given the same right that is always given courts to relieve a party from a forfeiture. Suppose the entryman comes in and says, "Yes, I have technically forfeited my right, but I am ready now to pay up and be reinstated or to perform the conditions that are required of me, if the court holds that I have been in default," it sems to me there ought to be a provision in the amendment that would allow the court itself to relieve from forfeiture.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that I had not contemplated exactly the con-

ditions that he has supposed, but I had in mind cases where it would be unjust and inequitable to declare a forfeiture where in equity there would be a defense. I will say that in drawing this proviso I was guided to some extent by the provision in the currency act, which is as follows:

Any noncompliance with or violation of this act shall, however, be determined and adjudged by any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in a suit brought for that purpose in the district or territory in which such bank is located, under direction of the Federal Reserve Board, by the Comptroller of the Currency in his own name before the association shall be declared dissolved.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator's amendment does not interfere in any way whatever with the equitable power of the court to provide in a decree that an entryman shall have a certain number of days within which to make deferred payments before the prior payments shall be forfeited and his entry canceled, because the language of the proviso is entirely in the negative. It provides:

That any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act or of said reclamation law shall be determined and adjudged by such court in a suit brought for that purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, before any homestead entry within such reclamation project shall be declared canceled and before any payments made thereon shall be declared forfeited.

In other words, as a prerequisite to declaring the homestead entry canceled or the payments forfeited, that matter shall be determined by the court. It is a necessary prerequisite to that action. But that does not interfere with the ordinary equitable power of the court to attach the usual terms.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is this the object of the Senator: If a man holds two years and under the ruling, under the just obligation of the Secretary of the Interior under the bill, he can give him four more or six more, and then, at the end of the six years, he can bring a suit to ascertain whether the land shall be declared forfeited?

Mr. STERLING. That is not quite the idea.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is what it will accomplish by the statement of the Senator here.

Mr. STERLING. In considering the question as to whether a man's entry should be declared canceled or any payment that he has made shall be declared forfeited, there may be a good many other questions to consider than the mere fact that he has not paid. Questions of engineering may arise and questions relating to the construction of contracts. The question as to whether the Government has done its part or not arises in this class of cases as it does not in any other class of public-land entries. The question, then, that will appeal to the court is whether, under all the facts and circumstances, there has been a forfeiture of the settler's rights.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to reply for a moment to the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I think the Senator is in error in his construction of this proposed law. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the bill, he will find this in the middle of the section:

If any such applicant or entryman shall be one year in default in the payment of any installment of the construction charges and penalties, or any part thereof, his water-right application, and if he be a homestead entryman his entry also, shall be subject to cancellation, and all payments made by him forfeited to the reclamation fund.

There is a direct provision that his right shall be forfeited. The question that will be submitted to the court will be simply whether or not the entryman's negligence has forfeited his right. Turning to the provision at the bottom of the amendment we find the following:

*Provided*, That any noncompliance with or violation of the provisions of this act or of said reclamation law shall be determined and adjudged by such court in a suit brought for that purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, before any homestead entry within such reclamation project shall be declared canceled and before any payments made thereon shall be declared forfeited.

In other words, before it can be declared forfeited the court will have to determine the question whether there had been a forfeiture. I am very doubtful if, under that, the court could exercise the ordinary equity powers of a court to relieve from forfeiture upon proper conditions that would be consistent with the law. That could be accomplished by adding at the end of the amendment these words:

And the court may in its decree relieve the entryman from any forfeiture upon such terms as the court may impose, not in conflict with the purposes of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, that would be very objectionable. Under such a provision we would never get any enterprise at work and never get a dollar paid into it. I suggest to the Senator whether this will meet the case: "That all cases arising in law or equity under this act shall be triable in the United States district court of the State where the land is situated." Now, what more do you want? I will agree to that amendment now.

Mr. STERLING. Down to the proviso my amendment covers exactly the same thing, and it is stated about as tersely as it can be stated.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator strike out the proviso and let the balance of the amendment stand?

Mr. STERLING. No, Mr. President; I am not prepared to strike out the proviso.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Very well. I am extremely anxious to get through with the bill before the morning hour shall close. I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. STERLING. I wish simply to say that I will accept the suggestion made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] as an addition to be made to the proviso in order that it may be perfectly clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. The question, then, is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] as modified.

Mr. STERLING. I wish further to say, if it is not already understood, that I have also accepted the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Has the question been put on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. So the question now is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota as modified.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. My hearing is extremely bad this morning, and I did not catch the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have sent the amendment to the Secretary's desk, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment proposed by Mr. STERLING it is proposed to add the following words:

And the court may in its decree relieve the entryman from any forfeiture, upon such terms as the court may impose not in conflict with the purpose of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the question at any length, but I will say to the Senator that it would be almost as well not to pass this bill at all as to pass it with all these proposed limitations. They will simply, in my judgment, destroy the chance of the money being returned to the Treasury. We have been thrashing this matter over for months and months, and when the bill is about to pass Senators suggest amendments to cover individual cases. If Senators will bear with me for a moment, I want to appeal to them—this being a bill for one particular purpose and framed in the language of the old act, only it is more liberal than the old act—not to jeopardize it by seeking to attach amendments designed to give the courts jurisdiction of some particular case under which you might put in the hands of the man who does not intend to carry out the law, who does not intend to make a home, and whose only purpose is fraud, a weapon by which he could very easily accomplish his object. The Senator from South Dakota does not intend that, but that is the effect of the amendment, for under the right to sue, as proposed by his amendment, a man could refuse to pay a cent for four years, and then turn the claim over to somebody else at a high price.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona what kind of a judge would he be who would give a decree preventing payment within a reasonable time? The Secretary of the Interior, under this proposed amendment, may bring suit or order suit to be brought just as quickly as the man on the outside. I know that the Senator wants to deal fairly in the matter. Let me present this case: Suppose an entryman, because of the failure of his crops or otherwise, is more than a year behind in his payments—most of them are several years behind now—although he has done the best he could, under the provisions of this bill his entry is subject to forfeiture, and everything he has paid in will belong to the water users' association.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is subject to forfeiture.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the proposed statute his failure to comply with the law would subject his entry to, and the payments he had made to, forfeiture for the benefit of the water users' association. If the court finds it to be a fact that he has failed, would the Senator from Arizona, in his desire to get money into the Treasury or into the water users' association, prevent the court from saying to that man, "If you will pay the balance within 30 days I will relieve you from the forfeiture"?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Would the Secretary of the Interior insist upon a forfeiture any quicker than you or I would?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Secretary of the Interior has no right under this bill to make any extension whatever of the time.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. He has absolutely under this bill. It is left entirely to him. Then, if I may ask the Senator a question, would he allow the conditions to exist such as I have already suggested? This bill is more liberal in every respect than was the original law, as to which no complaint has been made, except as to the shortness of time in which the entrymen must repay the money.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will answer the Senator that the experience of the American people who have had to deal with public lands has been that almost universally they would prefer to try these cases before a court; and the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is that a court may determine the question after the party has had a hearing. I am assuming that this amendment will be adopted. If it be adopted, then the Senator must agree with me that authority ought to be given to the court to release from the forfeiture upon such terms as are not in conflict with the purpose of the act.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this matter was very carefully considered by the committee of which I am a member. It is a very difficult problem to determine just what ought to be done in these cases. The people who have taken up these lands in a great many instances have not been fairly dealt with by the Government. Contracts have been made with them upon the basis of $30 an acre, for example, and before they have concluded the project the price has become $40 an acre, and even more. In some cases the price has run up as high as $60 and $75, and I think in one case it has transpired that actual cost to the entryman will be $100 an acre.

That is one side of the proposition; but the other side is that it is an exceedingly difficult matter for the Government to collect the money that is actually and justly due from the people who take up these lands. My own judgment about it is that we should be extremely liberal in the way of time; give them every opportunity to make these payments and then insist upon them being made. The Government should be protected as well as the entryman, and the money that comes into the Treasury will be carried on to other projects for the benefit of other people. It is a very well-known fact that there has been very little of the money that has been expended by the Government repaid by the people who have taken up these lands. The intention of the committee was to give ample time within which to make the payments, and then make it compulsory upon the entrymen that they should make the payments, which will be very small in amount, extending over 20 years. It seems to me that the bill is extremely liberal toward them. It was intended to be so, I know, by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] as modified. [Putting the question.]

Mr. STERLING. I ask for a division.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not want a division. Let it go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The noes seem to have it.

Mr. STERLING. I call for a division.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 10, noes 13; no quorum voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Nelson | Smith, Ga. |
| Borah | Johnson | Norris | Smith, Md. |
| Bradley | Jones | Overman | Smith, S. C. |
| Brady | Kenyon | Page | Smoot |
| Brandegee | La Follette | Perkins | Sterling |
| Bristow | Lane | Pittman | Sutherland |
| Burton | Lea, Tenn. | Ransdell | Swanson |
| Catron | Lee, Md. | Reed | Thomas |
| Chilton | Lippitt | Saulsbury | Thornton |
| Clapp | Lodge | Shafroth | Warren |
| Clark, Wyo. | McCumber | Sheppard | West |
| Cummins | Martin, Va. | Sherman | Works |
| du Pont | Martine, N. J. | Shields | |
| Gallinger | Myers | Smith, Ariz. | |

Mr. REED. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE], who is still detained at his home by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on important public business.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota as modified.

Mr. STERLING. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as a friend to the reclamation projects I want to ask the Senator from Arizona two or three questions, which will take but a moment. I have not had time to study this bill, but, as I understand, it extends the time of payment by settlers on irrigation projects from 10 to 20 years.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. The original act provided that there should be a period of 10 years, the payments to be made year by year without interest. Am I correct?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That was the provision in the original act.

Mr. GALLINGER. This bill extends the time on the same terms?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Upon the same terms, except that the payments are graduated differently. The payment required is a little less the first year and grows more and more as more land is put under cultivation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I intended to ask the Senator another question, but that was answered by some Senator on this side a little while ago, when he said that very little of this money had been paid back to the Government up to the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Very little has been paid back, because very little water has been turned on the land and very few of these projects have as yet been completed. That is the reason why more money has not been paid back to the Government, and explains why the extension provided for in the pending bill is necessary. If those who have taken up homesteads under the original reclamation act were required to make payment according to the provision of that act, it would break every one of them who is trying to acquire property.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator answers the question to my satisfaction, and I want to ask the Senator, in his judgment, whether or not the plan is working satisfactorily?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It will work satisfactorily, in my judgment, from now on; but it has not worked satisfactorily in the past, because, as the Secretary of the Interior stated in his report, both the people and the Congress were too hopeful as to what would be accomplished. Many unforeseen difficulties, engineering and otherwise, were encountered, involving a vast expense, before the farmer could get the lands ready for the water, and then when he could get the water, the expense absorbed everything that he had in the world.

Mr. GALLINGER. I find on my desk a copy of Senate bill 4934, introduced by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which proposes that we shall appropriate $250,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the feasibility and economy of irrigation by the reservoir system, and so forth. It occurs to me, if the plan is working as well as its friends said and hoped it would, and as I have supposed it was working, that it is rather strange that we should now be asked to pass a bill appropriating a quarter of a million dollars to make further investigations as to the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, while I do not wish to prejudge the object sought in the bill of the Senator from Texas, because I know nothing whatever of the facts, I imagine that that bill embodies a particular pet scheme of some one and involves the international relations between Texas and Mexico.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I have said, I am a friend, as the Senator from Arizona knows, of the irrigation plan, and I have nothing further to say about it. I hope the Senator's bill will pass.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I notice on page 3 the bill provides:

> SEC. 3. That if any water-right applicant or entryman shall fail to pay any installment of his construction charges when due there shall be added to the amount unpaid a penalty of 1 per cent thereof, and there shall be added a like penalty of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid on the first day of each month thereafter so long as such default shall continue.

In other words, if a farmer gets behind in his payments, he is to be charged 13 per cent for not being able to fulfill his contract. The Government can get all the money it desires for 3 per cent; but if the farmer, by reason of the failure of crops or otherwise, does not keep up his end, he is to be charged a penalty of what amounts to a little over 13 per cent. First, there is a 1 per cent penalty, and then there is added 1 per cent a month as long as the default continues. Does the Sen-

ator think that the necessities of the occasion demand such a heavy penalty as that?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That shocked me, as it did all the balance of the members of the committees of both Houses. They worked on it for about three months, however, and concluded that those hardships were not half so apt to occur as that there would be those who would intentionally avoid it. No man would permit his neighbor's property to go in default for lack of the payment of 1 per cent per month on $3. One per cent on $3 will be his first charge; and it keeps a percentage of that kind on so small a sum merely as a penalty for not doing it.

As I say, there is not a single man in the West worthy to live there who will see a neighbor going in default because his family was sick and he could not do the work or because he himself was sick and got behind. He would know something about his neighbor in such a case and would help him out. This is simply intended as a penalty, to force those to come in who would not come in otherwise.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, I understand that. It is just exactly the same as some of our State tax laws, which provide a penalty of 1 per cent a month. It is not done as a matter of punishment. They may accomplish something by compelling a man to pay it in time. The Senator is mistaken, however, about its being $3. The language is:

That if any water-right applicant or entryman shall fail to pay any installment of his construction charges when due—

He shall pay this amount. Now, the installment may amount to a great deal more than $3 per acre. If he should have 100 acres, it would be $300; and that would be quite an important sum.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is mistaken about how the installments are paid. The installments are for the water that you use. The water that you use in a month on your acre of land will be a very small amount. If you do not do this at all, if you remain in arrears all the time, there is no way of paying the charges except to put it on the shoulders of the neighbors.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is not the way it reads. It reads:

Shall fail to pay any installment of his construction charges.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Why, that is a part of every irrigation project. It is part of the construction charges that they have to pay. The construction charges under this bill are 2 per cent. That is what the bill says.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is based upon the acreage, of course. If the construction charges that a man had to pay amounted to $3 an acre, and he had a hundred acres, the total would be $300, would it not?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes. All I can say to the Senator in that particular is that the full committee of the Senate, composed largely of western men, and the committee of the House of Representatives, composed largely of western men, the Secretary of the Interior, the Reclamation Service, and the correspondence that I have in my office from water users' associations all concur in the conclusion that that is the only safe way. So far as I am personally concerned, therefore, I am averse to consenting to the change now, although I know how it would appeal to the Senators to put it in here. The persons I have named have put three or four months' work on this very proposition, and this bill is the result of all their labors.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should prefer, of course, a reason rather than a conclusion that we ought to make it this amount because the committee has reported it at this amount.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is no difficulty in giving the reason.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we did that, of course there never would be an amendment made on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will give the Senator the reason. The reason is to prevent thievery of public lands. The reason is to prevent a man coming into one of these irrigation enterprises and throwing the duties and obligations and burdens of the great, costly enterprise on other people, holding his land without putting up a cent just as long as he can hold it, going to court, having a suit about it, and staying as long as he can. If you should add the amendment we are talking about, he would never put up a cent and the improvements and the annual charges of the other people would have to be borne in bulk and distributed among those who did pay. It was to keep out that class of people, who number 5 to 1 as against those who are in default because they can not pay, that the committee acted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I confess I fail to see the connection in the argument between improper persons getting hold of this land for irrigation and a charge of 13 per cent to the honest entryman because he is in default.

To bring the matter to a focus—it may not seem a great deal to the Senate, but I think 13 per cent is a little heavy—I move to strike out "one," in line 9, page 3, after the word "of," and to insert in lieu thereof "one-half"; also, in line 10, to strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one-half."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will accept the amendment, so far as I am concerned, if I can speak for the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have been trying to say something on this subject. I do not think the amendment ought to be accepted. I think the bill ought to remain as it is. The object of providing for a penalty of 1 per cent is to compel the payment of these installments by making it unprofitable for the person to fail to make payments. It is put in for exactly the same purpose that we provide in our tax laws that the taxpayer who does not promptly pay his taxes shall pay, in my own State, 1½ per cent. It is not based at all upon the idea of charging a reasonable interest for money. It is imposed for the purpose of a penalty, and it is imposed in order to compel the delinquent to make his payments.

The Government is not engaged in the enterprise of loaning these installments back again to the individuals. It is interested in collecting them, and it ought to impose such penalties as will enforce their payment. When a provision is put in here that it shall be only one-half of 1 per cent, it is simply to put it upon the basis of a 6 per cent loan. It had better not go in at all, as it seems to me, unless we make it a sufficient sum to operate as it is intended to operate, as a compulsion upon the delinquent to make his payments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STERLING. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 16. That the district court of the United States for the district where the lands or some portion of the lands included within any reclamation project are situated shall have jurisdiction of all suits brought by the United States or the Secretary of the Interior for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and jurisdiction of all suits now pending or which may be hereafter instituted by any legally organized water users' association or irrigation district in behalf of the water users and settlers thereon for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and of the provisions of the reclamation law as referred to and defined in section 1 of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona if he will not accept an amendment which I am going to offer here. I appreciate entirely what the Senator said with reference to the work on this bill, and I do not want to delay the vote, nor do I want to interfere with the final passage of the bill. I wish, however, to offer an amendment upon page 2, line 2, after the word "fund," to strike out "five" and insert "two," so that a charge of 2 per cent shall be made at the time the application is filed instead of a 5 per cent charge.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BORAH. I offer that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 2, after the word "fund," it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that he ought to make a further change. By the amendment that has just been adopted he has provided for the payment of 100 per cent. The first payment was 5 per cent. That has been changed to 2 per cent. Now one of the other payments ought to be increased; otherwise you will never get all the money back.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I see. We will have to take care of that. Go on.

Mr. NORRIS. We have a provision now for the repayment to the Government——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I see the Senator's point. We will have to take care of it.

Mr. NORRIS. You can easily arrange that by increasing by 3 per cent one of the other payments, and that will make it come later on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read first for amendments, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

For relief of destitute American citizens in Mexico, including transportation to their homes in the United States, to be expended under the direction and within the discretion of the Secretary of State, $40,152.47.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 4, after line 23, to insert:

Payment to Samuel Butter & Co.: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of "An act for the relief of Samuel Butter & Co.," approved March 3, 1913, $11,709.69.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 7, after the date "nineteen hundred and fourteen," to strike out "$49,455" and insert "$74,182.50," so as to read:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For distinctive paper for United States securities, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, $74,182.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public buildings, construction and sites," on page 7, after line 19, to insert:

Washington, D. C., old building, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, repairs and alterations: For repairs, painting, reenforcing floors, vault equipment, partitions, plumbing, conduit and wiring, and contingencies, to adapt the first floor of the old building of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the accommodation of the Stamp Division of the Internal-Revenue Bureau, which is to be transferred from the Treasury Building, $17,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 2, to insert:

Washington, D. C., Treasury Building, special repairs: For changes and alterations in the basement and first and second floors of the Treasury Building, in order to provide accommodations for the Reserve Board created under the provisions of the recent currency act, $14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engraving and Printing," on page 9, line 3, after the words "plate printers' assistants," to strike out "$64,048" and insert "$96,072," so as to read:

For salaries of all necessary employees, other than plate printers and plate printers' assistants, $96,072, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 17, after the word "employed," to strike out "$187,150" and insert "$280,725," so as to read:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants, when employed, $280,725, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 8, after the words "Secretary of the Treasury," to strike out "$33,952" and insert "$50,928," so as to make the clause read:

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials except distinctive paper, and for miscellaneous expenses, including purchase, maintenance, and driving of necessary horses and vehicles, and of horse and vehicle for official use of the director when, in writing, ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury, $50,928, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 10, after line 19, to insert:

For maintenance of marine hospitals, including subsistence, and for all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under special heads, $11,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

For an additional amount to reimburse the appropriation of the Life-Saving Service on account of expenditures therefrom for construction and repair work made necessary by reason of extraordinary storms, encroachment of the sea, unusually high tides, and "military necessity," and for the completion of said construction and repair work, if necessary, $38,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "District of Columbia," on page 12, line 4, after "$100,000." to insert "*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to pay for legal services," so as to make the clause read:

Public Utilities Commission: For necessary personal and other services and expenses in making valuations of public utilities as provided by section 8 of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, to continue available during the fiscal year 1915, $100,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to pay for legal services.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment just read go over for the present.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say that since the action of the committee I have conferred with the Public Utilities Commission, and they say they have no purpose of using this money for legal services, and that it is entirely agreeable to them to have the amendment stand as it is; that they have no use for it for legal services.

Mr. SMOOT. It will not embarrass them at all?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Not one particle.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection to it. I will say to the Senator that I tried to get into communication with them this morning and failed, and that is the reason I asked that the amendment go over at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did get into communication with them, and was assured that they did not mean to apply the money in that way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

Militia: For subsistence furnished Naval Battalion by Navy Department for annual cruise, July 11 to 24, 1912, inclusive, $379.99.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 6, to insert:

To pay the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., transportation and freight service furnished in connection with annual encampment, August 14 to 28, 1912, inclusive, $3,074.07.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 10, to insert:

To pay William Phillip's Sons, cordwood furnished for use at annual encampment of 1912, $509.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 13, to insert:

For pay of members of brigade rifle team on duty at Camp Perry, Ohio, August 13 to September 2, 1913, $1,487.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 16, to insert:

In all, $5,450.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 14, to insert:

Employment of females: To carry out the provisions of the act approved February 24, 1914, entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," as follows: For three inspectors, two of whom shall be women, at the rate of $1,200 per annum, from April 1 to June 30, 1914, $900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 15, after line 21, to insert:

To reimburse James F. Oyster, late president of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for amount paid in settlement of judgment for costs in the case of Mary E. Nalle *v.* James F. Oyster et al., at law No. 55569, $183.20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the appropriation bill be proceeded with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside. The reading of the appropriation bill will be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers," on page 18, after line 2, to insert:

Marion Branch, Marion, Ind.: For household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, $8,000.

For hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Military Establishment," on page 19, after line 11, to insert:

To reimburse the various appropriations for the support of the Army for sums expended, or necessary to be expended, prior to July 1, 1914, in transporting and caring for interned Mexican soldiers and refugees, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and the expenditures heretofore made for the above-named purposes are hereby ratified and affirmed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that amendment be passed over for the present.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Would it not be as well to take it up now and dispose of it, unless the Senator has some good reason for its postponement?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that a number of Senators are at lunch who I think desire to speak upon the amendment. I do not believe it will delay the bill at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am willing to have the amendment passed over on that statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 20, after line 17, to insert:

Payment to Port Graham Coal Co.: For payment to the Port Graham Coal Co., Seldovia, Alaska, for a scow rented of the company and lost by the Navy Alaskan coal expedition in Cook Inlet, Alaska, November 16, 1913, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Navy Department, under the provisions of the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913 (36 Stat. L., p. 607), on account of damages occasioned to private property by collisions with vessels of the United States Navy and for which the naval vessels were responsible, certified to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 752, $401.90.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 25, after line 19, to insert:

PUBLIC LAND SERVICE.

Contingent expenses of land offices: For clerk hire, rent, and other incidental expenses of the district land offices, $30,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1913 is continued and made available for the fiscal year 1914, and said unexpended balance shall be transferred upon the books of the Treasury and placed to the credit of the appropriation now available for contingent expenses of land offices for the fiscal year 1914.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "United States courts," on page 29, after line 2, to insert:

Rent of rooms: For rent of rooms for the United States courts and judicial officers, $4,655, for the balance of the fiscal year 1914, and for the purchase of necessary furniture and other like equipment for court rooms in the city of New York, $10,000; in all, $14,655, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 8, to insert:

The Attorney General is authorized to enter into a lease for rent of rooms for the United States courts and judicial officers in the city of New York at an annual rental, not exceeding $18,620, for a period of five years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," subhead "Bureau of Lighthouses," on page 33, after line 1, to strike out "To pay the claim for damages which has been considered, adjusted, and determined be due to the claimant by the Commissioner of Lighthouses, under authority of the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 537), on account of damages occasioned by collision for which a vessel of the Lighthouse Service has been found responsible, certified to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 486, $65.38" and insert "To pay the claims for damages which have been considered, adjusted, and determined be due to the claimants by the Commissioner of Lighthouses, under authority of the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 537), on account of damages occasioned by collision for which vessels of the Lighthouse Service have been found responsible, certified to Congress at its present session in House Documents Nos. 486 and 756, $75.38."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Labor," at the top of page 36, to insert:

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.

For per diem, in lieu of subsistence of special agents and employees while traveling on duty away from their homes and outside of the District of Columbia, at a rate not to exceed $3 per day, and for their transportation, and for employment of experts and temporary assistance, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding $8 per day, and for traveling expenses of officers and employees, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," subhead "Senate," on page 36, after line 21, to insert:

SENATE.

To pay to Mrs. Virginia Lamar Bacon, widow of Hon. Augustus O. Bacon, late a Senator of the United States from the State of Georgia, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 37, to insert:

For compensation and mileage of Senators, $1,767.12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 1, to insert:

The Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Joseph R. Sullivan $116.67 for clerical services rendered the Hon. JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, of Illinois, from March 26 to April 16, 1913; and to Harry H. Buck $466.67 for clerical services rendered the Hon. BLAIR LEE, of Maryland, from November 4, 1913, to January 27, 1914, from the appropriation of "Salaries of officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate," for the fiscal year 1914.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 12, to insert:

The Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Hattie A. Krueger and Lizzie Krueger, sisters of Paul R. Krueger, late clerk to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands of the Senate, $74, being the amount due him on account of salary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 18, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 19, to insert:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

To reimburse the official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate for expenses incurred from September 15 to December 1, 1913, for clerk hire and other extra clerical services, $1,155.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 38, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, and for all necessary personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, $10,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Am I correct in my understanding that this reading is for committee amendments? I desire to offer an amendment, on page 38, when it is in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The bill is being read for action on the committee amendments. When we get through with the committee amendments, and there are not many left, the Senator from Iowa will have an opportunity to present his amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Very well.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 39, after line 9, to insert:

For stationery for the use of the committees and officers of the House, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 13, to insert:

BOTANIC GARDENS.

For procuring manure, soil, tools, fuel, purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; and for services, materials, and miscellaneous supplies, and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Gardens, under direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, $3,321.35.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Government Printing Office," subhead "Printing and binding," on page 41,

line 3, after the words "Treasury Department," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For printing and binding for the Treasury Department, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 4, to insert:

For printing and binding for the Interior Department, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after the words "Department of Labor," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$8,000," so as to make the clause read:

For printing and binding for the Department of Labor, $8,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word in connection with this amendment. The amount of $30,000 was put in the bill on the floor of the House. An explanation was made of it there, but the head of the department, I understand, estimated for but $8,000. I notice in the hearings before the House committee the reason why $30,000 was appropriated was on account of lack of funds for printing some twenty-odd documents prepared by that department. They are very desirous of having $30,000 instead of $8,000 appropriated; but, as long as the matter will go to conference, it can be thrashed out there. If the Senate conferees should be convinced that it is absolutely necessary that $30,000 shall be appropriated, they can yield; and of course whatever amount is absolutely necessary can be provided for without any further amendment being offered at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will, of course, be open for the consideration of the conference. The committee, after full consideration and discussion, reduced the amount from $30,000 to $8,000 because the Secretary of Labor had asked for only $8,000; but if any mistake has been made, or if any necessity should be shown for an additional amount, it can be taken up in conference.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments, Court of Claims," on page 42, line 4, after the words "Six hundred and sixteen," to insert "and Senate Document No. 441," so as to make the clause read:

For the payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 616 and Senate Document No. 441, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 7, after the words "War Department," to strike out "$4,043.89" and insert "$28,187.55," so as to make the clause read:

Under War Department, $28,187.55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 8, after the words "Navy Department," to strike out "$4,271.10" and insert "$8,250.56," so as to make the clause read:

Under Navy Department, $8,250.56.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 11, after the words "In all," to strike out "$8,846.79" and insert "$36,969.91," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $36,969.91.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judgments in Indian depredation claims," on page 42, line 22, after the words "six hundred and fifteen," to insert "and Senate Document No. 442"; and in line 24, after the word "session," to strike out "$5,076" and insert "$13,350," so as to read:

For payment of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in Indian depredation cases, certified to Congress in House Document No. 615 and Senate Document No. 442 at its present session, $13,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 11, on page 44.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. To make the meaning clear, I move to insert a comma after the word "quartermaster's" and before "subsistence" in line 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Without objection, a comma will be inserted after the word "quartermaster's."

The reading was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Panama Canal," on page 45, after line 7, to insert:

For the purpose of paying the expenses of formally and officially opening the Panama Canal as provided in section 4 of the Panama Canal act, including the compensation of such persons as may be appointed by the President to provide for such opening, the President is authorized to use out of the moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the construction, completion, operation, or maintenance of the Panama Canal the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. The appointment of persons in the military and naval service of the United States is hereby expressly authorized: *Provided*, That if any person so appointed shall be employed in either the military or naval service of the United States the amount of compensation fixed by the President under this resolution shall be in addition to the official salary paid to such person.

The wage scale of the persons employed in the construction of the Panama Canal in effect prior to April 1, 1914, shall continue unchanged during the period of actual construction, and no claim of any person employed in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal shall be recognized or paid by the United States for longevity service or lay-over days accruing subsequently to June 30, 1909.

Authority is hereby given to employ and pay, from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made, an attorney versed in the Spanish law, and familiar with the conditions on the Isthmus in connection with the acquisition of privately owned lands in the Canal Zone, and in connection with the codification of the Canal Zone laws, at a salary not to exceed $7,200 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 13, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1911 and other years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 443, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For miscellaneous expenses, Internal-Revenue Service, $4.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $12,521.97.
For expenses of Revenue-Cutter Service, $1,204.24.
For Life-Saving Service, $599.17.
For contingent expenses, office of Director of the Mint, $128.75.
For contingent expenses, mint at Denver, 1913, $74.40.
For pay of assistant custodians and janitors, $9.50.
For fuel, lights, and water for public buildings, $3.30.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $1.68.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $2.
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, $48.21.
For vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings, $4.
For heating apparatus for public buildings, $68.95.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $2,322.09.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, $32.20.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, $1,097.20.
For subsistence of the Army, $122.70.
For regular supplies, Quartermaster's Department, $15,338.80.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, $407.84.
For water and sewers at military posts, $145.41.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, $12.09.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For pay of the Navy, 1912, $1,349.07.
For pay of the Navy, $3,360.20.
For pay, miscellaneous, $50.54.
For pay, Marine Corps, $964.23.
For transportation and recruiting Marine Corps, $38.34.
For contingent, Marine Corps, $17.18.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $143.07.
For maintenance of naval auxiliaries, Bureau of Navigation, $8.70.
For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $3,249.48.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1913, $8,022.73.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $797.94.
For construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, $31.36.
For indemnity for lost property, Naval Service, act March 2, 1895, $34.65.
For destruction of clothing and bedding for sanitary reasons, $28.50.
For enlistment bounties to seamen, $100.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1913, $869.79.
For collecting statistics, Bureau of Education, $2.
For painting dome and central portion of the Capitol, 1913 and 1914, 95 cents.
For salaries and commissions of registers and receivers, $4.
For contingent expenses of land offices, $9.15.
For surveying the public lands, $1,829.28.
For Geological Survey, $65.45.
For investigating mine accidents, $1.75.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1913, $47,345.04.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1912, $221.13.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1913, $12.58.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1912, $4.59.
For telegraphing, transportation, etc., Indian supplies, $101.73.
For irrigation, San Carlos Reservation, Ariz., $395.14.
For administration of affairs of Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1913, $69.28.
For support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, $3.63.
For indemnity to certain Chickasaw Indians for losses, treaty June 22, 1855, $14,050.
For Army pensions, $136.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For public printing and binding, $134.40.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, $114.25.
For relief and protection of American seamen, $425.19.
For general expenses, Bureau of Chemistry, $44.45.
For laboratory, Department of Agriculture, $20.50.
For general expenses, Bureau of Entomology, $4.45.
For contingent expenses, Weather Bureau, $2.88.
For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Fisheries, 20 cents.
For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce and Labor, 54 cents.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $100.

For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1913, $819.55.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1912, $61.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $15.15.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For mail transportation, star, $11.71.
For shipment of supplies, $99.84.
For electric and cable car service, $29.80.
For miscellaneous items, first and second class offices, $16.
For Rural Delivery Service, $530.43.
For indemnities, domestic registered mail, $30.
For compensation to postmasters, $121.38.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 1, to change the number of the section from 3 to 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 6, to change the number of the section from "4" to "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment which was passed over.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, after line 11, the committee report to insert:

To reimburse the various appropriations for the support of the Army for sums expended, or necessary to be expended, prior to July 1, 1914, in transporting and caring for interned Mexican soldiers and refugees, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and the expenditures heretofore made for the above-named purposes are hereby ratified and affirmed.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Hughes | Overman | Smith, Md. |
| Brady | Jones | Page | Smith, S. C. |
| Bristow | Kenyon | Perkins | Smoot |
| Bryan | La Follette | Poindexter | Stephenson |
| Burton | Lea, Tenn. | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Catron | Lee, Md. | Ransdell | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | McCumber | Reed | Thornton |
| Chilton | Martin, Va. | Shafroth | Tillman |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martine, N. J. | Sheppard | Townsend |
| Dillingham | Nelson | Sherman | Vardaman |
| du Pont | Newlands | Shields | Warren |
| Gronna | Norris | Smith, Ariz. | West |
| Hollis | Oliver | Smith, Ga. | Williams |

Mr. PAGE. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what is to be done with this $500,000 and who are to be the beneficiaries of the appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator I believe it is very well understood. I supposed the Senator understood it, but I am perfectly willing to explain it.

There are five or six thousand Mexican soldiers who, in battle in the Federal army, were defeated, and those five or six thousand men who were in the Federal army fled across the border for safety and came within the territory of the United States. They were taken in charge by the Army of the United States and interned in three camps—two in Texas and one in California. In taking care of the military refugees who fled for the preservation of their lives and came into our territory there have already been expended about $236,000. The Secretary of War, under the orders of the President of the United States, put them into those camps and has provided for them until about $236,000 have been expended. It will require about half a million dollars to take care of those people until the 1st day of July, the end of the present fiscal year. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of State estimated these expenses and appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and explained it to the committee very fully. The item is intended to meet that expenditure.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I ask when these refugees came across the border into the United States?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not give the Senator the precise date, but I should say about January most of them came into our territory.

Mr. SMOOT. The 420 who are interned at San Diego, Cal., came across the border nearly one year ago—that is, last April—and the 5,325 others came across the border either in the latter part of December, 1913, or in the first part of January of this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I take it that the date is not material, except that the Senator wanted to draw attention to the long-continued detention of these soldiers.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is what I am getting at. I want some information about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They have been detained here. The Quartermaster General of the Army came before the committee and gave a detailed statement; but I take it that it is not necessary to go into these details more minutely than has been done.

I will say while I am on my feet, in respect to this matter, that when that item was first called to my attention it somewhat startled me. I called up the Secretary of State and desired some explanation from him. I got very briefly an explanation, but the Secretary expressed a willingness to come before the committee. In the meantime I investigated the matter myself, and I found, at least to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the committee, that the action which had been taken by the Government was in accordance with the long-established usage as between nations. It was not only free from any objection on the idea that it was an unfriendly act, but it was absolutely obligatory on the United States to take those men into custody, to detain them, and not to allow them to return to Mexico to further engage in war.

Mr. BRISTOW. Do I understand that the Senator from Virginia states that it is the duty of the United States to imprison these men and to prevent them from returning to their native land if they wish to do so?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do most unquestionably contend that it is the duty of the United States, according to the rules of civilized warfare and international law and usage, to detain those people and not to allow them to return to Mexico to further engage in war. It was not only the privilege of the United States to do so, but it was an obligation devolved on the United States in accordance with international usage and the rules of international law to detain them and not to allow them to return to Mexico to further engage in war. I will ask the Senator to let me read to him what the text-writers say on this subject. Hall's International Law and all the other standard works on the subject lay down this doctrine; but I have seen fit to bring to the attention of the Senate only what Moore's Digest of International Law lays down regarding it. I will read from page 1001 of that work.

Mr. VARDAMAN. From what book is the Senator from Virginia going to read?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I shall read from Moore's Digest of International Law, which is recognized as a standard authority, and the language there used is almost an exact copy from Hall's Work on International Law, an English book of the very highest standing and a recognized authority on this subject all over the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before the Senator from Virginia reads from the volume may I ask him a question, with the permission of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator undoubtedly laid down what is the general rule as between two separate nations; but I want to know if that same rule applies to war between people or factions of the same nation?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Undoubtedly, in my judgment, it does so apply. I will call attention to the fact that the United States does not recognize any de jure government as being in existence in Mexico at all; it does not recognize the Huerta government as a de jure government, nor does it recognize the Carranza government as a de jure government. They are, however, both de facto governments; each has full control of a large territory, and each has established a government. They have put themselves in the position of belligerents, and the United States has put itself in the position of a neutral. Whenever it is a civilized war, just as much so as in the case where two independent nations are at war, whenever two belligerents are engaged in war this rule is applicable; there is no doubt in my mind whatever about that; and ex necessitate it must be in force in the case of belligerents.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not want to go into the argument of that question just now, because I doubt if we can say that there is a real war in Mexico at the present time; it is rather a struggle between different classes of bandits; but I want to ask the Senator this question also——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Let me see if I understand the Senator aright. Does he mean to say that he does not consider that there is a civil war now being carried on in Mexico?

Mr. McCUMBER. I mean to say that Mexico is overrun by bandits; I do not see anything that I would dignify by the name of "war"; but we might differ about that.

I want to direct my question to another point of the assertion of the Senator, namely, that there were 5,000 Mexican soldiers detained in this country. Did the Senator mean to say that there were 5,000 Mexican soldiers in addition to the refugees, the women and the children that you are taking care of there, or are there 5,000 in number altogether?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The women and children are camp followers; the women are cooks. Under the Mexican civilization, they being a semicivilized people, according to the usage prevailing down there, they take the women along with their army, and the women who have children take their children along. There are some few children and a considerable number of women, but they are all attached to the army.

Mr. McCUMBER. Can the Senator from Virginia tell just how many actual Mexican soldiers there are now on American soil?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There are about 6,000 people, including the camp followers.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator include the soldiers in the number of people?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not give the number exactly. I think I have it here somewhere among my papers, but it can not be material. The number of soldiers is approximately 5,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is, altogether?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; there are 6,000 altogether.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would the Senator from Virginia say there were 5,000 soldiers and a thousand women and children?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am just stating this as a guess; perhaps that might be the number.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator from North Dakota exactly the number of each class. At Fort Bliss there are to-day 1,081 women, there are 533 children, and there are 3,198 enlisted men and civilians. The department does not say how many of them are enlisted men or civilians, but states that there are 3,198 enlisted men and civilians. There are there to-day 513 officers. At San Diego, Cal., there are 3,420 enlisted men and civilians, including 6 or 7 officers.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would seem, then—I address my remark to the Senator from Virginia again—that we are not merely taking care of a lot of Mexican soldiers, if we dignify them by the name of "soldiers," but we are taking care of their families and of other refugees that may stray over. The other day it was stated that there had been about 80 births in one of these camps in a very short length of time; and the question might arise whether the Government is conducting a lying-in asylum down there for the benefit of the Mexican people. All of these matters ought to be presented to the Senate, so that we may know whether we are taking care merely of soldiers or whether we are expending a half million dollars for taking care of Mexicans who find this country a better place in which to live than is Mexico.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have an official statement here from the War Department giving all the figures, but I have not felt that it was necessary to consume the time of the Senate in reading them.

The Senator from North Dakota is putting an extreme interpretation upon our action. I do not see how he can in any fairness, in the face of the facts, talk about the Government maintaining a lying-in asylum. He understands as well as I do that these people who are straggling in here from civil life are people who are coming here seeking protection from assassination on the part of their conquerors. The Mexicans had in their army women, and some of the women had children; but most of these people are officers and soldiers regularly enlisted in the Mexican army. There are some camp followers, who, in accordance with the usage in Mexico, practically constitute a part of the army. Those women cook for the soldiers; they move from place to place with them, and are attachés or appendages of the army in Mexico.

Mr. McCUMBER. Are not most of them willing to go back to Mexico to-day?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not know; but, in my judgment, the United States is not at liberty to permit them to go back.

Mr. McCUMBER. "Not at liberty" to permit women and children and those who are not soldiers, the civilians, to go back?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no doubt whatever that the United States would be very willing to let the women and children go back.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the civilians?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. But the women and children are a part of the army; they were with those men, they came here with them, and they will not leave them; and as to the men who are soldiers, the United States is not at liberty to permit them to go back to Mexico.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Virginia permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], if that be agreeable to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I was on the floor being interrogated by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], but I am perfectly willing to yield the floor and to give my views more at length later on in this discussion if it be necessary. I was simply trying to answer questions propounded to me.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have the Senator proceed. I will wait until he is through with his explanation, and then I will continue my interrogatories, because I want the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator from Utah interrupted me previously to the Senator from Mississippi, and I will yield to him after I have finished answering the Senator from Utah.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was merely going to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. After I get through with the Senator from Utah I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi, but I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: Can he explain to the Senate the real reason why the State Department is holding these Mexican refugees in the United States?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As I understand, the United States Government is holding these people in accordance with an obligation imposed on it by international law. It is doing exactly what every enlightened nation does in like circumstances. I will go further and say—for I see the Senator seems trying to make a little politics out of this matter——

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. And I am very glad for him to make all the politics out of it that he can.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does me an injustice.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Expressing simply my own opinion, I have no doubt that it is very agreeable to the administration to withhold from the conflict in Mexico soldiers from Huerta's army. But it is not doing so for that reason. It is doing so in accordance with an obligation placed upon the United States by the usage of civilized countries and by international law.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sorry the Senator made the reference to me which he did, because I had no such thought. If we are going to discuss this subject, it seems to me the Senator ought to tell the Senate frankly—and that is the object of my question—exactly what is involved in this matter. That is why I asked the question. I had no other object in view.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have told everything that is involved in the matter. The Senator was trying to get at motives which he thought were a criticism of the course pursued by the administration. I interpreted his attitude as such, and I think the overt acts which we have seen fully justify that interpretation. The Senator knows as well as I do that these people are held by this administration in accordance with what they consider their duty and the obligation imposed upon this country by the principles and rules of international law. When this band of refugees came to the territory of the United States it became obligatory on the United States to take them into custody, and it did take them into custody and put them in camps. It had a perfect right to do so, and it was its duty to put them in camps or in fortresses, or wherever it may be necessary, remote from the border, detain them, support them, and care for them until either an agreement is reached for their disposition or peace is declared, and then our Government can make claim against Mexico for the expenses incurred in caring for these people who have fled to this country for safety.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the question which I was going to ask has been answered. I was going to ask the Senator from Virginia if it was the purpose of the President to hold these people until hostilities shall cease in Mexico? He has answered the question.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator is mistaken. I do not know what the administration is going to do. I have said what the law provides in respect to this matter.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There has been no intimation to the Senator from Virginia from the Secretary of State or from the President as to the time these refugees would be detained?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The provision which was asked for by the Secretary of State was for an indefinite appropriation—not fixing any amount, and not fixing any time—but simply appropriating such an amount of money as may be necessary to care for these interns. The committee, however, saw fit to fix a limit of time and fix a limit to the amount. It was found that it would take a half million dollars to reimburse the $236,000 already expended and to continue to support these people until the 1st day of July, the end of the fiscal year. So we recommended an appropriation of the amount of money necessary to maintain these people until the 1st day of July, the end of the current fiscal year, thus departing from the request made to us, which was indefinite as to amount and as to time.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I understand the soldiers that are held are the ones who have sued out a writ of habeas corpus for their liberation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If any writ of habeas corpus has been sued out, I am not advised of it. The Secretary of War, who appeared before our committee, was asked the question, and he said if any writ of habeas corpus had been sued out he had no knowledge of it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have noticed an account of such a proceeding in the courts of Texas.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I want to say that this question is, in its nature, an international question; and the duty of dealing with questions of that kind devolves upon the President of the United States. A condition was presented that required immediate action. It was a grave and important proposition, and the President, through his Cabinet officers—for they acted by his instructions, as they stated to the committee—determined that, in meeting this responsibility, it was incumbent upon him to take these people into custody and to detain them. I desire to say, as this involves an international question in connection with a most serious problem, it is exceedingly desirable that there shall be no division on party lines and no division on any other lines. I have myself always stood ready throughout my service in the Senate to maintain to the utmost reasonable extent the attitude of the administration in dealing with foreign questions, and I feel that the wise course for the Senate in this instance is to make this appropriation to reimburse the money actually expended and to provide for these interned Mexican soldiers for a while, until the problem can be further examined and a permanent solution of it reached.

I have no right to say that these soldiers will be maintained until peace is declared, but I say that it is an obligation imposed upon us by international law to detain them until peace is declared rather than to permit them to return to Mexico to again engage in war.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia a little about conditions in San Diego, in my State. I have not understood that there were any Mexican soldiers there, but that there were women and children there, who are really regarded as refugees. I know when I was there last summer they were being taken care of largely by the Red Cross Association and by private citizens. I can understand very well the reason why we should take care of soldiers as an international question; but the other seems to me to be a humanitarian question.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that there are 426 officers and men interned at San Diego, according to the War Department report. There seem to be no women there at all; but 426 officers and men of the Mexican army.

Mr. WORKS. There must be some mistake about that, I am sure.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That may be so, but that is all I know, and, as I have said, I gather that information from the official reports furnished me by the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that all we are paying for, according to the report of the department, is 420 Mexican soldiers and 6 officers. The report states that they are all soldiers and officers, as the Senator from Virginia has stated.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is all the information I can give, and it is from the official statement of the War Department.

Mr. WORKS. Of course, the question of taking care of soldiers, including officers, is one thing, and taking care of other people is quite another thing; and I wanted to ascertain the facts about it; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We have the facts certified by the War Department, which show the figures I have given.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator wishes to continue, I will wait. I merely wanted to say a word with regard to this distinction, which I think is a very important one.

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Massachusetts proceed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I merely desire to say that what I have said has been merely in answer to the questions of Senators. I have not attempted to go into a full discussion of this matter; but, later on, I will read the legal authorities bearing on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there can be no question whatever about international practice in regard to the troops of belligerents coming across a neutral frontier. The practice has always been to disarm those troops and to intern them. I say "always," but certainly it has been generally the case, and I think we may say that it has always been the case of late years to disarm such troops, to intern and maintain them until the close of the war. The ground on which that practice of international law rests is, of course, the observance of neutrality; and for the purposes of neutrality you apply the same rules to belligerents engaged in civil war, after you have recognized a state of belligerency, as you do to two belligerent nations.

As to the naked right of a nation to refuse asylum, of course there can be no question whatever. It is quite within the power of any nation, for instance, to compel a ship of war of a belligerent to leave a harbor within 24 hours, even if she goes right out into the teeth of a hostile fleet. In the same way a nation can refuse to permit a beaten army to come across its frontier. Perhaps the best-known case of the sort is the case of the army of Gen. Bourbaki, in the Franco-Prussian War, when retreating through the south of France. That army, or a large portion of it, which, I think, was under the command of Gen. Clinchant, or some such officer, crossed the Swiss frontier. It was entirely within the power of Switzerland to refuse to permit them to cross their frontier and allow them either to be destroyed by the Germans or made prisoners by a superior German force, but Switzerland, and I think Belgium also in a similar case—certainly it was true in the case of Switzerland—allowed the French Army to cross its frontier. It put them in a place of safety, then disarmed and interned them, and supported them until the end of the war. I assume that the expenses were repaid by France, although I do not know that that actually happened.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations; he is very familiar with all these matters, and speaks with authority, as we all appreciate. So I wish to call his attention to a treaty ratified in 1907, while he was a member of that committee, in which this very thing is provided for. The Hague convention submitted it to the United States, as it did to all the other civilized countries, and it was ratified and proclaimed on February 28, 1910.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; we are signatories to that convention.

Mr. OVERMAN. We are one of the signatories to that convention; and while the Senator is very familiar with the treaty, I thought I would call his attention to it. Articles 11, 12, and 13 of that treaty are as follows:

ARTICLE 11.

A neutral power which receives on its territory troops belonging to the belligerent armies shall intern them, as far as possible, at a distance from the theater of war.

It may keep them in camps and even confine them in fortresses or in places set apart for this purpose.

It shall decide whether officers can be left at liberty on giving their parole not to leave the neutral territory without permission.

ARTICLE 12.

In the absence of a special convention to the contrary, the neutral power shall supply the interned with the food, clothing, and relief required by humanity.

At the conclusion of peace the expenses caused by the internment shall be made good.

ARTICLE 13.

A neutral power which receives escaped prisoners of war shall leave them at liberty. If it allows them to remain in its territory, it may assign them a place of residence.

This really carries out the statement which the Senator said was the doctrine of international law.

Mr. LODGE. It is.

Mr. OVERMAN. And here is our solemn agreement entered into by the signatory powers.

Mr. LODGE. I was about to refer to The Hague convention. What the Senator has read is the statement of a universal practice among nations. That, of course, does not debar a nation from excluding an army of a belligerent, if it sees fit to do so, a beaten army or an army retreating across a frontier. A nation is at liberty to protect its own territory, of course; but that convention embodies our pledge to other nations in any case of this sort which may arise.

The two factions that are fighting in Mexico have been recognized as belligerents in practice by this Government, and must be treated as such. In observing neutrality between them, if one of their armies, or a portion of one of their armies, retreats across our frontier, there is only one thing to do, as it seems to me, and that is to disarm and intern them and subsequently to deal with them as the conditions may then seem to require.

I think it very important, however, Mr. President, that a distinction should be drawn between refugees and soldiers. The convention speaks only of armed men—of armies—and international law deals only with armed men. I do not mean by that to exclude the women and children who accompanied, as I am told, the Mexican army. The armies in Mexico, as we all know, are made up very largely of Indians, because the bulk of the Mexican population is Indian, and it is their habit to carry their women and children with them, and the women and children pertain to the army, so that they are not refugees in the ordinary sense; but it is the duty of no nation, as a matter of international law, to take charge of refugees generally who happen to come across the frontier. That, as the Senator from California has said, is a matter of humanity.

The wording of this provision seems to me to go rather far when it says "and refugees," without confining it to those who accompany the army, if that be necessary, in order to protect these women and children and camp followers. As the bill stands, it seems to me, with those words "and refugees," it covers any Mexican escaping, armed or unarmed, soldier or not soldier; any Mexican who chooses to come across the border and throw himself on our mercy and protection.

Mr. SMOOT. Right there, I will say to the Senator that I have a note made for the purpose of offering an amendment, so that it will read "interned Mexican soldiers and military refugees."

Mr. OVERMAN. That would be all right. I do not think there would be any objection to that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am very willing to accept that. If there be a few exceptions, it is a case of de minimis. We all know exactly what the situation is there. It does not change the practical result one particle. I am very willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think we had better make it definite, so that it will be understood that we are acting entirely along the lines of The Hague convention and international law, but not including refugees generally.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I had no idea of providing for refugees except in connection with the army.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I understand it to be.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. And I am very willing to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LODGE. But I think it would be very well to confine it in that way.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The amendment simply makes specific that which was always intended.

Mr. LODGE. One word more, Mr. President. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Kansas, and I do not mean to trespass upon his time unreasonably.

There is one other point I wish to make. The whole doctrine on which this treatment of armed soldiers of one belligerent coming across a neutral frontier rests is, as I have said, the doctrine of neutrality. We can not and must not undertake to hold those soldiers or return those soldiers as a benefit or an injury to one side or another. That would at once put us on a basis of intervening. Our position would become indefensible if we were to say for a minute that we hold those men because if they were released they would go to the Huerta forces or they would go to the Carranza forces, and therefore we are holding them back. We are holding them back because we are neutral, anxious to enforce neutrality. These people have taken asylum in our territory. We therefore disarm them and hold them so that they can take no further part in the war and become neutrals, as we are.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas permit me for a moment?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know very little about international law or the rules of war, but I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the situation in Mexico is such as is described by the authorities that have been quoted by the Senator from Virginia? There is no government in Mexico recognized by the United States. It is a revolution.

Let me illustrate it further. Suppose there were a revolution in France to-day and the revolutionists were driven over into Swiss territory. Does the Senator from Massachusetts insist that that is a case that would come under the international law cited by the Senator from Virginia, and that the Swiss Government would have to take care of those people?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am afraid that opens the door to a very long explanation, but I shall try to put it in a few words.

Where there are civil troubles in a country and the body of insurgents or those who are in insurrection against the government are sufficiently strong to control part of the country and not to be amenable to the government of the other part of the country for the purposes of a neutral they are belligerents. They are not a belligerent state, but on a question like this, dealing with fugitive troops, you apply to them the same doctrine that you would apply to the troops of a belligerent state.

In Mexico the northern provinces are not under the control of the central government in the City of Mexico. They are pro tanto independent. They are recognized as belligerents by us and by all the world; that is, they are not to be treated as criminals who are simply trying to overthrow the Government, but have no power. They have reached the point of a practical belligerency. Under those circumstances we should apply to them precisely the rules that we should apply to a belligerent state. They have gone far enough for that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course I am not qualified to discuss that question. I have heard the international law quoted two or three times, and listened to it as it has been read, and I did in committee. It occurred to me, however, that this matter dealt with two separate nations, such as France and Germany, for instance, or England and France, and that where a portion of the army was driven across into neutral territory then the treaty and the provisions of international law would apply.

Here, however, is a country that we say has not any government. We refuse to recognize the existing government as a government. Two factions are fighting each other in a cruel and relentless way. A portion of those people are driven over into our territory. Then we apply to those people the treaty agreed to by several Governments and the principles of international law. Personally, I have failed to bring my mind to comprehend exactly our obligation in that regard.

Mr. LODGE. I think probably what the Senator from New Hampshire heard read in committee, though I do not pretend to say that it is so, was those passages in Moore's International Law which relate to the interning of troops. The language used there is "belligerent States, or belligerents." In the same way, if you will look at Hall's book, which is one of the most recent authorities, you will find, when they are dealing with this question of troops coming across a neutral frontier, that they use the word "belligerents." You must go to an entirely different part of the book and to an entirely different discussion in order to determine what constitutes a belligerent. It is not necessary that it should be a State in order to constitute a belligerent.

In our Civil War, for instance, the belligerency of the South was recognized by practically all the world, and the rules of war were held to apply, and the rules of international law were held to apply. In this case we have two factions, neither of which we have recognized as a government, but which between them have established a state of belligerency and are entitled, I think, to the application of the rules of war and of international law which would be applied to two belligerent States.

Mr. GALLINGER. One further point; and I thank the Senator from Kansas for yielding.

Under the terms of the treaty and under the provisions of international law, if France and Germany were at war and a portion of the French troops were driven into Switzerland and were taken care of there at the expense of that Government, it is perfectly understood that the Government of France would be responsible and would pay the bills. I should like to ask the Senator, however, who is going to pay these bills if we invest a million or two million dollars in this way?

Mr. LODGE. I can answer that question at once. No one except ourselves will ever pay these bills. There is no question about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; that is what I think.

Mr. LODGE. But it is a question of our conduct in regard to it. If I may illustrate one moment more, when this beaten army of Orozco, or whoever it was, were fleeing toward our frontier, if we had refused to admit them, as we could have done, of course we should have at once taken sides against that

fugitive army. We should have at once departed from the position of neutrality. If we had received them and held them with arms in their hands and allowed them to go back as an organized army, we should have departed from the position of neutrality the other way. That is the basis of the international theory embodied in The Hague convention of taking men, interning them, and reducing them to a condition of inaction and nonaction.

The question has been suggested, "What would be done if they wanted to go back?" I do not think that would alter in the least the attitude of the neutral nation. The object of the neutral nation is to preserve neutrality between belligerents. If the French army in Switzerland wanted to go back in order to take part against Germany, to have allowed them to depart and take part again in the conflict with Germany would have been to have taken part against Germany, because if Switzerland had not admitted them the Germany army, we may assume, would have captured them all. In the same way we may assume that if we had said to these men who came over our border that they could not come they would have all been made prisoners, or probably would have been shot. We allowed them to come over. Having given them refuge and protection, and having saved them from being defeated in battle or made prisoners, if we now turn them loose again we at once are guilty, of course, of an obvious breach of neutrality.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will permit me to inquire——

Mr. LODGE. As I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Kansas and by his courtesy, I certainly will permit him to inquire.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should not they be paroled, the same as prisoners of war, under a pledge that they will not take further part in the conflict?

Mr. LODGE. It is a usual practice under international law to parole the officers; but usually the men, the soldiers, have no resources, and probably would have great difficulty in supporting themselves in a foreign country. The custom of paroling officers is frequently followed; and I have no doubt we could parole the soldiers if we could get sufficient guaranty that they would remain in this country and feed themselves.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator one question. Would it be a violation of international law if the Government of the United States should decide to take these interned Mexican soldiers and ship them into some other part of Mexico, into the territory controlled by those under whom they were fighting? In other words, suppose those that are at Fort Bliss should be transferred to the southern part of Mexico at small expense and turned over into a territory over which Huerta has complete control?

Mr. LODGE. In order to answer that question you must go back to the point at which they crossed our frontier. If they had not crossed our frontier, they would have been lost to the side on which they were fighting. Having crossed our frontier, if we restore them to the side on which they were fighting, of course we take part with that side. Just in the same way, if instead of allowing them to cross our frontier in obedience to humanity and the practices of international law, we had refused to allow them to do so, we should have taken part with the side which was pursuing them and was going to destroy them or make them prisoners.

I am afraid we can not escape from the responsibility.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I understand the policy before last April was that wherever there were refugees from Mexico, driven into our territory, they were not interned, but they were allowed to sift back into the territory to which they owed allegiance or to which they belonged.

Mr. LODGE. Those must have been civilian refugees. They could not have been regular armed troops. They could not have been soldiers.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator, in reply to a question that I asked as to why these men should not be paroled, said that it was frequently the custom to parole officers. Why should not these men be paroled, and then permitted to return to their own countries under the parole?

Mr. LODGE. A parole that they would not take part——

Mr. BRISTOW. That they would not take part in the fight.

Mr. LODGE. I can see no reason why that should not be done, if you can trust the parole.

Mr. OVERMAN. The only thing I want to say is that this article of the treaty only excepts officers. It says the men shall be interned. I do not know why, but it says the men shall be interned and held, but that there may be a parole of officers.

Mr. LODGE. That is the language and practice of international law, as well as the convention.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is the treaty we entered into.

Mr. BRISTOW. The inquiry I made has led to a very interesting, and to me instructive, discussion of this matter.

Mr. LODGE. On the point the Senator has just raised, if they are paroled and returned across the border, as I understand these are Huerta troops, they would be very likely to be massacred as soon as they went over. On the other hand, if we take them and deposit them in a port within the territory under the control of President Huerta, we have immediately taken a step which is distinctly favorable to him.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course, if we parole his officers in order that they may return.

Mr. LODGE. The reason a parole is not extended to the men, I suppose, is because of the extreme difficulty of enforcing it.

Mr. BRISTOW. That may be true, of course. I can appreciate that, especially with people of this character.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Exactly.

Mr. BRISTOW. We have arrived, apparently, at this conclusion; we have here a number of Huerta's soldiers who are refugees, with a lot of camp followers, and we are taking care of them. They are the troops of the Huerta government. We are unwilling to recognize the Huerta government as such. We have refused to recognize any government there. If the Huerta government were recognized for what it is, a government over a certain part of Mexico, the authority there, and if Carranza and Villa were recognized as in authority over the part of Mexico which they control, and then we interned and took care of the troops that fled across the border, we would have some right to call upon the Mexican Government to reimburse us for the money which we expended in taking care of these people who are the citizens of the so-called Mexican Republic.

The policy which the United States Government is pursuing, however, is involving us in very heavy expenses, the amount of which nobody can now foretell, and is absolutely foreclosing us from any claim upon any constituted authority whatever for reimbursement.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I must express my dissent from that proposition. If the United States had recognized the Huerta government, our duty would have been exactly the same as it is now. There are two belligerents there.

Mr. BRISTOW. I recognize that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We are maintaining a position of absolute neutrality. Upon the troops of either belligerent coming on our territory under these conditions it was obligatory on the United States to pursue the course which the administration has pursued in this case. Whenever a de jure government is established in Mexico, whether it be the Carranza faction or the Huerta faction, whichever one is successful will be accountable to the United States for the expenses which we are incurring.

Mr. BRISTOW. Suppose this rebellion, as I will term it, against the constituted authority of Huerta fails. Huerta recognizes these people only as bandits, declaring that they are worth 19 cents apiece, which is the cost of rope to hang them, so the papers say. He recognizes them only as bandits, criminals, who are undertaking to overthrow constituted authority. Do I understand the Senator from Virginia to claim that if the rebellion ultimately fails we can call upon the Mexican Government to reimburse us for any assistance we may have given these "bandits" when they fled across the border?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, we shall be well justified by the rules of international law in calling on whatever Government is finally established in Mexico to pay for these expenses, and it will have to pay for them. It will be under an obligation to make them good, and will be compelled to do so.

We have observed absolute neutrality. We have done nothing for the one side or for the other side. We have met our obligations under a solemn treaty which we entered into.

It may be well, if the Senator will permit me, to read that which has been read in detached portions. I should like to read the provisions of the convention which was entered into by the civilized nations of the world, including the United States, in respect to this very matter.

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall be very glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was signed at The Hague on the 29th day of July, 1899. The United States is a party to it, and she bound herself by these obligations:

ART. 57. A neutral State which receives in its territory troops belonging to the belligerent armies shall intern them, as far as possible, at a distance from the theater of war.

I desire to call attention to the language used, "belligerent armies." It does not say "armies of independent nations," but "belligerent armies."

Now, let me finish reading the other section on this subject:

It can keep them in camps, and even confine them in fortresses or locations assigned for this purpose.

It shall decide whether officers may be left at liberty on giving their parole that they will not leave the neutral territory without authorization.

ART. 58. Failing a special convention, the neutral State shall supply the interned with the food, clothing, and relief required by humanity.

At the conclusion of peace the expenses caused by the internment shall be made good.

They could not be made good by the defeated army. When this convention provides that at the termination of the conflict and the establishment of peace the expenses shall be made good, it means they shall be made good by the successful faction, by the Government that is finally established.

That, I believe, is all I need read.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to call the Senator's attention to this difference: We have not recognized either of these factions. The question that comes to my mind is not what I think we ought to have done, or what the administration may think it wants to do or does not want to do. That has not anything to do with it. If these warring factions had been regarded as belligerents, and were so considered by the Government, we would have some basis for a claim. When, however, the Government refuses to recognize either of them as belligerents, or as having any standing whatever other than bandits and murderers, it seems to me we forfeit the claim we otherwise would have.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator from Kansas has no authority whatever for saying that the Government has not recognized them as belligerents. The Government has refused to recognize either one as a de jure government. There are, however, two governments warring with each other in Mexico—the Huerta government and the Carranza government. Each has control of a large territory, and is levying taxes and appointing officers and conducting all of the affairs of government.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then let me inquire of the Senator why we do not recognize that condition of fact, instead of refusing to recognize it, when everybody knows it is the truth?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We are recognizing it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then we would have some basis for a claim. Now, we will spend hundreds of thousands, and probably millions, of dollars, and it seems to me we have no foundation for a claim against the Mexican Government, because we have refused to recognize that there is such a thing as an organized belligerency there on either side.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The belligerency is a fact. This condition exists there. There are two separate factions. They are at war with each other. They are belligerents. We have not recognized either. We maintain a position of absolute neutrality, and will not recognize either as a de jure government; but no intelligent man can deny the fact that there is a state of belligerency; that there are two armies confronting each other; and that there are two governments in operation within the limits of the Mexican Republic.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think the Senator and I do not disagree as to what our Government ought to do as to taking sides in the controversy in Mexico. I am not suggesting that we should recognize one side as right and the other side as wrong. I am suggesting that, as a matter of fact, there are two sources of authority—governmental authority—military and civil authority. We are dealing with these two recognized authorities, and we ought, in fact, to recognize them as such and not refuse to recognize them and at the same time be compelled to tax our own people and thereby recoguize a fact which politically we refuse to recognize.

Mr. WORKS and Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and to whom?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield first to the Senator from California. Then I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WORKS. What difference does it make whether we can recover this money back or not? The obligation rests upon us. We have assumed the authority of taking these soldiers and interning them, and they are on our hands. The question whether or not we can recover back the money is something that will have to be settled in the future. Nevertheless, I think we ought not to admit here in the Senate that some of these people will not, at some time, be responsible to us. Certainly, however, it is not necessary to settle that question now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that the principle of international law which has been read here does not prescribe, as a condition upon which it will operate, either that there shall be a declaration of neutrality or that there shall be a recognition of belligerency. It says that wherever there is a state of war existing, and soldiers from either side come over, they shall be taken and interned by the government upon whose territory they have come.

The Senator can see that if that were not the law, and if it required the recognition of belligerency, it would compel a nation, before it could ever get a recovery, to recognize as belligerents people who were not entitled to recognition as belligerents, and who, in fact, were not such. It would lead to a complication in international law which would result in recognition of belligerency where belligerency was not authorized by international law. For that reason the very principle is laid down which has been read here by the chairman of the committee, that these soldiers, whenever they come over, no matter to which side they belong, shall be taken and held. That is for the very purpose of preserving the neutrality of the nation upon whose soil they are.

Mr. BRISTOW. Referring to the suggestion of the Senator from California that it is a matter of no consequence whether we ever recover this money or not, I can not agree with him as to that. I think when we spend the money of our own people to take care of the citizens of a foreign country we ought to be able to collect that money from the foreign country, and that country ought to be held liable for the expenditure. I do not believe in taxing our own people for the benefit of others unless it is done as an act of charity. If this is a proposition of charity for these people, of course that is another thing.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it is a treaty obligation. It is a solemn treaty of the United States that requires us to do this.

Mr. OVERMAN. And Mexico is one of the signatory powers.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. In addition to the considerations of humanity and in addition to the obligations of international law, we are under treaty obligations to do it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then we should have fortified ourselves with ample grounds for just claims against the Mexican Government when the war that is now in existence is ultimately settled.

I wish to say before I close, however—I will take my seat now in a few minutes, because I have gotten all the information I rose to elicit—that I think the camp followers ought to be excluded. If they had not been taken care of by us, they probably would have been taken care of by their friends at home. I think a great many of these people who wandered across the border did so because there is not any special reason why they should not stay where they can be supported comfortably, rather than go back and have to make their own living in their own country in its disturbed state.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas evidently misunderstood my position. I did not say that it was a matter of no consequence whether this money should be paid back or not. What I said was that it was not a matter to be determined at this time. The obligation rests upon our Government to take care of those people, whom we have taken in charge. The question of repayment by the government in Mexico, when one is established, is quite another thing. I think we should insist upon the repayment of the money whenever there is a government established there; I do not care by whom it may be established.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if there is not some method by which we could separate those who are not soldiers and allow them to go, though they be refugees, and support only the soldiers and the families of soldiers who accompanied them. I confess it was information to me that the women and children of the soldiers accompanied them. If that be the fact, I certainly can not see how we can escape the obligation to care for the helpless ones in connection with caring for the soldiers themselves; but according to this statement there are a great many civilians, who did not belong to the army, who did not take up arms, and it does seem to me that they ought to be separated from the others, so that we will not be at any more expense than what is proper in observing the line of neutrality.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Under the amendment of the Senator from Utah I think the separation of the civilians, if there be any, may be safely left to the President and those under him. It is a de minimis proposition. The Secretary of War made the statement before our committee that so far as women were there they were really attached to the army as cooks or in some capacity waiting on soldiers; that, differing from our civilization or life, they were there as servants, doing all sorts of domestic work in the camp, and especially the cooking, the

washing, and the cleaning up; that they were attachés of the army. There are no civilians in the proper sense, as I understand it, in the camps; but under the amendment of the Senator from Utah that has been covered as far as it is possible to cover it, and we may rest assured that the matter will be handled judiciously by the administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Virginia whether the committee accepted the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As far as we can we accept it. It will have to go to a vote of the Senate. We ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Before the word "refugees," in line 15, insert the word "military."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I felt that it was unwise to provide an appropriation as recommended by the Secretary of State, unlimited in amount, with no time specified when the expense should cease on the part of the United States. The committee agreed with that position, but instead of making a limit effective April 1, 1914, it provided that this expense could be maintained until the 1st day of July of this year, and the appropriation carries half a million dollars for that purpose.

Under the estimate made by the department, if no other refugees come from Mexico before July 1 it will cost this Government four hundred and eighty-six thousand and some odd dollars. That is based upon an expense for each refugee of 32 cents per day.

I thought if a provision was made to pay the expense up to the 1st day of April that that would be sufficient to meet immediate requirements. The expense incurred to date amounts to about $242,000; and every day hereafter, if no more refugees cross our border, it will cost the Government over $1,900 every day as long as they are detained.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Will the Senator from Utah permit me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should like to know what the Senator thinks is going to happen in the next 12 days that we should make the appropriation only up to the 1st of April? What does the Senator expect to happen in the next 12 days that will relieve the situation?

Mr. SMOOT. If nothing happens, we could relieve the situation exactly as we are relieving it in this bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator what is the difference if we do appropriate to cover the time until June 30? If it is not expended, it reverts back to the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. It is virtually an invitation to the State Department to continue the care of these people, and Congress says that it is perfectly willing it should be at Government expense. That is the only reason. If an amendment was adopted limiting the amount to $264,500, the amount it would take to pay the expenses of the present refugees to the 1st of April, the State Department would at least take that as a notice that Congress wanted something done in some way to relieve the Government of the United States from this daily expense of $1,900. It is for that reason, and that only, that I believe the appropriation should provide for the care of the refugees until the 1st day of April instead of July 1.

Mr. McCUMBER. What would the Senator suggest could be done in that time? What is in the line of possibility within that period?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will frankly say that I believe the Government of the United States should send all the women and all the children, at least, to the territory from which they came and let the government which they belonged to take care of them. That should be done, at least. There are at present 1,081 women and 533 children at Fort Bliss, and there may be some at San Diego. As to the latter, of course, I can not state, because the report from the department does not give the information.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator heard read here but a few days ago of the most savage and brutal atrocities committed against women and children in the warfare in Mexico.

Mr. SMOOT. Those were American women and children.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would the Senator send those women and children back to the tender mercies of Villa and his contingent?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know why the Senator asks that question. I did not even suggest such a thing. As the Senator has referred to the brutality practiced upon the women in that country by Mr. Villa and his followers, I call his attention to the fact that those were American women and children; they were not Mexican women and children. I never suggested that they be turned over to Villa. I never suggested that they be turned over to the constitutionalists. My suggestion was that our Government deliver them to the Huerta government, where they belong. That would relieve us of nearly one-half of the interned refugees and reduce the expense of the Government of the United States nearly one-half.

I understand that the Mexicans who are interned are held, not because they want to remain in the country, but, on the contrary, they want to go home; they want to return to Mexico. It seems to me it would be very good policy, if not in violation of international law, to permit it. As far as the women and children are concerned, it does seem to me that the Huerta Government ought to be compelled to take care of them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say to the Senator I understood his proposition was to send them back to the place from which they came, and I understood that these refugees were from really the northern section, and at the same time belonged to the Huerta contingent—if I may call it—of the army up there. I do not understand that the refugees themselves came from the City of Mexico.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are a part of Huerta's army. They all came with the soldiers. These women and children came along as attachés of the army.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about that; but the Senator had reference to where they enlisted and under what government they were fighting. Of course, the women did not enlist, or the children; but the men enlisted as soldiers of the Huerta government, and I understand they came from the Huerta territory. My proposition was that the women and children be sent back to that territory—not to be driven back across the border line into the constitutionalists' territory—because I believe, myself, if that were done the most inhuman treatment and death itself would be visited upon everyone so driven out.

I am in full accord, as far as that is concerned, with the policy of the Government not to turn them over to the constitutionalists and have them slaughtered, as no doubt they would be.

But, Mr. President, I suppose there has been enough said to-day in the Senate to call the attention of the State Department to the fact that there ought to be some way arrived at by which this expense could be cut down. I do not believe we will ever get this money back, and it makes no difference to me if we never do, so far as the expense already incurred is concerned. They are here, and from a humanitarian point of view we have fed them and clothed them. I believe under the amendment I have offered to the amendment of the committee that in future civilians coming from any part of Mexico desiring the Government of the United States to take care of them will be barred. But under the amendment as it was drawn thousands and tens of thousands of Mexicans could have drifted to our territory and had us take care of them. The fare given to the present refugees by the Government of the United States is better than they are accustomed to in their own country. Without the amendment the committee amendment would be an invitation to the hungry Mexican to come to the United States and be fed and clothed as long as the war lasts. I can not say how soon the war will cease, nor can any other man tell. Last April it was predicted that the war would be over and the Huerta government would fall within a few days. The Huerta government to-day is stronger than it was then. No one can tell what the result will be in 30 days or in a year from now, nor what the future has in store for that distracted country.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am not going to offer the amendment that I intended changing the date from July 1 to April 1 and changing the amount from $500,000 to $264,500, although I do believe it would have been wiser for the Senate to have provided for the maintenance of the refugees until April 1 of this year, and thereby give notice to the State Department that we desired the present condition of affairs to cease at an early a date as possible.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it seems to me, from the statement which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has made, that he has assumed a premise which he had no right to assume, and that is that these refugees have no connection whatever with the army. There was no evidence before the committee to that effect. There is nothing to indicate that any of the persons the United States Government is taking care of are mere refugees, who had no connection with the army.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the Senator's attention to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and we will see whether the statement he has just made is correct or not. He will find on page 4 of that report the following statement:

JANUARY 17, 1914.

Memorandum for the Secretary of War:

1. The records of this office show that the following expenditures have been made or authorized in connection with the supply of the interned Mexican prisoners and refugees now at Marfa, Tex., or en route to El Paso, Tex.

2. Reports show that we are supplying 513 officers, 3,198 enlisted men and civilians, 1,081 women, and 533 children, making a total of 5,325.

3. In response to a telegram from Gen. Bliss, dated January 14, a copy of which was furnished this office by The Adjutant General, the following supplies have been shipped from St. Louis, Omaha, Jeffersonville, and Philadelphia depots.

He then goes on and gives the supplies ordered by Gen. Bliss and shipped from the depots he has named. The report shows that there are not only enlisted men and officers but civilians and women and children.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In this connection, if the Senator will permit me, if he knows anything of the Mexican army, he will know that an army generally carries about that proportion of women and children—the wives, sons, and daughters of soldiers. The whole household sometimes goes along with the army, and it is pretty hard, I imagine, to segregate the civilians from the soldiers. They are in one solid mass, and regularly form a part of an ordinary Mexican army.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that he has read the report of January 17, 1914; but the last report——

Mr. SMOOT. The report I was reading from is dated February 24, 1914.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but the immediate memoranda are dated January 17, 1914. The memorandum which I am reading from states that there are at Fort Bliss 3,180 enlisted men—those are not women or children or civilians—officers, 426; women—it does not state whether they are connected with the army or not, but presumably they are—women, 1,256; children, evidently connected with them, 554; total number, 5,416. That is the record upon which we are acting, and that is the record upon which the appropriation is made. That is the last expression of the War Department concerning those people. There is no statement with respect to civilians. It may be that there are a few civilians there, but you can not turn back sympathizers of a cause who have been coming in with the army and expect them to go over to the territory of the enemy, where they evidently would be assassinated or annihilated. Even if there are few of them, the United States Government does have the obligation resting upon it to take care of them, at least until the few refugees who are civilians may be eliminated. Inasmuch as the amendment which has already been adopted specifies only military persons, refugees under the expenditure which we are making now can receive no benefit hereafter if they have received it in the past.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I said; and the only reason why I interrupted the Senator was because of the statement he made that there were no civilians provided for.

Mr. President, the report here of the Secretary of the Treasury, dated February 24, 1914, was the report which we considered in the committee. Not only that, but I know what report the Senator has. Gen. Aleshire handed it to the committee at the time when he was before the committee. This report is signed by Secretary McAdoo, and I believe it is absolutely correct. But, as I said to the Senator, that would make no difference to me. We have assumed the obligation and we are in debt to-day $242,000, and we have to pay that. It was only as to how far in the future we would provide for in this appropriation bill.

There is another thought that was in my mind, Mr. President. This is an urgency deficiency bill. There is another deficiency bill coming here. It will be passed, perhaps, in May or June—I hope in May, but not later than June—and if the policy that is being followed to-day is to be continued, it would not hurt anything at all to provide only until the 1st of April at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, their army has civilian employees, and the report that we get concerning the refugees is that all the cooks are women. Of course, civilian men are employed in transporting the army, and so forth. That will account for a certain portion of those termed "civilians."

Mr. SHAFROTH. The report which the Senator from Utah read did not specify how many were civilians. Not only that, but under the explanation which has been made it would be proper, of course, to care for those who were a part of the army that came over. This report especially states that these prisoners consist of those who crossed the frontier and then enumerates them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the chairman to accept a little amendment that I offer. It is recommended by the Navy Department, and is very urgent. It involves only a small amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, after line 11, insert the following:

Naval Militia Office—For the following, from April 1 to June 30, 1914, in addition to those now authorized and being paid from the appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia," namely: Clerks—1 of class 2, 1 of class 1, 1 at $1,100, 1 at $1,000; in all, $1,175, which sum shall be paid from the appropriation "Arming and equipping Naval Militia," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the Senator explain the amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have information from the Navy Department to the effect that it is impossible for them to do the work that Congress has authorized them to do with the present force. The amendment authorizes the employment of two additional clerks out of the appropriation already made and requires only $1,175. I am told by the head of the bureau that he can not do the work that Congress required him to do unless he has two more clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it to apply from now until June 30, or is it to apply after June 30?

Mr. OVERMAN. To June 30, it says.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will not object to the amendment, because it can be investigated further when the bill goes to conference. I dislike to see amendments come in without having received full consideration, but under the circumstances I will not object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, on page 48, after line 10, I move to insert:

To pay to John Pepper, father of Rufus F. Pepper, late a Representative from the State of Iowa, $7,500.

Mr. President, I should like to say just a word in explanation of the amendment.

Mr. Pepper was a Representative from the second Iowa district. He was an unmarried man and died just before Christmas. This is to pay to his father the customary amount that has been paid to widows of Members of Congress who die in office.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe in the custom. I believe it is wrong to pay a year's salary to the widows of Members of Congress. I do not believe there is any law or any authority for it. There might be a reason for paying some small amount in order that the family might return home and the old status be established, but I can not really see any more reason for paying a year's salary than that we should pay a year's salary to the widow of a man who was killed in a factory somewhere. But it is the custom and has been for many years, and as long as it is the custom, until that custom is changed, it ought not to be a custom that works differently for different people. I have introduced a resolution to abolish the custom, but although it is a sort of sentiment of the Senate that the custom is wrong, I do not know when we will ever get it up.

Mr. Pepper was a poor man. His father is a poor man. There is a great deal more reason for making this appropriation for Mr. Pepper's father than there is in 7 out of 10 of the cases where the salary is voted to a widow. A year's salary has been voted at times to the widows of Senators whose estates were worth up in the millions of dollars.

Now the question is raised, I understand, why it was left out in the House. I want to say, parenthetically, that it was left out because of misinformation. I am satisfied as to the financial condition of Mr. Pepper's father; but the point was made by the committee there, I understand, that there is no precedent for voting a year's salary to anyone but the widow, at least none to vote it to the father.

Mr. WARREN. To the widow and children.

Mr. KENYON. The widow and children. I want to call attention to two or three cases. In the case of Senator Allison, from my own State, who was a widower, the salary was voted to nephews and nieces. In the case of Senator Frye the salary

for a year was voted to the daughters. In the case of Senator Mallory, of Florida, the salary was voted to nephews and nieces, who are certainly much further removed than the father.

Mr. President, I hope we will not have this custom long, and if all these items for appropriations to widows could be taken out of the bill, I would not urge the amendment or ask it at all; but if we are to have the custom, there is just as much sense in voting it to a dependent or partially dependent father or mother as there is in voting it to a widow.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, I am not against his amendment, but I should like to ask him whether there is any precedent exactly in point?

Mr. KENYON. I do not believe there is; but a niece or nephew is much further removed than a father or mother. Mr. Pepper's father owns a little home in Ottumwa, in our State. He is an aged man. He is too feeble to earn a living. He lives around with his children. He is a man of great pride. I would not say anything here that he could take exception to in that respect, and I ought not to have to do it, but I have letters here from people who know him well and they state the situation fairly. He can get along, living with his children and economizing, but at the same time this son who died contributed to his support. He had come up as a poor boy from a poor home and made a great success in life along lines of helping his fellow men, but not along lines of accumulating a great fortune.

I appeal to the chairman of the committee if it is right to vote a year's salary to widows who are worth, I will say in one case at least $7,000,000 and in another case over a million and a half dollars, why discriminate in the custom as to this particular man?

The House put in the bill an appropriation for the widow of Mr. Bremner and also for the widow of Mr. Wilder. Mr. Bremner's sickness and death attracted the attention of the Nation because of the hard struggle and courageous fight that he made for life. I do not want to raise any objection to that. I understand that in the other case the people are wealthy. The House put in those two items, and why they left out the other I can not understand. I ask the chairman if he has any objection to this item, and if so, what are the objections to it?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa very well knows that it has been a long-established rule here, a rule of comity between the two Houses, that each House fix the expenditures for its own body. The Senator knows that whenever that rule is departed from it results in friction and causes trouble.

With reference to other cases that were provided for by the other House, what the Senator has said is true, but the House did not provide for the widow of the late Senator Bacon. Why? Because that was a matter for the Senate to deal with, and the Senate has dealt with it. The Senate committee did not go into the merits of this case at all, because Mr. Pepper was a Member of the other House. The committee of the House took this matter up, considered it, discussed it, passed upon it, and they declined to make this appropriation. It was again taken up on the floor of the House, discussed on the floor of the House, and the House refused to appropriate this money for the father of Mr. Pepper.

The Senator has said that this action was taken from a lack of understanding; that the House did not understand it. There are other appropriation bills; this is not an urgent matter; it is not a matter that need be done to-day or to-morrow; a general deficiency bill will come along very soon, and besides there are other appropriation bills on which this item might be put, but the proper place for it is on the general deficiency bill.

I have not the slightest indisposition to pay this amount. The Senator knows there is no purpose to discriminate against Mr. Pepper. I have not the slightest idea that any human being desires to discriminate against Mr. Pepper. But I say that the committee left the item off this bill because Mr. Pepper was a House Member, and it was a matter for the House to dispose of. It was an expenditure peculiarly within the control of the House, and, according to usage and comity and the rule, which is an excellent one, it is a matter with which the House ought to deal. If the House has made a mistake, if the House acted with imperfect information, it will be only a very few days when the House can correct the mistake. I think it ought to be left to the House to determine whether or not this appropriation shall be made.

If the Senate chooses to act differently and to violate the rule, which has become a very fixed one here, it will be perfectly agreeable to me; but in the interest of harmony and peace, and to avoid friction and trouble with the House committee and with the House itself, we left the item off. We hope the House will take it up again and do what they think is right about it; and I am sure there is not a Member of the Senate who will object to the item if the House sees fit to put it into the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not quarrel with the statement of the Senator from Virginia; but the rule which he invokes has been broken in this very bill, for on the next page the committee of which he is the distinguished chairman has inserted——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. To what item does the Senator from Iowa refer?

Mr. KENYON. To the item found on page 39 of the bill. I am going to read it:

For stationery for the use of the committees and officers of the House, $1,000.

So the Senate takes up the question of stationery for the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me to interrupt him, I will state that we had a letter from the chairman of the House committee asking us to insert that item. It is not a departure from the rule; it is a compliance with the rule. The item was omitted inadvertently in the House; and, I repeat, the chairman of the House committee asked us to put it in, and we did so. That has been the rule here ever since I have been a Member of the Senate.

If the House had said that they wanted the Pepper item inserted, we would have inserted it. We did telephone over there; we got in touch with Mr. FITZGERALD and would have been glad to have added the item if the chairman of the House committee or the House itself had said that it would be agreeable to them to have us do so, but Mr. FITZGERALD was out of the city, and we were told by the person who came to the telephone, representing him, that Mr. FITZGERALD would not send a letter or ask us to insert the item.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if the House does an injustice, that is no reason why the Senate should not rectify it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator from Iowa says this was done from lack of information, the House can rectify it. The House has not done any injustice, according to the Senator, but it acted without full information. Give the information to the House committee on the next deficiency bill, and your item will go in.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, if it is passed by now, it never can, in my judgment, come up again. This is the place where such appropriations are being made and being made for the widows of Senators and Representatives. Of course, if somebody in the House, out of pique or something else—I do not know what—can succeed in having this appropriation for widows or for nieces and nephews carried through as to certain individuals and defeated as to others, it is well that we should know that, because this is a custom which, in any event, I think, will go when the American people thoroughly understand it.

Mr. President, I do think that perhaps my case is hopeless, but I feel that this is an injustice being done to this old man, who, I know, in his old age was dependent to a large extent on this boy. If, however, the Senate is so bound up by the rules of the House that we can not do justice in this body, even though they have done injustice in the other body, I can not make any other appeal, but I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment, and that it may be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will consent that this amendment may be adopted, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which I mentioned to the chairman of the committee [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, under the heading "Department of Labor," it is proposed to insert:

Contingent expenses: For additional amounts for contingent and miscellaneous expenses for the offices and bureaus of the Department of Labor, to be available for the objects named in the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Commerce and Labor contained in the act approved March 4, 1913, and for all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included therein, fiscal year 1914, $10,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply want to say that this matter was called to my attention yesterday after the Committee on Appropriations had passed on the bill or I would have called it up in committee. I afterwards spoke to the chairman of the committee in regard to it. It seems that in the hearings the Secretary and the chief clerk of the department came before the House committee and also before the

Senate committee and stated that some of the items, especially in the contingent-expenses estimate, were absolutely necessary. For instance, I find on page 46 of the Senate hearings that Mr. Watson said:

First and most important is that in regard to naturalization certificate papers. We will require to enable us to issue the necessary petitions and certificates during the balance of the year $4,200. That is one item for which it is absolutely essential provision shall be made if we are to continue to naturalize people until the end of the fiscal year.

I have no doubt that we shall continue the naturalization of aliens, and we ought to make whatever provision is absolutely necessary for it.

Then, on page 48 I find that Secretary Wilson came before the committee, and in the first part of his statement I find this:

Senator SMOOT. I understood the Secretary to say that he appeared here in behalf of his contingent fund.

And Secretary Wilson said, at the bottom of the page:

The contingent fund, however, that we are asking for is imperative. It is needed in order that we may get the material with which the clerks that we have may be able to work.

Then on page 49 he says:

As has been stated by the chief clerk, it is essential that we should have a sufficient amount of money in the contingent fund to pay for the certificates of naturalization that will be needed during the balance of the fiscal year. The current fiscal year has been extraordinary in the number of certificates of naturalization that have been applied for. It is far in excess of any previous year. We must always depend upon the supplies of paper. It is a special paper that has to be specially provided for.

Therefore, according to the hearings, it would appear that this item is necessary and that there should be provision made for it in the contingent fund. The department asked, I believe, for some seventeen or eighteen thousand dollars, but I have only asked in the amendment proposed by me for $10,000. I do not want to appropriate any more money than is absolutely necessary for any of the departments, but this is a new department, and I do not think that we ought to hamper it, and I know the chairman of the committee does not want to hamper it. We all want to give the department what is actually necessary to carry on its work; and they say that this amount is necessary. Whether there is anything anywhere else in the bill showing that it is not necessary I do not know; but it does seem to me that on the statements which I have quoted from in the hearings we ought to make some appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Department of Labor for the rest of the year. So I have offered this amendment proposing an appropriation of $10,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, there has been an appropriation this year of $36,000 for the contingent expenses of this department. If we are merely going to appropriate everything that is asked for without knowing whether or not it is necessary, the Treasury of the United States will be swamped. The committee did not think this appropriation was necessary. It was considered by the committee; they were not satisfied that it ought to be allowed, and I am not satisfied that it ought to be allowed. There is nothing urgent about this matter, and there is no occasion for putting it on this bill. This is an urgent deficiency bill; it is designed to meet pressing necessities; it is to provide for paying people who are doing work for the Government and who would not otherwise be paid. There is an appropriation of $2,600,000 that is immediately needed on the Panama Canal.

The bill is designed to meet emergencies, urgent necessities, and the item referred to by the Senator from Washington is not urgent. It can wait. We excluded it from this bill simply to get further information. We were not satisfied about it. I do not say that it is wrong, but, as I have said, I was not satisfied that it was right; I am not in favor of putting it in the bill; and I can not ask the Senate to put it in now. I think it ought to be rejected until further investigation is made of it.

Mr. JONES. The Senator says the committee considered it. He means the subcommittee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The subcommittee.

Mr. JONES. It was not considered by the full committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was not.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the Senator a question. As I understand, this urgent deficiency bill is to provide funds considered absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the Government to the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is.

Mr. JONES. How is it determined whether they are necessary? The Secretary of this department says, for instance, that this amount for certificates of naturalization is absolutely imperative. What stronger showing could be made than that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I was not satisfied that it was right; I am not satisfied now; and I hope the Senate will not put it in this bill. It can be provided for in the general deficiency bill, if it is right; and in the meantime we will give it further investigation. It can not go in the bill until I have better information and am better satisfied about it, so far as my vote is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by the statement made by the Secretary of Labor in relation to the appropriation for the Bureau of Naturalization; but I looked up the question somewhat, and I found that this same matter was discussed before the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and its urgency was brought to their attention, but they decided not to put it in the bill. If the Senator has at hand the deficiency estimates, he will find, on page 26——

Mr. JONES. I have not the deficiency estimates at hand.

Mr. SMOOT. I have them here, and I will state that the House refused to put the item on this urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. JONES. That is no argument whatever for not putting it on in the Senate, because in a good many cases where the House has appropriated a certain amount we have increased it.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the class of paper to which he refers comes under the Bureau of Naturalization and not under the miscellaneous expenses of the department. Another thing that I did not understand was the following statement in the estimates, under the heading "Salaries, Bureau of Naturalization":

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act approved June 29, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 736), establishing the Bureau of Naturalization and providing for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, namely—

Then it goes on to say:

Commissioner of Naturalization * * *, $2,500; Deputy Commissioner of Naturalization * * *, $1,750.

And then there is an estimate for a number of clerks. There is nothing there to show the need for the purchase of paper, but I understood from the head of the department that that was included. I want to say to the Senator that the regular bill carrying the appropriations for the paper for all of the departments will be over here in a short time, and so I do not think there is any real necessity for having the item put on this bill.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the Senator a question. I find on page 6 of the bill the following item:

Dallas, Tex., post office: For new site, $250,000.

Is that urgent? Is that absolutely necessary? Has that actually been contracted for, and is it a deficiency?

Mr. SMOOT. Not only has it been contracted for, but they simply have not enough money to go ahead without this appropriation.

Mr. JONES. Can it not be taken care of in the——

Mr. SMOOT. In the public-buildings bill?

Mr. JONES. In the general deficiency bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It would only put the matter off that long.

Mr. JONES. Well, this work of the Department of Labor has also got to be done, or else we have got to stop naturalizing people. But the item to which I have referred is not the only one. There are items here of over $18,000 which are said to be really necessary. Here is what was said at the close of the hearings in the House:

It is apparent from a consideration of the foregoing tables that the department is confronted with liabilities aggregating $19,800 for the balance of the fiscal year, to meet which there is an available balance of but $1,842.57, hence the request for $17,950.

That amount is required for contingent expenses, as is shown on page 373 of the House hearings. I will not take up the time of the Senate by giving each particular item.

Mr. SMOOT. They are provided for, but not to the amount requested. The department asked for $19,500.

Mr. JONES. Nineteen thousand eight hundred dollars, and there is nothing for the contingent expenses of the Department of Labor in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. But we have heretofore provided $36,000, and I can assure the Senator that there will be no lack of naturalization if this item does not go on the bill.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand why when a department, especially when the head of a department, comes here and says certain amounts are absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the department, we should cut them off. I do not think the chairman or any member of the committee wants to cripple the Department of Labor; and yet it has seemed to me that from the beginning we have been cutting down appropriations for that department and hampering it in every way in starting to do the work which we all hope to have done by that department. If there is any department that ought to be cared for and which ought to have the necessary appropriations to do its work, it is the new Department of Labor, from which we hope so much and which I am satisfied will bring so much good. I do not know anything about the necessity for these appropria-

tions, except as the statements are given in the hearings. The Secretary says that he needs this money; that it is imperative that the department should have it; and the chief clerk also says it is imperative they should have it. That is all I know about it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I inquire if the Secretary of the Department of Labor did not spend a portion of the contingent fund provided for his department for an automobile and accessories?

Mr. JONES. I do not know.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand so, but I may be misinformed, and I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if a part of the contingent fund that was appropriated for him was not expended in the purchase of an automobile, which had been refused by Congress in the original appropriation?

Mr. JONES. I do not know about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am not prepared to explain how the contingent fund was expended.

Mr. BRISTOW. I may have been misinformed, but I understand that was brought out in the debates in the House, and that being the case, I think we need not worry about the contingent fund being exhausted.

Mr. JONES. Of course we do not know that that is the case.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think if the Senator will read the debates in the House he will find that it is the case.

Mr. JONES. I have not had time to do that. Of course, if that has been done, we ought to have some provision that would stop anything of that kind; but when the officials of the department come here and say that the amounts estimated by them are necessary to carry on their work and they have not the money with which to do their work, it seems to me we ought to appropriate the amount required.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does not the Senator think that the money should have been expended for the purpose for which it was appropriated instead of for automobiles?

Mr. JONES. I have no doubt in the world that that ought to be done.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah just now made a statement, if I correctly understood him, that an appropriation in this bill for a new site for a public building at Dallas, Tex., was an urgent deficiency appropriation. I should like to inquire how it is possible for an appropriation of that kind to be either urgent or a deficiency?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not a copy of the hearings, or I should like to turn to them and read to the Senator——

Mr. THOMAS. I will take the Senator's word for it. The statement was so unusual that I should really like some explanation of it. I can understand how an appropriation of money to pay for the completion of a building might be in an urgent deficiency bill, but I can not understand how the purchase of a new site for a public building can be so classified. The Senator, however, need not take the trouble to look the matter up in the hearings. His recollection is nearly always correct, according to my experience.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not positive in my recollection as to the real reasons, and I would not want to give the Senator the reasons unless I could give them with assurance.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well, then, the Senator need not answer the question; and I will not take the time to ask for any further information about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Washington to state the purport of his amendment. I did not catch it.

Mr. JONES. It proposes to appropriate $10,000 for the contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. They have estimated for various items, including naturalization certificate paper, $4,200; stationery, $5,125; and so on, amounting to over $18,000. The amendment which I offer only proposes to appropriate $10,000, but the department officials claim that an appropriation sufficient to cover all the items is absolutely necessary in connection with the work of the department.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the matter to which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] has referred. I would have doubt about it as affecting the Department of Labor unless the fact were substantiated; but I have been informed from sources, which, I think, are reliable, that this increased fund is necessary for the actual work of the department. I know furthermore that this department has not been very well taken care of since it has been organized and created for the work which it necessarily has to do. While I know nothing about the facts to which the Senator from Kansas has referred, I have reason to believe that an increased appropriation of the kind is necessary for the department.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not state positively, but in running through the RECORD hurriedly, I got the impression from the debate in the House that the Secretary of Labor had used the money in his contingent fund to buy an automobile, and that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations criticized him very severely for it. I do not speak with absolute accuracy, but that was the inference I got from running through hurriedly the House debates on that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, after hearing the statement of the Secretary of the Department of Labor before the subcommittee, I felt very much inclined to put in the bill as a deficiency the item of $4,200 for naturalization-certificate paper; the item of $3,550 for "machinery, including typewriters, adding machines, addressing machines, numbering machines, and parts therefor." The remainder of the nearly $19,800 asked for at the time is made up of the following items:

Stationery, $5,125; hardware, metals, cordage, and leather and saddlery, $316; dry goods, flags, and notions, $254; lumber, mill work, packing boxes, and so forth, $175; paints, oils, glass, and painters' supplies, $40; soap and cleansing materials, $96; ice, $112; and a long list of little items which we did not consider should be placed upon the urgent deficiency bill. When we came to look into the matter further we found that typewriters and adding machines had been borrowed, I suppose with the understanding that when the appropriation was made they would be paid for out of the appropriation. Therefore it is not going to hamper the work of the department, so far as these items are concerned, if the amount is omitted from this bill.

As I have said, I thought that the naturalization-certificate paper ought to be provided for in this bill; but the committee thought otherwise, owing to the fact that there is no question that the regular bill carrying these items will be passed here in ample time. So it was not considered necessary to include the item on this bill. Those are the reasons why it is not in this urgent deficiency bill. I have here a list, if the Senator cares to look at it, of every single item of estimated deficiency, or I will read it if the Senator desires me to do so.

Mr. JONES. With reference to the statements as to what the House has done, I find on page 6 of this bill the House appropriated $49,455 for distinctive paper for United States securities, while the Senate has raised it to $74,182.50; on page 10 the House appropriated $33,952 for engravers' and printers' materials, and so forth, which the Senate has raised to $50,928; and there are other items showing similar increases, so that because the House did not do a thing is not any argument why the Senate should not do it. I do not say that these increases were improper; I think they were proper. But to say that because the House did not authorize an appropriation we should not do so is no argument at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator will admit that the increase in the items he has mentioned was not only absolutely necessary but urgent. We are printing United States notes at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and an order has been issued to print 1,080,000 of such notes every day. I want to call attention to the fact that, in spite of the number being printed, there is a demand all over the United States for one and two dollar notes which it is almost impossible for the Government to supply. We are engraving now 960,000 imprints every day, and it will take every dollar of the amount of money that is appropriated by this bill to provide the paper and to pay the engravers, plate printers, and other employees until June 30 of this year.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not question that at all; but here is what the Secretary of this department said:

> The contingent fund, however, that we are asking for is imperative. It is needed in order that we may get the material with which the clerks that we have may be able to work.

If he does not know what he is talking about——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think if there is a head of a department in this Government that would spend money economically, it is the head of the Labor Department. So far as I am concerned, when he makes that kind of a statement, unless there is some showing other than has been made here, I am in favor of giving him the money. There is not a more important department of the Government than this department, and there is no disposition, so far as I can see, to enlarge it or to accentuate its powers. I am in favor of supporting this amendment upon the statement of the Secretary of the Department of Labor.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that it is imperative that an appropriation be made to purchase the necessary machinery, including typewriters, adding machines, addressing machines, num-

bering machines, and parts therefor. I admit it; and I want to say to the Senator that those very machines are being used to-day by the Department of Labor, as the department has borrowed the machines, and, as I understand, with the distinct understanding that when the general appropriation bill is made up we will take care of the items just named and they will be paid for from that general appropriation.

That is as I understand the situation. While I do not know whether I asked the head of the department at the time he was before the committee, I really think I did, and that is what you will find in his statement.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debate in the House, which appears on page 3854.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will pardon me, there is one item that I forgot to bring to the attention of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I have read that. It is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMOOT. The information is satisfactory to the Senator from Colorado, is it?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all I wish to say, then.

Mr. BRISTOW (reading):

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation can not be justified. When the Department of Commerce and Labor was divided and the Department of Labor created, Congress passed an act requiring the segregation of the appropriations that had been made for the conduct of the Department of Commerce and Labor between the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor. At the last session of Congress it appeared that out of the appropriation of $60,000 for the contingent expenses of the Department of Commerce and Labor $26,100 was transferred to the Department of Labor. In addition to that, Congress at the last session appropriated $5,000 additional for the contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. At that time a request was made by the Department of Labor to authorize the Secretary of Labor to purchase three automobiles—a seven-passenger touring car for himself, at $4,500; an electric runabout for the use of himself and others, for $2,500; and an automobile truck.

The committee declined to include that authority in the bill, based upon the fact authority had never been given to any of the departments to purchase automobiles for the Secretary or others connected with the department. In some way or other the information got noised abroad that such a request had been made, and innumerable Members of this House served notice upon the committee that they would not tolerate such a situation. The authority was not given, and yet it appears that during this session of Congress an automobile has been purchased for the personal use of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. BORAH. That does not change my mind a particle. I am not permitted to comment upon what Members of the other body say, or what they do, or what their motives are. I do know, however, that from the hour the Department of Labor was created there have been a great many people in this country who regretted that it ever was created; and they have undertaken in every possible way to hamper it in its work, and to prevent its development, and to keep it from doing that which it was created to do. I know from my own observation and from my own investigation and talk with those who are in charge of the situation that the Department of Labor has not been given an opportunity to do what it felt it ought to do. I do not know anything about this matter of automobiles.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, of course, does not accuse the committee of showing any partiality against the Department of Labor?

Mr. BORAH. This committee?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. No; I have no knowledge that that was the case.

Mr. WARREN. On the other hand, can the Senator mention a single department to which the committee gives all they think they require or sustains them to the extent to which they wish to go in demonstration and exploitation of their department?

Mr. BORAH. I understand the Senator to ask if I can name any department that gets all it wants?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. No; I can not name any department that gets all it wants.

Mr. WARREN. So that is rather general.

Mr. BORAH. I can, however, name departments which have gotten money from Congress for doing things which never ought to have been done, which were without any justification in the world, and things which, in my judgment, had no connection at all with the benefit of the public service; while here is a department which is of prime concern to a class of people who have never heretofore had a real representation in the departments of the Government.

Mr. WARREN. I appreciate what the Senator says about the Department of Labor. It is important. It is one that we ought to sustain. By the same token, however, that the Senator states that the departments have spent money where they should not, it becomes the duty of the committee to go a little slowly in making these appropriations, especially in an urgent deficiency bill, when we can take care of the matter a month or two later in a general deficiency bill, and when there is no idea of either restraining or unduly hampering the department.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that I know nothing about the efficiency of the Secretary of Labor. I would not know him if he should enter the Chamber. I do know, however, that when a Cabinet officer is refused an appropriation for automobiles, if he then takes his contingent fund and uses it to buy one he is misappropriating public money, and he deserves the censure of Congress. I do not care what his record is on anything else.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not know, of course, what the truth is in regard to the statement the Senator has read; but I have here, on page 372 of the House hearings, an itemized statement of the expenditures from the contingent fund that the Senator describes, amounting to $36,100. It is itemized, and there is no item there that could be classed as an automobile; and I am satisfied, from the amounts given opposite the different items and the descriptions of them, that there is not any expenditure of that kind in this amount, at least. That accounts for $34,257.43 of the $36,100 set aside for the contingent fund of this department.

Mr. BORAH. Did the committee find anything in regard to the spending of this money for an automobile that ought not to have been spent?

Mr. WARREN. The committee did not pass upon it at all. The fact that he bought one, and has it, settled the matter, of course.

Mr. BORAH. Did the committee ascertain that he purchased it out of this fund from which he ought not to have purchased it?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know what fund he purchased it from.

Mr. BORAH. It may be possible that he purchased it out of money that he saved up from daily labor during the long years in which he worked.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the Senator, however, that I am sure that did not prejudice the committee at all in looking over these expenditures. I did not hear a voice raised around the committee table in anything but the utmost confidence and respect for the Department of Labor and the intention to sustain it. While this happened to be picked out just now as an amendment, the Book of Estimates is full of things that we have left out in the case of all of the departments. So the committee have not differentiated at all as against the Department of Labor, and, so far as I am concerned, I never should have permitted it, if I were able to prevent it, if such an attempt had been made.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I should regret to see this item rejected on account of the automobile suggestion, for it seems to me we have not the information which would justify us in condemning the Secretary of Labor in connection with the purchase of an automobile. The fact is that every other Cabinet officer in this city has an automobile, and I do not see any reason why the Secretary of the Department of Labor should not have one.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to know if every Cabinet officer has an automobile that was bought with public money and is maintained at public expense?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no doubt of it, though I can not refer the Senator to the specific instances.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator ought to be better informed. I should like to have him advise me of a single one, unless it is the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of War.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They have had carriages, and I suppose they may not have gotten to automobiles yet; but that is a matter that ought to be treated on its own merits. I do not think we ought to deny an appropriation to the public service on a mere suggestion that a Cabinet officer has bought an automobile for his personal use. I do not think that it is treating the department exactly right. Neither am I prepared to condemn this appropriation.

The most the committee did was to say that they would not provide for this matter now, in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. We may put this item in the general deficiency bill. If it is meritorious, we certainly will do it.

There is no disposition to discriminate against the Secretary of Labor. I do not know a department of the Government that is entitled to be treated more generously than the Department

of Labor. It is not out of favor with the committee at all. On the contrary, I think it is the desire of the committee to treat it with very great generosity. Certainly that is my feeling.

We turned down items for every department in this city. This is not the only one. We turned down many, some that we believed were right, that were just, and that ought to be cared for; but we did it on the ground that they ought not to be provided for in the urgent deficiency bill. This is one of the items that was turned down for that reason. We shall certainly put it in the general deficiency bill if a more thorough investigation satisfies us that it is just and right and needed for that department.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the chairman whether suggestions like that do not encourage the department to go on and incur deficiencies? We say: "Well, if you incur a deficiency, we will take care of it in the general deficiency bill."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should think it would rather discourage them to turn down their request.

Mr. JONES. But the Senator suggests: "We will take care of it in the general deficiency bill."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If it is right, we will.

Mr. JONES. Yes; of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly. If we find it is just and right, we will take care of it in the general deficiency bill; but we rejected quite a number of items because we felt that the urgent deficiency bill ought to be kept within reasonable limits, and we ought not to appropriate for all the wants of the Government in such a bill. I think this item can wait, and can be investigated more thoroughly, and after investigation it certainly will be treated justly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], who is absent from the Chamber, I offer his amendment, to be inserted at the bottom of page 37. I understand the chairman of the committee has accepted the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the bottom of page 37 it is proposed to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, the Capitol police, and W. A. Smith, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, borne on the annual and session rolls on the 15th day of October, 1913, who are receiving an annual compensation of $2,500 or less, as reimbursement for mileage expenses and for extra services during the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, a sum equal to one-twelfth of the annual compensation then paid them by law, and to the officers and employees who are receiving an annual compensation in excess of $2,500 the sum of $200 shall be paid in lieu of mileage expenses and for extra services during the said session, the same to be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be paid one-twelfth of the annual compensation now received by them in the same manner as they are now paid under existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Does that apply to the House employees as well as to those of the Senate?

Mr. KENYON. I am not prepared to say. I introduced it at the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. If there is any question about it, I prefer that he should answer it.

Mr. BRYAN. I raise the point of order that this amendment is out of order under the first section of Rule XVI of the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. I have sent for the Senator from Minnesota, and I should be glad if the Senator from Florida would wait until he comes to discuss the matter. There are other amendments to be proposed, I presume.

Mr. BRYAN (after a pause). I will read the part of Rule XVI to which I refer:

No amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

This amendment is objectionable upon all of the grounds I have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to sustain the point of order to the amendment. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Utah, in reference to the inquiry suggested by the Senator from Colorado—I had intended to ask the same thing—why post offices are placed in the urgent deficiency bill, and especially the item of the Dallas (Tex.) post office:

For new site, $250,000.

Why is the purchase of a new site for a post office a matter of urgent deficiency?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in a letter dated January 23, 1914, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John Skelton Williams, addressed the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the subject, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, January 23, 1914.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I inclose herewith another original, properly signed, of department letter dated January 16, 1914, relative to the recommendation for an appropriation, in amount $250,000, for a new site for the post office at Dallas, Tex.

It is understood that the original letter referred to has not been received at the House of Representatives, nor by the Committee on Appropriations, to which committee, presumably, it would have been referred.

Inquiry at the department to-day made it necessary, with a view to preserving the record and of showing the original action of the department, to take the necessary steps to immediately renew the original communication without delay.

Respectfully,

JNO. SKELTON WILLIAMS,
*Acting Secretary.*

Now, if the Senator will wait just a moment until I look up the hearings, I will find the other letter.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, while the Senator is looking up the letter to which he refers, I desire to say to the Senator from Iowa that, in the first place, there must be a limit of expenditure. Then, after that has been provided, we get estimates from the Treasury Department, usually in time to put them in the sundry civil bill. In cases where the item has been overlooked, however, or the expense has gone along faster than we expected, or where some emergency has arisen, we take up the matter in a deficiency bill and appropriate for it; but we are all the time within the limit which has been authorized by Congress, and we only provide for the earlier expenditure.

Mr. KENYON. This has been included in the public buildings bill, then?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. KENYON. And passed upon by the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I wish to call the Senator's attention now to the letter of January 16, 1914, signed by Hon. John Skelton Williams, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, January 16, 1914.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: The public-buildings act approved March 4, 1913, authorized the purchase of additional ground adjoining the post office and courthouse at Dallas, Tex., or in lieu thereof the acquisition of a new site, in either case the limit of cost not to exceed the sum of $300,000.

The department, under date of December 30, 1913, accepted a proposal in the sum of $250,000 for a new site at Dallas, Tex., and the papers conveying title thereto are now before the Attorney General for consideration.

It is anticipated that the report of the Attorney General, as required by the statutes, will be received by this department in the course of a day or two, and it is therefore necessary that prompt provision should be made for the payment of the amount involved in the acceptance above referred to.

I have the honor to recommend, therefore, the insertion of the following paragraph as a deficiency item in the deficiency bill now pending before the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives:

"Dallas, Tex., post office: For new site under present limit (act Mar. 4, 1913), $250,000."

Respectfully,

JNO. SKELTON WILLIAMS,
*Acting Secretary.*

Mr. KENYON. I think that is a satisfactory explanation. Has the Senator explained the other items for post offices in Texas? Texas seems to be especially favored in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the subcommittee did not scrutinize very closely the items which were put into the bill by the House, because there was no question involved. Therefore I should not want to say offhand just what the reason was; but, if the Senator desires it, I will look up the matter.

Mr. KENYON. I rather suspected they were urgent political deficiencies.

Mr. SMOOT. That I can not tell.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I simply want to make a statement. It has been charged here very broadly that the Secretary of Labor has violated the law. I have set on foot an inquiry in regard to the matter, and I think I shall be prepared to answer that charge in a few minutes. I want now, however, while the matter is fresh, to give notice of the fact that I think there is a perfect explanation of the matter to which the Senator from Kansas has referred.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri that I read the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to that matter, and that was the authority I cited.

Mr. REED. But the Senator followed it with the charge that it was an absolute violation of the law.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Missouri is mistaken when he says I charged that. I made this statement, as I remember, and if I did not make it then as I make it now I intended to state that if the Secretary of Labor had used money from his contingent fund to purchase automobiles which Congress had refused to appropriate for, he deserved the censure of Congress for so doing.

Mr. REED. That is a pleasant sort of reference to make to a man on the floor of the Senate. It goes to the country as a broad and sweeping condemnation. It is true there is an "if" in it, but the "if" is bottomed upon a statement which was read here.

Now, I am not here to defend any man, but I thought it was proper to say that I thought I should have the facts regarding this matter in a few minutes, and that I thought there was an explanation, and I thought it only fair to make the statement now while the matter is new in order that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the statements contained in the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives are erroneous, and the Secretary of Labor did not use the public funds to purchase this automobile, then of course the criticism which is inferred from my remarks should not lie against him. I do not wish to criticize the Secretary of Labor if he has not done what it is alleged he has done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it does not at all follow as a necessary conclusion that even if all the Senator has said transpired the Secretary of Labor might not use the contingent fund to purchase a necessary vehicle. That fact still remains to be settled.

Mr. BRISTOW. That would depend upon the construction of "a necessary vehicle." If an automobile for personal use, which Congress refuses to permit by direct appropriation, can be purchased from the contingent fund and regarded as a necessary vehicle, those who regard it as such may approve it. I for one would not.

Mr. REED. The Senator again injects into his remarks the proposition "an automobile for personal use." It seems that some of us have an unfortunate way of stating things. I have not said that there was any automobile purchased for personal use. I do not think anybody has used that term except the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 19, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1914.*

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Daniel F. Hudson, of Lander, Wyo., to be United States marshal, district of Wyoming, vice Hugh L. Patton, removed.

Thomas B. Martin, of Boise, Idaho, to be United States marshal, district of Idaho, vice Shadrach L. Hodgin, whose term has expired.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18, 1914.*

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Charles F. Pond to be a rear admiral.
Commander Edward H. Durell to be a captain.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank N. Eklund to be a lieutenant.
Henry McDonald to be an assistant surgeon.
Richard M. Little to be an assistant surgeon.
Pay Inspector Frank T. Arms to be a pay director.
Asst. Paymaster Harold C. Gwynne to be a passed assistant paymaster.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW JERSEY.

Charles H. Hitchner, Elmer.

TEXAS.

S. R. Brown, McGregor.
Joe F. Coffey, Eddy.
W. H. McCurdy, Moody.
J. R. Ransone, jr., Cleburne.
F. J. Reese, Comanche.
J. P. Rodgers, Hico.

VIRGINIA.

Richard P. Barham, Petersburg.
W. C. Lauck, Luray.
John B. Norfleet, Suffolk.
L. E. Stephenson, Wakefield.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *March 18, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our heavenly Father, whose spirit pervades and fills all space with rays divine, from whom proceedeth life and its issues, we draw near to Thee for restraint, for encouragement, for reproof, for inspiration, that the issues of our life may not only be for our good but for the good of mankind. We realize that it is not so much what Thou hast called us to do, but it is the motive we put behind it and the way in which we do it, that counts. Fill us with Thy spirit and make us willing followers of the dictates of conscience, that we may do the right as it is thus given us to see the right. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of a bill which I introduced, H. R. 14623, providing pay for extra services performed by persons in certain navy yards, by referring it to the Committee on Claims instead of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MANN. Is it a private or public bill?

Mr. WILSON of Florida. It is a private bill.

The SPEAKER. It is a private bill and will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

IMPORTATION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The unfinished business is the bill H. R. 14330, and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] in the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14330) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday last it was agreed that general debate on this bill should cease in one hour upon the resumption of its consideration to-day, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the other half by myself. I will ask if the gentleman from Illinois is ready to use some of his time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to prohibit the importation of convict or pauper made goods into the United

States. The existing law prohibits the importation of convict-made goods into the United States. The greatest friend that labor ever had in this country, in my opinion, was William McKinley, and in the McKinley Act of 1890 it was provided in section 51—

That all goods, wares, articles, and merchandise manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision.

I suppose no one knows that any convict-made goods are now being imported, because if anyone did know of such importation the goods would be seized and the importation refused.

This bill, which I favor, puts a penalty clause, however, into the law. It does not make the law any more effective, as far as the prohibition of convict-made goods is concerned, but it provides a penalty against anyone seeking to import goods and provides for the seizure of the goods. I am reminded that the other day when we passed a bill to prohibit the interstate shipment of convict-made goods, when I sought to insert a penalty in that bill gentlemen on the other side of the House voted it down, including my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] on this side of the House.

It is claimed now that the prohibition in the existing law—and this section 51 of the McKinley Act is still the law, as it has never been repealed—it is claimed that the prohibition of importation is not wholly sufficient without the penalty clause. I am glad that the gentlemen propose to insert a penalty clause in the law, making it a little more dangerous to attempt to import convict-made goods. But I regret that the gentlemen the other day were unwilling to insert a penalty clause in the other bill in relation to interstate shipment of convict-made goods. So far as I know there is no violation of the existing law prohibiting the importation, but the bill we passed the other day in regard to interstate shipment had no teeth in it. It amounts to nothing. There is no penalty for a violation of it; in fact, no prohibition that could be enforced.

I am very glad to insert the proper penalty. I do not believe that the convicts, here or elsewhere, ought to be engaged in the manufacture of goods in competition with free labor. [Applause.] Of course the problem of taking care of the convicts is a problem yet unsolved so far as their occupation is concerned while in confinement. But having a little more feeling in favor of free labor than I have for those who are subjected to confinement for violation of the law, I am in favor of protecting free labor. [Applause.]

I wish this bill went a little further. It provides against the importation of pauper-made goods. It makes a definition of what a pauper is under the terms of the bill, but when that provision is reached in the bill I propose to offer an amendment providing that the term "pauper" shall include all adults who receive wages of less than $1 a day, so that we may protect American labor from pauper-made goods, whether the paupers are in an asylum or whether they are supposed to be free laborers. We have the right, and I think it is our duty, to protect the American laborer from competition with pauper-made goods abroad. [Applause.]

We now have a law under which goods may be brought into the United States from India, where the wages are 5 or 6 cents a day. There is just as much danger to the American laborer in the importation of these goods as there is by the importation of goods made in some eleemosynary institution in Europe or elsewhere. I hope that the gentlemen will agree to the amendment so that we may give real protection to the American laborers. We do not know of any convict-made goods coming into the country now, but we know of plenty of pauper-made goods, or goods manufactured by what we consider pauper labor. We ought to protect our people from the insidious influence of these goods in competition with American labor. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to say to the gentleman that to-morrow morning I hope to show to the gentleman that we are bringing into this country 95 per cent of the shingles manufactured in British Columbia, and that 80 per cent of them are manufactured by Chinese labor.

Mr. MANN. And Hindu labor also, I suppose?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but mostly Chinese.

Mr. MANN. That is the problem we are up against. There is nothing to this bill unless it is made effective. Convict-made goods do not come into this country now. That is contrary to the laws since the days of William McKinley. Let us make the bill of some value by putting something in it that amounts to something. That is my doctrine. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was absent on official business in the State of Colorado two weeks ago, when the bill was under consideration, which was finally acted upon in the House in reference to the shipment of convict-made goods in interstate commerce. I voted for that measure in the last Congress, and I was not only anxious to vote for it again but to offer an amendment to it which would prohibit the shipment of convict-made goods or convict-mined coal into any State of the American Union. Congress has been agitating this question for more than 20 years. If we have reached a point now where we have determined to write this meritorious legislation on the statute books, then I fully agree with the statement made by the minority leader [Mr. MANN] that we ought to make this law effective, and we ought to provide such penalties that men will not violate it. In the consideration of this bill we ought to go a step further. If it is wrong and unfair to the American workshop and American wage earner to place in competition with goods made in foreign lands by convicts, then it is equally so for the American Congress to permit the policy under which more than 30 States are to-day engaged in manufacturing or permitting, under the contract system, the manufacture of convict-made goods that are shipped into thirty-odd States every day in the year and sold in competition with similar articles made by honest, free American workingmen. The bill that was passed two weeks ago gives a remedy only so far as 10 or 11 States in the Union out of 48 are concerned; and if it is our duty, and it certainly is, to protect the honest workingmen in those 11 States, why should we hesitate to extend the same relief to the honest workingmen in the balance of the States in the Union?

The State of Nebraska manufactures brooms through a private contractor, who has the labor of convicts at a price of 55 cents, and who sells them in competition even with the output of factories run by the unfortunate blind of the country. There is a contracting firm that practically has a trust or monopoly in more than half a dozen States which manufactures knitted goods and overalls, shirts, and skirts, and brings that cheap convict labor into direct competition with the labor of the unfortunate wives and daughters of workingmen in our crowded tenement cities, who are compelled to work. We are encouraging and permitting the States to increase the number of convicts every year in the workshops within the walls of the penitentiaries. They commenced with one line in the production of goods and to-day they have multiplied and greatly increased the number. Why should we not, while we have the power and the opportunity, enact effective legislation that will wipe out this blot, this unjust system, a system which is unfair to the laboring man who has a family to support, and who bears his shares of the burdens and responsibilities of citizenship?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested and in favor of the bill, as the gentleman is; but what would the gentleman do with the convicts? What employment would he give them?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would put them on the public roads of this country to aid Congress and municipalities, counties, and States in giving a splendid free-road system in all parts of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman has looked into this matter carefully. About how long has this system been in vogue in this country?

Mr. AUSTIN. We have been working convicts——

Mr. HAMLIN. I mean the system of permitting private contractors to work convicts in the different prisons of the country?

Mr. AUSTIN. I can say that as far as my own State is concerned, to the shame of Tennessee, we have permitted our convicts to be used in the coal mines in competition with the honest miners for 30 or 40 years, and also a large number, several hundred, working in factories under private contractors within the walls of the penitentiary at Nashville.

Mr. HAMLIN. That has existed for a great many years. The gentleman's party has been in power for 16 years. Why did not it take some action looking to a discontinuance of that infamous system?

Mr. AUSTIN. The responsibility should be shared not only by the Republican Party, but wherever the Democratic Party is in power in a State, like Tennessee or Missouri, or any other Democratic State in the Union. That party must be charged

with full share in not putting a stop to this unfair and infamous system wherever it exists in Democratic States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman is correct about that; but this is national legislation. Why has there not been some step taken to prevent it by national legislation? Why wait until the Democratic party gets into power before this is attempted?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking to excuse or palliate the failure of the gentleman's party or my party, but I am calling to the attention of this House the opportunity now, not for piecemeal or partial legislation on this subject, but for complete and final legislation that will make it impossible for any State in the Union to ship in interstate commerce the product of convict labor in the mine and in the workshop.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Do I understand my friend from Tennessee to say that the Democratic Party is in power in that State?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, the Legislature of Tennessee is Democratic and has been in the control of the Democratic Party for the last 30 or 40 years during the convict-lease system, with the possible exception of four or five years, and the State bought the coal lands and constructed the plant and put convicts in the coal mines when we had a Democratic legislature and a Democratic governor, who signed the bill that made that system a law.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the State is Democratic now?

Mr. AUSTIN. We have a Republican governor, and we are going to reelect him in November notwithstanding the advice and admonition of President Wilson for the Democratic Party to get together and beat him. [Applause on the Republican side.] But, Mr. Chairman, let us put aside political quibbles and be a unit in this House for a proposition that ought to appeal to the fairness and justice of every man in this House who believes in giving an honest deal to the wage earners in every State in this Union.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman's opinion as to what disposition he would make of the criminals convicted in Federal courts. The gentleman has talked about those in State courts. Now, I would like to have the gentleman explain what system he would suggest for handling criminals who are convicted in the Federal courts?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, we had a proposition in this House during the Sixty-second Congress to use Federal convicts in the Leavenworth Penitentiary to construct a public road from the penitentiary to the Army post near that city. There are plenty of ways and methods of utilizing Federal and State convict labor without bringing it in disgraceful competition with the blind, the women, and the children, and the unfortunate laboring men of this land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes, as I would like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The House has fixed the time and it can not be extended. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Maryland control the time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Tennessee a question, if he is willing to answer it, and I will ask it in my own time. My question is this: When you put convicts out on the public highways at work, do you not bring them in competition with American labor?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, there is plenty of work for labor upon the public roads of this country, and we have a field not only for the honest laboring man upon the public roads but a field for the labor of convicts as well, which will come less in competition with the wage earner than anywhere else.

Mr. GORDON. But we are told everybody is out of work——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Nearly everybody.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is an unlimited field for the construction of public roads, not probably in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, but in the rural districts of this country.

Mr. GORDON. But the gentleman is bringing the convicts into competition with the farm laboring men just the same.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. GORDON. Why, according to the statement you people have made on the floor of this House everybody now is out of work. Now, you propose to put the convicts at work on the public highways and bring them in competition with American labor. I say your argument is inconsistent.

Mr. AUSTIN. It may appear so to the gentleman from Ohio, but I am entirely satisfied with it.

Mr. GORDON. All right, sir. [Laughter.] I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say I favor the proposition contained in this bill to prohibit the importation of foreign convict-made goods in anyway that will make effectual such prohibition. While I have taken no stock in opposition or favor of the bill, it seems to me that that part of the bill prohibiting the import of the products of pauper labor and section 9, defining the term "pauper" as one held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at public expense, in whole or in part, brings into our councils a Trojan horse. I think that it is hardly humane when we have in our country an asylum for the blind, for instance, taken care of by the charity of our people—that is, at public expense—an eleemosynary institute whose industry is sought to be utilized by the manufacture of certain products, that any country should say that the goods made by them should be prohibited from being introduced into such country. And yet in this bill we are doing that very thing. We propose to say to the unfortunates, not because you are a criminal but because you are poor, because you are old or blind or halt, and are in part taken care of by your Government, we will restrict the market of the products of the labor of your hands and cut down the price of your industry by such restriction as far as it is within our power. We will not let what you make be imported into our country.

Now, it seems to me that that is bringing in the doctrine of protection, and protection gone to seed, and this is the old cry of protection against the pauper labor of Europe, and it seems to me the question of pauper labor is amply taken care of by our tariff duties, which impose upon the products of Europe a pretty thoroughgoing tariff tax. But to single out the products of the poor and exclude them, is it right? Is it just?

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly; because I am speaking with diffidence, loath to differ with the gentleman or the committee.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman from Texas evidently has not consulted the report made in this case. He has not ascertained the fact that the Treasury Department declares that the prohibition in the present law may apply to goods wholly made by convict labor, but that it does not apply to goods partially made by convicts.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say to the gentleman that I am inclined——

Mr. HENSLEY. And from 1892 down to the present time there has been no seizure of such goods as this bill is intended to apply to, or anything done that would indicate that the present law is effective or can be enforced by the Treasury Department.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is talking on one thing and I am talking on another.

Mr. HENSLEY. There has been nothing done to indicate that the present prohibition has been effective at all. And now, if the gentleman will permit, on the question to which he directs his argument——

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman get me just a little more time?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENSLEY. I desire to say this, that I can not believe that the gentleman from Texas favors the bringing of such goods into competition with the product of the people whom he has described, where they are objects of charity and where they have been treated as objects of charity by the State, and their labor paid for in whole or in part by the State, and where the product when manufactured does not cost anything like the product that has been manufactured by free labor being employed upon it.

You can certainly appreciate what a demoralizing effect it will have upon the commerce of an article of that character. Take shoes and carpets, for instance, manufactured in a prison or in an institution where people are blind or otherwise unfortunate and those products do not cost anything like what they cost when manufactured by free labor. And then these people take that product out and put it into competition with the product of free labor, and it constitutes a disturbing element and produces a very demoralizing effect not only upon the commerce——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] five additional minutes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Now, just one second. You can certainly see the effect of such competition on labor conditions in that vicinity.

Mr. HARDY. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that no one regrets more than I to differ with him or the committee on this question, and I do it with diffidence, and it may be that a fuller understanding of the question will show me light on it. All that the gentleman has said of convict-made goods I agree with. But I want to say this, that if these eleemosynary institutions, supported by the charity or the public taxes of a country, are not allowed to use their industry in the making of products that may be sold in the markets of the world, those institutions must be supported by taxes levied on these very laboring men themselves in whose interest this bill is drawn, as well as on the public at large. Certainly if we exclude the products of the eleemosynary institutions of other countries, we may expect them to do the same by us.

Now, we have very few of these eleemosynary institutions in comparison with the number of people engaged in manufactures. We have a deaf and dumb asylum in Texas, you have one in your State, and they have them all over the country. The inmates of those asylums can do something, and under the humane laws we are beginning to enact now the proceeds of their industry are given back to them to help them to eke out a miserable, sorrowful existence; and now we are asked to say to them by our law, "Subject of charity as you are, we are not going to let your produce enter into competition with the produce of the world. We are going to restrict its market, and thereby reduce its price, and make your miserable earnings smaller still." Is it humane, and is it right?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly. I am seeking light on this subject, because I do not like its aspect.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Of course, the effect of this bill would not be to restrict the home market.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman says it will not restrict the home market; but we restrict the market of other institutions of that kind in other countries, and they will restrict the markets of our institutions of similar kind in our country. So it is a mutual wall that we each build up around ourselves, we for ourselves and they for themselves, the result being we will ostracize and oppress the poor and the helpless, who ought to be the object of humane consideration.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does not your argument carry you to a point where you would favor the convict-made goods entering into competition with free labor?

Mr. HARDY. Now, that is the gentleman's question. I can not give him all my time. I say that I am with you for prohibiting the importation of convict-made goods not only from abroad, but I am willing to prohibit convict-made goods of our own country from entering into competition with the products of free labor.

I would work the convicts on the public roads or on public improvements for the benefit of all. Convicts are not special objects of care and consideration. They are criminals and we are meting out their penalty to them, and we are trying to do that as humanely as possible.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman believe also that a criminal is an object of humane consideration? Is he not mentally defective and subject to the same charity as a blind man?

Mr. HARDY. He is subject to humane treatment, but not to all the humanitarian consideration or that degree of care that the deaf or the dumb or the blind may be. The blind are without faults, so far as we are concerned. We surely pity them. We have not condemned them. Certainly we ought not to put them outside the pale of equal and fair treatment. The criminal has put himself in the category of having wronged humanity, and if we say he is equally subject to humanitarian consideration as the blind or the deaf or the dumb, we deny the rule of justice and should abolish all punishment for crime.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Still, most criminals are defective mentally, and a man who is defective mentally to the extent of being criminal ought to be entitled to consideration as well as is one who is otherwise mentally unfortunate.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will pursue that argument to the ultimate conclusion, he will find himself with those men who favor no punishment at all for crime, but say all crime is the result of conditions. He becomes a fatalist, believing in no merit or demerit, no virtue to be rewarded, no crime to be punished.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Do I understand that by the terms of this bill goods manufactured by eleemosynary institutions, such as industrial schools for wayward boys and the like, are put on the same basis as goods made by convicts?

Mr. HARDY. They are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to add that I did not intend to talk so long.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois use some of his time?

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, this measure is right. The elimination of the products of pauper labor, the products of those who are maintained by charity, from the ordinary channels of commerce is right. We do not want to mix our charity with our business affairs. There is an old saying that charity begins at home, and when we are endeavoring to practice charity we want it understood that we are practicing charity. It is essential, in order that charity may have its proper course and accomplish the things that are to be accomplished through charity, that there be no mixture between business and charity. If we try to make money out of our charity, our charity becomes as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. It ceases to be charity. It becomes commerce. And so, if we establish our eleemosynary institutions and say that the blind shall be taken care of at the expense of the State, and we all pay our taxes and then put those blind and unfortunate people to work and use the products of their labor to compete with one particular class of society, we make that particular class pay twice. We make that class not only suffer the penalty of taxation in connection with the charity, but we also make that class suffer unjust competition against the products of labor of that class. That is unjust, and overturns the whole idea of charity.

If the State of Texas, for instance, has an institution for the blind, that institution ought to be handled by the State of Texas as a home charitable proposition. As I said, there is an old saying that charity begins at home. It is unjust and wrong for the State of Texas, for instance, to establish a great charitable institution and take in the blind and the orphans and the crippled and those who can not compete in the ordinary channels of commerce, and then ship out into other States the product of the toil of those unfortunates and make other States foot a part of their charity bill. It is all right for the States and the inhabitants thereof to compete with each other in the matter of the production of the various articles of commerce, but it is not right for one State to put over on another State its charity-made goods and make that other State pay its charity bill.

And so this measure is right. The truth is, this measure is exactly what ought to be put on our statute books. Nor does it involve the question of protection. That is not the question at all. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], my colleague over there, a while ago reduced that practically to an absurdity. When it was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that we should enact a measure here eliminating all kinds of products that were brought in from places where people worked at those low wages, my colleague suggested the shingle proposition, and at once put the people of British Columbia in the category of pauper labor. Of course that subject is so distantly related that it can not be considered in connection with a thing of this kind.

Charity is charity. There should be no degrees about it. There should be no half charity and half commerce, and when a man or a State or a company of men undertake to do charity they ought to do charity and not attempt to do commerce. Otherwise, as I said at the beginning, you will find one class not only contributing to charity but also being met in competition in the articles they manufacture by the products of those who are the recipients of such charity, and thereby compelled to pay twice to that cause of charity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a forward step in the march of progress which during the last two centuries has led labor steadily onward and upward to the plane of the inde-

pendent employee. The early dawn of civilization found labor on a very low plane. For 5,000 years labor toiled on a level with the beasts of burden, deprived of three of the greatest rights that bless mankind, which are as follows: The right to own property, the right to marry, and the right to worship a God.

That is true. For centuries labor was controlled by imperial forms of government which held it down on a low plane of civilization. But by the organization of labor into unions, by the effort of humanitarian spirits, by the effects of wise legislation initiated by men who had hearts of love and sympathy, labor gradually rose in recognition until to-day I am glad to say that labor stands in the sunlight of advantages and privileges, the same as are accorded to other callings among men.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this bill is a step along the line of the new freedom for labor, and it ought to be enacted into law. The opposition to labor has not been confined to a failure to pass wholesome laws for its benefit, but it has been compelled to compete with the pauper labor of every country in the world. Capital in America finding that it could not control labor as had been done in the past undertook to overcome the influence and power of organized labor by going to other countries and taking up the criminal, cheap, pauper labor and bringing it to America to compete with honest American labor to cut down the wages of American labor. What man will stand for such conduct unholy, unrighteous, intolerable?

This bill is in the direction, not of preventing the labor itself from being imported but it goes a step beyond that and prevents the importation of the products of labor made in other countries by criminals, convicts, and paupers of such countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Six minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting question, but I do not think we have got to the end of it here to-day. It is a question we have had in our State for a good many years. At one time we had the old system of contracts, whereby men were let out at so much a day to work inside a prison at their trades. We had that system for a good many years, and finally it graduated into a system whereby contractors paid a stipend to the convicts for their labor on a sort of piece-price plan. Some of the convicts would accumulate money, so that when they got out of prison they would have an accumulation with which to start again in the world. Then the penologists decided that that system was vicious, and laws were passed prohibiting the payment of any money direct to the convict by the contractor. But that law was honored a good deal in the breach, perhaps more than in the observance, and some of the contractors got around it by crediting the convict every week or every month with the value of his services as they had before rated that value, and placing that as a credit on the book which they kept for that purpose; and when the convict went out he received a check from the contractor for the total of his earnings while he was in prison. Afterwards honest laborers, as we say, people who had not been convicted of crime, began to complain of the competition because of these contracts and the low wage that was paid to the State, and various schemes were put forward to solve the proposition, finally resulting in work on State account, the State going into the manufacture of furniture and other things, and the law providing that the convict-made goods should be sold to no one except for use by the State or the municipalities within the State. So that none of our prison-made goods go outside of the State. The uniforms for the National Guard are made in the State prisons. The clothing used by the prisoners, and used in the asylums and eleemosynary institutions, is largely made by the prisoners in the State prisons.

That method seemed to work to the universal satisfaction of all. The labor people were satisfied, and there has not been much complaint that has come to my ears, though I have sometimes wondered why not. Of course it is a species of competition, because outside labor would make all these goods for the municipality if they were not made within a State prison. Years ago we tried road making with some of the convicts. That was not a success. That was 20 or more years ago and we had not got into the way of building roads.

Within the past year or two the convicts have made some roads in the vicinity of the State prisons. There being a State prison at my home town, I have had more or less personal observation of the success of that plan. The convicts went out to make country roads, working with the machinery owned by the towns, the money being raised by the towns or by the counties, or both, and the convicts made turnpike roads and macadam roads, and that has been reported as being something of a success. There was no trouble from convicts escaping. I believe one did escape, but the man's fellow convicts made up a purse for a reward to get him back. They wanted to stay outdoors. They did not want to have any of their number misbehave while they were out for fear this work would be stopped. Still, as has been said, that is more or less of a competition.

Mr. CANTOR. May I say to the gentleman from New York that the reason no complaints have been made by outside labor is that the act was drawn with the cooperation of the labor unions of the State, and no complaint ever reached me during my day up there nor since. The labor unions seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the fact that this employment was confined to the manufacture of goods used by the State and by the municipalities.

Mr. PAYNE. By the State itself and its institutions.

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not heard any complaints. I know that the labor unions joined in with the rest of the State for the enactment of this law.

Mr. CANTOR. Other than that they were employed——

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want to give the gentleman any more of my time. Further than that, I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, I have sometimes thought the solution of this whole question would be that the State would finally pay the convicts for their work, running it on State account and paying the convicts a decent wage, so that there will not be unfair competition with outside labor.

It is perfectly horrible to contemplate prisoners locked up day after day without any work, as they were in our State during the transition from contract labor to this State system. It is horrible to think of the blind or the poor who must be supported in State institutions idling away their time day after day, with nothing to think about or to do except to bewail their sad condition, in an eleemosynary institution. They want work, and ought to get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like about three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I have given the gentleman all of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I give the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. If this system should be put in practice, it would take away undue competition with outside labor in the first place, because the men would be paid. You might make an allowance for their board while they were in prison and charge that to them, and credit up the balance to the convict unless he had a family. If he has a family, then give it to the family for their support. Sometimes it is a hardship in the enforcement of the criminal law, to feel that when you shut a man up his family are not only suffering in their feelings but suffering for the lack of daily food and proper shelter, while the man who ought to support them is shut up in prison. Let the money that he earns go as far as it will toward their support; or, if he has no family, there will be a fund for him that he can look forward to at the end of his term; and if there is a germ of manhood left in him, if there is a germ of honesty left in him, if there is any ambition left to make something of himself in life, he has something to look forward to that will help him out. I know of many cases under the old system where the contractor accumulated this fund for the convict, where the convict himself went out into the world, after his term expired, and with his ambition kindled because he had had a chance to do something for himself by honest labor, he went to work and made a good citizen of himself.

Some of these men discharged from prisons have remained in my own city and been employed in shops where they need skilled mechanics and have earned a good wage. Some of them, I know, have married and raised families and become good citizens. I do not know but that there is that reform now, but I have not seen much of it when there is no ambition for a convict to earn something while in prison. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ].

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman, there is no question as to the purpose of this bill. It seeks to remedy a situation which should never have existed; and if it becomes law, will, in my opinion, result beneficially in many respects. Not only does it plainly and unequivocally prevent the importation of articles made abroad by convict labor or articles into which convict labor has entered, but it also prevents the importation of any material convict made which may be used to form a part or portion of any article manufactured or completed in this country.

In other words, if Congress enacts this bill and it is written into our statutes, our workmen and our manufacturers will not be compelled to enter into competition with the labor of foreign convicts; neither will there be danger from that source of contamination by disease from prisons, many of which are not institutions which, to say the least, are sanitariums as to health or spotless as to cleanliness.

We of this House have just indorsed legislation forbidding interstate transportation of convict-made merchandise. This action was taken in response to protests from legitimate producers, whose interests were being injured by the products of the prisons, where at least 150,000 men and women labor without compensation, with thousands of short-term prisoners adding their assistance for a greater or lesser length of time.

We did not give heed to the argument of the philanthropist or the reformer that by doing this we might add to the misery and already unsatisfactory conditions surrounding the inmates of our penal institutions; that we would thus endanger their moral, physical, and mental states by reducing their hours of labor to almost nothing, and thus increasing the hours of their confinement in small and insanitary cells. Perhaps all this is true; and the argument may apply until each Commonwealth abandons its idea of making its penal institutions self-supporting and provides some equally as healthy or better method of exercise for the inmates. This may, I believe, be done in various ways without infringing on the welfare of the laborer or the manufacturer who has not infracted a statute or in any way menaced society. I am a believer in proper methods of punishment for those whom the law says deserve it. I believe the question is one of the most vital in importance, including not only the method of restraint but the proper consideration of the care and encouragement of the punished and the career thereafter opening to him.

But our recent action in the matter of our home situation in this regard should prove to foreign nations that we intend to be consistent—aye, even more than consistent—so far as their prison product is concerned. Europe, I am told, has at least 2,000,000 convicts who are busily engaged earning their enforced bread and butter in penal institutions, where articles for home and foreign consumption are made. It is not just or fair that our gates should be open to the competition of a vast army of that character. If we recognize, as we have, the unfairness and injustice of the smaller competition of our own home institutions, we certainly can not close our eyes to the objects of this legislation. Under these circumstances I am one who believes this measure should be here indorsed without a dissenting voice.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has nine minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], which, I confess, does credit to his moral and sympathetic nature, I think it ought to be pointed out that the principle governing this subject is that competition should determine who should have the privilege of making and selling the goods, keeping in mind, of course, that natural and normal competition which results from action of the free forces of society. In an economic sense there is no difference whatever between the character of the product of the pauper detained or supported at the public expense and of a criminal detained and supported in the same way, however great and fundamentally important the ethical difference of the persons involved. The practical effect, therefore, of saying that pauper labor sustained at public expense might have a right to import its products would be to say that the State itself might enter into competition with the individual, when the right of free import of its goods would merely amount to a subsidy, paid at the cost of our own welfare, for such foreign States as maintain such pauper manufacturing institutions and succeeded in selling their wares in this country. I believe that is all I have to say with reference to this subject.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The committee has not offered any amendment in which they propose to define the words "pauper labor."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. There is a definition in the bill proposed, and the committee thought that adequate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have been looking for it.

Mr. BRYAN. It is on page 6, line 3.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It reads:

SEC. 9. That the term "pauper" as used in this act shall be limited to those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at the public expense in whole or in part.

Mr. BARTLETT. We frequently hear the term applied in a different way to some other subjects under discussion.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. And in a way that would involve all labor in any other country. Of course the act does not mean to apply the term in any such way. Now, Mr. Chairman, all time having been exhausted, I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all goods, wares, and merchandise produced in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or prison labor, or in the production of which foreign convict, pauper, or prison labor has been employed, either directly or indirectly, in any manner and for any purpose, or in the production or manufacture of which has been used any material prepared, manipulated, or assembled by convict, pauper, or prison labor, and all materials, wholly or partly finished articles, goods, wares, or merchandise, or wrappers, or containers, or attachments of merchandise, separately, or a part of any goods, wares, and merchandise, all the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of foreign convicts, or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country, and whether the same be the product of the field, the quarry, or manufacturing establishment, any part of which, or the materials entering which, have been produced, treated, manipulated, or manufactured at any State, in whole or in part, by convict, pauper, or prison labor, or by detained persons in a foreign country, shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited; and all such materials, goods, wares, and merchandise in any manner the product, in whole or in part, of convict, pauper, or prison labor, or of persons under restraint, whose service is hired, leased, contracted for, or given with or without compensation and utilized outside of prisons, or in places of restraint or employment, whether in the field, quarry, the forest, factory, yard, or inclosure wherein such prison labor and free labor are utilized, such products, including all the products hereinbefore described, shall be deemed and held to be convict or prison produced materials and goods, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "which," strike out the word "foreign."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "foreign."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "prohibited," strike out the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Maryland what is the object of striking out the latter part of this section?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The committee on consideration felt that the matter stricken out added nothing to the prohibitory efficacy of the preceding part of the section, and might confuse the clarity of the proposition as a whole.

Mr. MANN. Is not there a distinction between that part of the section and the preceding part of the section?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. We did not find that there was a distinction of such value that the committee thought it should be retained. The committee was unanimous in rejecting that portion of the section.

Mr. MANN. Does the first part of the section which remains in cover prison labor which is utilized outside of the place of confinement?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. Where?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Take lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 2, which read:

Or a part of any goods, wares, and merchandise, all the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of convicts, or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country, etc.

Mr. MANN. I notice it provides:

Prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country, etc.

While the part stricken out provides:

Whose service is hired, leased, contracted for, or given with or without compensation and utilized outside of prisons.

I do not find that the latter part is covered by the first part.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If the gentleman will look at the first lines of the section, which read:

That all goods, wares, and merchandise produced in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or prison labor.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; that is descriptive of a certain class. Then follows the limitation that—

all the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of convicts, or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country.

If there is any question about it—and it seems to me there is, and the author of the bill evidently thought there was—I think it should be left in. The author of the bill endeavored to cover that and the committee endeavors to strike it out.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no doubt that the bill as reported amply covers all products of convict labor. With reference to the place of detention, of course the convict is always under detention; but the act describes his product independent of the question of his domicile, and the portion stricken out we thought was a mere repetition that would confuse the clearness of the proposition rather than help it, and might be used to delimit the totality of the proposition rather than to increase it.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. It seems to me that very question is in debate here. If the bill should pass with this amendment, that might be debated in the court. What, then, would be the objection to eliminating all questions of that sort, to make it certain and sure?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think the retention of the rejected clause would tend to produce uncertainty rather than reduce it.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the part stricken out the definition is given of convict-made goods. No such definition is given in the part that remains, and I suggest to the gentleman that it might very seriously weaken the effect of this very meritorious measure if the committee strikes that out. It seems to me safer to leave that language in.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think it is not customary to include attempts at definition of convict-made goods in such bills. At least, if such attempts have been made, I am not familiar with them. I believe it better to leave that to the future and to judicial interpretation than to attempt a definition here which necessarily would be exclusive, and therefore might except from operation important particulars.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the committee, and I hope of the country, to the fact that the principle suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] of employing convicts at a living wage and paying that compensation to the wife or dependent relative, has found expression in concrete legislation in the State of Wisconsin. Only last year our State legislature authorized the State board of control to pay to those confined in our reformatories and prisons a wage for the benefit of the prisoner or his wife or dependent relative. That recognizes the advanced idea that the products of the prisoner while confined should be utilized for his benefit or the benefit of his family. The old idea that he should be punished by incarceration without work and later on with work for the benefit of the State that imprisoned him is fast disappearing from the public mind, and this newer idea that if a person is so unfortunate as to commit a crime, punishment should not be meted out upon his family or dependent relatives is coming into vogue. The family must necessarily be supported by the State or the municipality; and if such is the fact, where can there be any objection to allowing the fruits of the labor of the unfortunate who is confined in prison to be doled out to the more unfortunate who remain at home and who are naturally dependent on him? I hope this newer idea which has so recently found expression on the statute books of my State will spread, and as we are considering this general subject at the present time, it is my expectant wish and hope that legislators in other States may take this idea to themselves and adopt the Wisconsin idea, so far as this remedial legislation is concerned.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard briefly on this proposed committee amendment. I am in entire sympathy with this bill. I think the importation of convict-made and prison-made goods should be prohibited, and it seems to me that as the bill is drawn it accomplishes that purpose, but I doubt very much whether it will accomplish that purpose if we adopt this committee amendment. The committtee amendment to which I am opposed proposes to strike out the following important language:

And all such materials, goods, wares, and merchandise in any manner the product, in whole or in part, of convict, pauper, or prison labor, or of persons under restraint, whose service is hired, leased, contracted for, or given with or without compensation and utilized outside of prisons, or in places of restraint or employment, whether in the field, quarry, the forest, factory, yard, or inclosure wherein such prison labor and free labor are utilized, such products, including all the products hereinbefore described, shall be deemed and held to be convict or prison produced materials and goods, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

I think the committee was certainly sincere in its action in recommending the adoption of the amendment, but it seems to me on further consideration it must admit it would be unsafe to adopt it, because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has pointed out, the language proposed to be stricken out in the committee amendment refers to the production of convict-made goods not only in prisons, but outside of prisons. As I read the language which is left if this amendment should be adopted, there is nothing that completely covers that case.

Furthermore, as I suggested to the chairman of the committee a few moments ago, the language which is proposed to be stricken out by this amendment defines convict-made goods. If you adopt the committee amendment, then you have left in the bill no definition of convict-made goods. I think there ought to be in the bill such a definition. Therefore, it seems to me, in view of those two considerations, first, that if you adopt the amendment proposed by the committee there is nothing which provides any definite language for goods which shall be made by convict labor outside of penal and reformatory institutions; and, second, because if you adopt the committee amendment you have stricken from the bill the very language and the only language which undertakes to define convict-made goods—it seems to me for these two reasons that the amendment should be rejected. It seems to me it is very much safer to leave the bill in the form in which it was introduced. I hope this committee amendment will be voted down. I am strongly in favor of the bill, and that is why I want the amendment voted down, because it will preserve, in my judgment, the clearness and the strength of the measure.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, of course, the sincerity of gentlemen who differ with the committee upon this matter, but I can not appreciate the force or logic of their objection in view of the portion of the section that is retained, namely:

That all goods, wares, and merchandise produced in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or prison labor, or in the production of which convict, pauper, or prison labor has been employed, either directly or indirectly, in any manner and for any purpose——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption in that particular?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Though the gentleman has read the general language, which I agree with him would exclude all articles which were manufactured in any way, directly or indirectly, by convict, pauper, or prison labor, nevertheless he fails to appreciate the fact, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], that the clause following, which begins in line 4, page 2, is a restrictive clause, and is as follows:

all the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of convicts, or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted—

That is a restrictive clause that limits the effect of the general phraseology in the first part. The gentleman's whole bill will only be applicable to the persons who are found within the restrictive phrase of the section here which I have just pointed out.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I think the gentleman is clearly in error in his interpretation of the sentence from which he has read. It says:

All the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of convicts.

And then comes a comma. There we have a completed thought. The bill could stop there, or it might go on——

Mr. STAFFORD. But it does not stop.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I understand, but let me say to the gentleman it is evident that the lawyer's hand has been at work in the preparation of this bill. You have the prohibition stated not once but you have it stated seven or eight times in the section as it now stands. Lawyers take the precaution in filing their declarations to state the proposition in a variety of ways in order to insure the total meaning. That is done here ad nauseam, and I call the gentleman's attention to the expression here.

Or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint.

If they were working in a mine that would be a place of restraint temporarily.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are trying to reach those cases where convict labor is farmed out.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It goes on further to say:

Or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country.

Now, it is not a matter of great moment, I confess, as to whether the balance of this matter is treated as it was treated by the committee or not, and I make no urgent plea to the House in reference to the action of the committee, but it seems to me experience shows that when you have said enough in a statute it is wise to say no more, and having made that suggestion I close the discussion so far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "part," insert the words "by children under the age of 14 years or."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment which I have offered is adopted, the section will read——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon that amendment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Illinois does not decide that; that is for the Chair to determine. I am making the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. And I make the point of order it is too late.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have the right to make my point of order without objection, and I ask the Chair that I may be permitted to make it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I had started an explanation of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was discussing the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. But I was trying to see what the amendment was, Mr. Chairman, and it is not germane to this bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman insist on his point of order against a matter cutting out child labor?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I might be pardoned, if I may be permitted to say so, if I do not reply to any such demagogic question. Mr. Chairman, I attempted to get upon my feet as soon as I realized the effect of the amendment. I was listening to the amendment, and immediately the amendment was read I attempted to rise to make the point of order that the gentleman's amendment was not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman ought to have the right to make the point of order if he rose in time.

Mr. MADDEN. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Georgia, that he was trying to get on his feet and was a little slow in doing so, that under those circumstances the Chair would hold that the gentleman has the right to offer the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. It is the uniform practice of the House, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The gentleman from Illinois is right.

Mr. MADDEN. When the discussion of a subject begins the point of order is not allowed to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] states that he was endeavoring to get on his feet to obtain recognition.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am subject to all the rules of the House, of course. I realize that. I heard the amendment, but I could not realize what it was until the Clerk had read it, and the gentleman from Michigan proceeded immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair defer to me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the Chair will indulge me.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask for the production of the Reporter's notes, in order to see whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] had begun to discuss the matter or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair decided that the gentleman from Michigan had.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will be permitted to have proof of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state this: That the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] made his point of order after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] had said two or three words.

Mr. BARTLETT. Two or three words; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia then stated that he was trying to get on his feet, and did so, to make the point of order, and made it just as soon as he possibly could.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just as soon as I understood what the amendment was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to say that he would hold that the gentleman from Georgia was in his rights in making the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course there is no doubt whatever that the gentleman from Georgia was endeavoring to make his point of order. Nobody denies that.

The CHAIRMAN. And then the gentleman from Illinois and somebody else followed too late.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing the Chair should rule. I did try to make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will discuss the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is a bill to prevent the importation and entry of goods, wares, merchandise, and so forth, made by convict labor or prison labor, and that the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan is to amend it by including, as I gather it—of course I can not repeat the amendment from memory, and I would ask that the Chair have the amendment read again——

Mr. STAFFORD. "Children under 14 years of age," following the word "part," in line 4.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I say that is not germane to this bill. I have not the rules before me, nor the authorities, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that with a proposition to prohibit altogether convict or pauper made goods, or goods made in whole or in part by convicts, the people in the workhouses, or who come under the definition of paupers, as provided by this bill, in section 9, a proposition to go further and make the terms of the bill apply to goods made in whole or in part by children under 14 years of age, or any age, is not germane. That sort of legislation upon this kind of a bill is not germane to it. That is the point of order I make.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of this bil undoubtedly is to prevent the importation of goods into this country which are made by cheap labor. That is the only excuse of which I know for the passage of the bill at all. It is aimed at the products of cheap labor, which should not come into competition with the labor of the United States. Therefore any proposition which has the same purpose in view, namely, the prevention of the importation into this country of goods made by cheap labor, even cheaper than convict labor, is in general covered by the purposes of this bill.

Now, it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the cheapest labor in the world is labor performed by children under 14 years of age in foreign countries. I want to call the attention of the Chair in support of this proposition to the fact that in Japan there are 61,000 children employed in factories who are under 14 years of age, and the wages that those children are receiving will average only 7 cents a day. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a cheaper labor than any convict labor in the world, and if the purpose of the bill and of the gentleman who introduced it is to restrict the importation of goods made by cheap labor, then the amendment which I offer comes fully within the scope and is in perfect harmony with the purpose of the bill.

And the same thing is true of India. There are 50,000 children in the factories of India, and they are working there at 5 cents a day, which is cheaper labor than any convict labor on earth. This being the case, why can not we amend this bill in such a way as will exclude the products of the cheap labor of the earth of all lines in the interest of the American workingmen?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is germane, and that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I refer to Rule XVI, paragraph 7, of the House Manual and Digest, which says:

* * * and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

This rule was not one of general parliamentary law, but was adopted in 1789 and amended in 1822 by the Congress.

Now, there are quite a number of authorities on that subject. I refer to one on the bottom of the page, which says:

One individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition, even though the two belong to the same class. Thus the following are not germane: To a bill proposing the admission of one Territory into the Union, an amendment for admission of another Territory; to a bill for the relief of one individual, an amendment proposing similar relief for another.

This rule of germaneness is not one of general parliamentary law. It is one that has been adopted by Congress since the time to which I have called attention.

Now, just one word, Mr. Chairman. As long as my friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] has digressed, I hope I will be pardoned for not further arguing the point of order, by saying this: That no one, Mr. Chairman, is more in favor of proper regulation by law of child labor than myself. Under the guidance of the Democratic Party and the head of the Democratic Party in my State, to which particular faction of the party I belong, we have passed laws along that line, both proper and humane, in accordance with the spirit of the age.

But this bill, Mr. Chairman, proposes to exclude goods made by convict labor and prevent the importation of goods made by those who are held in custody by their government, who are compelled to work to produce goods or wares or merchandise while they are under restraint for crime or because they are in the workhouse by reason of poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia understand that by this bill there is a prohibition of the importation of the products of but one class of labor?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is all in one class, but of different species.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It is publicly sustained labor, in whole or in part.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I understand. While there may be different varieties of labor, it is of the same class.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Georgia say about this language?—

That all goods, wares, and merchandise produced in whole or in part by convict labor or prison labor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, that means the same class, Mr. Chairman, according to my construction of it.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If I may interrupt——

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Both are publicly sustained. The pauper in an eleemosynary institution is sustained in whole or in part by public money.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim that convict labor and pauper labor are not two different classes?

Mr. BARTLETT. They are different species of the same class as defined by this bill. They are both labor held in restraint by the Government, one for crime and the other in the workhouse. While it is not a crime to be poor, yet the poor are put in there by law. And section 9 of this bill defines what is meant by "pauper labor."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman from Georgia consider a person living on 7 cents a day not a pauper?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; if they are not publicly sustained, if they are working for themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what the gentleman calls the pauper labor of India and Japan when he is speaking on the tariff. But those people live upon that wage. In some portions of Japan they now have a famine and they are not able to get even 7 cents a day.

Mr. MADDEN. Would not the competition be quite as severe with so-called free labor at 7 cents a day as it would be with the so-called pauper labor that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BARTLETT. A laborer who receives a pauper's wages from an employer is not in the same class as the laborer who receives no wages at all and whose actions are restrained by law and who works not for himself, but for the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Might we not write a new definition of what "pauper labor" means?

Mr. BARTLETT. You gentlemen have a definition over there that has been repeated for the last 50 years when the tariff bill has been up.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If my friend will permit, is not the true definition of convicts and paupers those who labor under duress? Those who work voluntarily, no matter at what low wage, are not in the same class, because they are not under duress and are working voluntarily. Are not the two classes clearly differentiated in that way?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. I said, Mr. Chairman, that the bill itself defined what pauper labor is. I called attention to it, to section 9 of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. That is where I wanted to speak.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], before the reading of the bill began, in answer to my inquiry of him, called my attention to the fact that section 9 defined what the words "pauper labor" meant in the bill. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. It was right there that I wished to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. Now, since the bill has defined what pauper labor is, is it not competent for the House to broaden the definition given by the committee?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I do not think it is. Are you willing to declare that children who are under 14 years of age fall under the category of pauper labor? I am not willing to go on record as contending that children in any European country under 14 years old, who may get as much wages as anybody not pauper laborers, shall be put in the same class as paupers. The gentleman does not want that to go out, I apprehend.

Mr. MADDEN. If we assume the right to define what a pauper is, we ought to have the right to broaden the distinction as far as we choose.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was in a foreign country myself some time ago and some laborers—the girls, probably, under 14 years of age—were receiving very handsome wages and could in no sense be called paupers. But the pauper under this bill, Mr. Chairman, a pauper laborer, is one who is confined or held in some public institution, one who works not for a wage, however great or small, but for no wage at all; whose labor, whose work, is for the public.

That is all I desire to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the rule, as the Chair is well aware, is well settled. Where a bill relates to one particular thing you can not amend it by adding another particular thing, or you can not amend it by adding a general class.

The gentleman from Georgia, I think, cited a case of that sort, where a bill related to the admission of one Territory and an amendment was offered to add another Territory. But the gentleman did not refer to the fact that where a bill proposes to admit two Territories you could add a third. The rule is just as well settled one way as the other.

Now here is a bill that is not confined to one class but to several classes, and there is a good deal closer connection between pauper labor and child labor than there is between prison labor and pauper labor.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I call the Chair's attention, in the gentleman's time, to a reference which I omitted to read?

Mr. MANN. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I read:

Thus, the following are not germane:
"* * * to a provision for extermination of the cotton-boll weevil, an amendment including the gypsy moth; to a provision for a clerk for one committee, an amendment for a clerk to another committee; to a bill prohibiting transportation of messages relative to dealing in cotton futures, an amendment adding wheat, corn"—

And so forth.

Lastly I refer to the ruling two years ago of Speaker CLARK wherein he held that to a prohibition against dealing in cotton futures an amendment prohibiting the dealing in futures in grain was not in order. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MANN. That is right. I remember the decision of Speaker CLARK on that subject very well, and he said if the bill had covered two items you could add something more if you wanted to; and Speaker CLARK, in making the ruling that you could not add grain to a bill relating to cotton futures said that to a bill relating to wheat and corn you could add other articles specifically.

That is the case here. This bill does not relate to one class. It relates to several classes, and under the rule it is always construed that where you have a bill relating to several classes you can add an additional class. If this bill were confined solely to convict-made goods, the amendment would not be in order to add pauper-made goods.

But the bill itself, covering both convict-made goods and pauper-made goods, is open to the addition of another class. There is no great distinction between the class that is sought to be added and one of the classes that is in this bill. If the Chair holds that pauper-made goods are entirely distinct and separate from child-labor goods made by children under 14 years of age, the Chair will make a very strained construction of the facts, in my opinion.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this amendment is clearly not germane to the substance and logic of the subject with which we are dealing. As suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] a few moments ago, that subject is a person under duress, a person in a state of detention, a person who does not make his own labor contracts or have a voice in determining the wage he shall receive, but a prisoner in a penitentiary or a pauper in an eleemosynary, publicly sustained institution, who has his wages determined for him, and who must accept and who must work. You have, therefore, a person under duress. Now, the products of such persons is likely to disturb and thwart the fair operation of the laws of competition. It was not the policy of the Underwood law, a section of which is being amended by the proposed bill, to stop all competition, but it was its intention to promote competition. It picked out this one species of subjects and brought upon it an absolute prohibition, because this particular subject, namely, the slave of the law, who could not make his own contract and whose wages therefore do not represent a normal cost element in manufacture, is picked out and put under the ban of prohibition.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason that goes to the merits and the good sense of this rule as to germaneness. The Committee on Labor is now considering bills on the subject of child labor and of child labor under 14 years of age. It is a very complex subject, and it will require the best thought of the best men in this country to secure proper treatment and solution.

Mr. MADDEN. Are not those men here?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. They are here, but they are not adequate to treat that situation to-day unless they feel very differently about it than I do, and it has received a good deal of my thought and my very deepest interest.

Now, sirs, what would be the effect of a prohibition like this upon the commerce of this country? I am speaking on the question of its germaneness now. The proponents of this proposition must accept one or the other horn of the dilemma. They must state that foreign-made goods are to a degree made by children under 14 years of age, or they must say that they are not. If they are not made in part or in whole by children under 14 years of age, then this amendment would be utterly nugatory and without effect, because there would be nothing for it to act upon. On the other hand, if, as I suspect may be true, the manufactured goods imported into this country, the commerce of other countries with our own, are partly or in whole made by the labor of children under 14 years of age, the enactment of this amendment would culminate in a complete prohibition of such foreign trade. Now, I want to ask the members of this committee if they are seriously ready this afternoon, on so small preparation, to ask that this Congress pass an enactment which will completely prohibit the importation of foreign goods? The subject of child labor is wholly distinct from the kind we are dealing with here, because, either in contemplation of law or as a matter of fact, child labor is free labor, and the price paid for it is made according to the elements and the laws of competition which obtain.

Mr. BRYAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair has his mind made up I doubt if I could alter his determination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me very clear that the line of demarcation between the two thoughts is wide and deep; that child labor under 14, if it be detained, is included in the bill; that if it is not detained labor, it should not be included in the bill; that the line of cleavage is whether the labor is voluntary or involuntary. If it is the labor of anyone who is confined by virtue of the judgment of a court, or by any proceeding of that sort, so that he has not the right to go about freely or to contract for himself, his labor is included in this measure; but if other labor than that is sought to be included, then a new departure is taken that to my mind is clearly not germane to the thought in this bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. In just a moment, after I have completed the thought in my mind. Then I will yield. It is said that the labor of children in India or in China and some other countries is cheap labor. I deny that proposition. That would raise an entirely different question for discussion here. A very great industrial lord in America, Mr. Carnegie, has told us, and I think with much truth, that the highest paid labor is the cheapest labor; but my friends across the aisle confuse a low day wage with cheap labor. It is not. The dearest labor is the labor that gets the low daily wage. Those two ideas can not be confounded in this or any other measure or in the discussion of it. Now I will yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand the gentleman's argument to be that this bill applies only to that labor which is under duress.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not under duress, but under legal duress.

Mr. WILLIS. Then I invite his attention to the provisions relative to pauper labor. Does that come under the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. So far as my knowledge goes the pauper is never confined to a public institution without some sort of proceeding, and if he leaves that place those who have control of it or who have the custody of him have the right to follow him and retake him.

Mr. MANN. It does not take a legal proceeding for a man to get into a poorhouse.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It is not necessarily a judicial proceeding in a courthouse, but it is a legal proceeding of some sort. I know of no way by which one could be sent to a poorhouse in our State without some sort of a proceeding under the law.

Mr. MANN. There are ways by which a man can get in by going and asking to get in.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Oh, yes; a man could break in like a burglar.

Mr. MANN. No; go there and be admitted.

Mr. BRYAN. Section 9 of this bill defines "pauper." It says:

SEC. 9. That the term "pauper," as used in this act, shall be limited to those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at the public expense in whole or in part.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, some of the very best citizens of this country are old soldiers, and we all respect and admire them. But is not a soldiers' home an eleemosynary institution, and are not the soldiers who go into those homes kept there in part at public expense, and would the gentleman say that this term would not include the output of a soldiers' home in a foreign country, if there were such a thing?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman himself classify the soldiers' home with the poorhouse—the home of paupers?

Mr. BRYAN. Most emphatically I do not classify them with the poorhouse, but I do say that they are eleemosynary institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Under this definition?

Mr. BRYAN. I say that they are eleemosynary institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is the gentleman at all afraid that goods will be manufactured in these soldiers' homes which will in any way interfere with goods made in this country?

Mr. BRYAN. I am not afraid of that happening in this country. It might happen in a foreign country, and this only refers to foreign countries.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman know that there are eleemosynary institutions in other countries such as he refers to?

Mr. BRYAN. There are soldiers' homes in all countries.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman speak with knowledge? I am not inclined to agree with him.

Mr. BRYAN. I have no doubt about there being soldiers' homes in all the lands of the earth.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. BRYAN. There are plenty in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I did not know they had soldiers' homes in Canada.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman has not answered my question as to its including soldiers' homes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If any foreign countries have soldiers' homes which are eleemosynary institutions and manufacture goods, why not exclude them? They would be excluded under the terms of the bill, and I see nothing wrong in that. Does the gentleman say that he would have them brought in?

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman will admit that the bill does not include only those who are under restraint or under arrest or in prison, but may include those who are in eleemosynary institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If there are eleemosynary institutions where they are compelled to remain under legal duress, I would exclude them.

Mr. BRYAN. Well, let us take the blind, not under restraint, but they are there as the wards of the State, where the State would be very glad to release them at any time. That would be including the blind, and the cripple, and the lame, and the halt, and all.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman is taking up too much of my time. If they are detained by virtue of any law, why not exclude products of all labor of that kind? I see nothing wrong in it.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of orderly parliamentary procedure, I would like to make an observation or two. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall not vote for this amendment on account of the difficulty of dealing intelligently with so grave a question in this manner, as has been so clearly stated by the chairman of the Committee on Labor. But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is germane, and my authority for so stating to the Chair is this—it seems to me that it would be a parallel case to the one that I will state to the Chair:

To a resolution embodying two distinct phases of international relationship an amendment embodying a third is germane.

They are seeking by this bill, as I understand it—and that is why I am going to vote for it—to restrain certain classes of labor from importing goods in competition with our goods manufactured by free labor. One class are those legally restrained by the State, and the other are restrained by eleemosynary institutions, and the third one the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] wants restrained are under the restraint of their parents. So all three classes are under restraint and all three classes are producers of cheap labor, and his amendment seeks to keep out the class of child labor which manufacture goods by children under 14 years of age, this being in conformity with the real intent of the law as to the other classes mentioned in the original bill. Therefore I think it is perfectly germane, and I think the point of order should not be sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me one minute. The title to this bill, though not an absolute basis for the construction as to its purpose, states there are three classes of goods to be prohibited—convict, pauper, and detained. If we take the first section of the bill, we find there also three classes to which the bill refers—convict, pauper, and prison-made goods. Now, if this bill relates in its general provisions, as embodied in section 1 and as confirmed by the title to the subjects stated there, why naturally the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is germane and in order. There is no restriction in the bill limiting the character of pauper-made goods; that is for the bill to determine, and section 7 in nowise restricts the scope of the bill, but adds to it.

Clearly on the face of the bill in section 1 this refers to three classes—convict, pauper, and prison labor—without any idea of whether it is detained or not. It must follow that goods produced by children under 14 years of age is an absolutely germane amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that in this bill the committee enumerated the class of persons whose labor was to be restricted from entry into the United States, and under the rule which has been cited we have in this bill already convict and pauper labor, making two classes, and the Chair thinks it is germane to add another, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment I desire to call attention further to the fact that there are employed in Great Britain in the textile industry alone 37,000 children under the age of 14 years; that there are about an equal number in France; that there are in the neighborhood of 50,000 in Germany——

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman know how many children in this country are engaged in raising cotton and corn and other agricultural products which we sometimes export?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that out of the 48 States in the Union, 40 do not permit the employment of children under 14 years of age in factory, mill, or mine.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman is aware that if we exclude the manufactured products of our country in this manner, they might exclude our farm products from their country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The chairman of the committee already says that he has a bill under consideration to take care of domestic child labor, and we can very well wait to take up that question when that bill comes before the House.

Mr. HARDY. But if foreign countries were to adopt retaliatory tactics, it would stop all commerce, for they could keep out our cotton and grain.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think if the foreign nations could afford to adopt that program, we could very well stand it also.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman would not like to have it imposed on this country, would he?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am in favor of shutting out the products of all labor of the children of foreign countries, when that product is produced by children under 14 years of age.

Mr. HARDY. But your manufacturers of cotton in the East and in the South——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to yield any further time to the gentleman, because I have only five minutes, and I want to finish my statement. The gentleman can oppose this amendment in his own time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. May I call the gentleman's attention——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I can not yield just now, but if I have time I will do so later on.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I just want to suggest a subject that he may discuss.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will not do so now. I will not yield for the present.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How will we ascertain——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in Italy there are 60,000 children under 14 years of age who are employed in factories, and the minimum age limit in that country is 12 years. The average wage of those children is 10 cents per day. In Belgium there are 21,000 children under the age of 14 years employed in factories. The cotton spinners of Ghent at the age of 13 receive an average of 79 cents a week; at the age of 14 they receive an average of 98 cents a week. The flax spinners of Ghent at the age of 12 receive an average of 45 cents per week; at the age of 13, 89 cents per week; and at the age of 14, $1.17 per week. Further, there are hundreds of thousands of children in southern Europe, in Asia, and in other countries employed in textile and other industries who do not receive to exceed 10 cents per day. And it does seem to me that the Congress of the United States, out of consideration for the laboring people of this country, should shut out of the customhouses of the United States the commodities made by that cheap labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, there has been agitation in this country going on for some time to restrict child labor, and one of the most serious obstacles standing in the way of this reform has been the fact that the product of the cheap labor of all the world, the product of the cheapest child labor in the universe, comes into the United States. Let us stop this, and the first step will be taken toward the certain elimination of child labor in the United States, it seems to me. In addition to that, we ought to prohibit the importation of goods made by these children in behalf of the workingmen generally of the United States, outside and independent of the great moral and social questions involved in the employment of young children. Of course, with all of our genius, we can compete with the countries of the world if we are willing to slide down to their scale of civilization; but, Mr. Chairman, we have boasted here that this country offers a little better chance for the man who toils; that in this country he can have a better home; that he can send his children to school; that under our flag the opportunities are better for him than anywhere else; and we have been unwilling to slide down to the basis of Japan, China, and India. It is time—and this is a splendid time—for the Congress of the United States to adopt this amendment and emphasize the position of the American people upon this question. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is charged with the most incredible folly, and I hope that it will not be merely the majority of the House that saves the gentleman from Michigan from the consequences of the folly he proposes. The most superficial view of the subject shows us to what utter disaster it would lead, for it amounts, so far as one can see, to complete prohibition of foreign commerce in some articles of which this country is not a producer at all and on which it depends for its daily sustenance. Take the subject of coffee, for example. I believe that is totally a foreign product.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; we raise considerable quantities in Porto Rico.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Oh, I presume the State of Wisconsin raises it, too. That State seems to raise enough of everything for everybody everywhere.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a very versatile State.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If this amendment be adopted, and it develops that children under 14 years of age in the tea and coffee producing countries of the world are employed in the

production of these products, the American people would be denied the right to drink tea or coffee if this amendment prevailed. If the conditions of which the gentleman speaks prevails in other countries—that is, of child labor being generally employed under that age—then that labor enters into nearly every product that is sold from abroad into this country, much of which is absolutely essential to our physical comfort and given to the sustenance of our lives.

It is apparent, of course, in this very case how much sense the rule of germaneness has in it. Here is a proposition that appeals to the tenderest sentiments and feelings that human beings can have.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I do not now yield. Some one in France, I think, some time ago exclaimed, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" The whole people of this country would be likely to exclaim in the same way, if this amendment became law, "O Politics, what awful disasters have been brought upon us in your name!" The amendment is rationally impossible; and if it were to go into effect it would kill our commerce and the revenues of the country might be cut in half, our Navy and our Army Establishments would be paralyzed, and the operations of the Federal Government crippled, if not entirely prostrated. A subject of this kind requires not only the sincere application of general principles, but minute, careful, and painstaking study upon the part of publicists and Members of Congress, in committee and elsewhere, in order to realize proper, just, and practical legislation upon the subject of foreign child labor. Such an amendment could only prove a most serious disaster to child-labor legislation now sincerely under consideration. I do trust that the House will vote this amendment down.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is an amendment to this amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is germane.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I desire to send to the desk an amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; to be added to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan in the body of the bill itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the amendment, the following: "That six months from and after the passage of this act no carrier of interstate commerce"——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BARTLETT. What is the amendment?

Mr. MANN. The Clerk need not read it any further for anyone to know it is not germane.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to hear what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the Clerk read the amendment as far as the point he has just read.

Mr. BARTLETT. We would like to have it read in order to ascertain whether it is germane.

Mr. MANN. You can tell at the beginning; there is no need to read back about it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Maybe that is true as far as the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, but it is not true as far as the rest of the committee are concerned. It seems to me that is evidently germane if the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is germane, and therefore I offer this as an amendment, and not as a substitute, but as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Why did the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Because it is impossible to insert the amendment in the bill the way the gentleman suggests. It is not germane at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia want to inquire any further?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk read the part of the amendment to the point where the gentleman from Illinois made the point of order. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentlemen opposed to the amendment, and am interested, too, in the reasons they have given in opposition to it. They suggest difficulties in the matter of foreign trade. I have wondered if there are not some domestic difficulties, if there are not conditions existing in some of the States represented by gentlemen who have so strenuously opposed that amendment. This comes to my mind in view of the fact that two gentlemen who have strenuously opposed the amendment come from a State where there has been considerable agitation lately and an unsuccessful effort made to raise the standard of labor and to protect children from unjust and harmful conditions. In my time I ask that the Clerk read an editorial which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News relative to the agitation in Georgia and the refusal of the legislature of that State to adopt remedial laws. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISGRACE OF GEORGIA.

The State of Georgia, splendid and progressive in many ways, has one foul blot on her escutcheon. In no State in the Union is the traffic in child labor so repellent or degrading. In no other State are children of tender age, some as low as 7 years, driven to the cotton factories to work for the pittances that enable them to exist. The laws of Georgia may sanction this crime against the child, but the greater law of humanity indicts it as a system that menaces the future of American manhood and womanhood. In Georgia the protection of the American child is prostituted to the greed for the dollar.

The other day the Georgia Legislature killed a bill providing that the working age of children be raised to 14 years. In other words, that no child should be allowed to slave in the cotton mills of the State who had not reached that age. That means that there are thousands of children under that age limit whose mentalities are dwarfed and their physical strength impaired so that the profits of the Georgia cotton manufacturers may be multiplied.

Surely not a very creditable spectacle for an American Commonwealth to permit. Surely if crime there be, it must be laid at the doors of the legislature who would rob childhood of its joys and opportunities for innocent pleasure and send into the world of stress and competition the thousands to whom they deny the equal chance of fair living that our common humanity and the American Constitution decree to be the portion of every citizen.

If this be the standard of patriotism and Americanism in Georgia, the sooner it is destroyed the better for the reputation of that State. When the lives and future of children under 14 years of age are balanced with dollars it is certainly time for some sort of authoritative interference. The National Government can pass laws of far less importance than one that will protect the little ones of this Southern State from assassination of character by a body of legislators who are a disgrace to any American State.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire the date of that, and by whom it is signed?

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the politics of that paper?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that this seems to be from the Rocky Mountain News of date of August 21, 1913.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it an editorial or a communication?

The CHAIRMAN. It is an editorial.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know who the Rocky Mountain News editor is, but I know that either he has not quoted correctly or has made some mistake. I do not know where he gets his facts. The gentleman from Michigan, I think, remembers on another occasion, last session, I placed in the RECORD, when some suggestion was made about child labor in Georgia, some facts on that subject, and I think this is the third time I have probably been called upon to do it. The gentleman from Michigan will remember I called his attention to it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I did not send this editorial to the desk.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thought the gentleman did.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I did not send that editorial to the desk.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thought you did. [Laughter.] My good friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] ought to be sure that the statements in the editorial which he presents are true before he vouches for it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I was inclined to believe it was true, in view of the fact that two of the three gentlemen who so strenuously oppose the amendment are from the State of Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not ashamed of my position, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman may be inclined to believe it is true, but if the gentleman vouches for the truth of the statement in that article, he is far off his facts. I have sent, Mr. Chairman, for the laws of the State of Georgia, which I hope to put in the RECORD. I have already done so on another occasion.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is it not true that in the State of Georgia children are permitted to work in factories at an age as low as any in the United States?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, sir. No child can work in a factory under 14 years of age, according to my recollection of the law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. When was the law changed to raise it from 12 to 14? I am informed the law provides for 12 years of age.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is misinformed. The gentleman is relying on information which he is conveying to the House without investigation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We have not made a misstatement.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman had examined the RECORD, where I have on one or two occasions before placed the statutes of the State of Georgia in the RECORD of this House—on no less than two occasions—when I called attention to the law, and which I will endeavor to call attention to again, as soon as I can get it, he would not say that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what other Georgia gentleman he referred to as being opposed to this child-labor amendment, as they call it, referring to child labor in foreign countries. I am opposed to this sort of legislation to prevent the import of goods made in whole or in part by child labor. It is but another effort on the part of the high protective tariff advocates in this House to endeavor to affect the tariff law indirectly. An effort was made in the Senate to place upon the tariff bill the same amendment. And the gentlemen are not so much interested in the welfare of the children in foreign countries as they are in endeavoring to affect the tariff changes which have been made by the Democratic tariff law. The gentlemen in their hearts do not yearn so much for the children of the foreigner who are working in field or mine or factory as they yearn for something to affect in some way the tariff law of the United States. And that is the purpose of it, Mr. Chairman, and not to affect the interest of the children in foreign countries or of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, and I think I can be borne out by my colleagues here, that this statement made in this newspaper is not true. I do not know where he got his information; but he did not state any facts. It is simply an assertion without facts and without any truth in it, so far as the law of the State of Georgia is concerned. We have had a struggle, of course, in that State, like that had in Massachusetts and elsewhere, like they have in Michigan sometimes, where not only the laws for the protection of children are not enforced, but it takes a congressional investigation to protect the grown laborers that work in the mines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the law of the State of Georgia prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age in the factories, except under certain conditions. It also lays down other restrictions for the purpose of protecting the children under 14 years of age. I will put the law in the RECORD again. I hope the gentlemen, before they again make an assault of this sort upon the State of Georgia, will inform themselves of the facts and not rely upon the statement of some misinformed or ignorant editor in the Rocky Mountain region.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I hold in my hand a statement just issued by the Department of Labor. It is headed:

AGE OF LEGAL EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES AND PRINCIPAL EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

Legal age of employment and maximum legal hours of labor of children employed in factories for each State, January 1, 1913.

And it says:

Georgia. Age below which employment is prohibited, 12.

Now, is that a false statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is not in accordance with the statutes of the State of Georgia.

Mr. MANN. Well, here is the statement issued by Secretary Wilson, or by the Department of Labor. Is that department inefficient or has this matter been incorrectly stated?

Mr. BARTLETT. He is mistaken as to that. Whether he is efficient or not, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. If he is correct, the gentleman is mistaken?

Mr. BARTLETT. What year did the gentleman say that was in—1913?

Mr. MANN. January 1, 1913.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a Republican Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MANN. No; this has just been issued by the Department of Labor.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman said "in 1913."

Mr. MANN. It said "legal age of employment and maximum legal hours of labor" for each State, dated January 1, 1913.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understood the gentleman to read that from a bulletin issued in 1913.

Mr. HARDWICK. Probably some inefficient Republican official got that information up and the department published it.

Mr. MANN. Well, there is a list here of all the States. Is it possible that this department is so inefficient that it can not have these figures and facts given correctly? I assume that they are correct, and that the gentlemen themselves are mistaken about the laws of their own State. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question before he sits down?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is that from the census of 1910?

Mr. MANN. This is not from a census report at all. This is recent information, down to date, issued by Secretary Wilson, Secretary of Labor, a Democratic member of the President's Cabinet. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. It is recent misinformation. That is what it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It was obtained from the department yesterday.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not care when it was obtained. It is misinformation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is Democracy up to date. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, Republicanism consists chiefly in making misstatements and giving misinformation to the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, since into the discussion of this question of child labor in the South, Georgia has been injected by the insertion of an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], I want to say this, that the statement that children as young as 7 years of age ever worked in Georgia in the cotton-mill industry is an unfounded and infamous falsehood.

The law in Georgia, the act known as the Bell act, passed in 1906 or 1907—I have forgotten which—provided that no children under 10 years of age could work in any manufacturing institution in the State under any conditions whatever, but that children between the ages of 10 and 12, upon the affidavit of their mothers, could be employed, in the discretion of the judge of the court of ordinary of the county in which the application was made. That is to say, the mother had to be in a dependent condition upon the labor of her child between the age of 10 and 12, or a widow, or was required to establish the fact that she had a worthless, trifling, no-account husband who did not contribute to her support, and a good many have them in Georgia as well as in Michigan. [Laughter.] If she made an affidavit and set out the fact that she was absolutely dependent upon that child's labor for her support during the years of 10 and 12, then, under those conditions, it was discretionary with the judge of the court of ordinary of the county in which the application was made as to whether that child between 10 and 12 years of age should be allowed to work at all. Between the ages of 12 and 14 it was necessary for the child to be able to read and write and present a certificate that he or she had attended school within one year for at least 12 weeks, and if said child failed to comply with this provsion, it was excluded from the mills. Now, then, that law in Georgia is enforced.

The law of Georgia is administered, but the law in Michigan is defied. We respect the law in Georgia, and you violate the law in Michigan openly. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You deprive, not children, but you deprive American citizens and grown men of their rights and privileges. You shoot them, you murder them, you kill them like dogs, if you can not control them, and we have not resorted to that method of controlling people in Georgia yet. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. You burn them.

Mr. HOWARD. Not as much as you do in Illinois.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. In a moment. We have heard of it.

Mr. FOWLER. That is in Chicago.

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; and we have heard in the city of Springfield, Ill., of more negroes being lynched in one day than was ever pulled off in a Southern State in two years. [Laughter.] We have heard of it; yet, Mr. Chairman, these inflammatory newspapers are continually printing their falsehoods about

my State, when your State has done worse than we have, without one-half the provocation.

Mr. MANN. You mean the last two weeks, do you not?

Mr. HOWARD. Yet in the State of Georgia we absolutely protect the little children under 12 years of age, and these irresponsible and unscrupulous newspapers that have been circulating this infamous calumny against the State of Georgia have done it without any foundation on earth in fact. The children in the cotton mills in Georgia—those that work, the young people and the old people—have decent sanitary homes to live in, garden spots, and milch cows. Why, in Michigan and in the New England States, the idea of a cotton-mill wage earner owning a milch cow would be such a luxury that they would stabulate her in the bedroom, and the children would bow down and worship her, and the old lady of the home would kiss the cow every morning before breakfast. [Laughter.] And yet the gentleman says that in the State of Georgia we grind the existence out of little children by working them in cotton mills below the age of 7 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, I say that the people of Georgia are a law-abiding people, and when the lawmakers enact a statute the people conform to that law. But in the State of Michigan they not only violate the State laws, but they arrogate to themselves the power of usurping the Federal law, and they actually deport people in Michigan and banish them from the State. You have done that very recently, and I think the insertion in the RECORD of an editorial, reflecting upon the State of Georgia, comes with ill grace from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] when his State to-day is almost in a state of warfare and the conditions are a stench in the nostrils of all law-abiding people on account of the conduct of the great copper-mining kings.

Mr. FORDNEY. By a Democratic governor and Democratic administration.

Mr. HOWARD. Ah, the gentleman says "by a Democratic governor and a Democratic administration." What could that Democratic governor do? You have already more troops in the possession of the mine owners than the governor of Michigan has in his possession. You have a Democratic governor, thank God, for that; but the people who defy law and order, who are withholding living wages from the miner, and who are attempting to drive him like a galley slave are Republicans.

Mr. FORDNEY. What did he do?

Mr. HOWARD. What could he do? You have the biggest crowd. He says, "I do not want to declare war in my own State. I want to settle this horrible and disgraceful affair amicably." At this moment a committee of this House is in session investigating these awful conditions in the gentleman's State, investigating the efforts of those people to wring money and extort gold from the poor miners of that State.

No, Mr. Chairman; no such conditions ever existed in the Empire State of the South as exists this moment in the State of Michigan. I regret that such conditions exist there. I sincerely hope these Republican mine owners will desist in their defiance of law and order. May they learn a lesson by turning their faces to the South, and especially to the great State of Georgia, where they will find a prosperous and contented people; where we have absolute industrial peace, and where thousands of bright-eyed and rosy-cheeked little children are living witnesses of the falsehood of the editorial in the Rocky Mountain News.

Mr. FORDNEY. Without interference, it would be settled in a week.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion has reached a very wide scope, indeed. [Laughter.] The gentleman refers to the deportation of men in Michigan. When I referred to a Democratic administration in the State of Michigan, I made that reference with the greatest of respect for the present Democratic governor of that State, whom I admire for his courage, for the sincerity of his convictions, and for his honesty of purpose. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] stated that if goods made by child labor under 14 years of age in foreign countries were excluded from our markets it would, in his judgment, exclude all goods, because he knows, and so does every other man here know, that in every European country child labor under 14 years of age is employed in the production of the goods that come into the United States in competition with honest American labor, enjoying the American standard of wages and living. Yet, gentlemen on that side of the House have recently passed an immigration bill that, if enacted into law, will exclude from the United States any child under 16 years of age who is not accompanied by a parent.

It will exclude laborers from foreign countries coming to the United States seeking a home and honest employment here, and the purpose of that bill is to protect organized labor as well as unorganized labor in this country by keeping away from our shores labor from any other country in the world. Yet when it comes to this question those gentlemen are in favor of striking from this bill an amendment that will exclude from our markets the products of the cheap labor of children under 16 years of age made in any country in the world. You do not want foreigners to come here to compete with our employees in the factories or on the farms of the United States. You throw that out as a sop to the labor of which you pretend to be the friends, but in the next breath you would vote to admit into our markets the products of child labor from every country in the world, knowing that child labor, as well as adult labor, receives in the highest paid country in the world outside of the United States for their labor not more than 50 per cent of the wages paid to the same class of labor in this country. You get back to the proposition that you are not only in favor of a tariff for revenue only, but, body and soul, you are free traders when you take that position. I say the position taken by you on this question is absolutely inconsistent with the position you took on the immigration bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of gentlemen who are mistaken on this question—and some of them are honestly mistaken—I will read from the Code of Georgia. It seems to me that the gentleman who had read an article stating that children were employed in Georgia at the age of 7 owes it to himself to correct the injustice done my State. I read from the Code of Georgia, section 3145:

On and after January 1, 1908, no child under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within the State between the hours of 7 p. m and 6 a. m.

My colleague, Mr. HOWARD, has explained conditions for labor by day, under the age of 14, permitting the employment of children. The law provides that children under the age of 14 may be employed in a factory by consent of aged parents, or of a mother who is a widow and who is unable to support herself, upon the making of certain affidavits.

The Georgia Code provides as follows:

First. No such child between the ages of 14 and 18 years shall be so employed unless such child shall have attended school for 12 weeks of the preceding year, 6 weeks of which school attendance shall be consecutive, and at the end of each year, until such child shall have passed the public-school age.

Second. No child, except as heretofore provided, under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State unless he or she can write his or her name and simple sentences, and shall have attended school for 12 weeks of the preceding year, 6 weeks of which school attendance shall be consecutive.

Third. No child under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

Fourth. No child under 12 years of age shall be so employed, or allowed to labor, unless such child be an orphan and has no other means of support, or unless a widowed mother or an aged or disabled father is dependent upon the labor of such child, in which event, before putting such child at such labor, such father shall produce and file in the office of such factory or manufacturing establishment a certificate from the ordinary of the county in which such factory is established or located, certifying under his seal of office to the facts required to be shown as herein prescribed.

Fifth. No child under 10 years of age to be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State under any circumstances.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] has been in manufacturing establishments in the State of Georgia. He has seen the conditions that exist in those factories, and if he will come out squarely and make a fair statement to this House I believe he will say that he did not see any children under 12 years of age employed in any factory he visited. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that he has been in manufacturing establishments in Georgia himself? The gentleman refuses to speak.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. No, Mr. Chairman, I intend to get my own time to reply to the gentleman, and if he will permit me I will answer him then.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I will make the statement in my place that I have been in at least one-tenth of all the cotton-manufacturing establishments in Georgia. I have been through those factories for the purpose of meeting the operatives, and I have never seen a child employed in any factory in the State of Georgia under the age of 12 or 14 years. I can safely say

that I have never seen one employed under the age of 14, and I think my colleagues on the floor of this House can make the same statement. Sectional lines should be blotted out in this House and this country. Each State should sympathize with the other States in the disposition of great economic questions. All the States have troublesome questions with which to contend. Georgia and Michigan are not alone. Georgia is able to care for herself as well as any State of the Union. We have our local problems and we have our burdens. What other State in the Union has borne the burden of education of a race that contributes almost nothing to that education and borne that burden as patiently and as well as the State of Georgia? In 1864 a great horde of slaves were turned loose upon our people. They had no property then and they have very little to-day. Yet they have an equal educational opportunity with the white children of the State of Georgia. The people of Georgia have gone down into their pockets, taken out their money, and divided it equally between the whites and blacks in educating all alike; and it is unfair, it is not right, it is not just for Members to come upon the floor of this House and criticize local conditions in our State, and they certainly should state the facts when they make a statement concerning our State laws.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia do me the courtesy to loan me the book from which he read, containing the Georgia statute that he quoted?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I did not mean to ask the gentleman to bring it to me.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman read it all?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Georgia did not read it all. The gentleman from Georgia, for whom I have a good deal of admiration, said that some of us were honestly mistaken about the law of Georgia, and then he read this part of the statute:

> On and after January 1, 1908, no child under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within the State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

The gentleman did not read those last words with the same emphasis that I have read them.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman to read the preceding section.

Mr. MANN. I do not ask the gentleman to make my argument.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I want to make this statement——

Mr. MANN. I prefer that the gentleman do it after I get through. I do not mean to say that the gentleman intended to give the House the impression that the law of Georgia forbids the employment of children under 14 years of age to work in any factories, but the provision which the gentleman read applies only to night work. Now, what applies to day work?

On the same page of the same book appears:

> No child under 10 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State under any circumstances.

Yet we have been told by two gentlemen from Georgia that the statutes of that State prohibited employment of children under 14 years of age, and the gentleman from Michigan was denounced because an editorial from a great western paper was read, and yet here is the statute produced by the gentleman from Georgia himself not forbidding child labor under 14 years of age but only forbidding child labor under 10 years of age.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman be kind enough to call attention to section 3144?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] gave a very lucid explanation of that, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] referred to it, but that does not do away with section 3143, which puts the prohibition at 10 years of age.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labor was criticized as inaccurate; they criticized the Rocky Mountain News and said that was inaccurate. I hold in my hand a telegram which appears in the Washington Times. It may be inaccurate, I do not know. At New Orleans they are having a convention of the annual national child-labor conference. Yesterday Mr. Wiley H. Swift, of Greensboro, N. C., according to this paper, delivered a scathing denunciation of southern manufacturers who employ children. "Why it is hard to get child-labor laws in the South" was the text of Mr. Swift's statement, and it appears here as though he was a manufacturer. He goes on to complain, and refers especially to North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and says that the South is far behind the standard in child-labor laws. It may be that Mr. Wiley H. Swift—his name, his residence, and address is given—it may be that he does not know anything more, according to my friend from Georgia, than does Secretary Wilson, of the Department of Labor; but, after all, I suspect he is right.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that further discussion on this amendment be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; let us make it 30 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Does the gentleman want to speak?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. How about the division of time?

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENSLEY. How many speeches are permitted on an amendment without an agreement for time?

The CHAIRMAN. One for the amendment and one against.

Mr. HENSLEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will not make it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is a motion in order to strike out the last word in the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I make the point of order that a previous motion was before the House, made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I made a request for time.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does a parliamentary inquiry do away with the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

The CHAIRMAN. It did in this case.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, one of the political curses of this country is the display of sectionalism, an example of which we have had here this afternoon. On a question of this kind this middle aisle ought to go out of existence. [Applause.] There ought not to be any difference between parties on the question of child labor. I am against child labor; I am against it in Michigan, I am against it in Georgia, I am against it in the United States. I am for a national child-labor law. [Applause.] You will never get a national child-labor law if you continue forever a quarrel based upon sectional lines.

I know enough about legislation to realize that whenever a legislator has a chance to accomplish a reform he needs to seize the opportunity when it is presented to him, and not delay. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] is in order; it is germane; it means business, and the men on both sides of this aisle ought to forget their partisanship this afternoon long enough to support it.

Mr. HARDWICK rose.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to yield just now, but I will before I get through. This bill provides for the prohibition of the importation of convict-made and pauper-made wares or merchandise. It has as one of its great purposes the protection of labor in this country. A prohibition of child labor is not only for the purpose of the protection of the children, but it has also the purpose of protecting labor and the home. If this amendment goes into this bill, it would accomplish two purposes—one, protect the child, the decent, godly thing; and it would also protect labor in this country. [Applause.]

Now, this particular amendment will not become a law. I have served long enough in Congress to know that whenever an amendment is offered which means business, which is drastic and puts the mighty congressional hand upon one of the sore spots of this Nation, we do not get the legislation. It may be this afternoon that enough men on both sides of the aisle will vote for this amendment to put it in the bill. It will not stay in the bill. It will be knocked out in the Senate, in all likelihood; and if not knocked out in the Senate the bill will be pigeonholed and killed.

That is one of the troubles in this country; while you are fighting on sectional lines the old fight based on old prejudices Congress does not do the thing that is demanded—that is, the really remedial thing—that will bring actual correction. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wanted to ask the gentleman how this amendment would affect child labor in the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we exclude child-labor-made goods from abroad, we will have speedily a national child-labor law in the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. How can we have such a law under the present Constitution of the United States?

Mr. MURDOCK. We can have it under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the courts have held otherwise.

Mr. MURDOCK. And one of the ways to bring it around speedily is to write this amendment into law.

Mr. HARDWICK. That will not affect it at all.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman from Kansas has described the fate of this bill, providing this amendment is adhered to. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the amendment because he wants the bill to be defeated in the Senate and not become a law?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in favor of making the membership here and at the other end of the Capitol face the music. That is what I am in favor of. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am in favor of adopting amendments here which mean business, which will do some good in the country. Let the other gentlemen face their responsibility; I will answer for my side of the case.

Mr. HENSLEY. Is the gentleman in favor of this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am; and I am in favor of making it an effectual law to the last sense of the word.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that further debate on this amendment be confined to 25 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, first, in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], I will say that I had an opportunity not long ago to see something of factory conditions in one of the towns of the State of Georgia, and, as far as I was able to see, they were good. What I said was not based on my personal observation, nor did I intend severely, certainly not unjustly, to arraign the State of Georgia, but here is an amendment which seems to me to be wise and ought to be adopted. The gentlemen from Georgia are the ones who are taking principal part in opposition to it, and are citing conditions in their own State to justify them. I have in my hand an editorial citing the fact that a deplorable condition in the matter of child labor had been brought to the attention of the Legislature of Georgia; that the legislature had been asked to correct the condition and had refused to do so. I had taken that statement that appeared in the newspaper as true, but if it is not, I regret that I offered it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I decline to yield at present. It seems to me the gentlemen have not been quite fair in presenting Georgia's case in their citations of law governing the age below which children in that State are not permitted to work. The law has not been correctly read. I do not accuse them of intentionally misreading or misquoting, but what they did read, what they chose to read as to child-labor laws in that State, has misled the House. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has read the law correctly, and has read the important sections and paragraphs which the gentlemen from Georgia inadvertently omitted.

Mr. Chairman, it is not incumbent upon me nor is it necessary for me to defend the State of Michigan from the acrimonious charges made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. I venture, however, to say that when the committee of this House appointed a short time ago to go to Michigan to make investigation of conditions existing in the mining sections of the State makes its report it will be found that not one single charge contained in the resolution adopted by the House and directing the investigation to be made is sustained in any manner or respect whatever by the evidence. And I venture to say, also, that if the gentlemen of the investigating committee put into their report what they have learned of general conditions existing in the copper-mining section, they will say that the mining conditions of northern Michigan are the best that they have had the opportunity to observe and in their opinion are the best in the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. My time is only five minutes. I wish to criticize the Democratic Party for its professions on the labor question and its attitude upon labor bills. The Democratic Party assumes to stand to-day as it has assumed to stand for many years, as the champion of labor, proclaiming that it is only at the hands of the Democratic Party that relief, so far as labor is concerned, can be secured. Yet when we look for labor legislation intended to alleviate conditions of labor, improving conditions under which wage earners perform their work, we find that statutes on that subject and for that purpose are conspicuous by their absence in the States which are most strongly Democratic.

My time is very limited, and I do not wish to prolong this discussion or go outside of the matter before the House; but inasmuch as the statement made by the Department of Labor has been referred to, I wish to call the attention of the House to one portion of it. The age at which children are permitted to labor and the States in which that age is low are, Alabama, 12 years; Florida, 12 years; Georgia, 12 years; Mississippi, 12 years; North Carolina, 12 years; South Carolina, 12 years; every one of them a State strongly Democratic. In no other State in the Union is the age below 14 years. And the gentlemen from the States in which the age is lowest are talking loudest and making themselves conspicuous here demanding legislation in favor of labor and trying to give the country the idea that only by legislation enacted by their party can labor conditions be improved. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If these gentlemen, or if Democrats as a party, wish to improve conditions of labor by legislation, why do they not enact laws along that line in States where they are in complete control? And it is a fact that a very large proportion of labor is of such a character and is performed under such conditions as to be amenable to State law; or if the performance of labor is in any manner influenced or controlled by law, those laws are enacted by State legislatures and not by the Federal Congress. But the Democratic Party in their national platforms declare their devotion to labor and their love of the wage earners, and promise all sorts of legislation for their benefit and protection, knowing full well that hardly one man in a hundred is so situated with respect to his employment as to be influenced in any manner whatever by Federal law. And in the States where legislatures are solidly Democratic or where the Democratic Party has complete control there is little if any attempt made to enact law for protection or uplift of men, women, or children who live by their labor.

The Democratic Party are inconsistent. They are profuse in their promises in respect of which they are unable to perform, and they fail altogether to accomplish anything in the States where they might do some good if they wished to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to enter into the partisan spirit that has been engendered in this discussion, but I am going to say that the world is getting better every day and that there is more tendency all along the line to a greater spirit of humanity. There is a greater disposition for better education among our people, both physical and mental, than there ever was before. There is a greater disposition to prevent the dwarfing of the oncoming generation than there ever was before, and I am very glad that such a spirit is manifest all over the country. When I was a boy I was brought up in poverty, and I was obliged to work before I was 10 years of age, and so were many other boys. That day has gone forever, and I am glad it has. The spirit of humanity is prevailing everywhere now, and the thought of the best thinkers of the world is along the line of uplifting the human race, and that the best way to do that is to help build the children up physically when they are young and mentally as they grow everyone now agrees.

We want a virile citizenship in our Nation, and we are beginning to lay the foundation for that kind of a citizenship. We have laid the foundation for universal education in America and we no longer believe in the employment of children below 16 years of age in most of the States, and I know of no better thing that can be done to give notice to the world where we stand upon this subject than to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] on this bill. [Applause.] We have no disposition to employ the children of our own land; indeed, we prevent that by law. That being true, there is every reason why we should prevent the product of child labor coming here in direct competition with that of our labor, and this amendment will in a large measure cure the evil which is known to prevail among our people.

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. KINDEL. How are you going to prevent that when the parcel post brings these goods from abroad to Denver and beyond in 11-pound packages at 79 cents as against $1.32 from New York? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I know very well the gentleman has some kind of a difference with the Post Office Department, that he and the Postmaster General are not getting along in very close harmony; but I can not understand why his quarrel with the Post Office has anything to do with the employment of child labor.

Mr. KINDEL. It has this to do, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. KINDEL. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MADDEN. I have answered it the best I know how. The gentleman's question has no place in this discussion.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I realize the troubles of the gentleman are enormous——

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. MADDEN. And that it is somewhat difficult to harmonize his views with those of the Postmaster General, that he believes the express companies ought to charge more than the Post Office charges for the transportation of goods; but I do not see where that comes into the question of the employment of child labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I suggest to the gentleman that the difficulty he sought to correct was he wanted children carried through the mails by the parcel post.

Mr. MADDEN. He wanted them tagged, I see; I did not know that.

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. KINDEL. But the gentleman makes a misstatement about me when he says that I want the express companies to charge a higher rate than the parcel post. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MADDEN. Perhaps not.

Mr. KINDEL. And I will prove it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Colorado does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. KINDEL. I can prove I do. I challenge the gentleman to disprove any facts and figures I have presented on the subject of transportation and parcel post.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the Postmaster General thinks the gentleman does not know what he is talking about. At any rate I want to emphasize what I have already said, that I believe fully in enacting a child-labor law which will not only prevent the employment of child labor in any State in the American Union, but also will prevent the importation of goods made by child labor in any other country in the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to put in the RECORD again the entire law on the subject of child labor and the labor of children in factories in the State of Georgia, from which it will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that the statement made in the Rocky Mountain News, an independent newspaper, so declared to be by itself—I do not know what that means down our way, it means Republican or Bull Moose, or something of that kind, I suppose it is a Bull Moose. Now, I said that was misinformation, and I am going to prove it in a moment. My good friend from Michigan, who had the article read, at the same time had in his hand a report, or at least he said he to-day had a report of the Secretary of Labor which declared that the age of labor in factories permitted to children was 12 years, and yet with that information——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that article was not secured by Mr. MCLAUGHLIN.

Mr. BARTLETT. But Mr. MCLAUGHLIN, in his reply to me, stated that he had it to-day.

Mr. MANN. It was furnished; it did not come through him.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know——

Mr. MANN. I am telling that to the gentleman because he did not know.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did not know what? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said he did not know whom it came through.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know what the gentleman meant, but some other gentlemen do not seem to know what the gentleman meant. Now, the gentleman from Michigan stated that he had the report to-day. Now, the gentleman from Michigan vouched for the statement made in a newspaper and published in Colorado, stating that the laws permitted the employment in factories of children 7 years old.

Under the law of Georgia children under the age of 10 years of age can not work in a factory at all, and under 14 years old can only work after their parents make an affidavit that their labor is necessary in order to sustain the family, which affidavit has to be approved by the probate judge; and children under 14 years can not work at all unless there is a certificate that they have attended school a certain length of time. I will put the whole law in.

I will repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the statement made in this editorial is false in its reference to the laws of the State of Georgia. The gentleman from Michigan, my good friend Mr. MCLAUGHLIN, can not vouch for the truth of the editorial or the truthfulness of the editor when he says that children 7 years old, under the laws of Georgia, are permitted to be driven to the factories to work. I stand by the statement with which I opened my remarks, namely, that that utterance, Mr. Chairman, is wholly untrue so far as Georgia is concerned, and I trust my friend from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] will not insist that it is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD the laws of the State of Georgia to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ARTICLE 4.

CHILD LABOR IN FACTORIES REGULATED.

3143. No child under 10 years of age to be employed: No child under 10 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State under any circumstances.

3144. Child under 12 years: On and after January 1, 1907, no child under 12 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor unless such child be an orphan and has no other means of support or unless a widowed mother or an aged or disabled father is dependent upon the labor of such child, in which event, before putting such child at such labor, such father shall produce and file in the office of such factory or manufacturing establishment a certificate from the ordinary of the county in which such factory or establishment is located, certifying under his seal of office to the facts required to be shown as herein prescribed: *Provided*, That no ordinary shall issue any such certificate except upon strict proof in writing and under oath clearly showing the necessary facts: *And provided further*, That no such certificate shall be granted for longer than one year nor accepted by any employer after one year from the date of such certificate.

3145. Child under 14 years: On and after January 1, 1908, no child under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

3146. Educational qualification: On and after January 1, 1908, no child, except as heretofore provided, under 14 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State unless he or she can write his or her name and simple sentences and shall have attended school for 12 weeks of the preceding year, 6 weeks of which school attendance shall be consecutive; and no such child, as aforesaid, between the ages of 14 and 18 years shall be so employed unless such child shall have attended school for 12 weeks of the preceding year, 6 weeks of which school attendance shall be consecutive; and at the end of each year, until such child shall have passed the public-school age, an affidavit certifying to such attendance as is required by this section shall be furnished to the employer by the parent or guardian or person sustaining parental relation to such child. The provisions of this section shall apply only to children entering such employment at the age of 14 years or less.

3147. Affidavit as to age, birth, etc.: It shall be unlawful for any owner, superintendent, agent, or any other person acting for or in behalf of any factory or manufacturing establishment to hire or employ any child unless there is first provided and placed on file in the office of such employer an affidavit signed by the parent, guardian, or person standing in parental relation thereto certifying to the age and date of birth of such child and other facts required in this article. Any person knowingly furnishing a false affidavit as to the age or as to any other facts required in this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

3148. Inspection by the grand juries: The affidavit and certificates required in this article shall be open to inspection by the grand juries of any county where such factory or manufacturing establishments are located.

3149. Penalties: Any person or agent or representative of any firm or corporation who shall violate any provision of this article, or any parent, guardian, or other person standing in parental relation to a child who shall hire or place for employment or labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State a child in violation of any provision of this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the committee for renewing some statements made in regard to this amendment. My apology is that there are those present now who may not have heard the former discussion.

This amendment proposes absolutely to prohibit the importation of foreign-made products in which child labor under 14 years of age has directly, indirectly, partly, or wholly contributed to the product. The probabilities are that few if any articles are imported into the United States as to which child labor under 14 years of age has not been a contributing factor. There are many articles that are imported into the United States, let me say to the committee, that are practically not the subject of cultivation or manufacture in our country at all, and are yet essential to its daily life and comfort. I mention tea and coffee as obvious ones. It may be possible for our Congress by some method of legislation to affect the legislation with regard to child labor in foreign countries. It may be possible, I say, and is worthy of grave and thorough investigation. But whether it be possible or not, certainly it will be more becoming that this Congress should legislate with regard to interstate commerce and child labor in the United States

before it undertakes to remove beams from the eyes of its neighbors over the sea. That is a problem of civilization for them to determine, I submit, and not for us. Now the Committee on Labor has before it at this very time and is holding hearings, I think, for the first time in the history of any committee in this body on legislative propositions looking toward the restriction of the employment of child labor in the different States of the Union. It would be incredible folly, I repeat, to adopt this amendment here to-day. I give notice, as one as much interested in labor legislation as anyone in this body, that the adoption of this amendment is the surest way to kill this legislation, because the country itself in 24 hours after it ascertained that the amendment had been passed would visit upon us and the bill its sorest condemnation. It is impracticable and absurd, and simply makes unholy political use of the name of "child" for party purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield before he sits down?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman tell the committee in what manner it imperils this legislation?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Because, as I suggested, it is utterly impracticable. This Congress, whatever it might wish, even in the sore contingencies of war, could not strike down all its foreign commerce by one single blow or in a single day. The effect of this legislation probably would be to strike down totally the tea and coffee commerce and many other articles of commerce of common everyday use.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARDNER. Are tea and coffee manufactured articles?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. They are products of labor that would come under the provisions of this bill, as is sugar, I am reminded, although that is partially manufactured at home. There may be men in this House who hate foreign commerce and who would be willing to enact prohibitory laws against foreign commerce to kill it with a single blow, but when they use the name of "child labor" and the sentiments surrounding childhood in order to do it they are commercializing the most sacred feelings and sentiments of the heart.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that this amendment has been offered to this bill.

I hold in my hand a bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to prevent interstate commerce in products of child labor, and for other purposes. Now, it seems from the remarks that have been made here to-day that we are almost unanimously in favor of protecting the children from being exploited for profit in the manufacturing industries of the country. This bill would be a special act, for the reason that it equalizes the proposition throughout the United States, and to this bill, it would seem to me, the amendment that is being considered here to-day could be applied, and treat the child-labor question alike in this country as well as in foreign countries. It could not be said then that we were discriminating against any country in regard to the matter. And if the feeling is so unanimous here, and we are in favor of legislation of this sort, it seems to me after the Labor Committee gets through with its hearings on this question we could get a measure like this up by unanimous consent and be able to pass it in the near future and not load the present bill down with an amendment the utility of which is questioned.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman think the Palmer child-labor bill would be effective as between the States, and that we could prohibit the transportation of child-made goods from one State to another?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that, in my judgment, if he wants my judgment, which probably will not amount to much to the gentleman, as I am not a lawyer, if the Federal Government have such right to legislate in regard to interstate commerce I do not see where the Constitution puts limits on it.

I voted for the amendment of my colleague [Mr. MANN] the other day, and the only objection that I heard to it was that it might be successfully attacked as to its constitutionality. I have advised with lawyers, who say it was constitutional, and I do not agree with those who thought it could be attacked successfully in that way.

Mr. MOORE. If such a law were effective as between the States, barring child-made goods, why would it not be competent to pass a law here barring the importation of goods made by children abroad?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I did not catch that question.

Mr. MOORE. If we are capable of passing a law that would be effective preventing the shipment of child-made products from one State to another, why are we not competent to pass a law to prevent the admission into the United States of child-made products from foreign countries?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I endeavored to make it plain that I was in favor of an amendment of that sort, or an addition of that sort being attached to this child-labor bill of Mr. PALMER'S, but do not think it properly applies to the bill under consideration.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman's attention been called to the wide difference between the Palmer bill, which attempts to regulate child labor, and the Heusley bill, which attempts to regulate the admission of the products of convict labor in this particular? The child-labor bill attempts to restrict child labor in factories and in unhealthy occupations, while the convict-labor bill is so broad that even if a convict were employed on a farm or in some healthful occupation, still the product of his labor could not be admitted to this country. There is a wide difference between the two measures.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is no legal difference.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I think it would apply more properly to the Palmer bill than this bill, and it would affect it in a less objectionable way. I do not think the present amendment should be attached to this bill. I am as much in favor of antichild-labor legislation as anyone here, I suppose, and I have spent a good deal of time trying to secure its enactment and prohibit child labor.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman is in favor of prohibiting the importation of goods made by convict labor, why does he not vote for it now? The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] says frankly that he is not in favor of prohibiting the importation of goods made by child labor, and for that reason opposes the insertion in this bill of an amendment which would accomplish that result.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I am in favor of it, and at the proper time and in the proper place I favor the enactment of legislation prohibiting the shipment of the products of child labor in interstate commerce and the importation into this country of the products of child labor abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute by Mr. BRYAN:

"Page 2, line 15, after the word 'country' insert 'or any goods, wares, or merchandise which is the product of any factory where children under the age of 12 years are employed.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that all time has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, that eliminates from——

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offer this as a substitute for the amendment?

Mr. BRYAN. I offer it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report it.

The proposed substitute was again read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will withhold it and offer it later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 4, after the word "part," by inserting the words "by children under the age of 14 years or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 74.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEWIS of Maryland and Mr. KELLEY of Michigan to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer now the amendment that I offered a few moments ago, asking the Clerk to modify it by substituting "14" for "12," down in the body of the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, on that amendment I ask that all discussion be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that the debate on the amendment be closed in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I wanted to inquire if the debate had not already closed on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. It has closed on the amendment. The Chair recollects that the gentleman from Maryland made the motion to close debate on this amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "country," insert the words "or any goods, wares, or merchandise which is the product of any factory where children under the age of 14 years are employed."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, will only restrict the importation as to manufactured articles. There can not possibly be the criticism that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor has made as to tea and coffee and other agricultural products. If I could only fall upon some wording for an amendment that would satisfy the Democratic majority, I would be very glad. This amendment proposes merely to cut out from this country the articles that are produced in factories in foreign lands where child labor is employed. I hope the members of the majority will tell us how they would like the amendment drawn. I would propose a 12-year limit if I thought the majority would accept that. I hope the gentlemen will vote for my amendment, or else amend it so you can vote for it. You all claim to be against child labor.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRYAN. The whole subject has been already discussed, and I do not care to go into it extensively, as I know the House is anxious to conclude the consideration of this bill; but I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman think that is a specious exception, to exclude the product of children who work at tilling the soil or collecting coffee or tea, and to include the labor of those who perforce from necessity work in the mills?

Mr. BRYAN. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. When it comes down to the actual hardship of child labor, what is the difference whether the child works in a factory, where it has a roof over its head, or works out in a swamp, picking huckleberries? What is the difference?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a very substantial difference. We can not expect to regulate the indiscriminate work on farms, where the owner of the farm, the head of the family, manages things according to home rule, and where the children take part in the farm labor; but where children are assembled in a factory under certain sanitary or insanitary conditions, under certain economic conditions, then the situation is altogether different, and it is our duty to make some kind of provision; it is our duty to establish some kind of uniform rule; and that is the case with all statutes in every State for the regulation of child labor. Such laws are never applied to agricultural labor and things of that kind.

Mr. FARR. Would it not be a protection to our industry and our labor, as the gentleman intends this amendment to be?

Mr. BRYAN. I do not specialize so much on that subject as the gentleman from Pennsylvania does.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now proposed is subject to exactly the same arguments as those that have been made with reference to the preceding one. At this point I want to make a suggestion that I hope will not be without profit to all of us. It is this: So far as I know, no bill has ever been introduced in this House, and certainly no bill has been referred to the Committee on Labor, dealing with the subject of foreign child labor. Neither the Committee on Labor nor, so far as I know, any other committee of this House has ever had an opportunity to consider this subject at all. And as one keenly interested, I have a right to make my complaint, and make it with emphasis, against people who threaten the life of well-considered reform legislation by immature political suggestions, thought of, perhaps, at least spoken of, for the first time on this floor. [Applause.] Every Member of this House knows that legislation can not be wisely prepared and enacted in that way, and I want to make these strictures with regard to this amendment, as well as the one that has preceded it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MURDOCK) there were—ayes 38, noes 77.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend section 1 of the bill by striking out the word "pauper" wherever it occurs. That will leave the measure one to prohibit the importation of the products of convict labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, section 1, by striking out, wherever it occurs, the word "pauper."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact of how wildly we go when we start out in a certain direction. My friends on the other side of the aisle almost to a man voted a moment ago for a proposition to exclude from this country the product of all labor of children under 14 years of age. If this law were passed and a similar law passed on the other side of the water, excluding from European countries the products of all child labor of this country of children under 14 years of age, what would be the result? Simply this, that not a yard of manufactured cotton goods could go from this country across the water, because nearly every bale of cotton in the South is grown partly by child labor; that is, labor of children under 14 years of age. Not a bushel of grain could go from the West, because nearly every farm there is worked in part by persons under 14 years of age.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. No; I have not the time. Not only that, but Europe stands with reference to her manufactures somewhat as we stand with reference to our agriculture. By what process of reasoning do we, because we may be farmers, propose to say to the inhabitants of a great city, "Your children shall not work in any gainful occupation until they are 14 years of age or, if they do, we will not permit the products of their labor to enter into international trade." That is what the bill means. The sensible, statesmanlike way for all countries to do is to handle their problems of child labor each for themselves. Why, about a hundred years ago the problem of child labor was a great one in Great Britain. They were then employing small children long hours in the day and sometimes into the night, as much as 14 hours a day. Humane people began to object, but selfish interests claimed they could not compete without these long hours of labor for children. The struggle between selfish interest and humanity was long and many pitiful conditions were proven to exist. In the end humanity won. England did not seek to regulate the child labor of foreign countries, but she adopted laws limiting the hours of labor for children and providing healthful conditions under which they might labor, and England continued to more than hold her own in her competition with the world.

Will you say for my State under what conditions our children under 14 years of age shall work? Shall I for your State undertake to say in what way you shall regulate your child labor? Is the Federal Government of all the States prepared to legislate on the child-labor question for each of the States? I for one am not; and since I am not ready here to legislate for Missouri or California or New York or Georgia and determine for them at what age or in what field or for how many hours their children may work, surely I am not prepared to try to determine these things for England or Germany.

But, Mr. Chairman, my motion is to strike out the word "pauper" from this bill so that it will not affect the products of those defined by the bill as paupers—that is, those held in eleemosynary institutions. In all these institutions the inmates may and do produce things. Certainly, we ought not to want to take away the fruits of their labor. Yet by the principles of this bill every country and every State would shut its doors against the products of such labor of every other country or State, because they were made in an eleemosynary institution. We propose to say that we will not allow such products of a foreign country to be imported into this country. What a

strange perversion of humanitarianism for the twentieth century!

Gentlemen, shut your doors to the product of convict labor, shut convict labor out of the factories and farms in your State and mine, or, if you will not do so in your State, I am willing to shut the doors of my State, against the convict-labor products of factory and farm in your State; but do not shut your doors against the products of your poor, your weak, and your helpless or of the poor and weak and helpless of any land. When you pass this bill with the word "pauper" in it you are losing sight of the humanitarianism of the age and you are standing on the ground of selfishness alone and saying, "We will not help the weary, the weak, the poor, the helpless, but we will help the strong against the helpless." I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the word "pauper" ought to be stricken from this bill, and I move that it be stricken out.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's motion. The gentleman says this side of the House voted almost unanimously to exclude the products of child labor from coming into this country. That is true. With one exception we on this side, Republicans and Progressives, voted unanimously for that proposition; but for the most part you Democrats on the other side of the House voted to admit the products of foreign child labor. Now, why did you vote us down? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] says he voted against our child-labor amendment because he thought it ought to come into some other bill, by unanimous consent, at some future time. But, said he, "I am in favor of excluding the products of child labor from this country." I am in favor of excluding the manufactures of child labor from this country, Mr. Chairman. I want to see them excluded from interstate commerce as well. I want to see child labor stopped, just as does the gentleman from Illinois. Singularly enough, the gentleman from Illinois votes with the chairman of the Committee on Labor, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], but he does not agree with him. What says the gentleman from Maryland? Oh, he does not say "I want to stop the products of child labor coming here from abroad," as does the gentleman from Illinois. Not a bit of it.

The gentleman from Maryland says, "You must not exclude the products of child labor, because if you do you will put an end to commerce with foreign nations." Could anything be more fantastic than a statement like that? I admit that there may be some further amendment needed if you adopt our amendments; but you have a chance in this bill to limit child labor. You will probably never reach the Palmer bill. Very likely it is not constitutional. You will never get it up by unanimous consent, as has been suggested. The situation is very puzzling. Here we have one gentleman—the chairman of the Committee on Labor—saying that he does not want to exclude the products of child labor, while the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] says that he, on the contrary, does want such a provision, but that he will not vote for it because the gentleman from Maryland, who does not want it, says that he is not going to vote for it.

I do not know whether it is constitutional or not to forbid the transportation of the manufactures of child labor. Formerly I believed that the courts would hold it unconstitutional. To-day I am by no means so sure. The courts have changed their views a good deal of recent years. My oath of office will not permit me to vote for a bill which I know to be contrary to the Constitution; but I believe that there is a fair chance that the courts would hold the Palmer antichild-labor bill constitutional. Therefore I shall vote for it if I get the chance.

Whether or not the Constitution gives us the right to exclude the manufactures of American child labor from transportation, at all events it gives us the right to prohibit the importation of manufactures on which children have been employed. Inasmuch as I believe that child labor ought to be suppressed, I give my vote to exclude the manufactures of child labor from importation into this country.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and section be concluded in five minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. We have another amendment on this side.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Well, I will make it 10 minutes. I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY]. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "prohibited," insert the following: "That the shipment or transportation in any manner or by any means whatsoever of any goods, wares, or articles of merchandise of any nature, kind, or description whatsoever, which, or any of the materials in which, are or have been made or manufactured in whole or in part by the labor of convicts or inmates of penitentiaries, prisons, jails, houses of correction, or reformatories, whether under contract or otherwise, from one State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or from any foreign country into any State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, which said goods, wares, or articles of merchandise are intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, disposed of, or in any manner used in violation of any law of such State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is hereby prohibited."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, on the 4th of this month the House passed a bill which provided that convict-made goods transported from one State into another should be subject to the laws of the State to which they were shipped. This pending bill provides for the prohibition of convict-made goods coming from foreign countries. The amendment I now offer prohibits the transportation of convict-made goods from one State to another. It seems to me that it is highly important and germane to this bill and that it ought to be adopted.

In my judgment, it is ten times more important in prohibiting convict-made goods going from one State to another than from coming in from foreign countries. It seems to me that what we want to-day is a law to prevent the States from shipping convict-made goods from one State to another. In other words, making States take care of their convicts and the products of their labor. We believe in Colorado in working them on the public roads and not manufacturing goods and shipping them into another State in competition with the free labor of that State. I have a bill, H. R. 4875, prohibiting the right of interstate transportation to the products of any mill, factory, or manufacturing establishment in which females employed are permitted to work more than 8 hours in any one day or more than 6 days or more than 48 hours in any one week; and if the Chairman holds that it is germane to this bill I intend to offer it as an amendment.

The amendment which I offered a few moments ago and which the Chairman ruled out on the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was my bill H. R. 4874, prohibiting the right of interstate transportation to the products of any factory or mine in which children under 14 years of age are employed or permitted to work.

The amendment which I now offer is my bill H. R. 4878, and which I hope will be adopted, as follows:

That the shipment or transportation in any manner or by any means whatsoever of any goods, wares, or articles of merchandise of any nature, kind, or description whatsoever, which, or any of the materials in which, are or have been made or manufactured in whole or in part by the labor of convicts or inmates of penitentiaries, prisons, jails, houses of correction, or reformatories, whether under contract or otherwise, from one State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or from any foreign country into any State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, which said goods, wares, or articles of merchandise are intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, disposed of, or in any manner used in violation of any law of such State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment in principle that was offered and that the Chair held not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill under consideration prohibits the importation of goods manufactured in a certain way by certain persons. This amendment provides for the transportation of goods between the States, and refers to domestic commerce, and therefore is not germane to the bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, to come in at the end of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

And all goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured in whole or in part by the labor of children under 14 years of age, or in the manufacture of which the labor of children under 14 years of age has been employed, either directly or indirectly, in any manner and for any purpose, or in the manufacture of which has been used any material prepared, manipulated, or assembled by children under 14 years of age,

and all wholly or partly manufactured articles, goods, wares, or merchandise, or wrappers, or containers, or attachments of merchandise, separately, or a part of any goods, wares, and merchandise upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of children under 14 years of age, shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. MANN. It is not subject to a point of order; it is more limited than the other amendment that the Chair held in order.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The subject has been disposed of by a vote of the House. The operation of this amendment would not be distinguished from the first one disposed of.

Mr. MANN. The first amendment, as the gentleman from Maryland stated, applied to all goods, and, as he claims, it applied to tea and coffee. It applied to all goods produced in the field. This amendment applies only to manufactured goods.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The last amendment applied to manufactured goods and was ruled out.

Mr. MANN. That is still another proposition. The mere fact, by the way, that the same substance might be contained in different language does not make an amendment subject to a point of order. This amendment is in the language of the bill, modified only by the fact that it applies to manufactured goods in which child labor is used in the manufacture of and in gathering and assembling the elements used in the manufacture of goods. It is not so broad as the other amendments which have been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say that in his opinion this amendment is, to all intents and purposes, the same as the amendment which the committee rejected a short time ago, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, the Chair does not undertake to say that the Chair determines whether two amendments are alike? That is not for the Chair to determine. That goes to the merits of a proposition. If, as the Chair has stated, two amendments are to all intents and purposes the same, then the Chair, having ruled the other amendment in order, must rule this one in order.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair begs to state to the gentleman from Illinois that it is not within the power of a member of the committee to keep offering the same amendment over and over again with but one meaning, though it may be in a little different language; it means the same thing.

Mr. MANN. It is within the power of a member of the committee, when he is recognized, to offer any amendment which is germane to the bill. This is not the language of the previous amendment, and the Chair can not undertake to say whether the committee prefers one form of language rather than another form of language. Here is the same proposition that may be involved in another proposed amendment. One gentleman offers an amendment in one form of language, and the committee does not determine to use that form of language. That fact does not prevent the same identical proposition, so far as the substance is concerned, from being offered in another amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman agree to the proposition that you could not offer the identical proposition that has been defeated?

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly you can not—not twice in the same day, at any rate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why is not this the same thing in principle?

Mr. MANN. Why, any one can see. Here is a question in reference to child labor. The committee voted upon one proposition. Objection was made to the form of the proposition. That was the main objection that was offered.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is just the gentleman's idea. The proposition was defeated upon its merits.

Mr. MANN. The proposition that was presented was defeated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I can not tell whether the committee will defeat the proposition when presented in a proper form, in the opinion of the committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. Can a gentleman simply change the form and present the same substantive proposition one time after another?

Mr. MANN. Certainly he can.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think he can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the first amendment was offered in connection with language already in the bill. The amendment which is now offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is in substance the same as the amendment offered before, omitting the particular language used at that particular time, but does not change the meaning of the amendment, and the Chair thinks that under the rules this amendment is not in order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated by the Chair, I most respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon that. The Chair has ruled that because an amendment was voted down in committee which reads, "Insert on page 1, line 4, after the word 'pauper,' the words 'by children under the age of 14 years,'" that, therefore, you can not offer an amendment, which the Chair says is the same in substance, at the end of the section, about 15 or 20 lines in length, possibly more, forbidding the importation of manufactured goods produced in whole or in part by the labor of children under 14 years of age. The Chair gives as his reason that the amendments are substantially the same. That is to say, the Chair passes on the language which the committee may desire to use. Whoever before heard that when you are endeavoring to perfect a bill, and you have a substantive proposition under consideration, that voting down one amendment in one form of language upon that subject precludes the opportunity to vote upon another form of language on the same subject? The Chair, a very distinguished Member of this House, upon reflection himself, I think, will see that his ruling is wrong. One is not required when an amendment is offered to offer all kinds of amendments or substitutes for that amendment. In fact, you are limited under the rules to the number of amendments which may be offered and which may be pending at one time to bring the matter before the committee. The committee votes down one form of language and then the Chair rules that a more restrictive form of language can not be presented to the committee or to the House, because the Chair thinks it is the same thing. The Members of the House should have the opportunity of determining whether it is precisely the same thing in meaning when the language is different. The Chair will not pretend to say that the language is the same because it is evident that one line is not precisely the language of 20 or 30 lines. Nor is the meaning the same. The first amendment, it was contended by the gentleman from Maryland, covered farm products. That was the main argument against the first amendment. Here is an amendment restricted to manufactured articles, and if the decision of the Chair shall stand as the decision of the committee and become the parliamentary practice in this body, Congress might as well adjourn the House as soon as it meets and let the Chair write the laws.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, there were two amendments dealing generally with this subject. The first one did deal with farm products, and we voted it down. The second one dealt with manufactured products, and was likewise voted down. The third one, as the Chair has stated, possesses the same effect as the second one, that has already received disposition at the hands of the committee. If a mere shifting from similes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 for dilatory purposes can be accomplished, then the House is unable to protect itself by any reasonable rule. Some authority must determine those matters, and the Chair, of course, is that authority, and I submit to the Chair that he ruled correctly in this matter and ought to be sustained.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the judgment of the Chair; but I think if the Chair had carefully examined this amendment, he would not have come to the conclusion that he did, nor has the gentleman from Maryland stated the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan applied to all goods, wares, and merchandise produced, and, as the gentleman from Illinois has well said, it was contended, and properly so, by the gentleman from Maryland that that would include products of the field as well as products of the factory. Then, later, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offered an amendment making it apply only to products of the factory; in other words, manufactured articles. Now comes the gentleman from Minnesota, and his amendment applies to products of the factory—in other words, manufactured products—and also, Mr. Chairman, all material entering into that product in which child labor has been employed; so I respectfully submit and state to the committee that this amendment is absolutely different from either the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan or

that proposed by the gentleman from Washington, and therefore I submit it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt. Those favoring the proposition that the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the committee will rise and stand until they are counted.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 72, noes 45.

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, has not the time expired for discussion of amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes remaining.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "prohibited," line 17, page 2, insert the following: "That all goods, wares, and merchandise produced in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or prison labor, or in the production of which convict, pauper, or prison labor has been employed, either directly or indirectly, in any manner and for any purpose, or in the production or manufacture of which has been used any material prepared, manipulated, or assembled by convict, pauper, or prison labor, and all materials, wholly or partly finished articles, goods, wares, or merchandise, or wrappers, or containers, or attachments of merchandise, separately, or a part of any goods, wares, and merchandise, all the foregoing upon which, or any part of which, has been employed in any manner the labor of convicts, or of prisoners confined in any jail, penal institution, workhouse, or other place of restraint, detention, or occupation permitted, established, and set aside to be utilized by or for criminals or detained persons in any foreign country, and whether the same be the product of the field, the quarry, or manufacturing establishment, any part of which, or the materials entering which, have been produced, created, manipulated, or manufactured at any state, in whole or in part, by convict, pauper, or prison labor, or by detained persons in any part of the United States, shall not be entitled to enter or be introduced, or attempted to be entered or introduced, into the commerce of the United States, and the entry or introduction thereof into the commerce of the United States is hereby prohibited."

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill; that the question has already been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. HARDWICK. As I understand the amendment the gentleman proposes that the language in this bill shall be applied to interstate commerce, is that correct?

Mr. RAKER. It uses the same language as applied to section 2.

Mr. HARDWICK. And applies to interstate commerce?

Mr. RAKER. No; the purpose is, section 2 of the bill prohibits any of these goods from being used in commerce of the United States, and after, under section 3, they may be forfeited. This provision is intended to make it mandatory that they are prohibited. After sections 2 and 3 are applied, it will exclude all foreign importations under section 1 as well as interstate commerce.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand the gentleman from California to say that he admits the amendment was to apply to the language of the bill as to interstate commerce. I take it that is what the amendment really is, and if so, it is undoubtedly not in order, because it is not germane. I can not tell from the gentleman's last statement to what it does apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to state the language here reads:

Or attempts to be entered or introduced into the commerce of the United States, and the entry or introduction thereof into the commerce of the United States is hereby prohibited.

The Chair thinks that means interstate commerce.

Mr. RAKER. Well, the real purpose of the amendment is to round out section 1 and to make that applicable to sections 2 and 3 of the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is it to make it interstate commerce?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that in a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just wanted to know.

Mr. RAKER. I will be specific in the matter. It means any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured in places prohibited in this section shall not enter the commerce of the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does that mean interstate commerce?

Mr. RAKER. That means foreign, interstate, and all.

Mr. HARDWICK. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I submit the time agreed to applied to debate as well as amendments on the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it applied to the debate.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Will there be any time for discussion of the amendment about to be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to state there are five minutes for debate on this section remaining. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "labor," insert "or labor employed for more than eight hours per day."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is not germane.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me for a moment on that?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Of course, the purpose of the amendment is to prevent the importation of goods on which labor abroad has been employed for more than eight hours a day. In order to argue the point of order it seems to be necessary to state the real purpose of the amendment.

If we have the power to bar goods that are made by convict labor or by children under 14 years of age, it seems to me we also have the power to bar goods made by convict labor or by child labor that is employed for more than eight hours per day. The committee has rejected the child-labor amendment, but nevertheless if foreign child labor is employed for more than eight hours a day, as we are informed it is in Italy, in Germany, and in Great Britain, it seems entirely proper for us to say that that foreign child-labor product shall not come into this country to compete with American labor that works eight hours a day. The whole purpose of this bill is to protect the labor of this country, the child labor as well as the full-grown labor, although it is said that child labor conflicts with full-grown labor.

Now, this House has had one or two opportunities to vote whether we should admit convict-made goods from abroad to compete with free-made goods in the United States. I contend that an amendment to a labor bill which proposes to limit the imports of the product of labor in foreign countries which come unfairly into competition with the labor of the United States is not only germane but is also wholesome. Here is a chance for our friends on the other side of the Chamber, who have just voted that they will permit child-made goods to come into the United States to compete with the free-labor products of the United States, to vote down foreign-made goods made by foreign children, convicts, or any other kind of labor that works more than eight hours a day. It was voted down in the tariff-bill discussion, but here is a chance to vote upon it again.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment is germane. I have stated what I want to say: This bill, in the interest of the labor of the United States, is to prevent certain kinds of goods passing between the States; and, if that is the purpose of the bill, surely we have a right to provide against unfair labor products coming in from foreign countries to compete with goods that pass between the States or that are sold wholly within the States.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment is not germane. It is not available under the rules of the House in regard to the consideration of this section—the 10 minutes within which all amendments and further debate must be restricted.

Mr. GARDNER. You can not shut off amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman from Maryland is correct in that the amendments must be limited to 10 minutes. The debate is limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I may not have succeeded in conveying my thoughts in words, but my idea was to have the debate, as well as the amendments, restricted to 10 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Such a motion as that would not be in order under the rules of the House. The gentleman can not shut off amendments.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair ruled upon the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled yet, but is likely to do so.

Mr. FOWLER. All right. I am very anxious to have him do so.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask that the gentleman's time be extended? I would like to know what he has to say in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no thoughts to offer with reference to the point of order. I know the Chair has made up his mind on that question. I am anxious to have a ruling.

Mr. MOORE. How do you stand on the 8-hour question? That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair makes the statement that this bill is to provide for the prohibiting of the importation of goods made by labor of certain classes in foreign countries, and this amendment provides that that labor must be employed for only eight hours a day. While the Chair begs to state he is in hearty sympathy with any eight-hour provision, yet, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, he feels constrained to sustain the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a new section to come in after section 1.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I submit it is now too late. The Clerk had proceeded to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is proper the amendment should be offered. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, after the word "prohibited," in line 3, by inserting the following section as a new section:

"That no goods, wares, articles, and merchandise, except immediate products of agriculture, forests, and fisheries, manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country, principally by children under 14 years of age, in countries where they have no laws regulating child labor, shall be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited. Any shipment consigned for entry at any of the ports of the United States of goods, wares, articles, and merchandise "——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish I could inform the gentleman what it is.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman may learn something if he hears the whole section read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman has a right to make a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not until the reading is over.

Mr. PAYNE. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the section shall be read.

Mr. MANN. What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PAYNE. No one knows.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman state what his point of order is. The gentleman made a point of order and I asked him what the point of order is. I think he should state his point of order.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not take me off the floor when I am asking him to state his point of order.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The point of order is that the subject matter has already been disposed of by the House.

Mr. PAYNE. It never has been disposed of. It is a new proposition.

Mr. MANN. I submit that that can not be determined until after it has been read.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Also that it is dilatory.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I insist that my amendment be read. It is not long, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, the Chair can not determine whether it is the same, even with the omnipresent knowledge that the Chair has, until it has been read. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman from Illinois seems to have known before it was read whether it was germane or not.

Mr. MANN. So did the Chair, and so did everybody else in the House, except the gentleman from Colorado. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We did not know what it was at all, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the remainder of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

except immediate products of agriculture, forests, and fisheries, manufactured in any foreign country, province, or dependency, where the industrial employment of children not regulated by law shall be accompanied by an affidavit of the shipper of such merchandise or his legal agent to the effect that the merchandise covered by the invoice has not been manufactured principally by children under 14 years of age, the form of the affidavit to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is also authorized and directed to issue such further regulations and to collect all information pertinent thereto through cooperation with the Consular Service of the United States as may be necessary for the enforcement of the provision.

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. If the gentleman from New York wants to make a speech, I will reserve my point.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I think the language is strictly in order. It is different from the other amendments that have been offered. It relates to the employment of children under 14 years of age. It proposes a method by which that is to be determined. It is entirely different from the other amendments that were said on that side of the House to be "crude and ill considered." [Laughter.] This provision was well considered. When I give the authority the gentlemen will all think so.

Mr. HOWARD. Go ahead and make your speech.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order made or reserved?

The CHAIRMAN. It is reserved, as the Chair understands, unless the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] makes the point of order.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PAYNE. Ordinarily I would be content to wait without attempting to make a speech.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how it is possible for the Chair to hold this amendment to be out of order. The Chair has ruled that an amendment relating to goods made by children under 14 years of age was in order on this bill, so far as concerns the importation of such goods. It is true that the Chair a while ago made an erroneous ruling, which he will take back on the first opportunity he gets hereafter [laughter], when he undertook to say that the Chair would determine whether one form of language was more suitable for a committee to adopt than another. Now, the point of order is made——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will it be in order to withdraw the point of order that I made?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I will do so, then.

Mr. MANN. I thought I would get results. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland withdraws his point of order.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I can borrow that amendment from the reporter, I would like to do so for a moment. It is the only copy I have.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It is not debatable, Mr. Chairman. The time for debate has been used up under the resolution adopted by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. This is a new section.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. This is not a new section. It is an amendment to the old section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that this is offered as a new section?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; as a new section—section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The first section has not been disposed of yet. There can not be a second section until the first has been disposed of.

Mr. PAYNE. The first section has been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the first section has been disposed of and no further amendments are offered to it, the offering of a new section would be in order.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. If that is the proposition, that is a different matter. I move now, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment be concluded in 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. That will not be in order until debate has been had.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that that will not be in order now.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and some others of the gentlemen who seem to have some severe qualms about an amendment being offered to this bill, I will say that I ought to have his and their support. When an amendment bearing some relation to this one was offered a few moments ago, the gentleman from Maryland said an amendment of that kind ought to be well considered; that it was dangerous to put it in a bill without having some committee consider it. I offer now

an amendment which has been well considered by a committee—not a committee of this House, but of the Senate—and it was put in as an amendment in the Senate to the blessed Underwood tariff bill that has created so much destruction in this country in the past few months. [Laughter on the Republican side.] This is one of the good amendments that you struck out. I do not know why it went out. I was an honorary member of the committee having it in charge [laughter], but only honorary.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes. I was not permitted to be present at the time it was discussed in the committee or in conference.

Mr. GARDNER. Did the gentleman say he was present at the seance?

Mr. PAYNE. I was not present.

Mr. GARDNER. He was not responsible for the manifestations? [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. No; not in the slightest degree. That fact takes away the whole objection that the gentleman made to another amendment similar to this, which was offered a few minutes ago; and which would relieve the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], who was speaking here a few moments ago, who thought this side of the House was trying to put on this bill some crude amendment in order to defeat the bill in another place. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] has had some worry about the danger of its being defeated in another place; but I offer an amendment that has been adopted in another place, so that there is no question about that.

I said I was not permitted to be present when this was considered in conference. I did not even hear the report of the Democratic caucus upon this amendment when they considered it before they came in here to vote. This is something that you had a right to consider some months ago. I am not going to accuse any of you of having ever considered either this or any other part of that tariff bill or the amendments of the Senate. I know your consciences were in the keeping of some one else as regards the greater part of that bill and the amendments of the Senate; but this amendment has been carefully considered in another place. Gentlemen, I want to tell you that this amendment would do the business. Why it was stricken out I do not know. I have heard some rumors that to satisfy some of the brethren it was stated that it would be taken up later and put into a new bill. The later time has come right now, and if it is ever going into a bill it ought to go into this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are considering this subject now. What better time can there be?

Now, do not think you are going to fool your people when you go home when they complain to you about this child-labor business. Why, this will satisfy even the statutes of Georgia, and no man can tell whether that means 7 years or 12 years or 14 years as the lowest limit of age. It will satisfy even the utmost limits of that. It is only a step in the right direction, to be sure, but it is in the right direction.

You can not fool the labor people about this proposition. It is up before you. Let us see if you will have a solid Democratic vote on that side, with the exception of the half dozen honorable men who voted independently; and I honor the men on that side who had the courage to stand up here in the face of this Democratic clamor to stand together and to follow some one somewhere else, to follow the invisible hand that guides legislation, and tells you what to do about matters great and small. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] Come up here and show your independence. When you go home to your people and your labor unions ask you how you stand on a 14-year child-labor bill, tell them how you came to vote against an amendment that was well considered in the Senate and put into the Underwood tariff bill, and that only went out because you wanted to wait until the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] could fix up some amendment that would cover it into a bill to be brought in here in the future. Vote it in now, gentlemen. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 43, noes 70.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEWIS of Maryland and Mr. PAYNE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported ayes 45, noes 68.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That if any consigner, seller, owner, shipper, importer, consignee, agent, or other person or persons shall enter or introduce, or attempt to enter or introduce, into the commerce of the United States any prison or pauper made goods, wares, and merchandise, as defined and covered by the provisions of section 1 of this act, such prohibited articles and the package or packages in which contained shall be seized and proceedings taken against the same as hereinafter prescribed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 4, strike out "consigner" and insert "consignor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That all goods, wares, and merchandise covered by section 1 of this act shall be liable to be proceeded against, probable cause having been shown, in any district court of the United States within the district where the same is found and seized, for confiscation by a process of libel for condemnation. And if any such goods, wares, and merchandise are condemned as being within the prohibition of this act, the same shall be forfeited to the United States of America and delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury for disposition as provided for in section 8 of this act.

The proceedings of such libel cases shall conform as near as may be to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any such case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit and in the name of the United States.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland what is meant by "pauper-made goods"?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Pauper-made goods are goods made by people in eleemosynary institutions who are maintained partly or in whole at public expense. The definition is in section 9 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That if any consignor, seller, owner, shipper, importer, consignee, agent, or other person or persons shall knowingly or with notice enter or introduce, or knowingly or with notice attempt to enter or introduce, into the commerce of the United States any goods, wares, or merchandise the importation of which is prohibited by this act, such person or persons shall, upon conviction, be fined for each offense a sum not exceeding $5,000, or be imprisoned for a time not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve merchandise so prohibited from seizure and disposition as elsewhere provided by law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 6, strike out the words "or with notice" and insert the words "and fraudulently."

The amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 7, strike out the words "or with notice" and insert the words "and fraudulently."

The amendment was agreed to.

[Mr. SMITH of Minnesota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the arrival of any goods, wares, and merchandise prohibited by this act within the territorial limits of the United States with the intent to land, or the existence of any other facts constituting a violation of this act, shall be deemed an attempt to enter and import: *Provided*, That when probable cause is shown any collector of customs that entry of any such goods, wares, and merchandise is attempted, he shall refuse entry thereof until the owner, consignee, agent, or claimant of such goods shall personally appear before him and subscribe to a declaration on entry that the merchandise is not prohibited by this act, the form of which declaration shall be prescribed and promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Maryland if he does not think that it may sometimes work a hardship to require the owner, consignee, agent, or claimant of such goods to personally appear and subscribe to a declaration on entry?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The gentleman is referring to the requiring of affidavits?

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It simply provides that when probable cause is shown any collector of customs that entry of any such goods, wares, and merchandise is attempted, he shall refuse entry thereof until the consignee, agent, or claimant of such goods shall personally appear before him and subscribe to a declaration that the merchandise is not prohibited by this act, and so forth.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Does that mean that the person whose name is in the bill of lading must appear?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It might be any of these parties, the owner, consignee, or agent, and that might be an attorney.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Assume this situation, that it was not consigned to the agent.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. It might be consigned to any party; the agent or owner or consignee would be entitled to present the case on behalf of the goods.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Maryland a question, and I move to strike out the last word. I do not know how it strikes the other members of the committee, but I call the attention of the gentleman from Maryland to this language:

That the arrival of any goods, wares, or merchandise prohibited by this act within the territorial limits of the United States with the intent to land.

You can not ascribe the intent to goods.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The implication is that that is the general purpose under which the goods are moving, that it contains the intent.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the goods do not contain the intent?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman that this bill has been passed upon by the Treasury authorities, and we have taken the best advice and counsel with respect to its language that we can find.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have great deference for the opinion of the officials of the Treasury Department, but it seems to me that this language incorporated in this section is very awkward. If it has been submitted to the Treasury officials and meets with their approval, however, I do not care to press the matter.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. They made some corrective suggestions and let this clause stand.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, whenever goods, wares, and merchandise have been delivered to him pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this act, to dispose of the same by donation to the American National Red Cross, or other national charitable organization, to be by such organization disposed of free of charge and without sale: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall have authority to destroy any of the goods described in this bill if, in his judgment, such goods were made by persons affected with disease or diseases capable of being transmitted to those using the goods under the provisions of this section.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 24, strike out the word "bill" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what reason there is, after goods are confiscated for violation of the terms of this act, that the goods shall be given away instead of being disposed of as other goods that are confiscated by the Government are disposed of and the proceeds turned into the Treasury?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. The reason, I think, is fundamental. The object of the legislation is to remove an element of unfair competition present in convict or pauper made goods. If the Treasury, after condemning the property, were to sell it at public sale, that element of unfair competition would be repeated, because the goods would be sold below the normal cost of manufacture, and thus would enter into mischievous competition with our products.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Let me ask the gentleman if the goods are donated to any society or charitable organization, do they not take the place of just that quantity of goods, no matter by what kind of labor those goods are made?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. In some possible instances that might be true, but it has been the opinion that a charitable association such as the Red Cross has a great many more demands than it has purchasing power, and that, in their hands, these goods would be used for charitable purposes, and would not become as a matter of fact elements of competitive force.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Suppose you carry this doctrine to its legitimate conclusion. There are other laws under which property being illegally used is confiscated. The law provides that the property shall be sold and the proceeds turned into the Treasury of the United States. For violation of the oleomargarine laws, under certain conditions, the goods are sold, and that certainly comes in competition with people who are obeying the law, and yet the Congress has not gone so far as to say that rather than put these goods on the market we will just give them away. I think the gentleman is carrying the doctrine of competition too far.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Is it the gentleman's argument that we should not take any step at all in this connection unless we could make it complete and applicable to all instances where the Government has property for sale in its hands derelicto?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I do not apprehend that there are going to be very many confiscations under this law, and that any very great harm will be done to the commerce of the country if a few goods are sold because they are condemned for violating the law. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That the term "pauper," as used in this act, shall be limited to those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at the public expense in whole or in part.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "part," add the words "and to adults who receive wages at the rate of less than $1 for each day while working, whether paid by the day, the piece, or otherwise."

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The bill, in section 1, endeavors to prohibit the importation into this country of goods made in whole or in part by convict, prison, or pauper labor. A good many inquiries have been made during the day as to what the term "pauper labor" means. What one gentleman says is pauper labor another gentleman says is not pauper labor. The committee therefore proposed to define pauper labor by a definition.

Now, if it is within the power of the committee to consider that definition at all, it is within the power of the committee to make a definition of pauper labor. It is within the power of the committee to say that pauper labor shall be anything except the labor of millionaires, and it is equally within the power of the committee to say that pauper labor shall be as it is in fact—pauper labor. If the definition were not in the bill, it is quite probable that a motion by way of amendment would not be in order to define it, and that we would be left to determine what "pauper" means. But here is the definition in the bill. It is that the term "pauper" refers to those who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at public expense, in whole or in part. That covers everybody in a hospital who is maintained in whole or in part at public expense. That covers everybody in a soldiers' home; that covers everybody in a deaf and dumb asylum or a blind asylum; that covers everybody in an eleemosynary institution, although in fact it may be an institution where they are paying to be retained there. Now, that definition going away outside of the ordinary definition of a pauper, it is within the power of the committee to add to the definition, and it is certainly germane to the definition.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the word "pauper" has a legal significance. The English language imputes to its use well-understood relations for the individual. He is an individual who has to be maintained at public expense. Now, not only must he be such an individual, but under section 9 of this bill he must be "held" or "confined" in an eleemosynary institution. To seek to fix the wages of all the human beings on this planet, some fifteen hundred millions outside of ourselves, by an unconsidered amendment like this, would be simply grotesque in any situation where Republican politics are not involved. I dismiss the amendment with that suggestion.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LLOYD. May I ask the gentleman from Maryland: Does he mean to confine "pauper" to those in eleemosynary institutions? Is it not true that in the United States we have a number of paupers who are not in an eleemosynary institution?

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. In the legal sense of the word a pauper is one being sustained at public expense. Now, ordinarily he may be in his own house or in somebody else's house, but under this section he must also be held or confined in some eleemosynary institution.

Mr. LLOYD. I am getting at that point. Now, a man in a private house who is kept by his relatives or his friends is a pauper——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. He is not a pauper in the legal sense of the word. He is not a pauper unless he be kept in whole or in part at public expense.

Mr. LLOYD. If he is maintained by members of his family, in whole or in part, in the event he was not able to maintain himself, then he would not be a pauper in that sense, but if he is in a private home and maintained by members of a community in that private home he is just as much a pauper as he would be if he were on the county farm, in the county infirmary, or any eleemosynary institution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the Chair's attention to the only rule of this House which relates to germaneness. The rule reads as follows:

And no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Is the gentleman's proposed amendment different from the subject under consideration? No. On the contrary, section 9 of this bill relates only to one question, and what is that question? Section 9 is solely devoted to answering a conundrum, to wit, What is a pauper? Section 9 proceeds to define the word "pauper," so that there shall be no mistake in the interpretation of this law. It makes no difference what a pauper may signify in common parlance. Section 9 supersedes common parlance. It defines the meaning of the word "pauper" as used in this bill, not in some other bill. The rule of germaneness requires that an amendment must affect the particular subject which is under consideration.

The matter now under consideration is section 9 of this bill. Section 9 provides that the term "pauper" as used in this act shall be limited to those persons who are held or confined in eleemosynary institutions at public expense in whole or in part. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois seeks to enlarge that limitation; nothing more. It does not matter how foolish the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois may be; it does not matter how impossible it may be to determine what wages are in a foreign country, the vortex of order does not engulf the wisdom or the foolishness of an amendment. It relates only to its parliamentary aspect. Mr. Chairman, originally parliamentary law never prohibited amendments which were not germane. The requirement of germaneness for amendments is of comparatively recent growth in parliamentary law. Formerly no point of order against an amendment would lie simply because the amendment was not germane to the matter under debate. Any amendment could be offered, whether germane or not. In the course of time it was found necessary to limit the power of amendment so that new questions might not suddenly be thrust upon the House. For that reason this rule was adopted, that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois seeks merely to amplify the definition which we ordain for the word "pauper" as it is used in this bill. Can anyone contend that such an amendment or proposition is "on a subject different from that under consideration?"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to say that section 9 of the bill is to define what a pauper is for the purpose of the act, and, as the Chair views it, however ridiculous any amendment might appear to be, that is not the question to be taken into consideration by the Chair in deciding whether this amendment is in order or not. And, taking the view of the subject that this is a definition of the term "pauper," the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I understand the purport of this amendment is to include nine-tenths of the laborers of all other lands as paupers, because, I guess, the proportion is not much below for those who get a dollar or less a day, excepting, perhaps, England and the Australian colonies.

Now, the suggestions that have been made earlier in the discussion are entirely apposite to this amendment. We should not be able to import many of the actual necessaries of life into this country, articles which can only be produced in other countries and other climates, if this amendment were to prevail. It surely would without any consideration strike down nearly all of our foreign commerce. I earnestly hope that the Members of the House, instead of making politics and endeavoring to develop political advantages at the expense of this serious effort at legislation, will vote this amendment down.

Mr. Chairman, I move now that all further discussion of this section and amendments thereto be restricted to five minutes from this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to detain the committee at this late hour in the afternoon on an amendment that every man in the committee ought to be able to determine upon by the reading of it. I am in favor of protecting the American laborer and the American manufactured article from the unfair competition of the cheap and debased labor of foreign lands. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there left?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I would not take up any time at this late hour were it not for the fact that I can look out over my own country and find labor in America in many instances toiling for long hours on a wage below a dollar a day.

Ah, some of you say "where"? Do you come from the canneries anywhere in the United States? If you do, I invite your attention to the condition of the women, girls, and boys who are laboring there from 10 to 17 hours a day on a wage of less than a dollar a day; yes, from four to five dollars a week.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I simply want to say that the gentleman is mistaken about the State of Washington. There is no such wage paid there, and no such hours are exacted.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know where the gentleman comes from except what he says about it. [Laughter.] But I do know that the reports on labor in the canneries of America show that the people work there for long hours—as much as 17 hours a day—at a wage less than a dollar a day, and I invite all doubting Thomases to a careful perusal of these reports.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is always interesting on certain occasions. [Laughter.] He reminds me of a story I once heard told of an old gentleman who had never seen a telescope. An itinerant vender of this wonderful instrument appeared at his door late one evening and requested lodging for the night, which was cheerfully granted. While his good wife was preparing supper her husband learned that his guest was selling hand telescopes. The old gentleman never had heard of a telescope before, and he made anxious inquiry concerning its construction and use. The itinerant vender exhibited his sample and explained its wonderful magnifying powers and the splendid opportunities it afforded in the study of astronomy, telling him that it would make the moon look a hundred times larger than its ordinary size and bring it close enough to reach with his hand. The old gentleman became much interested and implored his guest to give him an opportunity to test the accuracy of this marvelous statement. The moon soon rose in the heavens to the proper height for a good view. The itinerant vender adjusted it properly on the moon and the old gentleman took a look at it. He was perfectly charmed with its wonderful revelations. The moon appeared to be so much larger and so much nearer than usual. He grasped the telescope in his left hand, reaching out with his right, as if to lay his hand on it, and began to walk toward it, and while under the spell of the new revelations he unguardedly wandered beyond the premises into a patch of weeds close by and fell into an old deserted cistern and was drowned. The next day at his funeral, which was largely attended, his wife did not appear to be very much depressed and showed but little signs of grief, but his two grown daughters were heartbroken and seemed to be perfectly distracted. One of them on observing the unconcerned demeanor of her mother went up to her, weeping bitterly, and threw her arms around her neck and said, "Oh, mother, isn't it perfectly awful, the way in which father met his death?" The mother looked down at her daughter and said, "Gertrude, I don't think it makes very much difference. If your father had been looking after things closer to home he would be alive now." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, if my colleague from Illinois had been looking after things closer to home during his long service in Congress he might have some excuse for trying to regulate the wages of labor in foreign countries. He plays politics instead of statesmanship. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. That is very smart, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "part," insert "and to adults who receive wages at the rate of less than 50 cents for each day while working, whether paid by the day, the piece, or otherwise."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this act, and to annually report to Congress all violations of and

prosecutions under this act, together with his decisions and recommendations in regard thereto.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14330) to prohibit the importation and entry of goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by convict, pauper, or detained labor, or made in whole or in part from materials which have been made in whole or in part or in any manner manipulated by convict or prison labor, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 4145. An act to authorize the government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. I.;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 4019. An act to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek, in Pike County, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 19, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 474) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LINTHICUM, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 381) relating to the third Hague conference, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 416), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PROUTY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12873) relating to the assessment for taxation of real estate in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 417), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BORCHERS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14738) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 414), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSSON: A bill (H. R. 14739) creating the National Park of the Cliff Cities; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14740) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Red Bank, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 14741) to provide for a survey and estimate of cost of removing Adams Island, located in the channel of the Hudson River at Troy, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida (by request): A bill (H. R. 14742) to establish and maintain a permanent force of park policemen for the protection of the White House and grounds and the Federal parks in the District of Columbia, under the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 14743) to prohibit the free transportation of private cars by railroad companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14744) for increase of cost of a site for post-office building in the city of Wadesboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14745) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Sanford, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14746) for increase of cost of a site for a post-office building in the city of Rockingham, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14747) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14748) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 14749) to create an interstate trade commission, to prohibit and prevent unfair competition, and to protect commerce against monopolies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14750) providing for the manner in which the Official Register of the United States shall be published, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Printing.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BORCHERS: A bill (H. R. 14738) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 14751) granting an increase of pension to S. Augustus Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 14752) granting a pension to James E. Forshee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 14753) for the relief of George B. Gardiner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14754) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14755) granting an increase of pension to Orrin S. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 14756) granting a pension to William Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14757) granting a pension to Parker Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14758) granting a pension to Sarah K. Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14759) granting a pension to Elvina Hemphill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14760) granting a pension to William Higombottom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14761) granting a pension to John H. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14762) granting a pension to Naomi Landers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14763) granting a pension to Samuel D. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14764) granting a pension to Elizabeth Luck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14765) granting a pension to Annie McCaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14766) granting a pension to Mary N. McCollough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14767) granting a pension to C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14768) granting a pension to Isaac West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14769) granting a pension to Cornelia B. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14770) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14771) granting an increase of pension to David Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14772) granting an increase of pension to Hattie D. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14773) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Statler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14774) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Turneaure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14775) for the relief of Hiram B. Hatton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14776) for the relief of Thomas McClure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14777) for the relief of Elbert Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 14778) granting an increase of pension to Michael Gannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 14779) granting a pension to Ella V. Temple; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 14780) granting an increase of pension to Judy A. Turley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14781) granting an increase of pension to James P. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14782) granting an increase of pension to Morton B. Fitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14783) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rahelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14784) granting a pension to Melinda Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 14785) pensioning the survivors of certain Indian wars from the year 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14786) granting a pension to Julia T. Nickerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 14787) granting a pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14788) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14789) granting an increase of pension to John D. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14790) granting an increase of pension to Woodson S. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14791) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Personett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14792) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14793) granting an increase of pension to John B. Shaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14794) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 14795) for the relief of Theodore Herbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 14796) granting a pension to Lois A. Bentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14797) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14798) granting a pension to George W. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petitions of sundry citizens of Muncie and Bluffton and various Methodist Episcopal churches of Monroe and Decatur, all in the State of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of 432 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 24 citizens of Plain Township, Wayne County, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of 48 citizens, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 43 citizens, of Baughman Township, Wayne County, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the 300 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Coshocton, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Homestead and Mount Oliver Borough, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the South Side Presbyterian Church Sunday School, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Petitions of Charles J. Frank and 2,016 others, of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 16 citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, and 60 citizens of Lockland, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petitions of sundry citizens of West Virginia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petitions of M. P. Church, of Hardingville; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clayton; 52 citizens of Salem; and the First Presbyterian Church, of Salem, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. M. Crouch, of New York City, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Brookiyn Standard Union Chapel of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, and of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Winfield, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the New York State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring passage of Owen-Goeke bill to eliminate fraud in time guaranties on gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petitions by various members of Local Union No. 174, Brewery Workers, of Red Wing, Minn., protesting against House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, which resolutions provide for nation-wide prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and importation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: Petition of the Union Sabbath School, of Upper Black Eddy, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petitions of Thomas F. Lavin and others of the State of Connecticut, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Alex Engblom and others of Shelton, Conn., favoring bill for erection of monument to memory of John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 50 members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Quenemo, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Petition of F. W. McKnight, T. M. Morgan, G. W. Rasmusen, and 29 other citizens of Ranger Lake, Cienega, and Estancia, all in the State of New Mexico, praying for the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, and the Presbyterian Church, of Osborn, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of New York, favoring House bill 11648, providing

for erection of a statue to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Piedmont, and vicinity, State of Ohio, and the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the United Mine Workers of America, favoring investigation of mining troubles in Colorado and release of Mother Jones from military prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Division 9, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Newburyport, Mass., against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of two citizens of Versailles, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against clause in House bill 12928, relative to sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of E. A. Wedgwood Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Salt Lake Stock and Mining Exchange, stating reasons for protesting against the bill to prevent the use of the mails and of the telephone and telegraph in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 11522; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Stewart Greer Lumber Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring McKellar bill, relative to shipping by water; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Shaw-Dundee Improvement Association, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring Senate bill 4041; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Lafayette Bank, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Hess & Culbertson Jewelry Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 2972, relative to abolishing time guaranties on gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Memorial of the local branch of the American Continental League of Ansonia, Conn., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the Grand Army Post at Wapello, Iowa, protesting against pensioning Confederate veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Presbyterian Standard, of Charlotte, N. C., protesting against increase of rates on religious publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the General Hancock Branch of the American Continental League of Providence, R. I., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petition of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: Petition from citizens of San Francisco and Richmond, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 9674, relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Cooks and Waiters' Alliance, the Brotherhood of Teamsters, the United Brotherhood of Leather Workers, of Oakland, and residents of Oakland, Alameda, and Berkeley Counties, all in the State of California, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., opposing the passage of House bill 8753; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petitions of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade and the Pomona Grange, No. 30, at Big Run, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of John H. Foster, Julius Rastetter, W. C. Hahn, A. C. Hahn, Clint F. Rose, Ernst F. Illing, L. E. Long, Netter Worthington, Edward N. Hill, Herman C. Frick, Paul J. Scheller, F. Mansom Gilbert, F. J. Schlotter, F. R. Corn, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Cutler Bros. and other citizens of West Hartford, Conn., in favor of legislation in behalf of farm-land mortgage finance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Irish-American Societies of Connecticut, of Ansonia, Conn., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Doctor Theodore Herzel Lodge, No. 183, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, protesting against the Burnett immigration bill, H. R. 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to work on Sunday in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring the bill proposing to submit national prohibition question to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POST: Petitions of 45 citizens of Bloomingburg and 32 citizens of Springfield, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Letters from Jesse Sierra, J. E. Gould, T. L. Stort, A. G. McAllister, D. M. Cartwright, George M. Marks, Joseph Sanginnetti, Roy T. Whitt, C. J. Chenoweth, C. W. Bolten, W. E. Hoskin, James M. Inlow, C. O. Reid, E. H. Sherman, W. Punter, William Lewis, J. E. Reade, William A. Gibbons, Joseph Gandolfs, C. W. Howes, B. A. Valverde, Louis A. Antonini, Philip J. Elsey, F. M. Dunn, and F. R. La Font, all of Sonora, Cal., protesting against House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from J. W. Montague, of Loyalton, Cal., protesting against House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters from E. M. Wynn and Mrs. Alice Wynn, of Standard, Cal., protesting against House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Local No. 8, Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, etc., of Meriden, Conn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Irish-American societies of Connecticut, protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the Presbyterian Church and citizens of Atlantic Highlands, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also petitions of William Britton and others, of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of 35 citizens of Idaho, protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Baptist Church, and the First Presbyterian Church, all of Pontiac, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petitions of sundry citizens of South Orange, N. J., protesting against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of 80 members of the Curtis Brotherhood of the Morningside Baptist Church, and Young

People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Baptist Church, of Pittsfield, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petitions of various associations and citizens of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, and of Mayham Lutheran Church, of Johnstown, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of 61 citizens of Massillon, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition signed by Mr. Frank Schreiber, of Zanesville, Ohio, and some 30 others, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Mr. J. S. Danford and 25 others, of Caldwell, Ohio, favoring the constitutional amendment for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14736) granting a pension to James A. Dowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of C. K. Easterday and 35 other citizens of Delaware, Ohio, in favor of the enactment of legislation to extend the authority of the Federal Government over nonnavigable watercourses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 19, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for all the processes of law and all the order of civil government which constitute us a Nation of freemen. Our slavery would be galling indeed, if we were the slaves of circumstance. We pray Thee to deliver us from that meaningless life, a life driven in bondage under the circumstances of life, which must be our fate unless we are controlled and guided and governed by the hand of God and under the guidance of a divine Providence. We pray that we may be free indeed with that freedom which Thou dost give, that we may in the realm of truth be above the processes of law and enjoy that freedom which is kinship with God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### EMPLOYMENT OF CONVICTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce stating that with reference to a letter from the Department of Commerce dated March 13, transmitting a report from the American consul general at London, England, in regard to the employment of convicts in foreign countries, the department incloses a communication from the consular officer in question which should have accompanied the letter above referred to, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Union County, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Baptist Church of West Hoboken, N. J., and of the congregations of the Friends' Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gillespieville, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the International Reform Bureau of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ulster County, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THORNTON presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nome, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the North Dakota Total Abstinence Association, of Waddock; of the congregation of the Baptist Church at Lidgerwood, and of sundry citizens of McKinock, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHILTON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of 75 citizens of Tyro, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a large number of memorials from approximately 2,000 citizens of Newark, Essex County, N. J., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages. I ask that the memorials may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented petitions of sundry citizens of German Valley, of the Temple Baptist Church of Plainfield, and the First Baptist Church of Hoboken; of sundry citizens of Dover, Plainfield, Arlington, Chatham, Flemington, Croton, Rockaway, Atlantic Highlands, and Haddon Heights; of the Baptist Church of Croton; the Presbyterian Church of Atlantic Highlands; the Methodist Protestant Church of Hardingville; the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Arlington; the Trinity Methodist Protestant Church, of Atlantic City; the Hightstown Presbyterian Church, of Hightstown; of sundry citizens of Bloomfield, Glen Ridge, Hightstown, and Trenton; of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Metuchen; of the Fifth District Sunday School Association, of Camden; the Pilesgrove Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Woodstown; the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Red Bank; the Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal Church, of Camden; the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Millville; the Broad Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Burlington; the Presbyterian Church of Boundbrook; the First Holland Reformed Church, of Passaic; the Finesville Methodist Episcopal Church, of Finesville; the Presbyterian Church of Pleasant Grove; the Presbyterian Church of Schooleys Mountain; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ridgewood; the Baptist and Methodist Churches of Windsor; the Men's Club of the Baptist Church of Orange; and the First Methodist Protestant Church of Bridgeton, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the West Side Presbyterian Church, of Englewood, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newark, East Orange, and Perth Amboy, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Trenton, Union, Weehawken, Mercerville, Hamilton Square, Elizabeth, Passaic, Jersey City, Hoboken, West Hoboken, North Bergen, West New York, Union Hill, and Bayonne, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of Freja Lodge, No. 17, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Hartford, and of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Plantsville and the Church of the Good Shepherd, Norwich, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMAS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Denver, Victor, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Trinidad, Rifle, and Leadville, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEE of Maryland presented memorials of sundry citizens of Maryland, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by the Methodist Episcopal, Protestant Episcopal, and Congregational Churches of Buffalo, Wyo., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gloucester, Rockport, Manchester, and Essex, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination in prices and to provide for publicity of prices to dealers and to the public, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENYON presented memorials of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs, of Dubuque, and of sundry citizens of Dubuque and Muscatine, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Plymouth County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of Cooks' Helpers' Union No. 110, of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of an admendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation giving the manufacturer of proprietary articles the right to make resale price on same, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Riverside, Cal., remonstrating against the repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the Missionary Society of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, of Sacramento, Cal., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the so-called Kahn Act, relating to exhibits at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a petition of the Municipal League of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Jose, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated employees of the civil service, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Meriden, Conn., and a memorial of the board of directors of the First National Bank of Wallingford, Conn., remonstrating against the enforced dismemberment of the New Haven Railroad, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Freja Lodge, No. 17, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of the Local Union Twin City Sign Writers, of Minneapolis; of the Minnesota Turnbezirk, of Minneapolis; and of sundry citizens of Red Wing, Goodhue, Mazeppa, Lake City, Belle Chester, and Marshall, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of Morning Light Grange, No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of Monroe, Me., and a petition of Augusta Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Augusta, Me., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of sundry druggists of Augusta, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination in prices and to provide for the publicity of prices to the dealers and to the public, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OWEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Morrison and Glencoe, in the State of Oklahoma, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I present a memorial and ask that it may be read. It is on the subject of Panama Canal tolls, and contains a very good statement of some phases of that question. At some later time—not now—I shall speak upon the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the East and West alike demand the freedom from tolls for our coastwise ships passing through the Panama Canal, because we have long suffered from excessive transportation charges of transcontinental railroads, and it is obvious should American coastwise ships be compelled to pay tolls, the possibilities of a competing line of commerce will be hampered, and we shall still be at the mercy of railroad corporations and will be compelled to pay in the future the present maximum transportation charges, which have worked untold hardships upon us in the past; and

Whereas the repeal from the statute books of the United States of the law exempting American coastwise ships from tolls is demanded by Canadian railroads, which are supported by American transcontinental lines, who endeavor to accomplish through diplomacy what they failed to obtain in Congress; and

Whereas the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade having been indorsed at the polls two years ago by over 10,000,000 voters, a majority of the voting population of this Republic, is therefore the constitutionally expressed will of the American people; and

Whereas the Panama Canal is the achievement of the United States alone, being built entirely with American money, American effort and enterprise, it is therefore a domestic possession of the United States by virtue of property rights in the Canal Zone, fully established by purchase; and

Whereas the control of the canal is vital to the interests of the United States and involves the honor of the country, since a stipulation in treaty arrangements between this country and Panama except matters in which a third nation is involved; and

Whereas it is inconceivable to the American people and highly incompatible to our honor and integrity as a nation to be called upon by pro-British pseudo statesmen to repeal a statute relating to our domestic affairs at the behest of a foreign Government: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Valley Central Grange, No. 343, Patrons of Husbandry, goes on record strenuously opposing the repeal of the statute granting American coastwise ships exemption from tolls in passing through the Panama Canal; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Agricultural Grange News, Kent Journal and Advertiser for publication.

C. S. FOLLETTE, *Worthy Master.*
VICTOR TONNASON, *Secretary.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

### CONTRACTS OF NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there are a number of bills pending in each House seeking to reach the kind of business conducted in the exchanges, and especially in the New York Cotton Exchange. I desire to present to the Senate two letters which bear upon this pending legislation, together with resolutions passed by bodies of men interested in the subject.

I wish to say just a word in connection with what I find to be the condition as reported in yesterday's morning papers. It appears that the New York Cotton Exchange is selling, or

was selling day before yesterday, March cotton at 12.54 cents per pound. This was middling cotton. It was selling July middling cotton of the same character at 11.77 cents per pound. In point of fact no new cotton comes in by July; only the cotton now in existence can be delivered then, and the burden is upon the man holding the cotton of carrying it until July. It is worth really about 10 points more in July than it is in March, and yet by some legerdemain of management the New York Cotton Exchange sells July at 69 points less than March, though it is worth from 10 to 15 points more than March, for it costs the interest on the value of the cotton, together with the expense of warehousing and insurance to carry cotton from March to July.

Again, spot middling cotton day before yesterday was selling in New York at 13.20, and the exchange was selling professedly the same cotton at 12.50, or 70 points less than the actual cotton was selling on the streets. It is to their system of manipulation, their system of unfair tender of the inferior graded cotton and arbitrary estimates of the differences in value between the cotton tendered and the cotton sold in settlement of their sales that enables them thus to manipulate the market and to nominally sell middling cotton at a price far below its real value. By this course the New York Cotton Exchange injures two classes of people—the producer, who has his cotton to sell, injuring him through creating a fictitiously depreciated market price for his cotton, and again the manufacturer, who, when he is selling his cloth, is confronted with what appears to be the real value of cotton fixed by the New York Cotton Exchange, when, in point of fact, the manufacturer must pay more for his cotton. The time has come when this conduct must stop or the New York Cotton Exchange should be deprived of the use of the mails and should be driven out of interstate commerce. I desire to keep this subject before the Senate, and I trust we may pass a bill before we adjourn this summer.

I send to the desk the letters and resolutions to be read. I ask first that a letter from the president of the Bibb Manufacturing Co., of Macon, Ga., with accompanying resolutions, may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MACON, GA., *February 26, 1914.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: You have doubtless received copy of some resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Hard Yarn Spinners' Association at Gastonia, N. C., on February 18, with reference to regulating the contract of the New York Cotton Exchange.

While we do not fully indorse everything contained in these resolutions, we are in sympathy with their general purpose.

If the interests of those of us who are concerned with the growing and manufacture of cotton in the United States are to be protected, it is necessary that something be done in the way of regulating the form of contracts on our cotton exchanges, and particularly in New York. We think that some standard classification of cotton should be obligatory on all exchanges, and that this be so arranged that the real value of cotton tendered on contract on any exchange should be controlled by the price that such grade of cotton could be sold for readily in the market where such contract originates and where the cotton is tendered on the day of tender. In other words, it should be so that cotton delivered to a buyer on contract—in New York, for instance—could be sold immediately in New York by this buyer at the price he pays for it under the contract.

The result of such an arrangement would be to legitimatize and commercialize the cotton contract and remove it from the realm of pure speculation. As it now stands, in New York particularly, their contract is so fixed that a legitimate purchaser on the exchange who has bought a contract for the purpose of hedging a sale of goods can be sandbagged with cotton which he does not want, can not use, and can not resell in New York at the price he must pay for it under the contract. In actual practice the New York Cotton Exchange proves to be simply a big "bucket shop."

If the cotton exchanges could be commercialized as above indicated, along the lines of the Chicago Board of Trade in the matter of wheat contracts, as we understand it, the purpose desired would be accomplished. If a buyer were delivered a grade of cotton which he did not want and could not use, it could only be delivered to him at a price at which he could actually resell it at the moment of delivery.

It would seem to us that this could be accomplished and allow delivery of cotton grading nothing below a good style of good ordinary and nothing better than good middling, present American classification, leaving the contract more flexible than is proposed by the resolutions first referred to.

We think that some legislation along the lines above suggested is of vital importance and should receive early consideration at the hands of Congress. Should you desire any further information that we can furnish, we would be pleased to put our resources at your command.

Yours, very truly,

BIBB MANUFACTURING CO.,
E. T. COMER, *President.*

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Hard Yarn Spinners' Association, Gastonia, N. C., February 18, 1914.

Whereas the spinning mills of the country are suffering loss on account of the disparity between New York cotton quotations and the price of actual cotton, which quotations are misleading and confusing to the trade: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this association that the present system of the New York Cotton Exchange relative to the great number of grades of cotton that can be applied for delivery on contracts is detrimental to the best interests of the farmer, manufacturer, and cotton merchant, and this should be so changed that a specific grade should be stipulated in all contracts, and that not more than three grades shall be deliverable on a contract, and these to be not more than one grade above and one grade below the stipulated grade; that the purchaser not be confined to buying a contract based on middling, as at present, but have the option of buying any grade desired, with the usual differential in price.

*Resolved further*, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to enact some law for the regulation of the cotton exchanges which will afford relief from these hurtful conditions.

To-day's market price for cotton is 12.90, while actual spot cotton in the South is 14 cents. We want the market quotations to reflect actual values.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Here is one other letter, which is short, on the same subject, that I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUGUSTA, GA., *February 26, 1914.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We are taking the liberty of sending you herewith a newspaper clipping in regard to a resolution adopted by the Vicksburg (Miss.) Cotton Exchange condemning the contract system now in use by the New York Cotton Exchange. We heartily indorse the action of the Vicksburg Cotton Exchange, and respectfully ask your cooperation in the effort to secure the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges in this country to adopt a contract system that will be fair and right; one that will serve the interests of the legitimate cotton trade, and not the one devised to promote and encourage speculation.

Yours, truly,

THE JOHN P. KING MFG. CO.,
LANDON A. THOMAS, *President.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to have the resolutions accompanying the letter appear in the RECORD for reference and use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without reading?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is not necessary to read them.

There being no objection, the resolution referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Vicksburg Cotton Exchange condemning the contract system in use by the New York Cotton Exchange, and petitioning their Representatives in Congress to try to secure the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges of this country to adopt fairer and better methods governing trading in cotton contracts.

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange the form of future contract in use by the New York Cotton Exchange constitutes nothing more than a medium for gambling; that it does not represent the real value of cotton as established in the spot-cotton markets of the world; that it absolutely fails to provide a safe, trustworthy, or legitimate hedge; and that through its form and application, both unfair and arbitrary, it lends itself to gambling operations by large dealers, to the detriment and demoralization of the entire cotton trade; and

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange the future contract of the New York Cotton Exchange is devoid of the essentials of a fair, just, and correct contract; that in placing in the hands of men of large capital the power to dominate the cotton market, whose operations unsettle and depress business, it is used to the great injury of the general cotton trade; and

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange a fair, just, and commercial future contract should contain the following provisions, viz, the adoption of Government standards of classification, commercial differences and not fixed differences, the requiring of but one certification of each bale, and limiting the number of classifications which may be delivered on a single contract: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of this exchange*, That we herewith petition our Senators and Representatives from this State in Congress to use their best efforts to secure the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges in this country to adopt a contract system that will be fair and right, one that will serve the interests of the legitimate cotton trade and not one devised to promote and encourage speculation.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to planters, shippers, and spinners generally, with a request for their active cooperation in the effort to secure through their Representatives in Congress the desired legislation.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington.

S. SUSMAN, *President.*
J. H. COOK, *Secretary.*

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, this is a very important matter to the cotton growers of the South and the manufacturers as well. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has a bill pending that I hope the Senate will take up and pass at as early a day as possible.

To throw some light on the facts stated by the Senator from Georgia, I wish to show a remarkable statement taken from the New York Commercial of Thursday, March 5.

On that day good middling was quoted for March in New York on the market at 12.19, when for spot cotton the manufacturers had to pay 13¾, at which price it was selling in the South. If you buy good middling on the New York market they can not deliver it to you, because they have not got it. Yet they agree to sell it to you, and when you demand it they give you a low grade.

I want to read from this same paper the amount of cotton the New York warehouses have on hand. If a man wants to buy good middling at their quotation price, how many bales have they to sell? Where they are selling 70,000,000 bales a year, as was stated once before on this floor by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], at this time they had only 164 bales of cotton of this grade, or good middling, in the warehouses.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator means middling?

Mr. OVERMAN. Middling. When they are compelled to deliver it, what do they do? As stated, they had on hand in New York in their warehouses only 164 bales of cotton. But what have they in addition to that? They have 10,000 fully low middling, 18,000 low middling, 10,000 below low middling, and 16,000 strict good ordinary, and 1,440 good ordinary. I ask to incorporate in this statement a table showing what cotton and the grades they had in the warehouses in New York at that time. If a man buys 500 bales good middling cotton on that market and demands the cotton, they will not deliver it, because they have only 164 bales; but they deliver him this dog-tail cotton, as the Senator from South Carolina described it, 10,000 bales of which they have on hand.

[From the New York Commercial, Thursday, March 5, 1914.]

SPOT MARKETS.

NEW YORK MIDDLING, 13 CENTS; LIVERPOOL MIDDLING, 6.95 PENCE; NEW ORLEANS MIDDLING, 12.75 CENTS.

The New York spot market was quiet yesterday, with prices remaining unchanged. Middling continued to rule at 13 cents, against 12.70 cents on the same day last year. The stock in licensed warehouses is 101,131 bales, of which 66,414 bales are certificated. Two years ago the licensed stock was 143,037 bales, of which 131,971 bales were certificated.

Grades of cotton in New York warehouses on March 3, 1914, inspected, classed, certificated, and grade guaranteed by the New York Cotton Exchange inspection fund:

| Grade. | Number bales. | Cents. |
|---|---|---|
| Fair | | 1.75 |
| Strict middling fair | 7 | 1.50 |
| Middling fair | 64 | 1.30 |
| Strict good middling | 240 | .90 |
| Fully good middling | 224 | .18 |
| Good middling | 179 | .65 |
| Barely good middling | 99 | .48 |
| Strict middling | 308 | .32 |
| Fully middling | 256 | .16 |
| Middling | 1,392 | (1) |
| Barely middling | 1,270 | .25 |
| Strict low middling | 6,554 | .50 |
| Fully low middling | 10,200 | .85 |
| Low middling | 18,723 | 1.25 |
| Strict good ordinary | 16,276 | 2.00 |
| Good ordinary | 1,481 | 3.00 |
| Strict good middling tinged | 41 | .45 |
| Good middling tinged | 753 | (2) |
| Strict middling tinged | 2,969 | .20 |
| Middling tinged | 3,598 | .40 |
| Strict low middling tinged | 1,550 | 1.25 |
| Low middling tinged | 164 | 3.00 |
| Middling stained | 86 | 1.25 |
| Total | 66,437 | |

[1] Basis. [2] Value of middling.

Revised November 19, 1913.
Inspected, but not classed, 179.

Yesterday they adopted the Government standard which is to go into effect in 1915, giving them a year to rob the people of this country. I say the bill of the Senator from South Carolina ought to be passed, and compel them to deliver what they sell.

What effect does it have upon the cotton-mill men and the cotton growers of this country? Cotton is quoted at 12 cents for May in New York, a price arbitrarily fixed by the exchange, when spot cotton is selling and the farmers are getting 14 cents for it. The manufacturer offers his goods in the market, and the buyer wishes to buy the goods from him, and he sees the quotations on the New York market at 12 cents. The buyer wants to buy at a price based on 12 cents when the manufacturer is paying 14 cents a pound for it. They fix fictitious arbitrary prices for it in order to speculate. This is a great injustice to the manufacturers as well as to the farmers in this country. The manufacturer can not sell his goods except on 12-cent cotton as quoted by the New York Exchange when the price of cotton in the actual sale is 14 cents a pound.

Therefore, I ask the Senate to take up and pass the measure the Senator from South Carolina has presented. I think it will correct the evil, and the sooner we pass it the better.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, adding to what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has just said, I wish to say that during this entire season spot cotton has been quoted in Memphis, Savannah, New Orleans, Charleston, and all the actual spot-cotton markets at from a cent to a cent and a half and 2 cents a pound higher than it was quoted on the New York Exchange, and it has been selling at 2 cents a pound higher in every little village in the South, showing the absolute, deliberate intent upon the part of the people of the New York Cotton Exchange to bear down the price of cotton by false quotations. They knew the quotations were false when they made them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I had intended this morning to call up Senate bill No. 110, in reference to trading in cotton futures, but I wish to explain to Senators who, with myself, are anxious to have this matter disposed of my reason for not doing so.

I think it has now been fairly proven by the New York Cotton Exchange that they have no right to exist so long as they practice the methods that they do practice, as referred to by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. They showed some symptoms yesterday of coming to the right attitude in reference to cotton. I give notice now that I shall to-morrow call up the bill and seek to put it upon its passage.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], in his grain-inspection bill, has a bill which is almost along the same line, and I hope that we can work in conjunction on the two bills, and see if this crying evil can not be remedied. I only postpone asking the consideration of the bill to which I refer until to-morrow for the reason that those who wish to offer amendments may have an opportunity to prepare them before the beginning of the discussion of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator's bill, but I have a notice on the calendar of an intention to move the consideration of a bill after the disposition of Senate joint resolution No. 1, and I do not want that notice displaced. I have been trying for the last month or two to get a hearing upon this matter, and, consequently, I want it to be heard. It proposes an amendment to the Constitution fixing the time for the convening of Congress and the terms of President and Vice President of the United States. It seems to me of great importance, and for that reason, and inasmuch as I have been so long trying to get it considered, I do not want my notice to be displaced.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That, of course, is a matter to be determined by the Senate. The necessity for the legislation to which I refer is very apparent at this time. In order that Senators may understand how pressing it is, I will state that the manufacturers throughout the country are now placing their orders for the next 12 months for the consumption of raw cotton. One of the leading manufacturers of South Carolina was in my office the other day. He told me that when he went to New York and offered his samples in order to place his goods he could not get an order, for the reason that the cotton he had to buy out of which to manufacture those goods was costing anywhere from 1½ to 2 cents a pound more in his State than the price at which the identical cotton was quoted in New York. Hence, the dealers would say to him: "We do not propose to buy your cloth upon the basis of 13½ or 14 cents when cotton is quoted here in New York at a cent to a cent and a half a pound lower for the identical grades that you will convert into this cloth." Therefore, I say, right at this time, if we propose to relieve the manufacturers who have already a stock of last year's cotton, who must of necessity convert it and sell it or leave a surplus that will be detrimental to the trade of both those who sell the raw cotton and those who sell the finished product, if we are going to relieve them of the 1913 crop and relieve them from the manipulations of the market for the 1914 crop, it is necessary for us to take immediate and speedy action. I believe that the bill which I have before the Senate will accomplish that purpose.

Since I have been in the Senate I have been striving to get relief for the farmers. I could not get the active support of some of the manufacturers for the reason that up to now they had not been the victims of this pernicious system; but the moment that the New York Exchange turned upon them and, in place of it being a "hedge market," letting "futures" and "spots" run somewhat parallel, it is now a different proposition. When a man bought cotton at 13 cents as a "hedge," hoping to pay 13 cents in the South, and the "hedge" dropped from a cent to a cent and a half a pound, while the "spot" stood exactly at the same plane at which he must buy, he stood to lose from $5 to $10 on the bale on his purchase in the South. When "spot" cotton went up a cent a pound and "futures" went up, he was protected, and when "spot" cotton went down and "futures" went down he was protected, but when "futures" went down and "spot" went up he was "split." That is the complaint they are bringing now. The grower has heretofore been the victim of that practice, and now the manufacturer is also being made the victim. It is a pernicious system, and we

have no right to give them 12 months lease of life in order that they may reap a profit out of their victims, having committed themselves to a system that they know can not exist longer in this country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the fact that his notice in regard to the consideration of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President is to follow Senate bill 120, which I have stated I would ask be made the unfinished business as soon as we could get rid of the present unfinished business, either by agreement or otherwise.

Mr. President, the arguments we have just heard from the Senator from South Carolina are very familiar arguments to me; in fact, I have been making for several days exactly the same kind of argument pertaining to the same kind of practices; and I regret very much that I did not have present to hear my address Senators who are interested in the raising and marketing of cotton. Cotton and wheat are the two greatest crops in the United States which are sold in the markets. There are a greater number of bushels in the corn crop, and it has a greater value, but the corn crop is mostly fed, while the cotton crop and the wheat crop are mostly sold for the manufacture of cloth and the manufacture of flour. Both of them are sold by grades, and the manipulations in the grades are exactly the same in one system as they are in the other, the opportunities are exactly the same, and I am asking whether, in conjunction or separately, the same consideration for the farmer who produces wheat and for the miller who manufactures that wheat into flour that other Senators are asking for the farmers who produce cotton and for the manufacturers who make that cotton into cloth.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WEST. I was present and heard the Senator's remarks, and I agree with his position. I trust that in the effort to relieve the situation as to cotton he will stand by the people of Georgia and the South, as we will endeavor to relieve the grain conditions in the West.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Georgia will find that I have agreed with the Senator from South Carolina all the time as to his bill, because I can see the similarity between the conditions affecting the production of cotton and the grain exchanges.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to say, in answer to the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], that I have no doubt his bill is important.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. LODGE. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order having been called for, and Senators having the right to enforce the order, the regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials, and nothing else is in order at the present time.

### NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present a resolution adopted by the Meriden Business Men's Association, of Connecticut, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MERIDEN BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION (INC.),
*Meriden, Conn., March 17, 1914.*

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Meriden Business Men's Association (Inc.), united with the board of trade, 1908:

*Resolved*, That the Meriden Business Men's Association unanimously places itself on record as emphatically opposed to any action being taken on the part of the National Government to force the dismemberment of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. and its allied properties, believing that the corporation as at present organized can serve the interests of New England more effectively and more economically than they could possibly be served by several independent transportation lines.

HERMAN W. MORSE, *President.*

Attest:

ALBERT A. MAY, *Secretary.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, in line with that I ask to have read, if the Senate will permit me, a letter from the Bridgeport Savings Bank, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BRIDGEPORT SAVINGS BANK,
*Bridgeport, Conn., March 16, 1914.*

Hon. Senator FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I beg to inclose herewith copy of resolutions which were adopted by the board of trustees of this bank relative to the proposal of the United States officials to dismember the New Haven system.

We firmly believe that the sentiment expressed in these resolutions coincides with the general views throughout the State, and we trust that the great necessity for delay in this matter may be sufficiently impressed upon the officials having this matter in hand.

Very truly, yours,

SAMUEL M. HAWLEY, *Treasurer.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I also ask that the resolutions may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolutions.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the prosperity and happiness of the people of the State of Connecticut are dependent upon the manufacturing, commercial, and farming industries of the State; and

Whereas these business interests are indissolubly bound up with the prosperity of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.; and

Whereas it is understood that an effort is being made by the officials of the United States Government to separate the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad from its steamship and trolley lines operating in this territory: Now therefore

*Resolved*, That the board of trustees of the Bridgeport Savings Bank firmly believe that such proposed dismemberment will seriously cripple this great transportation machine and bring great damage not only to commerce and business in this State but to individuals as well; and

*Further resolved*, That this board of trustees respectfully and earnestly request the officials of the United States Government to halt in their plan to dismember this transportation system until it can be satisfactorily determined that such dismemberment will work for the good rather than for the harm of all the people of New England.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask to have read a letter which I have received from the president of the National Whaling Bank, in my home city, in relation to the same matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATIONAL WHALING BANK,
*New London, Conn., March 17, 1914.*

Senator FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. BRANDEGEE: It seems to me that the Attorney General is persecuting the New Haven Railroad in a manner that is going to do great harm to all New England, to say nothing of the people who own the securities of the New Haven and Boston & Maine roads.

As apparently the only possible purchasers of the Boston & Maine are either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific, it seems to be the Attorney General's purpose to force the New Haven to sell its Boston & Maine stock at bankruptcy prices for the benefit of foreigners and at the expense of the people of New England, where a large part of the capital of the New Haven is held.

I notice in the daily papers that Boston & Maine notes are offered and have been offered for weeks on a 22.25 per cent basis and that New Haven notes are offered on an 18 per cent basis; this looks like bankruptcy, and I believe that about every individual in New England will be adversely affected if these roads drift into receivers' hands.

The savings banks of Connecticut are loaded down with the bonds of the New Haven road, to say nothing of their holdings of Boston & Maine securities, and there is considerable New Haven stock held by them.

The latest report I have of the bank commissioners of this State is the one issued for the year ending September 30, 1912, and in that report I find that the Savings Bank of New London then owned the following New Haven securities:

| | Par value. |
|---|---|
| Stock, 1,562 shares | $156,200 |
| Bonds: | |
| Convertible debenture 6s, due 1948 | 450,000 |
| Consolidated debenture 3-3½s, 1930 | 120,000 |
| Consolidated debenture 4s, 1954-1956 | 55,000 |
| Greenwich Tramway 5s, 1931 | 40,000 |
| New York & Centerville 5s, 1933 | 2,000 |
| Worcester & Connecticut Eastern 4½s, 1943 | 250,000 |

Besides they owned at that time the following securities of the Boston & Maine:

| | |
|---|---|
| 4s of 1926 | $110,000 |
| 4½s of 1944 | 40,000 |

I cite the holdings of the Savings Bank of New London to give you an idea of the popularity of these securities with New England investors in the past.

If you have any influence that you could exert to help the New Haven road to secure ample time to dispose of the properties that they hold contrary to law, I feel convinced that your efforts in their behalf would be greatly appreciated by your constituents without distinction of party preferences, and by the people of New England generally.

Very truly, yours,

BELTON A. COFF, *President.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have asked the indulgence of the Senate to allow me to have these communications read this morning, because I think the Senate will bear me witness that I have taken absolutely not one minute of the time of the Senate in the discussion of any question in relation to the New Haven Railroad situation, although I suppose the people of my State are more vitally interested in that question in all its bearings than are the people of any other State in the Union. Of course, all New England is vitally interested in it. I have refrained, up to this time, from taking any part in the debates that have been held here upon the matter, from the very fact that it seemed to me that, coming from the State in which this company is most largely located, anything which I might say might be, so to speak, discounted as being the utterance not of an unprejudiced and impartial man but of one who was more or less in-

fluenced by the pressure brought to bear upon him by his own constituents.

While to a certain extent a Senator ought to be influenced by the representations and views of his own constituents, it has always been a mooted question how far in his official capacity he was justified in acting upon his individual judgment rather than upon the wishes of his constituents; and many Senators, I think, sometimes shape their conduct in compromise between the two views.

However that may be, and whatever may be my duty in this matter, I have felt that, being in the receipt of these communications and a great many others similar to those I have put in the RECORD, I ought in some way to bring the matter to the attention of the public.

This matter is not pending before the Senate in any legislative way at the present time. I know of no committee that is taking jurisdiction of the particular question raised in these communications, so I have not asked that they be referred to any committee, but I have had them read in order that they may appear in the RECORD.

I do not suppose, of course, that the Senate or Congress itself can or would direct the Department of Justice in this matter. Here is a situation which is not a newly developed situation in my section of the country, but one which has existed for quite a number of years. It has been previously investigated by other administrations, by other Attorneys General. Other suits have been instituted at times, and upon further consideration have been withdrawn or dropped.

The Attorney General doubtless has his views about whether and to what extent the New Haven road is in violation of the Sherman antitrust law or other laws. They are questions of opinion; they are questions of law. The railroad company, of course, took the best legal advice it could obtain before it came into its present condition. The advisers of the road advised it that it was not violating the law. The Attorney General probably thinks it is; and he has a bill in equity drawn, so it is reported, to file against the corporation to dismember it. Pending that, I assume the situation is that he has advised the directors of the corporation that if they will so modify their existing consolidation as to bring themselves into a condition that he thinks will not violate the law, he will not file the suit, because all he would accomplish by filing the suit, if he won it, would be accomplished voluntarily by the management of the road.

Of course the directors are placed in this situation: Many of the stockholders do not want the road dismembered. They do not think the directors have any authority to agree to a dismemberment of the road without the consent of the stockholders whom they represent. The road is in a financial condition where by a certain time it has to raise enormous sums of money to meet maturing obligations. If the Government's suit is filed, nobody will lend the road the money to refund these obligations. If the stockholders attempt to tie up the directors and prevent them from voluntarily agreeing to the demands of the Department of Justice, that creates delay and the money can not be raised, and perhaps a receivership may stare the road in the face.

In the meantime funds deposited in all the savings banks and other financial institutions of my State and of all New England, to a great extent trust estates and endowment funds of educational and charitable institutions, are invested in the securities of this road, which have already had a tremendous depreciation.

Of course a receivership would mean a further recession in the prices of all these securities and possibly would make them unmarketable. So I think the Senate will see, irrespective of the determination of the question of law whether these corporations have been put together and now exist in violation of the law, that the matter is of tremendous consequence.

The trouble about the whole situation up there is that the people who have had nothing to do with committing any violation of the law, if any has been committed, which has not yet been determined, are the sufferers; and it is liable to be a tremendous privation and disaster to these people if this situation continues. I am at a loss to know what I can do about it. These people call upon me to use any influence I may have in the proper channels, with the proper officials, to prevent the dismemberment of this road, and they give their reasons why they think it would be undesirable. I have not felt like making any attempt to bring any influence to bear upon the Attorney General or upon the President as to what their conduct should be in this matter.

The Attorney General is the legal adviser of the Government. It is his business to enforce the Sherman law. What does seem rather hard is that, owing to the financial stress of the New Haven road and the time limits within which these great sums of money must be raised, and the refusal of capital to loan money to this corporation, it may be at any minute put in the hands of a receiver or may be dismembered, and the security upon which people have loaned their money utterly taken from them. The result is that the stockholders' property may have to be sacrificed at the opinion of one man on a question of law without the judgment of any tribunal as to whether or not they are in violation of the law, as alleged in the bill to be filed by the Attorney General.

Unquestionably it is proper for the Attorney General to consider filing a suit. The fact is that under the present circumstances the directors have no discretion in the matter. They are entrapped. They are between the upper and the nether millstones. They are the trustees and the custodians of the property of the stockholders and of other trustees. If they agree to part with millions of dollars of property of their cestui quis trust without making any effort to find whether they are legally compelled to part with it or not, they will be censured by all their stockholders. If they do not agree to part with it, they will be haled into court and prosecuted as a trust; and what other proceedings may be held in abeyance nobody knows. That is the position of the directors.

If the stockholder exerts his right to attempt to protect his property by saying "I will not permit the directors to allow this road to be broken up upon somebody's mere assertion that a road beginning in Boston and running down to Maine on the Canadian line is a competitive road with one beginning in Boston and running west down to New York"—if he says "I will not permit the directors to allow this to be done on the ground that the roads are competitive, when, in fact, they run in opposite directions and are not parallel with each other," then the suit is to be filed by the Government, and they are tied up in court for years, and the property is ruined.

As I say, I have not had any talk with the Attorney General. I have not felt like even mentioning the subject to him, and I have not done so, nor to the President. I did feel, however, that in view of this most embarrassing situation of the whole transportation system—rail, water, and trolley—in New England, I wanted to put into the RECORD the expression of responsible commercial bodies and banks, boards of trade, and individuals in my State, if it shall do no more than to advise the Senate and the Attorney General and the administration that in whatever course is taken in the premises they should be governed by the utmost circumspection.

I do not know whether in the past any violations of the law have been committed by this road, either in their organization, or in their subsequent transactions, or in their practices. The Senate has already authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the whole question of the financial transactions of this road and their subsidiaries and all their branches. The result of that will no doubt be laid before us later.

I have no defense to make if anything wrong has been done. I make no excuse or apology for it. I know of no wrong having been done. I do not know anything about it. I read in the newspapers statements about the matter, but my judgment will be influenced by the evidence in the case. Until that is given I hold my opinion in abeyance, and I do not propose to prejudge anybody or any corporation as guilty until it is proved guilty. As long as they are a legitimate business company, and the prosperity of a great section of the country is dependent upon them, I think, in justice to every interest and everybody, that this matter should be proceeded with not in the spirit of malice or of any vindictiveness but as wise men ought to handle a tremendously important, vital, and far-reaching question.

Mr. SHAFROTH obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent to say a few words with relation to the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GALLINGER. I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection, the Chair is compelled to enforce Rule VII.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, up until now I have not taken any part in the discussion that has been held here on one or two occasions concerning the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being an objection, the Chair is compelled to enforce Rule VII.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not understand that any objection was made to what I was about to say, but to what my colleague wished to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply asked for the regular order. I have been waiting an hour to present a matter to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials. If there are no further petitions to be presented, reports of committees are next in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. RANSDELL. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make exhibits at Forest Products Expositions to be held in Chicago, Ill., and New York, N. Y., and I submit a report (No. 352) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be taken up immediately. It proposes to appropriate $10,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make such exhibits as may be convenient and practicable at the expositions to be held in Chicago and New York. Unless it is acted on promptly it will be impossible to have the work properly done. The House has already passed the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be read.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. RANSDELL, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2806) relative to the appointment, pay, and rank of chief warrant officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service (Rept. No. 353); and

A bill (S. 1802) construing the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to improve the efficiency of the personnel of the Revenue-Cutter Service," approved April 16, 1908 (Rept. No. 354).

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. From the Committee on Immigration I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that certain letters from the Department of Labor relating to the bill may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing the letters as a document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. (S. Doc. No. 451.)

LABELING OF ARTICLES OF CLOTHING.

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 646) providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale which enter into interstate commerce and providing penalties for misbranding, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Manufactures. I will state that I have consulted the chairman and other members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and this motion is agreeable to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

DRAINAGE OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. OWEN. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13091) to provide for the drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, and I submit a report (No. 351) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill. It is only a short bill, and it is a local matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That whenever a drainage district is organized in any county in the Five Civilized Tribes of the State of Oklahoma, under the laws of that State, for the purpose of draining the lands within such district, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to pay from the funds or moneys arising from any source under his control or under the control of the United States, and which would be pro rated to such allottee, the assessment for drainage purposes against any Indian allottee or upon the lands of any allottee who is not subject to taxation or whose lands are exempt from taxation or from assessment for taxation under the treaties or agreements with the tribe to which such allottee may belong, or under any act of Congress; and such amount so paid out shall be charged against such allottee's pro rata share of any funds to his credit under the control of the Secretary of the Interior or the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, before paying out such funds, shall designate some person with a knowledge of the subject of drainage, to review the schedules of assessment against each tract of land and to review the land assessed to ascertain whether such Indian allottee, or his lands not subject to taxation, have been assessed more than their pro rata share as compared with other lands located in said district similarly situated and deriving like benefits. And if such Indian lands have been assessed justly when compared with other assessments, then, in that event, said funds shall be paid to the proper county in which such drainage district may be organized, or, in the option of the Secretary of the Interior, to the construction company or bondholder shown to be entitled to the funds arising from such assessment: *Provided further*, That in any event such assessment on any Indian allotment shall not exceed $15 per acre, and no such assessment shall be made unless the Indian allottee affected, or his legal guardian, shall consent thereto: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to deprive any allottee of any right which he might otherwise have individually to apply to the courts for the purpose of having his rights adjudicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma. Does the bill impose a tax, either special or otherwise, upon land which, by act of Congress or by treaty right, was to remain untaxed?

Mr. OWEN. Yes; it would provide for taxing for drainage purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Would it not then be in conflict with the agreement or treaty with the Indians, either the one under which they took their allotments or some other treaty or law in favor of the Indians?

Mr. OWEN. It would not be in contravention of any treaty. The general law which was passed, which forbade the alienation of any lands, of course made the lands also untaxed. In the eastern part of Oklahoma, which, of course, consist entirely of Indian lands, there are lands everywhere overflowed and they are practically valueless without a drainage district being established, and unless some such provision is passed it is impossible to restore those lands so as to make them productive. For that reason it is necessary to pass this measure.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The question in my mind was if an Indian wanted his land improved whether it might not be done by contribution rather than by levying a tax which was distinctly prohibited in law.

Mr. OWEN. The tax is not distinctly prohibited in the law, but the general provision that the land shall not be alienated has that effect, of course. It would be impossible to have any drainage district at all in Oklahoma, because it would contain somewhere a portion of inalienable and nontaxable lands.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator, I think, did not understand me. I supposed the same purpose could be reached by a voluntary contribution by the owners of the land.

Mr. OWEN. By whom?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. By the owners of the land. My inquiry was directed to the possibility that if the owner of the land did not want to be assessed for this special improvement, or whatever it was, he ought not to be assessed; and if he wanted to be assessed, the same purpose could be accomplished by a voluntary contribution instead of by violating the law.

Mr. OWEN. It is confined to consent. Everyone must consent. There must be unanimous consent before it is possible. That of itself is a very extraordinary condition, but the bill would not permit a drainage district unless it involved the consent of all the parties. Where everyone consents it does seem that there ought to be no artificial obstructions to it by the law. For that reason, I think, the bill passed the House of Representatives in its present form without anyone objecting to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if the Secretary of the Interior reports favorably upon the bill.

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. And it is the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. OWEN. With the amendment made by the House, I think no one was against it in the House of Representatives. It was amended in the House of Representatives to meet some objections.

Mr. SMOOT. Did any member of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate object to its passage?

Mr. OWEN. No; not a single member of the committee objected to it. It passed the Committee on Indian Affairs unanimously.

Mr. SMOOT. It is rather a far-reaching bill, it seems to me. I am not going to object to its immediate consideration, on the statement made by the Senator, but I wish to ask a question. Suppose there is a drainage district created and an Indian has consented to the creation of that district and circumstances occur under which he finds himself unable to pay the assessment for that district, does the bill provide for such a case?

Mr. OWEN. It provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall pay it out of the funds which the Secretary has in his hands for those Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. It in no way alienates the land from the Indians?

Mr. OWEN. No; it does not alienate the land from the Indians.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARY OF ADDITIONAL CLERK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 308) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized to pay the salary of the temporary clerk, authorized to be appointed by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads under Senate resolution of March 16, 1914, from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say that we have passed a resolution for this clerk, but it was awkwardly drawn, so that the money could not be paid out of the contingent fund until otherwise directed by law. This merely cures that trouble.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4954) for the relief of Stephen Morris Barlow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEST:

A bill (S. 4955) for the relief of the heirs of John C. Bowden, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4956) for the relief of the heirs of William McConnell, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4957) for the relief of the heirs of L. G. Brantley, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4958) granting an increase of pension to George Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 4959) granting an increase of pension to Zeba D. French; and

A bill (S. 4960) granting an increase of pension to George Dimick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4961) to reopen the rolls of the Choctaw-Chickasaw Tribe and to provide for the awarding of the rights secured to certain persons by the fourteenth article of the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, of date September 27, 1830; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4962) granting a pension to Emily M. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4963) granting a pension to Freddie O. J. Horne;

A bill (S. 4964) granting a pension to Lula S. Knight Bigelow; and

A bill (S. 4965) granting a pension to Hattie P. Longfellow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4966) proposing an amendment as to section 19 of the Federal reserve act relating to reserves, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4967) proposing an amendment to the Federal reserve act relative to acceptances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 4968) for the relief of Hyacinthe Villeneuve; to the Committee on Public Lands.

MESSAGES AND PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 307), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby directed to make careful inquiry into the sale by private parties of the publication known as "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," with a view to ascertaining all the facts in the case, and said committee shall also inquire into the desirability of an additional volume being prepared and published under the authority of the Government.

COTTON FUTURES.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 110) to regulate trading in cotton futures and provide for the standardization of "upland" and "gulf" cottons separately, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. JONES. I wish to call up Senate resolution 288, which was before the Senate yesterday. I understand that it went over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is true that it went over without prejudice, which means that it took the place it had on the calendar.

Mr. JONES. That is the reason why I thought I had better call it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It takes either unanimous consent or a motion to get it before the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understood that the resolution was on the table, and it went over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So it did.

Mr. BRISTOW. Would it not remain on the table then?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table, but it has to be called up by unanimous consent or on motion.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Washington is agreeable, I should like to have the resolution go over until the chairman of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals returns.

Mr. JONES. I will state to the Senator that I have no objection to that myself. I will not insist upon the resolution coming up this morning.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table and retains its position on the Table Calendar, and may be taken up by unanimous consent or on motion at any time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say in connection with this matter that the impression seems to have been conveyed from the remarks I made yesterday that my reference concerning an alleged interview of Sir Lionel Carden with the President was made on information I possessed or on matters within my knowledge. I think a reading of the remarks will show that this is not correct; that what I said was based upon a quotation from a paper with reference to the interview. This quotation was taken from the Washington Post, a paper that supports the policy of the President, and purported to be a dispatch to the New York American.

I wish to say, in justice to the President, that he has assured me in most positive terms that there is no basis of fact in the interview with Sir Lionel Carden for the conclusions or suggestion contained in the article in the Post, and when he gives such assurance I accept it without hesitation.

I wish to make that statement in justice to the President, because I do not want to do an injustice to anyone, much less to him. I do think that it emphasizes the importance of passing a resolution of this character at some time, so that we can get an official statement with reference to whatever information there is available in regard to this matter. It seems to me that the people of the country and Congress ought to be taken into the confidence of the President and those having information with reference to this important matter fully and completely. We ought not to be left to surmises and deductions from uncertain conditions and supposed facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the motion now before the Senate in connection with this matter?

Mr. JONES. The resolution has gone over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no action pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What does the Senator propose?

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] suggested that the resolution be allowed to lie on the table until the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, the entire matter goes over?

Mr. JONES. It does. I was going to add that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] made a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I wondered if that motion would lie on the table along with the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the very matter to which I wanted to call attention. That motion is pending.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; it is pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very much in favor of the matter taking that course. It ought undoubtedly to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is a matter that is peculiarly a diplomatic question, and it seems to me that that motion ought not to go over, but that it ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate and acted upon. Of course there is no way of keeping Senators from talking out whether the matter has been

sent to the committee or not. Senators can talk all they please. Speaking for myself, I should like to have the motion made by the Senator from Georgia to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations come before the Senate and be voted upon at the earliest moment possible, and if that be the regular order I call for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not the regular order. The motion goes with the resolution to the table until it is called up again.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Chair has just stated what I desired to make a point on—that it is impossible to consider the motion to dispose of the resolution so long as the resolution is lying on the table, and it could not be taken from the table without unanimous consent.

THE REPUBLIC COAL CO.

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. The regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. MYERS. Is not my motion in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The Senator from Montana moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 41. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to be heard upon that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. MYERS. I raise the point of order that the motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.] The noes have it.

Mr. MYERS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest to the Senator that if we proceed to the calendar we will reach the joint resolution more quickly than on a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MYERS. I will withdraw my motion, but I do not think it will be reached on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is too late for the Senator to withdraw the motion.

Mr. MYERS. Can I not withdraw the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion of the Senator from Montana, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and withhold my vote.

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I see he has not voted, so I will withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and vote "nay."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], but I transfer it to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. BRADLEY. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—27.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Lea, Tenn. | Owen | Thompson |
| Catron | Lee, Md. | Perkins | Townsend |
| Chamberlain | McCumber | Ransdell | Vardaman |
| Gronna | McLean | Shafroth | Walsh |
| Hollis | Myers | Sheppard | West |
| Johnson | Nelson | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| Jones | Overman | Smith, S. C. | |

NAYS—27.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Gallinger | Page | Sterling |
| Bradley | Gore | Poindexter | Swanson |
| Brandegee | Lippitt | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Bristow | Lodge | Sherman | Thornton |
| Bryan | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Tillman |
| Burton | Martine, N. J. | Smoot | Williams |
| Dillingham | Norris | Stephenson | |

NOT VOTING—41.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | du Pont | Lewis | Shively |
| Brady | Fall | Newlands | Simmons |
| Burleigh | Fletcher | O'Gorman | Smith, Md. |
| Chilton | Goff | Oliver | Smith, Mich. |
| Clapp | Hitchcock | Penrose | Stone |
| Clark, Wyo. | Hughes | Pittman | Sutherland |
| Clarke, Ark. | James | Reed | Warren |
| Colt | Kenyon | Robinson | Weeks |
| Crawford | Kern | Root | |
| Culberson | La Follette | Saulsbury | |
| Cummins | Lane | Shields | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the yeas are 27 and the nays are 27. The Chair votes "yea"; and the motion is agreed to.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution has heretofore been read at length and considered as in Committee of the Whole. It is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have heretofore explained this measure, I think, sufficiently, and have said all I feel that it is necessary to say upon it. My colleague [Mr. WALSH], however, has some amendments which he desires to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I merely wish to submit a few remarks on the joint resolution, but if the Senator from Montana is to offer amendments to it they, possibly, may cure the objections which I have to the measure.

Mr. WALSH. I trust the Senator from Iowa will defer his remarks until I have offered my amendments, which, as he suggests, may meet his objections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, first, on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What is the amendment, Mr. President? I ask that it may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a substitute for the entire joint resolution. May the Chair first inquire of the Senator from Montana if his proposed amendment is an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. WALSH. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the proposed committee amendment, in line 14, on page 3, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 2. Any right or title acquired by the said Republic Coal Co. under the provisions of this act shall terminate and be forfeited—

(a) If the said company, or any of its successors in interest, shall at any time engage in the business of mining or selling coal for the general trade or otherwise than for the use of or to produce power to be used in the operation of railroads, or if it shall sell or dispose of any coal extracted from the said lands or any of them except for such uses.

(b) If the said company, or its successors in interest shall during any one calendar year after that in which it shall purchase the said lands fail, except by reason of the prevalence of strikes or other conditions for which it is in no way responsible, to extract from the said land less than 200,000 tons of coal.

(c) If the said company, or its successors in interest, shall at any time, except with the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior, sell, assign, or transfer, or contract to sell, assign, or transfer any rights acquired by it by virtue of this act; but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to forbid the sale of the coal mined from said land except as hereinbefore provided.

(d) If the said Republic Coal Co. shall ever become a constituent part of any combination in restraint of trade, or if the said lands of any of them, or the right to mine the coal therein or any part thereof, shall in any manner pass to any such combination, or if any such combination shall be by the said company or any of its successors in interest permitted to mine any coal from said lands.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act contained shall be deemed to deny to the State of Montana the right to assess for taxation and to levy taxes upon the right and interest in the said lands which may be acquired under the terms of this act, or upon the coal that may be extracted therefrom, but in case of the sale of any interest thus acquired for taxes the grantee from the State shall hold the same subject to the same conditions as are hereby imposed upon the said Republic Coal Co. and under which it will hold the said lands should it acquire the same by virtue of this act.

Mr. WALSH. I have a further amendment to offer. I had supposed it was included in the one which has just been read,

but I see it is not. After the words "Secretary of the Interior," in line 6, page 3, I move to insert the words "at a figure not less than the appraised price."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Which is the first amendment offered by the Senator from Montana—this or the preceding amendment?

Mr. WALSH. This one properly comes before the amendment just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Secretary will state the pending amendment to the amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 3, line 6, after the words "Secretary of the Interior," it is proposed to insert "at a figure not less than the appraised price."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WALSH. I will say, Mr. President, that the lands have already been appraised by the Geological Survey, and this amendment forbids the sale at a price less than the appraised price.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WALSH. I desire to say to the Senator from Iowa that I should like to explain the purport of the amendment first offered by me.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the Senator one question, if he will allow me. Under the amendment of the Senator is it possible now, if this joint resolution becomes a law, that anyone else except this particular specified company could acquire these lands? In other words, does the amendment or do the various amendments of the Senator leave the joint resolution in the same condition in that respect that it was in before the amendment was offered, namely, that the sale must be made to this particular specified corporation?

Mr. WALSH. The amendments do leave it in that way. I will say, however, to the Senator that it is a grant of the coal only and leaves the land open to homestead entry.

Mr. KENYON. I understand that under the amendments of the Senator the lands will be leased, as well as sold, at the option of the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. No; the original joint resolution so provided; but the committee amendment provides for the sale only.

Mr. KENYON. That is one of my objections to the joint resolution, that it directs the sale and does not give any option to lease. I had understood that one of the Senator's amendments would reinstate that part of the joint resolution which was stricken out, which would give the right to lease.

Mr. WALSH. No; I have offered no amendment of that character. I will say, however, to the Senator that if he will offer an amendment of that character, I shall be glad to vote for it.

Mr. President, I desire to say as to this matter that I am opposed generally to the principle of this joint resolution. I am opposed, except under the most extraordinary circumstances, to the disposition of the public land by special act, which gives to a particular individual the right to acquire a particular piece of the public domain. We are, however, confronted with a peculiar situation here, the nature of which has been explained by my colleague [Mr. MYERS]. Everybody who has given any thought or study at all to this matter knows that it has been impossible to make any disposition of the coal lands forming a portion of the public domain under the existing coal-land act. In view of that situation of affairs, Mr. President, a bill was introduced by myself the other day contemplating the granting of leases of large tracts of the public domain, speaking relatively, and I propose to offer to-morrow a bill to amend the existing law so as to increase the acreage which may be taken under it.

Under the present law a single individual is permitted to appropriate only 160 acres of coal lands and an association is denied the right to take more than 320 acres. It requires the investment of a couple of hundred thousand dollars to equip a plant so as to permit the mining of coal anywhere in the West upon a commercial basis. The ordinary 160-acre or 320-acre tract of land will not justify any such expenditure. In order to meet that condition, for years the device was resorted to of making entries through the medium of dummy entrymen, a process that must have been always recognized as in violation of the law. Criminal prosecutions have been carried on and convictions have been had for the pursuit of that practice, with the result that it has been properly discontinued, and with the like result that it is now practically impossible to appropriate coal lands upon the public domain.

If the general law for the appropriation of coal lands had been in such shape that it could be operative, no doubt these lands would have been taken by some one who was desirous of operating them. I have no doubt in the world that the Republic Coal Co. or some other coal company, if it could have bought an entire section or two sections of coal lands, would have been perfectly willing to buy them; but it is denied that opportunity. So, likewise, it is denied the opportunity to acquire the lands through the medium of some one else who should have thus acquired them. Nobody will acquire them in tracts of 160 acres unless it is a body of men who acquire the lands thus for the purpose of subsequently transferring them to a single corporation by which they shall be operated; and that would be properly held to be in violation of the law.

On the other hand, the only other resource is to acquire lands from the Northern Pacific Railway Co. It will be understood that under the original grant to the Northern Pacific Railway Co., made by the act of 1864, it is entitled to take no mineral lands except lands containing iron and coal. As the result of this, the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. owns every alternate section in that neighborhood which is within the limit of the grant to the railroad company, so that the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. has an abundant supply of coal for its operations. This newer road, coming in during more recent years, has not that supply. It has no opportunity to acquire the title to any lands by which it can supply itself, and it is thus placed in a most disadvantageous position in the operation of its line in competition with the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. The Northern Pacific Railroad Co. pursues the policy of refusing, likewise, to sell any of its coal lands. In that situation of affairs I feel impelled to recede in this particular case from the attitude I would generally take of declining to give my acquiescence to a special act for the disposition of a tract of land.

The grantee or beneficiary of the bill is the Republic Coal Co., which we are told in the report is engaged in the business of mining this coal to be supplied only to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co., of which it is a subsidiary company. While it may have that policy now, however, it is organized for the purpose of engaging in business generally, and it may change its policy next year. The first amendment is intended to protect us from such a possible change in its policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a very high regard for the opinion of the Senator from Montana upon almost any question. I do not know whether the Senator has gone into it or not, but does he not think it is bad policy to pick out some particular beneficiary and pass a resolution to allow it to have certain concessions and certain rights? Is not that rather going into the South American concessionaire's business, which we never have gone into?

Mr. WALSH. I do think it is generally a bad policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not infinitely better to have general laws for everybody to avail himself of?

Mr. WALSH. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then how can the Senator justify supporting a bill of this description, which does pick out a particular beneficiary, and proposes legislation to fit its requirements?

Mr. WALSH. I was just endeavoring to explain to the Senate why, in this particular instance, I feel impelled to depart from the policy which the Senator has announced, and to which I very freely and fully subscribe.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say frankly that I know nothing about the particular bill or the particular situation involved here. Possibly I should have no sort of objection if I knew more about it. In other words, it may be that this bill ought to pass. I do not know. It does seem to me, however, that it is an awfully bad precedent; that we ought not to start picking out concessionaires and passing bills that amount simply to making concessions independently of the general law. It is not an English way of doing things. It is not an American way. It is a South American and Latin way of doing things.

Mr. WALSH. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I thoroughly disapprove of it, as a rule.

Mr. WALSH. I was endeavoring to explain to the Senator that the trouble about the matter is that the general law which we have and which is upon the statute books is utterly inoperative, and title could not be acquired to enough of the lands so that they could be operated at all. Under the existing law this company could acquire only 160 or 320 acres of land. It would be entirely useless for it to acquire any such quantity. In fact, such a quantity of land would not justify the expenditure of the money necessary to put up a plant adequate to handle the product.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is a very good argument in favor of the amendment of the general law.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it seems to me that ought to be taken up and, if necessary, the law ought to be amended; but this puts a lot of us in rather an embarrassing position. We do not know who the Republic Coal Co. is, and we have not the opportunity to find out. It simply puts us in the attitude of voting for special legislation for somebody's special benefit. I suppose it is for their benefit or they would not want it. It does seem to me that some of you people from the Western States ought to get busy as soon as possible and revise these laws. So far as I am concerned I am willing, as a rule, to follow you in it, because you know more about it than I do. Here, however, is the whole calendar of the Senate held up to-day in order that the Republic Coal Co. may receive a donation at the hands of Congress in the shape of special legislation. Here is the calendar crowded with things that we want to dispose of, and it has all been held up for a special concession to be granted by the United States Government. It does seem to me that the general legislation of the country ought to be put through, and yet the Senate, by a majority of one, has set aside all the general legislation of the country in order that this special concession may prevail.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. KENYON. I assume the Senator from Montana is, of course, not to blame for that situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that responsibility.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the Senator from Montana if the Republic Coal Co., of which he speaks, engages in any general business, or does it not simply provide coal for the Milwaukee Railroad?

Mr. WALSH. I desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi, as well as to the Senator from Iowa, that the bill is not mine, and I am not to be considered in any sense as the champion of the measure. I am very glad to give the Senator, however, such information as I have about the matter.

Mr. KENYON. I assumed that the Senator was familiar with the facts.

Mr. WALSH. I have taken pains to inform myself fully about it. It is represented to me, and I think that is correct, that the Republic Coal Co. does not engage in commercial business at all; that whatever coal it mines it sells to the Milwaukee & St. Paul road, which is nothing more than a system of bookkeeping, because the Milwaukee & St. Paul road owns the Republic Coal Co.

Mr. KENYON. So that the concrete question that is presented here is legislation directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain coal lands to the Milwaukee Railroad?

Mr. WALSH. Practically so; yes.

Mr. KENYON. That is the question. Of course, as the Senator has suggested, he is against the proposition of special legislation, and so am I. It would seem to me that there should be some exceedingly strong showing—I do not think there could be a strong enough showing to affect my mind on that proposition—of the necessity of this coal to this railroad company and its inability in any way to supply itself from other sources. Certainly if we pass a bill of this kind as it is presented here from the committee we are engaged in doing exactly what a good many of us have been complaining of for a good many years, namely, passing special legislation for the special benefit of some special interest.

That has been one of the reasons for my opposition to this bill. There is not even a chance for the Secretary of the Interior to lease this land. He is directed to sell it to the particular company, just as if we should put in a contract a direction to give the contract to some particular person. It does seem to me that it is most vicious legislation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I introduced what I had to say by signifying my acquiescence, in a general way, with all of the observations of the Senator from Iowa; and I was endeavoring to lay before the Senate such considerations as have induced me to withdraw my opposition to this bill in view of the general principle of legisfation, which I think is exceedingly sound, that we ought not to legislate specially with respect to these matters.

Mr. KENYON. I take it, then, that the Senator has sought in his amendments—of course, it is impossible to become familiar with them on this short notice—to take care of the question as well as he may be able to do so, and get away from the domain of special legislation?

Mr. WALSH. That was my purpose. I do not want to give this company the right to get this particular tract of land and then permit it to engage in general competition with other companies in the general commercial business, because the only reason for granting it is that here is a great public-service corporation that is put at a decided disadvantage in the conduct of its business by reason of a prior grant that was made to its rival, which entitles it to get coal out of the public lands, and which corporation refuses to sell to its rival any land from which it can supply itself.

Mr. KENYON. That is an unfortunate situation, but a situation which, of course, this company was fully cognizant of when it built its line.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Montana aright, this legislation is made necessary in a large degree by the fact that the general law prevents the proper development of the coal lands by private enterprise?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct; and if the general law were operative at all I should not give any countenance to this measure. It is because they can not supply themselves through the operation of the general law that I am supporting it.

Mr. LODGE. That is, if the Senator will allow me, it has been found that men will not invest money in developing coal lands unless there is a hope of getting a reasonable return?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator spoke of $200,000 being necessary to establish a mining plant, and said that 320 acres could not possibly supply such a plant?

Mr. WALSH. It would not justify that expenditure.

Mr. LODGE. Therefore they will not invest, I suppose.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if it is not a fact that this measure is rendered necessary for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co. by reason of previous legislation which granted to the Northern Pacific and other railway companies the right to secure possession of coal lands, and now new railroads can not compete with them on that account?

Mr. WALSH. Essentially, it is that consideration, and the further consideration that the general law in relation to the disposition of public coal lands has proven inoperative.

Mr. LANE. Was not that general law passed since the grant was made to the Northern Pacific Railroad?

Mr. WALSH. That law was passed in 1872.

Mr. LANE. When was the grant to the Northern Pacific Co.?

Mr. WALSH. In 1864.

Mr. LANE. Yes. You see, the fact is, in this case, if the Senator will pardon me, that there were large grants made to the Northern Pacific through which it gained access to these coal fields. Later on came a general law which denied the individual free access to them. Now, if I am not mistaken, this coal field is the continuation of the great Crow's Nest coal vein, the finest quality of coal on the Pacific coast outside of Alaska, and next after the anthracite coal of Pennsylvania the best coal in America, and the largest body known in North America.

Here is a railroad trying to get through the country, and it needs coal for its own use. Its opponents not only have access to the coal in Montana, but they have also secured large holdings in British Columbia in the Crow's Nest vein, and they control the situation.

It is an unfortunate condition. I do not like to see the title given to this railway. I am opposed to it; and yet I can see the justice of the claim of the Senator from Montana, if it is properly guarded.

The fact is that we are correcting one piece of bad legislation by passing another. We are confronted with the mistakes of the past. It is an unfortunate condition. If a substitute could be offered for this bill which would allow this railroad company, for its own use, to go into that coal field and to dig out of the ground sufficient coal to operate its railway, for that purpose only, at a toll or rate of rental to the Government of 10 cents a ton or 5 cents a ton, and have the use of it as long as it was used for that purpose, and so long only, I would be perfectly willing to grant it, and think it ought to be done. If, however, we let them in here with a title in fee simple as an entering wedge into that coal field, I am wondering what is going to become of that coal.

It is vitally important, gentlemen, to the entire Pacific coast. If I am right in my geographical information concerning it, it is a down-hill pull to the Pacific coast. Its supply is the greatest available for an immense territory of country, which is going to be dependent upon it for fuel for all time to come.

It is a wonderful resource of wealth. I do not live in Montana; but I believe the Senator will concede, if I am right in my surmise, that it is a continuation of the Crow's Nest coal and of similar quality. If that is the fact, it should be guarded well and carefully, and at the same time we should do justice by this railway company.

I hope the Senator has guarded that matter, for I should like to help the railroad company to open up that country. At the same time I do not want to be a party to any of the tactics which were practiced in behalf of the Northern Pacific and other railroads that went in there at an early day and grabbed up and now hold the natural resources of the country, to the disadvantage and loss of the people of that entire section for hundreds of years to come. It would have been better for the people and cheaper if this Government had given to the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and the Oregon & California Railway Co. and Central Pacific Railway Co. a hundred million dollars in cash to have gone over into China and gone to raising rice instead of allowing them the possession of the resources of that section as it did.

This matter wants to be guarded well, and I hope it has been or will be done.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate joint resolution No. 1.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until this measure which has been before the Senate is disposed of.

Mr. THOMAS. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN].

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall not consume much of the time of the Senate at this juncture. I know most of us are anxious to have a vote on this resolution, and I will only state a few of the reasons why I shall vote for giving the right of suffrage to American women. It appears to me that very few weighty reasons have been urged for not giving women the right to vote, and it has with some reason been said that the strongest argument for woman suffrage is the absence of any valid argument against it.

I do not believe the millennium will come merely by giving women the right to vote. We shall then, as now, make mistakes in the conduct of governmental affairs; unfit men will at times be elected to public office; unwise policies will be determined upon. There are, however, certain questions which women will give more serious attention to than most men do, and certain conditions the removal of which they will insist on, because those questions and those conditions concern the home and the family. One of those questions is the doing away with the vice of intemperance and its thousand and one attendant evils. The wife whose husband spends his earnings in the saloon, who suffers not only from want of material things but often has to suffer actual abuse at his hands, to say nothing of the shame and humiliation, has no patience with the temporizing with this evil condition; the mother who sees her son become a drunken sot, losing all manhood and all ambition and becoming a curse to himself and his family, or who perhaps sees a daughter started on the downward path because of the same sinister influence, will not hesitate to strike at the root of the evil when the opportunity presents itself. And other and happier mothers will be quick to do anything to eradicate this awful curse. Men are more apt to pass it by unnoticed so long as it does not strike near home, with perhaps a passing feeling of sympathy for the unfortunate families, congratulating themselves that they are more fortunate. Women see more clearly the ever-present danger of some member of their family taking the first short and easy step on the downward path, and which usually has but one end.

I believe that this Nation will soon, and that all nations must ultimately, stamp out the liquor curse, if they are not to perish from the earth. And I believe that giving the women the vote will hasten the day when this is accomplished in the United States. I know that in my State the influence of the women is what made it possible to banish the saloon. At the present time there is no danger of North Dakota reestablishing the saloon—there are few men within its borders who dare to suggest such a possibility—but there was a time when the sentiment was not so strongly in favor of prohibition, when it was an untried experiment, and then it was that the efforts and influence of the women were needed to make North Dakota one of the first States where the people had the moral courage to stamp out this monstrous traffic in the lives and happiness of men and women—the liquor traffic.

I quote from the immortal Lincoln, who was a believer in national prohibition:

> The liquor traffic is a cancer in society, eating the vitals and threatening destruction, and all attempts to regulate it will not only prove abortive, but will aggravate the evil. There must be no attempts to regulate the cancer. It must be eradicated, not a root must be left behind, for until this is done all classes must continue in danger of becoming victims of strong drink. "If it is a crime to make a counterfeit dollar, it is ten thousand times a worse crime to make a counterfeit man."

On the very day of his assassination Lincoln is reported to have said to his friend Maj. J. B. Merwin, of Middlefield, Conn.:

> We have cleaned up, by the help of the people, a colossal job. Slavery is abolished. The next great question will be the overthrow of the legalized liquor traffic. And you know, Merwin, that my head and my heart, my hand and my purse will go into that work. In 1842, less than a quarter of a century ago, I predicted that the day would come when there would be neither a slave nor a drunkard in the land; I have lived to see one prediction fulfilled; I hope to see the other realized.

Mr. President, if there were no other reason, this would be a sufficient one for me to vote to give women the ballot. There are, however, numerous other conditions affecting the home more or less directly, which I believe women will deal more promptly and more courageously with than men have done in most instances. I am emphasizing this aspect of the question because I believe there is where the effect of woman suffrage will first be felt and most strongly and beneficially felt. On other questions there is no reason to believe that women will make any more blunders than men have made. They have as much intelligence with which to consider such questions as men have; they have as much interest in whether the Government is good or bad as men have; and they have just as much right to say how they shall be governed as men have. If many of them have not paid much attention to public affairs in the past, there is a reason why they have not. They have had no opportunity to make their opinions and beliefs felt; it would have been strange if they had, under the circumstances, given as much attention to such matters as men have. In the States which have woman suffrage there has not, so far as I have noticed, been any complaint as to the failure of the women to take an interest in public affairs and cast their ballots.

I believe that giving women the suffrage will have a beneficial effect both in respect to those matters in which they are especially interested and others with which they are, perhaps, a little less concerned than men. When the mothers of the Nation have a voice in the conduct of its affairs there will be more concern on the part of the Government for the welfare of the sons and daughters of those mothers. In 20 years, I believe, it will seem as strange that anyone opposed woman suffrage as it now seems that there ever was opposition to universal suffrage among men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN].

Mr. THOMAS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GRONNA. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Owen | Sutherland |
| Bankhead | Hughes | Page | Swanson |
| Bradley | James | Perkins | Thomas |
| Brandegee | Johnson | Poindexter | Thornton |
| Bristow | Jones | Pomerene | Tillman |
| Bryan | Kenyon | Ransdell | Townsend |
| Burton | Lane | Reed | Vardaman |
| Chamberlain | Lee, Md. | Shafroth | Warren |
| Chilton | McCumber | Sheppard | Weeks |
| Clapp | Martin, Va. | Sherman | West |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ga. | Williams |
| Dillingham | Nelson | Smith, S. C. | |
| Gallinger | Norris | Smoot | |
| Gronna | Overman | Stephenson | |

Mr. REED. My colleague [Mr. STONE] is detained from the Senate by illness. During his absence he is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I make this announcement for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I will not consume more than one minute of the time of the Senate. I will merely say, in explanation of the vote I am going to give on the main proposition, that I believe each State should have the right to settle the question of woman suffrage for itself. For that reason I shall vote against the main proposition.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have the pending amendment read. It is an amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I understand, to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 12, of the joint resolution, after the word "sex," insert the following:

But in all other respects the right of citizens to vote shall be controlled by the State wherein they reside.

Mr. GRONNA. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the call seconded?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment I wish to suggest to have incorporated in the RECORD, if there is no objection, a communication of a few pages bearing upon the constitutionality of an amendment to the Constitution of this type. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] the other day incorporated in the RECORD a statement called "The State Rights Shibboleth," a rather extreme contribution, and this perhaps may be said to balance the matter on the other side. It is a communication from a very able lawyer who has made a special study of the fifteenth amendment and cases pending under the same. I will suggest that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BALTIMORE, *March 17, 1914.*

Hon. BLAIR LEE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: As I understand it, the question concerning which you have asked my opinion is substantially this:

Would the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in so far as the same may purport to confer upon women the right to vote at State elections, or to vote at election of United States Senators, be a valid exercise of the power to amend the Constitution conferred upon three-fourths of the States by Article V of said Constitution as against any State not assenting to or ratifying such amendment?

As you are aware, I have heretofore had occasion, in another connection, to give very careful consideration to some phases of this question, and I will proceed to state, as briefly as I may, the conclusions at which I have arrived.

Prior to the Civil War the question most fiercely debated was whether the Constitution was the result of a compact between the States, and therefore a creation of the States themselves, or whether it was a Government "ordained and established" by "the people of the United States," as recited in the preamble.

Whether rightly or wrongly, the latter view has prevailed as the result of the Civil War and the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and must now be accepted as a basic principle of American constitutional law.

It follows that the States, not having created or made the Constitution, have no power to change or amend it, except in so far as the power so to do has been conferred upon them by the people in the Constitution itself.

This power of amendment is conferred by Article V of the Federal Constitution in the following terms:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

It is manifest, of course, that this does not confer upon Congress any power to amend the Constitution.

Congress can only propose amendments. The States, or three-fourths of them only, can amend the Constitution by adopting such amendments as may be submitted to them under this article.

It is manifest also that in adopting this Constitution the people of the United States did not intend to confer upon three-fourths of the States an unlimited power of amendment.

In the first place, there is one express limitation upon this amending power still in force.

No amendments would be valid which would deprive any State without its consent of "its equal suffrage in the Senate."

From this express limitation, as I shall presently endeavor to show, certain implied limitations necessarily follow. But, independently of this express limitation or proviso, there is one general implied limitation upon the power of the States, or three-fourths of them, to amend the Constitution, which all will admit, viz:

No amendment could be deemed to be valid which would have the effect, in whole or in part, of defeating the purpose which the people had in view in adopting the Constitution.

Now, whatever differences of opinion in regard thereto may have existed prior to the Civil War, it is now well settled, as a result of that war and of repeated decisions of the Supreme Court, beginning with the opinion of Chief Justice Chase in the celebrated case of Texas *v.* White (7 Wall., 700), that the primary purpose and object which the people had in establishing and ordaining the Constitution was to create a Federal Union which should be perpetual; and that being so, of course, they could not have intended to confer upon the States the power to destroy the Union.

But it is equally well settled now, by the decisions of the Supreme Court to which I will presently refer and which are familiar to us all, that the preservation of the respective States in their integrity as self-existing political entities and with independent existence within their proper spheres is necessary to the perpetuity of the Union, so that any amendment which would have the effect of destroying a State would defeat the very purpose which the people had in view in establishing the Constitution by, to that extent, destroying the Union itself.

But it is not necessary in order to come within this implied limitation that an amendment or legislative act should destroy a State entirely. It is sufficient if it has the effect of stripping the State of any power or function "necessary to its independent existence as a State."

The soundness of this proposition will be made clear by a reference to the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Lane County *v.* Oregon (7 Wall., 71).

In that case the court had occasion to pass upon the question of the validity of an act of Congress which, it was claimed, required the State of Oregon to accept legal-tender notes of the United States in payment of State taxes.

The court held that the power to levy and collect taxes for the support of the State government was one of those powers which was essential to the separate and independent existence of a State.

It could not be claimed that the effect of the act of Congress in question was to entirely take away this taxing power from the State, because, of course, the United States legal-tender notes had some value.

Nevertheless, it was held that the act was void because it interfered with that power and undertook to restrain the State in the free exercise thereof.

In the course of the opinion, which was delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Chase, the court said:

"The people of the United States constitute one Nation under one Government, and this Government, within the scope of the powers with which it is invested, is supreme.

"On the other hand, the people of each State compose a State having its own government and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence. The States disunited might continue to exist. Without the States in union there could be no such political body as the United States.

"Now, to the existence of the States, themselves necessary to the existence of the United States, the power of taxation is indispensable. It is an essential function of government. * * * If, therefore, the condition of any State, in the judgment of its legislature, required the collection of taxes in kind—that is to say, by the delivery to the proper officers a certain proportion of products, or in gold and silver bullion, or in gold or silver coin—it is not easy to see upon what principle the National Legislature can interfere with the exercise, to that end, of this power, original in the States and never as yet surrendered."

And yet there is nothing in the Constitution expressly forbidding Congress to require a State to accept legal-tender notes of the United States in payment of taxes.

Again, in the case of Collector *v.* Day (11 Wall., 113), the Supreme Court held that the right and power to establish and maintain a judiciary was one of the functions essential to the independent existence of a State as such. That, although section 8 of Article I of the Constitution confers upon Congress in the broadest terms the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * * and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," and nowhere expressly forbids Congress in the exercise of this taxing power to tax the salary of a State official, yet that such an act of Congress was void, for the reason that it came within the implied limitation upon the taxing power; that it should not be used to, in effect, destroy a State by interfering with the exercise by that State, even in a small degree, of one of the powers essential to its existence as a State.

Mr. Justice Nelson, in delivering the opinion of the court (p. 123), discusses the necessary limitations of the taxing power in a manner which we submit is equally applicable to the amending power, as follows:

"The cases of McCulloh *v.* Maryland (4 Wheaton, 816) and Weston *v.* Charles (2 Peters, 449) were referred to as settling the principle that governed the case, namely, that the State governments can not lay a tax upon the constitutional means employed by the Government of the Union to execute its constitutional powers.

"The soundness of this principle is happily illustrated by the Chief Justice in McCulloh *v.* Maryland. 'If the States,' he observes, 'may tax one instrument employed by the Government in the execution of its powers, they may tax any and every instrument.' They may tax the mint. They may tax patent rights. They may tax judicial process. They may tax all the means employed by the Government to an extent which would defeat all the ends of government.

"'This,' he observes, 'was not intended by the American people. They did not design to make their Government dependent on the State.' (And it must be equally true, it seems to me, that the American people did not design to make any of the States dependent for their existence as Republics—as States with a republican form of government—upon the will of any particular number of States.) And, again: 'That the power of taxing it (the bank) by the State may be exercised so far as to destroy it is too obvious to be denied. * * * If the right to impose the tax exists, it is a right which in its nature acknowledges no limit.'"

It seems to me that this reasoning is equally applicable to the proposed woman's-suffrage amendment. That the right of a State to determine for itself who shall constitute its electorate—who shall vote at State elections—is one of the powers "essential to the existence of a State" would seem to be self-evident.

If any outside power has the right to regulate or control the right to vote at State elections in one respect, it has the right to regulate or control it in others. If it has a right to say that women shall vote at State elections, it would equally have the right to say that men should not vote. It would equally have the right to say that only children or that only certain classes of men having certain political or religious opinions should vote, or that only one or two men should vote. Upon the principles announced in the opinion just quoted from, it would seem to be clear that the proposed amendment would have to be regarded as a recognition of the right of three-fourths of the States to at least restrain or a hamper in the exercise of one of the functions essential to its very existence as a State within the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore void.

Quoting further from the same opinion:

"Upon looking into the Constitution it will be found that but a few of the articles in that instrument could be carried into practical effect without the existence of the States.

"The Constitution guarantees to the States a republican form of government and protects each against invasion or domestic violence. Such being the separate and independent condition of the States in our complex system, as recognized by the Constitution, and the existence of which is so indispensable that without them the General Government itself would disappear from the family of nations, it would seem to

follow as a reasonable, if not necessary, consequence that the means and instrumentalities employed for carrying on the operations of their governments, for preserving their existence, and fulfilling the high and responsible duties assigned to them in the Constitution, should be left free and unimpaired, should not be liable to be crippled, much less defeated by the taxing power of another government, which power acknowledges no limits but the will of the legislative body imposing the tax. * * * Without this power and the exercise of it, we risk nothing in saying that no one of the States under the form of government guaranteed by the Constitution could long preserve its existence. A despotic government might. (Pages 124–126.)

"It is admitted that there is no express provision in the Constitution that prohibits the General Government from taxing the means and instrumentalities of the States, nor is there any prohibiting the States from taxing the means and instrumentalities of that Government. In both cases the exemption rests upon necessary implication and is upheld by the great law of self-preservation, as any government whose means employed in conducting its operations, if subject to the control of another and distinct government, can exist only at the mercy of that government. Of what avail are these means if another power may tax them at discretion?"

Now, applying this reasoning to the question in hand, I submit:

(a) That if the right to tax is "a right which in its nature acknowledges no limits," so the right to extend or limit the elective franchise in a State is equally a right which in its nature acknowledges no limits.

If three-fourths of the States have the right under the amending power or under the pretense of exercising the right under the amending power to say that a State shall not deny or abridge the right to vote at State elections to any person on account of his or her sex, they have an equal right to say that a State shall deny to such person the right to vote on account of sex. They have a right, as already suggested, to prohibit men or grown persons of either sex to vote altogether; they have a right to say that only Indians shall vote in Oklahoma; they have a right to say that only Japanese or Chinese shall vote in California; they have a right to say that only Scotch Presbyterians or Irish Catholics or Hebrews or Episcopalians shall vote in New York. Clearly, the power that has a right to determine all this is the State, because the people who exercise the powers of government are those who have the power to elect public officials, the instruments through which those powers are exercised in the legislative and executive and judicial departments of the Government.

When the French Monarch made the historic boast "I am the State," he spoke the truth, because he stated a fact which none could deny. His will was law, and he determined who should fill all the offices of government. Therefore he was the State.

It is true that there is no express provision in the Constitution forbidding three-fourths of the States from interfering with the control by any State of its own electorate. But, as was said by the Supreme Court in the case from which we have been quoting, in denying the power of the Federal Government to tax the means and instrumentalities of the governments of the States the exemption from such interference "rests upon necessary implication and is upheld by the great law of self-preservation," as any government whose power to control its own elections is subject to the control of another distinct government and authority "can exist only at the mercy of the latter."

In *McCulloh v. Maryland*, Chief Justice Marshall said "that the power to tax involves the power to destroy," and while the tax in question did not, as a matter of fact, destroy the United States bank the law imposing the tax was held to be void because of its violation of the immunity which the bank as an instrumentality of the Federal Government possessed against even the beginning of such destruction. In other words, for all practical purposes any government which has lost the power to protect itself from destruction at the hands of another government or other outside authority is regarded as having been destroyed as an independent political entity.

Again, the very language of Article V in conferring the amending power contemplated the continued existence of the States. The Constitution may be amended by a vote of three-fourths of the States. Once destroy the States as such and there will no longer be any constitutional means of amending the Constitution and no means of doing so left, except by revolution. It is true that the right of a free people to change their form of government whenever in their judgment it ceases to fulfill the proper functions of government is absolute, and is so declared to be in the American Declaration of Independence. But that right is not a constitutional right. It is the right of revolution. What we are concerned with here are only constitutional rights.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

For reasons which it is not now necessary to go into, I am of the opinion—and shall remain of that opinion until the Supreme Court shall determine otherwise—that this language properly construed would not make the amendment applicable to voting at State elections. "Citizens of the United States" as such have no right to vote at State elections, and this amendment would be applicable properly only to voting at congressional elections and senatorial elections under the seventeenth amendment.

But if we assume for the purpose of the present occasion that the proposed amendment was intended to be applicable to voting at State elections, I am very clearly of the opinion that it is void, for the reasons which I am endeavoring to present.

Next to the case of *Lane County v. Oregon* (7 Wall., 71), from which I have quoted, came the great case already referred to of *Texas v. White* (7 Wall., 700).

That case turned upon the question as to whether Texas, after its admitted separation from the Union, was still a State, and required an examination of the question as to what constitutes a "State" within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, in the course of which examination the Supreme Court said:

"If, therefore, it is true that the State of Texas was not at the time of filing this bill, or is not now, one of the United States, we have no jurisdiction of this suit, and it is our duty to dismiss it." (Page 719.)

"Some not unimportant aid, however, in ascertaining the true sense of the Constitution may be derived from considering what is the correct idea of a State apart from any union or confederation with other States. The poverty of language often compels the employment of terms in quite different specifications; and of this hardly any example more signal is to be found than in the use of the word we are now considering. It would serve no useful purpose to attempt an enumeration of all the various senses in which it is used. A few only need be noticed.

"It describes sometimes a people or community of individuals united more or less closely in political relations inhabiting temporarily or permanently the same country, often it denotes only the country or territorial region inhabited by such a community; not infrequently it is applied to the Government under which the people live, at other times it represents the combined idea of people, territory, and government.

"It is not difficult to see that in all these senses the primary conception is that of a people or community. The people in whatever territory dwelling, either temporarily or permanently, and whether organized under a regular government or united by looser and less definite relations constitute the State.

"In the Constitution the term 'State' most frequently expresses the combined idea, just noticed, of people, territory, and government. A State, in the ordinary sense of the Constitution, is a political community of free citizens occupying a territory of defined boundaries and organized under a government sanctioned and limited by a written constitution and established by the consent of the governed. It is the union of such States under a common constitution which forms the distinct and greater political unit which that constitution designates as the United States and makes of the people and States which compose it one people and one country." (Pages 720–721.)

"The union of the States never was a purely artificial and arbitrary relation. It began among the Colonies and grew out of common origin, mutual sympathies, kindred principles, similar interests, and geographical relations. It was confirmed and strengthened by the necessities of war and received definite form and character and sanction from the Articles of Confederation. By these the Union was solemnly declared to 'be perpetual.' And when these articles were found to be inadequate to the exigencies of she country the Constitution was ordained 'to form a more perfect Union.' It is difficult to convey the idea of indissoluble unity more clearly than by these words. What can be indissoluble if a perpetual union, made more perfect, is not?

"But the perpetuity and indissolubility of the Union by no means implies the loss of distant and individual existence, or of the right to self-government by the States. Under the Articles of Confederation each State retained its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right not expressly delegated to the United States. Under the Constitution, though the powers of the States were much restricted still, all powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the States are preserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. And we have already had occasion to remark at this term, that 'the people of each State compose a State, having its own government, and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence,' and that 'without the States in union there would be no such political body as the United States.' Not only therefore can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States." (Pages 724–725.)

How can it be said that the people intended to establish a perpetual Union and at the same time—in the same breath—that they intended to confer upon any number of States the right to destroy it?

It does not seem to me that it is necessary to resort to any theory of implied limitation upon the amending power to show that the proposed woman-suffrage amendment would be invalid as applied to elections of United States Senators.

It seems to me it comes clearly within the provision of the express limitation upon the amending power contained in the proviso already referred to that "no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Quoting again from the Supreme Court:

"A State in the ordinary sense of the Constitution is a political community of free citizens (not of slaves), occupying territory of defined boundaries and organized under a government sanctioned and limited by a written constitution and established by consent of the governed." (Texas v. White, 7 Wall., 700.)

It is "such States" that constitute the United States. It is "such States" that are guaranteed by this proviso perpetual "equal suffrage in the Senate." That guaranty is necessarily equivalent to a guaranty that they shall continue to be "such States," States sovereign within their proper sphere of political powers.

Again, how could the people of Oregon, for example, be said to be any longer a "political community of free citizens," with "a government established by the consent of the governed," if without that consent, by an act of Congress and an amendment adopted by other States, enough Chinese or Japanese were directly or indirectly enfranchised within its borders to completely dominate its State government?

Or suppose an "amendment" were adopted conferring the right of suffrage at State elections or senatorial elections upon women in Oregon and taking it away from men, or conferring it upon Asiatics and taking it away from the Caucasian element, would that be a fulfillment of the guaranty that Oregon should never be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate? Would a "State" thus constituted or reconstituted against its will be the same Oregon which had been guaranteed forever equal suffrage in the Senate?

What is a "political community of free citizens"?

What constitutes a "State"?

Clearly it is those people in the State who have and exercise the political power—they constitute the State. In other words, it is the electorate that for all political purposes constitutes the State—they and such other persons as they may from time to time voluntarily admit to participate with them in the political power, i. e., the suffrage.

Whenever the electorate is forced against its will to admit others to participate in the exercise of the powers of government the result is an entirely new State and not the State which was guaranteed perpetual, equal representation in the United States Senate by the constitutional provisions already mentioned.

It may be suggested—in fact, I have heard it suggested—that this argument might be cited against the validity of the fourteenth amendment also, or that a portion of it which undertakes to determine who shall be citizens of a State by declaring them "all persons born in the United States or within the jurisdiction thereof shall be citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside." But it seems clear to me that no such argument can be made.

The citizenship of a State may be added to or taken away from by an outside power; but so long as the new citizens are not given by that outside power the right to vote at State elections or the right to participate in the election of those who are to exercise for the State its right of "equal suffrage in the Senate" the autonomy of that State is not affected in the slightest degree, neither is its constitutional guaranty of equal suffrage in the Senate affected.

For these reasons I respectfully venture the opinion that the proposed amendment would not be constitutional or valid, because it would not be within the power of amendment conferred upon the States, or three-fourths of them, by the Constitution.

Perhaps I may be permitted to add that even if it should be hereafter held that such power of amendment exists, I am frankly unable to see how any man who believes that the States, which are, as we might say, the water-tight compartments of the Constitution, should be preserved in their integrity, can vote in favor of the exercise of such a power. It seems to me that the question of granting or refusing to women the right of suffrage in State and senatorial elections is essentially a State question.

Very truly, yours,

WM. L. MARBURY.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, that in voting against this proposed constitutional amendment to enfranchise women, I do so on the ground that I believe it is a matter for regulation by the States. I believe it will be brought about more gradually, if it is a great reform, in that manner than by national action; that every advantage which can be secured out of any such great movement can be better secured and more constitutionally secured and more effectually secured by the education of the very people themselves who are to receive the franchise by the action of the several States themselves in due order than by imposing such an amendment upon the whole country, regardless of the local effect or the local interest or local conditions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to say in brief explanation of the votes I shall cast on the subject now before the Senate that I believe women should be accorded the right to vote. I am not yet convinced that this question of suffrage is a proper subject for Federal jurisdiction. But I shall not permit the fact that I am not so convinced to cause me to vote to prevent the American people from saying whether it is a proper subject for Federal jurisdiction. I shall not resist the expression of the popular will on a subject of such importance, a subject on which so many people wish the Nation to act. If these amendments to the Federal Constitution are not desirable, let the people say so. Senators ought not to say that the American people shall not consider these amendments unless Senators are first convinced that the amendments are in themselves advisable. I shall vote to submit the Vardaman proposition and the Ashurst proposition to the American people, who will voice their sentiment through the various States. Let the people speak.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the sentence or two just pronounced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. The misfortune about that position is that the moment we vote to submit this amendment to the States we take the position that it is a question which ought to be acted upon by the Federal Government. We can not sever ourselves from that position. Those of us who believe that the States ought to decide for themselves the conditions of suffrage within the States, and that other States ought to have nothing to do with that question; those of us who have always occupied that position, and who hold the position dating back to our forefathers, back to beyond the point when the fifteenth amendment was adopted; those of us who have stood in the shoe tracks of our forefathers, who said that Federal officials should be elected by those electors within the States who were given by the States the right to elect the most numerous branch of the State legislature, could not vote to submit this to the States except by first agreeing that it is a proper matter of Federal legislation, and that a minority of States should be coerced by a three-fourths majority and stripped in coercion of their State right to prescribe the condition of suffrage within the State. That we do not admit.

In this connection, Mr. President, on November 11 last Mrs. Helen H. Gardener made a speech at New Orleans, La. She is one of the most distinguished advocates of woman suffrage in this entire country. That speech was adopted by the Southern States suffragists as a campaign document and was published by the Southern States Woman Suffrage Conference. I ask leave to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being none, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Speech made in New Orleans, La., November 11. Adopted by all the Southern States suffragists as a "campaign document."]

WOMAN SUFFRAGE—WHICH WAY?

[Compliments of Helen H. Gardener.]

The time is past when there is any question as to whether or not we are to have woman suffrage. Already in 10 of our States it is an established fact and in 28 countries it is in operation and developing in scope with astonishing rapidity.

The question before us now is, Which way do we prefer to have it come—State by State, as it has so far come, or all at one time by constitutional amendment?

The South has had some rather trying experiences with the vote being conferred upon its citizens by the latter method.

With that experience in mind the question now is, Is the South willing to delay so long, to lag back so far, in this new movement in popular government, that it will again have the matter taken out of its own hands and be struck by another tremendous tidal wave of citizenship conferred from the outside, instead of being developed, won, and delivered from the inside?

Is it not far better that the men (as well as the women) of the South recognize that a real democracy is at hand? That a real (and the first) Republic is about to be born where government shall, in deed and in truth, rest upon the consent of the governed. Where there shall not be taxation without representation.

Where the "people" shall rule. Where one-half of the human race shall be recognized as "people" and not, as heretofore, a mere annex to the other half, political nonentities.

Is it not better that the southern men shall plan for and offer to share the citizenship which they prize beyond rubies for themselves with the women of their households?

The South is famed for its chivalry, yet the men of 10 of our Western States have passed them in this race for chivalry which is based upon justice. A chivalry which says to the women of their households: "We do not want to bind you by laws which we would fight to the death were they applied to us. We do not want to hold you in legal subjection. We are unwilling to hold a legal and political advantage over you. We feel humiliated by every law which humiliates you. You must and shall have every legal and political right which we claim as ours. Our liberty will be sweeter and dearer to us if it is shared with you. A country can not be free with its mothers a subject class before the law, with half of its people political paupers, utterly dependent upon the other half for justice. We are unwilling to hold office and legislate for the welfare of those who are not allowed to express themselves at the polls. We want our commissions as lawmakers to come from the homes as well as from the street and the office. We do not want the great words and principles of 'liberty' and 'democracy' to be too small to extend to both sexes. We are willing to share with women that for which we have fought and they have sustained us. They stood by our sides and helped to conquer the wilderness. They bore the hardships as well as the men to conquer those hardships. We refuse to take for ourselves alone the best and highest results of the struggle—liberty, equality, fraternity."

And with this outlook, with this splendid sense of chivalry that is based upon justice, the men of 10 Western States have already given to the women of those States absolute political and legal equality.

Is not that a far finer chivalry than is mere word flattery?

Is it not better that each State take this matter of its own electorate into its own hands, do it in its own way, with an eye ever upon local needs, conditions, dangers, and limitations that can be best met by local enactments?

Is it not far better that these needs and limitations and dangers be frankly and freely discussed by the men and women of each State, and that they work together to meet them with fairness and with their united wisdom? Are you willing that the western men outdo you, surpass the southern men in justice, courtesy, and respect for the women of their States? Do you put less trust in, have you southern men less confidence to repose in the mothers who bore you, the wives who bear your children, the daughters of whom you are so proud, than have the men of Illinois or California or Colorado? Are you willing that your women shall appeal in vain to you for citizenship, for the birthright of self-government, and that they shall receive it at the hands of men more just than you—through constitutional amendment? Do you not fear that the South will again be unprepared, and, therefore, swamped by its own electorate if this is the method of your receiving into your body politic the new voters? Is it not far better that you put your own house in order in your own way? Will not this gain and insure to you the gratitude, respect, and cooperation of the new citizens far more surely than the other way?

I can assure you, in this connection, that the western women are almost as proud of their men for having given them the franchise without a serious struggle by them to secure it, as they are of their new dignity of citizenship itself. They point with the greatest pride to the fact that the men of their States gave them what they so deeply prized for themselves and that these men never fail, in season or out of season, to express their confidence in the wisdom, the justice, and the success of recognizing the fact that women are people in a government where "the voice of the people" is the law of the land.

These men never fail, in season and out of season, to express their belief and knowledge that it has worked good, and only good, to their States.

And you must remember that it is no longer an experiment in some of them.

In Colorado, the most populous of them, where the women have been voters for so long (20 years) a time as to make it beyond question a good test, a State where there are large cities and vast wealth, a State which has many difficult problems to face, with its tremendous mining interests and problems that follow mining camps and frontier towns, as well as in the vice and liquor interests of these camps and the big, rich cities, it is the universal testimony of the public men of Colorado that the votes and the help of the women has been of inestimable value in bringing that State into the high condition of civilization to which it has attained. These men have found the advice, the insight, and the cooperation of the women of the State invaluable. It has resulted in a far higher grade of public officials being chosen, and in many other ways it has greatly benefited the State.

And it has done something even finer than this. It has made of those men and women real friends, real comrades. They respect each other. They trust each other in a better and finer sense. They realize that they are equally responsible for the defects of their government. The women are not resentful or petty in their judgments, holding the men to account for all the wrongs and mistakes and holding themselves as "judges after the fact," without responsibility and without redress, in short, without understanding of the needs, the difficulties, and the possible remedies.

They work together for the things they want. If they find they have made a mistake, they work together to correct it. This leaves no place for sex antagonism. It enlarges the outlook of the women. It makes them realize that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and that the governing of a city or a State is simply a larger housekeeping, a larger home making, for, after all, what is the State but your home? What is your city but your home?

The house you live in is only the smaller part of your home, just as the room you sleep in is another smaller part of that house—home—just as the kitchen or the dining room are your "home," but surely not all of your home.

No woman is doing all of her home making (her housekeeping) if she keeps only her own special room clean and attractive. She is not a good home maker if she thinks of and sees nothing but her kitchen. These parts of a home are not the home. Any one of them may be a model of its kind and the home be utterly chaotic—a bedlam, unhealthy and a menace to the lives and morals of the family.

It is equally true of the city and the State. The woman has the home maker's instinct. Men are natural nomads. They are born hunters, campers. What man ever makes a real home? He may pay for chairs and tables and cookstoves, but the quality which transforms these things into a home (whether of high or low estate) is the woman's natural part. She wants permanency. She wants cleanliness. She wants order. She wants beauty and harmony of surroundings. The State needs these and the other qualities which women bring to their work. Men do not see, or, seeing, do not care much for many of the things which make for the higher civilization, the cleaner, more ordered life. Garbage cans in the street, raw meat hung in the dust, milk cans washed in polluted water, these things are the housekeeper's problem. They appeal to women. Men are thinking of stocks, bonds, crops of cotton or grain—then the epidemic comes along, the typhoid gathers in a few loved ones, and some woman's club comes forward and finds out that the water supply of the town is polluted.

A clever writer said, in this connection, that women do not have to go out of the home (which was asserted to be her "sphere") in order to get into politics. Politics comes into the home and gets inside of the baby whenever some milkman with a pull and a dirty farm leaves milk at your front door.

But we must all understand that this "feminist movement" is not local. It is world-wide. It began with the education of girls and it can not and will not stop until every legal disability is removed—until woman stands as a human unit, even as her brother is a human unit.

Throughout history he has looked upon himself as the unit and upon her as the cipher that stood back of him.

From his point of view, of itself the cipher was valueless. In its relation to him only did it achieve value.

It multiplied him tenfold.

If he chose to remove himself, she became once more the cipher.

He remained the original unit.

If this condition was to remain, the first fatal blunder was made when women were allowed (not so long ago, either) to learn the alphabet.

That settled for all time her status of human personality, individuality, and in its finality her citizenship.

And, after all, it has taken a very brief time, as history goes, to lift the women of the world onto a plane of individual activity compared with the eons of time that it required to do the same thing for different classes of men.

Up to a few hundred years ago the masses of men were the pawns that barons and kings used to play with.

Men were the ciphers then, used by brute force and inherited rank to give fictitious value to themselves. The masses of men were no more considered by the masters of men in the questions of state than are the women now.

Those in power then, like some of them now, simply laughed at the mere idea of "the average man" having the same legal rights and political opportunities as were held by the privileged class of men.

They said it wasn't his place. He would be unfit for self-government. He would become "out of his sphere" and wreck the state.

Well, he changed the state, it is true, but he bettered it, and what was more important still, he bettered himself. He grew up to his new dignity and status of a human unit. Women must and will do the same.

And there never was in all history so well prepared a new electorate in the matter of education and intelligence as would be the women of America.

But we must remember that every struggle that man has made for his own emancipation from bondage to his hereditary rulers has, in the long run, worked as a leaven for woman's liberty also.

Men did not know it. They did not intend it. They were not able to think in a universal language. They thought in the language of sex and acted for one-half of the race only. The language of humanity was yet to be learned, even as the language of liberty for the male half of the human race was just becoming a spoken language.

But, after all, every blow that was struck for their own human status helped to weaken the bonds on the other half of the race which all the while stood beside the men of her household helping and encouraging him in his upward struggle.

She has earned your help now.

Her hour has struck. She is struggling for her rightful human status before the law, as a citizen, even as man struggled for his.

It would be ingratitude unspeakable for him to refuse to her the help and encouragement which she so faithfully gave to him. Never an argument used by man in the interest of his own liberty but applies with equal or added force to women. Never one!

Listen! Let me quote from three of your Democratic leaders of to-day. Then you shall say whether what they say is true, whether they meant what they said, whether they know the use of common language.

I shall quote from that distinguished Democrat, William Randolph Hearst, but lest you may not look upon him as the highest Democratic authority, I shall quote from your silver-tongued Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan. But, going even higher than that, going to a Democrat who is a southern man, an expert in the use of language, and your chosen leader, President Wilson, I shall quote from him, and then we shall decide whether they meant what they said, whether they know the use of ordinary English, and whether they have yet learned the language of humanity, or whether they still speak the language of sex only and believe that women are not human units, not people, not persons, not citizens; whether they truly believe that men are "all of the people" and that women are a mere annex to the human race.

In a very remarkable article written recently by that distinguished Democrat, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, in speaking of the founders of this Nation, he said:

"On the one hand were the Democratic Republicans, who believe both in the letter and in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, who were convinced that a new order of things was both advisable and advantageous; that the old-established systems of government by a superior class were failures; and that the government by all the people was not only the most just and righteous, but the most practical and the most successful form of government that could be devised."

Did he mean it? Government by all of the people, and that there should be no class? Did this distinguished Democrat mean just that? That that is the only righteous form of government? And, then, are women people?

Have words a par value or are they merely hereditary forms of speech?

In speaking before a great patriotic body of women recently in Washington our silver-tongued Secretary of State, the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, used these words:

"We established an independent nation in order that men might enjoy a new kind of happiness and a new kind of dignity. That kind which a man has when he respects every other man's and woman's individuality as he respects his own; where he is not willing to draw distinctions between classes; where he is not willing to shut the door of privilege in the face of anyone."

Now, women are certainly "anyone," whether they are people or citizens, or not. He demands the kind of dignity that respects every other man's and woman's individuality as he respects his own. Did he mean it?

Again, he said before this same distinguished body of patriotic women, of whom I was one:

"The problems are different but the principles are the same," and the principles are precisely the same. "Turn back to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and apply the principles found in them to our modern questions.

"This spirit must lead you to work for the preservation to each individual of his inalienable rights and to keep this a Government of the people, for the people, by the people. You must throw your influence on the side of the people in their struggle for liberty. Then, and then only, will you be true Daughters of the American Revolution."

Now, are women individuals? Are they people? Did the Secretary of State really mean those words at their par value. I hope that he did.

The arguments against woman suffrage are, in point of fact, always in the ultimate analysis simply arguments against self-government. They are in the ultimate analysis based on opposition to our form of government. They are the arguments which have been used by king to serf in all the ages past, with women now the disqualified unit instead of labor or poverty or any other "lower class."

If government is to rest upon suffrage at all—that is, upon the expressed will of anybody not a "king by divine right"—who is to decide that men are born with that divine right to vote, to express themselves in civic affairs, and that I am not?

When and how did they get the right and where and how did I lose it?

That always puzzles me. I can not remember when I lost it. How did one type of human units get the right to decide that another type of human units shall not have liberty of conscience and expression? I never could understand that. If it is a divine right, what particular streak of divinity has been discovered in man that women lack?

If it is not a natural, inherent, human right, then they say it is a "conferred privilege." Now, who conferred it? On what basis did they confer it, and where did they get it to confer?

Has the supply run out? Is not special privilege in government, in the final analysis, simply a wrong and an outrage against which people have been fighting since history began? Kings claim to be born with this divine right. The founders of our Government scouted the idea—for kings, but not for men. They announced to the world that we were born "free and equal," and that all just government is based upon the consent of the governed. They said—and both our President and Secretary of State said to us recently in this patriotic organization of women—that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I hope that they realized, even when they were saying it, that it was only a glittering form of speech. I hope that they realized that it is, in fact, a government of all of the people by a half of the people for a few of the people.

I hope that they realize that the Democratic Party now has the most wonderful opportunity that any party ever had since the beginning of time; an opportunity to make that great glittering generality a fact instead of a fiction.

Again, I want to point a moral here, and so I am going to quote from President Wilson:

"As for other men setting up as a Providence over myself, I seriously object. I will not live under trustees if I can help it. If any part of our people want to be wards; if they want to have guardians put over them; if they want to be taken care of; if they want to be children patronized by the Government; why I am sorry, because it will sap the manhood of America."

There never was a truer thing written than that. And it has already sapped the womanhood of America to such an extent that there are women willing to travel around the country telling other women that their place is at home; that they ought to stay inside of four walls, where guardians and trustees will keep them in perpetual tutelage, and take care of them like children, and they should not even want the ability to express themselves in their own government.

These traveling ladies, who insist that woman's place is the home, assert that this movement of ours is one of sex antagonism.

Was it "sex antagonism" that made President Wilson object to having guardians set over him? Let us use a little common sense and a little common honesty in dealing with these questions that are basically as old as time—the question of human rights; the question of equality before the law; the question of self-government. I should think men would be ashamed to accept opportunities, rights, and privileges which they are unwilling to share with their mothers and sisters and wives.

I am glad that the men of 10 of our States and of 28 countries have grown ashamed of it.

And there isn't even anything new about the cry of "stirring up sex antagonism." It is the same old argument used against Thomas Jefferson and against every other man who has stood for real democracy. It is the cry of power against people. It is the argument of those who have against those who have not the benefits which all must pay for. Absolutely the only change in it is that to-day they use the word "sex," while in our fathers' day they used "class antagonism" to cover the same old selfish abuse of privilege.

Again, in a recent speech, President Wilson emphasized in the strongest possible words—if words have any par value—the fact that it is not the size, nor the ability to fight, that is the sacred part of America's heritage, or the part which should give her distinction in the world, but that it is her claim to be governed by the consent of all of her people.

He even went so far as to say that he "would like to believe that nowhere could a government endure which is supported by anything but the consent of the governed."

That must be looked upon as pretty strong language by the war lord of Germany and a number of other rulers who do not trouble their heads about what "the people" consent to or do not consent to.

They treat the opinions and personal rights of the male people with almost as much contempt and disregard as America hands out to her women people.

But, lest you think I have misquoted the President, I want to read his own words. Then you may judge whether, if he knows the use of words as well as all believe he does, these were used at par value or only in a Pickwickian sense.

He was speaking of the great size of our country. Then he said:

"But the extent of the American conquest is not what gives America distinction in the annals of the world. It is the professed purpose of the conquest, which was to see to it that every foot of that land should be the home of free, self-governed people, who should have no government whatever which did not rest upon the consent of the governed. I would like to believe that all this hemisphere is devoted to the same sacred purpose, and that nowhere can any government endure which is stained by blood or supported by anything but the consent of the governed." (Woodrow Wilson's address, Swarthmore College, Pa., Oct. 25, 1913; Washington Post.)

In a book recently written by that distinguished and able statesman from Mississippi, Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, he has collected and commented upon the strongest and best writings and acts of the father of Democracy, Thomas Jefferson.

There is hardly a page of the volume which is not, in point of fact, an unanswerable argument for woman suffrage. And this holds good in regard to the words of both Thomas Jefferson and Senator WILLIAMS.

It is quite possible that neither of these men realized in the least that their words, if taken at par value, were quite as strong arguments for women and their liberty and self-government as they were for these same desirable things for men.

It is quite possible they were merely hereditary forms of speech when they used "mankind" to mean men only, or when they said "all of the people" or citizens, or "all those amenable to the laws" must have a voice in making the laws, and like forms of expression.

Possibly neither Thomas Jefferson nor Senator WILLIAMS so much as thought of one-half of all these "people" or "citizens" who must obey the laws when they propounded the "self-evident facts" about "inalienable rights," "rights derived from God" that could not be alienated even by their own consent, etc. How did all these terms get to be the property of one-half of mankind? Rights are not masculine only, and justice knows no sex.

Not long ago I heard a distinguished woman—one who has served the public as well as her family for many years—comment upon just this point. She said: "It is not a good thing to belong to a class of people who are absolutely forgotten, overlooked, when men are aspiring to advance the great principles of progress—when they are laboring to forward liberty. The humiliation of it is far deeper than was that of our forefathers, who were not looked upon as so negligible and unworthy an element as to be overlooked or ignored by King George, but as rebellious people to be coerced by him.

"It is a more humiliating thing to belong to a class that is so negligible as to have its 'rights' and needs forgotten than to belong to a class upon which imposition is attempted intentionally."

Now, is not that true?

It is the holding of women in perpetual tutelage, the eternal "playing of Providence" (as President Wilson puts it), the holding as wards, without limit of age or time, the patronizing against which the President so forcefully protests—when it is applied between man and man—it is this to which women who understand the fundamental principles of Democracy, the underlying thought of self-government—it is this against which women cry out in the selfsame words and for the selfsame reasons which actuated Thomas Jefferson, and which sustained our forefathers in their seemingly unequal fight against the "divine-right" idea as it was presented in their day.

Kings claimed to rule by divine right then—and mankind was voiceless, and must remain content with what was doled out from above.

Men are the "divine-right" rulers to-day, and half of mankind must, they say, remain content with what is doled out to them in the same way. The principle is no whit changed—only the stage and the actors. The result will be the same, also.

Now, assuming that all this is true, assuming that these and other distinguished Democrats (as well as Republicans and Progressives) said what they meant, assuming that they know the par value of words, assuming that they are sincere when they speak or write for the public (and I would not wish to be guilty of assuming anything else in their cases), I have come to you to ask in which way the South is going to meet this question—State by State, controlling the details itself, or by a national constitutional amendment?

On June 13 of this year the committee in charge of this matter in the United States Senate reported favorably the following joint resolution:

"ARTICLE —.

"SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

The same bill was introduced in the House, but is not yet reported. On July 31 more than 20 Senators spoke in favor of its passage on the floor of the Senate, putting in at the same time large petitions from every State in the Union signed by thousands of both men and women in those States.

It was pointed out that already there are over 4,000,000 women in America who have the presidential vote, who vote for their Senators and Representatives. What right have these 4,000,000 to a higher and firmer citizenship than have the other women of the country? Why should a woman who lives in Colorado or California or Illinois be a citizen, and in South Carolina and Louisiana a voiceless, unconsidered cipher, politically?

Why should she be a unit in one State and a cipher in another? Why is she capable of self-government and the dignity of liberty of conscience in Chicago or Denver or San Francisco, and incapable of or without that dignity in Charleston or New Orleans? Why can western men trust the women of their States, and the southern men not do so? Why are the women of one part of the country helpful in government and useless or dangerous in another part?

And in this connection I want to refer to one thing that is constantly brought up in arguments on this subject. That is whether or not women will better conditions when they vote; whether they will or will not vote for this or that "reform."

I insist that you have no right to ask just what woman is going to do with her vote when she gets it.

That question is always based on two assumptions: First, that man has a right to dictate to her, to control her vote, and make her vote the way he wants to; and the other is that she most likely is going to vote either like a knave or a fool, that she will be prone to use her vote with bad results.

Nobody assumes that attitude when extending the franchise to the young men as they become of age. Nobody insists that boys of 21 shall show how wisely and for just what reform measures they are going to vote before they are given the ballot. The callow youth, whom probably his mother has educated and sent to school and sent out in the world, is not asked to mortgage his vote before he gets it to prove that he will use it to please somebody else. Now, why should women be asked or required to prove that they are not going to vote unwisely? Are they more corrupt or more foolish than their 21-year-old sons?

The question of what measures women will or will not vote for is quite aside from the issue, which is simply and solely the issue of self-government. Have women the right of self-government in a Republic? If not, why not?

There is just one other point which it might be well to consider from a southerner's outlook in case the fundamental principle of self-government and human justice does not appeal to you when these standards of democracy are being applied to women.

It is this: You are doubtless aware that there is a strong movement on foot which was to follow (it was a fellow of) the election of Senators by a direct vote of "the people," which, as you know, is an accomplished fact. This other and companion move is to make the representation of the States in Congress depend upon the number of voters and not upon the population.

When that carries (and it has great and strong backing), the South will need the vote of every patriotic woman as well as man unless she is willing to be swamped utterly and hopelessly.

It will be a trifle late to prepare for this situation after the move is effected.

"Now is the accepted time" if the South is to hold its own in chivalry and justice toward its women, or yield these to the men of the West.

"Now is the accepted time" if the South is to hold its own in national representation, or yield to the hoardes of foreign-born voters of the East.

"Now is the accepted time" to gain the gratitude and respect of the southern women of the future and their loyal cooperation, or to throw these away by allowing the National Government to give them the dignity of citizenship which you refuse to them.

Woman suffrage is coming in the South as elsewhere. It is almost here. The only question now is, Which way?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not approve of all that Mrs. Gardener says. I do not quite agree with her in every respect; but it is so abounding in real, good, hard common sense, and, upon the other hand, also in sound and lofty sentiment, that I am more than willing to see it go forth as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of Senators and of the people.

Now, in connection with the matter introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], I have not read it. I have not heard it, but I know the general make-up of it in a way. I have always doubted the moral right of three-fourths of the States to coerce the other fourth into a new delegation of authority by the State to the Federal Government.

I am not taking this position as a lawyer now, and therefore I am dwelling upon the moral right, not the legal right. When we adopted the Constitution it was agreed that if 9 States adopted it it should go into operation as to those 9, not as to the others at all, and that those 9 should thereafter constitute the United States of America, not the 13. So I have always doubted the right of three-fourths of the States to hold and choke the other fourth and to give a renewed delegation of authority over the protest of one-fourth. When you consider that probably the one-fourth never would have joined the Union had they been faced with all the amendments which have been put down their throats, the strength of this position—not legally nor from a lawyer's standpoint at all, but from the ethical standpoint—is, in my opinion, all the greater.

I have already said what little I had to say upon the question of woman suffrage. I do not think it amounts to so awfully much of good or of bad as the extremes upon both sides imagine. I am perfectly willing to do whatever the good ladies of the State of Mississippi want me to do, and I am perfectly willing to leave it to them and to leave the men clear out of it; or I am perfectly willing to go into an election in Mississippi with the men voting, and if the ladies will convey to me their will I will vote as their delegate and vote to do what they wish done. But I do not see how anybody who has taken the old traditional southern view about the right of the State to prescribe the conditions of suffrage within its own limits can surrender that position in favor of permitting three-fourths of the States to prescribe for the other fourth what shall be the conditions of suffrage within their limits.

They were overridden historically, yes, it is very true. The fifteenth amendment was a horrible blunder and a horrible mistake. Hoping that the amendment proposed by my colleague [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the joint resolution may possibly effectuate the repeal of the fifteenth amendment, I shall vote for the amendment offered by him. I have my doubts as to whether it would or would not. I am rather inclined to think that, perhaps, it would be construed together with the fifteenth amendment as a part of the Constitution, and that the two being construed together, and the fifteenth amendment not being expressly repealed, his amendment would not repeal it at all;

but I am so anxious to see a repeal of the fifteenth amendment that I am willing to try that in the courts if it is adopted, and let the court pronounce what its effect will be.

As I said the other day, the fifteenth amendment was not a crime alone; it was more than a crime, as Talleyrand said; it was a blunder. In governmental affairs blunders are worse than crimes. That amendment created race feeling in this country that never existed prior to it. The negro men and women who had remained on the plantations during four years of war, taking care of their mistresses and the children, had earned the undying gratitude of the white race. The negroes, who were not so much interested in their own freedom as to want to do unjust things to the white women and children living at home while the men were out fighting, had no feeling of hatred of the white man until you gave it to them in the agitation for the adoption of the fifteenth amendment and in its after attempted enforcement. It was worse than a crime; it was a breeder of hatred and of all other crimes. It would have been infinitely better if the States had been left free to prescribe suffrage within their own limits as they came to see the necessity and the advisability of it. I shall therefore vote for the amendment offered by my colleague.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I had thought of making some observations on the joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution which is before the Senate for its consideration, but as there seems to be an opportunity to get an early vote thereon I shall refrain from doing so.

I had also thought I should speak at some length on the amendment which the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has offered, which, as I understand it, proposes to repeal the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I have pronounced opinions on that subject. I believe that, even if a mistake were made half a century ago in giving the suffrage to the negro race, they ought to be permitted that privilege half a century after the close of the war.

To my mind, borrowing the language of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is not only a blunder but a crime to deprive that race of the rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. For that reason, Mr. President, I trust the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] will not be agreed to. I hope that the Senate of the United States has not yet been brought to the view that that amendment, which proposed to guarantee and protect a class of our people in their civil and political rights, should be wiped from the fundamental law of the land.

I will not allude, Mr. President, to the methods that have been adopted to deprive the colored men of the South of the right of suffrage, because I apprehend that might lead to a discussion that I have no disposition at this time to engage in. I read the other day of a statute in one of the States of the American Union whereby it was provided that a negro could not even vote the Democratic ticket unless he had voted it in the year 1876 and could bring 10 white men to swear that he had voted it consistently from that time to the present. That is most extraordinary legislation. It is not in consonance with the principles that have guided the American people in the matter of equal rights before the law; and I trust, however some men from that section of the country may feel about the fifteenth amendment, that neither House of Congress has yet been brought to the conviction that that amendment, designed simply to protect a large class of our people, eight or ten millions in number, in their civil and political rights, will be voted upon adversely to-day.

Whatever becomes, Mr. President, of the proposition to enfranchise women, which I support, let us not go back and wipe from the Constitution of the United States a provision that simply and solely guarantees to eight or ten million people in this country equal rights under the laws and the Constitution of our country. I do not believe it will be done, and I say this without desiring to enter into a controversy with any Senator as to the political views that exist in one section of the country or in the other as to the race question, which I know agitates the minds of a very large class of people in our country.

I have said, Mr. President, all I care to say. If I were not anxious that the business of the Senate should rapidly progress, so that we may close this session in reasonable time, I would do as some other Senators have done—occupy a portion of the time in discussing the question that is really before the Senate at present—but I shall refrain from doing so in the hope that we may get an early vote upon this joint resolution and decide it one way or the other.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that my voice as well as my vote will be recorded in opposition to the proposition contained in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I am opposed to woman suffrage on principle. I need not say that I love and admire a good woman. There is no man in this body who can outdo and outvie me in efforts to uphold on every occasion the good women of this land; but as I listened a day or two ago to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and heard their fulsome remarks I said then that if we believed what those Senators said every man in this body should immediately proceed to apologize for his existence here and for his sex. I was half inclined to ask, "Pray God, why, in His wisdom, did the Great Creator create man, anyway?"

The Senator from Oklahoma said that the women do more than half the work. God knows, they do more than their share. I can remember full well that my good mother used to say: "Man's work is from sun to sun, but woman's work is never done." How is this going to lighten woman's work? Will not this impose an additional burden on the women of the land?

The Senator said women made better cooks, fairer and juster jurors, and, of course, they are more beautiful. That goes without saying. The only thing that surprised me in the learned dissertation of the Senator from Oklahoma was that he did not express that which I know was in him, finding fault with the great God above us, that when He appointed the Twelve Apostles He did not make at least six of them women. [Laughter.] I know that was a sheer oversight upon the part of the Senator, but I believe he felt that way.

The Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] a day or two ago, in discussing this question, made the statement that he had heard no dissatisfaction with woman suffrage expressed in California, that it had worked harmoniously there, and was a blessing. One side of a story is good, Mr. President, until the other is told. I hold in my hand an address from a woman in California. Some of you will remember that I made reference to this matter before. I refer to Miss Annie Bock, who says woman suffrage has been an evil in California. You ask, How does she know? She said: "I was a suffragette of suffragettes; I was a ward worker and poll worker; I went out in the by-ways, dragged in hesitating voters, and got them to vote; but after two years of that thing in California I saw that I was accomplishing naught for my country and doing positive evil to our sex." To-day she says she is as much an opponent as formerly she was in favor of it; and she testifies here in a document published by the Senate on this question that in her experience woman suffrage has been a positive detriment and a positive evil. So I will say to the Senator from California that his statement is not utterly uncontradicted.

I find that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]—and I believe that the other distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is to follow later—has told of the universal blessing that came to the sensible and sane women in Colorado as the result of the suffrage. He will agree with me that the Ladies' Home Journal, published in Philadelphia, finding a place almost in every household, is a paper of fair character and generally of impartial judgment. That journal sent a representative to Colorado, asking the question of women there as to their judgment as to the blessings of woman suffrage. Answers came in large numbers, and that journal has published many of them. Here is one from Colorado Springs, which states:

> I have lived many years in Colorado Springs and have voted only under protest. And I do not hesitate to say that I do not think woman suffrage is a success or has accomplished that which has been claimed for it. I am now opposed to it.
>
> HARRIET P. FARNWORTH.

I read from another as follows:

> Colorado has been my home for many years, and I have watched with interest the results of woman suffrage. I have considered it my duty at times, for certain reasons, to vote, but have always done so under protest.
>
> I can not see that suffrage has purified politics or placed better men in office or has been productive of any legislation beneficial to either women or children. I think women are too hysterical, too personal in feeling, and not well enough balanced to exercise the right of suffrage. And their attitude in all these discussions proves the truth of my opinions.
>
> I do not hesitate to state that I thoroughly disapprove of it, and have no wish ever to vote again.
>
> MARY MCKENZIE GAMBRILL.

There are a great many replies. I will read another:

> I think that the majority of women with families have little interest in suffrage; and if the right to vote were taken from them it would come as a release from a duty which they consider was thrust upon them.
>
> MRS. HARRY K. BROWN.

I will not read all of the replies contained in this paper, but will ask that they may be published in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). It will be so ordered, without objection.

The paper referred to is as follows:

IS MRS. GODDARD ALONE IN HER POSITION THAT WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO IS A FAILURE?

In The Ladies' Home Journal for January 1 there was published a statement by Mrs. Francis W. Goddard, one of the most prominent women in Colorado, declaring that, in her opinion, the experiment of woman suffrage in Colorado was a failure. This opinion caused universal astonishment, coming as it did from a woman in Mrs. Goddard's unquestioned social and civic position.

This declaration by Mrs. Goddard brought out the criticism that she was practically alone in this opinion among the prominent women of Colorado. In order to ascertain whether this was true the editors of The Ladies' Home Journal had a personal canvass made of some Colorado women of undisputed social and civic prominence, and their opinions are here given.

MRS. GODDARD'S STATEMENT THAT CAUSED SUCH UNIVERSAL SURPRISE.

I have voted since 1893. I have been a delegate to the city and State conventions, and a member of the Republican State committee from my county. I have been a deputy sheriff and a watcher at the polls. For 23 years I have been in the midst of the woman-suffrage movement in Colorado. For years I believed in woman suffrage and have worked day in and day out for it. I now see my mistake and would abolish it to-morrow if I could.

No law has been put on the statute book of Colorado for the benefit of women and children that has been put there by the women.

The child-labor law went through independently of the woman's vote. The hours of working women have not been shortened; the wages of school-teachers have not been raised; the type of men that got into office has not improved a bit.

As for the effect of the vote on women personally, I have known scores of women who worked for the Republican Party one year and worked for the Democratic Party the next year, telling me frankly that "the Democrats gave us more money."

Frankly, the experiment is a failure. It has done Colorado no good; it has done woman no good. The best thing for both would be if to-morrow the ballot for women could be abolished.

MRS. FRANCIS W. GODDARD,
*President of the Colonial Dames of Colorado.*

THE OPINIONS OF SOME OTHER PROMINENT COLORADO WOMEN.

COLORADO SPRINGS.

I have lived many years in Colorado Springs and have voted only under protest. And I do not hesitate to say that I do not think woman's suffrage is a success, or has accomplished that which has been claimed for it. I am now opposed to it.

HARRIET P. FARNSWORTH.

—

COLORADO SPRINGS.

Colorado has been my home for many years, and I have watched with interest the results of woman's suffrage. I have considered it my duty at times, for certain reasons, to vote; but have always done so under protest.

I can not see that suffrage has purified politics or placed better men in office or has been productive of any legislation beneficial to either women or children. I think women are too hysterical, too personal in feeling, and not well enough balanced to exercise the right of suffrage. And their attitude in all these discussions proves the truth of my opinions.

I do not hesitate to state that I thoroughly disapprove of it, and have no wish ever to vote again.

MARY MACKENZIE GAMBRILL.

—

COLORADO SPRINGS.

My views concerning woman suffrage, in a nutshell, are: Theoretically I believe in it. Practically, after watching it for many years in Colorado, I consider it a failure. I can see nothing that it has accomplished in its 16 years here that has not been done equally in other States where they have no woman suffrage. Our political "ring" remains as corrupt as ever, and the addition of women's votes in the downtown districts has been only to double its purchasable vote. Personally, having the vote, I believe in the obligation to use it—and do so conscientiously, but there are great numbers among the better classes of women who never go near the polls. I believe that there is a growing feeling that the whole thing has been a mistake, and that it would be a great relief to be relieved of the responsibility.

MRS. CHALONER B. SCHLEY.

—

DENVER.

In my opinion, women have no place in politics. Certainly they have not helped the political situation in Colorado.

MRS. HARRY ENGLISH.

—

DENVER.

In this country, where woman is man's equal, I can not see the need of the woman's vote. In England, where the law is for man alone, one can not blame the English woman for endeavoring to obtain equal rights.

MRS. CHARLES MACA. WILLCOX.

—

COLORADO SPRINGS.

I can see no actual benefit which has arisen directly from the woman's privilege of voting in this State.

HELEN L. BALLOU.

—

DENVER.

I feel that the woman's vote means very little to any of us out here.

MARY ALICE FIELD.
[Mrs. E. B. Field, sr.]

—

DENVER.

I think that the majority of women with families have little interest in suffrage, and if the right to vote were taken from them it would come as a release from a duty which they consider was thrust upon them.

MRS. HARRY K. BROWN.

DENVER.

I fail to observe that woman's suffrage has benefited Colorado in any way.

MRS. W. P. MCPHEE.

—

DENVER.

I am not at all interested in politics and do not believe in women voting, nor that their votes have in any way benefited Colorado.

GENEVIEVE CHANDLER PHIPPS.

—

DENVER.

As a native-born daughter of Colorado I always have and always will take a great interest in the politics of my State.

As a little girl the President's message was awaited with interest, for my father was an active participant in public affairs.

I have always believed that woman's influence for good in the political field is much greater if she is not compelled to actively participate in public affairs through the medium of the elective franchise.

I have lived in Colorado under the old régime before the days of woman's suffrage, and can therefore compare the conditions both before and after that event.

I can not see that the advent of women in politics has in any way improved conditions and has only had the effect of driving to the polls thousands of women who did not wish to vote, but who were forced to do so to offset, in a measure, the votes of the undesirable part of the female population who have the reputation of voting early and often.

My opinion is that just so long as the franchise is given without restrictions as to illiteracy or other qualifications absolute harm is done by extending it to the women.

In Colorado at least this has been the result, and I am sure that I voice the opinion of a large percentage of Colorado women when I make the statement that we should be glad to see the franchise withdrawn.

MRS. E. B. FIELD, JR.

—

COLORADO SPRINGS.

Colorado has been my home for many years, and I have watched with interest the effect of woman suffrage. I am, as always, opposed to it, and would not vote did I not feel it my duty to do so.

MRS. M. H. WILLIAMS.

—

DENVER.

Do I know of any great good to Colorado resulting from the votes of women? No; I do not.

MRS. HENRY J. HERSEY.

—

DENVER.

Woman suffrage, to my way of thinking, isn't doing politics any good in this State. Women vote because they have the right, but they haven't a keen interest or deep knowledge of affairs of state, and their voting doesn't mean anything in the way of an improvement in politics. I am not a believer in woman's suffrage.

MRS. LOUIE F. SPRATLEN.

—

DENVER.

Woman suffrage, so far as I can see, has produced no good effect. It has not improved politics in this State, and it only makes a number of votes that can be bought or given through friendship, because women, as a rule, do not understand politics.

MRS. W. H. DICKSON.

—

COLORADO SPRINGS.

I can not feel that the vote of the women has accomplished anything more than acting as a balance weight against erratic and radical (injurious) legislation, and perhaps that balance weight might be stronger in the influence of woman at home.

CAROLYNE H. MARBOURG.

—

DENVER.

The methods of many of the women in the last election showed that Colorado had not benefited itself any in having the woman's vote.

MRS. J. B. HUNTER.

—

DENVER.

As far as I am concerned, and from casual observation, I am not in favor of woman suffrage. It might be more beneficial in more densely populated States where child labor and equally harmful things are prevalent, but in Colorado we are not troubled that way, and it seems to me that the women have many other better things to do than to go in for politics.

MRS. LESTER B. BRIDAHAM.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to say as to the matter which has just been read that the Ladies' Home Journal did make an investigation and publish a report, to which the Senator from New Jersey refers, but the report was prejudged and predetermined before the visit of the representative from that paper to my State. It is significant that the statement is chiefly supported from Colorado Springs, where the elite of the State live, where many excellent ladies are too fashionable to care for public life, who think it is vulgar, who greatly prefer to devote their time to pink teas and "dansants." I make no reflection upon these good women of that section, for they are, of course, entitled to their views.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let me say, in answer to the Senator——

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he would bar all the women who dance the tango from the right of suffrage? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all; but I do not propose, if I can help it, that they shall bar the women who do not dance the tango from the right of suffrage.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's criticism that these letters come only from the particular locality of Colorado Springs, and that that is the prolific source of such letters, I have to say that here is another letter from a different section——

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; there may be similar letters from other sections of the State, but Colorado Springs is the principal section from which they come.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to ask the Senator whether he believes, and will assert, that Harriet P. Farnsworth, of Colorado Springs, devotes her time alone to pink teas and the tango?

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all; she is a most excellent and worthy lady.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is all very well; but what about the letters from Denver? Here is a letter from Mrs. Henry J. Hersey, in which she says:

Do I know of any great good to Colorado resulting from the votes of women? No; I do not.

Here is another one, signed by Mrs. W. H. Dickson, of Denver, in which she says:

Woman suffrage, so far as I can see, has produced no good effect. It has not improved politics in this State, and it only makes a number of votes that can be bought or given through friendship, because women, as a rule, do not understand politics.

I recollect, Mr. President, that on a previous occasion, when this subject was under discussion, I said a few words, giving that which I saw with my own eyes in Denver, Colo. Talk about woman suffrage purifying politics! No; it has failed to purify politics where it has been tried. Coming closer to home, here is another letter——

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator will search in vain for any expression of mine upon this subject in which I have claimed that woman suffrage was going to prove a universal panacea. My position has been——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. You can leave out the word "universal" and use simply the word "panacea," and it will be found that woman suffrage has not proved a panacea in reality.

Mr. THOMAS. I prefer to use my own expression. My position in reference to this matter always has been, and I think always will be, that the question is not whether any particular benefit will result from the establishment of woman suffrage, but whether one-half of the citizens of the United States are not, as a matter of right, independent of its effect upon political conditions, entitled to the franchise with the other half of the citizenship.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say, Mr. President, in answer to that, that I am not a lawyer, thank God, but a plain man, and I will stand by that which shall accrue and result to the well-being of the whole United States rather than by that which will satisfy the fine hairsplitting proclivities of the lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will ask the Senator from Colorado to wait a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a word. I have always noticed, Mr. President, that when certain gentlemen are unable to answer the questions or meet the position of an opponent they invariably thank God they do not belong to the legal profession. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Thank God for it; and the world would be a millionfold better off if you had been relegated to the rear before you were made lawyers. I do not say that to the Senator as an individual, but it is one of the curses of our times that after statutes are made efforts are made to break them and defy them.

My friend finds fault that I have gone only to the sunny West. Now I will bring you nearer home. I have here a letter dated Madison, N. J., March 4, from my own little Commonwealth. It is from a very cultured gentleman, who in some way had learned that I had been opposed to woman suffrage, and he wrote me a pleasant letter from Madison, which is quite a prominent place in our little Commonwealth, in which he said:

I saw so much of electioneering by the women in our school election that it made me disgusted and lowered them very much in my estimation. To see many of the women of the four hundred—

And they have a thousand of them there; it is called the Bankers' Knob—

To see the women of the four hundred drag in illiterate women, unable to speak our tongue and not knowing what the question was, and push to the polls these women was very repellant to me. Every servant—

And the women in that neighborhood have from 12 to 15, I will say—

including colored cooks, besmeared with the soot of the range, were brought out to vote.

My correspondent further says that the methods there pursued by the women were sufficient—

To have put the rankest Tammany Hall methods to shame.

There is an instance of the purifying effect in politics of having women at the polls.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will if the Senator does not want to exploit his profession.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely want to ask a courteous question, and I do not think there is any occasion for a statement of that kind. I will not further interrupt the Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will take it back. I think you are all saints and only lack wings. [Laughter.]

It makes me feel sad when I hear this plea of women demanding their rights. I know of no country, and there is none, that God's sun shines on where woman has more of her rights than she has in free, democratic America. Fair women, I say, in this land your friends are not the male advocates who are standing up here pressing for your votes; they are rather your enemies, detracting from the glorious teachings and the grand blessings which the God of humanity has vouchsafed and given you, which constitute a stronger power and a greater influence than any vote that may be placed in your hands.

"Oh, I want to vote." Two or three weeks ago I came to Washington on a Pennsylvania Railroad train from New York. I can not now recollect just what prompted the gathering here, but great numbers of women were on the train. There were three or four hundred of them, at least, I should say, many of them mere girls—young, sweet-faced, mild, modest young women—in the hands and guidance of some older women, with sashes banded across them, with words painted about 4 inches long "I want to vote"; "I want to vote"; and they stalked up and down the train making themselves ridiculous and conspicuous. I thought to myself, "Great God, young women and girls, what you need and what you want more than a vote is the guiding, controlling care of some motherly woman." I say that, Mr. President, advisedly.

This suffragette business takes different forms, it seems, according to the climate in which the women live. In England it takes to window smashing and house burning. Thank heaven, ours is a milder form here. Here, Mr. President, woman suffrage takes to hiking. I have never been able to find any association between hiking and women's votes; but they hike here, thank God, instead of burning houses. It may be that these fair women have instilled into their minds the idea that they are going to go in henceforth for athletics, and hence they hike from New York to Washington, D. C. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have no prejudice, God knows, and no hatred regarding women. I think my habits and my whole life will bear me out in the assertion that every measure tending to advance, enlighten, and make better the conditions of women I have always been counted sponsor for and in favor of. I oppose the joint resolution not because it is, and neither would I favor it simply because it is, strictly within the technical terms of the law, as suggested by distinguished lawyers, but I oppose it because I believe it will lead to a sad and sorry day for this fair land. I believe that better results to home, better results to country, better results to family, and better results to God will come from defeating this proposition.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it is not my desire to consume the time of the Senate for the purpose of postponing the vote on the pending joint resolution. The subject matter has been discussed at length—seeds have been sown in the mind of the American voter which I hope will bring forth ripe fruit. I think the senatorial mind has probably reached a conclusion—whether that conclusion shall be faithfully registered in the votes that will be cast it is not my province to say—but, Mr. President, after what has been said regarding the amendment which I proposed I feel impelled to trespass upon the patience of the Senate while I submit a few pertinent observations. I do not hug to my heart the hope that all who hear me will agree with me. I am sure that the flattery of approval will not be accorded my utterances by many Senators who sit on the other side of the Chamber; but, Mr. President, if I shall succeed in planting a truth, if I shall succeed in lodging in the minds of the Senators and the American people a fact regarding this paramount problem, I have no doubt that the seed here planted will

contribute ultimately in bringing forth the harvest, which will be the repeal of the fifteenth, the modification of the fourteenth amendment, and making this Government a government by white men, of white men, for all men, which will be but the realization of the dream of the founders of the Republic.

The purpose of the amendment proposed by me is to repeal, eliminate from the organic law of the United States, that legislative "Infamy of Crete" known as the fifteenth amendment, which, as I have said on a former occasion, was not adopted for the purpose of benefiting and uplifting the negro race, but was conceived in the hatred generated by war and brought forth in a spasm of venom and revenge to humiliate the white people of the South and "make rebellion odious." I thank God that the passions and prejudices generated by that unfortunate fratricidal conflict are sufficiently allayed, that the smoke that obscured our mental vision has wafted away, and that in the sunlight of truth we can see this constitutional or legislative enormity in all its nakedness and view it in its due proportions.

I have been impressed, Mr. President, with the fact that no Senator has risen in his place since I have occupied a seat in this Chamber and made any reference to the fifteenth amendment who did not say "that a mistake was made when it was adopted." Time has only added proof to the correctness of that statement; time has only served to convince us more profoundly that a mistake was made.

I listened with great interest to the brave, eloquent, learned address delivered in this Chamber a day or two ago by the gifted Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It is the bravest public utterance that has been made upon the floor of the Senate for half a century by a man who resides in the section of the Republic from which he comes. He has reached heights of patriotic devotion to truth, which might be emulated with profit by his colleagues, and which I am sure will be an inspiration to every lover of truth and every faithful friend of the enduring Republic. The learned Senator from Idaho has said that a "great mistake was committed when the fifteenth amendment was adopted." If a mistake was made 50 years ago it is quite as great a mistake, I submit to him, for the present generation to permit that mistake to go uncorrected. No intellectually honest man will deny that statement. Time can not make falsehood the truth, nor can age impart to error the virtue of verity.

Nations like individuals endure by truth alone, and when you deny the wisdom or the capacity of the people of a nation to correct its mistakes you sound the death knell of that nation. I submit that the time to correct all mistakes is now—to-day. We can learn a useful lesson from the ancients through an extract from the Sanskrit showing the importance of the "Now." The only time that belongs to us is the present. If you would know the necessity of acting to-day, listen to the voice of the sage, which echoes through the distant annals of the ages gone:

> Look to this day, for it is life—the very life of life. In its brief course lie all the verities and realities of your existence—the bliss of growth, the joy of action, the splendor of beauty; for yesterday is but a dream, to-morrow only a vision, but to-day well lived makes every yesterday a dream of happiness and every to-morrow a vision of hope.

We have a duty to perform as the Representatives of the American people, and the voice of duty calls loudly for immediate action. There is danger, there is disintegration, there is death in delay.

Mr. President, this is no new question. It has been an issue before the American people since the first boatload of negroes was landed on the coast of America more than 300 years ago. It was a burning, pregnant, pertinent issue a century ago when the Sage of Monticello said:

> Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people (the negroes) are to be free. Nor is it less certain that the two races equally free can live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation and in slow degrees as that the evil will wear off insensibly and their places be filled pari passu by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature will shudder at the prospect held up.

He urged the colonists to emancipate their slaves and send them back to Africa. "You can solve this problem now without the sacrifice of a human life," he said. You can solve it now with the outlay of a very small amount of money. White people will come, take their places as laborers, and the current of affairs will move on without a ripple. But what was the penalty which he predicted we should pay if we failed to follow his advice? He said slavery "would ultimately go out in blood."

Listen. The most remarkable prediction recorded out of Holy Writ was made when he said, "If left to force itself on, human nature will shudder at the prospect held up." What was he talking about? What was he looking at? As distinctly as I am looking into the faces of the Senators upon this floor this afternoon, from the mountain peak of his incomparable genius, with the soul of a seer and the eye of a prophet, he dipped into the future far as human eye could see, and he saw the vision of the world and all the difficulties that would be. He saw the war between the States that cost more than a million of the flower of American manhood; that cost more than $6,000,000,000. He saw the two sections rent in twain, brother against brother, father against son, frenzied with hate, grappling at each other's throat like wild beasts. He saw thousands of homes rendered desolate on either side of the line, adumbrated with the shadow of a deep and desperate sorrow. He saw the widow in her weeds, the orphaned children, the blighted lives, the frustrated ambitions. He saw more than that: He saw the hell of reconstruction, through which the white people of the South were forced to walk with bowed heads after the war. He saw more and worse than all that I have depicted. He saw the hundreds and thousands of homes that have been rendered desolate by the invasion of the black brute and the laying of his poisonous, blighting hands upon the fairest flower in the white man's home. He saw the difficulties which confront us here to-day. He knew that education would not qualify the negro to perform properly the highest function of citizenship in a white man's country. He knew that Christianization would not take from him the superstition with which his race has been cursed for 10,000 years. He knew that when the shackles of slavery were stricken from the black man's wrists and he was released from the uplifting influence and potential control of the white man that the call of the wilds would carry him back to the barbarism of his native jungles.

But—

Said Jefferson—

> wait until it forces itself on, and human nature will shudder at the prospect held up.

Human nature, Mr. President, shudders as it contemplates the horrors of the past, and I shudder to-day at the manifest indifference as to the gravity of the situation by Senators upon this floor.

Why was not the problem solved a hundred years ago and the million men saved, and the vast outlay of money and the fearful cost in tears and heartaches experienced by the women and children? The answer is easy. St. Paul answered the question when he said:

> The love of money is the root of all evil.

The northern white man was bringing the negro to America and selling him to the southern white man and making money. The southern white man was buying him and raising cotton and negroes with him, and making money. So the settlement of the question was postponed until we paid the penalty for our stupidity and inaction in blood and treasure, which causes human nature still to shudder at the "prospect held up."

Fifty years later another great man came along. He was not so learned as Jefferson in books; he had not the experience in statecraft. But he possessed the divine power which enabled him "to hear the ocean in one shell and see the whole world's winter in one leaf." It was he to whom Markham referred when he said:

> When the face of God grew dim,
> Held through the dark and trusted him;
> Soul of an heroic birth,
> Soul sent to poise a shaken earth,
> And then called back to God again
> To make heaven possible for men.

Who was it? None other than the patient, patriotic, loving, forgiving Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln said, you will remember, in his remarkable debate with Mr. Douglas:

> I am not nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races. I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with the white people. And I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and the black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality; and inasmuch as they can not so live while they do remain together there must be a position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

If what Mr. Lincoln said was true then, it is true now, and no thoughtful person will question the accuracy of his statement. Mr. President, that has been the history, the observation of men in all the ages of the world. There is not a Senator upon this floor, there is not a thoughtful, well-informed American in this Republic who has given any consideration to this question who does not know, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said on yesterday, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] said a day or two ago, that where the white man and the negro man are present in anything like equal numbers the white man is going to rule. We of the South endeavored to maintain a government by sharing sovereignty with the negro after the war. But he is peculiar. He would not

permit it. If you give the negro an inch, he will take an ell, and he will take the country there with him. Under his savage rule we saw the public domain squandered; we saw the Public Treasury looted; we saw the civilization reared by our fathers, glorified by their genius, and consecrated with their blood vanishing from the earth. What was left for us to do? Nothing, except to invoke the law of self-preservation, which we did; and by means, as I have said on former occasions in this Chamber, not as I would have them, but sufficient, the white man rose in the might of his superiority and drove the scalawag and the negro from power. We have held the mastery from that day to this by expedients which are violative of the spirit of the fifteenth amendment. We understand that as well as you do; and we also understand, as you do, that we are going to continue to hold the fort, whatever methods may be necessary to enable us to do it. Everybody knows that, and every right-thinking white man approves it.

In dealing with so grave and important a problem, why should there be any dissimulation? Why any side-stepping? Is it possible that any patriotic Representative in the Congress of the United States would permit his vote on this question to be controlled by his personal, political, or pecuniary interests? Why not meet the issue openly? It would prove infinitely better for the negro. If the South were turned over to the domination of the negroes to-day, the white men would be forced to leave. Those fertile fields, those vine-clad hills, and fragrant groves, the birthplace of American liberty, would be likened to the condition that prevails in Haiti, once the gem of the southern seas, but now scarred and marred by the blight of negro incompetency, where no semblance of civil government exists except in the seaports, which are dominated by whites and mulattoes. We all know that. Then, I submit, why not approach the matter in that calm, determined, enlightened, altruistic spirit which the gravity of the situation demands? I would not consider it in the spirit of race hatred. Oh, no; I do not hate the negro. I do not hate anybody, Mr. President. I have long since concluded that the man who hates hurts himself. Hatred beclouds the judgment, paralyzes the reasoning faculties, and pollutes the springs of love.

> Prince, pity our faults wherein we die;
> Our greed and cruelty both condone.
> Only the gods can mount the sky;
> Fame is the flower of love alone.

It is love that is going to solve this problem. Love is the universal solvent. I would that the Senate and the American people might take hold of it in the spirit of fair play, in the spirit which recognizes the racial peculiarities of the negro and the racial superiority of the white man. Peace can not prevail, harmony is impossible, and progress out of the question if the people of the South are forced to resort to all manner of legislative expedients in order to make the South habitable for themselves.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in passing upon the constitutionality of Mississippi's constitution of 1890, said that we swept the horizon of expediency to find a way around the fifteenth amendment, but we did it. I always thought that the Supreme Court upheld Mississippi's constitution and the other southern constitutions that imitated Mississippi's because the Supreme Court realized that such provisions were necessary in order to make life tolerable for the white race and preserve the civilization of the white people of the South. It was one of those pieces of judicial legislation which the American people approved and the world condones. Now, if these constitutional barriers were removed and we, the dominant race of the South, were permitted to enact laws to suit the moral qualities and intellectual acquirements of the negroes—in other words, write laws adaptable to the government of the negro—it would be infinitely better for all persons concerned. A law that suits the white man, "the heir of all the ages of the foremost files of time," is not adaptable to the government of the civilization-veneered savage, who has shown congenital incompetency in all the ages of the world to govern himself.

Mr. President, if the white man in dealing with the negro is compelled to resort to force, fraud, or other doubtful expedients, a conflict is inevitable, and you know when that happens the deadly attrition is going to be on the side of the weaker race. You know the negro is not going to stand up against the superior qualities of Anglo-Saxon manhood. Then why not, I implore you as patriotic American citizens, charged with the performance of a great trust, uninfluenced by any other consideration than to preserve our civilization, promote the interests of both races, and maintain our form of government in all of its pristine vigor that it may be transmitted, unimpaired in its usefulness, to posterity, by removing these barriers. If that shall be done, the white man of the South, where the negro question is a problem, the white man of the West, where the yellow man is a problem, the white man in every other section of the country, may take the matter in hand, and, guided by the motives and promptings of the heart and the direction of head, which has enabled him to rear the greatest Government and create the highest civilization the world has ever known, work out and solve for the good of the most the great problem which confronts the civilization of this century.

May the great God of the universe open your eyes and touch your hearts to the full realization of the gravity of the situation.

[Mr. JAMES addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss the merits of this resolution. I did that last summer, and the opinions I expressed then are still my opinions, more strongly confirmed by the discussion I have heard here.

All I desire to do now is to insert in the RECORD an article which I think is a very good and conclusive answer to the suggestions made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], and also to the high principle upon which my friend from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] opposes this resolution. The article was written by a very estimable lady from my State, Mrs. Susan Whitcomb Hassell, and it seems from her statements here that she formerly took the position that the Senator from New Jersey takes.

I am not going to ask to have this article read. I am going to read simply one paragraph:

> There is an army of women and a larger army of men whose ideal of womanhood is that sweet, modest, old-fashioned type who found tasks enough for hand and heart in her own home circle; was full of domestic virtues and charms, and shrank instinctively from public activities. * * * There is neither glory nor shame in holding this sentimental and esthetic ideal. To that class of idealists the writer belonged until a few years ago, and to that class, chiefly, this letter is addressed.

I trust my friend from New Jersey will read the article, and also my friend from Kentucky; and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Times for Wednesday, March 18, 1914.]

THE NEW FREEDOM FOR WOMEN.

[By Mrs. Susan Whitcomb Hassell.]

"Deliver me from strong-minded women. I can not imagine my mother voting and I would not like my wife to do it."

The speaker did not look like an old fogey nor like a brute. He had good manners, wore an honor key, spoke with the New England accent, might easily have been a lifelong Bostonian.

There is an army of women and a larger army of men whose ideal of womanhood is that sweet, modest, old-fashioned type who found tasks enough for hand and heart in her own home circle; was full of domestic virtues and charms and shrank instinctively from public activities. Often as in the case of the Boston bachelor—yes, he confessed that he had no wife—the ideal is "my mother."

There is neither glory nor shame in holding this sentimental and æsthetic ideal. To that class of idealists the writer belonged until a few years ago, and to that class chiefly this letter is addressed. The only shame is in shutting one's eyes to new light, the only glory in being open-minded.

Light streams down upon this subject from stars of every magnitude. Which ray may pierce any particular intelligence is a question of how strong the eyes are. Few have the eagle eye to face the sun. For those who find the sweeping visions and keen analysis of Ellen Key too dazzling here are some ordinary daylight truths.

NEW FREEDOM FOR WIVES.

The home maker has been freed from many demands which used to crowd her time and exhaust her strength. If the modern housewife does her own work, it probably does not include bread making or laundry, certainly not soap making and carpet weaving. Dressmaking and sewing are reduced to alterations and a little mending. A hundred necessities which were made at home 50 years ago are delivered at the door ready for use. Apartment houses simplify life still more. The average housekeeper who has servants finds her home duties few, unless she has multiplied them by adopting an elaborate and artificial style of living.

The family circle has grown smaller. A dozen children is news for the press. If a mother undertakes to teach her own child to read, sew, or cook, she may find that public-school kindergartens and specialists know better methods than she has ever learned. So strongly the current is set toward community ways of doing things, both industrial and educational, that the housewife has many hours to devote to interests outside the home.

VIEW GROWS BROADER.

The daughters of fairly well-to-do people are sent to college or vocational schools. They find open doors into the professions and into business life. If the economic urge is great, the girls, and in many cases the mother, too, has joined the wage earners.

The woman who found all she could do at home is becoming historic. The capable woman of to-day may be found there on the second and fourth Thursdays. At other times it is wiser to telephone, if you want to know.

The wise mother plans to be there when the only child comes in from school, but one whose interests are confined within her own walls is probably wasting time and nerve doing useless and foolish things, or she is starving for something really worth while.

The view of human oneness grows broader and clearer, and results in some compelling appeals to a woman's sympathies and energies. How

the big truth of the oneness of human interest is flashing over the common mind. The air I breathe is no better than my neighbor's back yard, for the wind blows over the fence. Your child may be no purer than the boy who lives at the lower end of the street.

MUST MIX WITH WORLD.

I know of a woman who said: "I can not enter into the social life of this crude little western community. It would not hurt me, but my children might be influenced by its low standards. I must keep them separate." Her children have grown up. Her son derives a good part of his income from rental of property in the so-called "restricted district." The daughter is married to a man who, her parents have said, "shall never cross their threshold." Their mother could not keep them separate.

The housewife may be ever so careful about her kitchen and refrigerator. It amounts to nothing if her food supplies come from a market where they are exposed to dust, flies, and dirty hands. Because we are all bound up together in common weal or woe, we give attention to public drinking cups, to the length of hotel sheets, to public rest rooms and libraries, to free baths and school nurses.

This socializing spirit has modified our ideas of religion, so that our highest duty seems no longer to a God whom we have not seen, but to the neighbor who needs us.

Our greatest fear is not of our own future punishment, but of causing some little one to offend.

GROWTH OF MOTHER LOVE.

What wonder that women have been quick to catch the new and wider view of life. The mother love, the care for home, developed through the generations, easily spreads its wings to shelter all children and to make all homes clean and beautiful.

Talking together and working together are necessary steps in obtaining social betterment. Out of this newly awakened spirit have sprung all manner of organizations for conference and education, to plan and to do things. Count the hospital boards and sunshine societies, parent-teacher clubs and consumers' leagues, child-welfare societies, Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, Christian associations, civic leagues, playgrounds associations, big sisters and social settlements, not to name the great clubs and unions composed of women only.

In all these the major part of the work is done by women who are not too busy in their homes to do these things for the homes of others. Such work appeals to head as well as to heart. It may be more picturesque to visit a fever-stricken home with a basket of jelly, but it is more effective to visit the city fathers and see that the municipal water supply is protected from pollution. It is easier to distribute cast-off clothing to the poor, but better worth while to work toward fairer labor conditions and living wages.

OPPORTUNITY TO HELP.

The social evil, the drink evil, the protection of working women, child labor, marriage laws—all these are home problems, and one who chooses to spend long hours at a whist party or in a club for culture rather than in opportunities for such human service is not quite awake to her privileges.

Those who are giving their spare hours to some effective organized work are no less sane than the old-time woman who sat down to quilting frames or to fashion garments tucked and hemmed by hand.

Opinions and choices regarding our common life are not crystallized into results until they are made law. By the will of the people, expressed at the ballot box, society is governed. Men and women counsel and plan together. They form opinions. The most conservative of people will not assert that it is unwomanly to hold an opinion, though they believe it is unwomanly to register that opinion on election day.

BIG QUESTIONS FOR WOMEN.

Here are women who have studied the big question, bigger, maybe, than trusts and regional banks and the tariff; questions concerning the underfed child, the tempted girl, the delinquent boy, the unsupported mother, the health of the home, the child who has no home. Some of them want to express their judgment in the most forceful and effective way.

And what of women in the industrial world? Even Chesterton, who deplores the feminist movement, thinks this worth quoting: "If women have trades, they must have trades-unions. If they work in factories, they must vote on factory laws. If unmarried, they will be commercial; if commercial, they must be political." So the old order changeth.

Women have entered the industrial field, all public activities, and already 3,000,000 of them have become political units. Just what is it that has changed?

NEW ROAD TO TRAVEL.

It is not the woman. She still has the home-loving spirit, though the home has changed. Her heart is quick to respond to human need, though needs have changed. Her head is as level as was her grandmother's, and she may have a truer estimate of values and a better sense of proportion. She loves beauty, truth, and fair play.

There seems no good reason why men and women should wear out their tiny brooms in opposing the advancing tide of the so-called feminist movement. There is a better attitude toward the inevitable; there is always a best thing to do under the circumstances.

The Garden of Eden may look more peaceful and lovely than the road which leads across the valley and up the steppes before us, but we are not facing the Valley of Eden. Better say, with the great German philosopher, "There is no path that we need long to return to; there is only the eternally new which is formed out of enlarged elements of the past; and our genuine longing must always be constructive, for a new and better creation."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the position which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has taken is no doubt based upon reason, if you regard the question of franchise simply as a question of privilege; but if you regard it as a matter of right, and that we have no rightful power to deny it to woman, it becomes an entirely different proposition.

The question submitted in this resolution is whether the people of the United States, under the constituted forms as prescribed in the Constitution, shall have the right to pass upon this matter, whether one State wants it or does not want it. That being the case, it depends upon the fundamental question whether this is a question of right.

It has been said that all powers of government are either delegated or assumed, and that all powers not delegated are assumed, and that all assumed powers are usurpations. If that is true, then every woman in this land who has never given her consent to have man alone control in government is being controlled by a usurped power. That being the case, is it possible that we have not some way by which this question can be determined? Is it possible that when the provision in the Constitution expressly says that a constitutional amendment can be submitted by a vote of two-thirds of the Members of the House and of the Senate, and ratified by three-fourths of the States, we can not submit a matter of this kind? If so, it seems to me we might as well wipe out of the Constitution that provision.

As this is a question of right, woman never having delegated her powers of self-government, she being controlled now without her consent, it seems to me that it is nothing but fair that the people of the United States, under the constituted forms prescribed in the Constitution, should pass upon this question.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, it had not been my purpose to discuss this question any further; but I feel that I should say, before the vote is taken, that my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], who has lately spoken, will find, if he will study the political situation in the States where women exercise the right of suffrage, that instead of that privilege degrading woman it has resulted in elevating the politics of those States.

The character of women is stronger in political matters than the vicious habits of men. Wherever their influence is felt, whether it be in the home, in the market place, or in politics, it is an influence for good. Why, I have heard the fact lamented that women are now able to earn their own living by engaging in occupations which were closed to them a half century ago. The time was, and it is within the memory of Senators who sit in this Chamber, when the problem of the man who had a family of grown daughters was to marry them off so as to get them properly provided for. Now they are independent and do not have to be married off in order to get cared for as though they were semichattels. They can go into the marts of trade and earn their own living. Civilization is advancing, and it will advance in this country until the power of women will be felt in the electon as well as elsewhere in our affairs. You may postpone the day when woman suffrage will prevail, but it is coming, and those who are opposed to it might as well get ready for it.

Why, we praise the influence of women in the home. If their influence in the home is good, it is just as good in the election booths as it is in the home, and it will be just as beneficial to the human race.

I am going to vote for this amendment because I believe that in so doing I shall render a service to my country, and that instead of imposing a hardship upon the States which would be compelled to permit their women to vote by the adoption of this amendment I shall aid in conferring upon them a benefit and a blessing.

As to the amendment that is now pending to the resolution, that offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I wish to say that if it was a mistake 50 years ago to give the franchise to the negro, as is alleged, to take away that privilege would be a political crime. After thousands of the race have exercised the privileges and borne the responsibilities of citizenship with credit to themselves and to their country, it would be worse than a crime to now deprive them of it.

Therefore I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi but in favor of the resolution giving women the franchise.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I find myself in an embarrassing situation with regard to the pending amendment presented by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. I have said outside of this Chamber and within it no later than last Monday in as strong language as I could command that I denied the moral right of the other States of this Union to deprive my State of the constitutional right in regard to suffrage which she now enjoys. I understand that the Senator from Mississippi also agrees with that general principle; but he is of the opinion that if the amendment offered by him is adopted and Senate joint resolution No. 1 is passed as amended, the States would be gaining more than they have lost, in this: That they would be getting back some of the constitutional rights that they lost through the adoption of the fifteenth amendment; and that is why he justifies himself in offering and supporting this amendment, as I understand.

I am not at all sure that the adoption of his amendment would have the effect of repealing the fifteenth amendment. I do not say positively that I believe it would not have that effect, but I do say that I have a serious doubt in my mind as to whether it would have that effect.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. THORNTON. I am sorry to be asked to do so, but I will.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was just going to suggest to the Senator, if there is an element of doubt in his mind about it, the necessity for repealing the fifteenth amendment being so great, would he be unfaithful to his constituents if he resolved the doubt in favor of the amendment?

Mr. THORNTON. I did not fully understand what the Senator said, except something about being unfaithful to my constituents.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I beg the pardon of the Senator. I did not say that. The thought of the Senator being unfaithful to his constituents never entered my mind, because I know he is so far above such a thing. I said this: Admitting that there is a doubt in the Senator's mind as to whether the amendment I propose would repeal the fifteenth amendment if adopted, the necessity for the repeal being so very great to the Senator's people, would not his duty to his constituents justify him in resolving the doubt in favor of it?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I intended to state my position on that subject before I concluded, and the Senator from Mississippi would have heard it if he had not interrupted.

I presume the Senator believes what everybody in Louisiana at least knows, that in the future, as in the past, I would go just as far to maintain white supremacy in my State as the Senator would possibly go to maintain it in his State. I wish to say to him that whenever he gets ready to offer a straight resolution here repealing the fifteenth amendment he will find me ready to vote for it as one of the means of assisting in the maintenance of white supremacy in my State. As I have said, however, I am not sure this amendment would have that effect, and I would not feel justified in going back on my record and my convictions in this matter unless I could be sure that his amendment would pass. I do not believe it is going to do it, and if it is not going to pass I would accomplish nothing by stultifying myself, as it were, by voting for it; and my vote on that question will be governed by what I see is going to be the result of the vote on the amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I assume from some things that have been said here to-day that the amendment of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] may be taken seriously. If it is not to be so taken, of course there is no use of saying anything about it. But I would not like to know that I had kept my seat in silence and thereby assented to the doctrines announced by the junior Senator from Mississippi, and especially not if his amendment shall prevail.

I am in favor of the constitutional amendment which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has in charge, and I have not been influenced in my position either by petitions for or against it, nor by letters which I have received, nor by any suffrage or antisuffrage lobby; but because I have a firm conviction that the right of suffrage in this country ought not to be denied on account of sex, race, color, or previous condition of servitude. I believe that woman is as well qualified to vote as is man. I feel that under a Republic she is entitled to every political right enjoyed by the male sex. I hold the opinion that we are doing woman an injustice by denying her the right of suffrage, but we are also doing ourselves and our country a wrong.

I am going to vote to submit this constitutional amendment to the States. I am going to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi. If it shall so happen that it carries, I shall then vote against the joint resolution itself thus amended, because in attempting to do what I claim to be justice to one class of our people I will not consent to do injustice to another class. While offering the ballot to some people now denied it, I will not through a constitutional amendment disfranchise others.

I have never raised my voice since I have been in Congress against the South, nor have I ever uttered a word to create sectional prejudice or passion. I have recognized that the South has had a problem which it was for them largely to solve. I have watched the solution and have felt that it was not being well solved in many Southern States. In others an honest, patriotic attempt has been made and progress has resulted. I have seen much to criticize, but never since I have been a Member of Congress have I ever known this southern racial question to be raised except by a southerner, and always without provocation. The bitterness born in the Civil War should be relegated to the past. The fifteenth amendment was proposed and it was adopted. I do not believe that any mistake was made in adopting it. That serious mistakes have been made in enforcing it since, there can be no doubt. That amendment has not resulted in political disadvantage to the South. The South has counted the negroes for representation in the Congress of the United States, and in some States has denied them the right to vote for Representatives. The Federal Government has not enforced that amendment as in my judgment it ought to have been enforced. Mr. President, I am very much opposed——

Mr. WEST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I dislike to yield just now.

Mr. WEST. I should like to ask one question. Was it not the case, when the negroes had no right to vote, before the war, that they were allowed three-fifths representation in the National Congress?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am talking about facts as they exist now, and to that point I wish to confine myself.

Mr. President, the institution of slavery has been wiped out, and everybody rejoices that that is so. The black man has made great progress in this country. No other race in history has made greater progress during the same length of time, but not so great progress as he ought to have made, not so great progress as he would have made if he had had all the help to which he was entitled and to which the country was committed if it was to perform its duty to him. But, I repeat, I do not care to discuss at length that question at this time, for I can not believe that a majority will favor this amendment. Let the clear proposition to repeal the fifteenth amendment come before the Senate, if any man has the temerity to bring it here, and I will have much to say against it. I should not have said one word if it had not been for the speech of the junior Senator from Mississippi, and his amendment was not to be voted upon, and if my silence otherwise might have been construed as an assent to the doctrines which he has enunciated.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending amendment, and in favor of the joint resolution which the Senator from Colorado has in charge.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, a day or two since, in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I was very much surprised to hear the statement made by both those learned Senators in discussing the policy of the Federal Government interfering with the freedom of the States to regulate domestic institutions, when it was asserted that Abraham Lincoln had never advocated the giving of the power and the exercise of the power to and by the Federal Government to abolish slavery. It came up in connection with the most able and eloquent speech of the Senator from Idaho, in which he raised the general question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government in such a matter as that which is contained in the joint resolution now pending before the Senate.

Only by analogy, of course, the question of slavery and the question of suffrage are connected, although I myself think that it is a close analogy, because the denial of the right to participate in the Government to a portion of our adult population is the enforcement upon them of political slavery. There is a very close analogy between that condition and personal slavery which was the great question before the country during the career of Abraham Lincoln. I am not going to detain the Senate to discuss that question, but to make myself right in the statement which I made then and to combat the statement which was made that nothing could be found in the writings of Abraham Lincoln or his declarations to show that he advocated the extinction of slavery. As a southern man I know the attitude of the South upon that question, and it is one upon which North and South 50 years after the war can agree—although we regret the means by which this was accomplished—that it is still a blessing to this Nation that slavery was abolished.

When Lincoln was renominated in 1864 one plank in the platform of the Union national convention, held in the city of Baltimore June 7 and 8, 1864, which nominated him, was as follows:

*Resolved*, That as slavery was the cause and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be, always and everywhere, hostile to the principles of republican government, justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic; and that while we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the Government, in its own defense, has aimed a deathblow at this gigantic evil, we are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and forever prohibit the existence of slavery within the limits or the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, what is the date?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was the convention which was held June 7 and 8, 1864.

Mr. VARDAMAN. At what time was the emancipation proclamation issued?

Mr. POINDEXTER. January 1, 1863.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think the Senator will remember that the Senator from Idaho, as well as myself, said that he had not announced that until the emancipation proclamation was issued. Of course, that proclamation was a declaration in favor of interfering with slavery, but that that was one of the cruel necessities of the war when Mr. Lincoln said, "The time has arrived"—I do not know that I quote him literally—"when we must know whether the black man is for us or against us." Up to that time the tide of battle had somewhat gone against the North, and it was his belief that the emancipation of the negro would cause insurrection and uprising in the South, and the men at the front would be forced to go back and protect their homes. But Mr. Lincoln never had that thought, I submit to the Senator from Washington, in his mind until he determined to issue his emancipation proclamation as a war measure. That is what I said. I knew he became a very ardent advocate, and expressed himself as willing to do almost anything within the law to bring it about.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the emancipation proclamation was issued in 1863. It is true it was a war measure. So far as that particular measure and its effects were concerned, that had been disposed of long before the proceedings which I am now discussing in connection with the acceptance of the nomination by Lincoln in 1864. In those days apparently the obligations of the platform upon which a candidate for the Presidency sought the votes of the people were regarded as of more weight than they are in these latter days. So Lincoln carefully considered this platform before accepting the nomination and said what I shall read in reply to the committee on notification on June 9, 1864. Addressing the committee, he said:

> I will neither conceal my gratification nor restrain the expression of my gratitude that the Union people, through their convention, in their continued effort to save and advance the Nation, have deemed me not unworthy to remain in my present position. I know no reason to doubt that I shall accept the nomination tendered; and yet perhaps I should not declare definitely before reading and considering what is called the platform. I will say now, however, I approve the declaration in favor of so amending the Constitution as to prohibit slavery throughout the Nation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington and I do not disagree as to the first proposition he states, and that is to the fact that woman ought to be permitted to vote. We only disagree as to the manner in which she shall acquire that right both as a practical proposition and as a wise method of procedure. But if the Senator from Washington understood me correctly upon day before yesterday, we do not disagree as to the other proposition. I insisted that Mr. Lincoln always contended, and that he specifically set forth with great lucidity in his debates with Douglas, that the National Government had no right and no power, neither was it wise or expedient, to interfere with slavery in the States; that it was a domestic institution which should be controlled and corrected and disposed of or sustained by the States.

I am not going into a discussion of that; but if the Senator from Washington will refresh his recollection by referring to the debates with Mr. Douglas, he will find that Mr. Lincoln stated that belief. He also stated it in his first inaugural address, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

But, Mr. President, the emancipation proclamation itself settled the whole proposition. It says:

> Whereas on the 22d day of September, A. D. 1862, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:
>
> That on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.
>
> That the Executive will on the 1st day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State or the people thereof shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by Members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such States shall have participated shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States.
>
> Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this 1st day of January, A. D. 1863, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit.

In other words, Mr. President, as I said the other day, it was purely a war measure, a necessity from a war standpoint, carried into effect with the war power and for the purpose of suppressing the rebellion. Everything which followed arose by reason of the necessity of carrying into effect that which had originated as a necessity of war.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire only to say one word. His action in accepting the nomination in 1864 and advocating an amendment of the Constitution so as to prohibit slavery was not a war measure; and I call attention to the fact that the analogy which the Senator seeks to draw between the emancipation proclamation and the resolution which is now pending here to amend the Constitution of the United States is not an apt one at all. The emancipation proclamation, it is true, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] states, was a war measure, under the war power, and not under any civil authority provided in the Constitution of the United States.

I admit, of course, that Lincoln accepted the Constitution of United States as securing the institution of slavery in the States. It is true that his great career was founded upon his leadership in opposing the institution of slavery in the territory out of which new States would be formed, confining it within those States where it already existed. That position was taken under the terms of the Constitution as it then stood. It did not involve the proposition whether the Constitution should be changed, and that is the question which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator suggests that the analogy which I seek to draw between the act of the President under the proclamation and the present situation is not a close one. I agree that it is not, but I did not bring the analogy into the debate. The Senator from Washington interrupted the Senator from Idaho during the discussion the other day with the suggestion that Mr. Lincoln did not agree with this view for the reason that he interfered with slavery in the States. I responded that he did that as a war measure, and that was the initiatory step of Mr. Lincoln upon that proposition.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not desire to prolong the debate, Mr. President, and will only say that I did not introduce the subject of the emancipation proclamation into the colloquy. I did refer to Mr. Lincoln's position with reference to slavery, not to his emancipation proclamation but to his attitude as to the policy of the Federal Government, not as a war measure or in time of war interfering with the institution of slavery; and I have cited what I have cited to substantiate that statement.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, just a few words to explain my vote. I do not intend to make a speech on this subject. I know the great desire to reach a vote on this matter at the present time.

I want to state, that there may be no misunderstanding by the Members of the Senate as to what my position is on the question of equal suffrage, that during two campaigns I spoke on behalf of equal suffrage from every platform in my State. I have worked before the legislature of our State on two different occasions in its behalf, and our legislature has twice, by an overwhelming vote, passed a resolution in favor of giving the women of our State the right to vote. In the coming election the question will be finally submitted to the people of our State, and I intend on that occasion to fight just as hard for the final adoption of the constitutional amendment as I have ever fought in the past. I believe that it is essential for good government in our State. Therefore I am going to fight for it. I do not know whether it is essential for good government in the States of the South. I am not prepared to answer that question, but I am willing to trust that question to those who have been elected to this body by the people of the South.

I know that there are questions affecting my State that I would ask those from the South to trust to me as I am trusting this question to them. We are facing just as serious problems as to what our relations shall be toward the Japanese and Chinese as the people of the South are with regard to the negroes.

I know that it is within the power of Congress and the States to amend the Constitution of the United States and enforce upon the Southern States equal suffrage and add to the negro vote that of the negro women. I know that the same power exists in Congress and the States to grant full citizenship to the Japanese and the Chinese in our Western States. I know the power exists in Congress and the States to so amend the

Constitution as to deprive us of the protection that we have to-day against undesirable foreign elements in the western part of the country. I have in mind the effort to compel our children to be associated at schools with undesirable Japanese—I am thinking of the demand of Japan that the State be prohibited from excluding Japanese from the ownership of property.

We are faced with just as serious a problem as the people of the South. I do not want to place myself in the position, as a representative of my State, that when we are face to face with such evils I can not come to the Representatives and Senators from the South and say to them, "We trusted this question to you, and we ask you to trust these questions to us."

I believe that this method of obtaining a vote for woman will not in the long run inure to her benefit any more than it will inure to the benefit of the men of this country. I think that they are injuring the cause of equal suffrage by any fight that may be intolerant to any section of this country. It is only through fairness, through tolerance, and through due consideration that they can win the sympathy and the support of the men of this country, and in this fight they must depend upon the men and the men alone.

I realize that a stand of this kind by Senators who for years have fought for equal suffrage will be misinterpreted, and by many it will be purposely misconstrued. The time will come when those who stand for this amendment will find out that if they do carry it they will have made a grave mistake by establishing such a precedent, particularly as far as the interests of the West are concerned.

As the men of our State will give our women the right to vote at the next election, and as we must have the support of the Southern States in our fight against the perils that threaten us, I can not vote for the amendment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, upon the discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] a good deal has been said in regard to the treatment of the colored people. A good deal has been said in regard to the want of progress they have made.

I would not by my silence be taken as acquiescing in the statements made by the Senator from Mississippi. Believing as I do that his amendment will be overwhelmingly defeated at this time, I do not think this is the time to discuss that question, but I simply desire to say that if in this body while I am here that becomes a material question I shall take occasion to give it a full and thorough discussion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendment is a proposition practically to double the suffrage of the country. It is sought to attach to it a proviso restricting the suffrage as it already exists. I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi and shall vote against it, and I am also opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment. The constitution of Connecticut provides that—

> Every male citizen of the United States who shall have attained the age of 21 years, who shall have resided in this State for a term of one year next preceding and in the town in which he may offer himself to be admitted to the privileges of an elector at least six months next preceding the time he may so offer himself, and shall sustain a good moral character and shall be able to read in the English language any article of the Constitution or any section of the statutes of this State, shall, on his taking such oath as may be prescribed by law, be an elector.

The proposition involved in this amendment, to wit, that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," is a proposition to strike from the constitution of the State of Connecticut the word "male."

Mr. President, the people of the State of Connecticut are quite competent, in my opinion, to determine the qualifications of electors in that State. They have always done it. If there is a majority of the women of Connecticut who want the privilege of voting, I am quite certain that they can easily impress that fact upon the general assembly of my State. If a majority of the women of Connecticut want to vote and will let the Legislature of Connecticut see that that is the case, the legislature will prescribe a method of determining the fact. They could pass a statute and have an expression of opinion among the women of the State. If only a minority of the women of Connecticut want to vote, I see no reason why the suffrage should be thrust upon an unwilling and protesting majority, and I see less reason why the United States Government should attempt to prescribe the qualifications of electors and amend the constitutions of the various States of the Union against their protest.

Mr. President, I think altogether too many propositions which the States could handle themselves if they will exercise the rights which are contended for, are sought by their enthusiastic followers to be embedded in the Constitution of the United States.

I am going to read an article which was printed in the New York Sun of February 17, which raises a very important question, which I think no person, and especially no lawyer who can see the difficulties involved in the situation, will care to express an unalterable opinion upon at first blush, but it raises a subject for consideration which I consider of the utmost importance now and in the future in this country. It is entitled "Can one State's reserved rights be taken away by the vote of other States?" and is as follows:

*To the editor of the Sun:*

SIR: The frequency with which the suggestion is made that the Constitution of the United States shall be amended to authorize the Federal Government to exercise powers that may be exercised by the States, but which at least some of them do not choose to exercise, suggests the question whether there lies in the States collectively a right to limit the reserved rights of any of the parties to the compact whose concrete expression is the American Union; whether there are no such exercises of authority as a dispassionate judge would pronounce ultra vires.

It is a fundamental principle of association that charters confer equitable authority to bind with respect only to such matters as are contemplated in their formation; and this restriction is not based on an expressed self-limitation in the documents themselves, but on obvious principles of justice. Yet, while this statement will be generally accepted without question, that charter by which the American Colonies bound themselves originally is, in practice at least, assumed to be an exception to the operation of the principle. Whether it is or not it might be presumptuous to say, but at any rate the question is a debatable one whether the thirteen original States entered into the compact with the understanding that their subscription to the Constitution implied that their sovereignty in their reserved rights was thereafter not to be absolute, but contingent on the will of a stated majority to the compact. Due consideration of the circumstances under which the compact was made, as well as of the agreement itself, can, I think, admit of but one conclusion—that they did not. And if this conclusion be valid it follows that though there is in the Constitution of the United States itself no express limitation of the power to amend there is in the case of that agreement a natural and necessary limitation in that respect, as well as of the right of legislation by the Federal Government, if any distinction between State and Nation is to be recognized.

Recognizing this distinction, however, one need not be a Marshall to perceive that amendments such as those depriving the States of control over their electorates or compelling them to adopt a prohibition measure are an abuse of the amending power and a violation of the spirit if not of the letter of the Constitution. If the State of Maine, for instance, deems it expedient to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicants within its territory, or the State of Colorado deems it expedient to confer the franchise upon women, they have not been debarred from the exercise of those rights by those States which, like New York, have preferred to adopt a different policy. If three-fourths of the States of the Union wish to adopt the policy of prohibition or universal suffrage, they have the unquestioned right to do so within their respective jurisdictions. But if, not satisfied with that, they have the additional right of compelling the minority of "sovereign" States, however much they may be opposed to such a course, however great a hardship it might impose on them, to adopt it also, it is obviously absurd to regard this as a Union of independent Commonwealths that for the purposes of that Union agreed to surrender certain sovereign rights, retaining the rest; there is in principle but one sovereign authority, the Federal authority, of which the States are but administrative subdivisions, because by the process of unlimited amendment all reserved rights may be absorbed in time by the Central Government.

The subject is so profound that one can do no more than advert to it in the compass of a newspaper communication; but if it does not receive greater consideration from layman and legislator alike than it has hitherto commanded, resulting in a more intelligent comprehension by the average man of the character and purpose of the Union, this Government will tend to become what Samuel J. Tilden feared: "Not only the most oppressive but also the most corrupt with which any people has been cursed."

F. J. DUNDON.

NEW YORK, *February 16.*

Mr. President, there is already pending another proposal, as referred to in this article, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors, to put that prohibition into the Constitution of the United States. Without expressing any opinion whatever about the wisdom of the manufacture or the sale of intoxicating liquors, it seems to me that the Constitution of the United States ought not to be made the vehicle to define the qualifications of electors, to define what shall be the sumptuary laws in the country, to put all sorts of prohibitions and restrictions touching the people in their home life and in their local municipalities and Commonwealths.

I have another objection to this proposed constitutional amendment. Whatever might be said practically of the fairness of submitting an amendment like this, prohibiting the States from confining the suffrage to males, if it were submitted to the whole people—no matter what might be said of its fairness if that method were adopted—of course this is going to be submitted to the legislatures of the various States; and if three-fourths of the legislatures of the States approve it, then it becomes operative. Mr. President, I do not think that in this kind of a question the verdict that would be given by the States that voted on this proposition would be what would be called a fair test of opinion, or would probably reflect the real opinion of the members who voted upon it. It would precipitate all over this country a contest in every assembly district of those

who were rival candidates for the legislature in their own States, and in every close assembly district, whether it was made up of a whole town or of a ward of a city, if one candidate pledged himself to this change, if it were a close district, it would take a mighty strong candidate who was opposing him not to do the same thing; in other words, I think that a great many of the legislatures would be tied hand and foot upon this proposition by the candidates having pledged themselves to the measure out of fear or out of a desire to gain some votes or to neutralize the votes that their opponents would otherwise gain. I do not think that would be a fair expression of opinion, Mr. President.

So upon every ground of home rule and of the right of a State, so far as possible, if it does not infringe upon the rights of its neighbors, to conduct its own affairs according to its own judgment and according to the demands of its own conditions and in view of its own environment, I think this matter should properly be left to the States, where it always has been; and I think, so far as the majority of the women in each State show that they want the suffrage, the men of each State can be relied upon to give it to them without any interference by the central Government here at Washington.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, at the last session of the Legislature of Pennsylvania a resolution was adopted providing for the submission to the people of Pennsylvania of a constitutional amendment extending the right of suffrage to women. If that resolution is again adopted at the coming session of the legislature, as I think it undoubtedly will be, this question will be submitted to the people of our State for decision at the general election in 1915. If the people of Pennsylvania at that time decide that women thenceforward shall vote, all well and good; if they decide that women shall not vote, then I deny the moral right of any 36 States or any 47 States of the Union to force that action upon the people of Pennsylvania. For that reason, Mr. President, and not because I am opposed to woman suffrage, I expect to vote against the pending joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, at the last session of the New Hampshire Legislature the same proposition was before it as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] has suggested was before the Pennsylvania Legislature. It was acted upon adversely in my State; but had it been acted upon favorably, it would have submitted the question of the right of women to vote to the men of the State, which I think is not a fair test.

A few moments ago, Mr. President, in expressing opposition to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I failed to say that I have given the joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment which is before the Senate very serious consideration, and have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to vote for it.

Whatever the opinion of the people of my State may be, it is a conviction with me that woman is denied the right to vote simply because men have the power to deny it—for that and for no other reason in the world. Hence, Mr. President, when the question comes upon the joint resolution as reported from the committee I shall cast my vote in favor of it.

As to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I regret exceedingly that it has been presented to the Senate as an amendment to the joint resolution. I do not think this is the time or the place for the serious discussion of that question. It may be that at some future time the fifteenth amendment will be blotted from the Constitution of the United States. I hope that time will never arrive; but, whether it does or not, it is clear to my mind that the Senator from Mississippi has made a tactical mistake in attempting to attach the proposition to do so to a joint resolution that has been so long and so ably discussed and upon which we are about to vote.

I remember very well in the year 1872, when Gen. Grant was nominated by the Republican Party as their candidate for President of the United States—the man who declared, and his words rang from one end of the country to the other, "Let us have peace"—I remember the enthusiasm with which this resolution was adopted by the Republican Party:

3. Complete liberty and exact equality in the enjoyment of all civil, political, and public rights should be established and effectually maintained throughout the Union by efficient and appropriate State and Federal legislation. Neither the law nor its administration should admit any discrimination in respect of citizens by reason of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude.

And, Mr. President, I remember at a later date, almost 25 years after the fifteenth amendment was engrafted upon the Constitution of the United States, that the great Democratic Party in convention in Chicago nominated Grover Cleveland for the Presidency and Thomas A. Hendricks as their candidate for the Vice Presidency, and adopted this resolution as a part of the Democratic platform:

Asserting the equality of all men before the law, we hold that it is the duty of the Government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all citizens, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political.

It may be, Mr. President, that a mistake was made in ratifying the fifteenth amendment, but it seems to me that almost 25 years after that time, when the Democratic Party in convention declared in their platform what I have just read, there was not that intense feeling against it that some Senators say has existed from the time it was ratified until the present moment.

The Southern States to-day have 40 Members of the National House of Representatives and 40 votes in the electoral college, based upon representation that is not permitted the right of suffrage guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that under those circumstances the South ought to be content, and that no serious complaint should be made by Senators from that section of the country. It is the North that has a right to complain.

I simply wish to repeat, Mr. President, that I trust the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be defeated, as I believe it will be defeated; and I wish further to say that it will give me great pleasure to vote in favor of the joint resolution which is now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I believe that democracy is the highest form of government devised by man; that it can be successfully conducted only by a people of the highest civilization and intelligence; and that when conducted by a people of inferior civilization and intelligence, whilst it may have the form of democracy, its essential spirit will be that of autocracy or despotism. I believe that the highest standards of citizenship as the controlling influence in government should be maintained, and believing, as I do, that this country is subject to greater menace from the race question than any other, I believe in making this a white man's government, and I would gladly restrict suffrage in this country to people of the white race, without invidious reference to other races differing in color. I believe that issue will yet be predominant in this country.

We already have 14,000,000 of blacks in our midst. Taught, as they will be, the laws of sanitation and of health, their death rate will diminish steadily, and a constantly increasing proportion of blacks will be drawn into the electorate of the country. We have that condition on our own soil, a condition unknown in any other prominent country dominated by the white race.

We are also threatened from without. Confronting us on the Pacific lie countries with 50,000,000 of the brown race, three or four hundred million of the yellow race, and three or four hundred million of Hindustanese, all of them looking to this country as the land of opportunity and eager to come and settle. I believe we should determine this question soon by writing the word "white" in our Constitution as to the right of suffrage and restricting the immigration to this country, except for purposes of commerce, education, or travel, to people of the white race. I believe if we do that we can then apply ourselves to the problem of the highest and best development industrially, economically, intellectually, and morally of the black race, and that we will not be drawn from that important work by efforts to keep them down in order to prevent them from becoming a part of the governing electorate of the country. Such a course means the highest humanity to the black race itself, upon whom no greater cruelty could have been imposed than suddenly, at the close of the war, to turn them from slaves into sovereigns, dominating for a time the white people of the South and controlling the Government there, until a mighty movement, sustained by laws which have scant warrant in the Constitution, in my judgment, but which are sustained by public sentiment, wrested the control of government from the blacks. It will hardly be possible to prevent them in the future, if present conditions continue, from holding the power, or at all events the balance of power, in that region; and that power will always constitute a deadly menace to democratic institutions.

So far as sex is concerned, I see no reason why the males of the white race should deny the females of the white race the right to vote. No reasoning can satisfy my mind that it is right to exclude the white women from the electorate of this country. I stand, therefore, for the extension of suffrage to white women. I stand for the denial of the right of suffrage in this country to the people of any other race than the white race.

How can I make my vote effective, and how can I make it harmonious with these views? The Senator from Oregon [Mr.

CHAMBERLAIN] has proposed a constitutional amendment not confining the right of suffrage in this country to the white race, but extending the right of suffrage to women. I am for the extension of the right of suffrage to women. But the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has offered an amendment to this proposal under which the whole question of the right of suffrage will be left to the legislatures of the respective States. I should like to vote for that amendment if it would result in the exclusion of the blacks from the right of suffrage, as it will undoubtedly partially do; but I fear that if that amendment is adopted it will mean that many Senators who are for woman suffrage will vote against the proposal as amended, and I think the women of the country are entitled to a fair expression of the sentiment of this body as to whether they are entitled to the right of suffrage. For that reason I regret that the Senator from Mississippi has chosen this opportunity to present to the Senate a different issue that will cloud the determination of the principal issue. I trust the Senator from Mississippi will withdraw that amendment, in order that the question it involves may come up at some more auspicious time when that will be the sole issue before this body—the issue of white supremacy in this country.

I do not know how many amendments will be offered, but I shall endeavor to maintain my vote throughout in harmony with these views and to maintain it in such a way as to keep before the Senate the dominant issue as to the right of women to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice of an amendment that I propose to offer following the vote upon the pending amendment. The amendment is to insert the word "white" between the preposition "of" and the word "citizens," in the first line of section 1 of the proposed amendment, so that it shall read:

> The right of white citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

That will bring up squarely the question which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] desires to have brought up. It will present to him and to others this proposition, if they desire to consider it. Without saying anything more about it now except to express my appreciation of the fact that the Senator from Nevada has just made a speech abounding in rich common sense, I wish to express my sympathy with the idea that, sooner or later, we will declare this to be a white man's Government. In that event it will be the better for all of us, including even those people who are not white and who live amongst us. Whether they are Chinese, Japanese, or Negroes makes no difference to me. Of course the Chinaman is an infinitely superior man to the Negro, and the Japanese is not our inferior in any degree at all. He is just simply different; that is about all. But he is not white.

The Pacific slope is trying to excite the country a great deal about the Japanese. The little Jap has proven his equality upon the battle field. He has proven it in the forum of civilization. He has proven it at American and English and German universities. He has proven it everywhere. Yet I do not want the Pacific slope ever to be threatened with Japanese domination nor with Japanese balance of power as between white factions there; not because the Japanese is, in my opinion, my inferior—I do not think he is—but because his ideals and his traditions and his notions are different; and I want this Government to be a white man's government, carried on in accordance with the white man's traditions and the white man's ideals.

Differing from a great many people, I have never been ashamed that I was a white man. I am rather inclined to the opinion that the white man stands at the forefront of the advance guard of progress and civilization, in literature, in commerce, in law, in war, in peace, and everywhere else. I have never found it possible even to apologize in my own mind for being a white man, and I have never found it possible to apologize in my own mind for wanting to govern my country in my own way. I want this to be a white man's country, governed by white men. I certainly can not find any consistency in the position of those men out on the Pacific coast who do not want a white man's civilization to be interfered with by Chinese and Japanese, and who do want it interfered with by niggers in some other part of the country, unless it be due to the fact that the darky was born here and the other fellow was not. There may be something in that, though I do not think there is much, because, with as full opportunity, after having been born here, he has never yet made an American out of himself, and he never will do it. He will continue to be an African for all time to come.

While I am on this subject, although it has nothing to do with this particular amendment, I believe I will say a few words about hyphenated Americans, anyhow.

I do not think it a disgrace to be simply a plain American, without any hyphenation at all, whether an Afro-American, or an Irish-American, or a German-American, or a Hungarian-American, or any other sort of an American with a hyphen in it. Of course I assert no superiority upon the part of plain Americans to other people. I do not believe there is any superiority existing. Still I do assert that we are not necessarily inferior simply because we are not hyphenated.

I think those of us whose forefathers fought to put the French language off the American Continent and make this an English-speaking continent, and whose forefathers afterwards fought to throw off British usurpation, although Britain was the land of our language and commerce and literature and progress, are entitled to stand at least upon a ground of equal footing with the hyphenated Americans of every description. I assert for us no superiority, of course. I would not dare do it. I would not believe my own assertion if I did.

I find that human nature in certain broad lines is about the same everywhere. I have lived upon the Rhine and the Danube, and have dwelt and sojourned by the Thames and the Seine and on the Mississippi, and have been an infrequent visitor even to that highly aristocratic coterie of people who live along the Hudson, and I find that white human nature is about the same all over the world, and nigger human nature is about the same, and Chinese human nature is about the same, and Japanese human nature is about the same. The nigger in Louisiana is a good deal like the nigger in Africa. The white man on the Thames is a good deal like the white man on the Mississippi, and a Chinese at Hongkong is a good deal like a Chinaman in San Francisco.

I have been rather astonished to find so much good, real, hard, common sense expressed during this discussion. I am not at all astonished to find it expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], because I expected it from him, but I am very much pleased with his utterances; and I wish to express the hope that the day may come some of these times when the white people of the United States will have enough courage and common sense to say that this is a white man's country and they want it ruled according to the white man's traditions and the white man's ideals, and that they are not ashamed to say it, nor afraid to say it; that they do not think they are violating any injunction of civilization or humanity or progress in saying it; but, upon the contrary, that they are of the opinion that the white men of this country can govern it just as well as any other race, and perhaps a little bit better, and that they can govern it better if they are not disturbed and embarrassed by the traditions and the ideals and environments and the notions of other races.

In saying that I am making no assertion of white superiority, either. I am just making the assertion of difference. That is about all. I might assert some superiority if I chose to do it. At any rate, I would believe in it if I asserted it, but it is not necessary.

You can not have democratic institutions in any country in the world without race homogeneousness. You can not have any real liberty without real equality, and you can not have any real equality without real fraternity, and you can not have any real fraternity between races which, in potentiality, at any rate, do not intermarry. It comes down to the old, fundamental, rock principle after all of tribal relationship, of potential, if not actual homogeneity of blood, and to the point of willingness to accept in blood kinship, in acknowledged lawful wedlock, the man that you call "brother." If you are not going to call him "brother," you are not going to call him "equal," and if you are not going to call him "equal" you are not going to call him "free"; or if you do, you are hypocrites, because you do not mean it.

All democracy is founded upon a temple whose four pillars are liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice. The more you attempt by law to give artificial rights which you do not recognize in your own hearts the more injustice you are going to have. You can not prevent it. It is a part of human nature itself, and God alone can change human nature. So-called race prejudice, after all, is simply race knowledge and race difference.

The Senator from New Hampshire may stand here and tell me until he is grayheaded [laughter] that he believes in racial equality, but I know that he does not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not quite understand the Senator's observation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say, the Senator may tell me that he believes in racial equality, but I know that down in the bottom of his heart he does not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I certainly do, as before the law and under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; a convenient phrase, that.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Senator will become baldheaded before he persuades me to the contrary. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say "baldheaded"; I said "grayheaded." "Equal before the law"—a convenient phrase that. So do I. I believe that in the administration of justice the scales of justice ought to be held absolutely equal for all races and all people; but that is not what I said, nor can the Senator nor can anybody else evade the issue by thrusting in that convenient phrase, "before the law." I am talking about your heart, not the law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is a matter that I thought the Senator would not proceed to inquire into, because he might find some trouble in discovering it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I would not find any trouble. Yours is a great, big, good heart, and I know it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator. I will ask the Senator what was the meaning of the plank in the platform of the Democratic Party, adopted in 1884, at the time they nominated Mr. Cleveland, when it said: "We believe in a free ballot and a fair count"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, some fellow came into the convention and said: "We will catch some nigger votes by putting this in." [Laughter.] Let us just be frank and honest with one another, you and I above all men.

Mr. GALLINGER. In other words, I suppose it was as binding as the free-tolls plank in the Democratic platform of a few months ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just about the same; and I expect it was gotten into the platform in about the same way, too. [Laughter.]

When you come to talk about the equality of men before the law, that is a thing to which every gentleman will subscribe. I go further than that. I will give some little leeway to the fellow who, because of race or because of poverty or because of some other reason of inferiority, would not stand quite as good a chance before a jury as I would. I will make allowances for him. Down in the State of Misssisippi I would send a white man to the penitentiary as quick as the snap of a finger on a charge of stealing chickens, but I would not send a nigger to jail on the same charge. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator does not quote me quite accurately. I said, "before the law and under the Constitution of the United States." I did not refer, of course, to the question of law suits, which the Senator is now discussing, but I referred to political rights.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know; but I am going to talk about the law now, and I will come back to the other matter later on.

If a white man were brought before me, and I were a member of a grand jury, and he were charged with bigamy, I would indict him at once. I would not indict a darky for bigamy. [Laughter.] So far from not giving him an equal chance before the law, I would give him a better chance. I know his traditions; I know his ideals; I know his social life; and I do not hold him to the white man's standard. It would be unjust if I did.

If I were working a lot of white men in a wages squad, I would make them do good work. In working a lot of darkies in a wages squad, I look off every now and then and let them rest, because they need it, and they ought to have it. [Laughter.]

When it comes to giving an exact and equal administration of justice, I do not think any man with a good heart in him could deny it to anybody, of any sex or any race, anywhere. That must be given. If you do not give that, you are not honest yourself.

That, however, is not the question I am talking about now. That is not the question I put to the Senator from New Hampshire. I said that if he told me he believed in racial equality I did not believe he believed it, and I thought he was getting things mixed up.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I believe in it precisely as I have stated it. The Senator must not put me in the attitude of entertaining a belief that I have not discussed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I would not put the Senator from New Hampshire in any attitude in the world that he did not want to be put in, for half a second.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have known the Senator from New Hampshire for long years; and although he is a stand-pat Republican and I am a Bourbon Democrat, I think we have mutual respect for one another, because we always know where to put our fingers on one another, and that is a great deal in this world. We do not know that about everybody else. [Laughter.]

What does racial equality involve, if you really believe in it? It involves actual or potential blood relationship in lawful marriage. There is not any one of you who believes in that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator's definition is correct, then I agree with the Senator absolutely on that proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew the Senator would, and that is the reason why I made the assertion that I did a moment ago. Abraham Lincoln agreed with me absolutely, too. Thomas Jefferson, the radical of radicals, and the radical of the ages, agreed with me, too.

So I come back to what I started out with a moment ago. In a democratic republic you must have homogeneity of race rule; not necessarily homogeneity of race population, but you must have homogeneity of the governing race, because you can not have a real democratic temple without one pillar with "liberty" inscribed on it, without another pillar with "equality" inscribed on it, without another pillar with "fraternity" inscribed on it, and without another pillar that must go with every sort of a temple, whether democratic or not, with "justice" inscribed on it.

I repeat that you can not have any temple top resting upon those pillars unless you have real liberty. Real liberty involves real equality, and real equality involves real fraternity, and real fraternity involves actual, potential willingness to blood relationship in lawful marriage—in lawful marriage, and not the hypocrisy of concubinage.

So there is none of us who believe in racial equality. Therefore I shall offer this amendment at the proper time:

That the right of white citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

That will dispose of the Japanese question of the Pacific slope for all future time, and the Chinese question, and the balance of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. In a great many States, including New Hampshire, the colored man is permitted to vote without let or hindrance. Does the Senator think that commits us to racial equality as he interprets it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I frankly do not, nor did I attempt to make that point.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator ought to differentiate between racial equality as some of us understand it, which guarantees to all citizens certain rights——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I frankly did not intend that my remarks should be taken to that full extent. I know the Senator understood me, but I am glad he called my attention to the matter, because I do not want to make a wrong impression upon other people.

I am trying now, however, to bring this question down to its fundamental, elemental essence, and to leave out the mere embroideries and frills and margins of it. That is the reason why I brought it down to the point I sought to bring it down to, and that is the reason why I picked out, purposely, the Senator from New Hampshire. I knew if there was a man in this body who stood diametrically opposite, traditionally and ideally, to what I have stood for, with my heredity and environment, it was perhaps he; and I wanted to show that when we came down to the fundamental, elemental essence of it there was no difference between us, and there is none.

I hope that when we reach it finally, the amendment I have offered shall be adopted. I say, "I hope." I do not hope anything of the sort. I want to be honest with all of you; but I say it would be a good thing if it were adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], upon which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BRADLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], who is not present at this moment. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] has a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. By arrangement we transfer those pairs so that the Senator from Tennessee and myself may vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Chamber by illness. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when Mr. CRAWFORD's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the fact that he is paired as stated by the Senator from Minnesota. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD, when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). The Chair wishes to announce the unavoidable absence of his colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that his colleague is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KENYON (when Mr. CUMMINS's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. Were my colleague present he would vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. By mutual consent it has been arranged that that pair shall be called off so far as the vote on the main question is concerned; but I do not understand that I have a right to vote on amendments. I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. BRYAN (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] is paired with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. Under an arrangement by which a transfer of pairs has been made I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON (when Mr. ROBINSON's name was called). The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (when Mr. SAULSBURY's name was called). I was requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Were the Senator from Delaware present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], as heretofore announced.

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] has been called to the Interior Department upon a very important matter in reference to the reclamation act, and therefore he is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If the senior Senator from Michigan were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. By an arrangement with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], a transfer has been made, so that the Senator from Pennsylvania will stand paired with the Senator from Arkansas, which will enable both the Senator from Mississippi and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I am informed, however, that if he here here his vote would be the same as mine. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a regular pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], which I transfer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). In accordance with the announcement made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], I vote, notwithstanding my pair. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], but I understand that he would vote the same way that I intend to vote upon this amendment, and I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I find that I can not transfer my pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] but that I may transfer it to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LIPPITT (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I find that he has not voted, and I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—19.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bryan | Martin, Va. | Sheppard | Tillman |
| Gore | Myers | Shields | Vardaman |
| James | Overman | Smith, Ga. | West |
| Lea, Tenn. | Ransdell | Smith, S. C. | Williams |
| Lee, Md. | Reed | Swanson | |

NAYS—48.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gallinger | Martine, N. J. | Sherman |
| Borah | Gronna | Nelson | Smoot |
| Brady | Hollis | Newlands | Stephenson |
| Brandegee | Hughes | Norris | Sterling |
| Bristow | Johnson | Oliver | Sutherland |
| Burton | Jones | Owen | Thomas |
| Catron | Kenyon | Page | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | La Follette | Perkins | Thornton |
| Chilton | Lane | Pittman | Townsend |
| Clapp | Lodge | Poindexter | Warren |
| Clark, Wyo. | McCumber | Pomerene | Weeks |
| Dillingham | McLean | Shafroth | Works |

NOT VOTING—28.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Cummins | Lewis | Shively |
| Bradley | du Pont | Lippitt | Simmons |
| Burleigh | Fall | O'Gorman | Smith, Ariz. |
| Clarke, Ark. | Fletcher | Penrose | Smith, Md. |
| Colt | Goff | Robinson | Smith, Mich. |
| Crawford | Hitchcock | Root | Stone |
| Culberson | Kern | Saulsbury | Walsh |

So Mr. VARDAMAN'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now offer the amendment to which I called the attention of the Senate. I move to insert the word "white" between the preposition "of" and the word "citizens," in the first line of section 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend section 1, line 1, by inserting before the word "citizens" the word "white," so that, if amended, the section will read:

SECTION 1. The right of white citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. WILLIAMS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] and withhold my vote.

Mr. BRADLEY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and withhold my vote. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I do not know how he would vote on this question. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to pairs and transfers, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when Mr. CRAWFORD's name was called). I make the same announcement in regard to the absence of my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] and his pair as before. If my colleague were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. KENYON (when Mr. CUMMINS's name was called). I make the same announcement as to my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] as before. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will therefore withhold my vote. Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. LEA of Tennessee (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the last vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). On account of my pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). I make the same announcement with regard to my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] as on the last vote. If he were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] on account of sickness, and state that he is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I again repeat the announcement of the absence and pair of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] and state that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before with respect to my pair and the transfer of it, and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I desire to make the same announcement as before. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. He is away on official business and is paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. ASHURST. I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If the Senator from Delaware were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—21.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bryan | Myers | Shields | Vardaman |
| Gore | Newlands | Smith, Ga. | West |
| James | Overman | Smith, S. C. | Williams |
| Lea, Tenn. | Pittman | Swanson | |
| Lee, Md. | Ransdell | Thornton | |
| Martin, Va. | Sheppard | Tillman | |

NAYS—44.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gallinger | McLean | Shafroth |
| Borah | Gronna | Martine, N. J. | Sherman |
| Brady | Hollis | Nelson | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Hughes | Norris | Stephenson |
| Bristow | Johnson | Oliver | Sterling |
| Burton | Jones | Owen | Sutherland |
| Catron | Kenyon | Page | Thomas |
| Chamberlain | La Follette | Perkins | Thompson |
| Clapp | Lane | Poindexter | Townsend |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lodge | Pomerene | Weeks |
| Dillingham | McCumber | Reed | Works |

NOT VOTING—30.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Cummins | Lippitt | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bradley | du Pont | O'Gorman | Smith, Md. |
| Burleigh | Fall | Penrose | Smith, Mich. |
| Chilton | Fletcher | Robinson | Stone |
| Clarke, Ark. | Goff | Root | Walsh |
| Colt | Hitchcock | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Crawford | Kern | Shively | |
| Culberson | Lewis | Simmons | |

So Mr. WILLIAMS's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is in the Senate and still open to amendment. The question is, Shall the joint resolution be read the third time?

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. JAMES called for the yeas and nays and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. BRADLEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], but on this vote we are agreed. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is detained from the Chamber on account of illness. As it would require a transfer to two on this vote, and I am unable to get two, I have to decline voting. It is needless to say that I would vote "yea" if at liberty to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is absent. Not understanding that it requires a transfer of two for one, I transfer my pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when Mr. CRAWFORD's name was called). I make the same announcement as before in regard to the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] and his pair. I will state that if he were present and permitted to vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. KENYON (when Mr. CUMMINS's name was called). I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS], and I desire to say that if he were present and not paired he would vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], but it has been mutually agreed between us that the operation of the pair should not apply to this vote. I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CATRON (when Mr. FALL's name was called). My colleague [Mr. FALL] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. If my colleague were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BRYAN (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the two previous votes, I vote "yea."

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. If he were present to-day, he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMPSON (when Mr. ROBINSON's name was called). I will again announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and state that he is paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. ROOT's name was called). The senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. If present, the senior Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (when Mr. SAULSBURY's name was called). I desire again to announce the absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona], and I desire further to announce that if present my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I again announce the absence and the pair of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I make the same announcement in reference to my pair and its transfer as before and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when Mr. WALSH's name was called). I am authorized to announce that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily detained from the Chamber. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I am further authorized to state that if my colleague were here he would vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. As I am unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore feel at liberty to vote and I vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the affirmative). Since recording my vote upon this question I have been informed of the terms of the pair between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and under it I find I can not properly record my vote. I therefore withdraw the same.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLAPP. Observing that the idea of a single pair prevails, I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OVERMAN. I again announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—35.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Newlands | Smoot |
| Brady | Hughes | Norris | Stephenson |
| Bristow | Jones | Owen | Sterling |
| Burton | Kenyon | Perkins | Sutherland |
| Chamberlain | La Follette | Poindexter | Thomas |
| Clapp | Lane | Ransdell | Thompson |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lea, Tenn. | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Gallinger | Myers | Sheppard | Works |
| Gronna | Nelson | Sherman | |

NAYS—34.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | James | Overman | Swanson |
| Borah | Johnson | Page | Thornton |
| Bradley | Lee, Md. | Pittman | Tillman |
| Brandegee | Lodge | Pomerene | Vardaman |
| Bryan | McCumber | Reed | Weeks |
| Catron | McLean | Shields | West |
| Dillingham | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Williams |
| du Pont | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. | |
| Gore | Oliver | Smith, S. C. | |

NOT VOTING—26.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Burleigh | Fall | O'Gorman | Smith, Ariz. |
| Chilton | Fletcher | Penrose | Smith, Mich. |
| Clarke, Ark. | Goff | Robinson | Stone |
| Colt | Hitchcock | Root | Walsh |
| Crawford | Kern | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Culberson | Lewis | Shively | |
| Cummins | Lippitt | Simmons | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution not having received the constitutional two-thirds, it is rejected.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it is manifest from the discussion which has been had in the Chamber to-day that many Senators have voted against the joint resolution on the theory that it forces equal suffrage upon the States against their will. I have here, and I ask unanimous consent out of order to present, a proposed constitutional amendment, which requires each State, upon a petition signed by 5 per cent of the citizens of that State, to submit to the voters of that State the question whether or not equal suffrage shall be adopted in that State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator correctly that 5 per cent of the population of the State may force this issue upon the consideration of the State?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will read it, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But is that the case?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think so. It is the same as the requirement regarding the initiation of legislation in a good many of the States.

Mr. JAMES. I call for the regular order.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be laid aside at the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 20, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION.

*Executive nomination received by the Senate March 19, 1914.*

DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE CANAL ZONE.

William K. Jackson, jr., of Ancon, Canal Zone, to be district attorney of the Canal Zone.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19, 1914.*

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Peter Hanson to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Nannie S. Coleman, Jasper.

ARIZONA.

Alberta M. Fulghum, Willcox.
Wilson T. Wright, Globe.

COLORADO.

C. C. McWilliams, Marble.
A. F. Reeves, Montrose.

FLORIDA.

Malcolm J. McMullen, Largo.

GEORGIA.

William F. Boone, Baxley.
Robert D. Brown, Hawkinsville.
Abner I. Head, Tallapoosa.
William H. McMillion, Demorest.
L. S. Peterson, Douglas.
W. J. Roberts, Arlington.
John P. Turner, Columbus.

IOWA.

T. D. Bellinger, Laurens.
J. S. Blair, Columbus Junction.
J. M. Bricker, Nevada.
W. S. Clark, Pocahontas.
Elizabeth Crowe, Clermont.
J. W. Floerchinger, Oxford.
John McC. Gass, Albia.
A. E. Jackson, Tama.
Samuel W. Koster, West Liberty.
Albert Lille, Lakeview.
E. C. McMeel, Delmar.
R. B. McSwiggin, Williamsburg.
Kate C. Warner, Dayton.

KANSAS.

J. H. Burnett, Blue Mound.
Emery W. Caywood, Clifton.
Ida McCann, Macksville.
William Reedy, Yates Center.
John I. Saunders, Cheney.

LOUISIANA.

Samuel J. Gandy, Westlake.

MAINE.

Monroe V. Curtis, Freeport.
Minnie M. Holland, Dixfield.
Percy E. Storer, Waldoboro.

MASSACHUSETTS.

J. J. Harrington, Chester.
James Kinsley, West Acton.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sybil Q. Stratton, Liberty.

MISSOURI.

Clay Adair, Clinton.
Andrew E. Doerr, Perryville.
Casper Ehrhard, St. Charles.
S. T. Jeffries, Salem.
Elijah E. Johnston, Sedalia.
H. V. Merritt, Campbell.
Obadiah C. Mitchell, Springfield.
J. G. Moutier, Union.
Charles F. Newman, Greenfield.
Simeon W. Ragland, Webb City.
James E. Williams, Butler.

MONTANA.

John P. Bowen, Libby.
George R. Fisk, Hamilton.
E. H. McDowell, Terry.

NEW JERSEY.

William H. Cook, Palmyra.
Joseph V. D. Field, Boundbrook.
Walter D. Finch, Mahwah.
Thomas F. Watson, Florence.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. F. McMenamy, Reynolds.
Walter Priest, New Rockford.

OHIO.

Philip Wetzel, Perrysburg.
Jacob D. Yocum, Mechanicsburg.

OKLAHOMA.

L. K. Bingham, Minco.
Walter B. Hensley, Checotah.
Ida Per Lee Pugsley, Morris.
D. G. Woodworth, Kingfisher.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George B. Bailey, Greenwood.
Francis M. Cross, Westminster.
Arthur R. Garner, Timmonsville.
Peter T. Sapoch, Blacksburg.

UTAH.

George W. Young, Coalville.
Luther McLaurin, McColl.

TENNESSEE.

John S. Gilbreath, Pulaski.
J. W. McGlathery, Humboldt.
James C. Springer, Lawrenceburg.

TEXAS.

S. H. Gardner, Honey Grove.
C. V. Gates, Gorman.
George N. Gentry, Pecos.
Reuben J. Kennedy, Whitesboro.
J. F. Kunkel, Clarksville.
William R. McAdams, Lorena.
Joseph B. Patty, Brookshire.
E. W. Sharman, Liberty.
J. S. Spradley, Van Alstyne.

WASHINGTON.

Mae O. Gray, Stevenson.
Anna P. Hanley, Enumclaw.
Charles O. Jackson, Eatonville.
Charles H. Runkel, Arlington.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harvey Ewart, Hinton.
J. K. Kerwood, Ripley.
Buckner F. Scott, Terra Alta.
Joseph F. Thompson, Martinsburg.
A. H. Wiedebusch, Wheeling.
James W. Wilson, Barboursville.

WISCONSIN.

Lyle I. Daigneau, Boyceville.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *March 19, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, in whom we live and move and have our being, impress us, we beseech Thee, with the duties devolving upon us, and make us tractable to the heavenly influence, that we may be responsive to its call and render unto Thee and our fellow men faithful and efficient service; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in us, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13612. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4628. An act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington use some of his time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that some time in December I made a statement on the floor of the House with regard to the shingle business of the State of Washington. I submitted a list of something like 194 mills that were at that time closed. The Department of Commerce sent two gentlemen out there to investigate in reference to the conditions. They made a report, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, inserted that report in the RECORD. I propose now to take up that report and reply to some of the statements therein made.

I may say in the beginning that there is no dispute as to the fact that the conditions were as I had represented. The only question is as to what was the cause.

CHARACTER OF THE INVESTIGATION.

Who are the gentlemen who made this investigation? Are they tariff experts? No one, so far as I know, has ever claimed that this was true. Of course, these men might have been able to obtain some facts and have given these to the Secretary of Commerce, upon which the Secretary could have formed an opinion; but no attempt whatever was made to do this. These "experts" gave the opinion and wrote the statement which the Secretary signed. The action of the Secretary in relation to this matter was entirely clerical. This appears from the statement itself. So, take this report in its strongest light and it is only the opinion of a subordinate in the Department of Commerce about a question upon which the greatest minds of this Nation have always differed. This report is simply an attempt by two clerks to try and sustain the preconceived opinion of the Secretary of Commerce upon certain phases of the tariff question. In making this statement I am simply showing what every man in this House knows to be true. Everyone knew what the report would be before the pretended investigation was made. The only question of doubt was what reasons they would give for reaching the conclusion.

These subordinates should not be condemned. No man is to be blamed for working in the interests of his daily bread. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] during the debate upon the provision creating a bureau of foreign and domestic commerce gave his opinion as to the character of

men that would be appointed to make these investigations under this provision of the law. He made a point of order against this provision when it was offered. He expressed the opinion that the proposition had been "born one afternoon in a corridor of the Capitol." In giving his reasons for opposing it, he used this language (pp. 6182, 6183, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2d sess., 62d Cong.):

The gentleman from Alabama has said that the present Tariff Board is a body of clerks of the President. How much more true would it be, with these subalterns in this little bureau, charged with all these great and important duties of the Tariff Board, appointed by a subordinate officer of the President—by the administration—how much more true would it be that, then, we could consign to a body of clerks the duties which are now exercised by the Tariff Board?

But so long as it will be composed of clerks who may be small politicians back in the country, appointed for the purpose of rewarding them for some political support, I shall oppose any effort on the part of the Committee on Appropriations or anybody else to put this tremendous power in the hands of such a board or bureau.

This statement was received by the House with applause. I do not care to further comment on the character of these "subalterns" appointed by "subordinate officer of the President," who may be "small politicians" appointed for the purpose of rewarding them for political support.

This report surely justifies every criticism Mr. Palmer made against the system. If he needs any evidence demonstrating the wisdom of his judgment, he will find it here.

CHARACTER OF THE EVIDENCE.

But few men would have had the assurance to submit to the public a report based upon the character of evidence furnished by this so-called expert investigator. Not only did he select with care his witnesses and refuse to talk with anyone that he thought might be hostile, but he fails absolutely to give the name of any witness he interviewed and whose evidence he uses. He does not give the name of a single witness that he examined while making this investigation. He does not give the name of a single man whose opinion he quotes. He does not give the name of a single man with whom he talked. He does not give the name of a single man that furnished him information. What is the value of a report based on such foundation? He only gives the names when he refers to records and letters. Even then, as I recall, he mentions only four names, and the evidence quoted from these witnesses, taken from court records or letters, is of little importance. Why does he refuse to give the names of his witnesses? He makes no explanation. If he had given the names of his witnesses, I could have ascertained if his version of their evidence was authorized. I could have ascertained if he had misquoted their testimony. But by giving anonymous evidence he precludes the opportunity to know the truth. If he told the truth, certainly he would have been anxious to have it corroborated. If he did not tell the truth, naturally he would have been anxious to prevent any inquiry being made to sustain him. Undoubtedly he feared that a telegram from me would bring from these witnesses a prompt and emphatic contradiction of the statements he attributes to them. If not, why is there no explanation for this unusual and most suspicious action. What explanation other than this can be given for the disreputable and contemptible method? Did he manufacture his own evidence under the guise of anonymous witnesses? This is the common method of those who follow the system of quoting anonymous witnesses. Again, I repeat that few public officials would have had the assurance to submit a statement to the public based upon ex parte and anonymous testimony, and my distinguished friend, the Secretary of Commerce, is certainly entitled to any credit it may bring to him.

Now, I want to take up the evidence and refer to some of it in detail. I am going to hurry through this as rapidly as possible. First, I refer to what he says about lumber. I read from page 84 of the report:

The effect of the removal of the duty on lumber is almost universally conceded to be negligible; at least it is so considered among lumbermen on the Pacific coast.

I do not know whom he consulted, as none of the witnesses are named. I am utterly unable to find out upon what foundation he bases that statement; and as he considers the question worthy of little consideration, I will only refer to one letter, which is from the manager of the West Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association. Surely, if there was any man in the State of Washington whose opinion he should have sought, it was the manager of this great association. The letter is as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *December 9, 1913.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As requested by Mr. J. H. Bloedel, I am inclosing a list of lumber mills that have closed down owing to a lack of business, along with their daily 10-hour capacity; also a list of mills that have shortened their running time owing to a lack of business. This amounts to a decrease in daily production of 3,917,500 feet, or about one-fifth of the output of the fir lumber in Oregon and Washington.

Everything indicates a greater shut down, as there is not sufficient business coming into the country to keep the mills going. The mills that have shut down entirely and those that are running on short time and limiting their output have thrown 8,400 men out of employment. This, of course, includes the men that work in the woods supplying the logs for the mills as well as the men that work in the mills, but does not include the shingle mills nor the men thrown out of employment by the closing down of the shingle mills. That information, I have been advised, has been sent you by Mr. Traill. I have checked his figures and find them correct.

Cessation of operation among the shingle mills has thrown 6,300 men out of employment by the closing of lumber mills and working limited time, making 14,700 men that are idle at this time on account of the inability of the mills to operate, and present indications are that this number will be increased very materially by the first of the year, as the mills are being forced to shut down from day to day.

I can not help but feel that the revision of the tariff is responsible for this condition. I addressed a letter April 29, 1913, to Hon. WESLEY L. JONES, Senator from this State, in which I set forth reasons of the West Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association for asking that the tariff be retained on shingles. At that time it was felt that it was hopeless to even attempt a retention of a tariff on lumber, but we did feel that we might be able to have the tariff, or at least a portion of the schedule then in existence, on shingles retained. As you are aware, we failed in this, with the result that our business is now in a deplorable condition. The letter I wrote to Senator JONES, as well as a number of others written him by various organizations and individual concerns interested, were submitted to the Senate by Senator JONES and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, September 2, 1913, commencing on page 4492. You possibly are familiar with this correspondence; but if not, would respectfully suggest that by reading it you might secure some information that you have not heretofore obtained.

If there is any further information that I can give you that will be of benefit to you, I would be pleased to do so.

Yours, truly,

WEST COAST LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
By W. C. MILES, *Manager.*

Although these experts could find no man in the State of Washington to express the opinion that the tariff had anything to do with the condition of the lumber industry, this is the opinion of the manager of that great lumber association:

I can not help but feel that the revision of the tariff is responsible for this condition.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from Washington yield for just one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The date of that letter is December 9, 1913.

Mr. GOULDEN. And what is the name of the author?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The name of the author is W. C. Miles, manager of the West Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, the big lumber association of our State, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. At the close of my remarks I will insert an article from the Seattle Times showing the result of the proposed repeal of the Panama Canal tolls law on the lumber industry of the Pacific coast.

CHINESE LABOR.

I want to quote now from the report submitted by the Secretary. He says, on page 3:

A number of the manufacturers, responding to the request for information sent out by the manager of the association, expressed themselves unequivocally that they were of the opinion that the removal of the duty had nothing to do with then existing conditions.

Now, I take the report, and I find that on pages 9, 10, and 11 the expert quotes 5 men, who apparently express the opinion that the removal of the tariff has nothing to do with the conditions in the shingle industry; but it appears from this evidence itself that he had at that time about 100 replies from the shingle men of the State of Washington before him. He was looking at the replies that had been sent in to the manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Association. He finds 5 out of 100 that he can quote in support of his contention. What did the other 95 say? I refer to this to show you the character, the honest endeavor shown in this report to get the truth. The Secretary in his letter says that a number of the manufacturers responding to the request said that the duty had nothing to do with the then existing conditions; and yet these experts could find only 5 out of 100. Why did he not bring in all of them? Why did he not make a summary of the other replies?

I want to call your attention a little further to other statements. The same report, signed by Mr. Redfield, on page 2, says:

The labor cost of producing shingles in the United States and British Columbia does not differ greatly, if at all.

Now let us see what the report says about that. On page 69 of the report he quotes one of the witnesses, who says:

He thinks that the total difference in the cost of labor in the two countries is in favor of Canada, but he does not know how much. At the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill wages in Canada were considerably lower than they are now. It was then established to the satisfaction of the authors of that bill that this difference was

equivalent to 35 cents to 50 cents per thousand shingles, and they fixed the duty at 50 cents per thousand. In his opinion, the difference now is not more than 15 or 20 cents per thousand.

And yet in his letter he says that the cost of producing shingles in the United States and British Columbia does not differ greatly, if at all.

If I had the time I could read from several other witnesses who gave testimony to the same effect, but I will just read from one letter that I have received in regard to this question of Chinese labor; and I want to take occasion to call the attention of my Democratic friends to the fact that this report shows that 90 per cent of the men working in the shingle mills of British Columbia are orientals, and 70 per cent of the 90 are Chinese. I read from a letter of Mr. E. E. Case on this question. He lives in the district of my colleague Mr. JOHNSON, at Raymond, and is one of the largest shingle manufacturers in the county, and a man of highest standing. He says:

Practically all of the shingles in British Columbia are manufactured wholly or in part by Chinese labor; approximately about 90 per cent of the labor used is Chinese and 10 per cent white. The Chinese labor is mostly under the contract system; they contract for the manufacturing of the shingles from the water to the dry kiln during the winter months at 28 cents per thousand, and in some cases during the summer months at 30 cents per thousand.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman reduce that to a per diem basis?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can not take the time to do that now. I want to finish reading this.

This is the full labor cost with the exception of a filer, at about $5 per day; the engineer, at about $100 per month; and the night watchman, at $75 or $80 per month. In a mill cutting 100,000 shingles per day, for example, the cost per thousand would run:

| | Cents. |
|---|---|
| Contracted labor | 28 |
| Engineer | 4 |
| Filing | 5½ |
| Night watchman | 3 |
| Total | 40½ |

In a mill in Washington operated under the most favorable circumstances and strictest economy the cost for the same work would total exactly 57 cents per thousand. These are the actual figures, taken from my own experience and observation. How a man could conceive the idea that there was no difference in the labor cost in the two countries I do not understand.

You may tell Secretary Redfield for me that, though the oriental labor is said not to be as efficient as the white labor of this country, if he will make it possible for me to get a crew of Chinese as they have in the mills of British Columbia, I will pay the same wages as they do there and give him a check for $10,000 a year as a bonus.

I also quote from an interview had with Michael Earles, who is one of the largest lumber and shingle manufacturers in the State of Washington, published in the Seattle Times of March 10, 1914:

Michael Earles pointed out to-day the fact that the British Columbia stumpage is easier to hold than stumpage in this State or Oregon, because it was held under leases and on a small tax. He showed, too, that oriental labor employed in the British Columbia mills is paid less than half as much as American workmen on this side of the line, and that manufacturing costs generally were lower in British Columbia.

Now, I am not going to take up further time in regard to this question of oriental-labor matter. The fact is admitted that Chinese and other oriental labor is employed in British Columbia, and I put the common sense of mankind against any statement these experts or the Democratic Party may make about it. If it is not to the advantage of the British Columbia mill owner to employ Chinese labor, why are they employed? Certainly there is no sentimental reason for doing it. Certainly there is no patriotic purpose in it. Everyone knows that they employ Chinamen in British Columbia because they do the work for less. Oriental labor is employed because it is cheaper. All the experts and demagogues can not deceive anyone as to that fact.

EFFICIENCY.

Of course most of the ills suffered by the shingle mills of Washington are due to their lack of intelligence. They do not know how to conduct their own business. There can be no doubt of this, for the great expert sent out there by the Department of Commerce, who probably never before saw a shingle bolt and likely does not know a knot saw from a hole in the ground, tells us so. I read from page 3 of the report:

A striking fact in the shingle industry in the State of Washington is that a very large portion of the mills operating in the State consist of fewer than seven machines. In other words, less than 25 per cent of the mills, according to the generally accepted standard, are equipped for the most economical production.

The State of Washington produces more than 84 per cent of the cedar shingles in the United States, and more than 66 per cent of all the shingles of all kinds produced in this country; yet 75 per cent of the men in the shingle business in that State do not know how to conduct their business. No wonder 80 per cent of them had to close their mills under a Democratic tariff law. Here at the very beginning of this report we have the matter settled.

NEW MILLS.

One point made in the report is that new mills are being started in Washington. Before the Payne law went upon the statute book the shingle mills of Washington ran practically only six months in the year. That statement was made on several occasions on the floor of the House by me and by my colleague. Since that time, or at least during 1912, according to the evidence submitted in this report, the shingle mills of the State of Washington ran a greater portion of the time and received a higher price for their product than ever before in their history. And yet the experts make a great point out of the fact that these mills sometimes closed. They seem to be laboring under the impression that if the mills in the State of Washington could meet the demand by running a portion of the time, that it would be no injury to them to have direct competition from British Columbia.

The expert says that a new mill is being constructed in the State of Washington and that another is in contemplation. I have no reason to doubt the correctness of this statement except the fact that he made it. He emphasizes these facts to show that the tariff has not injured the business. I remember that when we were urging an increase of the tariff during the consideration of the Payne bill that this same objection was made. The fact was then pointed out that several new mills had been built in the State the previous year. Yet it was then admitted by all that the mills for many years had been closed practically half of the time. The shingle business in the State of Washington is peculiar and depends on many conditions that one not familiar with the situation can not understand. A man may conclude to clear a tract of land. The cedar stumps and the broken trunks of trees on that land must be manufactured into shingles or burned. The construction of a mill is not costly, and often it pays to build a new mill rather than to haul the bolts to an old one. Again, a piece of timber, probably mostly fir, must be cut. The cedar must also be cut at the same time, and much of it not fit for lumber must be wasted or manufactured into shingles. Under these circumstances a new mill often must be built. We can not in our country cut one kind of timber at a time. When you cut a piece of timber in the State of Washington you must cut all kinds at the same time. Again, there are many purchasers of timber in our State that have been made with a limited time for its removal. This timber must be cut and the cedar must be used. Any one of the conditions which I have mentioned, as well as many others, may call for the construction of a new mill, and this notwithstanding the fact that many old mills, owing to the bad condition of the markets, may be closed. Again, it is always possible that a very large mill, owing to some unusual condition, may be able to make money even while many small mills may be compelled to close.

It is not claimed, and never has been claimed, that all our mills will be closed all the time and all our timber remain unused even under free trade. However, as to the direct effect of the tariff on this particular proposition of the construction of two news mills, I have a newspaper clipping that may give some light. The report says that the new mill under construction is being built at Everett; that it will have a capacity of about 750,000. This newspaper clipping, taken from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, is as follows:

[From the Post-Intelligencer, Feb. 17, 1914.]

NEW TARIFF LAW SENDS BIG MILL OUT OF STATE—EVERETT MANUFACTURER SAYS SHINGLES CAN BE MADE CHEAPER IN VANCOUVER WITH CHINESE LABOR.

CHEHALIS, *February 16.*

H. W. Stuchell, one of the principal owners in the big Eclipse mill at Everett, while in Chehalis to-day on business, announced his intention to build at an early date a shingle-mill plant at Vancouver, B. C., that will have a cutting capacity of 1,500,000 shingles daily. Chinese labor will be employed principally. He says that by using this cheap labor he can make shingles at 50 cents a thousand less than they can be made for on this side of the line, and that since the new tariff law has taken the duty off shingles he can make big money in the enterprise.

Mr. Stuchell is not optimistic over the outlook for the lumber business. Not until the railroads begin buying in earnest, says Mr. Stuchell, will there be any real improvement in the situation.

This shows what one man in the shingle business and living at Everett thinks of the situation. He is probably the largest manufacturer of shingles in Everett and one of the largest in the world. It is perfectly apparent that he does not agree with our expert.

Now, there are many other matters that I might take up, but I do not care to spend any more time except on one proposition, and that is as to whether or not the tariff had any effect upon the closing of these mills.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it not a fact that the sickness of the shingle industry is due to a great extent to the abandonment of the use of wooden shingles and the substitution therefor of metal, which is being pushed by the insurance companies throughout the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Undoubtedly that has had some effect.

Mr. GORDON. Has it not had the greatest effect in lessening the use of wooden shingles?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; the gentleman is mistaken. It has increased competition; it has, to a certain extent, restricted the demand; but it seems to me a strange argument that when the shingle men have to meet that competition to say it will not hurt them to have also the competition of British Columbia, where they employ cheap Chinese labor.

THE MATERIAL QUESTION.

The evidence submitted is entirely ex parte and mostly based on statements or alleged statements of unknown and unnamed witnesses. An ex parte statement at best is of little value. It is always received by the courts with great caution and never acted upon except under unusual conditions. Human experience shows that such evidence can not be relied upon, but an ex parte statement based on anonymous evidence is so worthless that it is used only by cowards, character assassins, and expert political investigators.

But let us examine this evidence, discreditable and worthless as it is, and see if even this testimony bears out the statements made in the letter of Mr. Redfield. Three things are established by the evidence submitted in the report beyond dispute. First, on page 51 of the report it shows that 80 per cent of the shingle mills in the State of Washington were closed. I had only claimed 60 per cent. Second, on pages 44 and 45 it is shown that more shingles have been brought into this country from British Columbia since the enactment of the new tariff law than ever before in the same period of time. Third, on page 47 it shows that there were more idle men in the State of Washington in December last than ever before.

With these facts directly asserted in this report the material question is: Was the tariff a factor in bringing about these conditions? In other words, was the tariff a material factor in the closing of the shingle mills in the State of Washington? This is the real issue. Mr. Redfield, in his letter transmitting the report, says:

> It can be reasonably inferred from Mr. HUMPHREY'S letter that the removal of the duty has contributed largely to this condition. No shingle manufacturer was found willing to make such statement.

He was referring to the conditions in the shingle business. He further states:

> Not one of those mills reported that they closed because of the removal of the duty.

All through his statement given to the press and given to Mr. UNDERWOOD to insert in the RECORD he seeks to make it appear that the removal of the duty upon lumber and shingles has had no material effect upon these industries in the State of Washington. Does the report of his expert based on his ex parte and anonymous evidence bear out these statements? That this expert had the desire to support the statements made by Mr. Redfield can not be doubted; that he did not have the brains to do it is demonstrated. As for the proof of this assertion I quote the report itself. I read first from page 7, where a letter is quoted written by Mr. A. F. Trail, manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association. This letter was addressed to different shingle manufacturers in the State of Washington. I read as follows:

> If not now closed, do you expect to do so, and when? Congressman HUMPHREY will be able to use this information with considerable effect, and it may help us to get some modification of the tariff during the next 12 months.
>
> Shingle conditions could not be much worse. Orders are scarce, and prices seem to be steadily dropping.

It is evident that at least the manager of this great association thought that the tariff had something to do with the conditions which he describes. If not, why did he desire a modification of the tariff law? His opinion is at least entitled to as much weight as the nameless witnesses quoted to try to show that the duty had no effect. Again, I read from the report, on page 43, and it seems to me that this evidence from their own expert ought to raise some doubt even in the minds of Mr. Redfield and of Mr. UNDERWOOD as to whether or not the removal of the tariff has had anything to do in bringing about the present conditions in the shingle industry.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Was it not the intention of the Democrats to make a difference when they took the tariff off? Of course it was.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course.

Mr. MADDEN. I wondered why they are apologizing for the tariff not having had any effect?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want the Members of the House to listen to this statement made by this expert, upon whose report the Secretary of Commerce bases his statement that the tariff had nothing to do with the conditions of the shingle industry in the State of Washington. I am reading now from the opinion of the expert himself, on page 43 of the report:

> The general consensus of opinion, as expressed by a great majority of the shingle producers seen, is to the effect that the removal of the duty has been a factor in bringing about present conditions, but that these conditions are not largely due to such removal. An important fact to take into consideration in this connection is that nearly all of the shingle manufacturers of the State of Washington are protectionists; that they have been taught, and many of them believe, that a duty on shingles is necessary to the prosperity of the industry. Their attitude of mind is entirely antagonistic to free trade or even low tariffs.

And yet, says Mr. Redfield, no manufacturer was found willing to say that the removal of duty had largely contributed to the conditions then existing. Yet, says his expert, "many of them believe that a duty on shingles is necessary to the prosperity of the industry." Of course, these men that are engaged in this business, that study it, that have their money invested in it, that make their living out of it, are mistaken about it being injured by free trade. I read again from page 44:

> The proportion of the shingle manufacturers seen who expressed the opinion that the removal of the duty has had nothing to do with existing conditions in the industry was small.

So small are the number of shingle manufacturers who expressed the opinion that the removal of the duty had nothing to do with the existing conditions in the industry that this energetic expert, after many days of investigation, was not able to find even one whose name he would give that was willing to stand behind such statement, and yet Mr. Redfield would have you believe that the shingle manufacturers of Washington do not believe that their industry has been materially affected. I read from page 46, from one of his anonymous witnesses:

> While he states that he does not believe that the present depressed condition in the shingle business is entirely due to the tariff, or even in a large measure due to the tariff, he does believe that it had some effect. The principal influence so far has been that the retail dealers have withheld their orders, and that there has not been a normal demand. He believes that it is entirely too soon to tell exactly what the effects of the removal of the duty will be. He is sure that the shingle manufacturer will be hurt considerably unless he can get logs from the Canadian side without paying an export duty.

One of the things we especially urged was that the tariff bill should prohibit the imposition of the duty upon logs brought from Canada if their timber products were to be admitted free into our markets. We called attention to the unfairness of the proposition to admit their lumber and shingles free and yet allow them to impose a duty upon logs that we desired to be brought into this country for the purpose of being manufactured. But this proposition the Democratic Party refused to consider. I quote from another unknown witness, page 47, who is described as a large interior manufacturer. And let it be remembered that I must quote from the few witnesses that the expert selected from the many, and it is not to be supposed that he selected those whose testimony was weakest in favor of his cause. This man says:

> The greatest bear factor in the shingle business is overproduction. The mills make too many shingles. To the extent that shingles are imported and thus affect the supply, to that extent do importations affect the market, and the removal of the duty has undoubtedly increased importations from Canada. He believes that the price of shingles in the United States will be lower than at present. The removal of the duty will be the main factor in bringing about this condition.

Let me quote once more from Mr. Redfield's statement:

> There was complaint at that time and there is still complaint because of the depression in the price of shingles. It can be reasonably inferred from Mr. HUMPHREY'S letter that the removal of the duty has contributed largely to this condition. No shingle manufacturer was found willing to make such a statement.

Yet this man says:

> The price of shingles in the United States will be lower than at present. The removal of the duty will be the main factor in bringing about this condition.

I place this statement in Mr. Redfield's letter against the statement made in his report. His letter he gave to the press, but his report few people will see. This same witness continues (p. 47):

> He thinks that the effect of this removal will be more pronounced later on than at present. The Canadian mills will gradually build up a trade in the United States. While this condition is to be expected, at the same time the tendency now is for slightly higher prices. The

difference between the cost of producing shingles in Canada and in the United States will widen from year to year. The Canadian timber is cheaper, better in quality, and more accessible. Labor is also cheaper. The timber in the United States is becoming scarcer, poorer in quality, and less accessible.

Now, let me quote the words of the great expert as set down on page 48:

One manufacturer stated that just after the passage of the tariff bill of 1909 his company went into New England, where the best shingle trade was largely in the hands of Canadian mills. The 50-cent duty imposed by that law enabled them to enter the New England market, and they practically drove the Canadians out of that business. He says that they held this trade until the duty was removed in 1913, and that now they have very little business in the East.

"And yet," says Mr. Redfield, "no manufacturer was found that would state that the removal of the duty had materially affected the industry." Once more I call to the stand one of these unidentified and unknown witnesses described as an official of one of the largest shingle concerns in the State. He says (report, p. 50):

That he could not say that the tariff had caused the present depressed condition of the shingle industry and the lumber industry. As a matter of fact, there have always been frequent depressions in the shingle business, the primary cause of which is "too many shingles."

The cause, then, is too many shingles. They are getting more shingles from British Columbia now under the new law than ever before, at a time when the market is already depressed. But, of course, this fact did not materially affect conditions. It is not the tariff. It is "too many shingles." This witness continues:

If the importations of shingles from Canada are increased because of the removal of the duty, naturally he would expect the industry to be adversely affected at home. Every car of shingles imported necessarily displaces a car of domestic production.

I want to read now two clippings from a newspaper, the Daily Province, printed at Vancouver, the principal paper in the Province of British Columbia, one under date of March 4, 1914, and one under date of March 6, 1914:

BRITISH COLUMBIA'S EXPORTS NOW DOUBLED—NEW TARIFF REVISION OF UNITED STATES STIMULATES BUSINESS—EXTRA WORK FORCES CONSULAR BRANCH TO INCREASE OFFICE SPACE—GREATEST GAINS NOTED IN SHIPMENTS OF SHINGLES AND LUMBER PRODUCTS—MUCH ACTIVITY MANIFESTED IN KOOTENAY AND BOUNDARY MINING DISTRICTS.

Since the new tariff revisions brought into effect last autumn by the United States Government have been in operation the exports from British Columbia have been doubled.

Announcement to this effect was made this morning by Mr. Robert E. Mansfield, United States consul general at Vancouver.

In order to cope with the extra export business which has resulted from the elimination and reductions in the duties on British Columbia commodities, it has been found necessary for the Vancouver consular branch to acquire additional office accommodation and to rearrange the quarters to facilitate the transaction of commercial business.

HOW BUSINESS GROWS.

The increase in the business relations between this Province and the United States was reflected in the comparative statement published in the Province early in January, showing the amount of exports up to December 31. Later returns show that the exports have been practically doubled during the period that the new tariff provisions have been operative.

The greatest gains are noted in the figures for shipments of shingles, lumber of different classes, wood pulp, fish, ore, and bullion. It is the general opinion among those in touch with the lumber situation that the placing of shingles on the free list has imparted a big stimulus to the industry in British Columbia. Much activity in the export trade has been manifested in the Kootenay, Boundary, and other mining districts within the jurisdiction of the Vancouver general consulate, while all along the coast the shingle industry has been given an impetus.

FISHERY INTERESTS PROFIT.

Large quantities of fish are being shipped almost daily from Vancouver, the exports showing a big increase since the adoption of the new tariffs.

Two extra rooms are being provided in the quarters of the consul general. One of these will be fitted up as a trade reference library. Journals covering all branches of industry and catalogues of all the leading manufacturers will be stocked in the room and will be available for reference.

The appointment of a consular agent at Prince Rupert has been recommended by Mr. Mansfield, in order to cope with the increase of the export business from that port and in readiness for the expected development which will follow the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Large quantities of fish are being now shipped to Vancouver for export, and activity in the export trade of shingles and mining products is also expected when transportation facilities are installed. On the completion of the new transcontinental line fish and other British Columbia products will be shipped direct to the prairies and eastern points via the Grand Trunk Pacific.

—

MILLS SHIPPING SHINGLES SOUTH—ALMOST ENTIRE OUTPUT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA INTERESTS IS CROSSING THE LINE—AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS ARE SAID TO BE "KNOCKING" CANADIAN PRODUCT.

Most of the shingle mills in British Columbia are said to be shipping almost their entire output to the United States. Discussing the article in the Province yesterday dealing with the exports from this Province to the United States, a prominent shingle manufacturer stated this morning that 95 per cent of the shingles now being made in British Columbia were being shipped across the border to meet the demand, which has been gradually increasing since the removal of the duty under the new United States tariff revisions last autumn.

Eighty per cent of the shingle mills in British Columbia are now in operation, and the provincial product is being given the preference in all parts of the United States, it is declared. The spring trade has hardly really opened yet, but the demand is looked upon as auguring well for the industry during the coming summer. An indication of the extent of the trade which has been developed during the past few months was given when a dealer, closely in touch with the lumber situation, mentioned that special investigators were sent to Vancouver recently from Washington, D. C., to probe reports to the effect that while shingle mills of the Puget Sound and other districts in Washington had been closed down the industry was flourishing on this side of the border.

A systematic campaign of "knocking" British Columbia shingles has been started by the rival manufacturers in the United States, stated one manufacturer here to-day. In proof of this assertion he produced a copy of a letter which was being widely circulated in order to "head off" the trade in the Canadian article. The letter claimed that the local product was not manufactured or packed properly and that experts were criticizing the output.

Despite the prediction that as a result of the lowering of the tariff barrier American manufacturers would invade the local field and establish mills on this side, it was stated to-day that no definite steps had yet been taken in that respect, although several lumbermen had instituted inquiries along that line. The fact that British Columbia shingles are going south would seem to indicate that there is little chance at present of the American interests entering British Columbia.

Although the demand for British Columbia shingles is now in excess of that existing in the past, the prices are not as good as last year, it is said. Plenty of business is offering, however, and several mills are working at full capacity, and have sufficient orders on hand to keep them busy for several months. The estimate that 95 per cent of the output is going south is questioned by some of the manufacturers, although it is generally admitted that the bulk of the export business is to supply the American markets.

I received the other day a letter from Mr. H. B. McMaster, of the McMaster Mill Co., at Blaine, Wash., which was entirely unsolicited on my part, and I desire to read two or three paragraphs from that letter. The letter is dated February 5, 1914. In it he says:

Was over in British Columbia and made a thorough investigation of things over there, and found at Fort Albernia a sawmill in which there are at least 100 men working; the foreman, head sawyer, engineer, and edgerman were white men; all the rest were Asiatic. At New Westminster, British Columbia, the Royal City Mills, running a large mill day and night, employ all Chinese. The Fraser Mills, the largest in the world, are doing all the work with Hindo labor and other Asiatic help. Port Moody Shingle Co., at Port Moody, running five machines day and night, the filet and engineer were all the white men employed, all the rest yellow. The same conditions exist in the Thorston-Flarselle Mill, and, in fact, all the mills do the work in the same way with this sort of labor at our expense.

In the little city of Blaine there are 22 shingle machines, and all have been shut down since this tariff went into effect, and the men are looking for jobs.

During the month of January, 1913, there were 5 cars of shingles came in at this port from British Columbia, and in January, 1914, I understand there were 70, and believe the same proportion will apply at each port of entry where shingles cross the line.

Here are two or three other letters which I will read:

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *October 30, 1913.*

MY DEAR HUMPHREY: The condition of the lumber and shingle business at the present time is deplorable. Prices are below cost and more than one-half the mills and camps are closed. We had 1,000 men last June. We have less than 500 to-day, and would not have these there but for our foreign business. Canada is dumping trainloads every day, and with their favorable governmental system of stampage and low taxes and Oriental labor they can continue indefinitely. In the endeavor to meet it all wages are 25 cents per day less than three months ago, and another 25-cent drop is very likely. I suppose the Government may investigate, as Mr. Wilson threatened. We would welcome it, but a little investigating before the damage was done would have been more to the point.

Meanwhile prices keep up on the Canadian side, and we can not get over their tariff wall except with rough lumber, which is free.

Consistency is a jewel conspicuously absent from the tariff bill's decorations. Please read page 170, paragraph 20, as issued by Government Printing Office. I suppose the author knows what a "paving post" is; but waiving the point, why are "paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods" protected with "10 per cent ad valorem," while all other products of the great lumber industry come in free? That larger quantities of these particular products are produced in the South than elsewhere is, of course, a coincidence. Ten per cent ad valorem on shingles and manufactured lumber would look good to the owners of idle mills in the Northwest.

Yours,

J. J. DONOVAN.

—

WINCKELMANN & WILDER SHINGLE CO.,
*Fairmount, Wash., December 17, 1913.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Have just read an article in the Seattle Times telling of your efforts in behalf of the shingle mills in this State in regard to the British Columbia tariff. This is such a burning issue with myself at present that I felt impelled to write you and wish you success in your efforts.

In your speech you said that 194 mills in the State were shut down. Personally, I think this statement is underestimating it, since a few days ago the shingle association issued a list of over 200 mills idle, and my own mill and two others in this neighborhood were not included in this list (although we've all been shut down since November 15), and presume it has been as inaccurate in other localities.

On account of the cheap oriental labor employed in the British Columbia mills and no duty to pay, these mills are running full blast and supplying the American market, while we are forced to keep our mills idle.

It is hard to estimate the thousands thrown out of employment by these conditions. Here in our own community families dependent upon the mills are actually in want.

Personally, I can't see any relief unless the tariff question is amended, and therefore again wish you success in your endeavors.

Very sincerely,

G. WINCKELMANN.

I call attention to the fact that these gentlemen signed their names to these letters, they are not anonymous witnesses, but are men of character and standing, and I place their statements against the anonymous statements brought in by these experts of men whose names they dare not give, neither do they attempt to give any reason for not giving the names of their witnesses.

Again, I quote from the great investigator, on page 52 of the report:

At a conference with between 25 and 40 representative shingle manufacturers in Seattle on the evening of January 23, 1914, the question was presented as to whether or not the depressed conditions in the latter part of 1913 were brought about by any factor that was not present in bringing about similar conditions in 1911. As a matter of fact, the question was never frankly answered. There appeared to be a disposition on the part of the spokesman for the shingle producers to evade the question. One said, "Can't tell until we go through with it." Another said, "No one claimed that a duty of 50 cents a thousand enabled the shingle producer to obtain 50 cents more for his shingles." Finally, it was suggested to the manufacturers that the trouble is that too many people are making shingles. A prominent operator present replied, "That is true."

Here we have the solution of this vexed question, according to this highly intellectual expert, "Too many people making shingles." According to his opinion, that absolutely answers every argument and explains every difficulty. But the fact that we removed the duty and let all the shingle manufacturers in British Columbia directly into our market had nothing to do with the condition where "too many people were making shingles," even if they did have over in that country cheaper labor and cheaper timber. Once more, I quote from this intellectual wonder (report, p. 53):

That the removal of the duty has had some effect in bringing Canadian shingles into American markets can not be denied. The figures for imports show this clearly. A representative of one of the most efficient shingle mills at Vancouver, British Columbia, stated to a representative of this bureau that when the duty on shingles was 30 cents per thousand, they had a considerable trade in the United States; after that duty was increased to 50 cents, they had only a very small business in this country. Since the removal of the duty entirely, they are receiving orders from this country.

As I read page after page of this testimony I am really at a loss how to classify this author that on such evidence as this reports to the Secretary of Commerce that the removal of the tariff has had no material effect on the shingle industry in the State of Washington. It is hard to tell whether he is blindly partisan, intentionally dishonest, or just an ordinary ass. I quote him once more on page 57:

At the same time, as already noted, the removal of the duty in 1913 has been followed by a considerable increase of importations, and it is not unlikely that price has been affected in some measure and that this effect will be permanent.

Here is the case that this expert has been able to make when he himself selects the evidence out of all the witnesses that he could secure, and when he gives such evidence his own construction, and when he does not generally even attempt to quote them literally, and when he simply gives his memory as to what they really say. Let me once more quote from the evidence he furnishes to demonstrate that the tariff did not largely contribute to the present conditions and that no shingle manufacturer was found willing to make such a statement. I read from page 51 of the report:

An official of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, when asked the following question, "Do you think the manufacturer's ills are entirely due to the removal of the tariff?" said: "No. Supply and demand has a good deal to do with it, and the consumer has not been benefited by it."

Of course, importing shingles from British Columbia in greater quantities than ever before, as the expert says, would have no tendency to increase the supply or affect the demand. He continues:

This official stated in the presence of 25 or more shingle manufacturers and also in the presence of representatives of the Bureau of Corporations.

Mark this statement well. The expert wishes to call to your attention and to demonstrate that what follows was said under circumstances where it can not be denied or its truth doubted. Let me read again:

This official stated in the presence of 25 or more shingle manufacturers, and also in the presence of representatives of the Bureau of Corporations, that immediately after the removal of the duty buying was stopped. That started a poor market. Since that time shingles have been as low as $1.65 for clears, which resulted in a closing down of about 80 per cent of the output of the mills.

I had said only 60 per cent.

"Those mills have all been down until possibly within a week or 10 days (prior to January 23). The reason for starting is not because market conditions are any better, but the mills had all shipped their product out pretty well, and this is the time when business is to be expected." He said:

I am not prepared to say that the tariff has anything to do with it at all. Six months or eight months prior to the tariff having come off Canada had a panic, and their buying had ceased almost absolutely.

Their markets were gone. Their mills were closed. Then what happened?

Prior to that the mills had marketed their product. I guess the Canadian mills were universally down for six or eight months in 1913, when we were running and enjoying a fair business.

Why were the American mills enjoying a fair business, and why were the Canadian mills universally down for six or eight months? Let the witness answer:

They could not get over here. Thirty days before that tariff came off the British Columbia mills started up.

What, then, was the effect of the new tariff law as shown by the evidence quoted in the report of this specially appointed expert that was sent forth to demonstrate that it did not materially affect the industry, and that no manufacturer had so testified? Here is the evidence, and here is what it shows.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman say whether the price of shingles has been reduced to the consumer in the United States by reason of this process?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. So far as I have been able to ascertain, just as one of the witnesses stated here, one of the experts that was placed on the witness stand, it has not benefited the consumer.

Mr. GORDON. Then how has it hurt anybody? If shingles have not come down in price, how has it hurt the gentleman's manufacturers? Will he tell us that?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; because our mills are shut down, and you are buying your shingles at the same price from British Columbia, manufactured by Chinese labor. Does that hurt anything? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. How have the manufacturers whom the gentleman represents here on the floor been hurt if the price has not come down?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But the price has come down, but not to the consumer.

Mr. MOORE. Manufacturers have been hurt, and the consumer has not been benefited a particle in the price of the manufactured article. I will answer the gentleman from Ohio when the proper time comes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I want to get some information, if it will not disturb the continuity of the gentleman's remarks. Will the gentleman tell me how many stumpage feet it takes to make a thousand clear cedar shingles?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I can not tell the gentleman. I am not a lumber expert.

Mr. WINGO. What do you pay for stumpage of cedar logs that go into shingles?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I prefer to yield to my colleague, Mr. FALCONER.

Mr. FALCONER. I will ask the gentleman to repeat his question again.

Mr. WINGO. How many stumpage feet does it take to make 1,000 clear feet of shingles?

Mr. FALCONER. Seven thousand clear shingles are made from 1,000 feet of cedar timber, and 1,000 feet of cedar timber in the stumpage, generally speaking, is worth $2.

Mr. WINGO. Is that what the mills pay for it?

Mr. FALCONER. It is.

Mr. WINGO. What do the mills get in the State of Washington for clear cedar shingles?

Mr. FALCONER. They get about $2.10 for 5 to 2 clears; that is, in a normal market; I do not know what they are getting at this time.

Mr. WINGO. They are selling at $2.10?

Mr. FALCONER. In a normal market; yes. Now, I want to make this statement if the gentleman will permit me. The great bulk of the cost of manufacturing shingles is not in the raw material or product, but it is in the labor and wear and tear. Now, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GORDON), he suggests that other roofing has operated to bring down the price of shingles in this country. Why does not the gentleman's party put the other lines of roofing on the free list? If two men are in a contest and the police power of a State holds one man and lets the other fellow beat him to death, he is sure to go down. That is what is happening in the cedar-shingle industry. Slate, felt, and iron roofing protected; cedar shingles free. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Here is the effect of the present tariff law on the shingle industry of Washington, as shown by these experts, even from their ex parte, anonymous evidence.

Under the old law all the American mills were running. All the Canadian mills were closed. Thirty days before the new law went into effect, after it had passed the House and every one knew that shingles would go on the free list, the Canadian mills opened up and are now running. Immediately after the new law went upon the statute books buying shingles in this country stopped and 80 per cent of the American mills closed. Free trade closed our mills and opened the Canadian mills. Protection closed the Canadian mills and opened our own.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Has the gentleman any statistics showing the output of the different mills, the number of men at work, and the wages paid?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is all in the report, but it is too voluminous to go into now. He reports that there is not very much difference in the labor.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman did not get my question. I am asking it purely for information, not to enter into any controversy; but has the gentleman any statistics showing the capital invested in the different mills, how many men are employed, and what the annual output is?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There are about 15,000 men employed in the shingle industry in Washington at the present time. Now, going back to show what this evidence discloses, it shows that free trade benefits the foreigner. Protection benefits the American. No better illustration could possibly be given of the working of these two tariff systems than comes from the lips of the anonymous witnesses quoted by these special experts in an effort to bolster up a report that was already agreed upon before the so-called evidence was either submitted or obtained. It was stated in the papers long before the report was made by Secretary Redfield, if he was correctly reported, that such report would be satisfactory to the administration. It had to be. Simple matters like facts or truth would not be permitted to interfere. The expert had to report that he had found the conditions as he was instructed to find them. Once more let me refer to the report. On page 51 it states that 80 per cent of the mills closed following the removal of the tariff, as I have already quoted.

On page 57 it says that the removal of the duty increased importations and affected the price, and that that result will be permanent.

On pages 44 and 45 is found this statement:

> More shingles were imported into the United States during the months of November and December, 1913, than during any other two months within the past three years. The increase, however, has not been as great as some protectionists predicted, nor have the imports very greatly exceeded those of some other months in past years.

But it does show that it did exceed that of any other two months in the entire history of the shingle industry in the State of Washington. Let me read one more quotation from this expert who discredits and impeaches upon every page of this report the statements made in the letter written by Secretary Redfield. On page 77 is found this language:

> When the shingle mills and lumber mills close, as a matter of course, those who had been employed in those mills become idle. To the extent to which the mills were closed in the State in December, 1913, to that extent was the number of unemployed increased.

Then he says on the same page:

> In December, 1913, and at the present time there are probably more unemployed persons in the State of Washington than have been found there in any year past.

So the expert finishes his report by showing the industry to be in a much worse condition than I had stated. I had stated that 60 per cent of our mills were closed. He states than 80 per cent of them were closed. I have stated that a large number of men were idle. He stated there were more idle men in the State of Washington last December than ever before, even exceeding the awful times we had back under Grover Cleveland.

I call the attention of my Democratic colleagues to that statement. I have never used language so strong in regard to the situation in my own State. Every time I have mentioned that men were out of employment that side of the House grew frantic with resentment. Here is the testimony of your own hired, specially appointed expert. It is now in order to denounce and revile him and to hold him up to contempt and scorn as a "calamity howler."

Here is the summary of the evidence in this report taken by a partisan and prejudiced investigator from his own anonymous and expert evidence, translated and colored, misrepresented and construed to the extent of his limited ability, in an attempt to make it show what he wanted it to show and what he was expected to make it show as the price of his job, shown without the chance of explanation or cross-examination, or any other opportunity to learn the truth except as this expert was unable to conceal it.

At the risk of repetition let me again say: This evidence shows, first, immediately following the removal of the tariff 80 per cent of the shingle mills in the State of Washington closed; second, immediately before the removal of the tariff the closed mills of British Columbia began running at full capacity; third, following the removal of the tariff more shingles have been imported into this country than ever before; fourth, following the removal of the tariff there were more idle men in the State of Washington than ever before.

Such is the evidence, and yet Mr. Redfield solemnly asserts that the removal of the tariff has had no material effect upon the shingle industry in the State of Washington. Several gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House were much perturbed the other day when I said that I would show that evidence contained in the report of his own expert contradicted practically every statement made in the letter sent to me by Secretary Redfield, and to Mr. UNDERWOOD and given to the press. I leave it to this House and to the country if I have redeemed that promise. Mr. Redfield, in his letter to Mr. UNDERWOOD, expressed the desire to have his statement given wide publicity, and in "that consummation devoutly to be wished" he shall not fail through any fault of mine.

In the State of Washington we are suffering from this Democratic administration only as they are suffering everywhere throughout the Nation. Our markets have been largely taken from us and given to the foreigner. But the official figures show that this is general throughout the country. We have in Washington more idle men than ever before, says the expert, but idle men are found in every town and city. Everywhere throughout the Nation the soup house has superseded prosperity. Such is the condition at home after one year of Democratic administration under the benign influence of the "New Freedom."

Our foreign policy has become a national disgrace. We stand distrusted and discredited, our prestige destroyed abroad. A frantic effort is now being made to cover up the egotistical stupidity of this administration with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. To such low estate have we fallen that at the price of self-respect we are trying to purchase friendship. In this day, under this Democratic administration, as we look at conditions at home and abroad, it has become, indeed, a proud distinction to be an American citizen. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I will insert in the RECORD the letters of E. E. Case and H. B. McMaster, from which I have heretofore quoted. I will also insert an article from the Seattle Times of March 10, 1914, in reference to the effect that the repeal of the law giving American ships the right to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls will have on the lumber business of the Northwest.

McMASTER MILL CO.,
*Blaine, Wash., February 5, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to write you regarding restoring the duty on red cedar shingles, as the present free entry of shingles into the United States from British Columbia is working a hardship on the people of this immediate vicinity, and in the same way effects the residence of other places as well.

I believe if the situation is once thoroughly understood by our Democratic friends they will cheerfully correct the hardship caused us. It is not a question of price so much as it is a question of getting the business. Star A Star shingles are to-day worth $1.55 per 1,000, and under the former tariff we sold them as low as $1.45, and were glad to get it.

We are but a small mill company and buy all of our timber supply from the small farmer in the immediate vicinity, who dig up stumps where the large cedar trees were logged off many years ago and logs that have laid under the Pacific coast moss for ages and are fit for nothing else, not being good for fire wood, but such is the quality of the cedar here, although it makes the best kind of shingles.

Those farmers who are clearing the land sell each one a few cords of bolts, and the boys earn fair wages working at sawing and packing the finished shingle in the mill when we can run our mill, but now the orders are going across the line and the good United States money instead of being used to clear our own land is going into the pockets of the Japanese, Hindus, and Chinese of the Dominion of Canada.

Was over in British Columbia and made a thorough investigation of things over there and found at Port Albernia a saw mill in which there are at least 100 men working; the foreman, head sawyer, and engineer and edgerman were white men, all the rest were Asiatic. At New Westminister, British Columbia, the Royal City mills, running a large mill day and night, employ all Chinese; the Fraser mills, the largest in the world, are doing all the work with Hindu labor and other Asiatic help. Port Moody Shingle Co. at Port Moody, running five machines day and night, the flier and engineer were all the white men employed, all the rest yellow. The same conditions exist in the Thurston-Flarselle mill, and, in fact, all the mills do the work in the same way with this sort of labor at our expense.

In this little city of Blaine there are 22 shingle machines, and all have been shut down since this tariff went into effect, and the men are looking for jobs.

During the month of January, 1913, there were five cars of shingles came in at this port from British Columbia, and in January, 1914, I understand there were 70, and believe the same proportion will apply at each port of entry where shingles cross the line.

Hoping that you may be able to show our friends in Washington, D. C., how we have struggled along for years.

I have been manufacturing shingles in this State for 25 years and made a living, as well as did the others, but now since the orders are going into British Columbia to be filled it makes it hard on us all. We would be willing, and always have been willing, to sell at the same prices if they will give us the business.

Yours, very truly,

H. B. MCMASTER.

—

[From the Seattle Times, March 10, 1914.]

TOLLS MESSAGE BLOCKS HUGE TIMBER DEAL—MONEY WAS AVAILABLE FOR VAST HOLDINGS AND SALE ARRANGED BY MICHAEL EARLES, BUT SYNDICATE QUITS—BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS GET PREMIUM—LUMBERMEN POINT OUT FREE LIST FOR AMERICAN PRODUCT, WITH CANAL TOLLS, PUTS NATIVE INDUSTRY OUT OF RUNNING.

President Woodrow Wilson's message to Congress, urging that the exemption from tolls to American ships passing through the Panama Canal be repealed, blocked a $1,000,000 deal in timber and sawmills that had been practically consummated between eastern capitalists and Washington lumbermen.

The deal had been arranged by Michael Earles, president of the Puget Sound Mills & Timber Co. The money was available and cash would have been paid last month for vast timber holdings in the Northwest and sawmills located on Puget Sound. Just as the deal was to have been consummated the President's message demanding that Congress withdraw the exemption from tolls given American shipping was published and the eastern syndicate abandoned the project.

American lumber placed on the free list and American vessels compelled to pay tolls in passing through the canal means granting to British Columbia mills a premium to compete for the trade of the Atlantic coast, according to such well-known lumber authorities as Michael Earles, E. G. Griggs, E. G. Ames, C. D. Stimson, and others.

There is a margin of $3.25 per ton in favor of British vessels plying between British Columbia ports and New York as compared with American vessels running from Seattle to the same Atlantic coast point.

And, in addition to this advantage, E. G. Ames pointed out to-day, the Navy Department is chartering foreign bottoms to transport coal to the Puget Sound Navy Yard at a rate which would enable them to carry lumber from British Columbia to Atlantic coast points at $4.50 per ton or less. The rate in American vessels can not be less than $11 or $12 with exemption from tolls, and it would have to be raised to meet whatever tolls would be paid under the Wilson program.

It was pointed out to-day by a big Seattle shipping firm that at the rates the Government is paying foreign shipowners for transporting coal the vessels could afford to return practically empty, and anything gained as freight for the return trip would be so much added profit.

While the Government can employ foreign bottoms in its own carrying trade the west coast lumbermen must use American bottoms in shipments to the Atlantic coast.

C. D. Stimson said to-day that Robert Dollar has declared that if the exemption to American ships is withdrawn he will place his entire fleet in the Dollar Line under the British flag. H. W. Meyer, head of the lumber-exporting department of Hind, Rolph & Co., insisted that if the administration plan is adopted it will mean that, in so far as this coast is concerned, the Panama Canal has been built with American money for the benefit of British Columbia.

E. G. Ames, of the Puget Mill Co., estimated to-day that on a steel sailing vessel carrying lumber from Puget Sound to New York the addition of canal tolls would mean an extra cost of $1.33 per ton on lumber and 13 cents per thousand on shingles.

"With the cheap tonnage available to British Columbia mills it simply means that we are driven out of the Atlantic seaboard market that we thought was to be opened to us with the completion of the Panama Canal," said Mr. Ames to-day.

MILLS UNPREPARED.

"I do not believe that the coast mills of British Columbia favored putting lumber and shingles on the free list, for they feared that action would mean opening up new mills and overcrowding the British Columbia markets. But now that we propose not only to provide for free lumber and shingles, but to compel American manufacturers to ship to coastwise points in American bottoms and compel those vessels to pay the full canal tolls, we have actually offered a bonus to British Columbia mills to come in and steal our markets.

"Some of the foreign countries rebate to their shipowners the cost of canal tolls. Others pay a bonus to shipowners engaged in world-wide trade. All foreign vessels are operated far more cheaply than our American boats. If we have to compete with a nation that pays a bounty or rebates tolls with vessels already overtaxed, it is easy to see that the shippers must go out of business.

"The canal is apt to work a serious loss to the Pacific Northwest. We are now in competition with the yellow-pine manufacturers of the Southeast in Atlantic coast points, but because of low rates they have enjoyed and the enormous rates we have had to pay for all-rail hauls we have gotten only a small portion of the high-class business. In the meantime, however, we have controlled the business of the west coast of South America. We have sold a large share of the lumber consumed at Montevideo, the big lumber market of the east coast of South America.

"With the opening of the canal the yellow-pine manufacturers will be brought closer to the west coast of South America than we are. The Democratic administration, which put sugar on the free list, already has destroyed our market for lumber in the Hawaiian Islands.

"On top of these disasters we are now compelled to face the danger that the administration will force the transfer of the lumber business from Washington and Oregon to British Columbia."

CHEAP LABOR ACROSS LINE.

Michael Earles pointed out to-day the fact that the British Columbia stumpage is easier to hold than stumpage in this State or Oregon, because it was held under leases and on a small tax. He showed, too, that oriental labor employed in the British Columbia mills is paid less than half as much as American workmen on this side of the line, and that manufacturing costs generally were lower in British Columbia.

"The lumber trade used to figure that the duty of 30 cents on shingles, $1 per thousand on rough lumber, and $2.50 on finished lumber gave us an equal show with British Columbia," said Mr. Earles. "First, then, the administration removes this duty, and now it proposes to expose us to the peril of competition from manufacturers who can both manufacture and ship cheaper than we can.

"The prospect for procuring trade on the Atlantic coast was difficult enough in any event, for we had to compete with the yellow-pine manufacturers, who are right at the door of the new Atlantic coast markets and whose colored labor works longer hours than our men for $1.50 a day.

"It was estimated that we would be able to lay down our lumber in New York at a transportation cost of about $12 per thousand. We would have to use American bottoms alone in our trade. If we are compelled to pay the canal tolls in addition we can not figure on a rate lower than $13 or $14 per thousand, possibly even higher, especially on green lumber. In the meantime British Columbia manufacturers, enjoying the cheaper carrying rates of foreign ships, can use any carrier that comes to them and dump their protected products into our own markets at figures against which we can not compete."

WILL CHANGE REGISTRY.

C. D. Stimson said: "I have been in communication with Robert Dollar, who is now in Washington, D. C. He is the owner of 10 steamships, one named for each member of his family. Six of these ships are now under the British flag, and four of them have American registry, in the coastwise trade. And he has intended to retain them under the American flag, inasmuch as the exemption of the canal tolls would have amounted to $1 a ton.

"But if there is no exemption, if the act remitting the canal tolls is repealed, and American ships are placed exactly on the same basis as the ships of other nations, Mr. Dollar declares he will be obliged to transfer these four ships to British registry.

"The reason is convincing. Owing to the British regulations and the ability of British shipowners to get cheaper crews and to run ships at less expense, there is a margin of $3.25 a ton in favor of those ships in the transportation of freight between the Straits of Fuca and New York.

"It follows naturally that all such ships will abandon the American flag. They will be transferred to the British flag. And it will be inevitable that freight from the Pacific Northwest will not be carried in American ships. The cities of British Columbia will be able to handle cargoes at a greater profit of $3.25 a ton than can the cities of Puget Sound. The instant effect of the repeal of the law as it stands now will be to favor Canadian ports at the expense of Seattle and other American ports."

H. W. Meyer, head of the lumber-exporting department of the great shipping and exporting house of Hind, Rolph & Co., and recognized in the commercial and industrial world as one of the country's ablest experts in his own specialty, to-day said:

"It is a question of life or death to the Pacific Northwest States. It is a question of the living or starving of hundreds of thousands of laboring men and their families in these States. If the national administration succeeds in its efforts for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise ships from the canal tolls, it will simply mean, as regards the Pacific coast, that we have constructed the canal with our own money for the benefit of the lumber interests of British Columbia.

ATTITUDE RIDICULOUS.

"The attitude of the present Government in regard to the canal tolls," he declared, "is absolutely ridiculous and absurd, but as a Boston newspaper very accurately put it, we have to look for the transcontinental railroads. They are the nigger in the woodpile. The railroads want the repeal of the exemption clause, as they know, much better than the lawmakers, that the repeal of the clause will knock American shipping on the head. In this matter the lawmakers should consider the difficulty of operating high-priced American ships in competition with the ever so much cheaper foreign tramp steamships.

"The lawmakers at Washington evidently don't know that the foreign tramp steamship can be operated at almost two-thirds the cost of operating an American ship.

"At present they are now selling new 10,000-ton steamships in England for approximately $400,000, whereas the estimates on this coast for ships of the same size and construction mount up to $700,000, while in the Atlantic market the price is close to $600,000.

"The cost of operating foreign steamships is so much smaller than the same cost for American ships that there is nothing in common between the two sets of figures. The wages paid Norwegian, German, and British sailors fluctuate between 4 and 5 pounds sterling, or about $20 to $25 a month, as against an average of $35 a month paid by American ships to their sailors. Moreover, the American sailor must be well provided with substantial and wholesome food, while the foreign sailor is satisfied with whatever he can get.

"The American shipping laws require that all vessels flying the American flag must be built in the United States and be manned with American crews. These crews are unionized. This will help to explain the difference in the cost of operating foreign and American ships.

"It is quite plain, therefore, that American-built ships already are laboring under a heavy handicap in their competition with foreign ships. This handicap should be relieved by levying tolls on foreign ships passing through the canal instead of being made still worse by placing the foreign ships on the same footing as the American vessels in that respect."

—

CASE SHINGLE & LUMBER CO.,
*Raymond, Wash., February 27, 1914.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, inclosing a communication from Secretary Redfield in reply to your challenge to him to investigate the shingle and lumber business of the State of Washington and the effect of the tariff removal on it.

Regarding this report of Mr. Robertson's, in the first place, it is quite evident that the Department of Commerce was far more anxious to seek to discredit some portion of the remarks you addressed to its head than they were to ascertain the true condition of the lumber and shingle manufacturers of the Northwest.

The questions propounded by Mr. T. M. Robertson in his inquiries of the shingle manufacturers of the Pacific coast during his examination into the shingle industry were principally directed toward trying to secure an admission that it was no uncommon occurrence for the mills to be closed during the winter months, and that the closing of them during the latter part of 1913 was not directly the result of the removal of the tariff. While it may possibly be true that the closing of the mills was not altogether due to the removal of the tariff, admitting that it has been customary or necessary for the shingle mills in the State of Washington to discontinue operation for a certain period of each year, it would still be more reason why shingles should not have been admitted free from British Columbia, because, if there was not a market to allow the manufacturers here to operate their plants steadily, which Mr. Redfield's report would indicate, was principally

not what he was trying to prove, that it was an injustice to white labor of this country to admit, duty free, shingles from British Columbia that were manufactured almost entirely by Chinese help. It is a very evident fact that the admittance of shingles duty free from British Columbia did not in any way help our condition, nor, in fact, has it proven of any material help to any other class of American citizenship.

By consulting the customhouse reports of the imports of shingles during the latter part of 1913, you will find that there was a very large increase over the months in the early part of the year. If Mr. Robertson and Mr. England had been as energetic in ascertaining the true condition as they were in trying to get information to discredit some of the minor statements in your charges, they could have gathered a world of information in regard to the shingle industry in the State of Washington.

In giving you some data to aid you in compiling your answer to Secretary Redfield, I shall begin at statement No. 1 and answer them in turn.

Statement No. 1 we will concede to be practically correct.

Statement No. 2 is perhaps partly correct. There is no way for Mr. Robertson or Secretary Redfield or the shingle manufacturers from the State of Washington to tell to just what extent the closing of the mills during the latter part of 1913 was due to the removal of the tariff except by consulting the customhouse report as to the increase of imports of shingles. As I previously stated, by consulting the records of the customhouse you will find that there was a very large increase in the imports of shingles during the latter part of the year; a great many dealers throughout the Middle West withheld their orders during the agitation for free lumber and shingles, and as to the actual effect it had on business it is impossible to say. A great many believe that with the removal of the tariff the prices would be lower and withheld their business on this account.

Statement No. 3 is absolutely incorrect. The shingle manufacturers did everything in their power to get evidence before Congress and before the committees to show the disastrous effect the removal of the tariff would have on the shingle industry in Washington, but, as I understand, we are never allowed a hearing of any kind. There has been a general feeling among the shingle producers that the removal of the tariff would work a hardship on the manufacturers that would mean nothing less than ruin to many of them.

If statement No. 4 is part of the report of Mr. Robertson, I am surely very much surprised. I am at a loss to know in what way it would be possible to garble the information that he had at hand to conform to a statement of this kind. I am not going to make any further comments on this statement, but will give you the actual figures showing the labor cost of manufacturing shingles in British Columbia and Washington.

Practically all of the shingles in British Columbia are manufactured wholly or in part by Chinese labor; approximately about 90 per cent of the labor used is Chinese and 10 per cent white. The Chinese labor is mostly under the contract system; they contract for the manufacturing of the shingles, from the water to the dry kiln, during the winter months at 28 cents per thousand, and, in some cases, during the summer months at 30 cents per thousand.

This is the full labor cost with the exception of a filer at about $5 per day, the engineer at about $100 per month, and the night watchman at $75 or $80 per month. In a mill cutting 100,000 shingles per day, for example, the cost per thousand would run:

| | Cents. |
|---|---|
| Contracted labor | 28 |
| Engineer | 4 |
| Filing | 5½ |
| Night watchman | 3 |
| Total | 40½ |

In a mill in Washington, operated under the most favorable circumstances and strictest economy, the cost for the same work would total exactly 57 cents per thousand. These are the actual figures taken from my own experience and observation. How a man could conceive the idea that there was no difference in the labor cost in the two countries I do not understand.

You may tell Secretary Redfield for me that though the oriental labor is said not to be as efficient as the white labor of this country, if he will make it possible for me to get a crew of Chinese as they have in the mills of British Columbia I will pay the same wages as they do there and give him a check for $10,000 a year as a bonus.

Right here let me say that I am unable to see how these gentlemen are able to harmonize the statement "The oriental labor employed in British Columbia shingle mills is less efficient than white labor" with their other statement that "they produce a better shingle." His report says, "While a great many Chinamen are employed in the mills of British Columbia, their work is not as efficient as the white men."

I wish to call to the attention of Mr. Redfield's special representative here that while on a visit to British Columbia I called his special attention to the facts that where white sawyers were employed in the mills that there were found the poorest quality and poorest manufactured product of any of the mills visited.

In our own market we find the competition with the Canadian shingles very keen, not on account of quality but on account of price. Everywhere in our territory we find them encroaching on our markets. Only last week one small concern with which I am well acquainted bought 50 carloads of shingles from British Columbia. In statement No. 5 they were a little more liberal. As to this I will give you a comparison as to values of timber in Pacific County, Wash., and in British Columbia. In our county the average value of one section of 640 acres of timber is approximately $80,000; the interest, which we could not hope to get at less than 6 per cent, would amount to $4,800 per annum, and the taxes are approximately $1,500, making a total overhead carrying cost of $6,300. The timber on a section in British Columbia the manufacturer can buy from the Government at a cost of 50 cents per thousand feet, payable as the timber is removed. A license fee of $150 per year covers all taxes and all overhead carrying costs for a period of 20 years. There is no investment; there is no tax; there is no interest to pay. He has 20 years in which to remove the timber, and then only has to pay for what he actually takes off, enabling him to select a higher grade of logs; while on this side of the line, when a man buys a piece of timber he has to remove it all to keep the stumpage rate down to where he can live. Did it not occur to these gentlemen or to Secretary Redfield that possibly the fact stated, "The Canadian mills do not cut their timber as closely as the American mills, and consequently there is more waste," indicates directly the contrary to that other statement, "The advantage they have in the cost of timber is not as great as appears from a comparison of prices of logs in the two countries"? Why then can they afford to waste?

On the contrary, they would have one infer that the American manufacturer had a decided advantage because he could not afford to waste.

The very fact that they can select their timber is also one of the reasons why the Canadians can afford to make a better shingle than many of the American manufacturers find possible, and thereby are helped to capture the American market.

As to statement No. 6: The American manufacturers are not abandoning their mills, nor are they moving to British Columbia, probably because they feel a good deal like a man at sea in a disabled ship with no help in sight. They do not abandon their mills, because the majority of them would not have anything to go anywhere else and go into business with. I venture to say that Mr. Robertson did not visit one mill or meet one manufacturer in the State of Washington who would not have been glad to sell his plant for a much smaller sum than the cost of the plant, less depreciation. Furthermore, there is probably not in the State of Washington 10 mills that you could not buy at a round 60 cents on the dollar of the estimated value, based on the actual cost. It is true they are not moving their mills to British Columbia, but a great many of the manufacturers are going to British Columbia to build new mills, and hundreds more would go if it was possible to dispose of their interest on this side to obtain means to go into business over there. This is the main reason why more do not go across the line to embark in the shingle business. There is, however, one other reason—that is the hope that shingles will not remain on the free list for any length of time.

It is true that some new mills are being built and old ones enlarged. It would, indeed, be a very sad state of affairs to think that a business of the proportions of the shingle industry in Washington could be so utterly ruined by the enactment of a tariff law that no man, under any circumstances, would dare to rebuild a burned plant or enlarge an old one, or that business would be so desperately bad that no one would embark in it under any consideration. The latter part of statement No. 6 would lead one to infer that the shingle business of Washington is in a prosperous condition. On the contrary, the new mills being built are very few, indeed.

If Mr. Redfield understood the conditions under which logging operations were carried on in the State of Washington, that cedar is scattered throughout the forests, and that it must be removed with the other timber at the time that the logging is carried on or will be an utter loss, as cedar is very easily destroyed by fire, and practically all logging operations are burned as soon as the timber is removed, therefore it is necessary for the large operators to remove their cedar when they remove their other timber, and makes it necessary for some of them to rebuild their mills or construct new ones.

Statement No. 7: It is true there has been no material reduction in wages in the shingle mills. Under present conditions about the only thing a shingle manufacturer finds it possible to do when prices get so low that shingles can not be manufactured is to close the mills. He has no chance to procure labor at oriental prices.

However, if the statement reading "in only a few instances have there been wage reductions in the lumber mills" had been exactly reversed, it would have been absolutely correct. In a great many mills, of which I have knowledge, there has been one, and in some cases two, cuts in the last six months. I do not know of a single locality in the State of Washington where wages have not been reduced in the lumber mills, except on Willapa Harbor. The manufacturers of Willapa Harbor have not cut wages of their old employees, but for months all new men have been taken on at about 25 to 50 cents a day less than was paid in the middle of 1913.

Regarding statement No. 8, there has never been a time during my residence of 20 years in the State of Washington when there has been as many idle men in this region as during the fall and winter of 1913.

Statement No. 9. It is true that substitutes for shingles have made some inroads into our markets, but while some manufacturers may fear the substitutes as much as the competition of the Canadian shingles, a little time will demonstrate to all the manufacturers of shingles on this coast that the competition of Canadian shingles will hurt them far more than all the substitutes on the market. The history of substitute roofing is that no man uses it the second time, while Canadian red cedar shingles will always be in demand as long as there is no duty.

The rest of the letter is confined expressly to what I stated in the opening of this letter, that nearly the whole time of the investigation was directed toward the immaterial object of trying to discredit the accuracy of some of the statements contained in your challenge to Secretary Redfield.

I wonder if the Secretary stopped to consider how absurd is the statement: "A large number of the unemployed men in the State of Washington have come from British Columbia." They would lead you to believe that unemployed shingle weavers from British Columbia came across the line to increase the number of our unemployed. I suppose that Secretary Redfield is aware that no Chinese are allowed to enter the United States, and I venture to say there has not been 10 white shingle weavers crossed the line into the United States in six months' time. Ninety per cent of all the men employed in British Columbia in the shingle mills are Chinese; the bolt cutters are either Hindus or Japanese.

It is not true that many of the shingle mills of British Columbia have been closed the past winter, but very few have been closed. By far the majority have been operated steadily since the removal of the tariff.

One of the oldest manufacturers of shingles in British Columbia told Mr. Robertson in my presence that with a duty of 20 cents per thousand they could profitably ship their surplus shingles, but that 50 cents per thousand shut them out. It is also a fact that millions of shingles were shipped into the United States when the duty was at 50 cents.

One of the largest manufacturers in British Columbia, the Hastings Mill Co., has been shipping a great percentage of their cut into the United States for several years, even with a duty of 50 cents. While it is true that in some cases they have received a higher price for their product than some of the American mills, in no case have they obtained anything near the difference made by the tariff. Usually their price averages about 20 cents per thousand above the market price for the usual grade of shingles.

There are manufacturers, however, in the State of Washington who at great pains and at considerable cost make a product that is just as good, just as nicely manufactured as anything across the line.

In regard to the efficiency of the Chinese, in the investigation that I have made in British Columbia I find that in packing and grading they have no equals. They are far more efficient than most white men. When you once get them taught how to do their work you have no further trouble with them, while with our white men it is necessary to keep an inspector continually in your packing and sorting room to watch the quality of the work.

As to the statement of the shingle manufacturer who owns mills on both sides of the line saying that his cost of operations is no less in British Columbia than in the State of Washington, I will refer you to the schedule of labor and the price of timber as stated in the fore part of this letter.

Immediately on the removal of the tariff on shingles British Columbia more than doubled her export duty on logs, and in some grades placed it as much as four times that which it was previously during the high tariff on shingles.

I am not complaining on account of British Columbia doing this only to show that they use some business sense and want to give their own manufacturers the benefit of using the raw material in their own country. One of the worst features in the removal of the tariff at the present time is that the British Columbia manufacturers will use the United States for their dumping ground for surplus stock. To-day the price of cedar shingles throughout Canada is $2 per thousand for six to two shingles, while they are dumping them by the millions on the American market at $1.75 to $1.80, and in some cases even less.

The surplus that British Columbia has to market outside of her eastern Provinces is about 10 per cent of our entire consumption. If we had an overproduction before, and according to Secretary Redfield's letter we could run but 10 months in the year, and you can readily see what an additional 10 per cent is going to have on us.

Their attitude reminds me of a doctor at the bedside of a patient to whom he has prescribed an overdose of strychnine, as he smoothly and plausibly explains to the despairing man and his assembled friends, "You are not dying, it but seemeth so, and if perchance dying it be there were surely some other cause. Grippe maybe, or the inclement weather." Such a one would be capable of comforting himself and others if he dared with a further fine philosophy that death itself after all were but a proper and natural state. However, one can not imagine any great amount of comfort in all this for the patient.

Antidotes and corrections for the state of business in the Northwest was not what they were sent for, but a justification for the fine-haired folly of their superiors. Any man knows that if he takes strychnine in the proper quantity it will kill him; if a man will take enough of the shingle business under existing conditions, it will break him; one is just as sure as the other, and yet Secretary Redfield has gone to a great deal of pains, with considerable cost, to try to prove to you that this brand of strychnine won't kill.

The removal of the tariff, as I understand it, was for the purpose of reducing the cost to the consumer. I will defy Secretary Redfield or any other man connected with the tariff legislation to point out one single instance where free trade on cedar shingles has reduced the price to the consumer one cent per thousand. On the other hand, the day is not far distant when American labor will be compelled to compete with oriental labor in the manufacture of shingles. It is going to be impossible for the American manufacturers to continue to maintain the scale of wages now being paid and compete with the British Columbia mills.

We have a very small degree of sense left, although we are in the shingle business. It was not necessary for us to take this dose to know that some one had to die. I repeat again that I do not believe there are 10 mills in the State of Washington that are not now for sale under value.

A statement is made by these gentlemen that some mills were bankrupt due to bad management. This is along the line of the rest of their remarks. I would like to know how, in the very limited time at their disposal, they ascertain that these mills were bankrupt from bad management.

The whole sum and substance of his letter is not to show the actual conditions existing with the shingle manufacturers of this coast compared with those of British Columbia, but to try to discredit the best judgment and experience of the manufacturers on the Pacific coast.

I spent between five and six days with Mr. Robertson while he was in the Northwest, and gave him every opportunity to see both sides; gave him our actual reports for the cost of labor during the past three years, showing a steady increase; went with him to British Columbia and visited the mills there; had the manufacturers tell him the actual wages paid their men; showed him the class of men who worked in the mills; and brought him to our own plants and showed him the highest class of labor there was in the shingle mills of Washington.

I am unable to see why any man or set of men should attempt to drag down American labor to a level with the oriental labor without any American receiving any benefits whatever from so doing. Certainly no one in this country benefited in any degree by the removal of the tariff, unless it might be the shingle broker and, in some instances, the retail dealer; the manufacturer and the mill employees were injured and the consumer was not benefited by the change.

Trusting the above will be of use to you, and wishing you the very best of success, I am,

Very truly, yours,

E. E. CASE.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. VOLLMER].

Mr. VOLLMER. Mr. Chairman, the European critic, that finished product of 2,000 years of culture and restraint, says that we Americans love to deal in superlatives. I believe that the charge is true. Our modest answer is that we are a superlative people, not necessarily the superlative of excellence, for we sometimes beat the world in the other direction, but we hate to be tamely mediocre. We have not been brought up in that way. We live in a stupendous country. We have a wonderful history. The achievements of our people, the influence of our environment, the very air we breathe cause us to speak, to think, and to act frequently in superlative superlatives.

In this proud sisterhood of States the one which I have the honor in part to represent on the floor of this House is content with claiming nothing less than unquestioned supremacy as the greatest farming State in the Union.

The rolling prairie between the fortieth and forty-fourth parallels of north latitude, which is folded in loving embrace by the limpid silver of the Father of Waters on the east and the tawny gold of the Big Muddy on our western slope, is a garden of the Lord, which, in the liquid music of the Indian tongue, was appropriately named "Iowa, beautiful land."

From the day when the first meadow lark intones her song of spring, which no Mendelssohn, no Mozart, or Grieg, or other inspired human genius can approach in its glorious motif of the ever-recurring miracle of the rebirth of nature, till that perfect season in the Middle West, known as the Indian summer, when "the frost is on the pumpkin and the fodder's in the shock," the 60,000 square miles of Iowa soil are one vast workshop for the production of what Dick Oglesby called "the corn, the corn, the royal corn, which has within its yellow heart enough of food and wealth for all the nations." Four hundred million bushels is that State's normal contribution to the wealth of nations in a single year; and as scientific methods of seed selection, soil analysis, intensive cultivation, and improved processes as taught at our great agricultural school and experiment station at Ames and its extension courses for our farmers are more widely disseminated and more thoroughly understood and applied I expect to see a vast increase not only in the total production but in the production per average acre; and I believe we will live to see the day when we will have not only a billion-dollar Congress but a billion-bushel State, and that State will be Iowa—peerless Iowa.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLLMER. I will.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. VOLLMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I heard a distinguished gentleman from Iowa make the statement——

Mr. VOLLMER. My time is limited.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Just a short question.

Mr. VOLLMER. I can not yield to the gentleman for a stump speech.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I only want to ask this question. He stated that the people in Iowa could not go barefooted because the ground was so rich that it would make them grow too large. Is that so?

Mr. VOLLMER. That is pretty nearly correct.

In that State I was born, and have lived with but short absences the 46 years of my life, and since arriving at man's estate have constantly been dealing professionally and financially with the farmer. Surely I ought to be reasonably familiar with his past and present condition and entitled to make some guess at his immediate future, because all my interests are absolutely bound up and intertwined with the material prosperity of the farmers of the Middle West, and particularly of Iowa.

Judge, then, of my amazement on coming here to be forced to listen to obituaries on the farmer by stand-pat Republican orators, shedding crocodile tears because of his alleged moribund condition; to have to listen to statements that conditions in that industry are so bad out there where I come from that the Agricultural appropriation bill must be passed, forsooth, as "first aid for wounded industries" and "Red Cross for the dead." Under the hypnotic spell cast upon me by these woeful Jeremiahs of calamity I began to see things. Under the influence of this oratorical dope I saw the great farming industry of my section give up the ghost, which thereupon proceeded to cross the River Styx in a goodly company of other industrial shades, all howling to the moon about the wholesale murder perpetrated upon them by the Democratic Congress in its recent tariff legislation.

This would have been a fine subject for an imaginative picture by Gustave Doré, fit to rank with his pictures of Dante's Inferno; but I shall ask you to let go of the pipe and come out of the land of dismal dreams, back to serious, sober, solid facts.

A pretty good index to the prosperity of the farmer is the price of his land, upon which and with which his industry is carried on. In my county I have seen it go up from $50 to $250 per acre, and still going up. Some of it has recently been sold as high as $300 per acre, and this is all land which was homesteaded 60 or 70 years ago at $1.25 an acre. Many of the best judges refuse to set a limit on its further increase in value short of $500 an acre when fully improved with buildings, drainage, silos, and so forth.

It is a resistless tendency, due to increase of population in the world at large at geometric ratio, while the increase of cultivated area is only at arithmetical ratio, and in consequence land not only in Iowa and the Middle West but all over the country where they have fertile soil and good climate and Anglo-Saxon people is bound to continue to rise in value. It is not necessary to hearken back to the theories of Malthus and Henry George, but to ponder the figures submitted in the very able report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, showing a constantly growing disparity between increase of population and food supplies in this country, in order to be convinced that this

is established beyond possibility of doubt as a fundamental fact, with which statesmen and economists must reckon.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a town of any size in the Middle West which has not its quota of retired farmers who have grown wealthy by reason of the increase in the value of lands. In my home town we have one street on which the residents are mostly of this class, and the people call it "Millionaire Road." There is one little town of 200 people in my county, mostly of this class, and in that town of 200 people are 77 registered and licensed automobiles. In the savings banks of my town are $30,000,000 of deposits, mostly farmers' money. Several small farming towns in my county have bank deposits and banking capital as large per capita as Providence, R. I., and that used to be considered high-water mark. Our farmers have largely ceased to be borrowers, and loan out many millions of dollars on mortgages themselves. One farmer in my county during the panic of 1907 loaned to a big manufacturing corporation in Davenport the sum of $50,000 in cash after the banks had shut down on loans. As a class, I say without hesitation or the slightest doubt on the proposition that the Iowa farmer is the most prosperous, free, and independent citizen on the face of the earth. If this does not hold true of all tenant farmers, due to the unearned increment and its tendency in higher rents to absorb the profits of farming as active business, that is not a matter of astonishment to students of the single tax, but does not concern the present discussion.

Now, if this is the true picture of this industry to-day, instead of the harrowing scene of ruin and devastation so often depicted on this floor, is there reasonable ground for fear that this condition will be changed for the worse by reason of the tariff legislation of the Sixty-third Congress? The farmer has not been hurt up to date. I am prepared to show from daily market quotations that they have not, and by every reasonable inference from existing conditions that they will not be. The daily quotations on corn for February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff, average 13 cents a bushel higher than the quotations for the corresponding month of 1913, under the Republican tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No call for the Red Cross here.

The daily quotations on wheat average about 3 cents per bushel higher in February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff, than they averaged under the Republican law in the same month in 1913. No necessity for calling the doctor so far.

The daily quotations on hogs for February, 1914, average 45 cents per hundredweight higher than those in February, 1913. No need to send for the coroner just yet.

The daily quotations on cattle average 18 cents per hundredweight higher in February this year than in the same month last year. The prices of the foregoing products are in each case higher to-day than the average price of the last four years. Pretty good for an industry "in immediate apprehension of speedy dissolution."

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLLMER. For a question; yes, sir.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was it not the promise of the Democratic Party that they were going to lower the price for these products to the consumer?

Mr. VOLLMER. As far as those products are concerned, which you gentlemen told the farmers you would increase and had been increasing in price by your bunko game of protection these many years, but did not increase in price, of course the repeal of the tariff could not reduce the price. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it is the gentleman's first talk and that it is improper and ungenerous to interrupt him.

Mr. POU. Let him come. He is able to take care of himself.

Mr. VOLLMER. I am willing to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was going to ask the gentleman in what market were the prices which he has given?

Mr. VOLLMER. The Chicago market.

The daily quotations on eggs for February, 1914, average about 9 cents a dozen higher than the quotations for the corresponding dates in 1913. This little item of eggs is not so small when you consider that the annual production of eggs in our State is estimated by the State department of agriculture at 97,549,731 dozens, and this increase of 9 cents a dozen means $8,000,000 more in the pockets of the downtrodden, poverty-stricken farmers of my State. I am tempted here to repeat that perfectly awful pun, "Here's to the Iowa hen; her son never sets." I append hereto a table showing these quotations as compiled from the files of the Daily Trade Bulletin in the office of J. R. Whitney & Co., and published by the Carroll Times, a reliable newspaper in the heart of the farming region of our State, where every farmer keeps these quotations and no attempt at deception would be dared on this subject:

February, 1913, came in on Saturday. The dates for which quotations are given are, therefore, February 1, 8, 15, and 21. There was no session of the board of trade on Saturday, February 22, a public holiday. The Saturdays of 1914 most nearly corresponding to these were January 31, February 7, 14, and 21. These are the dates for which the following quotations were reported in the Daily Trade Bulletin. The corn prices quoted are the cash prices for No. 3 mixed on track, Chicago, which is selected as a standard grade. Any other grade might be chosen, but the lesson taught by the quotations would be the same. The prices given on wheat are for No. 2 spring. The prices quoted on hogs are the lowest and highest, including both light and heavy grades, but excluding "pigs." The quotations on cattle are for "steers, medium to choice."

CORN—NO. 3 MIXED, ON TRACK, CHICAGO.

| | Low. | High. |
|---|---|---|
| 1913 | | |
| Feb. 1 | 48 | 50 |
| Feb. 8 | 49½ | 50½ |
| Feb. 15 | 47½ | 49½ |
| Feb. 21 | 47½ | 49 |
| 1914 | | |
| Jan. 31 | 60½ | 63 |
| Feb. 7 | 60 | 64 |
| Feb. 14 | 59½ | 63 |
| Feb. 21 | 59½ | 64 |
| Mar. 4 | 66⅜ | 67½ |

WHEAT—NO. 2, SPRING.

| | Low. | High. |
|---|---|---|
| 1913 | | |
| Feb. 1 | 88 | 90 |
| Feb. 8 | 88 | 90½ |
| Feb. 15 | 87 | 89 |
| Feb. 21 | 87 | 89½ |
| 1914 | | |
| Jan. 31 | 88½ | 90 |
| Feb. 7 | 89½ | 91½ |
| Feb. 14 | 91 | 92 |
| Feb. 21 | 93 | 95 |
| Mar. 4 | 94½ | 95 |

LIVE HOGS—LIGHT AND HEAVY.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1913 | | |
| Feb. 1 | 7.30 | 7.70 |
| Feb. 8 | 7.85 | 8.10 |
| Feb. 15 | 8.00 | 8.35 |
| Feb. 21 | 8.15 | 8.40 |
| 1914 | | |
| Jan. 31 | 8.25 | 8.50 |
| Feb. 7 | 8.45 | 8.72½ |
| Feb. 14 | 8.25 | 8.60 |
| Feb. 21 | 8.40 | 8.75 |
| Mar. 4 | 8.40 | 8.60 |

CATTLE—STEERS, MEDIUM TO CHOICE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1913 | | |
| Feb. 1 | 7.50 | 8.25 |
| Feb. 8 | 7.60 | 8.25 |
| Feb. 15 | 7.90 | 8.50 |
| Feb. 21 | 7.90 | 8.50 |
| 1914 | | |
| Jan. 31 | 7.85 | 8.85 |
| Feb. 7 | 7.85 | 8.65 |
| Feb. 14 | 7.75 | 8.65 |
| Feb. 21 | 7.85 | 8.60 |

Below is the market for the last seven years for January 13:

| | Bulk of sales. |
|---|---|
| Jan. 13, 1914 | $8.00 and $9.00 |
| Jan. 13, 1913 | 7.40 and 8.60 |
| Jan. 13, 1912 | 5.90 and 8.00 |
| Jan. 13, 1911 | 5.80 and 6.60 |
| Jan. 13, 1910 | 5.35 and 6.75 |
| Jan. 13, 1909 | 5.40 and 6.65 |
| Jan. 13, 1908 | 4.80 and 5.90 |

The Chicago prices for eggs in February, 1913, ranged from 15 to 24 cents. The prices for February, 1914, have thus far ranged from 24½ to 27 cents. The average of prices for the past month have been nearly 9 cents higher than for the corresponding period in 1913.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I said before that Iowa was going to become a billion-bushel-a-year State, as far as the production of corn is concerned. This may be doubted, but I can prove by Republican figures that we have become a billion-dollar-a-year State as far as the annual production of farm values is concerned; and those values of farm products are estimated by Republican State officials in my State in a publication just issued,

and are based on the prices obtainable in Iowa under the operation of the present Democratic tariff law. On March 5, 1914, our State department of agriculture reported that the value of live-stock on Iowa farms on January 1, 1914, was $470,272,000, and that the field crops of Iowa for 1913, together with the poultry, wool, and dairy products, amounted to $522,474,227, or a sum total of just about $1,000,000,000. The Des Moines Register and Leader, the organ of the senior Senator from our State, says that this is a new record, never equaled before in that or any other State in the Union. So, while Republicans on the floor of this House are "drowning the stage with tears" and are filling volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with alleged proof that the farmers of my State have been ruined by Democratic tariff legislation, and that they are all on the road to the poorhouse, Republican State officials at home are issuing statistics showing that our farmers were never as rich as they are now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The old song, "The bogy man will git you if you don't look out," is being dinned into the ears of the farmers. The first bogy is Argentine corn. Have you seen it? Compared with our Iowa corn, a measly, scrawny article, looking on the ear like popcorn, and my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says it is full of bugs. If that is the case, it must be rich in "bug juice," but I would not intimate that that explains the interest of my Republican colleagues from Iowa in the matter. [Laughter.] Whatever its nature or condition, all the importations of Argentine corn which we have received to date or that we are liable to receive in a measurable future are a mere bagatelle as compared with our domestic production of two and a half billion bushels of real corn. All the imports of Argentine corn for a year would not furnish a morning breakfast for the hogs of Iowa. And, by the way, all the importations of Chinese eggs would not furnish a nest egg apiece for the hens of my State.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLLMER. I yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. As scrawny and as worthless as the Argentine corn is, compared to the corn he is describing, is it not true that under the present tariff laws several millions of bushels——

Mr. VOLLMER. I yielded only for a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am asking you a question. Is it not true that several million bushels of Argentine corn have come into this country, which was purchased by our glucose and starch manufacturers on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. DONOVAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman refused to yield, and yet the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] continues to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has control of the matter himself, rather than the Chair.

Mr. VOLLMER. The statements that have been bandied back and forth on the floor of this House within the last few days that the importations of that corn were going to run up into hundreds of millions of bushels appear to be perfectly ridiculous when you look at the official figures as given in the Miller's Yearbook, which shows that the biggest production that they ever had in that country was 296,000,000 bushels. During the last fiscal year less than 1,000,000 bushels were imported into this country—875,000 bushels, or such a matter. Since that time there has been a slight increase, but nobody in his senses who looked at the actual importations will say that during the present fiscal year it can possibly run up as high as 10,000,000 bushels. But let us say that it will amount to 10,000,000 bushels. I ask the statisticians of calamity over there whether they can figure out a simple little arithmetical problem. Ten millions to 2,470,000,000 bushels is as 1 to 247, is it not? What effect can they figure out that the adding of 1 bushel to 247 bushels is liable to make?

I have traveled extensively in Central and South America, and, in my opinion, the Latin-American is not yet born who can compete with the farmer of the Middle West in the raising of corn. [Applause.] If the farmer of my State fears competition in this line, let him look nearer at home. Let him look to Texas and Oklahoma, to millions of acres of fertile soil in our Southern States, where Anglo-Saxons some day will put into the production of corn the same amount of brains and labor as the Iowa farmer.

As a matter of fact these importations of foodstuffs come here only at times of real or artificial scarcity. We had a most unusual drought in a large part of the Middle West last year, and that is what I mean by real scarcity. On the other hand, when speculators corner the people's food supplies and produce artificial scarcity the farmers get no benefit, as a rule, while gaunt want and hunger stalk among the laboring population of our great cities. If importations break up these rings and their corners, the great-souled, wealthy, broad-minded Iowa farmer will enter no protest.

The senior Senator from our State has been repeatedly quoted on this floor on the general proposition and he can not be quoted too often, for we propose to remind the farmers of our State of his real sentiments as expressed while he was headed toward the rising sun of progressive doctrines, as distinguished from the statements which he will make in his pending campaign for reelection which he will make as a reactionary.

On June 11, 1910, in the Senate of the United States, Senator CUMMINS said:

I know that my friend from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] does not agree with me in respect to these things, but I do not believe that we in Iowa receive any direct benefit for the 400,000,000 bushels of corn that we raise every year; I do not believe that we receive any direct benefit from the duty on 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 hogs that we market every year; I do not believe that of the $700,000,000 of agricultural products that we pour every year into the channels of trade protection advances the price of a tithe of them. * * * We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with a product that will surpass in value $700,000,000, and it is idle for even any enthusiast to assert that the price of these products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

The junior Senator from our State [Mr. KENYON] thus expressed himself on this proposition on August 1, 1913, on the floor of the United States Senate:

I have never in recent years heard it preached that the tariff on oats or corn or wheat increased the price to the producer.

And the following illuminating colloquy between him and his Republican colleague from North Dakota is not without interest in this connection and worthy to be noted by the farmer, whom they are trying to fool again in the same old way:

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator from North Dakota believe that if the tariff on wheat were a direct benefit to the producer to the extent of the tariff, thereby increasing the cost of wheat to the consumers of the country, any such tariff would stand?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe not (p. 3376).

Let our farmers ponder this well. This little colloquy substantiates our contention that our Republican friends could not if they would, and would not if they could, increase the price of farm products by the levy of tariff duties, and that these duties were enacted by them simply to serve their campaign purposes.

Now, as to importations of farm products increasing under the new tariff, I desire to call attention to the schedule of such importations, printed as part of his remarks by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and found on page 4501 of the RECORD:

*Schedule G: Agricultural products and provisions.*

VALUES OF IMPORTS BY YEARS.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1898 | $29,353,286 |
| 1899 | 32,505,236 |
| 1900 | 35,762,588 |
| 1901 | 38,566,704 |
| 1902 | 43,682,461 |
| 1903 | 46,221,428 |
| 1904 | 49,013,702 |
| 1905 | 47,570,416 |
| 1906 | 53,868,946 |
| 1907 | 63,720,855 |
| 1908 | 69,609,525 |
| 1909 | 71,719,069 |
| 1910 | 84,872,747 |
| 1911 | 105,974,044 |
| 1912 | 177,711,156 |

This schedule shows a steady increase in such importations under the Republican tariff, an increase every single year from 1898, when it was $29,353,286, to 1912, when it was $177,711,156, an increase of over 400 per cent in 14 years. These figures simply prove what anyone with an ounce of sense, unless blinded by party fanaticism or pet theory, might have expected, that as pressure of increasing population and relatively insufficient food supplies coexist there will be increased importations of foodstuffs; and as the colloquy between Senators KENYON and GRONNA quoted above indicates, no political party would dare to try to stop it or to make bread dear for the people. To do so would simply invoke such an agitation as that which led to the overthrow of the corn laws of England, and the toiling millions in our great cities would smash any party daring to do anything of the kind.

Indeed the problem foreshadowed by existing conditions and well-recognized tendencies is not getting too much food in the country, but how and where shall we get enough to fill the mouths of the hungry millions, because I fear that in spite of all that may be done to assist agriculture and make it more scientific, population will continue to increase faster than food supplies. The farmer need not worry about his prices. In spite of everything that Congress may do and in spite of importations from abroad, the prices of farm products are going to remain high.

I do not wish to be misunderstood as saying that the farmer has not some just complaints. When 57 per cent of the value of his products is lost somewhere between his hands and the ultimate consumer something is radically wrong, and the sphere

of sound remedial legislation appears to be right here. But in my judgment for the correction of these abuses the farmer has far more license to look to a Democratic than to a Republican Congress. I assert that no Congress has ever done more for the farmer than the Sixty-third. Talk about discriminating against the farmer in Democratic tariff legislation! It is absolutely false, for where the duties were removed or reduced on one product of the farm they were removed or reduced on five or six manufactured articles at the same time. Many price reductions on things which the farmer has to buy have already come and many more will soon follow as old stocks are disposed of and price agreements terminate or are broken up.

On the other hand, every Republican tariff ever enacted was of necessity and by its very nature a rank discrimination against the interests of the farmer, because in the main, with only isolated exceptions, the price of his products is determined in the free-trade markets of the world, while Republican tariff policies have turned him over, bound and gagged, to have his pockets picked by the confederated rings and monopolies that were the prolific spawn of the protective system.

People should be patient. They should give the new tariff a fair trial. Rome was not built in a day. This Congress has already placed on the statute books more legislation of a major character than was ever placed there in the same length of time by any Congress since the First, and if the people sustain the hands of the Democratic Party and do not allow the howling dervishes of calamity or the panic-plotting, predatory interests that want to see this administration fail to deflect them from their course the farmers particularly will find more than compensation for any importations of farm products in the reduction of the prices of all their supplies and in many other benefits which will be conferred upon them by the comprehensive program of progressive, remedial, and constructive legislation which will go down in history inseparably linked with the immortal name of Woodrow Wilson.

For our promise of future performance we can put up good collateral in the shape of past performance. The administration in one short year can point to the fait accompli of a reduction of the tariff, an income-tax law, a currency law, the popular election of United States Senators, the diversion of Treasury funds from Wall Street to the banks of the West and South, the elimination of the lobby; the adoption of the industrial employees' arbitration act, preventing the tying up of railways; the progress made toward a peaceful solution of the problem of the trusts; the extension of the parcel-post and pure-food acts; the inauguration of a system of markets for farm products; the extension of the activities of the Agricultural Department to the home life of the farmer; the new public-land policy, combining conservation with proper use; the Lever bill for farm-extension work. This is but a hurried and partial résumé of the work of the first year of Democratic government under the guidance and leadership of Woodrow Wilson. In every one of the propositions I have named the farmer has a very vital interest, and in every one the action of the Democratic Congress was in favor of the farmer, because it is the proud boast of the Democratic Party that it is, always has been, and always will be the faithful servant and the special representative of the great producing classes of the Nation. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, before I perform the somewhat unusual feat of speaking upon the bill, I want to say that at a later period, and after I have had some opportunity to examine the report to which he referred, unless some other Member on this side does it, I propose to answer the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I want to say that our friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. VOLLMER], who has made his first speech this morning, has fully justified, according to my opinion, the good judgment his constituents showed in sending so able a representative to this Chamber. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there are just a few words I want to say about the bill and about a proposition in my own district that is not in the bill, but I hope will be in it either before it passes finally or will be included in the next river and harbor bill.

On page 43 of the pending bill I find this language:

> Improving Mississippi River from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Mississippi River Commission: Continuing improvement with a view to securing a permanent channel depth of 9 feet, $7,000,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building of levees—

And so forth.

My information is that of this sum of $7,000,000 about $4,000,000 is to be spent for the construction or for the repair and maintenance of levees on the Mississippi River.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining of the conduct of this committee or of the action that this House may take when this large sum of money is appropriated.

It is not only authorized by the interests of a great section of our country, but it is also fully demanded by the platform declarations of the three great political parties of this country that are represented on this floor. Not only that, but as the committee has presented this proposition, this money is undoubtedly appropriated, so far as mere language goes, in the interest of and in the aid of navigation.

But, Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of this committee to the fact that there are other rivers in other sections of this country where just as strong a case can be made for the construction of levees, even if confined to the aid of navigation, as can be made in the Mississippi River case; and I rise to insist that the doctrine which the Democratic Party laid down in its platform at Baltimore and the doctrine which each one of the other great parties laid down at their national conventions on this great subject is not exclusive, is not sectional, is not a doctrine that does not apply impartially and equally to every section of this country, where conditions are the same and where the principle involved is identical. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say, on this floor, that in my judgment the day is not far distant, if it has not already arrived, when the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States will no longer permit appropriations of this sort to be made to one river and to one section of the country and deny appropriations of a like character, based on exactly the same reasons and on just as strong cases made in support of them, considering the amount that is asked, to other sections of this country.

You can take, Mr. Chairman, for instance, the case that I have in my own district. There the flood waters of the Savannah River, coming down from the Appalachian Mountains, gathering from five States, center at the head of navigation on the Savannah River at the city of Augusta. The river takes a sharp bend there, and the result is that every few years we have a great flood that destroys or certainly very seriously damages life and property in a great city of 50,000 or 60,000 people.

Now, we have not been careless or indifferent about this matter. We have not been neglectful of our own interests, because the inhabitants of that city, the people of that one prosperous but not overrich community in this great Republic, have taxed themselves to provide a million dollars to build a levee for flood protection there, and we are asking the Congress of the United States to aid in that project by an appropriation of $500,000—25 per cent only of what we are spending out of our own pockets.

What have we done for the Mississippi River? The levees of the Mississippi River have had $31,500,000 from this Government—about one-third, in round figures, from the Federal Treasury of what they have raised by local taxation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the result of the expenditure made out of the appropriation granted a couple of years ago for the protection of the city of Augusta? It was a comparatively small appropriation, was it not?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; it was not a very large appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to ask the gentleman about that.

Mr. HARDWICK. The result has been very good. We are grateful to the committee and to the Congress for that aid. I want to say this, that I am not criticizing the committee now. The report of the engineers on the levee proposition has not reached Congress yet, and therefore the committee could not up to this time have included this item in the bill, even if they had wanted to. For that reason I am not asking that the House vote on this item now. I think the first appropriation for revetment work, and an equal amount was contributed locally, was for $125,000, and it helped us a great deal.

Mr. MADDEN. I remember, as a member of the committee, looking carefully into the question that the gentleman refers to with respect to the damage done to the city of Augusta by the floods on the Savannah River, and we reached the conclusion that it was a meritorious proposition and ought to receive the assistance of the Federal Government.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the gentleman. Of course, his sense of justice led him to form that opinion when he knew the facts, and I think the sense of justice of every other Member of this House will lead him to reach the same conclusion when he becomes familiar with the facts.

Now, I am not going to go to-day into overmuch detail about all these things, but I will put in the RECORD a detailed state-

ment of what the last great flood cost the city of Augusta and its people. It cost over $2,000,000 in actual money loss and several lives.

The flood in the year 1908 was a typical one, and the loss of life and property can be taken as a guide in determining the total losses. It is impracticable, even with all data at hand, to cover these, as there are a great many intangible losses which can not be figured in dollars and cents. It is true these floods are of short duration, but the rise of water is so swift that it is impractical to guard against loss. At 6 p. m. on August 5 the river stage was 19 feet; at 8 a. m., August 6, or 14 hours after, the stage of water was 35 feet, and in a few hours this had reached 39 feet. The entire business section was covered and practically all of the best residential section. In the low ground, where the poor classes of people live, the flood water went to the eaves of the one-story houses, and the occupants had to be reached through the roof. The large residences on high ground had water on the first floor from 3 to 8 feet deep. All stores were, of course, flooded. The depth of water on office floors of hotels was from 5 to 8 feet. Seven cotton mills, 2 ironworks, 2 cotton compresses, many city blocks of cotton warehouses, 2 grain mills, 3 ice plants, and 20 other manufacturing plants, street-railway power house, electric-light plant, waterworks, the union passenger station, 6 railroad terminals, and, in fact, everything that goes to make up a city was put entirely out of business. The power canal, by which the city furnishes water power to all industries, was torn up for 3 miles; 1 railroad bridge and 1 wagon bridge across the Savannah River were washed away entirely and one span of another wagon bridge was destroyed. Four hundred and eighty stores and over 2,000 residences were under water, and many of the buildings collapsed. By the destruction of the city's water-power development, 6,000 factory employees were out of employment for 2 months and the city was without water for 40 days.

As to the property loss, no figures obtainable would cover it. Besides the actual cash expended in restoring buildings and replacing damaged stock, there is a loss in business, a depreciation in value of property, a loss in earning capacity due to abnormal conditions, and a general paralysis of the entire community which can not be figured in money, the loss through these items being far more than the cost of restoring the physical property. The area covered by the water within the city limits was approximately 3 square miles, and this territory included all the business and manufacturing section and many residential streets. The value of the property flooded, as fixed by the city for taxation purposes (and you know how extremely reasonable that is in any of our cities) was $24,197,245. This does not include the city streets, sewers, bridges, and so forth, which were so badly damaged. There has been a table prepared showing the damage to physical property, based on actual expenditure, which I will not take the time of the committee to read, but will ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Actual monetary losses from flood.*

CITY OF AUGUSTA LOSS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Repairs water-power canal | $120,000 |
| Replacing steel bridge across river at Fifth Street | 55,000 |
| New span at Thirteenth Street river bridge | 21,000 |
| Repairs to waterworks | 26,000 |
| Repairs to sewers | 12,000 |
| Repairs to streets and replacing bridges over canal | 110,000 |
| Repairs to cemeteries | 17,000 |
| Repairs to river wharf and warehouses | 8,000 |
| | 369,000 |

REPAIRS TO PROPERTY OF RAILROAD AND PUBLIC-SERVICE CORPORATIONS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Repairs to street railway power house and tracks | 25,000 |
| Repairs to electric lighting plant, telephone and telegraph companies' pole lines and underground conduits | 35,000 |
| Repairs to passenger depot | 8,000 |
| Repairs to Charleston & Western Carolina Ry. freight depot and tracks (this property was on river bank) | 60,000 |
| Repairs to Atlantic Coast Line yards | 12,000 |
| Repairs to Georgia Ry. yards | 2,000 |
| Repairs to Southern Ry. yards | 30,000 |
| Loss of railroad bridge across river (not replaced) | 45,000 |
| Repairs Augusta-Summerville tracks | 4,000 |
| Repairs Augusta Southern yards | 5,000 |
| | 226,000 |

LOSSES BY INDUSTRIAL PLANTS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Singleton Silk Mill (loss of stock and damage to machinery flooded) | 5,000 |
| Sibley Manufacturing Co. (cotton mill), loss of stock | 10,000 |
| King Manufacturing Co., loss of stock | 16,000 |
| Interstate Ice Co., damage to buildings | 12,000 |
| Southern Cotton Oil Co.: | |
| Damage to buildings | 15,000 |
| Damage to stock, meal, and other by-products | 40,000 |
| Riverside compress: | |
| Damage to buildings | $8,000 |
| Loss of cotton (floated down the river) | 14,000 |
| Augusta Warehouse & Banking Co. (cotton warehouse): | |
| Damage to building | 15,000 |
| Damage and loss of cotton | 8,000 |
| Riverside Mills (cotton waste), factory occupied two blocks: | |
| Damage to buildings | 60,000 |
| Damage and loss to stock | 80,000 |
| Augusta Compress Co. and allied warehouses, loss and damage to cotton, 4,000 bales lost or practically destroyed | 170,000 |
| Enterprise Cotton Manufacturing Co | 8,000 |
| Augusta Factory (cotton) | 18,000 |
| Sutherland Cotton Manufacturing Co | 5,000 |
| Globe Cotton Mills | 12,000 |
| Lombard Iron Works, damage to buildings | 4,000 |
| Georgia Iron Works | 2,000 |
| Augusta Mattress Factory | 15,000 |
| Georgia-Carolina Chemical Co | 40,000 |
| Southern States Fertilizer Co | 25,000 |
| Perkins Manufacturing Co., lumber, sash, door, and blinds (plant covers three city blocks) | 35,000 |
| Clark Milling Co. (grain) | 12,000 |
| Nixon & Co. (mill grain) | 8,000 |
| Augusta Lumber Co | 9,000 |
| Augusta Gas Co | 6,000 |
| Augusta Brewing Co | 2,000 |
| B. S. Bunbar Brick Co., Electric City Brick Co., Hankinson Brick Co., Merry Bros. Brick Co., McCoy Brick Co., McKenzie Brick Co., and Standard Brick Co | 35,000 |
| National Biscuit Co | 18,000 |
| Total | 707,000 |

LOSSES BY FIRE DURING FLOOD WHICH COULD NOT BE CONTROLLED BY THE FIRE DEPARTMENT.

| | |
|---|---|
| Five large buildings | 180,000 |
| Repairs to public-school property (1 large brick building collapsed, 4 others damaged) | 38,000 |
| Repairs to church property (11 churches) | 26,000 |
| Repairs to store buildings and pumping water from cellars and cleaning up | 75,000 |
| Damage to merchandise (in the 480 stores from a few dollars in the small shops to $22,000 in the largest wholesale houses), the total being | 240,000 |
| Repairs to residences (60 were destroyed and a large number damaged) | 70,000 |
| Damage to household furniture, carpets, etc | 150,000 |
| Loss on 6,000 acres of hay and grain south of the city (estimate made by the farmers) | 100,000 |
| | 879,000 |

TOTAL LOSSES.

| | |
|---|---|
| By municipal corporation | 369,000 |
| By railroads and public-service corporations | 226,000 |
| By industrial plants | 707,000 |
| By stores, residences, and miscellaneous | 879,000 |
| Total | 2,181,000 |
| Loss of wages to mill and factory operatives for eight weeks | 144,000 |

Loss to merchants and manufacturers due to interruption and loss of business, incalculable.

Mr. HARDWICK. It shows that the total tangible loss in this year was $2,181,000. Now, in addition to that there was the loss of wages to mill and factory operators for eight weeks of $144,000, and the loss to merchants and manufacturers due to interruption and loss of business, which is incalculable.

The losses shown in this table are from one flood, that of 1908, and it is typical of all others. Since 1840 we have had 10 floods. The city was powerless to help itself on account of the large cost of protection. However, after the 1908 flood, realizing that the very life of the community depended upon some system of relief, it was decided to make a determined effort in that direction. Gen. Kingman, then in charge of our district, made a thorough examination and reported that the only possible means of protection was by a levee along the river front from high ground above the city to high ground below. At his suggestion we called in Mr. B. M. Harrod, of New Orleans, who has spent most of his life on the Mississippi River work, and his report coincided with that of Gen. Kingman. To further satisfy the community, the cost of a levee being so tremendous, we called in Mr. A. L. Dabney, of Memphis, and Mr. H. T. Cory, of San Francisco. Each of these engineers, acting entirely independently of each other, recommended the construction of a levee as the only practical means of protection.

Nor can the case we present be differentiated in any manner from the levee appropriations made for the Mississippi River. If attention be directed to the contention so strongly made for the Mississippi levees that they are necessary in aid of navigation, then I answer exactly the same thing is true of the Savannah River at Augusta. On this proposition let me read from the report of the Government engineers in 1908:

These freshets develop a very high velocity of current, which attacks the banks of the stream, particularly on the Augusta side, and with every high freshet a loss of bank occurs. The material thus eroded is carried into the river and furnishes the material with which the bars

are made, which prevent or obstruct navigation at low water, and render the improvement of the river by regulation almost impossible.

So here we are. The Government officers say that these great recurrent floods at the head of navigation on the Savannah River at Augusta obstruct navigation and render the improvement of the river and its use for navigation almost an impossibility; and I say there is not a single case in the Mississippi River or Valley or in connection with the Mississippi River levee proposition that is stronger than that or that could be put in stronger words than the Government engineers have used with respect to this Augusta case.

Now, I am not finding fault with anybody. I am not adopting any dog-in-the-manger policy, because I do not feel that way; but I want to notify this committee—not in a threatening way, but in a fair, open way—that in my judgment the people of America are going to insist in applying whatever propositions you lay down for levee improvement on one river to every other river where the conditions are the same and where the principles involved are identical.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman has referred only to the Mississippi River. The gentleman is, I hope, not laboring under the opinion that the Mississippi River is the only river in the United States for which we have appropriated money for the construction of levees?

Mr. HARDWICK. I must confess that I was, and I got that impression from expressions made by the gentleman's committee. I understood the Chairman to say so. Am I right about that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the only one that we have been appropriating money for in the last few years, except occasionally the Senate has put on some.

Mr. HARDWICK. In other words, the policy of the House committee has been to confine this levee work to the Mississippi River alone, and they do it there on the theory that it is necessary to construct or help maintain those levees in the aid of navigation, to keep the river from spreading all over the country, and to keep it within its channel. Now, I say that my case is the same, that the Government engineers say that the reason why the Savannah River is not fully navigable at all times from Augusta, Ga., to Savannah, Ga., and can not be kept that way is because of these floods, which, to use their own language, make it almost impossible to make a navigable river of it at all until these floods at Augusta are controlled.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I agree with everything the gentleman has said since he has taken the floor, except his statement of fact.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the gentleman will correct me if I am in error.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Three years ago, I think it was, we appropriated $1,000,000 to build levees on the Colorado River in California for the sole purpose of preventing overflows. That was the sole purpose. It had no reference to navigation.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the chairman of the committee agree to that statement of facts?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The chairman will have to agree to it. I have the law in my hand, which states the purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whatever was done then, we would hardly do that now, I think.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. In addition to that, we are providing in this bill for a project on the Sacramento and Feather Rivers in California which contemplates the construction of levees and the improvement of those rivers in the interest of navigation and for the purpose of preventing floods there. The purpose I have in making this statement is simply to show the gentleman that what he contends for in the Savannah River is not utterly without precedent, and that, as a matter of fact, the Mississippi River is not the only river where we are building levees. I could name others.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I hope he is correct. That ought to be the policy. We can not afford to single out any one river and treat it differently from the way we treat other rivers in this country where conditions are the same. We can not treat one section of this country one way in our legislation and treat other sections in another and different way. I say you must have a rule, whatever it is, and then you must apply it impartially whenever the facts are the same. You must come right up to the rule no matter where your rule is, whether it is in a Democratic State or in a Republican State, in a southern, eastern, western, or northern community. We can not afford to legislate along any other lines.

I want to say that I am glad my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], a member of the committee, takes that same view of the matter. I do not see how anybody in justice and fairness could take any other view. And I want to ask the members of this committee, if you were situated as I am, how could any one of you go home to your constituents and tell them that the Mississippi River, which is a parallel case with ours, can get aid for its levee work, but other rivers similarly situated can not. It is not right to put any Member of this House or the other House in that position, and I do not believe the fairness of the Members of either House will submit to it, if that is the purpose of any committee of either House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all, Mr. Chairman, except to say that when this report does come in I am going to insist that the same principle that has been applied in the Mississippi River case be applied to the Augusta case. I am going to stand with every other man from every other section of this country in applying this principle impartially to every river and State in this country where the case is the same and where the principles involved are the same. I think that is right, and I believe this House on both sides of the Chamber will support that method of procedure.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman think the time has come when this great Government of ours ought to spend enough money and spent it systematically, so as forever to protect the people of this country from these floods?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. LAZARO. Instead of spending it up in Alaska?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do. I am heartily in sympathy with this doctrine, and I say no greater internal improvement could be conducted nor one more thoroughly justified by the existing conditions in this country than to protect the people of this country from these great recurring floods that come from its navigable rivers, wherever they may be located. It is right, just, and fair, and levee work and such other flood protection as may be needed and may be practicable ought to be impartially given on the basis of merit, and merit alone, to every section of our great country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I listened to some remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. VOLLMER], recently elected to membership in this House, and the gentleman referred to importations of agricultural products, especially of corn. He states that the amount of Argentine corn coming into this country under the new tariff law is insignificant in quantity, and therefore will have no effect upon the corn market in the United States. I want to call his attention to the importations as reported by the Department of Commerce.

For October, November, and December, 1912, and January, 1913, under the old law, there were imported into the United States 250,000 bushels of corn, as against 7,034,159 bushels under the present law for the same months, October, November, and December, 1913, and January, 1914.

He further states that at the present rate of importation of corn the quantity imported during the year would not exceed 10,000,000 bushels. If the corresponding rate of importation keeps up for the succeeding eight months, as compared with the four months above given, the importations for the first year under the Underwood tariff law will exceed 21,000,000 bushels, a quantity quite sufficient to regulate the price of corn in the United States markets, and materially lower the value of the corn crop in this country. This amount of imported corn coming from the Argentine Republic is more than one-half our usual annual exports of corn. The imported corn above referred to was purchased chiefly by the glucose and starch manufacturers located in the Atlantic States, and has taken away from the American farmer his market for just that much corn.

It is important to know, too, that the freight rate on corn from Argentina to the United States is 5 cents per hundred pounds, or 3 cents a bushel, while the freight from the Mississippi River Valley to the Atlantic Coast States is, in round numbers, 10 cents per bushel. This is an average freight rate from the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys to eastern ports. This is a very important factor in fixing the value of corn in the Eastern States, especially so when it is true that for the purpose of manufacturing starch and glucose Argentine corn is about as valuable as the extraordinary quality of corn produced in the United States.

The importations of oats for the same months under the old law were 23,580 bushels, and under the present law 16,194,145 bushels.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. VOLLMER] states that the farmers in his State are satisfied. Perhaps so. He would have us believe that the Iowa farmers are satisfied with having their corn placed on the free list, while the farmers of the South demanded and received a protective duty on rice. He would have us believe that the Iowa farmer is pleased to have his potatoes on the free list, while the farmers of Virginia and North Carolina have exacted a duty on peanuts. He would have us believe that the Iowa farmers are satisfied to have their live stock placed upon the free list, while the farmers of the South insisted upon having their tobacco highly protected. He would have us believe that the farmers of the North are satisfied with having fruit placed on the free list or at a very low rate of duty, while the orange and lemon growers of Florida demanded ample protection. Would he have us believe that the Iowa farmer is pleased with having wool placed on the free list, while Texas had demanded and obtained a protective tariff on Angora-goat hair.

Let me call the gentleman's attention to another article—butter—of which we imported $122,000 worth in the same months under the old law, and $1,631,000 worth under the present law.

The gentleman referred particularly to potatoes. Of these the importations for the four months named under the old law were 79,000 bushels, value $84,000, and under the present law for the same period 3,261,000 bushels, value $1,476,000. If the gentleman will refer to these figures he will find that the import value of potatoes under the old law was $1.29 per bushel, and now under the new tariff law 49 cents a bushel. Does the gentleman think he can throw out any sop of that kind to the Iowa farmer by saying, "Here's to the Iowa hen, whose son never sets." [Laughter.] You forget that the Canadian hen and rooster, with a pleasant smile on, look over the border into the United States, and with delight say to each other, "We can now be employed full time and have no fear of finding a market over there for the fruits of our toil."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know of the testimony of a very prominent witness before the Committee on Rules the other day, telling of the effect of the immense importations of corn from Argentina, when he said that the loss to the American farmer on account of that importation was $65,000,000?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, my friend; and at 6 cents a bushel on the amount of corn produced in this country last year—3,125,000,000 bushels—it is $180,000,000. And that is the extent the price of corn has been reduced.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have not the time to yield now. I will a little later. Our importations of breadstuffs for the four months I have referred to under the old law were $5,364,523, and under the new law, for the corresponding four months, they were $18,534,966. Do you think the Iowa farmer likes that? I would ask the gentleman the name of a farmer who has requested him to make the statements which he has made—that they are satisfied—or if he knows of any northern farmer who has asked any Democrat to do these things? If so, the poor unfortunate farmer does not know anything about the importation of agricultural products now coming into this country from abroad in direct competition with his products, the product of the sweat of his brow.

Now to get down to eggs: There were no importations at all under the old law given in the report, against $612,000 worth under this law.

Take 10 agricultural products, 10 items produced on the farm, and the value of those products imported under the old law was $14,503,000, as against $54,750,000 under this law. Do you think the Iowa farmer likes to hear that? Do you like to hear it?

When do you think you can hoodwink the Iowa farmer and make him believe that the Democratic tariff law has been enacted for his benefit especially? You did not do it in your last election. Your city vote alone saved you.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. VOLLMER] would lead us to believe that the farmers of Iowa are well pleased with existing conditions and prices on agricultural products under this new Democratic tariff law. Perhaps it would be worth his consideration and the consideration of other gentlemen of the House to note the change of expression of the people at the polls in the congressional district in Iowa which this gentleman has the honor to represent. In 1910 the Democratic candidate received 19,815 votes, the Republican candidate 16,971; in 1912 Mr. Pepper, the Democratic candidate, had no opposition and received 24,796 votes; and at the special election in 1914 Mr. VOLLMER received 12,655 votes, while the Republican candidate received 10,788, and the Progressive candidate received 3,730 votes. It is of much interest, also, to know that at this special election for the first time in many years the Republicans carried 85 per cent of the precincts in the farming districts.

I would ask the gentleman from Iowa, does he believe this comparison of votes cast in his district is any evidence of approval on the part of farmers in that district of this new tariff law? No one will deny that both Republican and Progressive votes cast in 1914 were cast by protectionists, favoring duties on farm products and registering disapproval of the new tariff law. The combined Republican and Progressive vote just given shows a majority against him of the votes cast amounting to 1,863.

The gentleman's speech will be understood as a veiled rebuke to the farmers who did not vote for him, and his special pleading for consumers in the cities will further enlighten his farmer constituents as to where his sympathies lie.

I ask you, my friends, can you point to a single industry in this country that has taken on an added impulse? Can you point to a single industry that has been established since the 3d day of October last by any encouragement given it in the Underwood tariff law? If so, name it. I can give you the names of some, but they are across the sea; they are in Europe, my friends. As predicted by the Ways and Means Committee in its report on the Underwood tariff bill and over the signature of its 14 majority members, which recited: "In our judgment, the future growth of our great industries lies beyond the sea." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. FORDNEY was given leave to extend his remarks by printing the following table:

*A comparison of imports of certain farm products during the months of October, November, and December, 1913, and January, 1914, with the corresponding four months of one year previous, namely, October, November, and December, 1912, and January, 1914.*

IMPORTATIONS OF CORN.

| | Bushels. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | 226,471 | $114,706 |
| November, 1912 | 25,819 | 21,567 |
| December, 1912 | 632 | 415 |
| January, 1913 | 5,757 | 2,988 |
| Total | 258,679 | 139,766 |
| October, 1913 | 473,259 | 378,011 |
| November, 1913 | 1,632,643 | 1,182,672 |
| December, 1913 | 2,343,444 | 1,485,307 |
| January, 1914 | 2,554,813 | 1,610,136 |
| Total | 7,034,159 | 4,656,213 |

Imports of corn for four months of 1912–13 amounted to but 3 per cent of imports for four months of 1913–14.

IMPORTATIONS OF OATS.

| | Bushels. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | 379 | $186 |
| November, 1912 | 4,266 | 2,052 |
| December, 1912 | 8,984 | 3,069 |
| January, 1913 | 9,951 | 6,397 |
| Total | 23,580 | 11,704 |
| October, 1913 | 2,524,793 | 886,094 |
| November, 1913 | 5,132,308 | 1,821,789 |
| December, 1913 | 5,577,626 | 1,918,985 |
| January, 1914 | 2,959,388 | 1,000,637 |
| Total | 16,194,145 | 5,628,405 |

Imports of oats for four months of 1912–13 amounted to but two-tenths of 1 per cent of imports for four months of 1913–14.

IMPORTATIONS OF BUTTER.

| | Pounds. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | 107,046 | $27,688 |
| November, 1912 | 169,233 | 42,454 |
| December, 1912 | 145,949 | 37,655 |
| January, 1913 | 47,947 | 15,112 |
| Total | 470,175 | 122,909 |
| October, 1913 | 463,399 | 105,075 |
| November, 1913 | 1,069,617 | 234,197 |
| December, 1913 | 1,183,152 | 244,321 |
| January, 1914 | 1,858,911 | 447,205 |
| Total | 4,575,079 | 1,031,739 |

*A comparison of imports of certain farm products, etc.*—Continued.

IMPORTATIONS OF POTATOES.

| | Bushels. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | 9,811 | $4,716 |
| November, 1912 | 10,668 | 4,800 |
| December, 1912 | 20,253 | 25,302 |
| January, 1913 | 38,698 | 49,823 |
| Total | 79,430 | 84,641 |
| October, 1913 | 472,052 | 202,356 |
| November, 1913 | 764,839 | 346,679 |
| December, 1913 | 1,641,693 | 738,614 |
| January, 1914 | 383,121 | 191,170 |
| Total | 3,261,705 | 1,478,819 |

IMPORTATIONS OF ANIMALS (PRINCIPALLY CATTLE).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | $1,077,952 | October, 1913 | $3,807,318 |
| November, 1912 | 1,098,446 | November, 1913 | 3,883,015 |
| December, 1912 | 830,028 | December, 1913 | 2,490,189 |
| January, 1913 | 461,966 | January, 1914 | 2,097,644 |
| Total | 3,468,392 | Total | 12,278,166 |

IMPORTATIONS OF BREADSTUFFS.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| October, 1912 | $1,292,184 | October, 1913 | $2,706,600 |
| November, 1912 | 1,191,221 | November, 1913 | 4,822,958 |
| December, 1912 | 1,487,775 | December, 1913 | 5,860,999 |
| January, 1913 | 1,483,343 | January, 1914 | 5,144,399 |
| Total | 5,364,523 | Total | 18,534,956 |

IMPORTATIONS OF EGGS.

| Date. | Dozen. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| October, 1913 | 21,594 | $5,322 |
| November, 1913 | 165,263 | 36,500 |
| December, 1913 | 1,514,296 | 334,315 |
| January, 1914 | 1,184,408 | 236,622 |
| Total | 2,885,561 | 612,759 |

For October, November, December, 1912, and January, 1913, no imports of eggs are shown.

Below is given a comparison of total imports of certain products for four months ending January 31, 1913, with four months ending January 31, 1914.

OCTOBER, 1912, TO JANUARY, 1913, INCLUSIVE.

| | Quantity. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| Beans, bushels | 70,590 | $141,728 |
| Peas, do | 38,698 | 160,370 |
| Wool | | 3,545,669 |
| Woolen goods | | 1,468,228 |

OCTOBER, 1913, TO JANUARY, 1914, INCLUSIVE.

| | Quantity. | Value. |
|---|---|---|
| Fresh meat, pounds | 13,440,751 | $1,082,337 |
| Beans, bushels | 187,358 | 331,730 |
| Peas, do | 125,691 | 268,634 |
| Wool | | 5,219,138 |
| Woolen goods | | 4,668,349 |

Per cent of imports free: January, 1913, 55; January, 1914, 61.

Total imports free: January, 1913, $90,413,718; January, 1914, $94,190,460.

Total imports dutiable: January, 1913, $72,649,720; January, 1914, $60,227,787.

Duties collected: January, 1913, $20,323,124; January, 1914, $23,528,080.

*Recapitulation of imports of principal farm products during months of October, November, December, 1912, and January, 1913, and the corresponding four months of 1913–14.*

| Product. | 1912-13 | 1913-14 |
|---|---|---|
| Corn | $139,766 | $4,656,213 |
| Oats | 11,704 | 5,626,406 |
| Potatoes | 122,309 | 1,031,759 |
| Animals | 3,464,392 | 12,278,166 |
| Breadstuffs | 5,364,523 | 18,534,956 |
| Eggs | | 612,759 |
| Beans | 141,728 | 331,730 |
| Peas | 160,370 | 268,634 |
| Wool | 3,545,669 | 5,219,138 |
| Woolens | 1,468,228 | 4,668,349 |
| Total | 14,503,330 | 54,706,929 |

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I approach a subject in this discussion which may seem to you to be personal to my own district, but I desire at the outset, gentlemen, to say that I want to place my remarks on a broader basis than a benefit to myself or to my people. In doing this I want to say that I do it not in a spirit of reflection upon the honorable committee which has brought this bill before this House. The chairman and all the members of that committee are among the very best Members of the House. They have devoted their energies, their time, and their talent for the purpose of bringing in a bill which will give to the country that character of improvement which we all so much desire, the improvement of the navigation of the water courses of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that this bill and former bills have carried large appropriations for improvements of various kinds, among which are improvements for the deepening of the channels of streams, improvements for harbors, and improvements of levees. These are the three great ideas which have been before the committee for many years. Probably the levee proposition has not been considered as long as the other two. But it is undoubtedly the policy of this Nation to improve levees along with the harbors and streams and other waters of the country. The policy of improving levees is confined largely to the Mississippi River. I have no complaint to offer for such improvement, but I voice the good judgment of the committee in its effort to control the waters of that great stream, the father of rivers in America, and in conserving a territory as rich as the Valley of the Nile and as productive as the plains of Egypt. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the proposition to which I wish to call the attention of the committee is a proposition involving the improvement of a harbor on the Ohio River. Inasmuch as the policy of improving levees outside of the Mississippi River, or on other streams than that of the Mississippi River, is not as popular as improvement of the levees on the Mississippi River; and as my proposition involves a levee improvement as well as a harbor improvement on the Ohio River, I have not met with success at the hands of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I am sure I had on that committee a great number of gentlemen who were in sympathy with my proposition and who would have gladly carried in this bill an appropriation sufficient to have made the improvement contemplated by my bill.

Now, it has been said by one of the speakers who preceded me that it is the policy of the three great parties in America to improve the navigable rivers of this country alike; to improve the harbors and levees of this country alike. That is, where the same conditions exist on one river that exist on another river where improvements are being carried on, the improvements ought to be carried on on both alike. In other words, if appropriations are made to improve the harbors and levees of the Mississippi River, then like harbors on the Missouri River, the Ohio, the Kentucky, the Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers, or any other river in the country ought to receive the same kind of treatment at the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that we make appropriations for the building of levees on the Mississippi River on the theory that they serve and are in the aid of navigation. That is so stated in the appropriation each time.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is left to the engineers at each time whenever they conclude to make an expenditure to say whether or not it is in the interest of navigation. Now, the engineers in reporting on the project at Shawneetown, to which the gentleman is addressing himself, say that in their opinion it is not in the interest of navigation at all to improve or extend the building up of the levee any further at Shawneetown. They say that the levee does not improve the navigation of the Ohio River, and in view of this further fact that the levee is being repaired by the State of Illinois, it is not incumbent on the United States to engage in any work there.

Mr. FOWLER. Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he submitted the question of the improvement of the harbor to the Engineer Corps? I think not. I have talked that question over myself with them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that some time last year I did submit to the Chief of Engineers the whole question there as to what further improvement, if any, to the levee should be made, the necessity for building it higher, and the advisability of doing so. What I have just read is a part

of the report made on the subject. Of course there is another report on the same subject that has been before our committee for some time, but this is a recent report.

Mr. FOWLER. If it is in the interest of navigation to improve the levees on the Mississippi River, what blockhead would say that it is not in the interest of navigation to improve the levees of the Ohio River, where like conditions exist. The honorable chairman intimates that there is a report from the engineers recommending this improvement, which I understand is true. A delegation of some of the best men in Shawneetown appeared before your committee a few weeks ago, and on their return they stopped at Cincinnati and consulted the engineers who made that survey, and they were informed by them that they had made a favorable report recommending the proposed improvement. I have not been able to get this report, but I understand that such report was made.

Mr. Chairman, I had a talk with the chief of the engineering division, as I shall show by and by, concerning this improvement. To be pointed about the improvement I speak of, it is on the Ohio River at Shawneetown, and here are the conditions there: It is a project of the United States, in the first inception. Shawneetown was laid out by the Government of the United States in 1808–9. A land office was established there, whereby all of the land in that whole Territory was sold to the people. A town was established there by the Government of the United States more than a century ago, a town at which the Government entertained the great Lafayette when he visited America while on his noted trip down the Ohio River; a town where Gen. Thomas Posey, the aid-de-camp of Gen. Washington, is buried; a town the oldest in the State of Illinois; a town where John McLean, the first Senator from the State of Illinois, is buried; a town lying in the bend of the Ohio River, with one of the best natural harbors on that river or any other river; a town located in one of the richest valleys in the world, and I challenge the productive Mississippi to surpass it; a town that yields bountifully to the skill of the industrious farmers, who surround it, the choicest wheat, corn, and other farm products; a town which affords to the people of that country access to railroad facilities connecting the interior of the State with the great Ohio River; a town which if cut off from the Ohio River cuts off the people from water navigation. There is a valley on both sides of the river—an extensive valley—some 5 or 6 miles wide.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Just for a question. I have only a short time in which to get this matter before the committee, but I always yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to know why the gentleman wants to put a harbor in there, unless there is some commerce going out and coming in?

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, there is an immense commerce.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have an engineer's report stating that the commerce is being driven off the Ohio River by the railroads, and that there is no more commerce on the Mississippi River. There is not a through Mississippi line of steamers from St. Louis to New Orleans and no through line on the Ohio.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not talking about through steamboats on the Mississippi River. I do not know whether there are any through steamboats from St. Louis to New Orleans—but I am informed there are—but I do know there are steamboats plying on the Ohio River from Memphis to Cincinnati. I do know that there are steamboats plying on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers up as high as they can navigate, from Florence and Nashville to Evansville, on the Ohio River. I do know that there are steamboats plying on the Ohio River from Cairo to Paducah and from Paducah to Evansville. I do know that our people in a great measure depend upon these local steamboats not only for their freight transportation on these rivers but for their mail facilities also. I do know that towboats carry millions of bushels of coal from Pittsburgh to New Orleans annually. I do know the freight traffic is immense and increasing. I do know from April 1, 1913, to December 31, 1913—nine months—the freight on the Ohio River was 8,618,369 tons, valued at $71,064,229. I do know the gentleman is not correctly informed on this subject.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOWLER. I beg pardon of the gentleman, but only one more question. I want to state my proposition.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to know if there is a single line of through steamers on the Ohio River.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; from Memphis to Cincinnati—the Lee Line, from Memphis to Cincinnati.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How often does a steamer go up and down that river?

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, they ply up and down that river often. They have some four boats, and they ply up and down the river, passing my own town, two or three times a week, up and down.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How much is the tonnage of each boat?

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, they are so big that you could see them a hundred yards. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, not to trifle with the gentleman's question, they are immense steamers, carrying hundreds of tons of freight as well as passengers. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to suggest to the gentleman that if he will look up the reports of the Ohio River he will see that it compares favorably with almost any carrying river in any part of the country.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have a report here which shows that the Ohio is the greatest coal river in the world, but the railroads are driving it out of the coal business.

Mr. FOWLER. Here is the condition I was trying to get before the committee: Shawneetown lies in a vast valley, where the river, when it overflows the banks, stretches out for 5 or 6 miles wide. For a stretch of 80 miles up and down the river, during high water, Shawneetown is the only place with a safe harbor at which boats can land. It is the only place to get freight from the country to the Ohio River or from the Ohio River to the country. In other words, it is the only refuge of safety for the people. Those are the natural conditions. It is really nature's harbor ordinarily, but in high water it is a harbor because of the levee. Without the levee there is no harbor for a distance of 80 miles, but with the levee we get access to the Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad and the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, Beardstown and Shawneetown division, both of which terminate at Shawneetown.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. What is the estimated cost of this proposed improvement?

Mr. FOWLER. One hundred thousand dollars. My proposition is to aid in the conserving of commerce and navigation by raising this levee. It is as much in the interest of navigation as the building or improving of any harbor or levee on any river in the United States. It is as much in the interest of navigation to strengthen and raise that levee as it is in the interest of navigation for like improvements in any other part of the United States on any other river, and it is just as meritorious. I will say to this honorable committee, as the levee proposition on the Mississippi River or the harbor proposition on the Hudson River, the Connecticut River, or any other river in the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield to the gentleman if he will get me a little more time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Perhaps I had better not take up any more of the gentleman's time.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the good chairman of this committee to think I am assailing him——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Because he is one of the most conscientious men I ever met. [Applause.] I could not pay him a tribute too high, for if there is a man who has ever commanded my highest respect and my heartiest handshake, the chairman of this honorable committee is that man. [Applause.] So I have no fight with him; I am fighting for a proposition equal to that of any other proposition in this bill. On the question of this levee proposition one of my colleagues has handed me a copy of the Floods and Levees of the Mississippi River, and as perhaps I have not read it before it might get me into a snare, but I will take the chance of snares when my proposition is laid by the side of any other proposition in this bill. It says:

> It is obvious that levees are upon a large portion of the river essential to prevent destruction of life and property by overflow. They give safety and ease to navigation, promote and facilitate commerce and trade by establishing either banks or landing places above the reach of floods, upon which produce can be placed while awaiting shipment, and where steamboats or river craft may land in time of higher water.

This is a report from the Mississippi River Commission. I thank the gentleman [Mr. COLLIER] for his kindness. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident to all thinking men that harbors and landing places are as necessary as the rivers in order to secure water transportation. The drift of civilization in America is to establish communication which will be rapid and cheap, and the policy of this Nation is to improve the watercourses which will afford easy communication, because it is the cheapest communication. Were it not for the rivers and lakes of this country, I doubt, sir, if the railroads were not checked by

the Interstate Commerce Commission, that a condition of oppression would fall upon the people of this country which they never have dreamed of before; but with the rivers and lakes to compete with the railroads of the country rates are held down and the people get cheaper commerce than they possibly could get in any other way.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of this country, the policy of every political party in this country, is to improve what? To improve the rivers themselves for navigable purposes, the harbors for landing purposes, and the levees to conserve life and property. Without levees, harbors, and landing places commerce is destroyed in many instances, thereby rendering streams useless. Commerce on water is impossible without harbors and landing places. Levees are often necessary to protect harbors and perpetuate them, and it is as necessary to maintain levees as it is to maintain rivers. A river without harbors and landing places is like a boat without a rudder.

Mr. Chairman, the Government laid out Shawneetown, sold it to the people, and made a town out of it. The first great flood which we had was in the year 1832, and the Government started in with a systematic plan to protect the country and the town and the harbor, and from time to time appropriations have been made by the Government to build and maintain this levee, aggregating the sum of about $80,000, all told. The State has also made appropriations for like purposes. The citizens of the town have taxed themselves to the constitutional limit, having expended $250.000. They have done more; they have contributed from their private means, without calling upon the Government for aid. But now the proposition is too big for them, because the levee must be raised 3 feet and widened at the base. While they are still willing to tax themselves for this purpose, yet they are unable to raise sufficient funds to carry on and complete the work. If the work is done now it will cost less money, for within the near future, if high waters continue, it will be impaired in weak places, which can be prevented by proper attention now.

The people of this rich valley can not afford to lose this harbor; the Ohio River can not afford to lose it; the country can not afford to lose it. In 1898 an angry flood swept down like a mighty hurricane against the levee on the upper side of the town and plowed a mighty gap through that part of the levee, something like 50 to 75 feet deep, carried a portion of the town away in its madness, and destroyed 25 or 30 lives of the citizens of the town. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Government repaired that gap. It was a great project. Gen. Bixby never did a better job in his life. It has stood the storm of all high waters since that time, unharmed, and I believe it will stand there for all time to come. Give me Gen. Bixby at the head of the engineering work and I will build a levee at Shawneetown and make a harbor there for all the people, not for Shawneetown alone. I will make it for the people who navigate the Ohio River, to transport their commerce to the Southern States and back to the Northern States. It is not a sectional question at all—it is a national question. Talk about sectionalism in this Congress. Why, we might have had something of that kind in the past, but civilization has reached a high level, wherein the consciences of men have been so schooled that statesmen come here and legislate for all the people alike and not for a part of them. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAHAN). One minute.

Mr. FOWLER. I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that if this levee can be raised 3 feet higher and strengthened at the base in some portions, it will cost more than $100,000. But that is the amount I have asked for in my bill. If you will give us that amount, we will furnish the remainder and make it as strong as Gen. Bixby made the gap that was caused by the angry floods in 1898. I do not ask you, gentlemen, to give it to me, but I ask you to give it to the Ohio River for improvements thereon, the same as you give to other rivers and other harbors and other levees in this country. I ask it in the name of justice. It is only because my harbor proposition has a levee proposition with it that I was turned down. If the banks had been high enough, without the aid of a levee, and the harbor then stood in need of repair, I would have had no trouble whatever in securing aid at the hands of this committee, but simply because a levee is connected with the improvement of the harbor, I was unable to secure recognition in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, we appropriate much money for river and harbor purposes. This bill carries many thousands of dollars for that purpose. Give me $100,000 for the Ohio River at Shawneetown, and I will then go home and tell my people that you are the best and wisest statesmen in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman from Washington like to proceed now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can use some time. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the rivers and harbors bill now under consideration carries a provision of much interest and great importance to the whole State of Kentucky, and especially to that portion of Kentucky which lies in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. I refer to that provision which indorses the expenditure of four and a half million dollars for the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland River from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., and which makes immediately available for that purpose the sum of $340,000. This sum will be used in purchasing four lock and dam sites in the State of Tennessee and six or eight lock and dam sites in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes. When these sites are selected and locks and dams built thereon it will complete the canalization of the entire upper Cumberland from Nashville to Burnside. There are now seven locks and dams in the Cumberland River in the State of Tennessee above Nashville, and a site already selected for the eighth lock and dam.

On the Kentucky side we have but one lock and dam, namely, Lock and Dam 21, 30 miles below Burnside, Ky. The sites for all the new locks and dams on the Kentucky side will have to be selected and paid for, and as much as is necessary of the $340,000 to which I have made reference will be used for that purpose.

In the political campaigns down in the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky there has been much contention as to whom credit is due for Lock and Dam No. 21 below Burnside. Many of the followers and partisans of former Congressman D. C. Edwards have been vociferous in their claims that credit is due to him alone for the appropriations with which to construct Lock and Dam 21. A little history of this matter will not be amiss.

Away back in 1882 Congress made provision for a survey of the upper Cumberland River to determine the feasibility and cost of improving it from Nashville, Tenn., to Burnside, Ky. The report of this survey also included the improvement of the Cumberland River to Smiths Shoals, above Burnside, Ky. The entire project, as later revised, provided for the construction of 28 locks and dams, also a minimum depth of 6 feet in the river for the entire distance from Nashville, Tenn., to the proposed head of navigation, a distance of 357 miles. Work on this project was commenced in 1888 and was continued at intervals up to February 26, 1906, when the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended that work on the locks and dams already begun should be completed and that the rest of the project be discontinued. Locks 1 and 2 on the Tennessee side had at that time been completed, while Lock 21 on the Kentucky side and Locks 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on the Tennessee side were under construction. Since February 26, 1906, Lock 21 on the Kentucky side and Locks 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on the Tennessee side have been completed, but it must be remembered that on February 26, 1906, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors said that they would not recommend any more money for any further improvement on the upper Cumberland River, either on the Kentucky or the Tennessee side, except to complete the locks and dams already begun. That there can be no chance of inaccuracy, I quote the following from House Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress, second session:

> On February 26, 1906, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after visiting the river and holding hearings to obtain full information, submitted a report (printed as H. Doc. No. 699, 59th Cong., 1st sess.) from which the following is quoted: "The board is of the opinion that the regulation of the river and * * * the completion of Locks and Dams Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, above Nashville, * * * is worthy of being continued by the United States, but that the construction of the locks and dams proposed between Carthage and Burnside, except No. 21, now under contract, is not at present justified by the commerce involved."

This shows that I am not mistaken in the statements I have made. This report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors made on February 26, 1906, put the upper Cumberland River on the "bum," so to speak, and not a single cent of money has been expended since that day, except on Lock 21, for the buying of a single site for any other lock and dam in the Cumberland River on the Kentucky side, nor the appropriation of a single cent for the construction of one. Congressman D. C. Edwards entered Congress on March 4, 1905, and remained in Congress for six years, or until March 4, 1911, when I succeeded him. He had been in Congress a few days less than one

year when the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, on February 26, 1906, reversed the policy which the Government in 1882 had undertaken and had had up to February 26, 1906, continuously under way, namely, the construction of enough locks and dams in the Cumberland River (28 in number) to make the river navigable the year around from Nashville to Burnside, Ky.

Mr. Edwards was a Member of Congress for six years. His first term began on March 4, 1905, and his last term ended on March 4, 1911. Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter was the man in Congress just prior to the first term of Mr. Edwards. Dr. Hunter became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1903, and continued in Congress for two years, or until March 4, 1905, when Mr. Edwards succeeded him. It was Dr. Hunter who succeeded in inducing the Fifty-eighth Congress to begin the improvement of the upper Cumberland below Burnside by appropriating $74,000 for this purpose. Dr. Hunter was a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, while Mr. Edwards was a Member of the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses. So in the Fifty-eighth Congress $74,000 was appropriated by Congress to locate and begin the construction of Lock 21 below Burnside, Ky. The rivers and harbors bill carrying an appropriation of $74,000 became a law on March 3, 1905, before Mr. Edwards became a Member of Congress. Then, to Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter is due the credit of securing the $74,000 to begin the construction of Lock and Dam 21. On June 3, 1906, March 4, 1907, and June 25, 1910, Congressman Edwards secured $120,000, $30,000, and $85,000, respectively, to help complete Lock and Dam 21, but in the meantime, on February 26, 1906, just a little less than a year after Congressman Edwards came into office—he came in on March 4, 1905—the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reversed the policy of constructing locks and dams in the upper Cumberland, which policy had been inaugurated in 1882 and continued for a quarter of a century, and decided that Lock 21, which had already been partially appropriated for, would be the only lock and dam on the Kentucky River below Burnside that they would recommend for construction.

It has been the policy of the Government to begin at the mouth of a river and build locks and dams from the mouth up, and not from the head down. This accounts for the fact that, while the Government in 1882 decided upon the policy of improving and canalizing the entire upper Cumberland and adhered steadfastly to that policy for a quarter of a century, no Member of Congress from the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky was able to get any money appropriated to begin building locks and dams at the upper end of the river below Burnside, Ky. And this, too, notwithstanding the fact that the eleventh congressional district during all this time was represented by a Republican Representative, and notwithstanding the further fact that during the last 16 years of this period, or down to March 4, 1911, the Republican Party was in power in the Nation, with Republican Presidents in the White House, supported by Republican Congresses.

During the Republican rule Democratic Members of Congress from the State of Tennessee had gotten from Republican Congresses appropriations sufficient to build and construct Locks and Dams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn. These appropriations, all told, will amount to more than $2,000,000. Republican Members of Congress from the eleventh congressional district were just as able men as those from the State of Tennessee, and just as faithful to their trusts, but they were unable to induce the Government to break its precedent of improving its navigable rivers from the mouth up and not from the head down, and it remained for Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter to break this precedent by inducing Congress to appropriate during the Fifty-eighth Congress $74,000 to start the construction of Lock and Dam 21, below Burnside, Ky.

It is almost an impossible task to get Congress to make an appropriation to build a lock and dam in any stream unless the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommend such construction. On February 26, 1906, they said in a report that the commerce in the upper Cumberland was not sufficient to justify the Government in expending more money in constructing locks and dams in the upper Cumberland on the Kentucky side except to complete Lock and Dam 21, as I have heretofore poiated out. This report of February 26, 1906, was made during the first year of Congressman Edwards's first term in Congress, and during the remaining five years he was a Member of the House he was unable to get the Government to reverse itself. He was unable to get any money appropriated to start any new locks and dams in the upper Cumberland.

When I became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1911, I found the upper Cumberland still under the ban, the Government refusing to start any new locks and dams there. All those conversant with the situation and interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland knew that we never would get Congress to appropriate any more money for the purpose unless we could get a favorable report from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to that effect. Realizing our dilemma, those interested in the improvement of the upper Cumberland set to work to see if they could get the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to reverse itself and report favorably instead of adversely upon the further canalization of the upper Cumberland. The first logical step in this matter was the introduction of a resolution before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, and accordingly the following resolution was introduced before and passed by that body:

*Resolved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, United States*, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the river and harbor act approved June 13, 1902, be requested to reconsider its previous reports on Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn., and to make a further report with recommendation as to the desirability at the present time of constructing one or more locks and dams above Lock and Dam No. 7.

On December 5, 1912, the said board granted a hearing here in Washington to those interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland, and Congressman CORDELL HULL, who represents the Tennessee district on the Cumberland River just south of the Kentucky boundary line, myself, and others appeared before that board and made arguments for the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn. We urged that the commerce in the upper Cumberland and the isolation of our people from railroads and the lack of transportation facilities fully justified the Government in spending the money to improve and canalize this stream. We asked for a new survey of the upper Cumberland.

The board granted our request and instructed the local engineer, Maj. Burgess, who is stationed at Nashville, Tenn., to make a complete survey of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., which he did, making his report on December 30, 1913. Maj. Burgess made a most thorough and exhaustive examination of the advisability of a complete canalization of the Cumberland River between those two points and reported favorably on that project. He estimated that it would cost the Government $4,500,000 to complete the canalization of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn.; that four new sites for locks and dams would have to be secured on the Tennessee side and six or eight on the Kentucky side, and that to purchase these sites and construct the necessary locks and dams would cost about $4,500,000, and that it ought to be done at the expense of the Government. The division engineer differed from Maj. Burgess, the local engineer, in this: The division engineer recommended that the canalization of the upper Cumberland ought not to be undertaken by the Federal Government unless the State of Kentucky and the State of Tennessee would undertake to pay half of the expense of it, or, in other words, $2,225,000. Those interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland knew that the States of Kentucky and Tennessee would never do this, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on January 28, 1914, kindly granted us a hearing on this proposition. A pretty complete delegation of Senators and Members of Congress both from the States of Tennessee and Kentucky appeared before the board on that date and made arguments in favor of the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland at Government expense. I am one of those who made an argument upon that occasion. I do not believe I can present to this House any more clearly the justice of our cause or the needs of our people than I did before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. With your permission, I will give you the substance of what I then said:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the board, you have been very patient this morning in listening to this long hearing which we have had. I will, therefore, try to be as brief as possible. I was born and reared up in that section of country which we have been discussing this morning, and I know something of the natural resources of that section of territory. I have no question to raise about the jurisdiction or authority of this board in any sort of sense. I can appreciate that if it was estimated to take, say, $15,000,000 to properly canalize this stream, that this board could not afford to recommend, or the Government to undertake, a thing of that character and magnitude. I can understand the position of you gentlemen on that matter, and I think you are right about it. I am a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and we could not do without this board or some similar board. It is indispensible to the proper placing of money over the country to improve the various river systems, harbors, and all that in the Union. As I understand it, the real question here is as to whether or not there is enough commerce, or will be enough commerce, in this immediate section to authorize or to justify the Federal Government in expending four and a half millions of dollars to properly canalize this river. As I understand it, that is the real question about which you gentlemen are concerned.

Col. BLACK. That's the question, sir.

Congressman POWERS. I shall not enter into a discussion at all of the local engineer's report. That matter is before you, and you have those facts and those figures. I will confine my remarks to a few outside matters. It has been said here that this section of the country

is one of the richest in coal and timber in the entire Union, and I think that is correct. It is true that in some of these lower counties here, where this river is to go through, the estimated value—the assessed value—of the property is small. It is small for the reason that they have no outlet for the wealth which they actually possess. That is the reason that the assessed value is so small, because in its present condition it isn't worth so much. I was reared up in Knox County. That is, not in this immediate section, but in southeastern Kentucky. I was reared on Brush Creek, and I remember when the citizens there were glad to get $5 and even less an acre for their coal lands. Lots of them were almost glad to give it away, because they were so poor they couldn't pay taxes on it even. Railroads have gone up into that territory and have bought that land that they were glad to sell at $4 or $5 an acre. To-day you can not purchase it for $100 an acre; and that coal-land leases for 10 cents a ton royalty, and they bring to the owners of that land as high as $1,000 an acre just on the royalty. It is almost impossible to calculate what the value of these lower counties will be when they can once get an outlet for the products which are actually there.

Milton H. Smith, the president of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., said a few years ago that Harlan County in 10 or 20 years would be the richest county in the State outside of Jefferson and possibly one or two others; that the county of Harlan, now with a population of less than 10,000 people, in 20 years would be the richest county in the State, with these two exceptions. Railroads have now gone into that county, and all that country around in there is now being developed. With proper transportation facilities, the same thing will be true of this lower country here. Within the last 10 years Bell County has doubled its population. According to the census of 1900 Bell County had a population of 15,701, and according to the last census it has a population of 28,447. Bell County is a little up above. It is not in this immediate section; but I am showing you what will be done in these lower counties when they once have the transportation facilities that Bell County enjoys. Bell County's population has doubled within the last 10 years. Railroads have gone up those streams, and coal mines, blast furnaces, commerce, and population are springing up everywhere.

Bell County borders on Knox County. Brush Creek, the creek on which I was reared, lies in Knox County. It is 10 or 15 miles in length. It runs through one of the richest territories in Knox County. It is now rich in coal and at one time was exceedingly rich in timber. This Brush Creek Valley comprises an area of over 10,000 acres. It is worth millions of dollars. Many, many years ago one man owned all this territory. As part of the folklore of the territory it has been handed down to us that the former owner of this now princely domain sold the entire territory for a bedquilt and a rifle gun. Time, the construction of a railroad through that territory and up that valley, the opening up of divers coal mines, the establishment of as many coal plants, with their expensive equipment, the shipping out from that territory of large quantities of one of the best domestic and steam coals on the market, have told the story of the advance in price of that territory from a flintlock rifle and a homemade bedcover to its now many, many millions of dollars. Until just a few years ago it had no outlet save a muddy, hilly, and rocky wagon road and the fitful tides of a meandering watercourse. But things have changed.

Greasy Creek lies over in Bell County. It runs parallel to Brush Creek and just across the Brush and Greasy Mountain from it. The tops of the Brush and Greasy Mountain is for many miles the dividing line between Knox and Bell Counties. My father's farm extended to the Bell County line. Within the last few years a railroad has made its way up Greasy Creek, and coal-mining plants and coal-mining operations are now doing a thriving business in that rich field of undeveloped resources

Kentucky now stands fifth in the coal-producing States of the Union, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and Ohio alone being ahead of her. The entire State of Pennsylvania, the State that stands far, far in the lead in the production of both bituminous and anthracite coal, has but 14,200 square miles of bituminous coal territory, while eastern Kentucky has 10,270 square miles and western Kentucky has 6,400 square miles; and yet Pennsylvania produced 161,865,488 short tons of bituminous coal in 1912 and 84,361,598 short tons of anthracite coal, while Kentucky produced no anthracite coal at all. She has none to produce, and produced only 16,490,521 short tons of bituminous coal. There was produced in the entire United States in the year 1912 only a little over 500,000,000 tons of coal. The State of Pennsylvania produced over 246,000,000 tons, or nearly half of this. The State of Pennsylvania produced in 1912 over 160,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, while the State of Kentucky produced only 16,000,000 tons; and yet Kentucky has 16,670 square miles of bituminous coal, while Pennsylvania has only 14,200 square miles.

The eastern Kentucky coal field, with its 10,270 square miles of bituminous coal territory, produced in 1912 only 8,617,192 short tons of bituminous coal, while the State of Pennsylvania, with its 14,200 square miles of bituminous coal territory, produced in the same year over 160,000,000 tons of the same coal. Why is this? The reason is not hard to find. Pennsylvania has reasonably adequate transportation facilities; Kentucky has comparatively none.

To show you what Kentucky can do, when she has but moderate transportation facilities, let me cite the county of Bell, one of the counties in my district, as an example. I remember when, but a few years ago, there was not a foot of railroad in the entire county—not a bushel of coal produced for transportation. That was just a few years ago. Capital, however, was not content to leave untouched the rich resources of that splendid county. Of the 8,000,000 tons of coal produced in 1912 in the entire eastern Kentucky coal field Bell County alone produced over 2,000,000 of this.

I have outlined in a way the resources in coal of the eastern Kentucky coal field, and cited Bell County as an example of what we may in a measure expect from the lower Cumberland country when the Cumberland River is canalized from Burnside to Nashville. The counties of Wayne, Clinton, Cumberland, Russell, and Monroe will all be heard from.

Now, with reference to these lower counties here: While it is true that they are not quite so rich in coal, still they are rich. I wrote the local engineer awhile ago (Maj. Burgess) and suggested to him that if there were any facts connected with this upper Cumberland that it was in my power to give him I would gladly do so, and he said in his reply, "I would like to have an estimate of the coal and timber up in that section of the country." I immediately wrote to my precinct organization and asked my managers to send me an estimate of the amount of coal and timber in their particular voting precincts, and I got as many of those estimates as I could and sent them to Maj. Burgess. Later I got a letter from him saying that in some way they had been misplaced, and he asked me if I had a copy of them. I was unable to furnish him with a copy, as I did not have them, but I sent some telegrams down there to those lower counties recently and asked them to give me an estimate of the number of acres of coal and timber in those respective counties, and here is a letter from Mr. W. A. Dicken, of Clinton County, in which he has this to say:

"Your telegram received, and in answer will state: Several of the business men have been together, and we have made as careful an estimate of coal and timber lands as possible. We estimate the number of acres of coal land in this county to be 7,500 acres; average thickness of veins, 4 feet. The coal in this county is of a good quality. We estimate the number of acres of timber to be from 20,000 to 25,000. The timberlands furnish poplar, cedar, oak, chestnut, walnut, hickory, ash, dogwood, gum, etc. Besides the timber and coal there is an enormous amount of chickens, eggs, and produce of all kinds produced in this county. I don't know how to estimate the quantity of timber in this county, but will state that there is an enormous quantity of it. Hoping that we will get some relief for the marketing of our productions, and that the Government will see that it is impracticable and improbable for the people of this section to bear any part of the expense of the canalization of the Cumberland River, and wishing you the greatest success in all your undertakings, I am,

"Yours, very truly,

"W. A. DICKEN."

They have underestimated the number of acres of timberland, because from the census of 1910 the number of acres of woodland in that county is 51,367 acres and the standing timber that is not exactly woodland 283,200 acres in this county of Clinton. Doubtless they have been too conservative, too, in estimating the coal.

Cumberland County is one of the counties that this river goes through. According to the census of 1910 there are 95,341 acres of woodland, absolutely woodland, while there are 185,760 acres of standing timber. Of course some of it, you know, is cleared in part, and that is what is meant by standing timber; but 95,000 acres is woodland.

Take the county of Monroe. It has 86,945 acres of standing timber. And Russell County is another one of these counties, and it has 80,666 acres. Wayne County is another one of these counties right along on this river next to Burnside. It has 17,818 acres of woodland, forests.

Now, you can see something of the value of the resources of this country when it is once developed. Of course, as it now stands and as it has stood for many, many years, those people are away back there off of the railroads, and there is no river transportation. Their coal isn't worth anything to them. The same thing was true up in my section. There was a day when the people would virtually give their coal lands away to keep from paying taxes on them. Their land was of no service to them at all. And that is the reason why this assessed valuation is so small, because there is no outlet for the products that they actually have.

Col. BLACK. Are these coal lands in those counties?

Congressman POWERS. Yes; in Wayne, in Clinton, in Cumberland, and in Monroe. There are none in Russell County. I think one of the counties down there hasn't any coal, but it has 80,000 acres of woodlands altogether.

Now, as to the State paying any part of this money, they will never do it. I know what I am talking about. They will never do it. You take the Mississippi River country, away down there where those floods overflow. Why, those States down there are not putting up any of this money except one, and that is the State of Louisiana, and that is only an insignificant part of it. Those States as States, as I understand it, haven't done it. At any rate, these are the facts that were brought out at the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee. As States they have not done a thing except one, and I think it is Louisiana, and that is a very inconsiderable portion.

Now, if those States down there, with their territory flooded by the angry waters of the Mississippi, destroying a material part of their actual possessions, won't put up any money to help defray part of the expense of preventing those overflows by means of these levees and all that, we can not expect Tennessee and Kentucky to do it in the case of the Cumberland River. Besides, these are mountain sections of the State, and, unfortunately, there has long existed a prejudice on the part of one section as against the other; and as to the legislature appropriating any money to do this, it will never do it, and it is just as well to kill the project as to expect or ask it. Of course we would prefer—speaking for myself and for my people—to have this report go in that the Government would do it if the local communities or State would do half of it than to have the board say that the thing is unworthy, because we would have no foothold then; and while it would mean the same to us now, and possibly would always mean the same to us, at the same time it would be more easy to get a foothold hereafter if the board reports favorably with this cooperative provision included than to say that the whole thing is unworthy of improvement at all. But this, gentlemen, is a worthy project, and we have many equities in our favor.

Now, you take many of the rivers of this country. They have railroads running alongside of them, and, notwithstanding that fact, this Government appropriates money—millions of dollars—to improve those streams. We have a proposition now concerning the Sacramento River in California, and I think it is a worthy project, and I am going to cast my vote for it. It developed in the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that there are five railroads running through that section, and many of them up and down this stream. These people have railroad facilities to get their stuff to the markets of the world, and yet, notwithstanding that, the Government is appropriating its money to canalize that stream and to make it navigable. We have no railroads in this Cumberland River country here. We are absolutely cut off. A territory there in Kentucky and Tennessee as big as the State of Connecticut hasn't a foot of railroad in it. We have no way of getting to the world at all. It would not be so necessary if we had railroads; we would then have some means of transportation. But we have neither railroad transportation nor water transportation—no transportation but wagon-road transportation—and unless this Cumberland River is open 12 months out of the year it wouldn't help the coal business in that country.

Coal plants have either got to run or not to run. No man would get coal territory and set up a coal plant and operate for only four or five months of the year. He wouldn't think about doing it unless he could get transportation all the year round. He couldn't afford to operate six or even nine months and then shut down. So it is absolutely necessary for him to have river transportation 12 months in the year. Coal will constitute one of the principal industries in that country if it is ever in a position where it can get its coal to the market. These people have been cut off down there. Their population hasn't increased virtually any for the last 20 years. I have the figures

here. Clinton County in 1890 had 7,000 population; 1900, 7,000; 1910, 8,153—and for the simple reason that they are down there and they are cut off. They can not get to market with any of their products. Their coal is worth nothing to them except just to supply their immediate needs. Their agricultural products are worth nothing to them except to subsist upon. But if you will ever once give them an outlet, then we will be able to tell you a different story. And those people down there have been cut off for all these years. It is a lamentable situation. It has been a lamentable situation for all of southeastern Kentucky. You have heard a good deal about that section of the country in the newspapers and in magazines and elsewhere. Why, there is no way for them to get out. You know that running along eastern Kentucky there is the Appalachian Mountain system, a great barrier to progress and civilization which in early times migrated westward. There was no way for my ancestors to know the difference in possibilities between that section, which has no arms to the sea, no lakes, no navigable rivers, no way of getting to the world, no way for them to know the difference, I say, in the possibilities in that section of the country and the great Ohio-Indiana-Illinois district. Civilization couldn't come to us from the East. It had to come down the Ohio, and then eastward into the State and eastern counties. Only within the last few years have railroads been traversing that great rich storehouse. In the improvement of the Cumberland below Nashville, I am informed, the one idea that they had in view was this rich coal field—this rich timber in eastern Tennessee and in eastern Kentucky.

The Government has paid out of its own pocket, without an iota of expense to Tennessee, for the improvement of the Cumberland River south of Nashville. I say the National Government has paid all this money for the improvement of the Cumberland River up to that point. In other words, it has gone through that section of the country where the people were most able to contribute half of the expense; and now, when the Federal Government has improved this stream up to the point where it really reaches the coal and timber and things valuable to the country, improved it on its own hook and responsibility, when it is ready to reach out and grab the thing that the country and the world needs, then to say "hands off; we can't proceed any further unless the State or counties put up half of the expense," it is doing a great injustice, gentlemen, not only to the people along the lower Cumberland, but an injustice to the people up there who are so poor that they couldn't put up money if they would. There is no way for those poor counties up there to contribute any of this money themselves, and the State won't do it, and it is up to the National Government. Why, you take this little county of Clinton that I am calling your attention to here. There was born within its boundary lines Hon. Shelby M. Cullom, from Illinois, the grand old man from that State who is now at death's door in the city of Washington. There was born in that county Gov. McMillan, of Tennessee, and Gov. Preston H. Leslie, who was once governor of the State of Kentucky and was governor of one of the western States. There are just as good people up there as there are in the world. Far removed from the marts of trade, far removed from the great industries of the world, they are nevertheless the purest and the greatest reservoir of old Anglo-Saxon blood in this country. We ask you, gentlemen, if you can see your way clear to do it, to open up this field. We know we have the coal there, and all we ask is an opportunity to get it to the market. I thank you.

I do not know that I can add to what I then said. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after hearing the arguments made before it, recommended to the Chief of Engineers of the Army that the entire upper Cumberland be locked and dammed at Government expense. I want to insert here as part of my remarks the report made by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors through its senior member, Col. W. M. Black, to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1914.*

From: The senior member the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.
To: The Chief of Engineers United States Army, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Report on Cumberland River, Lock 7 to Lock 21.

1. The board has the honor to submit its report in response to the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, United States*, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the river and harbor act approved June 13, 1902, be requested to reconsider its previous reports on Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn., and to make a further report with recommendation as to the desirability at the present time of constructing one or more locks and dams above Lock and Dam No. 7."

2. The question of improving the Cumberland River above Lock and Dam No. 7 has been considered a number of times, and the general physical and commercial conditions have been covered in reports now before Congress. The more recent of these, which bear directly upon the improvement now under consideration, are published in House Documents No. 699, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, and No. 632, Sixty-first Congress, second session.

3. Upon receipt of the resolution quoted above the board requested and later obtained a preliminary report from the district officer, dated October 29, 1912, covering the questions to be considered at the present time. That report contains an exhaustive discussion of the historical, physical, and commercial data available up to that time. A hearing was given in the office of the board on December 5, 1912, which was followed by a recommendation for a survey, the report of which bears date of December 30, 1913. These reports are full and comprehensive, and it is not considered necessary to go into details at this time. The essential facts obtained are as follows:

4. The distance covered by the survey from Locks Nos. 7 to 21 is about 171 miles, the fall being 127.5 feet. The original slack-water project for this reach provided for the construction of 13 locks and dams, while the present survey indicates that the number may be reduced to 10 without undue flooding of the banks. The estimated cost of the improvement is, in round numbers, $4,500,000 for first construction and $50,000 per year for operation.

5. It appeared from information furnished by parties in interest that the commercial statistics heretofore reported for this section of river were incomplete and more or less unreliable. This led to a more thorough investigation of the subject, in which the district officer was assisted by the Cumberland River Improvement Association. Data now available indicate that there is a commerce on the upper Cumberland amounting to about 300,000 tons, which is considerably more than heretofore reported.

6. The district officer goes into considerable detail regarding the difficulties and hardships experienced by the people living adjacent to this section of river, due to the entire lack of rail transportation, the uncertain and intermittent facilities afforded by the river, and the large annual flood losses of timber and farm products stored on the banks awaiting a favorable stage for shipment. He also outlines the advantages and benefits that would result from better water transportation. He is now of opinion that the extent of the present traffic and the likelihood of a considerable increase following the completion of the slack-water system justify the construction of the additional 10 locks and dams required, provided, however, that the States of Kentucky and Tennessee shall bind themselves to pay all damages arising from flowage, as well as the cost of ascertaining the same.

7. The division engineer does not think that the work is justified by the commercial benefits to the general public, but he states that the present inquiry discloses important benefits to the locality that indicate the propriety of requiring local cooperation, such as is often obtained from a community where it is furnished an effective transportation line. He is of opinion that the additional work should not be undertaken except on the condition that the States of Kentucky and Tennessee, or the local communities affected, shall contribute one-half of the estimated cost of construction. Otherwise he concurs with the district officer.

8. In addition to the information contained in the reports of the district officer and in those heretofore submitted, the board has given consideration to statements and arguments made at a hearing given at its office on January 28, 1914, which was attended by Hon. Ollie M. James, United States Senator; Hon. John K. Shields, United States Senator; Hon. Cordell Hull, Hon. Swagar Sherley, Hon. Harvey Helm, Hon. A. O. Stanley, Hon. A. W. Barkley, Hon. J. W. Byrns, Hon. J. A. Moon, and Hon. Caleb Powers, Members of Congress; Mr. W. E. Myer, and Mr. B. L. Quarles, all of whom addressed the board. Attention is invited to the record of the hearing forwarded herewith.

9. The section of country tributary to the Cumberland River between Locks 7 and 21, covering a very large area, is practically without any economical transportation facilities, and it appears from statements made at the hearing that there is no prospect of any railroad entering this section, not, however, on account of any lack of freight. A large part of this area is covered with timber of high value within hauling distance of the river, but under the existing uncertainties of navigation it can not be economically marketed. Much of the land in the valley and back in the hills is fertile but can not be cultivated to advantage for the same reason. There are also extensive coal lands that can be made tributary to the upper reaches of the river by short-rail connections, and it is claimed that these lands will be developed and that coal will be shipped out in large quantities. Much stress has been laid upon the fact that the United States has undertaken the improvement of both the upper and lower Cumberland by locks and dams, where the country has the benefit of rail transportation, leaving unimproved the section now under consideration, which is without rail facilities or the prospect of having any.

10. The amount of commerce at present is not extensive when considered in connection with an expensive slackwater improvement, and the amount that may be expected in the future is only conjectural, and it is believed that, measured by the usual standards applied in considering the question of advisability in such cases, it would hardly be sufficient to warrant a favorable recommendation. It is believed, however, that the present case is exceptional by reason of the vast territory affected, with no means of transportation, present or prospective, except by the river, and particularly because of the fact that Congress has undertaken the improvement of the river both above and below, leaving unimproved this section, the commerce of which must be largely looked to for justification of work already undertaken.

11. In view of the circumstances, the board concurs with the district officer and reports that in its opinion it is advisable for the United States to undertake the improvement of the Cumberland River from Lock 7 to Lock 21, as proposed by the district officer, at an estimated cost of $4,500,000 for construction, and about $50,000 annually for maintenance, provided, however, that the States, counties, or other local agencies shall bind themselves to protect the United States against any and all claims for damages due to overflow. The project should be subject to such minor modification from time to time by the Chief of Engineers as experience with the work indicates to be advisable. The first appropriation should be $340,000 for securing all lock and dam sites and for beginning construction of Lock and Dam No. 8, with contract authorization for $201,000 for completion of No. 8, and subsequent annual appropriations should be sufficient to permit the beginning of construction of two additional locks and dams each year.

12. In compliance with law, the board reports that there are no questions of terminal facilities, water power, or other subjects so related to the project proposed that they may be coordinated therewith to lessen the cost and compensate the Government for expenditures made in the interests of navigation.

For the board:

W. M. BLACK,
*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Senior Member of the Board.*

I want also to insert a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to Hon. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I have the honor to be a member:

CUMBERLAND RIVER ABOVE NASHVILLE, TENN.

[Letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, transmitting report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
*Washington, February 4, 1914.*

SIR: Referring to your letter of February 16, 1912, inclosing a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, dated February 15, 1912, requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to reconsider its previous reports on Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn., and to make a further report with recommendation as to the desirability at the present time of constructing one or more locks and dams above Lock and Dam No. 7, I have the honor to forward herewith reports by the board dated December 23, 1912, and February 4, 1914, in response thereto, together with reports by the district officer, Maj. Harry Burgess, Corps of Engineers, dated

October 29, 1912, and December 30, 1913, submitted for the information of the board in its study of the question presented.

2. For reasons fully explained in its report of February 4, 1914, the board concurs with the district officer in the opinion that it is advisable for the United States to undertake the improvement of the Cumberland River from Lock 7 to Lock 21 by the construction of 10 locks and dams, at an estimated cost of $4,500,000 for construction and about $50,000 annually for operation and maintenance, provided, however, that the States, counties, or other local agencies shall bind themselves to protect the United States against any and all claims for damages due to overflow, the project to be subject to such minor modifications from time to time by the Chief of Engineers as experience with the work may indicate to be advisable. The division engineer is of opinion that the improvement should not be undertaken except on the condition that the States of Kentucky and Tennessee, or the local communities, shall contribute one-half of the estimated cost of construction.

3. After due consideration of all the facts available I concur with the views of the district officer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The first appropriation should be $340,000 for securing all lock and dam sites and for beginning construction of Lock and Dam No. 8, with contract authorization for $201,000, covering the completion of this lock and dam. Subsequent appropriations should be sufficient to permit the beginning of construction of two additional locks and dams each year.

Very respectfully,

EDW. BURR,
*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Acting Chief of Engineers.*

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,
*Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,*
*House of Representatives.*

The Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which, as I said, I am a member, in reporting the rivers and harbors bill to the House—the one now under discussion—recommend, in the language of the bill, the "improving of the Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn.," in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document. So the Rivers and Harbors Committee have indorsed the complete canalization of the Cumberland River from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., at a cost of four and a half million dollars, to be paid for by the Government, with $50,000 annually for maintenance; and the present bill carries an appropriation of $340,000 to purchase all the sites for locks and dams from Lock 21, below Burnside, Ky., to Lock 8, above Carthage, Tenn., and for other purposes, as was recommended both by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers of the Army.

I have no doubt but that the House will pass this bill and that it will soon become a law. The upper Cumberland is now on its way to complete canalization. After the sites have all been selected and secured, which I hope to see done in less than a year from the passage of this bill, the work will be pushed as rapidly as possible until the last lock and dam have been completed.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as well as the Chief of Engineers of the Army, recommend that after this year the Government undertake to construct each year thereafter one additional lock and dam in the upper end of the river below Lock 21 and one in the lower end of the river above Lock 8, so in a few years this work will be completed and the people in the counties along the Cumberland River from Burnside to Nashville will realize their dreams of over a quarter of a century. Yes; it is over that—much over that. They began to dream about it away back in 1820, as the following excerpts, taken from the report of Maj. Harry Burgess to the Chief of Engineers of the Army of date October 29, 1912, will show:

HISTORICAL.

As far back as 1820 appropriations were made by the States of Tennessee and Kentucky for the improvement of the Cumberland River. In 1822–1828 Congress made several appropriations, but no additional funds were provided until 1871, when, after a lapse of 33 years, appropriations were again made and a more regular and systematic improvement was commenced. These funds, as they became available from time to time, were applied in constructing riprap retaining walls, removing gravel bars and rock ledges, and confining the low-water flow to selected channels by means of wing dams, all with a view to extending the boating season and rendering navigation safer.

22. In 1882 provision was made by Congress for a survey of the upper river to determine the feasibility and cost of improving it from Nashville, Tenn., to Burnside, Ky., by the construction of locks and dams. The report of this survey also included the improvement of Smith Shoals, above Burnside. The entire project, as later revised, provided for the construction of 28 locks and dams, to provide a minimum depth of 6 feet for the entire distance from Nashville to the proposed head of navigation, 357 miles. The cost of this work was originally estimated at $8,500,000. Work under this project was commenced in 1888, and has been continued at intervals when funds were available up to the present time. In all, Congress has provided $2,914,000 for the project of canalization from Nashville to Burnside. Under these appropriations Locks and Dams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 21 have been completed and placed in operation.

23. On February 26, 1906, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after visiting the river and holding hearings to obtain full information, submitted a report (printed as H. Doc. No. 699, 59th Cong., 1st sess.) from which the following is quoted:

"The board is of the opinion that the regulation of the river and * * * the completion of Locks and Dams Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, above Nashville, * * * is worthy of being continued by the United States, but that the construction of the locks and dams proposed between Carthage and Burnside, except No. 21, now under contract, is not at present justified by the commerce involved."

24. This recommendation resulted in a modification of the project, limiting the scope of the work originally contemplated. The present approved project provides, therefore, for continuing open-river or regulation work from the head of the pool formed by Dam No. 7 to Lock No. 21; but the only work now being done under this project, or contemplated, is the removal of snags and the cutting of overhanging timber.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors have recently reversed the report of February 26, 1906, and so, after long waiting, much anxiety, and many disappointments, the people of the upper Cumberland are about to come into their own. I congratulate them—the sturdy, honest, liberty-loving people that they are—that the dawn of their commercial redemption is drawing nigh.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, previous to my membership in Congress probably as frequent a kind of misinformation as any that I obtained had to do with the annual appropriations of rivers and harbors. The published information which has reached the public has almost invariably been of a critical nature, so that the mind of the average citizen, dependent on the public press for his knowledge of matters pertaining to rivers and harbors appropriations, has been poisoned against this expenditure.

A bill carrying as many items as an annual river and harbor bill does naturally will have certain ones in it which, however meritorious they may be, will be open to the criticism of the public if not fully aware of the conditions surrounding the appropriations. It is therefore comparatively easy to make a general criticism against this legislation based on a speaker's possible personal antipathy to certain special features.

Although I knew that my predecessor was for many years one of the influential members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and from my intimate acquaintance with him realized that his attitude toward legislation would be on the broad ground of public benefit, I nevertheless imbibed some of the prevailing critical views toward this legislation in general.

A year's service on the committee has entirely removed this impression. Whatever may be the result of the passage of the pending bill in this Congress, I wish here and now to express my small token of praise in behalf of the chairman and my colleagues on the committee for their invariable breadth of consideration, careful study of the projects, and accurate decisions as to their relative value. In this bill careful study has been given to the merits of the projects, and the final recommendations are based upon these investigations.

During the time the gentleman from Florida has been chairman, as well as during the time the present Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] was chairman, it has been an established rule of the committee not to include projects unless they have been first favorably reported upon by the distinguished Board of Engineers. While all of their favorable recommendations are not accepted, no project is adopted which has not been favorably considered by this impartial and scientific tribunal. The claim of partiality and local favoritism is therefore entirely removed, and it would be difficult to conceive of any future Committee on Rivers and Harbors returning to the old system so long in vogue, but now entirely done away with and discredited. Possibly some of the prejudice against legislation of this character in the past few years has been the result of conditions existing previous to the adoption of the present method of framing the bill. [Applause.]

There are two questions to be considered in our minds: First, Should the National Government expend money for the purpose of improving the rivers and harbors of the country for navigation? Second, If this work is to be done, in what manner shall it be authorized?

I doubt very much whether advocates of no Federal work will be found very numerous. While we are frequently in doubt as to the proper relations between the States and National Government, it would hardly seem reasonable to expect that the commerce of the world entering seaports should be dependent

upon the enterprise of a State for proper facilities and depth of channel. This matter is absolutely Federal in its bearing, the State or local municipalities only being a factor so far as they voluntarily wish to contribute in order to secure more favorable terms and more generous appropriations through the Federal Government.

The question then arises as to the relationship between the Federal Government and navigable streams. The only opportunity for argument in this case might be where a navigable stream is entirely within the limits of one State, of which there are instances. But fair judgment and all court decisions seem to tend toward recognition of Federal authority and control; consequently the responsibility and expense.

We therefore come to the second question, in what manner shall the Government's money be authorized for river and harbor appropriations? I submit that the method in vogue is as nearly just and equitable as can be made. All proposed projects are first considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and, if seemingly meritorious, an examination and survey are ordered. These are made by the experts of the War Department entirely on a basis of merit from the scientific standpoint of engineers. The results are submitted to Congress and placed in the hands of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Hearings are held, and the committee, having this testimony and the scientific opinions of the Board of Engineers, are certainly in a position to pass impartial judgment. I therefore think, provided the recommendations of the committee are accepted, that the loud cry, perhaps getting less distinct as years pass, or favoritism and governmental waste can be refuted in the minds of fair judges.

It is not my purpose to take the time of the House to enter into detailed discussion of the many projects contained in this bill. Others more experienced and capable than I will do this. I do desire, however, to briefly refer to a few of the largest items carried in the bill, then to items carried which directly affect New England, and, lastly, to an item not included in the present bill, but of deep interest to the district I represent on this floor.

LARGE GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

There are several large items applying to New York and the Hudson River. The item of $750,000 for improving the Hudson River above the city of Hudson is a continuation of the project previously adopted in order to secure a depth of 12 feet at the lowest low water. A general depth of 12 feet has been adopted in the construction of the new barge canal, for which the State of New York has made very large expenditures.

The enormous amount of passenger and freight business on the upper Hudson, from the barge canal to New York City, is so well known that it is hardly necessary to refer to it. It is estimated that in 1912, 3,045,136 short tons, valued at $172,107,996 were carried.

The appropriation for East River is $500,000, and for Staten Island Sound, N. Y. and N. J., a like amount. A very enthusiastic delegation, under the guidance of the Member from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], led by Hon. John P. Mitchell, mayor of New York, occupied all of one day in presenting to the committee the merits of the various projects affecting their city. There are two objects in view: One is to remove certain serious obstructions in the harbor, and the other is to clear the East River sufficiently to secure a channel 35 feet deep in order to allow ocean-going steamers to go out of New York Harbor by way of the Sound rather than causing the congestion of what is called "going down the bay."

In addition, this will permit of the use of dock facilities along the line of the East River not now possible. We of New England are also interested in the development of this channel, as it is not now safe or possible for the largest vessels plying between Boston and New York to go through Long Island Sound and thence into the East River to New York.

During the course of the hearing Mayor Mitchell testified as to the desirability of the National Government appropriating money in aid of navigation and was disposed to refute critical statements that may have, from time to time, appeared in reference to river and harbor appropriations.

It hardly seems possible that there can be in the mind of any Member of this House a question of the advisability of such appropriations as may be deemed necessary for maintenance of New York as the leading port of the Western Hemisphere. It is for Congress to cooperate with the State in maintaining New York's supremacy, and I for one shall vote for all reasonable appropriations recommended for New York City.

The maintenance of a channel 35 feet deep at mean low water reaching the great port of Philadelphia should certainly meet with our approbation. The tonnage of Philadelphia is estimated for 1912 at 26,267,335, valued at $1,235,106,621. These figures of themselves speak louder than any words of description of the claim of Philadelphia for a liberal appropriation from Congress in the interest of navigation. [Applause.]

It is expected that opposition will develop to the appropriation for the purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. The Government has properly, I think, inaugurated a policy of inland waterways, a great intracoastal system from Florida to New England. One of the links is that from the Delaware River to the Chesapeake Bay, and while another route is possible it seems that the purchase of this canal at the estimate made in the bill would be a fair investment by the Government. Estimates of the value have been made by the Board of Engineers very much higher than that of the committee, so that a purchase at this price would be in the end a saving of large sums.

The port of Galveston stands second in the value of foreign exports of any in the country, and therefore is entitled to proper care and the expenditure of reasonable sums under governmental supervision. The total volume is approximately 4,117,524 short tons, valued at $509,181,480. The continuation of the construction of a sea wall protecting the harbor is very necessary in order to avoid the possibility of repetition of the great damage done there a few years ago.

You will hear from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] all the possible arguments relative to the great needs of the Mississippi River and country adjacent, so that there is no occasion for my repeating any of the arguments, even briefly, that will be submitted by him.

The enormous amount of navigation on the Ohio River and the great saving in shipments of coal are ample reasons for continuation of the work of constructing the locks and dams, of which six have already been completed and three are under construction.

Crossing the continent, we find appropriation is made for the continuation of the work on the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., and also a new project on the Sacramento and Feather Rivers. This will be expensive, but that it merits our recommendation is shown by the large amount of money the State of California and local interests are willing to contribute. It is somewhat similar to the work on the Mississippi in that while it is primarily a project in the interest of navigation, it is also one of flood prevention and reclamation.

These are some of the largest general items carried in the bill.

NEW ENGLAND APPROPRIATIONS.

The appropriation of $105,000 for Portland Harbor, Me., is for continuation of work that has been under construction for some years. This harbor does an immense amount of coal business, the commerce during the year 1912 amounting to 3,259,949 short tons, more than one-half of which was coal. The value of the commodities was estimated at $107,981,000. In addition to the freight they also do a very large passenger business, and during the year 1912 the passenger movement amounted to 1,454,238.

The harbors in Connecticut, including New London, New Haven, and Greenwich, receive various sums in accordance with the importance of the projects and the recommendations of the Board of Engineers.

BOSTON HARBOR.

The project for establishing a channel 35 feet deep for Boston Harbor is practically completed. A survey for a channel 40 feet deep was authorized in 1913. The people of Massachusetts feel that Boston Harbor is deserving of a channel that will accommodate some of the largest ocean-going vessels. Statistics prepared by the director of the port of Boston and the Boston Chamber of Commerce show the rapidly increasing commerce of the port.

The State of Massachusetts in 1911 appropriated $9,000,000 for the development and improvement of commerce of Boston. A very able board has charge of this expenditure, and already gratifying results have been shown from its work. The largest trans-Atlantic liners can be secured for regular trips in and out of Boston provided a sufficiently deep channel is obtained.

It is a source of disappointment that the survey for a channel 40 feet in depth was not completed in time so that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors could consider the acceptance of the project in this bill. It is hoped that a favorable report will be secured from the Board of Engineers, and undoubtedly in the next river and harbor bill an effort will be made to make an appropriation to commence this project so much needed for the development of the commerce of New England.

BEVERLY HARBOR.

The proposition to deepen the channel at Beverly Harbor to 24 feet is a deserving one, and the appropriation of $61,500, with a continuing contract for a like sum, should meet with our ap-

proval. Owing to local conditions, it would be much more satisfactory if we could see our way to make one appropriation of the amount of $123,000 rather than half as a continuing contract. The commerce at this harbor consists chiefly of coal and oil, but owing to the fact that the channel is not deep enough some of the larger vessels which would ordinarily enter there have been unable to do so. Consequently, the business has not been as large as the city would desire, although during the past 10 years the amount of increase in the tonnage of cargoes delivered at this harbor has been 346 per cent. During the year 1912 the commerce amounted to 325,063 short tons, valued at $2,173,365. Of this amount about 245,000 tons were of coal. The maximum draft that can be carried now at mean low water is 18 feet, and it is estimated that if the depth of this channel can be increased to 24 feet the larger coal and oil vessels will be able to enter the harbor at any time. This means the commerce will be materially increased, and that it will be of benefit to both the shippers and to business men in general. Local and State assistance will be liberally forthcoming, as much interest in this project is shown.

OTHER MASSACHUSETTS APPROPRIATIONS.

It is very necessary to continue the removal of the dangerous rocks at Pollock Rip Channel, Mass., as commerce bound for New England passes along this channel, and there is evidence that it will continue to be very generally used even after the opening of the Cape Cod Canal.

The improvement of New Bedford Harbor and Fairhaven is in accordance with recommendations of the board and at the earnest solicitation of local interests.

It can thus be clearly seen that the large items for Massachusetts are for thoroughly meritorious projects and are based on the needs of commerce of the respective ports.

THE CONNECTICUT RIVER.

Probably no stream in the country has received more preliminary study and attention and had less actual work done upon it than the Connecticut River above Hartford, and again it is a source of disappointment to the people in Connecticut and Massachusetts that no appropriation appears in the present river and harbor bill. The expression "watchful waiting" as applied to Connecticut River navigation was worn threadbare, became gray with age, and reached a condition of senility long before it was ever coined by our distinguished President for application to our nonactive foreign policy. It, perhaps, is as applicable, however, to the method of handling the Connecticut River navigation as to the Mexican policy of the administration. I might fittingly describe both as inanimate inertia.

The subject is such a vital one to a large portion of the district I have the honor to represent that I can not allow the matter to go unnoticed during consideration of this bill. Great interest in this question has been shown in both the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts. Much of the information which I will submit is taken from the report of the Connecticut Valley Waterways Board on an investigation of the Connecticut River, and the report of the Connecticut Rivers, Harbors, and Bridges Commission, the former a Massachusetts board and the latter a Connecticut board, authorized by the legislatures of their respective States.

The resolve passed by the Massachusetts Legislature and approved on June 13, 1912, reads as follows:

That the governor, with the advice and consent of the council, is hereby authorized to appoint three persons, residents of the Commonwealth, one of whom shall be a member of the board of harbor and land commissioners. The persons so appointed shall constitute a board to be known as the Connecticut Valley Waterway Board. The governor shall designate the chairman of the board. It shall be the duty of the board to investigate the subject of the improvement of the Connecticut River for the purposes of navigation and to report to the next general court not later than the 1st day of February all facts concerning the present condition and uses of said river; what investigations, reports, appropriations, and expenditures have been made by the United States and by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the navigation of said river and protection of the river banks; and what action, if any, should be taken by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the various municipalities bordering on said river or contiguous thereto, either in cooperation with the United States and the various corporations owning or controlling water rights or privileges on said river or without such cooperation, to carry into effect such projects as may be recommended for increasing the present facilities for navigation. The board may expend a sum not exceeding $2,500 to meet such expenses as may be necessary in carrying out the purposes of this resolve. The report shall contain data as follows:

"(a) The existence and establishment of both private and public terminal and transfer facilities contiguous to the navigable water proposed to be improved, and, if water terminals have been constructed, the general location, description, and use made of the same, with an opinion as to their adequacy and efficiency, whether private or public. If no public terminals have been constructed, or if they are inadequate in number, there shall be included in the report an opinion in general terms as to the necessity, number, and appropriate location of the same, and also the necessary relations of such proposed terminals to the development of commerce.

(b) The development and utilization of water power for industrial and commercial purposes.

(c) Such other subjects as may be properly connected with such project: *Provided*, That in the investigation and study of these questions consideration shall be given only to their bearing upon the improvement of navigation, to the possibility and desirability of their being coordinated in a logical and proper manner with improvements for navigation to lessen the cost of such improvements and to compensate the Government for expenditures made in the interest of navigation, and to their relation to the development and regulation of commerce.

The board shall receive such compensation as the governor and council shall determine.

I quote from the report of this board:

At the public hearings held in Holyoke and Springfield, Gov. Foss was present and spoke of the value of the development of inland waterways, of the urgent necessity for the opening of the Connecticut River to navigation, and of the tremendous commercial importance to the State of an unobstructed waterway from Holyoke to the sea.

It is impossible to mistake the sentiment of the cities and towns of the Connecticut Valley. At every hearing the board was welcomed by audiences both large and enthusiastic. Local speakers presented strong arguments, sustained by local statistics, to prove the need of the community for waterway transportation and its inevitable commercial advantages. In addition, letters were sent to the meetings by individuals and corporations in favor of the movement. The citizens of the Connecticut Valley are demanding not only in their own interest but in behalf of the commercial prosperity of the whole State the opening to navigation of the Connecticut River from its upper reaches to the sea.

I also submit the conclusions and recommendations of the Connecticut Valley Waterway Board so far as these recommendations applied to the subject under consideration:

The demands of the cities and towns in the Connecticut River Valley between Holyoke and the southerly boundary line of Massachusetts for ample facilities for navigation on the Connecticut River from Long Island Sound to the present head of navigation near the Holyoke Dam, in order that they may benefit by a saving in freight charges on coal, cotton, lumber, and other commodities which might be brought by water and on manufactured articles which might be shipped by water from this community should be urged before Congress. The State of Massachusetts, if necessary, should cooperate with the cities and towns in that section of the Commonwealth by making sufficient appropriations for defraying a part of the cost of doing such work as may be required by plans and projects which may be adopted by the Federal Government for providing such facilities for navigation.

The depth of water which should now be provided in that part of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke should not be less than that now available from Long Island Sound to Hartford. A depth of 12 feet would enable the class of barges which now pass through the new barge canal to proceed through Long Island Sound and up this river as far as Springfield and Holyoke. Whenever the present depth to Hartford is increased a corresponding increase should be made in the depth of the channel as far as Holyoke.

In any law enacted by Congress for the construction of a dam across the Connecticut River at any point thereon between the mouth of said river and the Holyoke Dam it should be provided that a lock be built in said dam of sufficient dimensions for the convenient passage of water craft. Plans for said dam should provide for a depth over the sill in the lock not less than the ultimate depth to be provided in said river between its mouth and Hartford.

Any law enacted by Congress for the construction of a dam across the Connecticut River at any point thereon between the mouth of said river and the Holyoke Dam which provides not only for the improvement of navigation but also for the development of power for commercial or other uses, should require payment to the Federal Government for the privilege granted.

It is recommended that in case any corporation duly authorized by Congress to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River at Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut, should fail to build the same, then the board of harbor and land commissioners, acting jointly with representatives of the State of Connecticut, shall investigate the matter and report to the general court such plan or plans as it may deem necessary or desirable for relocating and constructing said dam, with a lock therein, the work to be done by the State of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut, acting jointly, for the purpose of improving navigation on said river and developing and utilizing the water power at this locality. * * * The board recommends that the legislature adopt resolutions in favor of a full and complete development of the entire length of the Connecticut River in Massachusetts, and that the Commonwealth cooperate with the Federal Government in carrying into effect projects of improvement for the benefit of navigation and appropriate from time to time the necessary funds for use in connection with such appropriations as may be made by Congress for the improvement and development of the whole river in accordance with such plans and projects as may be adopted by the United States.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? What new barge canal is it to which the gentleman just referred?

Mr. TREADWAY. The large canal built across the State of New York deepening the old Erie Canal.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean to imply that it is open now?

Mr. TREADWAY. The work is being done, I understand. Is it not?

Mr. PLATT. It will not be open before 1915 or 1916.

Mr. TREADWAY. It will be long after that, I am afraid, before we get a corresponding depth on the Connecticut River at the rate we have been going of late years.

Mr. PLATT. Why not build a new canal straight across from the Hudson River to the Connecticut instead of expecting traffic to go 300 miles around through New York Harbor and the East River?

Mr. TREADWAY. I believe that would suit the gentleman's constituents better, and it would reach a section in which I am somewhat interested, too. It is not, however, a project at present in contemplation, so it will be necessary for us to con-

fine our attention to those actively before us, such as deeper waterways in New York and this very active proposition of navigation on the Connecticut River.

The great interest of the people of the section affected is thus readily recognized, and the willingness of both the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut to cooperate is very apparent.

DESCRIPTION OF CONNECTICUT RIVER.

The Connecticut River is about 345 miles in length, flowing between the States of New Hampshire and Vermont and across the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut, emptying into Long Island Sound. The head of commercial navigation under present conditions is at the city of Hartford, 52 miles from the mouth. The river below Hartford is under improvement, the project providing for a channel 100 feet wide and 12 feet deep at mean low water; boats of 10 feet draft are now regularly maintained. The city of Holyoke, Mass., is 33 miles above Hartford, Springfield being 8 miles nearer Hartford than Holyoke. The places principally affected are Springfield, West Springfield, Chicopee, and Holyoke, besides small towns along the river both in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The population of Springfield at the last census in 1910 was 88,926; Holyoke, 57,730; Chicopee, 25,401; and West Springfield, 9,224.

It will not be necessary for me to describe the various examinations and surveys, with the accompanying reports of engineers, that have been made extending over a good many years, as these matters have all been previously referred to on this floor. The last survey was authorized in the river and harbor act of 1913. The preliminary examination for that survey was made during the summer of 1913, and has been duly approved by the officials of the War Department. It will appear later why the final survey has not as yet been referred to Congress.

The river may be divided into three sections between Hartford and Holyoke.

The first, 11 miles from Hartford to Enfield Rapids; the second from the Falls to a low dam 5 miles above, where there is a canal with locks owned by a private company, capable of passing a boat 80 feet long and 18 feet wide; the third is from the Enfield Dam to the foot of the rapids below a dam at Holyoke; distance, about 16¼ miles.

The committee is so thoroughly convinced of the justice of a Government appropriation for Connecticut River navigation that the chairman and a majority of the members inspected the river last October, and while no official vote has been taken as a result of that visit I fully believe the personal inspection was all that was needed to convince them of the necessity of as prompt action as can be consistently secured.

The conclusions of the preliminary examinations made by the district officer last year are that—

In view of the large and important commerce that may be expected to result from its improvement I am of the opinion that the Connecticut River between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass., is worthy of improvement by the Federal Government, if a channel of adequate depth can be secured in connection with the development of power, at a reasonable cost, and I recommend that such detailed surveys and estimates as are necessary to determine the cost be authorized. As extensive data is now available, no general survey of the river is considered necessary.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very much interested in this particular part of the gentleman's remarks. I want to ask whether there is any dam between Holyoke and Hartford?

Mr. TREADWAY. There is one and I will refer to that in just a moment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I thank the gentleman. I want to hear about that.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say that I have not made an extensive reference to that dam from the fact that in a previous Congress the matter was referred to, and a full description of the company controlling the dam and the present water power developed from it is of former record. Rights were secured from the General Assembly of Connecticut by a charter in 1824 to build a dam and locks. This company is still in existence, but it is now a part of the one to which I will refer later as anxious to construct suitable locks and dam for the present needs of the section.

The Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers concur with the district officer and division engineer in recommending "A survey in order to determine the extent and advisability of such improvement as may appear practicable in conjunction with any power development at Enfield Rapids that may be authorized by Congress."

For my part, rather than the policy of "watchful waiting" I prefer that of "patient perseverance," and that has been the characteristic of the friends of Connecticut River navigation.

At various times the question of authority between the Federal Government and the State government over waterpower on navigable streams has been at issue, but this has been cleared up by the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States against Chandler Dunbar Water Power Co. A unanimous decision written by Mr. Justice Lurton was handed down on May 26, 1913.

In the last Congress a power proposition was added in the Senate to the rivers and harbors bill, but was not accepted in conference. The reason why it was not adopted in conference was the expectation that one of the first acts of the new administration would be the establishment of the policy of the Government in the relation of power projects on navigable streams and the attitude of the Government toward Federal or State control thereof. A year has elapsed and we are still watchfully waiting the inanimate inertia of the Democratic administration which is so sorely testing our patient perseverance.

The time has arrived when this question must be met. The Connecticut River is typical of numerous streams throughout the country where thousands upon thousands of horsepower are daily running to waste. The old saying is more true to-day than ever, "That the mill will never grind with the water that has flowed by," in that with the modern appliances the transmission of power over long distance is a reality. I have already stated that it is a source of regret not to have this appropriation in the present bill, and the reason is the delay in the adoption of this policy. We have had frequent announcement during the year that this matter was under consideration, but the first actual indication of life came a few weeks ago in the letter the Secretary of War wrote to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in which the policy of the President was outlined. It is profoundly to be hoped that the committee's evident desire to provide such legislation as the administration wishes relative to the Panama Canal tolls question and the so-called control of big business may not entirely obscure the pressing need of power-control legislation.

It is not alone for navigation that this legislation is needed, but for conservation of the great natural resources of our navigable streams for power development. It is the most distressing waste of energy from which the country is suffering to-day, and one which should be checked with all possible haste.

Let me call attention how this general proposition applies particularly to the Connecticut River.

Nature provides the possible development of 35,000 horsepower in a thickly populated territory having large manufacturing plants, within a limited area, in need of electrical energy. These plants employ several hundred thousand people, who could thus secure cheaper light and heat. All this can be obtained without any expense to the Government and absolutely controlled by it within proper bounds. In connection with this, at a cost to the Federal Treasury small in comparison to the benefits received therefrom, navigation can also be secured serving this large population. Taking all this into consideration, is it any wonder that a loud call goes up for the prompt enactment of the necessary legislation?

To particularize on this last statement, let me say an ably financed company stands ready to accept such terms as the Government and State may designate to build the necessary locks and dam near Enfield or Windsor Locks, an estimated expenditure of about $5,000,000, and turn these over to the Government free of all cost in return for the right to manufacture electric energy under conditions prescribed by the State or Federal authorities. It seems to me that every possible condition is favorable to the public welfare. The only Government appropriation asked for in this transaction would be a sufficient sum to secure a channel, say, 12 feet in depth, from Hartford to Holyoke.

As recently as March 9 the Secretary of Commerce delivered an address before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences on the development of American commerce, in which he made this reference to Connecticut River navigation.

There is a strong tendency in all parts of our country to develop more and more the commerce of our rivers, and when there shall have been established, as soon as we hope there will be, a satisfactory fundamental basis for the development of dams for power and navigation upon our navigable streams, we may look for marked progress. The time is not far distant when such cities as Springfield and Holyoke in Massachusetts will have direct steamboat connection with New York and when other of their sister towns in different States may also have the benefit of water competition.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. The cities of Springfield, Chicopee, and Holyoke are all above the rapids at Enfield, are they not?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And if the river is opened to navigation, there ought to be a very material reduction in the fuel cost for New England, and particularly for those three cities?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am about to present some brief statistics; but the subject to which the gentleman refers could be followed up in great detail to show the benefit that would accrue in freight rates through river navigation.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman going to deal with that question?

Mr. TREADWAY. Very briefly, in the next paragraph; and I thank the gentleman for calling attention to it at this time.

Mr. MOORE. The New England fuel bill is very extensive and suffers for lack of transportation facilities.

Mr. TREADWAY. I entirely agree with the gentleman, and the people of the section we are considering are great sufferers. The sooner we secure river navigation the greater the saving to the consumer of western New England.

I might quote almost endless statistics in support of Connecticut River navigation, but will not weary you therewith, only giving a few very brief ones, referring only to places within Massachusetts on the river.

The value of stock and material used in Springfield, Holyoke, Chicopee, and West Springfield for 1911 was $54,213,766. The value of the product of these four places was $99,489,139. The consumption of coal in these places, together with three adjoining towns, was 1,387,417 tons. The output of the paper mills alone in Holyoke in 1912 was over 112,000 tons. The total freight tonnage in 1912 was nearly 3,000,000 tons. It is estimated that the saving by water navigation on coal alone would range from 60 to 80 cents per ton, and on all commodities from 10 to 15 per cent.

I think those are the statistics the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] wished, and I am sorry I have not the time to give them more in detail.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I could continue at great length upon the crying necessity for this development, upon the long and arduous struggle the proponents of this legislation have made, upon the need of prompt establishment of the Government's policy in relation to power development upon navigable streams, but I feel that I have taken sufficient time of the House and am willing to rest the case on the evidence submitted. I assure you this question will be further advocated when the next river and harbor bill comes before this body, and we fully expect to secure an appropriation commensurate with the merits of the proposition. In the meantime, I earnestly advocate the passage of the present bill, which while it does not carry an appropriation for the most deserving project in the United States, the absence of it is through no fault of the present Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] consume?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire particularly at this time to call to your attention that portion of this bill which provides appropriations for the continuance of the work on the Mississippi River. I had hoped, and I believe that a great majority of the people of the Mississippi Valley had hoped, that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would in this Congress and by this time have approved and recommended to Congress a project that would mean the building of the levees of the Mississippi River in such a way that there would be established for all time to come, with, of course, the usual necessary repairs from time to time, protection of the property, the farms, and the homes in that valley, which have suffered so greatly from the flood waters of that great river.

I can not conceive, Mr. Chairman, of anything of greater importance that this Congress could do than to authorize a project that would mean a completion of the work that has been done in piecemeal as regards the levees of the Mississippi River. I care not especially what project is approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee or which might be the one that Congress should decide upon. I believe that the project advocated by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] is a most feasible and practicable one to bring forth and to enact into law at this session. That plan has been studied out most carefully by scientific men and United States Army engineers, and they most generally approve of the plan proposed in the Humphreys bill. What we want now is action above everything else, and I hope that we will get it at this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has appropriated considerable money from time to time for the improvement of the levees of the Mississippi River. The usual amount for that purpose is contained in the present bill, but this method of appropriating is not satisfactory to the people of the Mississippi Valley. They believe that the time has come when Congress should formulate and put into operation a plan that will permanently improve conditions. I urge upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House that they come to some decision at the earliest possible date as to what should be done about this matter. If none of the plans recommended by pending bills are satisfactory, then Congress should authorize the appointment of a commission of experienced engineers, both from the United States Army and from civil life, for the purpose of determining and recommending to Congress the best thing to do.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4296) providing for the selection of such a commission. That bill is now pending before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I also have a bill pending before that committee (H. R. 2462) providing for an appropriation to raise the levees and reclaim the swamp lands. This bill I introduced after full conference with the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. I have no special pride, however, in these bills that I have introduced, but would most gladly support any bill that would carry out the purposes that I have indicated and that are so necessary to the health, happiness, and prosperity of the people that I in part represent here. There is no longer any doubt as to the feasibility that the levees can be raised and the swamp land reclaimed. This has been tried in many other places with success, and the cost of doing this work would be very small when we compare it with the results that would be realized. There are now some 77,000,000 acres of swamp and overflowed land in the Mississippi Valley which can be drained and made suitable for cultivation. The total cost I have determined, from careful calculation, would be about $15 per acre. The present value of these lands runs from $2 to $20 per acre. When they have been drained and made suitable for permanent cultivation the value will be anywhere from $60 to $100 per acre, and in many instances it could be sold as high as $400 per acre. Consider these figures as an evidence of the importance of the project. These 77,000,000 acres, after drainage, with an average value of $60 per acre, would have a total value of $4,620,000,000. The present value of this land is only about $8 per acre, which amounts to $616,000,000.

The cost of draining this land at $15 per acre would amount to $1,155,000,000. The value of the land, plus the cost of draining, would be $1,771,000,000. The amount, therefore, that the land would increase in value by reason of drainage would amount to $2,849,000,000. This land would also provide homes for 1,925,000 families, and thus result in a real and substantial reduction in the cost of living by increasing production. Vegetables and provisions for the home and table could be raised on this rich and fertile land in the greatest abundance. We all recognize the need for reducing the cost of living. It is much higher now than a year ago. The Democratic Party claimed in the last campaign that it could solve this high-cost-of-living proposition in the interest of the people. They asked for the power to do so, and the power was given them. For over one year we have had a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, but the cost of living has not been decreased. While the new tariff law has been in force many months and while that party has had its way as regards the tariff law, the cost of living is higher; and, besides, mills and factories are either closed or partly shut down on account of it. This tariff law gives preference to foreign manufacturers by reducing or taking off entirely the tax that they have paid under former administrations. This policy of the party in power has thrown already more than 3,000,000 men in this country out of employment. These men are honest and industrious, and most of them skillful in their trades; yet they can not find work. Why? It is because their work has been taken from them and given to foreigners, who are now manufacturing with cheap Japanese, Chinese, Hindu, and so forth, labor that which we in America must buy to eat, wear, and to carry on business. We buy nothing any cheaper and the foreigners are getting our money. Our men are idle and our mills and factories are wholly or partly closed. Bread lines are now a daily scene in our cities, and soup houses, no doubt, will be here soon. In some places, it is stated, they are already to be seen. Experience is an expensive teacher. Let us hope that this renewed evidence of free trade and tariff for revenue only will be a lesson to the people of this country that will cause them to drive this party from power and control at the earliest possible date. The enactment of the present tariff law has been already shown to be detrimental to the interests of the American farmer, the American mill, the American factory, and to every American industry.

Mr. Chairman, as regards this tariff, Congress has legislated against our own people and in favor of Europe, Japan, China, India, and other foreigners. Now, let us do something for our

own people and our own country. Reclaim this vast area of land in the Mississippi Valley. This land would be most suitable for the cultivation of provisions and vegetables. It would also increase in taxable value, and the getting rid of these swamp lands would tend to the health of the Nation. It would banish mosquitoes and malaria from this section of the country; it would aid in the construction of good roads, and in many ways be of great benefit to the Nation. We should not continue appropriating without some definite plan fixed and agreed upon, but we should get down to the real proposition at once, which is the raising of the levees, the deepening of the channel, and the reclaiming of this swamp and overflow land. The people of the city of St. Louis are anxious to see this brought about at the earliest practicable date. We of that city recognize that this will be the means of opening up new avenues of trade and commerce for our products, which we so abundantly manufacture, and of which we are capable of supplying the needs of the 30,000,000 of people in our trade territory.

The people of my city are most willing to do their part in paying the bill to do this job. We now pay taxes on real estate and personal property to the amount of $615,745,890. We pay more than one-third of all the taxes for our State. Our city pays more taxes to the Government than all the rest of Missouri. We will pay more of the income tax than the rest of our State combined. Still, Mr. Chairman, we are willing to bear our share of these burdens and also help to provide the money necessary for this great Mississippi River undertaking. Our people are a noble, a patriotic, and a most industrious one. We are doing our part at all times, and often more, for the city, State, and Nation.

Let me call your attention to the report of the commissioner of labor statistics of Missouri for the year 1912, as showing the amount of our manufacturing industries, and therefore why we are anxious to see this new territory opened up. This report states that the total value of goods manufactured in St. Louis during that year was $345,657,438; that the total value of materials and supplies used by us amounted to $196,255,770; that the total amount paid by us in salaries and wages was $70,698,296; and that we paid for rent, taxes, and insurance during that year $18,267,134; that we expended for miscellaneous disbursements in connection with our manufacturing industry, $24,249,814; also that we employed in this work 86,903 men and 25,564 women, making a total of 112,467 men and women given work in our manufacturing business. Our total capital invested in this business amounted to $240,794,199; that the value of the ground and buildings was $59,016,163; and that the value of machinery, fixtures, and tools used in this industry was $53,637,508.

Mr. Chairman, I know of nothing that this Congress could do which would be of greater interest to my city than the enactment of a law that would mean the reclaiming of these swamp and overflowed lands of the Mississippi Valley by the raising of the levees and the deepening of the channel from St. Louis to the Gulf. As stated, we need markets for our goods. When we have additional markets we can increase our manufactured products. That will give additional employment to many women in the factories in our city, and give markets for goods raised by the farmers, a great quantity of which we would need additional for our increased population and also for use in our factories and mills.

Open up this swamp and overflowed land to cultivation and let us have the farmers to till the soil. Some one has said that there were more farm lands now available for cultivation than there were farmers to cultivate them; but I doubt that, and much less do I doubt that there would be any such land as this remaining idle. Then, Mr. Chairman, if we have not enough farmers, let us urge the immigration of farmers to this country. We need good farmer immigrants. We ought to encourage immigration to the country and to the farm. That is the section that needs it most. In the early history of Missouri there was a large immigration of Germans to St. Louis and to other parts of the State. They have made splendid farmers, and I would be glad to see more of them come. The farm lands in Germany are poor as compared with the lands that we can reclaim in the Mississippi Valley. Some people are to-day decrying further immigration to this country. I join with them to the extent that all persons who are defective, physically and morally, should be excluded. I can not favor, however, exclusion of good, honest people that do not come in those classes simply on the ground that they can not read or write. Many of the best immigrants we have had to this country would have been excluded with such a law in force. What we want are men and women of muscle and good minds to help develop the great resources of this Nation.

The recent announcement that it will not be many years before Germany can boast of a population of 80,000,000 should make us pause before cutting down our immigration figures. The last recorded estimate of the population of Germany was 64,903,423, while our population was 91,972,267, according to the last census.

Germany, however, supported its population on an area estimated at 208,830 square miles, while the United States has 3,616,494 square miles for its 92,000,000 people.

The wealth of the two nations apparently bears a more direct relation to the difference in population than to the difference in land area. Germany's wealth was recently estimated at $60,500,000,000, while that of the United States was estimated at $130,000,000,000.

So far as the relation of our population to the area of the country is concerned, we are behind every civilized country in the world. We should not talk about restricting immigration until our population is large enough to utilize the land economically.

Another great advantage, Mr. Chairman, that would accrue to the people of my city by the carrying out of this project would be to give us deep water from St. Louis to New Orleans. In other words, we could load our manufactured products at St. Louis in seagoing ships, send the goods on down the Mississippi to the Gulf, thence on through the Panama Canal, and thus deliver them to the western coast of North and South America at a greatly reduced expense, and thus enable us to sell at a less price.

St. Louis and Missouri would benefit greatly by reason of this shorter route for its products. St. Louis is to-day exporting some $50,000,000 worth of goods annually to South American countries. St. Louis will be nearer the western coast of South America when the canal is finished than any other manufacturing city. The export trade of St. Louis will greatly increase, and as its manufacturing industries enlarge and its product becomes greater so will the great agricultural sections of the Mississippi Valley feel this impulse and greater prosperity come to it also.

The one stumbling block to the carrying out of this great undertaking would be the repealing of the act of Congress providing for free tolls for American coastwise ships passing through the Panama Canal. That question will come before the House in a short time, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will stand by the action of the last Congress. I can not see any worthy excuse or necessity for the repealing of that act. I was in doubt about this question at one time, but a thorough study of it has convinced me that free tolls for our coastwise ships should stand. The Panama Canal belongs to this country and its people, and it should be used for their special benefit. Their money has made the canal possible. President Woodrow Wilson asks Congress to repeal the free-toll provision of the canal act. In his recent message to Congress on this subject he said, in part:

> I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

The President in this message furnished Congress no information as to how free tolls for American ships interfere with his foreign policy. I, for one, believing our country morally and legally justified in our previous action, and knowing the great advantages to my section of the country in having free tolls, can not agree with the President, and can not support him in this matter on his mere request, without information as to its necessity. It seems to me that this action of the administration is an abject surrender to Great Britain. The President spoke in favor of the action of the last Congress as regards free tolls on August 15, 1912, at Washington Park, N. J., in these words:

> One of the great objects in cutting the great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports; to allow all the farmers on what I may, standing here, call this part of the continent to find an outlet at ports of the Gulf or the ports of the Atlantic seaboard, and then have coastwise steamers carry their products down around through the canal and up the Pacific coast or down the coast of South America.
>
> Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it had passed the House—provides for free toll for American ships through that canal and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company. You see the object of that, don't you? [Applause.] We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.

The Democratic Party platform, upon which the President made his campaign for election, declared in favor of free tolls in the following words:

We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal.

We also favor legislation forbidding the use of the Panama Canal by ships owned or controlled by railroad carriers engaged in transportation competitive with the canal.

This question was debated quite freely in the last Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, and the action of that Congress showed that it was not only in favor of free tolls, but also that our action was not a violation of the treaty with Great Britain. Great Britain has not sent any complaint to this country of the action of Congress in that regard. At least Congress has been advised of no such action by Great Britain. It is of immense importance, of course, that our country should keep inviolate its treaty agreements and remain on friendly terms with Great Britain and other foreign countries, but I do not believe that the American people want this done to the dishonor of our own Nation. I do not believe that we should bow to Great Britain in this regard. I, as one Member of this Congress, will not bow to the will of Great Britain when we are right. I think more of the intelligence and patriotism of my fellow citizens and those whom I represent than to think that they would wish me to. On the contrary, I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters asking me to vote against repeal and not one asking me to vote otherwise. The following is a sample of these many requests:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 9, 1914.*

Hon. L. C. DYER,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

A resolution was unanimously passed at a large public meeting held here last evening urging that you oppose a repeal of the Panama Canal tolls bill, as in the opinion of the meeting it is helpful to American commercial interest and not in violation of any treaty I have seen. Requested to wire you to this effect.

O'NEILL RYAN.

The press of the country is most generally against repeal. The New York American, a Democratic newspaper, has an editorial of late date, similar to thousands of other papers, on this question, as follows:

President Wilson's appeal to Congress to accept the British position on the canal-tolls question and to repeal without consideration the legislation adopted for the encouragement of United States shipping, and for the release of the Pacific coast from railroad extortions, is not convincing.

The merits of the legislation asked for the President declines to discuss. He discussed it once during the presidential campaign and warmly applauded the law he now wishes repealed. But that was, perhaps, in his own phrase, only "molasses to catch flies."

Indeed, the President has never even argued the American side of the case with Great Britain. He has never sent to the British foreign office any communication defending the law which our National Congress enacted. He yields without putting in a defense of American rights.

His appeal to Congress sounds like the petition of a person in terror. The sturdy ring of confident assurance of his country's power, of proper reliance upon the dignity and self-respect of the Nation, which might be expected from the President of the United States is wholly lacking.

He begs the Congress to undo its own law, passed by a Democratic House and a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President, simply to make his path easier in impending diplomatic controversies. "I shall not know," he says, "how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure."

The foreign policy of the Wilson administration has from the first been its weakest part. But the proposition now that the Nation shall extricate the President from dilemmas into which bungling diplomacy has led him, by yielding up, one after another, fundamental national rights is preposterous.

How long will it be before the nations of the world will see in the United States a melon ripe for the cutting, and one after another present to the complaisant President claims which, without defense, he will satisfy for dread of further complications?

We appeal from the President to his party in Congress in this moment of menace to the national honor, dignity, and integrity.

The United States has had its periods of weakness, its times when neither in population, wealth, nor military preparedness was it fit to cope with an aggressor. But in no such dark and menacing moment did it show the white feather.

At New Orleans, on the soil of that State, one of whose Senators now fears to vote according to his convictions lest Great Britain object, Andrew Jackson defended the right of the United States to self-government, and became a Democratic President whom the historian Woodrow Wilson was forced to honor, though President Wilson fails to emulate him.

History recalls no instance of Jackson's abandoning a prerogative of the American Government through fear of foreign disapproval.

In the days of our Civil War, torn and bleeding as we were, exhausted with fratricidal strife, pouring out treasure and sacrificing human life in the struggle, we could yet quietly compel Great Britain to stop fitting out Confederate cruisers to harry our commerce, and put a decisive check to Napoleon's project of erecting an empire in Mexico.

Lincoln did not find even the colossal contest of the Civil War a reason to submit to foreign impositions and aggressions.

In 1895 Great Britain reached across the sea to take a slice of Venezuela territory. The United States was woefully deficient in military or naval preparedness, but a Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, interposed a firm but effective protest, and notified Her Majesty's Government in words that live:

"To-day the United States is practically sovereign upon this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition."

Great Britain called that "shirt-sleeves diplomacy," but it compelled respect. Oh, for a few weeks of Grover Cleveland and Richard Olney now!

The President's appeal to Congress is primarily an appeal to his party. Can it be possible that the Democrats will signalize the first year of their return to power, after a quarter of a century, by turning right-about face at the demands of Great Britain, by sacrificing the right to deal with domestic problems in accordance with domestic needs, by giving up without a struggle the chief advantage of the Panama Canal, which they built after other peoples had talked about it for 400 years, and by exposing the United States to the world as a Government that may be bullied with impunity?

This is what the Democrats of Congress will do, this is the position in which they will place their party and their country if they give acquiescence to the demands of President Wilson to-day.

Mr. William R. Hearst, a former Democratic Member of Congress and now the editor and owner of many Democratic newspapers and one time a candidate for President himself, made the following personal statement regarding the action of President Wilson:

Mr. Wilson, following the custom well established in England and her dependencies, has again delivered a speech from the throne to Parliament.

It is not unusual for the governor-general or other head of an English colonial government to urge the colonial parliament to do nothing which would offend the mother country, so Mr. Wilson follows accepted usage in this respect.

It is perhaps without precedent, however, that a representative of any British possession, no matter how dependent, should ask his people to sacrifice their own undeniable rights and their own unquestionable interests to propitiate the British Government and to save his personal face.

History does not relate any instance, when these States were actually British Crown colonies, that a governor appointed by the King had this much of shamefully mingled humility and hardihood.

Nevertheless, Mr. Wilson, President of these formerly free and one-time independent United States, has had this much impudence and this little patriotism.

If Congress retains any spark of self-respect or American independence, it will tell Mr. Wilson that his face is not worth saving—at least, not at the sacrifice of the public interest and the national honor.

If Congress has not enough patriotism to adopt such an independent attitude, it is time for all honest Democrats and genuine Americans to save their own self-respect by quitting a perjured party which no longer considers its own precedent, its platform pledges, or the public welfare.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Mr. Chairman, I want to do everything that is honorable and right to sustain the hands of the President of the United States. I would most gladly vote in support of the President's wishes to uphold the honor and dignity of this Nation in "ungrudging measure"; but never will I vote to uphold him in surrendering the established rights of this country to Great Britain. I refer to this matter of free tolls and the President's position at this time only in connection with the project I have long advocated of providing deep waterway from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico, and the reclaiming of the swamp and overflowed lands of the Mississippi Valley; for I recognize and believe that if the free-canal-toll act for American coastwise ships is repealed, that it will be a most severe if not a death blow to this great American deep-waterway project, a project that will aid our industries, provide new markets, create new agricultural lands, and establish new homes and the means for earning livelihoods for millions of good, honest, and industrious citizens of our country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECENT PROGRESS IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to reverse the usual order of these speeches and instead of telling what the committee ought to do I am going to tell for a minute what they have done in the direction of river improvement and the improvement of navigation.

The pending bill carries an appropriation of $2,000,000 for continuing the improvement of the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth. This is in pursuance of a project which has been approved and adopted for the permanent improvement of that stretch of the river. The bill also carries a proposition for the survey of the river between Kansas City and St. Joseph, with a view to beginning the improvement of the upper river. At this juncture it may be interesting and important for us to examine into the recent history of the Missouri River and legislation leading to its improvement. On the success of this project rests the whole policy of the country for the improvement of inland navigable rivers.

Improvements are now being conducted on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth under a well-considered engineering plan and on a scale which will demonstrate for all time the feasibility of improving inland streams for the purposes of commerce. The Government has given some attention to the improvement of the Missouri River from a period as early as 1838, but from that year to 1884 the work was of an isolated local character and carried on under separate districts. In 1884 a survey was made of the river from Sioux City to the mouth, with a view to a general plan of improvement.

The project was so large, however, and the cost so great, compared with the volume of commerce then existing which might be served by an improved river, that in 1890 the project was modified to embrace only a systematic improvement of the stretch from Jefferson City to the mouth. This work was under the Missouri River Commission, and about 9 miles of the river below Jefferson City were improved in a permanent way, and that improvement is still in place. It has lasted, practically without renewal or repair, for 20 years and has maintained a minimum depth exceeding 7 feet. This makes it entirely certain from an engineering standpoint that the method adopted of revetting the banks is the successful way to deal with the Missouri River problem. The Missouri River Commission was abolished by the river and harbor act of June 13, 1902, and after that for a few years nothing was done, except a little temporary patching of the banks and some effort made to keep the channel clear of snags. The river and harbor acts carried small appropriations for the Missouri River, usually of about $150,000, for the purpose of snagging and for maintaining the revetment work then in place. It was utterly impossible for boats to use the river without a general and permanent improvement extending over a long enough reach to justify the restoration of commerce. The United States Government sent Edward A. Schulz to Kansas City as division engineer, who prepared a very careful engineering plan for the permanent construction of a 6-foot channel from Kansas City to the mouth. This report was submitted to the War Department September 29, 1908. It was examined by the Chief of Engineers and approved, with some minor changes. On December 7, 1909, it was submitted to the House of Representatives as House Document No. 1120, Sixtieth Congress, second session. The river and harbor act of that session, which was passed March 3, 1909, contained no appropriation for the Missouri River. I entered Congress on March 4, 1909, and immediately took up the Schulz report and pressed it upon the attention of Congress. It provided for a comprehensive and scientific plan of improvement between Kansas City and the mouth, to cost $20,000,000, and recommended that it be completed within 10 years. During the summer of 1909 Mr. D. S. Alexander, of New York, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, went to Kansas City and personally examined the possibilities of the improvement of the Missouri River. As a result, he submitted to the House of Representatives on February 11, 1910, a report in which he says:

> This river has a continuous navigable length of 2,285 miles from its mouth, about 17½ miles above St. Louis, Mo., to Fort Benton, Mont.

Speaking of the Missouri Valley he says:

> The crop production alone of this area amounted in 1907 to 25,000,000 tons ,with a value of $500,000,000 while the meat products of four cities located on the river amounted to about 800,000 tons. In addition to this, the manufactures of four States through which the river flows or touches approaches nearly a billion dollars in value. That a large percentage of these commodities does not seek transportation by water, especially when the various railroads are unable to handle it expeditiously, must be due to the fact that existing conditions do not permit the river's economical utilization.

He recommended the adoption of the Schulz report, and says:

> With an improved river and reliable and easy navigation established, the growth of water-borne commerce would, it is believed, quickly develop, and the saving to shippers through cheaper rates by water, as compared with railroad rates, would in a few years exceed the cost of the improvement. Taking the shipments of Kansas City alone, and assuming that only 20 per cent of it would seek water transportation, there is abundant authority for the belief that at least 1,000,000 tons annually would soon be accommodated by an improved river. The improvement of the lower river would be undertaken and completed first, for the reason that no growth of commerce on a stream can be expected until it is open and improved to its mouth, in order to give an outlet.
>
> Moreover, the thorough improvement of this reach of the river would be an advantage not only to commerce, but large areas of land would be protected and reclaimed. This river is one of the most destructive on the globe. The local engineer reports that every change in velocity or direction of current means new erosion and subsequent partial deposit, causing untold loss in value of land and products. He estimates the bottom land threatened, or to be benefited, on this reach at more than 500,000 acres, worth in the neighborhood of $50,000,000, or two and a half times what the entire improvement is expected to cost.

The rivers and harbors bill of that year, as approved by Chairman Alexander, passed June 25, 1910, carried $1,000,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River and provided a special board of engineers to complete the plans in detail. On December 9, 1910, Chairman Alexander reported a rivers and harbors bill, but provided no appropriation for the Missouri River, because the report of the special board of engineers had not been transmitted to Congress. After the bill passed the House, but before it was considered in the Senate, Senator STONE succeeded in getting the report of the Board of Engineers sent to the Senate on January 13, 1911. This report was so favorable on the Missouri River project that on motion of Senator STONE an authorization was put in the bill of $600,000 to continue the work of improvement during the season. This authorization is the rivers and harbors bill of February 27, 1911. The money was afterwards provided by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in the sundry civil bill.

In 1912 the first river and harbor bill reported by a Democratic committee of the Sixty-second Congress passed the House, carrying $800,000 for continuing the improvement of the Missouri River. In the Senate the Reed-Burton amendment was added, providing for local cooperation. This was done against the advice of the engineering board and over the objections of the friends of the improvement of the river. In its original form this amendment would have made necessary another examination of the project and a further delay in its prosecution, but it was changed at the last minute so as to permit the continuance of the work. The bill became a law July 25, 1912.

The river and harbor bill of the next session was passed March 4, 1913, and carried $2,000,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River, with the specific adoption of the Schulz plan and the requirement that the work be completed within 10 years. The Reed-Burton amendment was dropped.

The present bill carries another installment of $2,000,000 toward the completion of the project. This makes a total of $6,400,000 appropriated for the improvement of the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth since March 4, 1909.

NATURE AND PROGRESS OF THE IMPROVEMENTS.

The improvement of inland waterways and navigable streams has only recently engaged the serious attention of the American business man as a factor in the solution of the great transportation problem. These rivers are of two classes: One, the small streams which have only a limited amount of water and which can not support a navigable depth throughout the season without a system of locks and dams to impound the water. The improvement of these streams means the turning of them into canals. The second class embraces large streams which have more water than is needed for navigation, but where the natural conditions do not maintain a permanent channel of uniform depth. The Missouri River is the best type of this latter class, and the solution of its problems will solve that of the others. This river runs through a soft alluvial bed. Its immediate valley is from 2 to 7 miles in width between the rock bluffs on either side. The depth of the alluvial deposit in this valley averages 70 feet from the surface to the bottom, running down to the bed of the rock or hardpan.

The soil consists of fine, soft, rich alluvial earth, which has been carried down by the river and deposited through the preceding ages. The banks are so soft that they can not naturally resist the action of the water, and the force of the current, if directed against a portion of the bank, will erode it very quickly. The matter thus taken from the banks by erosion is carried downstream in suspension until it is finally deposited in the form of shoals, sand bars, or accretions to the shore line at some point below. For nearly 900 miles, from Sioux City to the mouth, the average fall of the Missouri River is quite uniform. The effect of the river upon its banks varies with the stage of the water. When the river is high the current is usually more swift and the erosion is very rapid. With high water and a swift current the amount of matter held in suspension and carried downstream by the water is enormous. As soon as the river begins to fall and the current slackens the matter held in suspension by the water is precipitated very rapidly and the shoaling occurs, forming huge sand bars and making the channel very shallow over the wide crossings. This is the reason that dredging will not answer as a permanent method. It can be used only until permanent revetments are in place. Although the current in ordinary times is not very swift, being normally about 4 miles per hour, it is too strong even in times of low water for the soft, yielding banks to hold. If the Missouri River were perfectly straight and had a straight channel, the force of this great body of water would be tremendous. However, the river, under the wise dispensation of nature, puts brakes on itself. It has two sets of brakes. First it wanders from side to side of the valley through which it runs, forming long, winding coils, like a serpent. If, as sometimes happens, it cuts off one horseshoe bend and straightens itself by a few miles, the immediate effect of the acceleration of the current is to form another bend at some point which will lengthen the river again to its proper mileage. In this way the river has, within the memory of living men, moved its bed in many places a distance of from 2 to 7 miles. This shifting of the river bed has gone on constantly for ages, and while much of the matter which is cut away from one point is eventually deposited somewhere else, the land which is swept away is a total loss, and the new land which is formed at some other point does not become of any value for many years after its accretion. Thus the Missouri River bottoms, which, with those of the Mississippi River, are

the richest in the world, have been of little economic and productive value compared with their great possibilities.

The river has a second set of brakes which it employs by swinging its channel from side to side within its banks. The current impinges on one bank of the river and then swings across and possibly a mile and a half or two miles below will be found next to the opposite bank.

The wide spots in the river, which are called crossings, are generally shallow in times of low water, because as the river spreads out the current slackens and the precipitation of the sediment is very rapid. The spots next to the bank where there is a swift current are usually deeper and are known as pools. The river is therefore a succession of crossings and pools, and the bottom of the river would look like a succession of waves.

These three twists of the Missouri River are extremely puzzling to those who are not familiar with it by long experience. There is, first, the swinging of the river from side to side in its broad valley; second, the swinging of the channel from bank to bank; and, third, the undulating character of the bottom of the stream, which causes it to be successively narrow and deep or broad and shallow. The engineers have shown us that it is possible to harness this great river by working in harmony with nature. They find, first, that wherever the river impinges upon the bluff or any other firm bank its channel remains stationary. The whole problem is caused by the size and power of the stream and the soft and yielding nature of its banks. The improvement of the river, therefore, begins at a point where it touches the rock bluff and extends from there downstream. At the next point below on the opposite side where the current strikes the bank a revetment is placed consisting of a willow mat loaded down with stones. It has been found that this revetment will prevent the current from eroding the banks. If the revetment is placed in harmony with some general plan of the improvement of the river, above and below, so that the river can not cut in behind it or go below it, it will form a permanent rectification of the channel. As the current crosses the river and strikes the opposite bank it is necessary to place another revetment at that point, and so on downstream from point to point.

If these revetments are properly placed in harmony with some general plan that will permit the river to have the proper swing of its channel in times of both high water and low water, they constitute a continuous improvement, and the effect is to prevent the erosion of the banks, the accumulation of sediment in the water, and shoaling, thus causing a deepening of the channel. This effect is well exemplified in the stretch of 9 miles permanently improved below Jefferson City and in the portions between Kansas City and De Witt, which have been improved under the recent appropriations. It is necessary from season to season to go back over the work to see whether the river is responding to the rectification plans and to see whether proper play has been given in all cases for the increased force of the volume of high water. As the improvements progress downstream and the erosion of the banks is gradually stopped the deposit of sediment below declines in volume and the river responds more readily to improvement. No more new snags are formed, because no more trees are carried downstream from the caving banks. This in substance is what has been going on under the direction of the Army engineers during the last four seasons. They began at Kansas City, where the banks have been made permanent on both sides of the river and are pursuing their work downstream as rapidly as appropriations are furnished. They promised only a channel with a minimum depth of 6 feet, but the results have shown that the channel will be from 7 to 9 feet at the lowest water stage.

The work is now under the charge of a brilliant and experienced engineer, Maj. Herbert Deakyne, and the results accomplished by him have delighted the friends of river improvement.

On my inspection trip down the river last fall with the Government engineers, we took frequent soundings over the crossings. Whenever the leadsman would sing out "Mark twain," it would make us all feel good. "Mark twain" means 12 feet, which is deep water and a good channel for any river boat. I hope when the project is finished it will be "Mark twain" all the way from Kansas City to St. Louis. [Applause.]

The effect upon the Mississippi River of the improvement of the Missouri will be very important. The engineers tell us that the Missouri River carries annually into the Mississippi River 289,000,000 cubic yards of sediment. This enormous mass of soil is sufficient to cover an area of 40 square miles 10 feet deep. It constitutes one of the serious problems of the improvement of the Mississippi River, and this difficulty will be removed when the banks of the Missouri River are revetted so that erosion will cease.

BANK PROTECTION AND RECLAMATION.

While the primary purpose of the Federal Government in improving the Missouri River, or any other stream, is for the purpose of navigation, and the improvement is justified only upon the ground of the demands of commerce, yet it has an effect necessarily upon the riparian lands. This is especially true on the Missouri River, where the riparian lands have in many cases been almost valueless on account of the uncertainty of making a crop. None of the work on the Missouri River is designed for flood protection. This will all be taken care of by levee districts, which are formed by the riparian-land owners under the State law. Before a levee district can be formed, however, it is absolutely necessary for the landowners to know where the river bank will remain. Under past conditions they were utterly unable to build levees because after much expensive work had been done the river might the very next season shift its banks a mile or two and cut away large portions of the levee. If the banks were once permanently located by revetment work the adjoining landowners can take care of the levee situation, and while the cost will be heavy in proportion to the present value of the lands, their increased value will doubtless justify the cost. Of course our Missouri farmers are eager to have the improvements proceed as rapidly as possible, and I am glad to say that under the present businesslike way of going at the project the progress which is being made is substantial. While it can not all be done in one or two seasons, yet we can certainly exceed the record which has been made heretofore.

RESTORATION OF NAVIGATION.

I have quoted from Chairman ALEXANDER'S large and statesmanlike views of the possibilities of the improvement of the Missouri. How far has his opinion been justified by the actual restoration of navigation?

When the merchants of Kansas City first came to Congress and asked for the permanent and businesslike improvement of the Missouri River as a great artery of commerce they were met by the question: "Where is your commerce? Why have you no boats on the river? What is the tonnage now carried by water?" It was difficult for Congress to understand the practical impossibility of carrying freight as a commercial proposition on the Missouri River in its unimproved state. They could not understand that a stream which apparently had such a tremendous volume of water would in the busiest months of summer frequently show, over the wide crossings, a depth of only 30 inches or less. It was hard to see why it was impossible for boats to use any portion of the river unless a sufficient channel was open between two large shipping centers.

The Kansas City men went home and, with characteristic energy, raised by popular subscription a capital stock of $1,250,000, to be used in building boats adapted for the navigation of the Missouri River. All of this money was on hand, but up to December 31, 1912, they had used in the purchase and construction of boats and barges $312,000; in the construction of wharves and terminals, $19,000; in shipping yards, material, equipment, and so forth, $35,000; in all, approximately $367,000. They are engaged in valuable experiments to find the best type of boat for inland navigation and the best methods of handling river commerce, and are proceeding as rapidly as their experience in handling that line justifies. They are not disposed to make an empty showing by expending their money hastily in equipment which might prove unsuitable or by rushing in to invite a failure, which might endanger the whole cause of river traffic. Let us see, however, how even this policy of extreme conservatism has met with success. Last year was a season of great drought in the Missouri Valley and the stage of water was the lowest in many years. Notwithstanding this, the boats ran successfully all season, although they sometimes had to be loaded light in order to get over the shallow places where the Government improvements had not yet been made. On this account the business was done at a greater cost than should have been necessary if the boats could have been loaded to their full capacity and operated in a permanently improved channel. The secretary of the Kansas City (Mo.) River Navigation Co. writes me under date of February 24, 1914, as follows:

With the increased fleet capacity last season we expected to make a very much better showing, but unfortunately the stage of water was very low after July 15—the records show it the lowest of any year since 1891. After the drought began to have its effect on the river, thousands of bags of grain booked for movement by boat were hauled to the rail line because of our inability to handle them with reasonable promptness. At the same time thousands of tons of freight were diverted at East St. Louis after having been routed our way. In 1913 we handled 10,000 tons of freight, and more than this amount was diverted after July 15 because of our inability to handle it.

We had in service the passenger and freight steamer *Chester* and the towboats *Advance* and *A. M. Scott*, with seven cargo barges. All of the boats and barges are of steel and iron construction, the barges

being absolutely fireproof and as nearly unsinkable as is possible to build them. In fact, we do not know of any barges on the inland waters which are equal to ours.

Our steamers *Chester* and *A. M. Scott* are of the twin-screw tunnel type, and the towboat *Advance* of the stern-wheel type. The *Advance* is now undergoing extensive alterations, having new engines, boilers, and auxiliaries installed, so as to develop 450 to 500 horsepower—three times her present power. The steamer *Scott* develops 600 horsepower, and with the increased power of the *Advance* we will have two towboats either of which can handle any of our barges. This will provide a more reliable service, as either boat will deliver its load at the terminal and pick up whichever barge is ready for the return trip. In addition to this, we expect to operate the boats night and day during most of the season, so as to provide quicker delivery of freight and also to reduce the operating cost.

Of the seven steel barges in service last season three were only completed and delivered to us in July. We will have an eighth barge ready for service in the early spring.

Our rates are 20 per cent less than the rail rate between points which we reach. In addition to this, we absorb the switching charges on carload lots to houses which are served by rail tracks, so that delivery by our line is as convenient as delivery by rail, and the customer makes a net saving of 20 per cent between the rivers.

On the whole, we are pleased with general developments and feel assured of success. After operating on the Missouri River in its present condition we are very enthusiastic as to the possibilities when a channel of 6 feet minimum depth shall have been attained.

Under date of February 28, 1914, he also writes me, as follows:

On receipt of your telegraphic inquiry this p. m. as to freight capacity of our barges I wired you promptly as per confirmation attached.

Below are listed the barges now ready for service and freight-carrying capacity of each:

| | Tons. |
|---|---|
| Alpha | 1,000 |
| Beta | 1,000 |
| Gamma | 600 |
| Delta | 600 |
| Epsilon | 600 |
| Endeavor | 1,400 |
| Handy | 200 |

And we will have in service early in the coming season the barge *Delaware*, capacity 400 tons, which will give us a freight-carrying capacity in barges of 5,800 tons, in addition to which the packet *Chester* has a capacity of 390 tons of freight.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BORLAND. I am sorry I can not. I have but a few minutes.

Mr. PLATT. I simply wanted to know what was the matter with the Greek alphabet? Why did you not go on with it?

Mr. BORLAND. I read further:

The above figures, you will understand, are based upon full capacity—barges loaded to 6-foot draft—and there are times when the channel does not permit of capacity loads.

On March 3 I received the following letter from the secretary of the Kansas City Missouri River Navigation Co.:

Replying to your favor of the 27th, regarding classification of tonnage moved by our line last season.

Generally speaking, we handle an unusual percentage of high-class tonnage for a river line. During the seasons of 1912 and 1913 more than 50 per cent of all tonnage handled was third class and higher. This percentage of high-class freight will naturally be reduced as our volume of freight increases, but we do not anticipate any material reduction of percentage until such a time as our total freight exceeds 25,000 tons.

An approximate division of last season's tonnage is as follows:

| | Tons. |
|---|---|
| High-class merchandise (dry goods, pianos, etc.) | 5,000 |
| Groceries and drugs | 800 |
| Hardware | 1,200 |
| Lumber, cement, etc | 60 |
| Produce, hay, and feed | 140 |
| Grain | 2,675 |
| Miscellaneous | 125 |
| Total | 10,000 |

It might surprise some people to know that we handled last season for one firm 211 pianos, as well as several carloads of other musical instruments. We have also handled glass in car lots. In fact, most anything which moves by rail may safely be handled by water with such equipment as ours. This again emphasizes the necessity for modern terminals. Without proper loading and unloading devices it would be impossible to safely handle the higher classes of freight.

THROUGH CONNECTIONS.

This freight line has been successful in spite of the difficulties owing to the irregular depth of the channel. If it had the use of a permanent channel whose minimum depth was never less than 6 feet, it could load its barges to full capacity and haul more freight at a cheaper cost. The boat line has a small shipyard at the mouth of the Gasconade River where it lays up its boats for the winter. During the present month of March the boats are being got ready to put into commission for the present season, and they will soon be running again. The prospects indicate the biggest season in river navigation they have ever had. As the letters of the secretary show, up to July 1, 1913, there were only four barges in use. Three barges were added to the fleet the 1st of July, but this was at the time of the low water when full use could not be made of them. During the coming season there will be eight barges in use throughout the season, and it is safe to say that they will more than double their tonnage of freight. It is planned this season to connect at St. Louis with a barge line for New Orleans. This will be especially convenient and important to the grain trade of the West and Northwest. Barges can be loaded with grain at Kansas City and taken through to New Orleans without unloading. This will not only reduce greatly the cost of handling but will relieve the congestion of the railroads at the time when grain is ready for shipment.

EFFECT ON FREIGHT RATES.

The effect of an improved river on freight rates is not confined to the river cities, but reaches back into the interior and benefits the whole producing country which might by any combination of rail and water traffic use any portion of the improved river as a route to market. The Interstate Commerce Commission recognizes the fact that whether all of the freight does or does not seek a certain line of carriage yet if it may use that route the reduction of rates must affect the general rates throughout the entire territory. This extends the benefit of the improved river to the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, eastern Colorado, Nebraska, North and South Dakotas, and Wyoming.

The rates now charged on the Missouri River are actually 80 per cent of the rail rates between Kansas City and St. Louis. The volume of freight carried by river has not been large enough to make any appreciable difference to the railroads or furnish any substantial competition. Its effect so far has been to relieve the railroads from excess freight, which they would probably have handled with great difficulty, delay, and inconvenience to the shipper. Even on this aspect of the question the improvement of the river has been well worth while in furnishing transportation facilities to a rapidly growing section of the country. When the river traffic is sufficient to compete appreciably with the railroads a more permanent and substantial effect upon rates will be seen. I think our friends of the grain-producing States understand this very thoroughly, but I was astounded to hear the gentlemen from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] say the other day on the floor of the House that the only effect of the improvement of the Missouri River so far had been to raise rates to interior points in Kansas. The improvement of the Missouri River has not raised a single freight rate in Kansas or elsewhere, and there is no possibility that it could have such an effect. The railroads have sought to raise freight rates not only in Kansas, but all over the United States, and they are still claiming that the expense of doing business justifies them in the right to advance their rates. They have advanced their rates in many parts of the country on many lines of commodities, but they have not advanced their rates in Kansas, and this is one of the few sections of the United States which has escaped a general advance. In fact, the Interstate Commerce Commission has recently decided two cases which have had the effect of reducing rates from 5 per cent to 15 per cent from Chicago and St. Louis into all points in southern Kansas. If it is possible that the gentleman from Kansas is so little informed about what is going on in his own State, I will call his attention specifically to the cases. The first case was the State of Kansas, through its public utilities commission, against the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway et al., decided June 18, 1913. This reduced the class and commodity rates from St. Louis to interior Kansas points to correspond with the proportionate rate to Kansas City. The other case was one brought by the Commercial Clubs of Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City against the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway et al. to reduce the rates between the Missouri River and common points in Colorado. The reduction of these rates to Colorado effected a reduction also in the rates to the intermediate points in Kansas. This case was decided January 13, 1914.

TERMINALS.

A very necessary adjunct to the restoration of traffic on the Missouri River is the construction of proper terminals. During the long period of years in which the river has been neglected the river front has in many cases gotten into the hands of the railroads. In some respects this is necessary, as the railroads must seek the water level for the convenience of grades. It is also necessary and very important that there be direct communication between the railroads and the boats. It is equally important that the boat lines have ample terminals, and that these terminals be free to the public, so that they can not be monopolized by any railroad or any boat line controlled by a railroad or any boat line which is engaged in a monopoly. All boats, big or little, and all lines of boats should have free access to the wharves, docks, and river terminals. In this way water navigation will be a constant check upon monopoly in the transportation business.

The fight which Kansas City has made to restore navigation of the river has been effective also in restoring to the city our

water front. After some litigation, the railroads, which had preempted the public land along the river, were moved back and new magnificent, modern, convenient municipal wharves and warehouses have been constructed, with electric loading devices and other appliances for the rapid loading and unloading of vessels. These wharves belong to Kansas City and are for the use of all boats upon the payment of reasonable charges. I understand that New Orleans is also reconstructing its municipal wharves, and that St. Louis is also equipped along these lines. No doubt all of the commercial cities on the river between Kansas City and St. Louis will see the imperative need of establishing municipal wharves and landing places to encourage river traffic and put themselves in the line of progress and improvement.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that Davenport, Iowa, has also made arrangements for municipal wharf facilities.

Mr. BORLAND. That is interesting as showing the trend of improvement of inland waterways.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I am satisfied that the efforts of the last five years for the restoration of navigation on the Missouri River have borne substantial and encouraging results. We are anxious that the work be done upon a permanent and business-like basis and think that your committee has been patient, careful, and conservative in approaching the solution of this problem. It required us first to have a preliminary survey made of the portion to be improved; second, to have this survey reviewed by the Board of River Engineers at Washington, and the result approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War; third, an experimental appropriation was made for revetment work and out of abundant caution a special board of engineers was created to revise the plans of the project, and to determine finally upon their feasibility; fourth, they required that local business men should demonstrate their desire and ability to put to use the river as a carrier of freight; and, fifth, they have restricted the appropriations to the exact amount that can be economically expended during each navigable season. I feel certain that all of these efforts will be crowned with success and that we shall have an improved river from Kansas City to the mouth, carrying the great productions of the plains States to market and adding needed transportation facilities to the Central West. The river will be restrained very much in its destructive force and while it is ministering to the demands of commerce it will also yield its banks up to a more abundant production of the food supplies of the Nation. The unimproved Missouri River has been a wild animal, useless to commerce and destructive of life and property; the improved Missouri River will be like a well-broken Norman draft horse, able to draw tremendous loads and turning its mighty strength into the means of production and the progress of civilization. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] is prepared to speak now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning of his administration I have appreciated and heartily sympathized with the desire of President Wilson to prevent war with Mexico, and believe we should support him to the limit.

I have spent much time during the last 13 years in Mexico. I have traversed the country on horseback from one end to the other and from one side to the other several times.

I have read a vast amount of misinformation about Mexico, written by people who only knew the Mexican of the railroad track, the beggar, the "ratero," and the pulque drinker of the cities.

But I, who have lived with the Mexican of the hills and the mountains and the wide open spaces, know a different people.

A more kindly, honest, and hospitable people are found nowhere. In their beautiful language, they are "simpatico."

In horseback trips covering more than 3,600 miles, traversing the great "barrancas," the wild stretches and the vast solitudes of the "sierras," I always found the people of the hills country honest, kindly, and hospitable.

I remember once, when Mrs. Hulings accompanied me, we had just made the long and dangerous ford of the Papaguyo River and reached a village of the Cacahuatepecs. The chief of the village at once put his own house, a structure of bamboo with palm-leaf thatch, at my disposal.

That night about 11 o'clock—a brilliant moonlit tropical night—I was awakened by music. Running to the open unglazed window, I beheld, to my astonishment, 22 players in a brass band discoursing fine music in a serenade to "La Senora Blanca," the name they had given to Mrs. Hulings. This tribe is numerous and remarkable for the stalwart strength and beauty of its people.

At another time, on the far coast of the Pacific, in the State of Guerrero, while a sojourner in the hacienda San Marcos, I heard one day a peculiar droning noise. On investigation I found it coming from an old adobe building, where the village school was in session. All the scholars were studying their lessons in half-audible undertone, making an indescribable droning noise, and transporting me in memory back to my primary school in Pennsylvania, where we had precisely the same habit of studying our lessons aloud.

I asked one little senorita about 11 or 12 years of age what she learned at school. She replied, "Geographie, histoire de la patria, grammaire, arithmetic, algebra, and geometry." There in the hills, remote from a white habitation, the little children were being taught much after the fashion of our own children, and I have been assured many times by American schoolteachers in Mexico that the scholars of the primary grades in Mexico are further advanced than our own children of the same age. These people of the hills and the great plateaux are a primitive people, ranging from the native wild man through all gradations, to civilized conditions.

In the towns and cities, as in towns and cities everywhere, the extremes of civilization meet. There great wealth, education, and refinement are found side by side with squalor, vice, and poverty.

It is a great mistake to suppose that Mexico is a poor, besotted, and benighted country, without the aspirations and ideals of civilization.

Before Hendrik Hudson sailed up the North River, Mexico City had a population of 350,000, with great institutions of learning and philosophy.

The first printing press set up in the American Continent was established and the first printed book, Las Casas's "Steps to Heaven," was published there in 1536.

It is a mistake to suppose that Mexico, with the finest climate in the world, with enormous natural resources, with an area of a little more than one-fourth of the United States, and a population of more than 15,000,000, with a foreign commerce in 1912, notwithstanding the internal strife, amounting to $240,000,000, is the helpless, worthless, and hopeless country some would have us believe.

Since the Spaniards were driven out in 1821 until 1876, a period of 55 years, there were seven revolutions. The Mexicans have the habit of revolution. The ignorant, excitable, imaginative masses quickly follow every new flag. Under Porfirio Diaz alone did quiet and order prevail and concepts of national unity and solidarity find a place in public sentiment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the gentleman think he ought to say that Porfirio Diaz himself was a revolutionist?

Mr. HULINGS. I thought so; so much so that I have stated it. I will read it in a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. All right.

Mr. HULINGS. But it is also a mistake to assume that the masses of the Mexican people are capable of republican government, or that even the educated classes, numerous and cultivated as they undoubtedly are, are farther advanced in the concepts of government than a government by an "aristocracy" or a "dictatorship."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HULINGS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman figures there showing the proportion of Mexican people that are educated and the proportion that are not?

Mr. HULINGS. I have not. You find them on the ranches and in the cities, as I have stated, but I have not got the proportion.

Mr. FESS. The great mass?

Mr. HULINGS. No. It was my good fortune to become personally acquainted with President Diaz. No one could be in his presence without being impressed with the power of the man. Under the form of a republic, with a constitution closely resembling that of the United States Government, his Government was an absolutism.

As a revolutionist he became the President of the Republic. The country then, as now, was overrun by guerrilla chieftains with bands of robbers and "ladrones," keeping the country in constant terror.

President Diaz adopted a plan that might well be followed if intervention should be necessary.

He called in some of the most enterprising of these robber chieftains, gave them a commission with rank and pay, had them bring in their followers, uniformed and enlisted them in his army, and then sent them out to destroy all the other bands, and thus pacified the country, made travel safe, and established law and order. This force—known as the "Rurales"—was pronounced by Phil Sheridan the finest light cavalry in the world.

There is no doubt of Diaz's sincere love for "his people." But at 82 his fires were dimmed and his arms were palsied; a bureaucracy surrounded him; no longer could he learn the truth; and I verily believe that he was the most surprised and grieved man in Mexico to learn that "his people" had raised in serious revolt against him, and in his grief and old age, rather than make serious resistance, he retired.

I was also personally acquainted with Francisco Madero. There is no doubt he was an earnest and sincere patriot and a man of great courage. He was an idealist, perhaps a dreamer, but he saw that "special privilege" was doing in Mexico its fatal work, as it always does everywhere, and recognized, as every man who studies the situation does, that Mexico will never take fair place as a nation until the great estates are broken up and the people on the land are given a stake in the soil. [Applause.]

This was the watchword of his revolution. Of course he contemplated that the breaking up of the great estates and their distribution should be under the operation of equitable laws, which would require time and require, first, that good order should be established in all parts of this country.

But during his revolution every man who could get a following of "ragtag and bobtail" became a revolutionary chieftain, a general, or at least a colonel, who became enamored of the power and the glory of a military career.

And while Madero was harassed and delayed and his program of the division of estates was not promptly fulfilled, the revolutionary chiefs saw in a counter-revolution the quickest and surest return to their erstwhile power and glory, and they quickly raised the cry "Madero is a traitor," and the present dreadful state of affairs was precipitated by the assassination of President Madero, the seizure of the Government by Huerta, and the new revolution under Carranza and Villa.

Madero's mistake was in supposing that a constitutional government is possible in Mexico now; that the people of Mexico are ready for self-government. The only real government they have ever known was that imposed by the iron hand of Diaz. They are a primitive people, quick to respond to kindness once their confidence is secured, but impatient, excitable, volatile, and cruel as children.

Madero's idealism did not permit him to use the methods of Diaz, and he naturally fell a victim to a counter-revolution.

Talk about "free elections" is sheer nonsense. The government that shall be established in Mexico may be called by one name or another, but it will be essentially a dictatorship, and it will require an iron hand and the wisest statesmanship for a generation before a republic in Mexico will be more than a travesty upon the name.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes

Mr. MURDOCK. Were there any elections under Madero?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; there was one, and he was elected; but there were only a few people who participated—about as many as voted for me at the last congressional election in my district.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the whole Republic of Mexico?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Elections were held repeatedly under Diaz?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; such as they were.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why does the gentleman characterize them as not free?

Mr. HULINGS. Simply because the people did not vote. They have not the public spirit; they have not the interest. Why should a man who lives in practical peonage and has nothing except a little corn and beans to live on or to live for, take any particular interest in government?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have heard the statement made repeatedly that Mexicans under Diaz did not have the right to vote, and I have heard the men who believed in Diaz say that they did have the right to vote. Was it merely a matter of their staying away from the polls?

Mr. HULINGS. They voted, when they did vote, as they were ordered to. Candidates were selected for them. If they elected those candidates, all right, there was an election. If they did not elect them, the election was set aside.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is a form of machine government from which we in this country have not been entirely free. Does the gentleman mean to say that where a nomination is dictated by a machine, that is not a free election according to his definition?

Mr. HULINGS. According to my definition it is an obtained election, not free. I believe that the people have not only the right to elect their officers, but they have the right to select their candidates.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point I am driving at is this: Does the gentleman believe that under Diaz Mexicans were prevented from voting?

Mr. HULINGS. That is a difficult question, because if the votes did not go right the election was set aside.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that answers my question, that they did not have free elections under Diaz.

Mr. HULINGS. Free! No; they did not. I have said that. The dangers to government in Mexico come not from "the plain people," but from "cientificos," the Latin breeds, the aristocracy, which naturally resist all efforts to reduce their special privileges and continually attempt to increase them.

After the present revolution had taken serious aspect, President Taft, through our representatives, advised Americans to leave the country. Our mistake was made then. A firm stand at that time would have prevented the present wretched situation. A strong man like Theodore Roosevelt would have settled the difficulty and there would have been no war. President Wilson followed the course already outlined by President Taft, and instead of taking firm, positive steps adopted what he called the "watchful waiting" policy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact that during the reign of Diaz in Mexico the authorities under Diaz had absolute control of all the polling places in that country?

Mr. HULINGS. I believe that is true; yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact, further, that during that time only such men as the authorities wanted to have vote were allowed to vote?

Mr. HULINGS. They knew if they came there to vote, they must vote right.

Mr. MURDOCK. That, however, is a disputed point.

Mr. PLATT. They were always free to vote for Diaz, were they not?

Mr. HULINGS. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

During the last two years a great many reports have come from one source or another of the murder, robbery, and rapine of American citizens, to which our Government has apparently given no heed.

Recently a British subject, William S. Benton, whom I knew very well, was murdered by the revolutionists with Villa, and at once our State Department has shown more interest than all the outrages upon American citizens have evoked.

Now, the question arises, Why is this so? What is there so particularly appalling in the murder of Benton that it should quicken our State Department, when it has been so indifferent to the murder of scores of Americans in Mexico?

The answer commonly given is that the Monroe doctrine requires the United States to protect citizens of European countries in any of the countries of the American Continent, because under the Monroe doctrine the United States will not permit European countries to interfere with the American countries.

I deny that the Monroe doctrine means any such thing. It never did mean that this Government holds itself responsible for the settlement of every dispute in which the southern Republic and a European nation may engage. [Applause.]

In 1821 the United States served notice on all European countries that they would not be permitted to colonize or make conquest of any land in the Americas.

There is nothing in the Monroe doctrine to prevent any country taking necessary steps to collect debts from or to protect its citizens in any American country.

There is nothing in the Monroe doctrine in itself that requires the United States to protect a British subject in Mexico, and there is not any reason in polity why Great Britain should not protect her own citizens in Mexico or wherever they may be.

The only objection to Great Britain protecting her own citizens in Mexico, and the only reason why the United States should undertake the task, is that if Great Britain undertakes it, it might involve a war and the overthrow of the Mexican Government by Great Britain, and in the reconstruction which

would follow the paramountcy of Great Britain in the government which might be established would be a violation of the Monroe doctrine, and that to prevent such a happening and to prevent a possible interference with the Monroe doctrine the United States must herself protect the citizens of all European countries in all American countries.

And yet, in all deference to those who hold that the Monroe doctrine requires the United States to undertake the protection of all foreign subjects and property in Mexico, I am of opinion that the protection of British subjects does not fall as a matter of duty or obligation upon the United States. If Great Britain, under the pretense of protecting her subjects, should attempt to colonize or make conquest of Mexican territory, in such case, and not until such case should arise, would the Monroe doctrine require the United States to deprive Great Britain of any excuse for her presence by herself giving protection to British subjects.

Mr. FESS. Suppose an indemnity were to be demanded by Great Britain and in lieu of the indemnity a coaling station should be demanded, would not that be a violation of the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; that would be acquiring territory, which is not permitted under the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. FESS. Suppose that Great Britain or Germany should go into Mexico and collect their damages; when they are in there how shall we get them out?

Mr. HULINGS. Shoot them out if necessary, the same as we were ready to do in 1865. [Applause.]

In its present vague and uncertain scope the Monroe doctrine is liable to get us into trouble. As the southern Republics grow in power and dignity they are more and more restive and jealous of what they regard as the tutelage and interference which their big northern neighbor assumes under the Monroe doctrine to exercise over their foreign affairs.

And we owe it to ourselves to define just what we mean by the Monroe doctrine, so that these needless jealousies may be removed and that the world may know exactly where we stand and so that if Germany, who has always scouted the doctrine, should seriously challenge it, or if Japan should renew her attempt to secure a foothold in the Magdalena Bay country, they would know and we would know just what the fight would be about.

It is certainly an unpleasant commentary upon American diplomacy that when American property and lives have been destroyed, practically no notice has been taken of it; but the moment a British subject is involved the British Government prods our Government into action.

Does British citizenship rest upon a plane superior to that of American citizenship? Is the protection of a British citizen a more sacred duty of our Government than the protection of her own citizens?

To what extent it becomes the duty of the United States to protect her citizens abroad is not clear.

If I deliberately, without invitation, remove myself and property to Mexico and engage in business there, placing myself under the protection of Mexican law, and if, without any discrimination against me as a foreigner, Mexican courts and Mexican laws afford me the same measure of protection as they give to Mexican citizens, and if I suffer loss from the rulings of Mexican courts, or if, through the weakness of the Mexican Government, I, in common with Mexican citizens, am not given protection of life and property, I am not at all clear that there is any obligation on the part of the United States to declare war for my reparation, especially if it has warned me to flee from Mexico. But if we concede that it is the duty of the Government to protect our citizens everywhere abroad, surely the time for action has come.

This is not the time to play partisan politics. Let us look the facts in the face.

Intervention means war. It means the expenditure of blood and treasure in volumes beyond computation. I would not pinch pennies when honor is at stake, but I would not be hurried into avoidable war. It is easy to enter upon a quarrel, but prudent men will count the cost and inquire the purpose.

Oh, I know it is easy to ring the changes upon Paul's reply "I am a Roman citizen." It is easy to inflame the passions to avenge the insults to American citizenship.

War with Mexico means a war of exhaustion. The moment our troops pass the frontier the Mexicans will drop their quarrels and make common cause against the hated "Gringo."

All the American blood thus far shed will be but a drop in the bucket. All the pecuniary losses thus far suffered will be but a bagatelle compared with the cost of six months of war.

I believe a well-appointed division of American troops might march where they would in Mexico, so far as organized opposition could prevent. But I know that country and I know that barrel-chested brown man. With 100 "tortillas" wrapped in his "serape" he can march for a week, and he can march as far in a day as any organized force could follow him in a week.

Great Britain learned the cost and the size of the armies required to defeat the 65,000 Boers, and the pacification of Mexico would be a gigantic task, requiring years.

And to what end? Will more bloodshed restore blood already shed? Will the sacrifice of more lives, more treasure, replace the lives and the treasure already lost? Will the destruction of 100,000 of those brown men, the misery and wretchedness which war will bring to the helpless women and children of that unhappy country add to the honor of the great Republic? Will the sacrifice of 50,000 of our manhood add luster to the American flag?

If the Mexicans in any case will fight to exhaustion, would they not better exhaust themselves upon each other than upon Americans?

These grave considerations, Mr. Speaker, justify the "watchful waiting" policy of President Wilson, and will justify it while a hope remains that the Mexicans will restore peace. Such a policy, if successful in avoiding intervention, would be the most signal proof that the great Republic has no ulterior designs upon her lesser sisters to the south, and give the lie to the oft-repeated slander that the United States is the great "American pig" that arrogantly, selfishly, and corruptly seeks to exploit the small nations of this hemisphere.

Mr. GORDON. Is it not a fact that the American Nation achieved its reputation as the great American hog by the unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of the territory of a sister Republic, the United States of Colombia, by Roosevelt? Was not that what gave the United States her reputation?

Mr. HULINGS. I think she had whatever reputation she has of that kind long before that.

Beyond all doubt this Government could secure, or at any time during the troubles in Mexico could have secured, a safe conduct to their own countries of every foreigner in Mexico and pay for all foreign property destroyed at less cost than the cost of intervention.

Beyond all doubt such a policy would be less expensive than war.

We could then, safely retired within our own borders, without other interest, prayerfully hope that Mexico, after she can fight no longer, decimated and impoverished, will see the folly of her course and stop the slaughter.

But our attempts to play the rôle of good neighbor have been repaid with insult and contumely. The marauding chieftains on both sides return our counsel and advice with contempt and threats, and conditions daily grow worse.

The destruction of American lives and property, the murder of helpless women, the raping of girls, the execution of prisoners, and wholesale slaughter still go on.

Mr. Chairman, it is just because every thoughtful American agrees that war should be avoided if possible; that as a mere economic question war is unjustifiable; and that insults to our dignity or even trespasses upon our citizenship committed by that torn and distracted people should be overlooked to the very limit of forbearance by this great and powerful Nation, that the American people have so long supported a policy of mere opportunism.

It matters not now that mistakes have been made. If peace and good order are established in Mexico without intervention, it will be the brightest star in the crown of President Wilson's achievements, and the world will resound in acclamations of his wisdom and statesmanship; but a "do-nothing" policy, if unsuccessful, will bring the United States Government into contempt in any chancellery in the world.

But, sir, there is another question. It is not an economic question. It is not a question of national honor or pride or dignity, nor the vindication of American citizenship. It is a question of plain Christian duty.

The duty of the strong man to prevent cruelty and crime stops not within the walls of his own household.

The duty of a powerful Christian nation to prevent the outrage of helpless human beings, to stop ruthless slaughter, is as wide as humanity and does not stop at the artificial lines that divide nations.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the right of revolution is a right that has been exercised in all ages and is one that is recognized by international law? Does the mere fact that war exists in Mexico warrant or justify any nation on earth interfering there?

Mr. HULINGS. I am just trying to say that it does. A revolution is never lawful. It is never recognized except when it succeeds. [Applause.] Here at our own doors are a people, many of them highly civilized, many of them ignorant and irresponsible, all of them broken into factions, swilling the land with blood. Rape, murder, assassination, and all the horrors of utter savagery are let loose upon a people who can not help themselves.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Would the gentleman compare the condition that now exists in Mexico with the conditions which existed in Cuba when this Government interfered there? Considered from the standpoint of interference by this Government, are not conditions now in Mexico as bad as they were in Cuba at that time?

Mr. HULINGS. I think they are far worse. One difference is, the Mexican people are doing this to themselves, while in Cuba it was the Spaniards who were doing it to the Cubans. Every sentiment of humanity, civilization, and Christianity demands that these horrors should cease.

This Government intervened in Cuba in the interests of humanity at the expense of a war with Spain, and she is not yet through with paying the cost.

She has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in suppressing the "head-hunters" in the Philippines and teaching the savages on the other side of the world the blessings of peace, and the end is not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am to have some time, and I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania two minutes.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is our duty, without respect to party lines, to stand shoulder to shoulder in this difficult Mexican situation. But I believe the time has come when something should be done. "Watchful waiting" has accomplished nothing. Something else should be done. A diplomacy that has no other plan than "to wait for something to turn up" has been tested to the limit. If intervention is the only other plan, then intervention should come speedily.

Deploring war as much as anyone, no one will rejoice more than I if resort to force can be avoided, but I begin to despair of the laissez faire policy.

I know that country and its people. Order will never be restored save by a strong man supported by a force superior to the factions now harrying the country, and there is no such force in Mexico. How can the Mexican people t rn the guerrillas back to their kennels. How can they pull the assassin Huerta out of his usurped place and put a strong, clean, red-blooded man in control and give him the necessary support? The business interests of Mexico, the conservative man of all factions, wearied of war and waste and bloodshed, would rally to his support. But in my opinion they will require outside help.

The time must come, if it has not already arrived, when it will be the imperative duty of this Government to announce to the world that present conditions in Mexico must cease, and that unless by a given time the Mexicans themselves shall have made pacific arrangements and ceased hostilities the United States in the interests of humanity will undertake to restore peace and good order.

I pray God this may not be necessary, but if war should come, I would willingly leave my place here and, as a soldier not for conquest but for peace and civilization, bear my share of whatever might befall. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending bill. The committee has, in my opinion, endeavored to be fair to all localities. I appreciate fully that with 35 States out of a total of 48 asking for appropriations and insistently pressing their demands upon the committee through their representatives that it is impossible to accord to every approved project the amount thought necessary by those most directly and vitally interested. What I have to say is not in the way of a criticism, but more to direct the attention of the House to the great extent of the California coast line, the important harbors within that area, and the rivers tributary.

The bill appropriates in cash $39,227,504 and authorizes $4,061,500 in addition, a grand total of $43,289,004.

EXTENT OF CALIFORNIA COAST LINE IF PLACED ON ATLANTIC SIDE.

The map of the United States before us shows the extent of the California coast line, 1,555 miles in length. I have marked on the Atlantic side a coast line corresponding in length and degrees of latitude. As can be seen, if the State of California could be moved directly eastward and occupy a corresponding position on the Atlantic coast, it would include within its coast boundaries alone territory from Beverly, Mass., to Charleston, S. C.

Now, let us examine the projects within this area, including parts of the 10 States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Massachusetts, from Beverly to the Connecticut and Rhode Island line, has six projects in the bill, carrying appropriations of $473,000.

Connecticut likewise has six, $312,700 being provided.

New York has 25 projects, for which $3,115,875 is carried in the bill.

The State of New Jersey 14, with a total appropriation of $672,800; Delaware 10, calling for $2,486,200; Maryland 8, for which that State receives $135,550. Virginia is allotted $1,385,784 for 15 projects; North Carolina, $710,075 for 22; and that part of South Carolina within the California radius, $107,000 for 6 projects. The total amount provided for that portion of the Atlantic seaboard corresponding with the California coast line is $9,455,984. California receives $1,097,000 for a total of 9 projects.

These figures are not presented for the purpose of criticizing the committee, for I realize that the population argument could be advanced as a possible justification for the excess appropriation of $8,358,984 carried in the bill for the corresponding Atlantic coast line.

CALIFORNIA NOT ASKING TOO MUCH.

I direct attention to the situation, because I have frequently heard, during my long service here, the criticism that California was asking more than other States for river and harbor improvements, no account being taken, apparently, of the vast extent of the Commonwealth's coast line and the great and growing commercial importance of its harbors. Through united action on the part of the Members of the California congressional delegation we have managed to obtain a fair share of the appropriations, but no more than we were justly entitled to receive.

We know no politics in California when it comes to obtaining an appropriation, and we have been fairly successful in our efforts.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There are no politics ever at any time whenever you seek to secure an appropriation.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Neither in California nor in the great South.

The following California appropriations are carried in the pending bill:

*California.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Los Angeles Harbor | $25,000 |
| San Francisco Harbor | 9,000 |
| Oakland Harbor | 98,000 |
| Richmond Harbor | 100,000 |
| San Pablo Bay | 40,000 |
| Humboldt Harbor and Bay | 525,000 |
| Sacramento and Feather Rivers | 25,000 |
| Do | 200,000 |
| Petaluma Creek | 75,000 |
| Total | 1,097,000 |

AWAKENED INTEREST IN WATERWAYS.

There is an awakened interest in California in waterway development. In San Francisco on January 15, 16, and 17 of this year an internal waterways congress was held, attended by representatives from every section of California. Various matters were discussed looking to a quickening of interest in the general subject of water transportation and the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the State. The gathering was most representative and the discussions extremely interesting. When a waterway is improved in California our State has an advantage over Eastern States owing to the mildness of our climate. Our rivers and harbors can be used during the entire winter season because there is no freeze over. The people of California are fully alive to the impetus which will be given to water transportation with the opening of the Panama Canal.

IMPORTANT LAWS FOR PROTECTION OF SHIPPING.

During the 10 years that I have been a Member of this House I have taken a deep interest in the improvement of the rivers and harbors in every section of California. I have fully appreciated the tremendous importance of these waterways in the development of my State.

In 1910 I offered an amendment on the floor of the House to the interstate-commerce act aimed to prevent practices which in the past had done much toward eliminating competition which shippers have a right to expect through water transportation. The amendment provided that when railroads in competition with water routes reduced rates for the purpose of

driving out water competition that they could not again increase such rates. This amendment is now a part of the interstate-commerce act. I also lent my best efforts in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in writing into the Panama Canal act a provision preventing railroad-owned ships from operating through the Panama Canal in alleged competition with themselves in an endeavor to minimize the value of the canal as a regulator of freight rates. The sentiment of Congress is so strong that the railroad provisions will, in my judgment, never be repealed, even though Canadian railroads continue to protest.

It is my purpose to refer briefly to a number of the California river and harbor projects, much of the data being compiled from Government reports.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY.

San Francisco Bay is about 40 miles long and varies from 3 to 10 miles in width. It has about 36 square miles of anchorage area, with depths of from 40 to 90 feet. This bay is a natural harbor of the highest type, and consequently the only impediments to navigation with which the Government has concerned itself were a number of rocks scattered about the bay.

The total amount spent prior to the operations under the existing project was $165,927.84. The existing project, adopted March 3, 1899, and twice amended, provides for the removal of Arch Rock and Shag Rocks Nos. 1 and 2 and Blossom Rock. These four rocks were removed and the work completed in 1903.

On June 25, 1910, Congress provided for the removal of Centissima Rock to a depth of 40 feet and Rincon Reef Rocks to a depth of 35 feet, the whole at an estimated cost of $170,000. Rincon Reef Rocks were removed during the fiscal year just past.

The amount carried in the bill—$9,000—will be used for the operating of a police boat to prevent illegal dumping in the harbor and to prevent unauthorized encroachments on the tidal prism. It will also be used for maintenance of ship channels under the present improvement.

Practically the entire harbor front of San Francisco is under State control and administered by a board of three State harbor commissioners appointed by the governor. The port of San Francisco receives no appropriations from the State or city. The State law requires that the harbor must be self-supporting, the cost of improvements, including the building of wharves, dredging, and the construction of sea walls, together with the expenses of administration, to be provided for out of the receipts. There is also a provision stipulating that harbor charges shall not exceed such rates as necessary to meet the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance. In private hands returns would be demanded upon the total value of the property and improvements, with the result that much higher rates would be charged. The belt railroad is controlled by the board. Practically no long leases have been granted, and every shipper can obtain accommodation at reasonable rates.

At present the piers and bulkhead wharves on the San Francisco water front offer about 5 miles of berthing space. In a recent report of the board of State harbor commissioners the statement is made that dock facilities may be so enlarged as to give 44 miles of berthing space.

OAKLAND HARBOR.

Oakland Harbor receives in this bill the sum of $98,000 for continuing work under the existing project. This is the amount which the local engineer, Col. Rees, states can be profitably expended during the fiscal year, considering the contracts which are now under way. On July 1 of last year there was an unexpended balance of $464,465 on hand, but most of this is now under contract.

This harbor has 20 miles of available shore line. The splendid harbor at Oakland has been the development of what was formerly known as San Antonio Creek. This harbor then had a depth of but 2 feet at low tide, with a tidal range of about 5 feet.

The city of Oakland has fought for years to regain control of its water front. In the early fifties the then town of Oakland made some unfortunate grants of valuable rights on the harbor to an individual. These were later transferred to a railroad corporation. It has only been within recent years that the city has obtained substantial control of its entire water front. This has been due to court decisions, legislative acts, and favorable compromises. The city has already voted $2,500,000 for improvements and has under way the building of reinforced concrete wharves and a quay wall 3,700 feet in length equipped with railroad tracks, steel warehouses, and machinery for the handling of freight. There is also being built a retaining wall across the key route basin, on the western water front, where most extensive improvements are contemplated. The city plans to eventually expend $20,000,000. The municipal belt railway system as planned will extend around the entire city front, connecting with every railroad that enters the city—three transcontinental railroads now entering Oakland—and with every wharf, with spurs leading to manufacturing plants. Under the proposed development of the water front there will be 46,000 feet of municipally owned docks and 46,000 feet of privately owned.

The Government engineer in charge of the Oakland district has just reported a most comprehensive plan for the fullest development of this western water front, a project that will allow of such expansion as to meet fully the growing demands of the future.

LOS ANGELES HARBOR.

Los Angeles Harbor consists of two parts. First, the outer or breakwater harbor, formerly designated San Pedro Harbor, and second, the inner harbor, formerly designated Wilmington Harbor. On account of the consolidation of the cities of San Pedro and Wilmington with Los Angeles on August 12, 1909, later appropriations for these works have been made under the name of Los Angeles Harbor.

The outer harbor, originally San Pedro Bay, was an open roadstead, with a considerable amount of kelp, well protected on the west by the bluff which terminates at Point Fermin, but exposed to the southeast, south, and southwest. A project to build a breakwater to the eastward of Point Fermin about 8,500 feet in length, or as much longer as could be constructed within the authorized limit of cost, $2,900,000, was adopted by Congress June 3, 1896. The amount expended under the project was $2,830,400.90.

As originally planned and built there was a gap of 1,887 feet wide between the west end of the breakwater and the shore. The project for extending the breakwater to the shore was authorized by Congress June 25, 1910, with an appropriation of $178,000. During the fiscal year the breakwater was completed at an outlay of $208,296.52. In addition to the $178,000, $30,296.52 was expended from the balance of the $2,900,000 appropriated originally.

The construction of the breakwater has resulted in the dying out of the kelp, and there is now afforded a harbor of refuge, easy of access and secure from storms for vessels of the largest size. It shelters 370 acres with 30 to 50 feet depth at mean lower low water, and 200 acres additional, outside established harbor lines, with 20 to 30 feet depth at mean lower low water. Two channels 30 feet deep have been dredged by private enterprise, each about 5,500 feet long, alongside wharves constructed or under construction. The breakwater also shelters the entrance to the inner harbor.

A project was adopted July 25, 1912, for dredging to the depth of 35 feet a portion of the outer harbor; $327,250 was appropriated for carrying out this project. The project is 28 per cent completed. Dredging was done to the depths of 22 to 34 feet over the area referred to. The amount expended to the end of the fiscal year is $64,919.07, with outstanding liabilities of $14,660.50.

The city of Los Angeles has begun the improvement of 79 acres on the westerly side of the entrance channel.

At the inner harbor, previous to commencement of the improvement, in 1871, there was a depth of less than 2 feet at low tide at the present entrance, the sea breaking across what is now Terminal Island at various points. Vessels anchored in the outer harbor, and cargoes and passengers were transferred by lighters to Wilmington. Wilmington Lagoon was a large expanse of shallow water, containing but one good channel, the channel leading to Wilmington.

The maximum draft that can be brought into the harbor is 30 feet at mean lower low water. The average of rise of tides above the plane of reference is 5.2 feet.

The existing projects for the improvement of the inner harbor were adopted by the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910. They provide for—

First. Dredging to 30 feet depth at mean lower low water from the entrance up to and including the turning basin. It was estimated that this work would require the dredging of 3,000,000 cubic yards of material, at a cost of 14 cents per yard, or $420,000. On June 30, 1911, the increase of this estimated cost to $596,000 was authorized for the following reasons: The original estimate for this work contemplated doing all the dredging by suction with the U. S. dredge *San Pedro*. The character of the material in the outer 5,600 feet of the channel, and especially opposite Dead Mans Island, was such that it was found necessary to handle the same by clam-shell or dipper dredge. A total of $596,000 has been appropriated for this work by the river and harbor acts of 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913.

Second. Dredging two channels from the turning basin into the east and west basins, respectively, the channels to be 200 feet wide and 20 feet deep. It was estimated that this work

would require the removal of 2,200,000 cubic yards of material, at an estimated cost of $390,000, including the construction of a dredge; subsequently reduced to $220,000.

No modifications have been made in these projects.

The amount expended on the 30-foot project of June 30, 1913, is $502,182.20, with outstanding liabilities of $7,041.18. It is estimated that the project is 79 per cent completed.

The amount expended on the 20-foot project to June 30, 1913, is $163,637.97, with no outstanding liabilities. It is estimated that the project is 88 per cent completed.

The result of the work done by the United States is to make 16,000 linear feet of wharf frontage accessible to vessels drawing 30 feet, and to increase the draft that can be carried to the upper parts of the inner harbor.

The funds on hand are sufficient to complete the 30-foot and 20-foot projects. The funds asked for, $25,000, and carried in this bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, will be used in maintaining these channels.

CONTROL OF PORT.

The port of Los Angeles is controlled entirely by the municipality, which, through a board of harbor commissioners, makes all rules and regulations for the government of the harbor, fixes all pilotage, dockage, wharfage, and handling charges, and operates the port as a municipal enterprise.

The city owns 394 acres in the outer harbor of what was originally submerged land. Of this, 154 acres was leased by the former city of San Pedro to private parties, who have reclaimed it and improved it with wharves and warehouses. Of the balance, the city has just completed reclaiming 66 acres, which are being improved with reinforced concrete wharves and steel transit sheds, and plans are under way for reclaiming 138 acres more.

There are now 24,905 feet of privately owned wharves along the water front held under franchises or permits, and the city has 1,985 feet of municipal wharves, most of which have been recently built. It also has under construction 3,590 feet of additional wharf, of which 2,520 feet will be of reinforced concrete, costing approximately $176 a linear foot.

The city also is constructing 1,800 feet of steel transit sheds and 1,530 feet of wood frame transit sheds, besides doing a large amount of dredging.

There are on present Government harbor lines approximately 20¾ miles of water front, most of it unimproved. This can be greatly increased by dredging slips, but only a few such slips have yet been definitely determined upon. The possibilities of the harbor, as shown by E. P. Goodrich, the consulting engineer for that city, will afford more than 100 miles of water front when fully developed.

THE SACRAMENTO RIVER PROJECT.

This project, for which the bill carries an initial appropriation of $200,000, is not the ordinary case of the improvement of a river. A brief reference to the early history of the State of California would probably best illustrate this point.

During the days of early mining the Sacramento River was filled up with débris, and the State was powerless to prevent it because the United States owned the land that was being washed into it. It took a great many years to make the Government understand the condition of affairs so the hydraulicking and washing of the hills down into the Sacramento Valley could be stopped. The gold which was produced as a result of this mining was almost a necessity to the Government in the early sixties, as the $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year that came out of California provided the gold to pay the interest on the Government bonds.

It was the Government's exclusive business to see that navigation on the river was not destroyed. The Government failed to do this, and therefore the State of California seems to have a case with larger equities than the case of an ordinary improvement of a river.

In 1893 the Federal Government recognized some obligation on its part to restore the stream to the condition that existed before the havoc was done by the mining interests, which operated under the laws of the United States.

In that year Congress pased an act, known as the Caminetti Act, creating the California Débris Commission and declaring a purpose of dealing with the subject.

Appropriations were made from time to time for this object, and the State usually contributed an equal amount.

In 1907, pursuant to the directions of the Caminetti Act, the débris commission made a partial report, recommending the execution of part of the plan under its jurisdiction.

Congress and the State each appropriated $400,000 for this purpose, which sum has been used in part to construct two large dredges, which have been completed and are now engaged in excavation at the mouth of the river.

In 1910 the commission made a more extended report, recommending a plan contemplating the construction of levees and the acquisition of by-passes to carry the excess waters in addition to channel improvement.

When this report was presented to Congress in 1912 the Committee on Rivers and Harbors declined to recommend its adoption, because certain features of the plan were intended to promote reclamation of land; but the principal reason for the action of the committee was found in the report of the Board of Engineers (1910), wherein it is said "the execution of this project is not necessary in the interests of navigation.'

At the session of the legislature of 1913 an act was passed which separates all of the plan which embraced the construction of levees and purchase of by-passes and rights of way, and provides to carry out at private expense all of the plan except channel rectification and enlargement and the construction of weirs to regulate the flow of the river, so as to encourage its scouring capacity and the consequent removal of the accumulated mining débris.

The débris commission assumed the burden of separating, as far as possible, the portion of the plan which related to reclamation and which did not relate to navigation directly, although it has always been understood that a complete separation of these elements is impossible.

For an illustration, private interests construct all of the levees along the streams whereby the water is confined to the channels promoting scouring and aiding navigation. For this part of the work Congress is not called upon to contribute any sum whatever, although it involves an expense of $7,838,975, as estimated by the commission.

In many instances in other States Congress has made appropriations for levee construction where flood control has been the primary object and reclamation the primary purpose. California does not ask this. While the State is doing so much for navigation is it unreasonable for it to request some participation by the Government?

The estimate of cost by the report of 1910 was $33,000,000, one-third of which, or $11,000,000, was apportioned to the United States. The supplemental report segregates all except $12,517,000, from which is deducted $800,000 already appropriated, leaving $11,717,000 to be borne by the State and Federal Governments—$5,858,000 each. This leaves over $20,000,000 of the original estimates to be provided by taxing the land of private owners that would be benefited by the work.

A considerable portion of these estimates has already been paid by the reclamation of large tracts at private expense.

The supplemental report strongly recommends a definite policy, as follows:

> First. That the Federal Government should not relinquish control over the entire plan, for the reason that control is necessary to prevent anything being done in one part of the work that affects the general plan, particularly in limiting flood heights.
>
> Second. The adoption by Congress of the plan would confer on the commission power to exercise control over the work done on other elements of the plan than those participated in by the Federal Government. It also appears that the plan, as supplemented by the present report, is necessary in the interests of navigation and apparently the best method of reasonable and permanent navigation.

One of the objects of the plan is the preservation of life and property as well as the reclamation of a vast territory of rich land that must be dependent upon the execution of this plan for any kind of cultivation or profit.

There are about 400,000 acres in a comparative state of reclamation, but it will never be safe until the plan is executed. In 1907 millions of dollars' damage was done, and nearly all of the reclamation districts were flooded. There are about 300,000 acres more in process of reclamation because of the expectation that this plan will be carried out, but no one would expect these reclamations to be effective to any degree unless the plan should be executed.

It must be borne in mind that all of this reclamation is being borne by private expense and that all of the plan excepting the river channel improvement and control is to be paid for by the owners of the land.

The interests of navigation are very much involved in the carrying out of this plan.

An initial expense in the purchase of the land required for the weirs must be borne by the landowners, as the title must be turned over to the Government. This expense will probably reach a sum in excess of $1,000,000.

Any appropriation would be contingent upon acquisition of title to the necessary land as an equal appropriation by the State. Such action would encourage the advanced movement in the execution of the problem under the stimulus of an interest displayed by Congress.

States and communities are constantly asking donations for flood control, but I do not know of any that have offered to

share so large a proportion of the expense. We are asking for less than one-sixth of the whole. The State is undertaking a work in which the whole Nation is interested and one that has always been recognized as one of the burdens of the General Government.

The State is contributing one-half of the money applicable to the interests of navigation, and in addition is spending millions of dollars in the construction of restraining levees, which directly benefit navigation by keeping the waters within the channels.

The State is building up and creating an industrial Commonwealth, which makes an immediate demand for better navigation to carry the augmented product, and the State is presenting to the United States an opportunity to assist in creating a condition which, in a few years, will bring the combined Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to the front in commercial importance. They are now occupying the fifth position.

The extent of land to be protected is 1,750,000 acres. The product from this land is now too great to depend upon present navigable features of the river. Better navigation is needed and the commerce of the United States demands that all reasonable improvements be made.

The dredging of the mouth of the river is to relieve a gorge of the channel which has been produced by the narrowing of the channel at that point, causing it to become crooked and tortuous. When this choke has been removed the water will find a free, uniform passage and the débris in the channel above will escape.

Control of the water in the upper reaches of the river will prevent deposits and keep the river free for navigation.

Caring for these features is purely a function of the Federal Government, the expense of which is usually provided for by Congress alone.

When this work has been completed the problem of navigation on the Sacramento River will be forever settled.

It must be remembered that the burden of maintenance of these works after completion falls upon the State of California and that the Federal Government is to be relieved.

At present the State is engaged in channel improvement on the Sacramento River. It has just appropriated $150,000, which is being used for protection of the banks, without asking Congress for assistance.

SAN PABLO BAY.

Before improvement there was a shoal with a least depth of 19 feet at mean lower low water lying across the path of vessels going to and from the Sacramento and San Joaquin and Mare Island Navy Yard. For the deeper-draft vessels navigation was possible only at the highest stages of the tide.

The original project was adopted June 13, 1902, and provided for a channel 300 feet wide, 30 feet deep, and 27,000 feet long across the shoals in the bay.

A total of $325,165.33 was spent on the original project prior to operations under the present project.

The existing project, adopted February 27, 1911, provides for dredging the channel in San Pablo Bay to a width of 500 feet and a depth of 30 feet, and for a dredge for maintenance. The total estimated cost of the War Department part of the project is $760,000, with $100,000 for maintenance.

Dredging work has been in progress throughout the year under contract. The location of the work is such that the spoils have to be deposited at a distance of about 2 miles from the channel. There have been a number of serious breakdowns and long delays during the year. This work is largely new work, but is partly renewal of old work that had been obliterated.

The total amount expended on the existing project up to June 30, 1913, was $268,573.48, no part of which was for maintenance. The sum of $110 was received for inspection of certain private work done under War Department permit. The outstanding liabilities at the end of the fiscal year amounted to $30,873.27.

The work of dredging is being done under continuing contract appropriation and the full amount of the authorization has been appropriated. The work in progress consists of dredging a channel through Pinole Shoal over a length of 27,200 feet. The approved project was about 74 per cent completed on June 30, 1913.

The funds estimated for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, will be used for operation of the Government dredge soon to be built for maintaining the channel across Pinole Shoal.

The bill carries an appropriation of $40,000, which is the amount that can be profitably expended on this project in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The San Pablo Bay project is particularly important because of its relation to the Government navy yard at Mare Island. The improvement of this channel is being carried on in conjunction with the Navy Department, under whose auspices dredging operations are being carried on to increase the depth of the channel leading to the navy yard. All Government ships bound for the navy yard pass through San Pablo Bay. The improvement is important not only to the navy yard, but is also of great commercial importance because of the shipping at Port Costa and through points to Carquinez Straits.

SUISUN CHANNEL.

It was my privilege to obtain the survey and assist in securing the first appropriation for Suisun Channel. Originally it was a tidal inlet from Suisun Bay, varying in width from 80 to 600 feet, and varying in depth from 0 to 17 feet at mean lower low water. Navigation was possible only at the higher stages of the tide. The section under improvement is about 2 miles long, and its lower end is about 15 miles from the mouth of the channel. The maximum draft that can be brought into the channel from the ocean is 9 feet at mean lower low water.

The present project was adopted in the river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, and provides for a harbor at Suisun 1,400 feet long by 150 feet wide and 6 feet deep at mean lower low water and a cut-off 3,000 feet long, 80 feet wide on the bottom, and 6 feet deep at mean lower low water, from the basin to Peytonia Slough. The estimated cost was $25,000, and $2,000 annually for maintenance. The cut-off having been found impracticable, the project was modified in accordance with the authority given by the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, by substituting the natural channel around the bend for the cut-off. No work was done in the field during the year.

The total amount expended on the existing project up to June 30, 1913, was $252.78, all of which was for preliminary work.

MONTEREY HARBOR.

No work has ever been done by the United States toward the improvement of this locality. The harbor is about 3,000 feet long by about 1,700 feet wide, and the depths vary from 18 feet in the inner part to 60 feet at the outer part. The plane of reference is mean lower low water. The harbor facilities are generally sufficient for present commerce, except in the matter of protection from storms and heavy ocean swells. The shipping facilities are inadequate for prospective commerce.

There is no bar at the entrance of the harbor. The maximum draft that can be brought into it from the ocean is 60 feet at mean lower low water. The present project, adopted July 25, 1912, is the original project. Nothing has been spent on this work as yet.

The existing project provides a method of improvement by breakwater 2,000 feet long, 10 feet above mean lower low water, and 15 feet wide at the top, at an estimated cost of $800,000, of which $200,000 is to be contributed by local interest, and subject to the condition that rail connection be provided between Monterey and San Joaquin Valley within a reasonable time.

THE RICHMOND PROJECT.

The bill carries $100,000 for Richmond Harbor. The plan provides for the construction of an entrance channel, a basin, and an inner branch channel, all to be protected by a training wall and dike. The ultimate depth proposed for the improved harbor is 24 feet at mean lower low water, but for the present only a part of the basin and the entrance channel are to have this depth, the balance of the basin and the inner channel to be given a depth of 20 feet.

The estimated cost of the whole work to a depth of 24 feet is $1,975,000, and of that part of it which it is proposed to do at present, $1,757,000. It is estimated that maintenance will cost $30,000 per year for the first year and $15,000 per year thereafter.

The Board of Engineers believes that the United States would be justified in undertaking this work on the basis of half its cost being paid by the locality, and it recommended the adoption of the present project involving an entrance channel 600 feet wide, protected by a training wall faced with riprap, a suitable turning basin at Potrero Point, and a channel thence to the Ellis Slough, all to a depth of 24 feet, at a total estimated cost of $850,000, provided that the locality contribute one-half of this amount.

The Rees plans for the east San Francisco Bay district include the harbor of Richmond. The enterprising people of this growing community have set an example of liberality in cooperating with the Government that many localities might well follow. The city has already voted $1,170,000 to be used for harbor improvements and in addition has authorized the submission of another bond issue, which provides for the payment of $75,000 per annum for a period of five years to be applied toward defraying the expense of Government dredging. Part

of the receipts from the harbor will be set aside for a like purpose. The entire inner harbor will be municipally controlled.

Richmond, fast becoming a manufacturing center, will offer, when the present plans are completed, fully 13 miles of berthing space. At least 7 miles of the water front will be municipally controlled.

NAPA RIVER.

The Napa River has a length of about 45 miles. The section included in the project is the lower 18 miles. The maximum draft that can be brought to the mouth of the river from the ocean is 24 feet at mean lower low water. Before improvement navigation was possible only at the higher stages of the tide.

The project for improvement adopted in 1888 provided for dredging and cutting off projecting points of land so as to obtain a channel 75 feet wide and 4 feet deep and to remove logs, snags, and other obstructions, at an estimated cost of $27,600.

The population and commerce of this locality have increased to such an extent that boats are required to sail on regular schedule instead of waiting for high tide, as heretofore, and this necessitates a deeper channel than is authorized by the present project, adopted 25 years ago. It is recommended that a preliminary examination be authorized with a view to determining upon the advisability of further improvement to meet the needs of present navigation.

The present project was completed in 1910, and a clear channel 75 feet wide and 4 feet deep was obtained from the mouth up to the head of navigation. The length of the improved section is 18 miles, and the head of navigation is the city of Napa.

The river and harbor act of 1913 authorized a resurvey of Napa River with a view to making the necessary cut-offs. This survey was made by the local engineer, who reported that further improvement was deemed advisable to the extent of making four cut-offs 6 feet deep at mean lower water and with widths as proposed by the district officer, at a total estimated cost of $43,000, provided that no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands. A preliminary appropriation of $20,000 is recommended for work on Jacks Bend, Spreckels Point Bend, and Car Bend, the balance of $23,000 to be appropriated when the necessary right of way and dumping ground for the cut-off at Horseshoe Bend have been furnished the United States free of cost. As the report was not received in time to be considered by the House committee, an amendment will, I understand, be offered in the Senate Committee on Commerce by Senator Perkins, which will no doubt be agreed to in the House.

PETALUMA CREEK.

Before improvement this creek was very crooked, dry in many places at low tide, and could be navigated only at higher stages of the tide. The channel was from 80 to 600 feet wide.

The existing project, adopted March 2, 1907, provides for dredging a channel 6 feet deep and 50 feet wide from the mouth to McNears Canal, and 4 feet deep and 50 feet wide thence to the head of navigation. The estimate of cost was $15,239. The improved project was completed in 1907, and all work done since has been for maintenance of the authorized width and depth of channel. The navigable portion of the creek is 18 miles in length.

The unexpended balance on hand being sufficient for all necessary work, no further funds, the local engineer states, will be needed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

REDWOOD CREEK.

Before improvement there were shoals in this creek that were bare at low tide. The channel had a width varying from 80 to 400 feet and was used only during the medium and higher stages of the tide. The total amount spent prior to the adoption of the present project was $31,442.66. This was for dredging a channel about 6,000 feet long, 50 to 60 feet wide, and 2 to 3 feet deep. In 1902 this project was modified to provide for a channel depth of 5 feet and certain works to confine the current.

The present project, approved June 25, 1910, provides for a channel 150 feet wide and 5 feet deep at mean low water up to the city dock, about three-fourths of a mile below Redwood City. The estimated cost is $12,000, with $1,500 annually thereafter for maintenance.

It is recommended that a preliminary examination of the locality be authorized, with a view to determining upon the advisability of reducing the project width of the improved channel and extending it to the head of navigation. The project requires a much wider channel than is necessary and does not provide for reaching the head of navigation. No work was done during the year and no expenditures made.

The total amount spent on the existing project to date is $10,320.80. The present project was entirely completed early in 1911, and the result was a channel 150 feet wide and 5 feet deep from San Francisco Bay up to the city dock.

No estimate is made for expenditures for the fiscal year 1915, because the funds on hand—$4,679.20—will be sufficient for all necessary work.

SAN DIEGO HARBOR.

This harbor is just north of the Mexican boundary, 89 nautical miles southerly of Los Angeles Harbor and 482 nautical miles southerly of San Francisco. At 21-foot depth of water at mean lower low water it has a width varying from 500 feet to 2,000 feet, and is about 9 miles long. The total water area is about 21 square miles at half tide.

The river and harbor act approved March 3, 1875, appropriated $80,000 for the construction of a dike across the mouth of San Diego River, to divert it into False Bay and thus prevent injury to San Diego Harbor from deposit of material brought down during floods. This work was completed in 1876 at a cost of $79,798.72. The cost of repairs made since has brought the total of expenditures to $86,832.03.

The project for the improvement of the harbor, approved September 19, 1890, provided for the construction of a jetty on Zuniga Shoal at the entrance of the harbor; the maintenance of a channel, 24 feet deep at mean low tide and 500 feet wide, through the middle ground; and repairs to the restraining dike. The jetty was to rise to the height of extreme high water and to be about 7,500 feet long, with a view to producing a depth of 26 feet at mean lower low water on the outer bar. The amount expended on this harbor up to the completion of this project was $625,211.68.

The river and harbor acts of March, 1905, 1907, and 1909, appropriated in all $60,000 for maintenance. The amount expended on this project—maintenance—was $59,904.21.

The project adopted June 25, 1910, provided for dredging a channel through the outer bar, 30 feet deep and 600 feet wide, and also a channel through the middle ground to the depth of 30 feet, this latter channel to be 400 feet wide at its southerly end and to widen out at the northerly end in order better to accommodate vessels using the United States Navy coaling station at La Playa. The act appropriated $125,000 for this work, which was the estimated cost of the improvement. The amount expended was $124,703.68.

The existing project was adopted March 4, 1913. The act appropriated $208,786 for dredging a channel through the outer bar, 35 feet deep at mean lower low water and 570 feet wide, with side slopes of 1 on 5, and also a channel through the middle ground of 32 feet at mean lower low water and of a regular shape. The same act appropriated $35,000 for the maintenance of these channels. No work has as yet been done under this project.

The legislature of 1911 granted to the city of San Diego control of its entire water front. The city has already voted a million dollars for a municipal pier, which is now nearing completion. This pier will be equipped with railroad tracks and every facility for expeditiously handling freight. The total length of bulkhead at San Diego is 50,500 feet, giving a total deep-sea dockage of 13 miles and a total coaster dockage of 6 miles. Very extensive plans have been prepared by the municipality for the future development of the harbor to meet the needs of increasing commerce. The importance of San Diego Harbor will be greatly increased with the opening of the Panama Canal, as it will be the first Pacific port in the United States for ships bound north after passing through the great waterway. The municipal wharves now under construction will be of concrete and steel. Private wharves are leased from the city, the administration of its entire harbor front being under a board of municipal harbor commissioners.

No additional funds are asked for, as it is estimated that the amount appropriated will complete the project, and $35,000 has been appropriated for maintaining the project depth.

The present bill carries an authorization for a new survey of this harbor, the following language being used:

San Diego Harbor, Cal., with a view to widening the main channel at the Government coaling station, and at other places in the harbor where widening may be needed; providing ample approaches to the municipal docks and wharves and a suitable turning basin.

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER.

This stream rises in the Sierras south of Mono Lake, near the California-Nevada boundary line.

After flowing southwesterly to a point about 35 miles west of the city of Fresno, it turns and flows northwesterly through San Joaquin Valley to the head of Suisun Bay. The stream has a total length of approximately 350 miles.

A draft of about 16 feet may be brought to the mouth of the river at low tide from the Pacific Ocean. The distance from the ocean at the entrance to the Golden Gate to the mouth of the

river by way of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, and Suisun Bay is 50 miles. These bays and the San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Mokelumne Rivers and their branches, sloughs, and artificial canals (dredger cuts) all go to form a large and important system of inland waterways.

The navigable portion of the San Joaquin River under improvement consists of two distinct sections: First, the tidewater section in the extensive and fertile delta region extending from the mouth of the river up to about Stockton, a distance of 45½ miles; traffic here is important and navigation is continuous all the year round. Second, the section above Stockton, and especially above tidal influence at San Joaquin Bridge.

The first appropriation was made August 14, 1876. With this and subsequent appropriations the operations have been thus far carried on, with the view of providing and maintaining an improved channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide all the year round from Suisun Bay to Stockton; removing the worst obstructions and closing several side channels in the river above Stockton Channel, with the view of aiding in some measure light-draft steamboats to ascend to Hills Ferry for wheat shipments; obtaining and maintaining, so far as is practicable, a low-water channel 80 feet wide and 4 feet deep in the lower 1½ miles of Mormon Channel; and preparing to dredge Fremont Channel and McLeod Lake to 9 feet at mean low water.

The expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, amounted to $3,327.39, of which $175 was for original work and $3,152.39 for maintenance.

The total expenditure up to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, amounted to $617,717.99, the greater part of which has been applied to the channel between Suisun Bay and the city of Stockton.

The improved channel is generally 100 feet wide and from 7 to 8 feet at low water. While the projected 9-foot channel has been obtained on several occasions, it has existed for short periods only.

While the length of the main river through the delta region is about 65 miles, the aggregate length of the network of natural and artificial waterway tributary to it in that region is over 200 miles. While portions of the delta region are reached by transcontinental railroads, three in number, no railroad has yet been built into the interior of the region. Consequently the bulk of the product is moved by water. Freight rates by water are low. They are also low by rail to such points as may be reached by both water and rail. Approximately 650,000 short tons of freight, valued at $33,000,000, is handled annually on the river.

By the act approved June 25, 1910, there was adopted a project for obtaining and maintaining a channel having a 200-foot bottom width and 9-foot depth from Suisun Bay to Stockton, at an estimated first cost of $240,000 and $25,000 annually for maintenance, to be accomplished by dredging where necessary and making two cut-offs. The project also provides for obtaining a sufficient right of way to permit of increasing the dimensions of the waterway should this become desirable in the future. The lands necessary for the two cut-offs have been acquired and deeded to the United States by local interests free of cost.

No additional funds are required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the balances unexpended being sufficient to carry on the work proposed.

SAN LUIS OBISPO HARBOR.

The original project, adopted August 11, 1888, provided for the construction on Whaler Reef of a breakwater of rubblestone rising to mean lower low water and extending from Point San Luis to Whaler Island, a distance of 326 feet, and thence to a point where the outer reef rises above high water. Exclusive of Whaler Island, which is 245 feet long, the breakwater was to have a length of about 1,736 feet, and its estimated cost was $284,898.

This project was modified January 17, 1893, to provide for raising the structure to the height of 6 feet above mean high water, with a top width of 20 feet and such side slopes as might be formed under the actions of the sea. The estimated cost was increased to $568,660.

The existing project, therefore, is the construction of a breakwater from Point San Luis to Whaler Island and from Whaler Island extending southeasterly to a distance about 1,800 feet, the breakwater to be built to a height of 6 feet above mean high water, with a top width of 20 feet and such side slopes as may be formed under the action of the sea.

The act of March 2, 1907, appropriated $63,660 and authorized continuing contracts for the completion of the work at a cost not to exceed the additional amount of $200,000, all of which has been appropriated.

The amount expended on the project up to June 30, 1913, is $508,367.89, with outstanding liabilities amounting to $18,619.99. Of this amount, $77,223.08 was expended during the year. The project is 93 per cent completed.

Further work under the project will afford increased shelter. The unexpended balance will be applied to the extension of the breakwater to its full projected length and height. No additional funds are asked for, as the amount appropriated will complete the project.

FEATHER RIVER.

The Feather River rises in the Sierras; flows westerly until it enters the Sacramento Valley in the vicinity of Oroville; flows south through that valley and empties into the Sacramento River at Vernon, 20 miles above the city of Sacramento.

For a number of years before improvements were undertaken by the Government, the expense of maintaining navigation in the Sacramento from its mouth to Red Bluff—258 miles—and in the Feather from its mouth to Marysville—30 miles—was met by the steamboat companies. After the advent of the railroads and the lessened profit to the steamboat companies these companies discontinued the work of improving the streams.

The first appropriation by Congress was made March 3, 1875. The low-water depth in the Feather River from its mouth to Marysville was about 2 feet, and this stream was navigated by one steamboat, plying weekly between San Francisco and Marysville.

From 1875–1899 the operations were carried on under indefinite projects which contemplated the maintenance of a low-water channel depth in the Feather River of 2 feet to Marysville. A portion of $740,860.21 was expended under this indefinite project.

Until recently Feather River has not been navigated by steamboats regularly. Between January 28 and June 30, 1913, one boat between San Francisco and Marysville made 18 trips, carrying 2,729 short tons of freight valued at $160,000.

Much of the country along the Feather River is subject to widespread overflow during the winter and spring months, the channel being unable to carry off the rainfall in the valleys and foothills and the melting snow in the mountains. Unrestricted hydraulic mining in earlier years has contributed largely to the difficulty by filling up the bed of the stream.

Occasional dredging seems to be the best method of treatment.

HUMBOLDT HARBOR.

This is the most important harbor in the northern section of the State. Before improvement the entrance was obstructed by a bar having channel depths of 12 to 15 feet. Navigation with the deeper draft vessels was generally limited to higher stages of the tides and to favorable conditions of wind and weather. The locality is about 272 miles north of San Francisco.

There is an available depth of 18 feet at mean lower low water over the bar across the jetty channel.

A project for the improvement of the harbor entrance was made in 1882, which was modified in 1888 and again in 1891, this final modification providing for parallel high jetties each 8,000 feet long. The amount expended on these projects—1882–1909—was $2,178,704.14.

The present project, which has not been modified since its adoption, provides for rebuilding the jetties in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 950, Sixtieth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $1,037,400.

The approved project was 48.09 per cent completed on June 30, 1913. It is now estimated that the completion will cost $500,060 more than originally estimated. This increase of cost is due to the increase in cost of labor, supplies, and to an additional tonnage of stone. The bill carries $525,000 for Humboldt Harbor and Bay.

BAY OF EUREKA.

The existing project, which has not been modified since adoption, provides for a channel 300 feet wide, 18 feet deep, and 6,200 feet long. The estimate of cost was $83,000 and was adopted by Congress on March 2, 1907.

The project was completed in 1908 at a cost of $86,895.70.

The descriptions which I have given of the various California projects provided for in the bill show how deeply my State is interested in river and harbor improvement. The future prosperity of the Commonwealth is dependent, in no small measure, upon the fullest development of its waterways. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ELDER].

Mr. ELDER. Mr. Chairman, I presume that it will be unnecessary for me to state that I am heartily in favor of this bill, representing as I do a district on the Mississippi River for the

length of 256 miles, a district that has perhaps more navigable miles of water transportation than any other district in the United States. I feel that it would be fair enough to say if I did not believe the money was wisely expended as proposed in the bill, I would certainly oppose it.

My congressional district is divided into two levee districts, known as the fifth levee district and the Tensas Basin levee district. In the fifth levee district there are 2,000,000 acres of land protected by the levee. Of these, 500,000 acres are cleared and 250,000 acres are in a state of cultivation. In 1912, 1,900,000 acres of this district were overflowed. It is estimated that 65 per cent of the levee is in a completed state. At this time, in addition to the help the Government gives us, there is an ad valorem tax of 10 mills, a tax of 5 cents on each acre of land; the railroads are taxed $100 per mile; there is a cotton tax of $1 per bale. The revenue from the State is about $75,000, with a gross annual revenue of $220,000. There are $500,000 worth of bonds outstanding. The assessed value of the district in 1911 was $8,619,245. In the Tensas Basin levee district there is an area of 2,800,000 acres of land, of which 300,000 acres are in a state of cultivation. In 1912, 560,000 acres of land were overflowed. This district has a 10 mills ad valorem tax, a tax of 5 cents on each acre of land, a tax of $60 per mile for each mile of standard railroad, and $30 for each mile of narrow-gauge railroad. It also receives 10 per cent of a seventeen-twentieths of 1 mill of a general State tax. The assessed value of this district in 1910 was $7,298,416. There has been spent by this district as a total up to January 1, 1914, the sum of $1,348,189.11. There are outstanding bonds of $65,000. It cost these two districts to make a largely unsuccessful high-water fight in 1912 $62,213.09.

I hear some advocate the theory here that as they do not live within the overflowed section, therefore their people should not be forced to contribute to the building and maintenance of a levee system for the Mississippi or any other river. Mr. Chairman, it looks to me that such a doctrine is a fallacy, and if carried to its logical conclusion it means that the Government would not expend money for any purpose; that it would not deepen the harbors or build a public building, as the immediate effect of such legislation is to show its particular benefit to the country immediately affected. However, I do believe in the doctrine that any expenditure of money which will help and benefit a particular section will eventually disseminate its good to the people of the whole country. I, of course, do not mean to imply this should be a wasteful expenditure or an expenditure that would not bring a commensurate return. We recently authorized an expenditure of $35,000,000 only as a starter to build a railroad in Alaska, in the hope that that country might be advanced and that the rest of America will eventually be benefited and repaid for this and the succeeding expenditures. You heard the advocates of that bill tell of the wonderful agricultural resources of the frozen North; yet, Mr. Chairman, even if their fondest ideas are realized the agricultural possibilities of Alaska can never equal by one-tenth the same possibilities of the overflowed district on the Mississippi River.

Another reason why this Government should protect the overflow of the Mississippi River is that we act as a basin for an enormous stretch of territory. We act as a basin for a waterfall that covers the entire States of South Dakota, Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska. We act as a basin for a portion of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina. A drainage basin that constitutes 41 per cent of the total area of the United States and also a portion of Canada. This overflowed basin is 29,000 square miles in extent. Previous to the cultivation of this 41 per cent of the area of the United States the flow of the water was slower and there was no such rush of the waters, and the lands were not so seriously subject to overflow for this reason. The land being an alluvial or made land, with an extremely rich and deep soil, is as rich as that alluvial Valley of the Nile. The people from various parts of the country began to open up this land and to cultivate it. In the beginning, these overflows were not serious. Broad and fertile farms that helped materially to give the United States its balance of trade were beginning to blossom all over that basin. At the same time the lands in the other portion of the country were being opened up, and year by year the rush of the waters began to be more serious, overflows began to threaten these people in this rich basin, and they began to cast about to find ways to protect themselves from the rush of waters of their sister States. It was found that the only feasible and economical means of flood prevention was by a system of levees, and this view was indorsed by the United States engineers as far back as 1860 and continuously since. There sprang up a system of local levees, the expense of which was borne by the people of the overflowed district. Year by year the floods became higher as the agricultural region of the United States was more fully developed. The drain became enormous, the levees were not uniform, one levee section had no control over another levee section; one State, although affected by the waters of another State, was unable to go into that other State and build levees, and the people who were interested at last realized that it was impossible to succeed in the way they were attempting, that the yearly expense of fighting these waters, together with the uncertainty of the success, made the drain such an enormous one that it was not a successful business proposition, and then they awoke to the realization that they were being compelled to care for a burden that was really a national problem, and that only in one way could there be a uniform and successful system of levees, and that was through national administration and action. And in answer to that sentiment all three of the presidential candidates and the platforms of the Democratic, Republican, and Progressive Parties in 1912 declared in favor of a national control and maintenance of this levee system along the Mississippi River.

The Democratic platform said:

We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem; the building of the levees to prevent overflow of the land and its consequent devastation resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

The Republican paltform said:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union.

The Progressive platform said:

It is a national obligation to develop our rivers, and especially the Mississippi, without delay, under a comprehensive plan. Under such a plan the destructive floods of the Mississippi would be controlled and land sufficient to support millions of people will be reclaimed.

Therefore this is not a party question; it is one of fair dealing toward your fellow man. It is one that with a fair expenditure of money will yield an astonishing amount of wealth to the United States. It is estimated by the Mississippi River Commission that $58,000,000 will complete these levees and make them of sufficient size and strength to withstand the greatest floods, and once completed the maintenance will be a small amount. In this overflowed section there are 20,000,000 acres of rich alluvial lands, with a season which lasts practically for 12 months in the year, that will produce from one to two bales of cotton per acre, that will produce enormous amounts of corn and clovers and garden truck. Only one-fourth of this area is now in a state of cultivation. It will not pay, in the face of the levee situation, to open up this additional three-fourths. Yet this three-fourths is level and can be easily drained and put in a state of cultivation. Once the people know that that deadly nightmare of each recurring year is not hanging over them like the somber hand of death they will reclaim it. These 15,000,000 acres that are now lying as an economic waste will in the course of time, if you give us the levee protection, produce $500,000,000 of products per year, will increase our trade balance, and will help keep down the cost of living to the people in the cities, and will unquestionably repay that portion of the United States not directly affected ten times the value of the money expended by the Federal Government. The people of that section have already spent $60,000,000 against the National Government's $27,000,000. It has been spent piecemeal, in driblets, and has naturally yielded no return such as it would if the levees were built within a reasonable time and of uniform size and strength. Our cultivated lands, with the richest soil there is in America to-day, are worth from $15 to $25 per acre. When these levees are built, 10 years later should see the price of these lands at $100 to $150 per acre, and yielding handsome returns in dividends. But until there is a fair and reasonable protection from all the waters of the sister States we will have to struggle against overwhelming odds, unable to secure a fair and adequate return from one of the brightest and most luxuriant garden spots of the world.

I have in my district 4,800,000 acres of land that is subject to overflow. At this time only about one-quarter of this land is cleared and about one-half of that amount in a state of cultivation. Yet it is all a rich alluvial land that has been made by the deposits of thousands of years. Long years ago in the early settlement of that section of the country, before these overflows were an annual affair, the American people, on account of the richness of that soil, went in and began to clear the land. We did not have these overflows at that time, because all the rest of

the United States was not in the state of cultivation that it is to-day. They opened up this field and succeeded, but as the rest of the country began to be developed along with that, the farms cleared, the waters came down on us more rapidly year by year. The overflows got to be such a serious menace to the people of that country they began to lay about for means to protect themselves from this high water. They found that the only feasible plan was levee protection. This theory has been borne out by numerous reports of the river and harbor commission and the engineers of the United States Army. For years these people have toiled and struggled and paid taxes that have exceeded, perhaps, the value of their land in an attempt to protect themselves from the waters of their sister States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELDER. Certainly.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman states that as the land has been put under cultivation and the drainage is perfected all along up the river, that has augmented the floods, the water has rushed into the river more rapidly. There is only a small proportion of the lands along up that river that is yet under cultivation, and if that cultivation continues, the levee will have to be built higher and higher from time to time.

Mr. ELDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman misunderstood me. I said as the rest of the United States became under cultivation. We act as the basin for 41 per cent of the United States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I understand that.

Mr. ELDER. And as the rest of this land of the United States began to be cultivated the water was not retarded and came down all at once and forced us to build these levees. The rest of the United States is largely in a state of cultivation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman think that more than 50 per cent of the land drained by the Mississippi River is under cultivation?

Mr. ELDER. Oh, yes, unquestionably; all the land that can be. As a matter of fact, all the water that falls within that area for which we act as a basin rushes down upon us now within a few weeks, and if it were every bit cultivated it could not come more quickly.

Mr. CALLAWAY. As the land is being put under cultivation, does not the water that rushes into the river from that land carry far more silt than it used to before the land was under cultivation?

Mr. ELDER. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And the deposits of silt are now much larger than they used to be?

Mr. ELDER. Yes; but if you will stop these overflows the rush of water will be swifter and will carry the silt on out to the sea. It follows as a law of physics that the narrower you confine the channel of the water, the swifter the water is and the farther it will carry the silt.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that the rapidity of the water determines whether it will carry the silt, and not the depth or shallowness of the water.

Mr. ELDER. Yes; and the narrowness of the stream as well as its pitch determines its rapidity. Mr. Chairman, if I had plenty of time I would like to continue this discussion, for it would be interesting, but in a limited time it would not permit me to explain the conditions as I find them. As a matter of equity the only reasonable way in which it can be done is for the Government to assume control of the building of these levees. Under the present condition we would have a levee of a certain height and strength in one district and in a district higher up there would be one which is not quite so strong or so good.

The result is that although you may expend enormous sums of money on one district, as the people in that district may be able to do, the other link in the chain is weak, and the strong link has no control over that in a local way. If the weaker link breaks, the whole country is flooded. The result of such a system means that if the people of a particular section refused to build a levee and protect their own lands, the people of the whole of the basin would be entirely helpless, and it is necessary from the standpoint of reaching actual results that the national body should take charge and build a uniform levee. The people who have none of these levees in their districts say, "Oh, we do not want to spend the Government's money for this, because we are not interested in it." My friends, you are wrong, and if such a doctrine were carried to its logical conclusion there would be no expenditure of public moneys. The people of my district are not directly interested in New York Harbor and they are not directly interested in those rivers and harbors just spoken of by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND], and yet they give their money and goods, and that money and goods are returned to them partly out of the general good of the country and by virtue of the products that the particular country aided may produce. We have in this particular country 20,000,000 acres of land, only one-fourth of which is now cultivated, land that will produce from one to two bales of cotton per acre, land that will produce enormous sums in other agricultural products, a country where the season extends for 12 months of the year, and if we are able to develop this area it will mean hundreds of millions of dollars that will go to the American people to form for us a balance of trade, of which those who are not directly interested will ultimately receive a benefit.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I desire to ask a question purely for information.

Mr. ELDER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. In the gentleman's State, and in all the States that are subject to these destructive overflows, there are vast areas of upland not subject to overflows. Take Tennessee, for instance.

Mr. ELDER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the gentleman know to what extent those uplands not subject to overflow in the various States have been taxed by the people of those States to aid in flood protection?

Mr. ELDER. I could not answer for the State of Tennessee.

Mr. WILLIS. Well, in the gentleman's own State.

Mr. ELDER. In my own State only to a small extent. We have a general State tax that will contribute so much, but a large portion of the burden falls on the particular district. Now, in my congressional district, the fifth, we have what is known as the fifth district levee board and the Tensas levee board, that have a right to lay on acreage tax, that have the right to tax railroad lands from $30 to $100 a mile. We lay a tax of so much on each bale of cotton; that is the burden which does not fall on the rest of the State; a small portion will fall upon the whole State, and in that way will affect the hilly regions.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman sees what I am driving at. Until the uplands of the various States are taxed, it would seem hardly fair to expect the people in the remote sections to be entirely willing to have their lands taxed if the people in the uplands of the States affected are not willing——

Mr. ELDER. The people of the State have been willing, and have contributed their small mite in this direction. They have contributed their share. They have not been able to contribute the whole of it, because they are not directly affected, but the people of the rest of the United States have contributed in an infinitesimally smaller share. Now I want to describe the conditions. Out in these great bottoms, what you might say are swamps, the land is as rich as any in the valley of the Nile. My people have no public buildings, there is but one Federal building in all that area; they do not have the advantages of great roads and great public buildings and public parks, like the people of most of the rest of the United States, yet every year, year in and year out, they have contributed their share of the taxes of the Government; they have labored and toiled in their humble way, attempting to make good citizens; they have been willing to bear arms for it at any time, but they do not receive the benefits from this Government which most of the other sections of the country get; and when their all is tied up for life in this property, when they are willing to contribute what they can, in God's name and in humanity's name why should not the rest of the Nation, that has been better blessed, bear its small portion of the burden? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to have had sufficient time during general debate to tell the committee and the country something about the great work being done on waterway improvements by the State of New York. We are building a great barge canal, 540 miles long, costing, all told, $130,000,000.

The bill H. R. 13811, making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, carries $39,227,504 in cash and authorizes $4,061,500, a total sum of $43,289,004.

The East River project, based on a bill introduced by me, will cost $13,400,000, and will be expended as rapidly as the money can be used—$500,000 in 1914.

In addition, the Harlem and Bronx Rivers, $100,000 each; Westchester Creek, $36,500; and East Chester Creek, $20,000. Add to these sums the different other appropriations for New York City, amounting to $1,200,000, and the grand total is $1,963,500 actually appropriated.

When the work now being done by the State of New York is considered and the fact that 60 per cent of the revenue from the customs is collected at that port, the sum carried in the bill under discussion is insignificant.

In the limited time at my disposal I can only say that the great State in part which I represent here has set the pace for her sister Commonwealths.

The improved barge canal, free from all tolls, reaching from the metropolis to Buffalo and benefiting all the Northwestern States, is rapidly approaching completion.

In 1916 the fleets of 3,000-ton barges will be sailing on the waters of the new Erie Canal.

To show the comparison, as well as for the information of Congress and the country, I will insert as a part of my remarks excerpts from an article published in the New York Herald of March 8, 1914, which contains much valuable information on this great work by the Empire State. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate some excerpts from the New York Herald upon this subject under date of March 8, 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if they are going to charge tolls on this canal, or propose to do so?

Mr. GOULDEN. No, sir; it is a free canal as all other canals ought to be to American shipping.

Mr. MANN. Then I do not object.

Mr. CANTOR. It is largely for the benefit of the Northwest, too.

Mr. MANN. I never knew New York to do anything except for the benefit of the Northwest.

Mr. CANTOR. Including Chicago.

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes; New Yorkers are always willing to help all other sections of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to by Mr. GOULDEN is as follows:

The annual report of State Engineer John A. Bensel relative to the State Barge Canal shows that this great work is much nearer completion than is generally supposed. The report states that contracts to the amount of $82,000,000 have been let and that work to the amount of $63,000,000, or about 60 per cent of all the work on the canal, which is to cost a little over $100,000,000, exclusive of real estate and terminals, has been completed.

So much has been printed about the Panama Canal that nearly everyone has at least a general idea of where it is, what it is, its cost, and the results which are expected from it. On the other hand, very few people, even in New York State, have anything but the most vague information about the Barge Canal, notwithstanding that the benefits to the State in general and to the port of New York in particular will be many times greater than from the Panama Canal.

In order to understand the relative size of the two canals a comparison of the main features is necessary. In the first place, the Barge Canal is 540 miles long, as compared to the 50 miles of the Panama Canal. It has 57 locks and 39 dams, while the Panama Canal has only 6 locks and 4 dams. The cost of the Barge Canal, including terminals and real estate, will be approximately $130,000,000, as compared with $375,000,000 for the Panama Canal.

Columns have been printed about the enormous amount of excavation and concrete in the Panama Canal, but the figures show that the Barge Canal will require considerably more than half the amount of excavation and concrete in the Panama Canal, the figures being 114,000,000 cubic yards of excavation in the Barge Canal, as compared with 203,000,000 cubic yards in the Panama Canal, and 2,750,000 cubic yards of concrete in the Barge Canal, as compared with 5,000,000 cubic yards in the Panama Canal.

Probably the most striking comparison, however, is shown by the fact that whereas the total lift of the Panama Canal is only 85 feet, the lift of the Barge Canal is 525 feet. In other words, a barge starting at tidewater from the port of New York will be 569 feet above sea level, or nearly as high as the top of the Singer Building when it reaches Lake Erie, the actual lift in the locks being 525 feet and the difference of 44 feet being the result of the natural flow of the water.

The barges not only finally reach an elevation of 569 feet, but they go up and down steps, as it were, on the way, climbing to a height of 211 feet at Schenectady and 420 feet at Rome, then down to the level of 363 feet at Syracuse and up again to 512 feet at Rochester, then on a level to Lockport, where they climb 50 feet, and then on to Buffalo at the 565-foot level. From Syracuse the Oswego branch of the canal drops 119 feet to Lake Ontario, while the Lake Champlain branch climbs 140 feet from the Hudson River at Albany to Fort Edward and then drops 44 feet to Lake Champlain.

* * * * * * *

It is estimated that the Barge Canal will carry right from the start a tonnage equal to the total tonnage which is expected to pass through the Panama Canal. It is estimated that the Barge Canal, which has a capacity of from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 tons per annum, will in the beginning handle at least 10,000,000 tons of freight a year, which is practically the same as the estimate for the Panama Canal.

* * * * * * *

In order to appreciate what an enormous amount 10,000,000 tons really is a comparison with the same volume if handled by rail is interesting.

Ten million tons would fill 333,333 freight cars having a capacity of 30 tons each, which would make a solid train 2,522 miles long. This train, if moving at the average speed of freight trains—20 miles an hour—would take over five days to pass a given point. It would extend from New York to Chicago and back again, with enough cars left over to reach from New York to Cleveland.

If 10,000,000 tons a year seems a large volume of business for the Barge Canal to handle, it should be remembered that this amount, which is only one-third of its capacity, is small in comparison with the tonnage through the Soo Canal, the outlet of Lake Superior, through which 72,472,676 tons passed in 1912.

41 CENTS PER TON BY BARGE CANAL, WITH $3.11 BY RAIL.

As startling as are the facts relative to the tonnage of the State Barge Canal, even more astounding is the official statement of the cost of bringing freight through the canal from the Great Lakes to this port.

The present average cost of carrying a ton of freight by rail from Buffalo to New York is officially stated to be $1.96 a ton, whereas the cost of carrying freight by the Barge Canal is officially estimated to be only 26 cents a ton, a saving in actual cost of $1.70 a ton. On the 10,000,000 tons which the Barge Canal is expected to handle from the beginning, this would amount to a saving of $17,000,000 a year.

The foregoing statement, it should be remembered, is a comparison of the actual cost of carrying freight by rail and through the canal, and is not a comparison of the charges made by the railroads and to be made through the canal.

It is officially stated that the average charge for carrying a ton of freight from Buffalo to New York by rail is $3.11, and the charge by the Barge Canal between the same ports, figuring on a liberal profit, is estimated to be only 41 cents a ton. There would therefore be a saving of $2.70 a ton, or a total saving on the 10,000,000 tons of $27,000,000 a year.

It is hard to realize that a ton of freight can actually be brought from Buffalo to New York for 41 cents and pay a satisfactory profit to the carrier, but when it is understood that the new barges will have a maximum capacity of 3,000 tons, in comparison with 250 tons, the capacity of the present barges, and that the new barges will have two and a half times the speed of the old barges, the reason for the low cost is apparent. In other words, a 3,000-ton barge, at the rate of 41 cents a ton, would earn $1,230 for the trip from Buffalo to New York, a distance of 440 miles. On the other hand, a 250-ton barge could only earn at the same rate $102.50 for the trip, which would take two and a half times as long as the new barges.

If 41 cents a ton seems very low for carrying freight by water from Buffalo to New York, a distance of 440 miles, it only has to be compared with the report for 1913 of the United States engineer in charge of the Soo Canal, which shows that the average cost of carrying the 72,472,676 tons passing through the canal in 1912 for an average distance of 831 miles was 56 cents a ton. In other words, if the tonnage through the Soo Canal can be carried 831 miles at an average cost of 56 cents a ton, it stands to reason that there will be a fair profit in carrying freight through the Barge Canal 440 miles for a charge of 41 cents a ton.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington use some more time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would say, Mr. Chairman, on this side we have used 2 hours and 52 minutes to-day and that is outside of what was consumed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have certainly consumed our share to-day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman could use 10 or 15 minutes until one of our friends is enabled to get his data, he would oblige us.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There is no one on this side now. There are only two other gentlemen on this side to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman might ask that the bill be read.

Mr. MADDEN. There were two gentlemen who obtained special time, one the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and the other the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and if there is nobody here who desires to go on would it not be a good idea to begin the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. That is perhaps true.

Mr. MADDEN. Or would it not be a good idea to adjourn, for I presume everybody is tired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. SMALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GARD, for three days, on account of important business.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the urgent deficiency appropriation bill H. R. 13612, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 13612, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman from New York will be agreed to.

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GILLETT.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, March 20, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report by the Mississippi River Commission, with maps and appendixes, on separation of the waters of the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers from those of the Mississippi River, made in compliance with the provisions of the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 841); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the president of the Civil Service Commission, submitting an estimate of appropriation for completing the examination of fourth-class postmasters during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, etc. (H. Doc. No. 842); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of appropriations relative to the public-buildings service (H. Doc. No. 843); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 751) to repeal section 2480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 418), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2419) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 419), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 14799) to create an Interstate Trade Commission, to prohibit and prevent unfair competition, and to protect commerce against monopolies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 14800) creating a commission to enroll the Indians into two classes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14801) to provide for certain unallotted members of the Pembina Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: A bill (H. R. 14802) to amend and reenact section 3246, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended in the third session of the Forty-fifth Congress, on page 334 of volume 20 of the United States Statutes at Large; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 14803) in relation to semimonthly payment of wages and salaries by railroads engaged in interstate traffic, and providing penalty for violating of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14804) authorizing Ponca City, Okla., and the board of education of said city to convey certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 14805) to create a new division of the Bureau of Education, to be known as the Federal Motion Picture Commission, and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CHURCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) relative to aid from the Government of the United States for industrial education and the inauguration and establishment of a national university and department of education at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Education.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 14806) granting a pension to Wealthy J. Larrabee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14807) granting a pension to Archibald Groom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 14808) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Galbreath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14809) granting a pension to Dartha Swihart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BALTZ: A bill (H. R. 14810) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of New York: A bill (H. R. 14811) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Medary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 14812) authorizing the appointment of Joseph Westesson a professor of mathematics, with the rank of lieutenant, in the United States Navy, on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 14813) granting a pension to Phoeba Pruitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARR: A bill (H. R. 14814) granting an increase of pension to John C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14815) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 14816) for the relief of Alonzo Briggs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 14817) granting a pension to Marion Atwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14818) granting a pension to Nannie J. Beckmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14819) granting a pension to Caroline D. Compton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14820) granting a pension to John Flattery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14821) granting a pension to William McNelis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14822) granting a pension to Napoleon L. Stemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14823) granting a pension to John E. Tingley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14824) granting a pension to Jonathan Toliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14825) granting an increase of pension to Lutisha A. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14826) granting an increase of pension to Mary Heffleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14827) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Kenesston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14828) for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Hathway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14829) for the relief of Kize Reed; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 14830) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Keating; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 14831) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: A bill (H. R. 14832) granting an increase of pension to Manuela de Benavides; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14833) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14834) granting an increase of pension to Manuelita S. de Lobato; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14835) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Cather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14836) for the relief of John W. Baggott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 14837) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14838) to correct the military record of William Deniston and grant to him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14839) to correct the military record of Henry Turnage and grant to him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14840) granting an increase of pension to John H. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14841) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Maginn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14842) to waive the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy for two years in the case of Commissary Steward Charles C. L. Haskell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 14843) granting an increase of pension to Christian Schmalz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 14844) granting a pension to the widow of James S. Frisbie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14845) granting an increase of pension to David Tanyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14846) granting an increase of pension to Julia Doran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14847) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Hotchkiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14848) granting an increase of pension to James Warden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 14849) granting a pension to Patrick McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14850) granting a pension to Edward East; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14851) granting a pension to Mary A. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14852) granting an increase of pension to William R. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14853) granting a pension to Margaret J. Verbesky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14854) granting a pension to Augustus E. Dodds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14855) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14856) granting a pension to Edith A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14857) granting an increase of pension to A. G. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14858) granting a pension to J. A. London; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14859) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14860) granting a pension to John H. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14861) granting an increase of pension to John J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 14862) for the relief of John P. Erwin; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14863) for the relief of the heirs of John M. King, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 14864) granting a pension to Gregor G. Krein; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the directors of the Swedish Hospital, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 11648, for erection of a statue to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), protest by Taxpayers' Association of the Fifth Ward of Paterson, N. J., against the proposed repeal of the Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition from the California Saengerbund, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 88 and Senate joint resolutions 168 and 50, providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution from certain citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the canal tolls clause for United States coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Philomathian Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of 492 citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petitions of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade; members of the Brethren Sunday School at Bryan, Ohio, and sundry citizens of Desher, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Resolutions adopted by several church organizations in northeastern Kansas favorable to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches of Warsaw, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 63 citizens of Wooster, Ohio, in favor of nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Altoona, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Moxham Lutheran Church, of Johnstown, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring investigation of the right of certain publications to use rates of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Illinois against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of the Municipal League of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, favoring passage of House bill 12743, relative to erection of marine hospital at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Riverside (Cal.) Business Men's Association, protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., protesting against amendment to the Kahn Act relative to exhibits at Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, favoring passage of the Lobeck bill (H. R. 9292); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Joseph E. D. Murray, of Bronx, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 7374, the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Canal Winchester, Franklin County, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of King Avenue Bible Class, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry members of the United Presbyterian Church of Reynoldsburg, Franklin County, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry members of the United Brethren Church of Pleasant and Jackson Townships, Franklin County, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Margaret E. Landry, of Washington, D. C., relative to bill for improvement of Thirteenth Street, Brookland, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER: Memorial of Lincoln Fortress No. 2, Daughters of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Racine, Wis., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Commercial Savings Bank of Whitewater, Wis., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of William McKinley Camp, No. 10, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 13044, the widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Minnesota Commandery of the Loyal Legion, favoring Townsend bill relative to Civil War volunteer officers' retired list; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of various Irish-American societies of Connecticut, against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of H. V. Lutz, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Hess & Culbertson Jewelry Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the Owen-Goeke bill, relative to fraud in gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, protesting against amending Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of P. H. Ellery and George C. Hanson, of La Crosse; the Wisconsin Maltsters, of Milwaukee; and Bartenders' Local No. 479, of La Crosse, all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers in support of a bill granting an increase of pension to Calvin E. Boynton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Memorial of the churches of Albuquerque, in the State of New Mexico, signed by 185 signers, protesting against any change in the act of August 24, 1912, granting compensatory time to postal employees on one of the six days following the Sunday on which they perform service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of 20 citizens of Xenia, Ohio, favoring the Hobson amendment for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Steubenville, members of the First Christian Church and Methodist Episcopal Sunday School and Church of Flushing, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bellaire, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carrollton, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petitions of various members of the Clearwater County (Idaho) Sunday School Association and members of Christ Church, Vollmer, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Bartenders' Union of Mullan, Idaho, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of sundry voters of the second congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of various Spanish War veterans of New York, favoring House bill 13044, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the New York State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring Owen-Goeke bill to eliminate frauds in time guaranties on gold-filled watchcases, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. J. Freel, president of the International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petitions of sundry voters, churches, Sunday schools, and temperance organizations of the State of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petition of the H. D. Lee Mercantile Co., of Salina, Kans., protesting against manufacturers fixing prices on goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of 800 citizens of Rockford, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: Petition of the International Reform Bureau, favoring bill to provide official national censorship of films of moving pictures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of William M. P. Bowers, of Providence, R. I., relative to House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Allied Horse Interests, of Providence, R. I., protesting against Webb amendment to Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the New England Association, United States Department of Labor, of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of House bill 196, for retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petitions of sundry citizens of Jersey City, N. J., and various members of the Emmanuel Baptist Church, of Newark, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring appointment of clerks of United States courts by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First National Bank of Wallingford, Conn., and the Meriden Business Men's Association, of Meriden, Conn., protesting against separation of New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. and its allied properties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Freja Lodge, No. 17, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Hartford, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Robert Davidson, Max De Jong, H. L. Rauch, Philip J. Seizer, Charles W. Ossenberg, J. H. Carson, Fred Kautz, Moses Barnett, J. R. Goodwin, William Eichel, A. W. Ellerbush, George C. Smith, Albert Schardt, A. S. Butterfield, Frank Endress, Henry Fligeltaub, and A. L. Flickner, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Britain, Conn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Meriden Business Men's Association (Inc.), of Meriden, Conn., opposing legislation to force the dismemberment of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. and its allied properties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Freja Lodge, No. 17, International Order of Good Templars, of Hartford, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 28 citizens of Surprise, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the New York State Retail Jewelers' Association and of Oliver M. Farrand, of New York City, favoring passage of Owen-Goeke bill to eliminate fraud in time guaranties on gold-filled watchcases, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to appointment of clerks of the United States courts by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., against proposed antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Section, Council of Jewish Women, favoring House bill 12292, relative to child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of the New York Merchants' Association, relative to Army and Navy football game being played in New York this year; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, protesting against repeal of canal tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the California Wholesale Grocers' Association, of San Francisco, Cal., relative to the manufacturer's right to make resale prices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Municipal League of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Federal child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., against any amendment to the Kahn Act relative to foreign exhibits at Panama-Pacific Exposition; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade and 44 citizens of Manasquan, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Volunteer Officers' Association of the Civil War, protesting against amending Senate bill 392, relative to three-fourths pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Harry Rosin and others of Monmouth County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: Petitions of 42 citizens of Huntingdon, Tenn., and 61 citizens of Savannah, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland (by request): Petition of various members of the Mount Airy (Md.) Lodge, No. 334, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of H. Schaffner, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against repeal of canal-tolls exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 34 citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jersey Ridge Grange, No. 2029, in favor of the Government standardization of barley; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the thirtieth New York congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition signed by Mr. D. C. Lasure, of Barlow, Ohio, and 20 others, favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Rev. C. M. Hartshorn, of Marietta, Ohio, and some 40 others, urging the adoption of the constitutional amendment providing for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of Arthur McClellan and other citizens of Cable; Levina Dillon and other citizens of Raymond; L. Dickerson and other citizens of Radnor; J. E. Heeter and 22 other citizens of Findlay; C. D. Marston and other citizens of Radnor; and various citizens of Bellefontaine, all in the State of Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Peter L. Clar and other citizens of Arlington; Jacob Horr and other citizens of Mechanicsburg; Mrs. Charles Stillings and other citizens of Milford Center; and Rev. W. McK. Brackney and other citizens of Kenton, all in the State of Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

### FRIDAY, *March 20, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for every influence that has ever come into our lives that has made it easy to do right and hard to do wrong. Over every path of life Thou hast thrown Thy law. Thy law stands as a barrier over every evil way. Thou dost guarantee the rights of men by Thine own divine sanctions revealed to men, made known by a thousand ministries of grace and love. Grant, we pray, that we may bring every question of civil administration to the supreme test of the moral law, that we may remember that we shall be great in the elevation of a great Nation, that we shall be strong in saving the best for all the people, in proportion as our lives are lived in accordance with the will of God. Grant us Thy guidance this day to this end. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914 and for prior years, and for other purposes; requests a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GILLETT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14234. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14546. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4019. An act to authorize the Tug River & Kentucky Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near the mouth of Blackberry Creek in Pike County, Ky.;

S. 4145. An act to authorize the Government of Porto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the city of Arecibo, P. R.; and

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution for the appointment of a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Seventh-day Adventist Church, of the District of Columbia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of McPherson, Graham, and Logan, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for a term of the district court for the district of Kansas at Salina, Kans., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WORKS. I have received a letter from the secretary of the Riverside Business Men's Association, of California, on the subject of the Panama Canal tolls. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVERSIDE BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
*Riverside, Cal., March 12, 1914.*

At the regular meeting of the Riverside Business Men's Association held Wednesday evening, March 11, 1914, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, to wit:

"Whereas, believing that the interests of California and the Pacific coast would be sacrified by the repeal of the free tolls for American ships passing through the Panama Canal and the benefits of the canal to both shippers and consumers on the coast would be sacrificed by such repeal:

"*Resolved*, That the Riverside Business Men's Association respectfully urges upon our California Senators and Congressmen in Washington that they use their influence and votes to defeat the proposed repeal; and

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of this association to each of our Senators and Congressmen at Washington."

Respectfully submitted.

RIVERSIDE BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
By O. P. SANDERS, *Secretary.*

Mr. LIPPITT presented memorials of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ansonia, Derby, and Shelton, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the

Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Thompsonville, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Noank, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BORAH presented a petition signed by the governor and sundry residents and taxpayers of the State of Idaho, praying that an appropriation be made to reclaim lands within the Black Canyon irrigation district, Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Club of Commerce, of Idaho Falls, Idaho, praying that an appropriation be made for a continuance of the work of the department of forestry, University of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of General J. N. Patterson Post, No. 3, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, of Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of soldiers who served in the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HUGHES presented sundry petitions of citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry memorials of citizens of the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Independent Order of King Solomon, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 39, of Taunton, Mass., and a memorial of Journeymen Barbers' Local Union No. 447, of New Bedford, Mass., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 3, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the clause of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the congregations of the Swedish Congregational Church of Thomaston, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the Advent Christian Church, of Bristol, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Middletown, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY. I present a memorial signed by 36 citizens of McCracken County, Ky., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and importation of alcoholic liquors. I ask that the memorial may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRADLEY presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Warsaw; the Broadway Christian Church, of Lexington; the Third Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Paducah; and the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Lexington, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Portland and Oakland, in the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Toledo, Columbus, and Put-in-Bay, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Elysian, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Society of the Swedish Lutheran Church, of Holmes City, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Jackson, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Ministerial Association of Alpena, Mich., remonstrating against any repeal of the present compensatory system for postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Howell Camp, No. 6, United Spanish War Veterans, of Adrian, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War and their dependent relatives, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of local branch, National Retirement Association, of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented petitions of Lewiston Grange, No. 1234, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lewiston, Mich., and of Burning Grange, No. 959, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bad Axe, Mich., praying for the establishment of a system of rural credits, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented petitions of the Equal Suffrage Association of Kalamazoo, of the congregations of the First Presbyterian Church of Kalamazoo, the Baptist Church of Birmingham, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Birmingham, and of sundry citizens of Grass Lake, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clarke County, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal act, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Holbrook, Portland, St. Johns, and Linnton, all in the State of Oregon, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OWEN. I present a petition signed by a large number of citizens of Oklahoma, urging favorable action upon Senate bill 4150, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] on January 22, 1914, and which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, proposing to appropriate $5,000 to Eva M. Bowman, widow of Robert L. Bowman, who was killed in the discharge of his duty as an Indian agent. I ask that the body of the petition may be printed in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and that it may be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the body of the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the Congress and President of the United States of America:*

We, the undersigned, respectfully represent to your honorable body that Robert L. Bowman was killed on about the 19th day of September, 1912, in the State of Oklahoma, just south of the town of Caney, Washington County, while he was in the active and courageous performance of his duty as a deputy United States marshal enforcement officer; that he was shot down by outlaws from whose possession he had taken some intoxicating liquors; that he was at all times during his three years as deputy marshal and five months in Indian service on the United States marshal's force a brave and faithful officer.

And we further represent that at the time of his death Robert L. Bowman was a man of 40 years of age and of excellent health; that he left surviving him a widow and three minor children, one of whom is an invalid girl about 2½ years old; that the husband and father was the only support of this family; and that by his death his widow and three children are left to shift for themselves; and their only income now consists of such earnings as the 14-year-old boy makes at selling papers and the wages of the widow from sewing at odd moments.

We earnestly believe that this widow and infant children of Robert L. Bowman, deceased, are most worthy objects of the bounty of the United States; that they have earned more from their country and contributed more to their country than it will ever be able to pay.

We therefore respectfully petition the Congress and President of the United States to pass and approve the bill now before a committee of Congress making to Mrs. Robert L. Bowman and her children a partial return for their great loss.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA (S. DOC. NO. 452).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a petition of the International Seamen's Union of America, the contents of which are set forth in the cover to the memorial, and I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The petition prays for the rejection of the conclusions reached by the International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea, so called, which recently met in London, and while the Senate has received no official communication from the Secretary of State as to the results of that conference, in so far as I am informed, they have been presented to Parliament and have been printed in at least two languages, and are already under public discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Wisconsin that he believes the Senator is in error. The Chair thinks the matter was handed down two or three days since and referred.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then there can be no objection, of course, to the presentation of the petition at this time, which discusses the conclusions, and I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done. Is it to be referred?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to have it referred. I suppose it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The report came to the Senate, I think, in executive session, as the Chair stated, I believe, to the Senator from Wisconsin. I think the whole matter is before the Senate as coming from the State Department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not aware of that. I was not present when the report was received, but as it had been presented to the British Parliament and printed for distribution there, and is under discussion in the papers of the whole world, in fact, I desired to have the petition which reviews that finding printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONTRACTS OF NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have two additional letters I wish to present to the Senate from manufacturers in Georgia upon the subject of the New York Cotton Exchange and its methods. It has been known for a long time that the lint-cotton growers complained of the manipulation of prices of cotton by the New York Cotton Exchange, and insisted that the exchange, by unfair contracts, was enabled to depress the price of lint cotton as it sold upon the exchange, and that the published prices fixed by the exchange had a sympathetic effect all over the country and depressed the price of the actual lint cotton.

What I am seeking to do now is to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that spinners are also complaining. I find from the New York Commercial that the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers and the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association each has passed resolutions condemning the contracts of the New York Exchange. I ask that these two short letters from cotton mills may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

FORSYTH, GA., *February 28, 1914.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We are using this method of indorsing the resolution adopted by the Hard-Yarn Spinners, in convention at Gastonia, N. C., on the 18th of this month, condemning the present workings of the New York Cotton Exchange, and earnestly appeal to you to use your great influence in the passage of some act whereby this exchange can be regulated. As it is operated at present, it is a serious menace to those most vitally interested in cotton. At present the quotations published by the New York Exchange are fully 2 cents under the actual price of spots in the southern markets, thereby making it extremely difficult for the manufacturer to get anything like a legitimate margin on the manufactured product. These operators on the exchange put forth the argument that purchases will be delivered if goods is asked for, but since they are allowed to deliver just as low grades as can be secured on contracts, and since they will deliver these grades, no one who is in need of the cotton will call for it, as they know that such cotton as will be tendered will be absolutely worthless so far as making goods is concerned, while, on the other hand, if they were forced in some way to deliver specified grades, it would be of great help to all concerned in both raising and manufacturing. The present conditions make the New York Exchange a disgrace to the Nation, and we trust that you will see fit to lend your valuable influence to the enactment of a law that will bring about the proper regulation.

Yours, very truly,

THE TRIO MFG. COMPANY.

THOMASTON, GA., *February 26, 1914.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
*Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We have before us a copy of resolutions adopted by the Hard Yarn Spinners' Association, Gastonia, N. C., on February 18.

We heartily approve of these resolutions and hope that you will use your utmost endeavor to relieve the cotton-mill industries of the conditions that exist. By so doing you will greatly oblige.

Yours, very truly,

THOMASTON COTTON MILLS,
By R. E. HIGHTOWER, *President.*

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram that I received this morning. I am sorry the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is not in the Chamber. I presume he received one of a similar nature. It is in reference to the matter that is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *March 20, 1914.*

Senator SMITH of South Carolina,
*Washington, D. C.:*

I am voicing the sentiment of all legitimate interests and sound speculation when I say all hail to your cotton-speculation bill. There should be at once some established grades to be tendered; no legitimate reason to wait till 1915 for this. I hope our Senators, OVERMAN and SIMMONS, will be in hearty accord; otherwise undue depression of prices by arbitrary grading by New York exchange to suit their interests at time of delivery will prove a serious handicap for legitimate handling of our great American product.

B. L. SCRUGGS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I send to the desk the following petitions and do not ask to have them read, but that they be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS' LAND, LOAN & TITLE CO.,
*Albany, Ga., March 11, 1914.*

Hon. E. D. SMITH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In view of the bills before Congress in reference to the New York Cotton Exchange and the great discrepancy of that contract and of spot cotton, I thought it might be correct to call your attention to that feature.

The New York contract is not worth the paper it is written on, with March quoted, say, at 11.65 and middling cotton selling in Atlanta at 13 cents the same day. Now, I wish you to tell me how under heaven a man can buy spots in the South and pay 50 cents freight and commissions and other expenses that naturally follow and deliver on New York contracts.

The truth is, dear sir, that contract makes the jobber feel that he should buy goods based on the said New York contract, whereas the poor manufacturer has to pay about 3 cents more for his cotton than the said contract would indicate, and you know how hard it is to convince the buyer against his will.

New York contracts should be so fixed that when they sell 100 or any multiple of same that the buyer should be warranted in delivery of straight middling cotton, and of an even staple. As the contract is to-day, the minute the buyer demands the actual cotton on his contract they go to work and give him all manner of grades mixed in the lot, and all lengths of staple. Now, unless the manufacturer has half dozen mills using different grades and staples he can not handle the stuff, hence he sells the contract to some other fellow at a discount rather than take the cotton, to the ultimate hurt of the farmer and manufacturer.

The main point with a manufacturer, first, is even staple; secondly, even grade.

I feel that it is high time for this crowd to be regulated and made to so correct their contract that when a manufacturer buys New York contracts—and they are very essential and should not be wiped out—he should be able to take delivery, as anticipated.

Pardon me for the presumption in writing this letter, but I have felt this thing on both sides of the market, having been a farmer all my life and a manufacturer for 12 years.

I trust you will use your influence to correct this iniquitous contract.
Yours, very respectfully,

J. J. LITTLEJOHN.

—

YORKVILLE, S. C., *February 21, 1914.*

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At our annual meeting held in Gastonia, N. C., on February 18, our association, representing a majority of the spinners on weaving yarns in the South, unanimously passed the inclosed resolution.

We are sending you this, hoping that you will use your influence in having these abuses corrected, as they seriously affect "the people back home."

Thanking you in advance for any action that you may be pleased to take in this matter, we beg to remain,
Yours, respectfully,

HARD YARN SPINNERS' ASSOCIATION,
By JOSEPH E. HART, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

—

Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Hard Yarn Spinners' Association, Gastonia, N. C., February 18, 1914.

Whereas the spinning mills of the country are suffering loss on account of the disparity between New York cotton quotations and the price of actual cotton, which quotations are misleading and confusing to the trade: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this association that the present system of the New York Cotton Exchange relative to the great number of grades of cotton that can be applied for delivery on contracts is detrimental to the best interests of the farmer, manufacturer, and cotton merchant, and this should be so changed that a specific grade should be stipulated in all contracts, and that not more than three grades shall be deliverable on a contract, and these to be not more than one grade above and one grade below the stipulated grade. That the purchaser not be confined to buying a contract based on middling as at present, but have the option of buying any grade desired with the usual differential in price.

*Resolved further*, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to enact some law for the regulation of the cotton exchanges which will afford relief from these hurtful conditions.

To-day's market price for cotton is 12.90, while actual spot cotton in the South is 14 cents. We want the market quotations to reflect actual values.

—

BRANDON MILLS,
*Greenville, S. C., February 20, 1914.*

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
*Senate, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I have your favor of February 14, all contents of which I have noted with interest; and in further consideration of the subject I beg to herewith hand you resolution received by us this morning from the Vicksburg Cotton Exchange. I have also been struck with the many similar expressions recently appearing in the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, published in New York City. The whole trade seems to be dominated by one interest which is sufficiently powerful as we gather from the newspapers, to carry through their ends.

Respectfully, yours,

J. I. WESTERVELT, *President.*

—

VICKSBURG COTTON EXCHANGE,
*Vicksburg, Miss., February 18, 1914.*

DEAR SIRS: We earnestly ask your cooperation in the effort to secure through your representatives in Congress the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges of this country to adopt a fair and honest contract system as regards trading in cotton futures.

The extent to which the cotton trade has suffered through manipulation of the market at the hands of large operators, which has brought about depression in business as well as large losses to legitimate dealers, is becoming apparent to everyone connected with the cotton trade from planter to spinner. We ask that through resolution, petition, or individual appeal you will use your efforts to secure the desired legislation by Congress.

Inclosed is copy of resolutions passed by the Vicksburg Cotton Exchange.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

—

Resolutions adopted by the Vicksburg Cotton Exchange condemning the contract system in use by the New York Cotton Exchange, and petitioning their representatives in Congress to try to secure the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges of this country to adopt fairer and better methods governing trading in cotton contracts:

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange the form of future contract in use by the New York Cotton Exchange constitutes nothing more than a medium for gambling; that it does not represent the real value of cotton as established in the spot-cotton markets of the world; that it absolutely fails to provide a safe, trustworthy, or legitimate hedge; and that through its form and application, both unfair and arbitrary, it lends itself to gambling operations by large dealers to the detriment and demoralization of the entire cotton trade; and

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange, the future contract of the New York Cotton Exchange is devoid of the essentials of a fair, just, and correct contract; that in placing in the hands of men of large capital the power to dominate the cotton market, whose operations unsettle and depress business, it is used to the great injury of the general cotton trade; and

Whereas in the opinion of the members of this exchange, a fair, just, and commercial future contract should contain the following provisions, viz, the adoption of Government standards of classification, commercial differences and not fixed differences, the requiring of but one certification of each bale, and limiting the number of classifications which may be delivered on a single contract: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of this exchange*, That we herewith petition our Senators and Representatives from this State in Congress to use their best efforts to secure the passage of legislation that will force the cotton exchanges in this country to adopt a contract system that will be fair and right, one that will serve the interests of the legitimate cotton trade and not one devised to promote and encourage speculation.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to planters, shippers, and spinners generally, with a request for their active cooperation in the effort to secure through their representatives in Congress the desired legislation.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington.

S. SUSMAN, *President.*
J. H. COOK, *Secretary.*

—

MEMPHIS COTTON EXCHANGE,
*Memphis, Tenn., February 28, 1914.*

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
*Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We beg to invite your attention to the inclosed resolutions passed at a meeting of the Memphis Cotton Exchange February 24, 1914.

Our exchange has come to the conclusion that the present New York Cotton Exchange contract should be changed so as to be more responsive to the market value of actual cotton.

We therefore request your assistance and cooperation in such legislation as will accomplish this end.

Yours, respectfully,

HENRY HOTTEE, *Secretary.*

—

Resolutions adopted by the Memphis Cotton Exchange February 24, 1914.

Whereas the present future contract of the New York Cotton Exchange is an impediment to business in that its fluctuations no longer bear any relation to the value of actual cotton, and as we feel that a future market with a contract fair and just to all is an absolute necessity in handling the cotton crop of the United States and maintaining prices when the movement is heaviest: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Memphis Cotton Exchange*, That we urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to have the future contract departments of all cotton exchanges doing an interstate business put under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture and subject to such rules and regulations as the department shall judge right and proper.

As cotton dealers we would suggest that the following conditions be inserted in all contracts for "futures":

1. Have all contracts stipulate the United States Government standard classification.

2. Make all exchanges adopt either commercial differences between grades or revise their differences every 30 days, basing these differences on the average differences then prevailing in the six largest American spot markets.

3. Allow not more than three different grades or six different half grades, including the full grades, to be delivered on each contract of 100 bales.

4. Require the class of each bale to be identified separately and either have the classers deputized by the United States Government or allow an appeal from the classification committee to officials of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to have read, as it comes from the New York Commercial, one of the leading commercial papers of the country, if not the leading one, an article in reference to this very point. I think it covers it as well as anything that may be said on this floor. I ask that the Secretary may read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the New York Commercial, New York City, March 2, 1914.]

THE SMITH COTTON BILL.

Senator SMITH of South Carolina has the support of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in his effort to improve conditions in the cotton trade by forcing the New York Cotton Exchange and all other cotton exchanges in this country to accept the Government standardizations of cotton grades. This bill is the outcome of long years of agitation, and the cotton planters of the South are united in their support of the measure. Several cotton exchanges at important points in the cotton belt have recently adopted strong resolutions condemning the method of trading on the New York Cotton Exchange and have memorialized Congress and requested Senators and Representatives from their several States to support a bill that will put trading in cotton futures on a real business basis and divest it of its gambling features and of its unjust discrimination against the man who grows the cotton or who trades in actual cotton and not merely in fictitious contracts that are practically never fulfilled by deliveries of real cotton.

Mill owners and cotton traders and planters alike know by bitter experience that cotton is not delivered on contracts in New York for the purpose of fulfilling those contracts, but it is delivered occasionally for the purpose of blackjacking some one who is regarded as an impertinent interloper when he ventures to ask for specific performance of a contract. This blackjacking of the holder of a contract is rendered possible by the system of grading cotton and of regulating prices of various grades on the fixed difference system that prevails on the New York Cotton Exchange.

The Department of Agriculture has established a set of cotton grades that is acceptable to the planters on the one hand and to the spinners who consume the cotton on the other, and they are desirous of having all trading in cotton based upon these Government grades, because it would simplify the business and would protect both buyers and sellers from loss. As it is now, many southern cotton exchanges, the southern planters, and the cotton-mill owners all over this country unite in declaring that New York contracts afford them no protection whatever and are absolutely valueless as hedges or insurance against commitments, because the price of spot cotton often goes up when the price of futures goes down on the New York Cotton Exchange, and vice versa.

Any member of the New York Cotton Exchange will grant, for the sake of argument, that the Liverpool cotton market is an important one. The Liverpool Cotton Exchange does not indulge in any such nonsense as establishing 27 full grades for American cotton. It deals in cotton on a commercial basis and its contracts mean something. It is not necessary to have all this complication in grading cotton such as has

been set up in New York. Cotton comes to Liverpool from every part of the world where it is grown at all, and all the miscellaneous cotton in the world coming from the minor cotton-growing countries is traded in on a basis of three splainable grades, just as wheat and other grains are traded in on the Chicago Board of Trade.

The Department of Agriculture has deferred to the wishes of the cotton exchanges to some extent in fixing its grades. If these Government grades and the samples or "types" on which they are based can be simplified or improved, the department officials will listen to reason. The New York Cotton Exchange will get a fair hearing at Washington as soon as it signifies its willingness to be fair to others, but that exchange can not browbeat the people of the United States or the Congress that represents them.

One of the penalties imposed by the Smith bill is the denial of the use of the mails or other methods of interstate communication for transmitting information regarding any cotton-future sale not in accordance with the proposed regulations. This feature of the bill is open to the objection that the Post Office Department should not be employed to do the work of the Department of Justice, but objections to the method of enforcing the proposed law do not affect the merits of the law itself or have any bearing upon the necessity for forcing the New York Cotton Exchange to deal in bales of cotton as a commercial commodity and not simply as counters in a brace game in a gambling house.

The New York Commercial has fought the battle of the planters and the spinners for many years and victory now seems close at hand. No amount of talking by members of the New York Cotton Exchange will convince Congress that the system of inspection, grading, and fixed differences in prices of various grades is of any value in advancing interests of the country or of the cotton trade as long as all the people who grow the cotton, who trade in actual cotton, and who spin cotton are in favor of simpler and fewer grades and prices based on commercial differences such as obtain in all other important lines of trade.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. On behalf of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 7967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is No. 269 on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is not closed.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that at the close of morning business to-day I would call up Senate bill 110.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 356), accompanied by a bill (S. 4969) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 290. Emma Sherwood.
S. 546. Louisa A. Thatcher.
S. 552. Mary Bottino.
S. 858. Blanche Packard.
S. 1326. Marion C. Turrill.
S. 1362. Laura E. Hess.
S. 1600. Michael E. Breck.
S. 2227. Francis M. Good.
S. 3103. Lucinda Randall.
S. 3379. William Cross.
S. 3624. Nana E. Sears.
S. 3699. Harriet G. Hayes.
S. 3907. James B. Romaine.
S. 4264. Catherine J. Carter.
S. 4476. Thomas Jordan.
S. 4511. Henry Luch.
S. 4611. Eugene P. McFadden.
S. 4612. Nettie Nieschang.
S. 4613. Leonidas Recob.
S. 4624. Fred Kamm.
S. 4630. Emma E. Bear.
S. 4631. Bessie P. Dummer.
S. 4675. Thomas Ranahan.
S. 4695. Sigmund Schlesinger.
S. 4705. Eli Ziegler.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8846) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 357) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2245) for the relief of Frederick B. McGuire, trustee for Bessie J. Kibbey, owner of lot 75, square 628, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, in said District (Rept. No. 358);

A bill (S. 23) for the relief of Clara Dougherty, Ernest Kubel, and Josephine Taylor, owners of lot No. 13; of Ernest Kubel, owner of lot No. 41; and of Mary Meder, owner of the south 17.10 feet front by the full depth thereof of lot No. 14, all of said property in square No. 724, in Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment for damages on account of change of grade due to the construction of Union Station, in said District (Rept. No. 359); and

A bill (S. 11) for the relief of Charlotte J. Pile, Eastmond P. Green, and Easie C. Gandell, owners of lots Nos. 53, 54, and 55, in square No. 753, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of change of grade due to construction of the Union Station, in said District (Rept. No. 360).

Mr. POMERENE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1653) providing against the abandonment of destitute, infirm, or aged parents, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 361) thereon.

Mr. WORKS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 31) for the relief of Ida A. Chew, owner of lot 112, square 721, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 362) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4690) to amend an act of Congress approved March 28, 1900 (Stat. L., p. 52), entitled "An act granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing an experiment station of the Kansas State Agricultural College, and a western branch of the State Normal School thereon, and for a public park," asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which was agreed to.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., and I submit a report (No. 364) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. WORKS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 11751) authorizing the sale of certain land to the county of San Diego, State of California, for public watering purposes, and I submit a report (No. 363) thereon. The bill is a short one and is local in its character. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 302, submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] on the 13th instant, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

The amendment was to add at the end of the resolution the following words, "and may, if deemed necessary, employ a stenographer at a compensation of not to exceed $1 per printed page," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to hold hearings upon any bill or matter pending before said committee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate, and that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and may, if deemed necessary, employ a stenographer at a compensation of not to exceed $1 per printed page.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 306, submitted by Mr. ASHURST on the 18th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on the pending Indian appropriation bill, such stenographer to be paid at a rate not exceeding $1 per printed page; and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL CO.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am directed by the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey to report favorably without amendment Senate resolution No. 304, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the resolution be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 304, which had been reported favorably by Mr. WILLIAMS from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the 18th instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey, or any subcommittee thereof chosen by said committee, be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate, ascertain, and report by whom the stock, bonds, and obligations of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. are owned, the value thereof, so far as the value of the said securities can be ascertained; the value, income, gross and net, and expenses of said canal; by whom and in whose interest the said canal is operated, owned, and controlled, and who is chiefly benefited by the manner of its operation; with authority to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed $1 per printed page, and to sit during the sessions of the Senate; the expense of said investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BURTON. What committee is it which is asked to make the investigation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee on Coast and Insular Survey.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I will say, for the information of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], that this reference was with the consent of the present acting chairman of the Commerce Committee. It is anticipated that it will be a very short investigation, possibly nothing more than getting certain records from the canal company. The Government of the United States owns considerably more than one-third of the stock of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. It has no knowledge who the other stockholders are; neither has any department of the Government nor the Interstate Commerce Commission nor the Bureau of Corporations. The river and harbor bill as reported to the House carries an appropriation of $1,300,000 for the purchase of this canal. In addition to this stockholding, the Government has a suit against the canal company for quite an amount of money. In view of the debate which will be had on this item in the Senate, it is desired that we shall have such information as is available, chiefly from the records of the canal company, as to the ownership of the securiites.

Mr. BURTON. Can the Senator from Delaware give any intimation as to the time at which this report will be filed?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should think by the middle of next week. That is my intention, if the resolution is adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think it rather unusual to refer a matter of this kind to the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey. I take it the Senator from Delaware has consulted with the acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have——

Mr. BURTON. And he expressed no objection?

Mr. SAULSBURY. In the absence of the chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas] and of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is the acting chairman, I consulted with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is the senior member, and he said that it was entirely agreeable that this particular matter should be so referred.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware if there is any particular haste in this matter or any necessity for immediate action thereon?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is, for the reason that, as the river and harbor bill carries an appropriation for the purchase of this canal, and as an amendment has been submitted in the Senate to provide for the power of condemnation, it is very material to know just who are the owners of the stock and what is the value of that canal so far as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 4970) granting an increase of pension to Enos M. Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4971) granting an increase of pension to George Wash (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4972) granting a pension to Dock J. Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4973) granting a pension to Esther Hounchill (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4974) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mason (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4975) granting a pension to Benjamin Girdner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 4976) permitting the Wisconsin Central Railway Co. and the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., its lessee, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Chippewa River at Chippewa Falls, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4977) to establish a fishery experiment station on the Pacific coast of the United States; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4978) granting a pension to Francis M. Vaughn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 4979) for the relief of the heirs of Willis Miller, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4981) to amend the acts to regulate commerce so as to provide that publishers of newspapers and periodicals may enter into advertising contracts with common carriers and receive payment for such advertisements in transportation; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 4982) for the relief of certain persons, their heirs or assigns, who have heretofore conveyed lands within national forests to the United States, and have made lieu-land selections under the act of June 4, 1897; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4983) amending sections 2347, 2348, and 2350 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4984) granting an increase of pension to Michael A. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 4985) granting a pension to Larkin Russell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4986) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Kelsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4987) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Turner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 4988) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry D. Geddings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4989) granting a pension to Joseph A. Black; and

A bill (S. 4990) granting a pension to Joseph W. James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) relating to the awards and payments thereon in what is commonly known as the Plaza cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BRADY submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for demonstration work on reclamation projects from $25,000 to $50,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $60,000 for the survey of the public lands in Malheur County, Oreg., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PURCHASE OF MINERAL LANDS.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2651) providing for the purchase and disposal of certain lands containing kaolin, kaolinite, fuller's earth, and other minerals within portions of Indian reservations heretofore opened to settlement and entry, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

SEEDS, BULBS, ETC., BY MAIL.

Mr. POMERENE. I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The bill (S. 4989) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1914, was read twice by its title.

Mr. POMERENE. When the Post Office appropriation bill was pending in the Senate I submitted an amendment providing that seeds, cuttings, and so forth, should be carried as fourth-class mail matter at parcel-post rates. The intention of the amendment was to give the farmers and others who might be interested the better rates provided for in the parcel-post system. It seems, however, that small packages of 8 ounces or less can be carried as second-class matter at a less rate than the parcel-post rate, and this proposed amendment to the law is intended for the purpose of continuing at second-class rates those packages which weigh 8 ounces or less. I hope the bill will be taken up and considered at a very early date by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant woman suffrage on certain contingencies in each State. I ask that it be referred to the proper committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he has any objection to having it read?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I have no objection to having it read.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 128) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely:

SECTION 1. Whenever any number of legal voters of any State, to a number exceeding 8 per cent of the number of legal voters voting at the last preceding general election held in such State, shall petition for the submission to the legal voters of said State of the question whether women shall have equal rights with men in respect to voting at all elections to be held in such State, such question shall be so submitted, and if, upon such submission, a majority of the legal voters of the State voting on the question shall vote in favor of granting to women such equal rights, the same shall thereupon be deemed established, anything in the constitution or laws of such State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BRYAN. I object to that. It seems to me it ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary. That is what the Judiciary Committee is for—to consider questions affecting the Constitution and laws of the country.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BRYAN. I move as a substitute that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. BRYAN. I ask for a division.

Mr. ASHURST. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Johnson | Overman | Sterling |
| Bankhead | Jones | Page | Sutherland |
| Borah | Kenyon | Perkins | Swanson |
| Brady | La Follette | Pittman | Thomas |
| Brandegee | Lea, Tenn. | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Bristow | Lee, Md. | Reed | Thornton |
| Bryan | Lewis | Saulsbury | Tillman |
| Burton | Lippitt | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Catron | McCumber | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Chamberlain | McLean | Sherman | Walsh |
| Chilton | Martin, Va. | Shields | Warren |
| Clark, Wyo. | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ga. | West |
| Dillingham | Myers | Smith, Md. | Works |
| Gallinger | Nelson | Smith, S. C. | |
| Gronna | Norris | Smoot | |
| James | O'Gorman | Stephenson | |

Mr. REED. My colleague [Mr. STONE] is detained from the Senate by illness. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is, Shall the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I had risen to say that I thought the President of the Senate had stated the motion incorrectly, but upon reflection I see that that is what is proposed by the substitute of the Senator from Florida. I hope the substitute will not prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division has been called for on this question, and it is not debatable.

Mr. THOMAS. I insist that I am in order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is compelled to rule against the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to have stated exactly what the motion is. I made a motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. The substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is to refer it to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the statement made by the Chair; but the Chair thinks its ruling is right when it says, a division having been called for, that the question of the division is not debatable.

Mr. GALLINGER. Pending that, I ask for the yeas and nays. We are wasting time.

Mr. WARREN. Before that, I ask as a matter of information that the question may be stated. Some of us have been engaged in committees, and are not familiar with the subject matter upon which we are to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the pending question.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] offers a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant woman suffrage in certain contingencies in each State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] was to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] was that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A division

was called for. Now the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] calls for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Chamber by illness, and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS (when Mr. KERN's name was called). I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I again announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand on all votes for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question if present, I withhold my own vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair so that the Senator from Florida will stand paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I understand, however, that if present he would vote as I shall, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. If he were present, I should vote "nay." In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. LODGE] is absent on account of business. I will let this announcement stand for the day. On other questions than this he is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. As he is absent from the city and I do not know how he stands on this question, I will withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—25.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Johnson | Reed | Tillman |
| Bradley | Lippitt | Saulsbury | Vardaman |
| Brandegee | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Weeks |
| Bryan | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. | West |
| Catron | O'Gorman | Smith, S. C. | |
| Dillingham | Overman | Swanson | |
| James | Pomerene | Thornton | |

NAYS—37.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Gallinger | Jones | Lea, Tenn. |
| Brady | Gronna | Kenyon | Lewis |
| Bristow | Hollis | La Follette | McCumber |
| Burton | Hughes | Lane | McLean |
| Myers | Perkins | Smoot | Walsh |
| Nelson | Pittman | Stephenson | Warren |
| Newlands | Poindexter | Sterling | Works |
| Norris | Shafroth | Thomas | |
| Owen | Sheppard | Thompson | |
| Page | Sherman | Townsend | |

NOT VOTING—33.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Borah | Culberson | Lee, Md. | Simmons |
| Burleigh | Cummins | Lodge | Smith, Ariz. |
| Chamberlain | du Pont | Oliver | Smith, Mich. |
| Chilton | Fall | Penrose | Stone |
| Clapp | Fletcher | Ransdell | Sutherland |
| Clark, Wyo. | Goff | Robinson | Williams |
| Clarke, Ark. | Gore | Root | |
| Colt | Hitchcock | Shields | |
| Crawford | Kern | Shively | |

So Mr. BRYAN's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order that this may not be taken as a precedent, the Chair desires to state that the motion to substitute was a violation of Rule XXVI. This being only a question to refer a joint resolution to a committee, it is not subject to amendment. The amendment, however, is lost.

The question now is on the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I did not make the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary out of any lack of confidence in the Committee on Woman Suffrage, but I believe an examination of the RECORD will show that no amendment to the Constitution of the United States has ever been referred to any other committee than the Committee on the Judiciary until the reference of the joint resolution seeking to provide for woman suffrage.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to state to the Senator that I think he will find he is in error in that statement, because the amendment providing for the election of Senators was sent time and again to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It went there many times.

Mr. BRYAN. It may be that that is the reason why we have so much trouble in construing what that amendment means. My recollection, however, is that the joint resolution upon which we voted came from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW. The last time the amendment that was adopted was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported out from that committee, but prior to that time the amendment had been sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I think a constitutional amendment is important enough to have the best study given to it by the committee organized by the Senate for the purpose of studying great legal and constitutional questions. That was the reason why I undertook to make the motion. The Senator from Colorado seems to think that because the Committee on Woman Suffrage has been organized a joint resolution of this character ought to go to that committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to state in this connection that the reason why I entertain that opinion is that the question of woman suffrage can not be considered in this body except in the form of a proposed constitutional amendment. If such amendments do not come before the committee I am at a loss to understand what office the committee has to perform. We know that legislation, ordinarily speaking, can not be introduced or considered affecting the question, and we must act through amendments to the organic law, if we are to act at all.

Mr. BRYAN. I think I can acquaint the Senator with the reason for the formation of the Committee on Woman Suffrage. It was created to provide a chairmanship.

Mr. THOMAS. The committee was not transferred from the minority to the majority and thus made an active committee at the recent organization of the Senate for any such purpose. It was done at my solicitation for the purpose of making woman suffrage an active issue.

Mr. BRYAN. I was answering the Senator's question. When it was created an active committee it was never thought that it would have jurisdiction over constitutional amendments, saying to a State that 5 per cent of its people could make them adopt any amendment Congress might want them to adopt. It ranked along with the great Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, which has struggled along until now with only three members. If a bill had

ever been referred to it a celebration of the event would have taken place.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. I will yield directly.

Then there is another great committee, the Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, upon which I had the honor to serve for three years. It has never had a meeting, I suppose, in 20 years; there never has been a bill referred to it.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] the other day offered a resolution and had it referred to the Committee on Rules to increase the number upon the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard from eight members to nine members. That calls to my mind the fact that we have many great problems and questions for that committee to consider in the immediate future, and the number of the committee ought to be increased from eight to nine. That resolution ought to be reported and let us immediately have nine members on that committee.

So I wish to appeal for the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers that the number be increased from three to nine. Here it has been struggling along through all these years with only three members. Likewise the Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands; and there is the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. TILLMAN. And the Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes also.

Mr. BRYAN. I am coming to that later. The Committee on Revolutionary Claims has only five members. If there were any claims to come up about which somebody would want a constitutional amendment, how could the Committee on Revolutionary Claims struggle along with only five members when the Senator from Indiana concedes the justice of having nine members upon the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BRYAN. I will yield in a moment. Likewise I want to appeal on behalf of the membership of the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures. That great committee ought not to be forced by the action of the Senate to struggle along with only five members.

What shall be said, Mr. President, in defense of the policy that heretofore has obtained of allowing five members to the Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to depreciate the importance of the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard?

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, no; Mr. President, it is a great committee, but there are other great committees here. I will say to the Senator frankly, I think we do ourselves an injustice by creating a large number of inactive committees, and we subject ourselves justly to the criticism that the Senate is engaged in a matter so small as that. If there are to be places for the purpose of giving clerks to Senators, we ought to do it in an open, manly way, and vote whatever clerical assistance is necessary. Then we stand upon a defensible position. But I answered the Senator from Colorado as to how the Committee on Woman Suffrage had been created, and I leave it to the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senator to say if my statement is not correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was going to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to two facts historical in their nature. One is that the late Senator and Secretary of the Treasury Windom made a very elaborate report, which is printed in two volumes, as chairman of the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard. The other historical fact is that I once served as chairman of that committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, it has existed and it exists now. I see no necessity for it to continue, because the Senate a few months ago did the manly, the straightforward thing of giving to Senators the clerks they needed. These committees, including the Committee on Woman Suffrage, as we all know, were created for the sole purpose of providing chairmanships and clerkships of inactive committees. It is true that since the Senator from Colorado has been chairman of the Committee on Woman Suffrage there has been one joint resolution referred to it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is correct as to most of his assertions about committees, but the Committee on Woman Suffrage happens to be a committee that antedates the time when they undertook to have a committee chairmanship for every Senator of the majority. That committee, as I remember it, was many years ago created to take up the subject and largely to receive the communications that were coming in great numbers and also to listen to the appeals that were made individually to that committee. It was originally a majority committee, but it went over to the minority later and is now back to the majority. In its original creation it was not of the nature of a number of other committees which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask the Senator if, until the reorganization last year, the Committee on Woman Suffrage had not been an inactive committee and if it was not maintained solely for the purpose of providing a chairmanship for a Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I presumed the Senator wanted to be historically correct. The only motive I had in rising was to state exactly how the committee originated and what has been its history since.

Mr. BRYAN. I want the Senator to answer my question. Was it not maintained for years for the sole purpose of providing a chairmanship for an inactive committee?

Mr. WARREN. Afterwards it became a committee of the minority and naturally ranked with the others, but that was not the original purpose in the creation of the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. It may be so, but that has been the purpose for which it has been maintained, and that is what I said.

Mr. President, it does seem to me with that history, from the fact that it has been an inactive committee, from the fact that it has never considered a constitutional amendment affecting the right of the people of the States or of the United States, a committee with perhaps at times not a lawyer upon it, it should not be contended that it was right and proper that the proposed joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution should be referred to it. What is the Committee on the Judiciary for?

Under the argument made by the Senator from Colorado a joint resolution must affect some subject matter within the control and jurisdiction of some committee other than the Judiciary Committee. Is it to be said that hereafter we have so little faith in the Judiciary Committee that we will not refer any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to it, but if it happens to affect woman suffrage we will refer it to the Committee on Woman Suffrage; if it happens to affect the disposition of useless papers, we will refer it to that committee; if it happens to affect trespasses upon Indian lands, we will refer it to that committee; if it happens to affect Revolutionary claims, it goes to the committee of that name? Then what is the use of maintaining the Committee on the Judiciary? An amendment such as is proposed by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that the Constitution be so amended as to change the date upon which Congress shall meet and upon which the President shall take office, an amendment deserving and requiring the best and the most careful consideration of the ablest lawyers in this body, would, under the argument that prevails here to-day, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, upon which there need not be a single lawyer.

That is the reason, Mr. President, why it occurred to me to be proper to refer a joint resolution affecting the Constitution of the United States to a committee that has always been one of the leading committees of the Senate and not to a committee that has always been until recently an inactive committee, without any intention of its ever having a meeting, ranking along with the other committees which I have mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have no doubt the Senator from Florida has stated correctly the original purpose of the creation of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and it is, of course, true that a great many inactive committees have been created perhaps solely for the purposes to which he has referred.

But, Mr. President, I am not convinced that because of that fact the Senate has in the slightest degree erred in referring this proposed amendment to the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman. It is either an active committee to-day or it is not. If it is an active committee, I respectfully suggest that subjects of this sort should properly be referred to that committee, and to none other. But in saying that I am not proposing to derogate either from the importance or the power of the Committee on the Judiciary.

But, Mr. President, the great committees like the Committee on the Judiciary have altogether too much business referred to them. It is physically impossible for the members of that committee to give proper and needed attention to the various matters which properly belong to their jurisdiction. If a measure of this kind so late in the present session should be referred to that committee, the chances are a hundred to one that it would not be reported upon even adversely during the pendency of the present session. It would be far better for the public business if the business were distributed more generally among

the various committees of the Senate, because in that event reports could be made much more intelligently with reference to great matters of business presented here for consideration than is at present the case.

I do not think that any Senator can complain that the Committee on Woman Suffrage, which is now an active committee and which is dealing with one of the most active and persistent issues which the public are to-day considering, has failed or been negligent in pressing as rapidly as possible the business which has been submitted to it for the consideration and ultimate determination of the Senate of the United States.

I think the Senator's argument perhaps proves a little too much, since if the Judiciary Committee is to consider everything that may affect the statutes of the United States or the Constitution it ought to be the only committee within this body.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. Now, by analogy——

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. BRISTOW addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to present some morning business as soon as this debate is over. I do not want to have the morning hour expire before I get that opportunity.

Mr. THOMAS. I am nearly through.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to inquire if the matter has been disposed of by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been.

Mr. THOMAS. Objection was not made when the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] was speaking.

Mr. SWANSON. We were willing to hear debate before the question was disposed of, and we consumed a great deal of time in that. It seems to me under ordinary procedure, having disposed of the matter, we should take up other measures. But I will not raise a point of order until the Senator from Colorado concludes.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to conclude in a minute.

Mr. SWANSON. When the Senator from Colorado concludes, I shall call for the regular order.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. BRYAN. I think the Senator from Colorado and I are both within our rights and within the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. I serve notice that when the Senator from Colorado concludes I shall call for the regular order.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to take up any time of the Senate and I will not justly——

Mr. BRYAN. I know the Senator wants to quote me accurately.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not think I made the statement that every question affecting a statute should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not intend to so state.

Mr. BRYAN. I said or intended to say that every question involving great legal principles or the Constitution of the United States ought to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I quoted the Senator in what I said, I did not mean to do so. I said that was the conclusion which I drew from his argument, saying that, in my judgment, it proved too much.

But let me, before taking my seat—and I will only take a moment—apply the Senator's logic to another committee or to two other committees of the Senate. I refer to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. If the logic of the Senator's position is correct, I can conceive of no office that the Committee on Interoceanic Canals can perform. We are soon, I suppose, to consider the question of Panama tolls, relating to the passage of vessels through the Panama Canal, and, if the Senator from Florida be correct, then, surely, when those matters are introduced here, instead of going to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals they should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That, of course, raises the question at once, If that be so, what office can the Committee on Interoceanic Canals possibly perform, except perhaps the mere creation of certain clerical positions which are necessary for other purposes?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct a statement which was made by the Senator from Florida relative to the joint resolution, to the effect that if 5 per cent of the voters of a State voted in favor of woman suffrage it would be established, which is not the effect of the joint resolution at all. The joint resolution provides that 8 per cent of the voters of a State shall have a right by petition to have the question submitted to the voters of the State, and a majority of the voters of the State must decide whether or not there shall be woman suffrage in that State.

Mr. BRYAN. I intended to state it in that way; but why does the Senator raise the percentage of petitioners from 5 to 8?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I did that very largely because of the colloquy which I had with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. BRYAN. Why did not the Senator reduce it to 1 per cent?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The reason I changed the percentage was that the Senator from Mississippi seemed most seriously to object to the percentage which I first fixed, and I thought it would be better to raise it to 8 per cent; but it seems to me, in view of the arguments which were made here yesterday by so many Senators, namely, that we wanted to force woman suffrage on the people of some of the States when they did not want it, that every Senator who is willing that the voters of his State shall determine the question should vote in favor of this joint resolution.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a joint resolution. It is exactly the same as the joint resolution the Senate voted on yesterday. The joint resolution just introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] is in the nature of a national initiative and referendum law to be embodied in the Constitution. It authorizes the submission of the question of woman suffrage to the voters of the States upon a petition of 8 per cent of those voters. It is more of a national initiative and referendum amendment than a woman-suffrage amendment, although it relates directly to woman suffrage. I am inclined to favor the joint resolution, but I prefer that the question of woman suffrage rest directly upon its own merits and be pending in Congress. I would rather that it stand alone and not be involved with the initiative and referendum question.

An analysis of the vote on the joint resolution yesterday shows that it was lost by 11 votes. Sixty-nine votes were cast. It would therefore have required 46 votes to have constituted the necessary two-thirds.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the Senator from Kansas think that it would require two-thirds of the membership of the Senate?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; it only requires two-thirds of the votes cast, a quorum voting.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not think so. The Constitution says that the vote of two-thirds of the Members of each House shall be necessary.

Mr. BRISTOW. No.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course it would not be very material, for it would go to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and they would settle the constitutional question there.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will examine the precedents, he will find that constitutional amendments have been heretofore adopted by two-thirds of the votes cast, a quorum voting. That has been the universal rule.

As I was saying, however, the joint resolution proposing the amendment was lost by 11 votes. If 11 Senators change their views and cast their votes in favor of the joint resolution, it will be adopted. I want this joint resolution, as we voted on it yesterday, pending in the Senate, so that the good women of this country may carry on their campaign until they get the additional 11 Members, or whatever number may be necessary, in order to pass the joint resolution through the Senate. I think with the development of public opinion that is now going on in this country that within a very short time the additional 11 votes will be secured; indeed, I believe that Senators who yesterday voted against the joint resolution, upon mature consideration during the next year, will then vote for it, if they have an opportunity. So I introduce the joint resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

## MINING ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in obedience to instructions from the Senate Committee on Public Lands, and as chairman of that committee, I move that the Committee on Mines and Mining be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 4898) to encourage and promote the mining of coal,

phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, and sodium on the public domain, which was introduced in the Senate on the 16th day of this month, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Inasmuch as my colleague [Mr. WALSH], who is the author of the bill and chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, is not in the Chamber, I ask that the motion may go over without prejudice, so that it may be called up to-morrow during the morning hour or immediately after the close of morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Montana will lie over one day.

THE REPUBLIC COAL CO.—ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MYERS. I desire to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the close of the morning business, I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate joint resolution 41; and if the Senate should not be in session to-morrow, then I give notice that I will take such action on next Tuesday, immediately after the close of the morning business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, has morning business closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not yet closed.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to say to the Senator that I hope the Senate will be in session to-morrow; and I also hope that the calendar will be taken up to-morrow immediately after the close of the morning business, and that the day will be given to the consideration of bills on the calendar.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to say that I agree to that proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is done, one of the first measures on the calendar is the joint resolution to which the Senator from Montana has referred.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I earnestly hope that it will be done; and if we can have a reasonable time in which to consider the calendar to-morrow, I will not call up the joint resolution to which I have referred. I am willing that it should come up in its order on the calendar, if we ever reach the consideration of the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is the intention to ask for a session to-morrow, especially for the purpose of giving opportunity to consider the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet at 2 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. Twelve o'clock.

Mr. MYERS. Well, at 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is out of order; that is the standing order of the Senate.

TRADING IN COTTON FUTURES.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the morning hour will soon expire by limitation, I give notice that on Monday next I will call up Senate bill 110 immediately upon the close of morning business.

SWINOMISH SLOUGH BRIDGE, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES. There is a bill which was received from the House of Representatives two or three days ago, and which is now on the table, providing for the construction of a bridge in my State. I ask that it may be taken from the table and laid before the Senate. I will state that Senate bill 4250, which passed the Senate on the 27th day of February is identical with this House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 12594) to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across the Swinomish Slough opposite the town of La Conner, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the Secretary be requested to recall from the House of Representatives the bill (S. 4250) to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across Swinomish Slough, opposite the town of La Conner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request will be made. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as the morning hour is so nearly closed, I do not think I will call up the resolution that is on the table; but I wish to state that on to-morrow I expect to call up the resolution calling on the President for information with reference to Panama Canal tolls; and I also desire to say that I shall avail myself of the rules of the Senate to hasten the disposition of morning business so as to reach the resolution as early as possible.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that it has been the plan for several days to give to-morrow to the consideration of the calendar, and I shall do what I can to follow that course, and shall insist that to-morrow the calendar be given precedence over everything else. There are many Senators with measures upon the calendar, which can be disposed of, who have been asking for it, and they are entitled to to-morrow, which is Saturday, for that purpose. Of course the Senate can refuse to proceed with the calendar and take up the resolution referred to by the Senator from Washington; but, so far as I am concerned, I intend to adhere to the statement I have made to a number of Senators, who desire to have the calendar considered, and I shall ask to proceed with it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not in order within the morning hour to call from the table the resolution which I have offered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can only be done by unanimous consent or by a motion.

Mr. JONES. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for a moment? I merely wish to make a statement.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] that I am in full accord with his statement in relation to taking up the calendar; but I wish to say also that, unless we take up the calendar for consideration and go through with it, I shall hereafter object every time unanimous consent is asked for the immediate consideration of a bill when it is reported to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington submits the resolution, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 309) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Senate what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls, what representations have been made regarding the same, and copies of all communications received from foreign countries relating thereto, together with copies of answers submitted by the United States.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the resolution is already on the table.

Mr. JONES. Not this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it is the same resolution that is now lying on the table, and I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the resolution will lie over and be printed. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? If not, morning business is closed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914 and for prior years, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to a conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 14234. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14546. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before we begin with the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII, I suggest the absence of a quorum, because there are a number of Senators who do not know that we are about to enter upon the consideration of bills upon the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Jones | Page | Stephenson |
| Bankhead | Kenyon | Perkins | Sterling |
| Bradley | La Follette | Pittman | Sutherland |
| Brady | Lane | Poindexter | Thomas |
| Brandegee | Lea, Tenn. | Pomerene | Thompson |
| Bryan | Lee, Md. | Ransdell | Thornton |
| Burton | Lewis | Reed | Tillman |
| Catron | McCumber | Shafroth | Townsend |
| Dillingham | Martine, N. J. | Sheppard | Walsh |
| du Pont | Myers | Sherman | Warren |
| Gallinger | Nelson | Shields | Weeks |
| Gronna | Newlands | Smith, Ariz. | West |
| Hughes | Norris | Smith, Md. | |
| James | O'Gorman | Smith, S. C. | |
| Johnson | Overman | Smoot | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The first business on the calendar was the bill (S. 1240) to establish the legislative reference bureau of the Library of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. GALLINGER. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1760) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE REPUBLIC COAL CO.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is that proposed by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been informed that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has some interest in this matter, either in favor of it or against it, I do not know which. I observe that he is absent. I suggest that the matter go over until he can be notified and can be present.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Nebraska and I have talked considerably about this bill, and he told me he did not care whether he was present or not when it was voted on.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well. On that statement I have nothing further to say.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I simply wish to place in the RECORD, very briefly, my objections to this joint resolution. There are a number of Senators whom I know are opposed to the joint resolution but who are not in the Chamber at this time. I do not wish to do anything that will further delay the consideration of the resolution. The Senator from Montana has brought it up several times, and he is entitled to have it voted on.

The original joint resolution, as referred to the committee, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co. I ask Senators to note that the words "or lease" were in the original joint resolution. That resolution was referred to the Secretary of the Interior for his opinion, and his opinion was favorable to the joint resolution with those words in it.

As the resolution came from the committee to the Senate, when my attention was first attracted to it, it was changed very materially from the form in which it was first introduced and in which it was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, so that I think his opinion is not of very persuasive force in the matter. As the joint resolution was presented to the Senate it was wrong, from my viewpoint, and I think wrong from the viewpoint of many Senators in this body.

The Secretary of the Interior was instructed, authorized, empowered, and directed, in the language of the joint resolution, to sell to the Republic Coal Co. certain coal lands, I think about 2,000 acres, the purchase price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior. It did not provide that there could be any lease. It was the amazing proposition of a joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a particular piece of Government land to a particular corporation.

It would not have been so bad if it had provided that the Secretary could lease or sell; but it did not even do that. It would not have been so bad if it had directed that the land should be sold to the highest bidder. Under the joint resolution, however, no one else has the right to buy this land except one particular corporation. That is bad legislation. It is the kind of legislation a good many of us have contended against for a good many years. I did not suppose it was possible, with the present enlightened conscience of the American people, that such a joint resolution could be earnestly urged in this body.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will ask the Senator whether this land can be purchased now by other parties?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think it can be. The authority is given to sell it to this company, as I understand, largely because the company themselves, under the general law, can not acquire the land. I think that is true. The Senator from Montana, I think, will confirm me in that statement.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, I am willing to accept the Senator's suggestion as to the land laws, because I am not so familiar with them as he is. It is conceded, however, that the Republic Coal Co. is merely an auxiliary organization of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co. So the original joint resolution as presented to the Senate, and upon which we were asked to act, was a direction from Congress to the Secretary of the Interior to sell this land to the Milwaukee Railroad.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I simply desire to say, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming, that the land is now open to purchase by private individuals. It has been appraised by the Geological Survey, and any individual otherwise qualified may purchase 160 acres of it.

Mr. KENYON. I will ask the Senator how long that has been true. How long has it been open to purchase by private individuals?

Mr. WALSH. My recollection is that the appraisement was made in 1908, and any individual may go in and buy 160 acres, or an association of qualified individuals may buy 320 acres. This company, however, can not buy. It is not qualified.

Mr. KENYON. That is possibly a fault in the law, but it does not change my opinion as to the merits of the joint resolution.

Outside of these preliminary objections I have an objection to the resolution which is fundamental, to my mind, though many Senators would not agree with me about it. I do not believe the Government ought to sell any more of its coal lands. It possibly ought to provide some system of leasing them, but the coal, which is in the earth for the benefit of all the people, ought to be conserved in some way by the Government for them. I do not mean to say that the Government ought to operate the coal mines; I would not go that far; but the Government ought to keep the coal lands.

That objection being so fundamental in my mind I can not vote for this joint resolution. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I am satisfied, of course, that they make the joint resolution much better than it was before. Whatever the amendments were they could not help making it better, and they undoubtedly have been drawn with the care and skill which the Senator from Montana possesses.

I feel it my duty, however, to vote against the joint resolution even if amended feeling as I do about it—that it is wrong legislation and vicious legislation. If there ever was a case of special legislation for special interests, it is this joint resolution as reported to the Senate from the Senate committee. Feeling as I do I shall have to vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator from Iowa with relation to the question of leasing and selling. This bill is a matter of no local concern to me, and consequently I have no interest whatever in the measure; but when the Senator proposes that all of the coal in the United

States shall be held and owned by the Government and that it shall be leased by the Government I at least must enter my protest against such a proposition.

Why? Because we have a dual form of government here. We have a National Government for national affairs and a State government for State affairs. When we consider the fact that the holding by the National Government will keep these lands from taxation by the States it becomes a most serious matter to the States whether these lands shall be sold or whether they shall be leased.

In my State there have been withdrawn from entry 9,425,000 acres of coal lands, valued by the Government at between half a billion dollars and a billion dollars. Not an acre of them is subject to taxation for the maintenance of the State government, for the maintenance of the county government, or for the maintenance of the schools; and yet we are required by the Constitution of the United States to maintain a republican form of government over these lands. Is it right that we should have a leasing system by which these lands shall be held and leased by the Government in perpetuity and not a dollar contributed to the State or to the county or to the schools which have the greatest amount of expense with relation to government over them? It seems to me that it is absurd to say that we should have a leasing system as to public lands. It means perpetual ownership in the National Government and administration from Washington, which was never intended by the framers of our Constitution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. For the information of the Senator upon that subject I desire to say that I had the honor to introduce, the other day, a bill which provides for the leasing of coal lands, but provides that everything derived from them shall go to the State in which they are located.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, we have had a good deal of tinkering with our laws out West, and every time we have had it we have met with obstructions. For example, the system under which a forest inspector goes and looks at a mine and determines whether or not it is a workable mine has practically killed prospecting in the West; so that right now, instead of having 40,111 miners of metalliferous ores in the State of Colorado, as we had in 1900, we had in 1910 19,568, according to the report made to the Committee on Mines and Mining the other day.

You must remember that we have certain duties to discharge as States. There is imposed upon us the duty of maintaining a republican form of government. We can not well do that without establishing an educational system.

It is just as much to the interest of the Nation that the children should be educated as it is to the State. What is the result if the lands are withdrawn? These lands valued at from half a billion to a billion dollars are withdrawn from any taxation for the purpose of sustaining a school system that is for the very purpose of educating people for citizenship, and in which the United States Government is as much interested as the State government. Are you going to take all the revenue?

I never noticed how serious this matter was until I was governor of the State. I found that we contributed to the National Government yearly $5,000,000 in taxation, and yet we raised for State purposes only $1,600,000. We pay to the National Government three times as much as we collect for our own State government. The amount here involved in the withdrawn coal lands is from half a billion to a billion dollars, estimated by the United States Government, and the result is we can not get a dollar of revenue from them. Is it possible that that is right? Is it possible that any Senator will say the Government should not maintain its dual relations, taking care of its national affairs and let this territory over which the State must exercise jurisdiction remain as it has been?

As to the quantity of coal, Mr. President, Senators talk about coal as if it were a scarce article. According to the Geological Survey we have 371,000,000,000 tons of coal in the State of Colorado. The yearly consumption of the entire world is only 1,250,000,000 tons. If you divide one into the other you will see that Colorado has enough coal to supply the world for 300 years. Wyoming has still more.

### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 120.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. NELSON rose.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MCCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that we may dispose of the measure which has been before the Senate.

Mr. MCCUMBER. May I ask the Senator whether, in his opinion, there will be any great delay in the disposition of that measure? If we can vote right away upon it, I shall not object; but if it is to be the subject of considerable debate, as it appears to me it is, I should like to exercise my right and proceed with this bill.

Mr. MYERS. I will say that my judgment is that at the outside not more than 20 or 30 minutes should be consumed in the discussion of the measure. I myself will probably speak on it about three minutes—five minutes perhaps—simply to make a reply to some remarks by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. I can not conceive that any great time will be taken.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I am informed by Senators here who expect to debate it that it will take considerably longer than that time, and therefore I must object.

Mr. MYERS. I was laboring under a misapprehension, then.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MCCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. This bill which has now been laid before the Senate is a grain-inspection bill that revolutionizes the whole grain-inspection service of the country and practically destroys the grain-inspection system throughout the country. The Senator from North Dakota has called up this bill on three or four different days and made lengthy speeches on it. I think he knew I was not in favor of the bill. Last evening after the Senate had gone into executive session, when there were not as many Senators in the Chamber as there are here now, and when I had gone, the Senator moved to take up the bill and to make it the unfinished business.

Mr. President, I have aimed to attend the sessions of the Senate here as far as my committee work would allow me. As a rule when we go into executive session it has been the custom that we transact no legislative business after that, and if we are not interested in anything in the executive session we leave. Last evening I stayed here until the Senate had gone into executive session. There were only a few Senators here, not as many as are here now, and I left because there was nothing on the executive calendar that I was interested in. Lo and behold, this morning I find on looking over the RECORD that after the Senate had gone into executive session, whether it was done while the Senate was in executive session or not—it appears it was done in open session—the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] asked to take this bill from the calendar and to make it the unfinished business.

I submit, Mr. President, without criticizing anybody, that that is not exactly fair to the opponents of the bill. I have told the Senator from North Dakota that I intended to debate it, and I think that in all fairness to me when he aimed to take up the bill out of its order from the calendar and to make it the unfinished business he ought at all events to have given notice to me.

Therefore, in view of these facts, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which last evening the bill was taken from the calendar and made the unfinished business. I think I am entitled to have the motion prevail as a matter of fairness and justice to me.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator from Minnesota to make a motion in this case. I had the floor and was recognized by the Chair. The Senator rose to address some remark to me and I yielded to him for that purpose. I decline to yield for a motion to be made while I have the floor.

Now, I want to answer the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Minnesota object to this bill being voted upon by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. NELSON. Not at all at this session, but I want our side to have an ample opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. NELSON. Now, why did you make your motion to take it up in executive session?

Mr. MCCUMBER. The Senator will have the opportunity if he wants to discuss the bill. The Senator is not unaware of the methods that have been adopted to defeat this bill year

after year, nor is the Senator from North Dakota unaware of the methods employed in attempting to keep it from being heard. All that I have asked for 10 years is that the Senate shall voice its sentiment upon the bill. That is all I stated to the Senator from Minnesota. I have given notice, and that notice has been here upon the calendar for three weeks, that immediately after the disposition of Senate joint resolution No. 1 I would move to take up this bill for consideration, not for the purpose of rushing it beyond any opportunity for Senators to speak upon it. I am not in a hurry. I thought that 10 or 12 years gave some reasonable opportunity to discuss it. All I want is that I may put it in a position, and I gave the notice that I would put it in a position, where we could get an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I expect to have it discussed. The Senator from Minnesota, as I have stated before, will have all the reasonable time that he may wish to take. All that I am asking for this bill is that it shall be voted upon at this session. Does the Senator want to deny me that privilege?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I heard his notice that immediately after the disposition of Senate joint resolution No. 1 he would ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill, and that he would ask that it be made the unfinished business. I accordingly was here waiting for that motion to be made, and intended to resist it. I waited until the Senate went into executive session. I waited in the executive session until it became manifest to me that there was no business coming up except routine matters. Having been engaged largely during the day in a committee upon hearings, I stepped out of the Chamber, and I was not gone more than about 10 minutes when I heard the bell ring for an adjournment.

It is absolutely, I think, almost without precedent to ask for the legislative order of business to be determined in executive session. I was here waiting the very notice the Senator gave, namely, that he would ask to have this bill made the unfinished business, and I waited until the legislative session had been merged into the executive session.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, on the contrary, it has been one of the most customary things in the world when in executive session to carry out a notice as in legislative session I intended, in accordance with my notice, to make the motion as soon as Senate joint resolution No. 1 was voted upon. I sought the recognition of the Chair, but the Senator who moved the executive session obtained recognition before I did, and, of course, his motion was carried. I had no objection to that. I then took the very first opportunity possible to put this matter before the Senate.

Now, I have a right to ask the Senator this one question: There is no hurry about the matter of voting or the matter of an opportunity to be heard. Is the Senator willing that we should have a vote on this question? That is all I am seeking—not to hurry the matter, but that every Senator shall have all the reasonable opportunity he may ask to discuss the bill. But is the Senator willing that the Senate shall vote on it at this session? I am not willing that it shall be crowded out until it becomes necessary to consider other important bills, and, therefore, I want a decision of the question; I want a reasonable time fixed in the future for a vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I regard this bill as an utterly vicious piece of proposed legislation, without warrant or justification, revolutionary in its character, and that it ought to be beaten. When I regard a piece of legislation that way I feel that I am perfectly warranted in insisting that it shall be brought forward in the ordinary way and not come in to the exclusion of other business, and take precedence of other business, by being placed upon the legislative program in executive session at a time when nobody expects it, when the probabilities are it could not have been placed upon the legislative program as unfinished business if it had been brought up in the ordinary way.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRONNA. With the permission of my colleague, I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that this was not the only business transacted by the Senate as in legislative session after the doors were closed. There was other business transacted. This bill has been before Congress for more than 10 years, and it has been considered as a most vicious piece of legislation by the chambers of commerce and by the boards of trade of the large cities of our country. On the other hand, thousands of farmers have petitioned that this bill or a similar bill be taken up and at least considered and voted on, and I believe that the thousands of American farmers are entitled to be heard as much as the few boards of trade and chambers of commerce that exist in our country.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. REED. There are always self-appointed representatives of the American farmer. Every time a man opposes any measure, no matter upon what ground, they immediately mount upon their throne of virtue and proclaim themselves the mouthpiece of the downtrodden farmer and hold themselves up to the general glorification of themselves; and they generally intimate that everybody who is against them is attached to some very wicked and sinister influence.

The fact of the matter is the Senator who has just spoken no more holds a brief to represent the farming community than I do or than other Senators do, and he has no more right to intimate that those who oppose this bill are doing it in the interest of boards of trade than I would have to attribute to him some evil or sinister motive, which I do not do, because I know it does not exist.

The fact is there is a difference of opinion between the Senator and myself with reference to this proposition. The question is whether it is the proper thing for the Federal Government to go into the respective States of the Union and displace their local officers and their local inspection and centralize it down here in the city of Washington. That is not a question upon which the farmers are arrayed on one side and the boards of trade upon the other. The Senator ought not to have made the argument he did.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if my colleague will allow me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri if he knows of anyone engaged in any other business except the chambers of commerce and boards of trade who have opposed this bill?

Mr. REED. Yes; and I shall make it perfectly manifest when we come to debate the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. I will be very glad to hear the Senator on that point.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to say that I am opposed to the bill unqualifiedly, and I have been opposed to it since the question was first up. I am not a member of any board of trade or chamber of commerce, but I can see no good in the measure but great evil. Senators speak of evil influences. There is some strange influence at work here in Washington. One day the first of the week two gentlemen accosted me on F Street. I did not know them, but they seemed to know me. They said that they hoped I was for what they called Senator MYERS's bill. I said, "I am generally for Senator MYERS, I am a great admirer and friend of him, but," I asked, "to what bill do you refer?" One of the gentlemen said he referred to the bill providing for the sale of coal lands. I said, "No; unqualifiedly no; I am opposed to the bill."

Mr. WEST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. WEST. I think the Senator from New Jersey is talking on a subject that is not pending now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think it is entirely germane.

Mr. WEST. It is the grain bill that is up, and not the coal bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. What I am discussing now refers to coal and not grain, but grain would do as well. We must have coal to keep the human body warm, but I want to say that it is taking a most dangerous step. I think it is contrary to the public welfare and to public policy. I helped the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] yesterday when he spoke of public lands acquired by dummy entrymen, as he termed it. I want to ask whether dummy interests may not prevail in this particular case.

I want to say further that I am opposed to the leasing or the selling of public coal lands. I want to have the Government operate the coal mines for the benefit of the people. I know it is a heresy to most of you, but many things that were denounced a few years ago we to-day swallow with the greatest avidity.

I heard the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] say that we have coal enough for 100 years. What do a hundred years amount to in the supply of coal for a great nation? We are not going to live for a day; we know we will live very much longer than a day as a nation.

I feel that this is a most extraordinary step, and I shall oppose it with all the ability and zest I have. It is dangerous in policy and unwise. The whole public mind is to-day agitated upon the question of the conservation of the great necessities of nature. I feel justified in pursuing any legitimate policy to defeat bills of this kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is like a great many other Senators upon this question. They do not consider the bill and the provisions of the bill before the Senate, but immediately branch off to something that is not in the bill or related to it in any degree whatever.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to bring this bill before the Senate for consideration, not some other bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have read the bill, and I thought I understood it. I may not view it through the lens of the Senator, but I view it through the lens of a common-sense layman. I believe it will be a disaster, and I oppose it. I believe there are interests behind the bill that make it dangerous.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator from New Jersey what bill he refers to?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am referring to the bill presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. I can not recall the number of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the coal bill, and I want to inform the Senator that his lucid argument upon the coal bill has nothing to do with the grain-inspection bill that I am discussing.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was not aware that the Senator had started on that tack, but whatever I have said I do not recall. As far as I have gone into the Senator from North Dakota's grain bill, I have expressed myself just as positively in opposition to that measure.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. Not yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in just a minute. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the Senator will express his opposition without reading the bill, just the same as he has expressed it here; but I have been trying to get an intelligent discussion of the merits of the bill. I have not been able to hold the attention of many upon the other side of the Chamber, and I am not surprised that the Senator from New Jersey has not the slightest idea about what is the bill I have before the Senate and that he goes off on a tangent to some other bill to which he has objection. In view of his statement, I have no doubt that, without any consideration whatever, he will be equally opposed to this bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to say I heard a portion of the Senator's argument—in fact, all the argument previous to to-day—on the grain bill; so I am not talking utterly unadvised.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator found any close relation between the grain bill and the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] for leasing coal lands, I confess I can not see the connection.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not claim that there is any relation at all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. The error of the Senator from New Jersey in not understanding that we were discussing the grain bill is very natural, because he probably did as the rest of us—remained at the session yesterday until the executive session was almost over and——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield. I yielded to the Senator for a question, if he desires to ask me.

Mr. REED. It was a general yielding.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator wants to discuss some other bill, I confess——

Mr. REED. I was not discussing another bill. I am saying that the mistake of the Senator from New Jersey was very natural. The Senator evidently——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I decline to yield for any purpose except for a question upon this grain bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor and declines to yield.

Mr. REED. May I make an inquiry? The Senator from North Dakota has taken a week's time in discussing the bill. I should like to ask if he intends to discuss it further, and if so, how long, because I have a committee meeting that I want to attend.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota care to answer the question of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President; I will answer it. I will discuss the bill just as long as the Senate want to discuss it, and not any longer; and if they will vote on it to-day, or to-morrow, or a week from to-day, or a month from to-day, and I am sure I will get a vote on it, I will be satisfied. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I only want to take advantage of the opportunity to add to the excellent speech which the Senator from New Jersey has just made upon the coal bill; that while made under a misapprehension as to what is pending before the Senate, I indorse what he has said about the coal bill, and I am very glad that he had this opportunity of opposing that bill. I do not agree with him as to the grain bill. I am in favor of that measure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Just a moment, Mr. President. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the grain bill, nor how it got on the calendar as unfinished business; I will let others take care of that; but I rise to say that I think we are falling into a bad habit in the Senate, inasmuch as Senators seem to think because they give a notice that at some time they will call up a bill it gives them some prior right. A week ago there were three notices on the calendar at the same time stating that at the conclusion of a certain matter which was before the Senate the Senators giving the notices would call up certain bills. Now, as a matter of courtesy that may have some potency, but under the rules of the Senate it does not give a Senator any prior right; he has to get recognition in the usual form.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has indulged in that method many times himself, and for a very good reason.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator never did indulge in it. I never gave a notice of that kind during my long term of service.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator has given notice when he would address the Senate on a certain subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not what I mean.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is exactly the same.

Mr. GALLINGER. Even in that case I think the Senator would have to search the RECORD a long time to find that I gave any such notice. What I mean to say is that Senators seem to think a notice gives them a right to proceed to the consideration of a bill not merely for discussion. That I want to put in the RECORD as being, I think, a bad habit.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think there is a single Senator who has any such idea, but there are Senators who desire to know when a matter is liable to be called up and discussed, and this method of notifying Senators, I say, has been indulged in, and for a very proper reason, in my opinion.

Now, I want to answer briefly the proposition of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

First, I want to say in all candor to the Senator from Minnesota, all I ask of the Senator and all other Senators is that they will allow this bill to be voted upon. The Senator can have his own time, fix his own date at which he desires to speak upon the bill, and in a reasonable time I will gladly——

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator address his remarks to me? Will he let me reply?

Mr. McCUMBER. I certainly will let the Senator reply.

Mr. NELSON. What I want to say to the Senator is that under the conditions we have been working here, at the close of an afternoon session, when we have finished our legislative work and go into executive session, unless Senators have something they are vitally interested in, as a rule we go home. I

do not think, with all due respect to the Senator from North Dakota, knowing my attitude in this matter and knowing that the Chamber was almost deserted, when there were not as many present as there are now, he called up this important bill at that time and had it made the unfinished business, when in all fairness he ought to have told me that he was going to do that in executive session. He failed to do it, and I insist that this question goes to the good faith and integrity of legislative proceedings. If this system is to prevail, we will never be safe about anything. We would have to stay here at all times, whether we are on a committee or not, being liable to have snap judgment taken upon us at any moment. I submit that for the integrity of our legislative proceedings and for the benefit of all Senators who have public business to attend to such a practice ought not to be tolerated for a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in just a moment. Mr. President, when any Senator puts himself in an attitude where he purposes to prevent the Senate from having an opportunity to pass upon legislation he must expect that the other Senator who desires the legislation shall put himself in an attitude where he will get a hearing whenever it is possible to get it. For 10 long years I have asked the Senate to vote upon this question. It has been reported out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry favorably. It has been reported upon the continuous demand of the great agricultural sections of the country. Opposing that demand have been a few of the great grain buyers at the great grain centers. Their position is not that they are willing to have this discussed and have it voted on, but to prevent consideration if possible. We have been more than fair to them.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator mean to intimate that that has been my attitude?

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator wants my opinion, I will say the Senator only the other day stated that all he desired was to have an opportunity to prepare such an address as he might want to make upon the matter.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; and under such conditions as the Senator from North Dakota made his address.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that opportunity will be granted, so far as I am concerned. The Senator need not have any fear but that he will have all the time and all the opportunity he wants in this matter. The Senate may vote me down, but they will have this matter before them as often as I can bring it before the Senate until I can get a vote upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not wish to argue the merits of this bill nor to oppose, in due course, the parliamentary procedure that may ultimately result in a roll call on it. What I wish to inquire is, when we go into executive session late in the evening, adjourning, say, at 5.35 o'clock, if it has not been the uniform course of procedure to adjourn without transacting any legislative business after we come out of executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator addresses the Chair——

Mr. SHERMAN. I was making that inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will answer the inquiry.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the complete interrogatory.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the answer to that inquiry is, that after we have gone into executive session we may either go back into legislative session immediately, when a motion can be made or a motion may be made as if in legislative session, without the formality of again returning to legislative session and opening the doors, and then adjourn. That has been the custom.

Mr. SHERMAN. The question which I wish to obtain information on has not been wholly answered. It was whether at a late hour in the evening it has not been the uniform practice for the Senate to adjourn for that legislative day?

Mr. McCUMBER. It has been the uniform practice of the Senate to adjourn when it got ready to adjourn.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I wish to say, Mr. President, that it ought to be the uniform practice to consider this bill when the Senate gets ready to consider it, and not as it may be farmed out to us by the Senator from North Dakota.

I regard it, Mr. President, as a course of procedure which, if persisted in, will in time lead to the abolition of the method of doing business in the Senate. The method of transacting business by unanimous consent, by such practices as this, will ultimately become a pitfall rather than a proper parliamentary procedure. A few more such efforts as this will tend to impeach the ordinary method that prevails here, notwithstanding whatever fixed parliamentary right may exist. It goes to the point of whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and others were not justified in believing that no other legislative business would be transacted after the completion of the executive session yesterday. I do not know how many were here. I was here until the close of the executive session, but at the isolated point where I am stationed I can not always ascertain, unless I have telephonic connection, just what has occurred.

I am very much opposed to the passage of this bill, and expect to vote against it on its merits. I am not opposed to its consideration and to a roll call upon it in due course of parliamentary business. I do not wish to state now that I am favorable to the suppression of the bill, to its burial under a mass of business here toward the close of the session that will result in never reaching a roll call upon it, but under the conditions that presented themselves last night I find this record made up:

> Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.
>
> The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.
>
> The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Then the Senator from North Dakota asked that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and it was so ordered by the Chair.

Then the other Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] moved that the Senate adjourn. Whether there was a quorum here, of course, will never satisfactorily appear, whether there was anybody here but the two Senators from North Dakota does not appear.

I am not attacking the motives of the Senator from North Dakota, who is in charge of this bill. I only believe that, in his anxiety, he sought to have it made the unfinished business, so that he might ultimately have a roll call upon it; but I am stating that in view of the uniform procedure that has prevailed here in the short time that I have been a Member, if such practices are to be indulged in, I serve notice here and now that I am ready to vote for a radical change in the rules governing the transaction of the business of the Senate. I will join, some time in the near future, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] in applying some drastic provisions under which we shall transact business as it is done in larger parliamentary bodies. We have followed these practices, Mr. President, uniformly, without anyone being misled. I do not feel that sense of indignation—I have not that right probably—so much as does the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SHERMAN. With the permission of the Senator's colleague, I yield to him.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to remind the Senator from Illinois, with the permission of my colleague, that, as I understand the change which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] proposes to make in the rules, is to hasten legislation and not to defeat it.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is one change. It is to prevent perpetual talk or perpetual conversation; that is the way I should describe it if I were an unprejudiced observer outside of the body. I have not been in sympathy with that heretofore.

The motion to adjourn was agreed to at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. The RECORD says:

> After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

That would indicate that we went into executive session about 5.25, remaining in session until about 5.30 or adjourning very nearly at 5.35; for, I presume, from the condition in which the RECORD is, that there were no untoward laggards trending on the heels of Father Time when this motion was made after the executive session had dissolved. I do not suppose that it took over half a minute to make this record. So, at the late hour of 5.35 o'clock p. m., Mr. President, it seems to me that Senators might all fairly presume, as did the Senator from Minnesota, that the business of the day had been completed.

I am not objecting and I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at some time so as to reach a roll call upon it, but I do object to the methods by which it was made the unfinished business; and I will state here that I regard it as a gross breach of faith from an unprejudiced layman's standpoint.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCUMBER. In a minute I will do so, Mr. President, but not until I have answered the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

I think that I am as well acquainted with the courtesy that is due the Senate and due Senators as is the Senator from Illinois. I know that I represent only an agricultural community; I know that the farmers, as a rule, do not take that quick and active participation in these matters that can be taken by an organized board of trade, but they have their rights, and they ought to have those rights passed upon by the Senate of the United States. They have been appealing for 10 long years that the Senate give an expression of its sentiment upon a bill that has been indorsed favorably by every farmers' organization throughout the United States. The farmers can not reach this body as quickly as can the boards of trade; they are not adepts in presenting their side of the question; but they know when they are robbed; they know when they are not treated fairly; and while I always labor under a great disadvantage, representing, as I do, an unorganized farming community as against the great organizations throughout the Union, I shall not allow my zeal to flag in their behalf as the result of any attempt on the part of those who oppose a measure which I know to be in the farmers' interests, and which they are demanding, but which it is sought to keep the Senate from voting upon. If this bill is vicious, according to the view of any Senator, then, for heaven's sake, let him record his vote against it.

The Senator from Illinois can not accuse me of being overanxious in presenting this bill when I have had it here for 10 years without being able to secure a vote upon it. I had charge of the national pure-food bill in this body and succeeded in putting it through some years ago. It took me five long years before I was able to get a vote upon it in the Senate, though when I did secure a vote there were only 3 votes against it.

Why did it take that long time to secure a vote upon that measure? The people wanted pure-food legislation; they were in favor of it; but a great many manufacturing establishments were not in favor of it, and they were strong enough to so control the action of the Senate that one appropriation bill after another would be crowded in to keep that bill out of the way, and every method known to parliamentary practice was indulged in that we might not secure a vote upon it. We finally did get a vote upon it, but it was only after we had persistently, and by the same methods that I am now adopting, insisted that the Senate should vote upon it.

Mr. President, what is there about this bill that so frightens these boards of trade? This bill provides for Government standardization of grades. Every one of those boards of trade now has come over to it, though a few years ago every one of them resolved against it as being vicious and as interfering with the rights of the citizen. I repeat, every one of them to-day has come over in favor of Federal standardization of grades, and they have adopted resolutions and formulated a bill, which was introduced in the Senate the other day and had already been introduced in the other House. They agree with me, therefore, in what I have been contending for, namely, the establishment of uniformity of grades under a Federal standard.

Now, wherein do we disagree? I insist not only that we should have a Federal standard, but that Federal officers, and not employees of the boards of trade, should do the inspecting. There is the only point on which we to-day differ. I say that when the boards of trade use their own employees for the purpose of inspecting grain their employees are subject to their control and every doubt is resolved in favor of the members of the exchanges; that they adopt a rigid or a loose system of inspection, as may suit their purposes; and that under that method the boards are able to manipulate grades and are able to make and to break markets overnight by a change of grade or a change of system. They can not do this as easily under State inspection as they can under board of trade inspection; but remember that there are only four States, I believe, which have State inspection to-day.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is mistaken as to that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Perhaps there are more. I say there are only about four States; there may be five or six; but most of the inspecting is now done under boards of trade or chambers of commerce.

Mr. President, I insist that the Federal Government shall take over the same men now employed on this work in Chicago, the same men now employed in Minneapolis and in Duluth, the same men now employed in Baltimore, put them under the civil-service law, and say to them, "Grade this grain according to our standards and according to our system."

Having agreed upon the standards by the consent of the boards of trade, there is left only the one matter of taking over the employees of the several boards of trade, putting them under the civil-service law, and allowing them to go ahead and make the inspection. That should not constitute a valid objection in the mind of any man who wants honest grading and who is not afraid of a Government certificate. It seems to me that only those who want to control the men who make the inspection should object to the inspection being put under Government control.

Mr. REED, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and to whom?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, if he wants to ask me a question.

Mr. REED. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota yields for a question.

Mr. REED. Will not the Senator from North Dakota yield the floor, so that the Senator from Minnesota may make the motion he tried to make nearly an hour ago, and let us settle whether or not this bill is really before the Senate? The argument on the merits of the measure can be proceeded with at some other time. The Senator from North Dakota has occupied nearly a week in discussing this bill, and it seems to me the question we ought to determine now is whether this bill is really and rightfully before the Senate. The Senator from Minnesota rose to make a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was made the unfinished business, and it seems to me the Senator from North Dakota ought to permit us to vote on that motion.

My reason for the suggestion is this: I happen to be the chairman of a subcommittee that is hearing a very important matter in a committee room upstairs, attorneys are in attendance on that committee, and my presence is desired there; but I also want to be present when we determine the question whether or not this matter is to be before the Senate, and it seems to me the Senator might permit us to have a vote upon it.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President. If the Senator from Minnesota or any other Senator on this floor says he is not ready to go on with this matter to-day, that he does not want to go on until next week, I am perfectly willing and ready to meet his views. If any Senator says that he wants this bill to be laid aside in order that he may be able to present his views on it, I have no objection to having it laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. When I yield I am going to yield first to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], because he asked me to yield some time ago.

So, Mr. President, those who want this matter before the Senate, those who are willing to have it voted on by the Senate, do not need to drive it out of the Senate again in order that they may have an opportunity to prepare themselves for the debate, because they will have no difficulty, so far as I am concerned, in having a full opportunity to discuss this bill. I do not think any Senator can say that I have ever taken advantage of a Senator who desired to speak upon a bill of which I had charge or that he could not have all the time that he desired to occupy on it. I want this bill the unfinished business, so that at some time during the session, before we get loaded up with the trust bills and the appropriation bills, we can pass upon it.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I am interested in this bill, and I have been interested in all the proceedings pertaining to the bill. As to the motive or design of the Senator from North Dakota in bringing up the matter last evening in executive session, I can not help but think that he was actuated by the best of motives and that he acted in perfect good faith. We all know how long he has labored in the interest of this legislation and what he has done during the present session, and I can not help but think that his only desire was that the bill might take its place as the unfinished business without any design to take advantage of anybody.

Mr. President, I myself hope to occupy a little of the time of the Senate in the discussion of this bill, and I have had occasion to confer with the Senator from North Dakota in regard to it and in regard to those who were expected to speak upon it. He has given me the names of Senators whom he thought would speak in opposition to the bill, and from that I know that there was no desire on his part to take advantage of anybody, but that he expected every Senator who had anything to say upon the bill, either in favor of it or against it, to have a full opportunity to be heard. As I have said, I think there was no desire on the part of the Senator to take advantage of anyone.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and to whom?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in addition to what has been said by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], I wish to remind the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that my colleague said on this floor a few days ago, in the hearing of the Senator from Illinois, that he would take advantage of every opportunity honorably within his power to press this bill to a vote, and he has done nothing more than that.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I refuse to be drawn into a controversy on the merits of this bill. I assume that at some period in the parliamentary lifetime of some of the Senators here it will be reached and that we can discuss it. What I want to know is whether this method of business shall prevail in the Senate? I am beginning to have it dawn on me that Senators have certain rights that afford a basis for making trouble, and if we are going to transact business strictly in a parliamentary way, I want to discover it. I think I can probably put myself in a position where I can be protected.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the matter is before the Senate at present on its merits. The Senator has made that statement before. The Senator will have full opportunity to discuss this bill, even if it should remain the unfinished business. Ah, Mr. President and Senators, we are not blind. It is the desire that we do not get to a vote upon this proposition. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] spoke accurately and with his usual candor when he stated, in substance at least, that he was justified in adopting any method of defeating this bill even to the extent of preventing its being brought before the Senate. Of course that is one method of defeating a measure; and if the Senator thinks that the bill is vicious, that a majority of the Senate can not see the viciousness of it, and therefore it is necessary to prevent its being brought before them, of course his position is perfectly tenable; but if the Senator agrees that the Senate ought to have judgment enough to know what is right and what is wrong, then at some time during the parliamentary life of the Members present, as expressed by the Senator from Illinois, we ought to get a vote upon the bill; and that is all I am going to ask for. I am willing to fix the date to vote at any time in April and allow the bill to be laid aside until that time, if Senators so wish, or to postpone the date to any other time Senators may desire, if they will give me an assurance that I may have a vote upon it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President, for a question.

Mr. REED. If the Senator, having made some personal remarks about me, will only yield for a question—and he seems to limit all his yielding to me for a question—I will take the floor in my own right when he gets through, if the Senator ever gets through.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. In a moment. The Senator from Missouri will not be deprived, of course, of his right to discuss the bill. The Senator has stated that in furtherance of his desire to prevent a vote upon this bill he would use such parliamentary tactics as he may think best. I am not criticizing him. On the contrary, I agree that it would be very appropriate for him to follow the line indicated in his statement a short time ago if he believes that the measure is so vicious. For my part I can not believe that a bill which has only one purpose in view, namely, to bring about the honest grading of grain and the certainty of grades so as to inspire confidence in the public can be a very vicious measure.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] seems to think that this will change, undo, and destroy everything connected with the present system of inspection. On the contrary, I have adopted in this bill the methods of inspection provided by the Minnesota law as to the arrival of cars and the inspection. The only difference on the face of the earth between the method proposed by the bill and the method now in vogue in the State of Minnesota would be that the inspectors would be under Federal control; that they would be compelled to stand an examination; that they would not be employed by any board in any State, but would be employed by the Government itself. I can not believe that that is going to injure any legitimate business.

We have had before us the complaints of the cotton growers. I could not help observing that they have been suffering exactly the same as the grain growers, and that the manufacturer of cotton has been suffering because of the lack of reliability in the grades of cotton exactly the same as the miller has suffered because of the lack of reliability in the grades of wheat. Anything that will cure that evil will be beneficial; and if, instead of opposing this measure, Senators would endeavor to frame a measure which would be acceptable to everyone, or at least against which no legitimate objection could be made, I think we would have very little difficulty in getting a satisfactory bill.

Furthermore, Mr. President, as those who a few years ago opposed pure-food legislation now with one accord support it, so I believe that all the boards of trade which now oppose Federal inspection and standardization of grain and cotton will, after it has been in operation a single year, be just as strong supporters of it as those who were opposed to the pure-food measure are to-day supporters of that measure.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator can not at this time induce any of us who are opposed to this specific bill—Senate bill 120—to enter into the general discussion which would be opened by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not asking it at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. This is not a fit time. If the time were opportune, I would advert to the fact that the bill providing for cotton grades, to which the Senator alludes, simply provides for a standardizing of the cotton going upon the market of this country. It does not provide for an inspection. There is not a similarity between Senate bill 120 and the cotton-grading or standardization measure. There is a similarity between the bill providing standards of cotton and the bill introduced by Mr. LEVER in the House, because that bill provides for supervision and standardization.

If the Senator from North Dakota is anxious that we shall meet upon some common ground where legislative action may be had favorable to standardization, I am satisfied that that can be attained; but that is a matter for discussion hereafter. What I more particularly wish to advert to is the remark of the Senator in reply to the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Minnesota, and others, that we represent no producing area. I think that is a manifest error. In the case of two of the great staple grains grown in North America, corn and oats, the production of the area which I have the honor in part to represent, even in the bad crop year of 1913, exceeded the production of any other State of the Union.

We have the good fortune to be situated as the Senator from Minnesota is, in that he has for one of the principal grains of Minnesota both the production area and the primary market for the grain inside of the same State. We have that good fortune in our State because of the existence of facilities, both in transportation, in warehousing, and in the large grain exchange, to supplement the efforts of the producers of that State—in other words, the farmers.

I hope I am not in that narrow position here which perhaps in part is intimated—although I would be quick to withdraw any such imputation if it were not true—that the Senators who object to Senate bill 120 represent only boards of trade and grain exchanges throughout the country. I beg to say that I do not believe any Senator who is objecting to this bill is representing any such narrow constituency. If we do represent any of the interests of the boards of trade or the grain exchanges, it is only as they are necessarily interwoven with the market and the fortunes of the entire State.

It is an implied indictment of the motives of Senators to say that for 10 years no roll call could be had upon a bill of this character. I do not wish to be made a victim of what has occurred here in years past. What I wish now is that this bill shall take the ordinary course. I was not here during the last 10 years, during which the Senator has been engaged in the strife in which he has very ably represented and given so much of his effort to this proposed legislation. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; and I hope the Senator will not be responsible for further delay. I hope he will assist us in securing a vote, acknowledging that the Senate has not done justice to the farming communities of the country in not allowing them at least to have a vote upon their measure. I ask the Senator to join me at least in getting a vote upon the

question. I am glad the Senator and I have gotten thus close together.

A short time ago there was not a board of trade in the United States that did not condemn standardization just as strongly as it condemned the other matter. Now they are all in favor of standardization, and I am in favor of it. Thus far they have come over to one proposition in my bill, for which I have been contending for a long time. I want them to come over to the other proposition, which will insure beyond peradventure an honest and an efficient and a conscientious grading of grain. That is all that I am going to ask them to do, and my bill provides for that. I am certain that we can accomplish that, and I am morally certain that honesty of grade and efficiency of grading can not harm any industry.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. What I wish is not to prevent the timely consideration of this bill, or a vote upon it at an opportune time before final adjournment. What I wish is a good deal like what our ancestors had in their minds when they threw the tea into Boston Harbor. It is that this bill shall go back where it belongs, and that whatever parliamentary rights I have here to oppose the bill may be preserved.

I will say that I will join the Senator from North Dakota in considering the bill in opportune time; but my parliamentary rights to have the bill returned to its former status ought to be preserved, so that I may receive the opportunity to oppose it as a right, and not as a matter of grace, to be farmed out, I repeat, by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Ah, Mr. President, the Senator can not suffer anything by reason of the bill lying upon the calendar, to be voted upon when he gets ready to make his speech and vote upon it. It is not harming the Senator; it is harming no one else who is willing to have a vote upon it, with my assurance—and I could not make it different if I wanted to—that the bill can not be brought up or any vote had on it until all Senators are through speaking upon it. I state again, however—and in that I ought to have the cooperation of the opponents as well as the supporters of the bill—that we ought to be sure to vote upon it during this session, before we get so congested with the appropriation bills that we will be compelled to lay it aside to take up other bills.

Mr. President, there is no accusation that those who oppose this bill represent boards of trade and do not represent a farming constituency. I know of no greater farming constituency in the country than that represented by the Senators from Minnesota and the Senators from Illinois; but I have petitions from the farmers' elevator companies of those States, and I have them from the farmers' organizations of those States, everywhere the same petition, that we have a vote upon this bill, and stating that they favor it.

Within the last hour I have had laid upon my desk a letter from the Senator's State, which I will read to him. It comes from the farming section. I have already read at length the resolutions from the farmers' organizations of the State of Illinois and from the independent elevator companies of the State of Illinois, all of them pleading and calling for the enactment of this measure. Therefore, when I read this letter from one of the Senator's own constituents, I am but adding one little letter to the volume of testimony that I have already introduced.

This letter is dated Princeton, Ill., March 17, 1914:

Senator McCUMBER, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I notice in the Chicago Tribune that you and Senator SHERMAN do not agree on the subject of grain inspection. At a recent meeting of the stockholders of the Farmers' Elevator Co., at Kasbeer, Ill., the subject received some attention. While I am not authorized to speak for the company, I am satisfied that it is the general opinion of the farmers in this locality that they suffer as much or more from improper grain inspection in Chicago than from almost any other one thing. That business should be taken out of State politics. Unless improvement in this is made, there will be concerted action by all of the farmers' elevators in the country for the better inspection.

I hope the measure before Congress will be so framed as to give this relief.

(Signed) A. W. HUSSEY.

That is but one of hundreds of letters that are coming to me daily upon this subject; and, as I say, I have failed to find a farmers' organization in the United States that has said one word against this proposition. There may be some that are satisfied with the State inspection. There may be others that are satisfied with the local board of trade or merchants' exchange method of inspection. We can not expect all to be unanimous upon any subject; but the record I made up, as the Senator says, through nearly two days of discussion, was made up of protests that have come from all over the United States, and upon a hearing had before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry showing the iniquities of the present practices in these grain centers. I insist that we ought to have an opportunity to give the farmers a vote upon a subject in which they have been so much interested.

The legislature of my State and the Tri-State Grain Growers' Association of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota have at almost every one of their annual meetings passed resolutions asking for the passage of this bill. All of the independent elevator companies have done so. I read to you the other day the statements made by the milling companies of the country, the Modern Miller, and other milling papers, showing that the milling interests of the country are looking for legislation of this kind. I am not speaking of the great milling interests; I speak generally of the little millers who have to buy their grain by grade.

In Minneapolis, for instance, where there are great milling interests, they can go and buy their grain by sample. They can look at it, and it is right there at their doors. They may not have any difficulty under the present system. The little dealers, however, the grocers down in the Southern States, who buy feed and buy a hundred other things in the line of grain, want to know, when they get a certificate of oats or hay or whatever it may be, that they are getting what they are paying out their money for.

It was asked by one of the Senators here, "Why not have inspection for potatoes, and coal, and turnips, and eggs, and cabbages?" Mr. President, the fact remains that wheat is sold by grade. Ninety-nine per cent of all of the wheat shipped at these great terminals is sold by the grade that is put upon it. That is the system under which it is done. The value of that grain is fixed by the grade. Therefore what little prosperity the farmer may have is dependent upon the proper grading of that grain. He believes that he will get a better grade; that there will be no loose and rigid inspection during different seasons of the year if the Government inspects it. He is not satisfied with the inspection that is made under the present system, and I am trying to give him the relief for which he is asking.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will go into this question at the proper time. I only wish to ask the Senator if he does not know that coal is bought and sold on grades?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly I know that there is some coal that is sold on grades.

Mr. SHERMAN. A very large volume, especially of soft coal, where there is the largest consumption in the United States, is bought and sold on grade. The fuel value, the carbon content, is tested. Nobody would insist, though, that there ought to be a United States grade established for coal.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is insisting that there should be a United States grade for wheat, a standard for wheat. Wheat is sold that way; so it does not make any difference whether coal is or is not, or whether potatoes are or are not, or whether they should be. I am not asking for standardization for potatoes or peas or beans. Wheat under the present system is sold by grades. Corn is sold that way. Flaxseed is sold that way. Barley and oats are sold that way, as is also rye.

That is the custom, and it is the better custom. I do not need to go into that subject. I think it is necessary, with the immense quantities of grain that we handle under the present system, that it be handled by grades. The intercourse in grain demands that we should have a system of that kind. So, agreeing upon that, the only problem now is to get a grade that will be satisfactory to the producer and to the consumer of the grain. That is all there is in this question, and that is all I want to secure by this legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he regards it as a probability that there might be some concessions made, or a settlement made, of the pending difficulties between the Lever bill and his own? I am not particularly attached to the Lever bill, except as it represents my idea of the standardization. I am opposed to the assumption by the General Government of the inspection systems of the various States of the Union. I am in favor of a standardization, so that the grain, when inspected, must comply with the standards fixed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we are already together on that. We both agree to that as it is. I do not care which bill

it is in. The only difference is that I want the Federal inspection, and the boards of trade do not want it, and the Senator from Illinois does not want it. The farmer does want it. The boards of trade do not want it. I want it. The Senator from Illinois does not want it, for the reason that he thinks it is not for the best interests of his constituency. All I want, then, is that the Senate shall vote upon that question. If it votes down the Senator from North Dakota upon that proposition, he will take his medicine, as the farmers will have to take theirs.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I decline to be put in a false attitude, as sought by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not seek to put the Senator in a false attitude. I want to disclaim that.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will adhere to the record. I think I remember it. If the Senator desires to modify his language, I shall be glad to have him do so. If not, I shall meet it at the proper time, but not here. He intimated, as he has already intimated and then retracted, that the Senators making objection to the process that was indulged in last night represent nothing but boards of trade and grain exchanges. I think it is my duty to represent the farmers, not only of my State but of the country at large, in a larger sense by far—the farmers as well as the exchanges and those who handle the grain.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I represent only the farmers and that portion of the boards of trade who are not afraid of honest inspection. I will admit that my representation is of the farmer element. I know their condition. I know their needs. I know the injustices that they have been suffering in the handling of their grain; and I know that the great majority of those connected with the buying of grain at these great boards of trade are themselves in favor of Federal inspection.

Mr. President, I wish to quote right here from the hearings that were held on this bill, so that I may bring this declaration of mine right to the attention of the Senator. For years we have had the Agricultural Department investigating this subject, to get at the truth of the matter as to what the objections were, and who objected, upon the boards of trade. In the testimony that was taken in 1912 I have that of Mr. Scofield, of the Department of Agriculture, the party who has had the principal talks and correspondence with these boards of trade. I will quote but a single paragraph. He says:

> As I stated a short time ago, I believe any system of national inspection will affect the grain dealers most and will meet with their bitter opposition; but there is a thing to consider, I believe, and that is that you in this bill are attempting to devise what the great majority of farmers want, and at the same time what the great majority of grain dealers want—not a majority in point of influence, but a majority in point of numbers.

That is the finding of the Agricultural Department.

> The grain dealers, in other words, are struggling as hard as they can to get at the same thing which you are in this bill. There is a certain element of the grain trade, which in point of numbers is insignificant, but which in point of influence is very important, who do not desire and will not permit, if they can help it, any system of either uniform or national control.

That was the condition when we were having a hearing two years ago. Since that time, after they had been advised in their annual convention that if they did not come part way over and at least provide for Government standardization they would have to take the whole thing, and get both Government standardization and inspection, they have come over that far.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. GRONNA] has some remarks to make upon this bill. Before yielding to him, however, I wish to call attention to another error on the part of a great many of those who are engaged in buying and selling grain. There seems to be a feeling or an understanding of this bill that under it you will have to have grain inspected in every instance in which it passes from one State to another.

That is not the intent and purpose of the bill. The only purpose is that you shall have your inspection at the same places where it is inspected now, under either State control or the control of boards of trade. As I may now ship a carload of grain, as I say, from my place to any point in Minnesota outside of Duluth or Minneapolis and I will not have any inspection whatever, either State or otherwise, so if I should ship it after this bill became a law, I would have no inspection of that grain. I admit, however, that the bill may not be as clear upon that subject as it might be, and therefore I have prepared three amendments.

Another complaint is that a person receiving grain in any State where there was no grain inspector would be compelled to go and obtain an inspector there. That is not the intent of the bill. It covers nothing of that kind. It simply provides for Federal inspection at these great grain centers.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to move the following amendment——

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my motion is pending.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a motion, and he can not make a motion while I am making my argument.

Mr. NELSON. I made a motion to reconsider the vote by which this bill was taken from the calendar and made the unfinished business.

Mr. McCUMBER. I refused, Mr. President, to yield for that purpose; and having the floor, under the rule the Senator could not take me off the floor for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that when a Senator yields to another Senator he can not determine the course that Senator shall take.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but I notified the Senator that I would not yield for the purpose of that motion.

Mr. NELSON. There was no such condition made at the time I asked the Senator to yield. It was made afterwards. The rules that prevail in the House of Representatives, where one Member can peddle out his time to another or state what time he will or will not yield, do not prevail in this body.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the moment the Senator began to make that motion I notified him that I would not yield for the purpose of that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator, however, had already yielded; and having yielded he could not prescribe the course of the Senator to whom the floor was yielded.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Minnesota can not make that motion. He did not vote for it, and he can not make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. NELSON. What is the point of order?

Mr. McCUMBER. The point of order is, the Senator not having voted for the motion he can not move to reconsider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there was nobody here at that time, or scarcely anybody here, outside of a few Senators.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has no right to say that if he was not here.

Mr. NELSON. I know, from Senators who were here, that there was not anybody here. I want to say, in this connection, another thing——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator says he learned from Senators who were here that nobody was here. I can not quite understand his philosophy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I will not yield now.

I wish to say at this time that one of the Senators who is opposed to this bill is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. When I made the motion the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] was sitting in his seat behind me, close to my left, one seat back of me. So the Senator can not say that those who were opposed to the bill were absent from the Chamber, because the Senator from Ohio was here.

I wanted to make it clear and have the bill printed in that form before laying it aside. So I move to insert, on page 4, line 10, after the word "grain," the words "where an inspector is located at such place." This is to perfect the bill so that there can be no question as to its purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4 of the bill, line 10, after the word "grain" and the comma, insert "where an inspector is located at such place" and a comma.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask for a vote on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I insist on my motion. This is a case where there is no way that you can tell who voted for or against a proposition. The rules in reference to that question can only apply in case there is a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McCUMBER. When the Senator says——

Mr. NELSON. And I want to say further in reference to this point that one day at the last session of Congress, when there were, I think, less than a dozen Senators present, a unanimous-consent agreement was asked to take a vote upon an important bill at a given date and it was given. There was a feeling that

an unconscious advantage had been taken of the Senate that day, and the Committee on Rules immediately reported an amendment to the rules, which was adopted by the Senate, requiring that when anyone should ask for a unanimous-consent agreement to take a vote on a bill upon a given date there must be a call of the Senate and the presence of a quorum ascertained before the proposition for unanimous consent could be presented.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that he will find a substantial basis for his claim that any Senator can move for a reconsideration when there was no yea-and-nay vote on page 414 of the Precedents of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not hear what the Senator read.

Mr. BRYAN. I have not read it. I said the Senator from Minnesota is, in my judgment, correct in his position that he has a right to move to reconsider, because there was no yea-and-nay vote, and I called his attention to page 414 of the Precedents of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. First, I have not the rules before me, and I can not tell what the particular wording of the rule is.

Mr. BRYAN. It is not a rule. If the Senator would like to read it, I will hand it to him.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is one parliamentary proposition that I think is universally acknowledged, I do not care whether the question is taken by a viva voce vote or whether it is by a recorded vote, and that is that no one can move to reconsider a vote unless he himself voted in the affirmative. When a Senator acknowledges that he did not vote in the affirmative he has thereby put himself in a position where he can not be the mover of a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels some doubt upon this proposition, in view of the reference which has been made to a ruling in the Precedents of the United States Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. Rule XIII reads as follows:

> When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration.

The precedent which has been cited at page 414 of the Precedents of the United States Senate is of date February 18, 1889, and is as follows:

> A question of order being raised as to the right of a Senator to move a reconsideration when he was not present at the time the vote on agreeing to a report was taken, the President pro tempore [Mr. Ingalls] stated that during the time of his service in the Senate it had been the uniform practice and custom, when there was no record of a vote upon a question by yeas and nays, to allow any Senator to enter a motion to reconsider, and unless otherwise directed by the Senate he would entertain the motion. There being no objection, the motion to reconsider was entered.

Mr. GRONNA. But there is objection to this motion.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Chair understands that there is objection in this instance to the motion for a reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the objection referred to, as I understand it, was to the motion being reconsidered. An objection to entertaining the motion would not have stopped the Chair from entertaining the motion in the case that the President of the Senate has before him, and the motion to reconsider was entered because there was no objection to the reconsideration. The right of a Senator to make the motion to reconsider was sustained by the Chair, even if there had been objection to a reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will decide that, unless directed by the Senate, in view of this precedent, the motion can be entertained.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, when a Senator is addressing the Senate on a subject and when he yields to another it is always understood that he is yielding for some question or some comment or some explanation, and it would be a gross abuse of all the rules of the Senate for a Senator to take advantage of the courtesy extended to him to ask a question to move to lay the subject on the table or to make some other motion. I declined to yield for the purpose of making a motion. As soon as I ascertained that the Senator desired to do anything further than to ask a question, I refused to yield for that purpose. Otherwise, I do not know how any Senator can guard himself, unless in every instance he asks a Senator, "Is it your purpose to make a motion?" or, "Why do you want me to yield to you?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be the view of the Chair that not having qualified the consent at the time when the floor was yielded, no limitation can be placed upon the right of a Senator to use the consent so given as he may see fit.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to have the Reporter read the statement of the Senator from Minnesota when he asked me to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Reporter can produce it, he will do so.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator asked me to yield for a question.

Mr. NELSON. I make the point that a Senator when he yields can not——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Reporter to the Chair, he not having the shorthand notes before him, is that the Senator from Minnesota rose and the Senator from North Dakota having the floor was asked if he would yield, and he said that he would yield.

Mr. NELSON. That is my recollection.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to know what the Senator from Minnesota requested in the first instance, if he made any request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Reporter to the Chair is that the Senator from Minnesota sought recognition; that the Chair asked if the Senator from North Dakota would yield to the Senator from Minnesota, and the reply of the Senator having the floor was, "I yield."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRONNA. I made the point of order that the Senator from Minnesota could not move a reconsideration because he did not vote on the prevailing side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And that the Chair sustained.

Mr. GRONNA. I call the attention of the Chair to Rule XIII, on page 14:

> When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration—

And so forth.

Mr. President, the precedent cited by the Chair refers merely to a case where it is impossible to ascertain whether the mover of the motion did or did not vote on the prevailing side. In this case it is evident that the Senator from Minnesota did not vote on the prevailing side.

Mr. NELSON. There was no vote taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was disposed to concur in the view just expressed by the Senator from North Dakota; but in view of the precedent to which the Chair has been cited, it would seem that where the yeas and nays have not been taken and recorded the construction given to the rule at that time would make the motion in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course I submit to the decision of the Chair; but where there can be no question as to the vote of the Senator who makes the motion to reconsider, when it is known and acknowledged by the Senator himself that he was not here and he could not have voted on the prevailing side, it seems to me it ought to be prima facie evidence that he can not under our rules make the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator having the floor that the Reporter's notes of the interruption are now available, and they can be referred to if he desires.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Chair has stated them substantially, I do not care to have them read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Chair was made upon the statement of the Official Reporter to the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. Ordinarily a Senator addressing the Chair when another Senator has the floor asks permission to ask a question or gives his reason for his interruption. If the Senator from Minnesota thinks that that is the proper method to pursue when he seeks recognition from the Senator who has the floor, it is for him to determine himself whether he considers it to be within the line of propriety.

Mr. President, I wish to ask, as a part of my remarks, that the bill be reprinted with certain proposed amendments, which are very short, and which I will give to the Senate.

On page 4, after line 10, insert the words "where an inspector is located at such place."

The next amendment is, on page 5, line 4, after the word "grain," to insert "arriving or collected at any of the aforesaid grain centers and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated at the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 4, after the word "grain," insert the words "arriving or collected at any of the aforesaid grain centers and."

Mr. McCUMBER. On page 6, at the end of line 25——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I presume these are simply amendments offered and not to be agreed to to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. But they are to be printed in the reprint.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if they are offered by the Senator on his own part, or whether they are from the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. They are offered on my own part, to make clear what is the intent of the bill.

After the word "grade," on line 24, page 6, insert the words "at such terminals."

I ask that the bill be printed showing those proposed amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment last offered will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "grade," at the end of line 24, page 6, insert "at such terminals."

Mr. McCUMBER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, a reprint of the bill will be ordered with the amendments now offered. The question then is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the vote by which the bill was taken from its regular order on the calendar be reconsidered.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor as yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] stated to me a short time ago that he wishes to submit some few remarks upon the merits of the bill, and I purpose to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, that he may address the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I object. The Senator has no right to select any Senator to whom he may yield the floor. While this motion is pending he ought not to go into discussion of the merits of the bill. There will be time enough for that. I have avoided that in this discussion. I simply ask that the motion be reconsidered in order that I can have an opportunity to be present when a motion is made to take up the bill from the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. I want to say, further, what I have already stated—that at the last session of Congress unanimous consent was asked when there were only 10 or 12 Senators present to vote on a given day on a very important bill. It was felt at that time by a great many Senators that an unfair advantage had been taken in that case. An amendment was offered to the rules, it was reported by the Committee on Rules, and adopted by the Senate, which provides that before any request for unanimous consent can be submitted the roll must first be called and it must be ascertained that a quorum is present.

Now, I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota if he pursues the regular course in the spirit of that rule, and provides a reasonable time in the future for the discussion of the bill, I for one shall not object.

I feel that the course which was pursued here last evening took an unfair advantage of me in this matter. It is simply on that account that I have moved a reconsideration. I shall not object when the proper time comes to taking a vote on the bill. I never intended to object to that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there can be no unfair advantage taken of any Senator who wishes to discuss the bill on the merits by allowing it to remain as the unfinished business. Why all of this talk about taking a regular course? It has taken its regular course. Notice was given two weeks ago, and that notice continued, that as soon as we had disposed of Senate joint resolution No. 1 I would move to take up this bill. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] obtained the recognition of the Chair before I could make my motion, and he moved an executive session. That motion was voted upon. I could not move an amendment to it or even debate it at that time. I simply took the very first opportunity following that to carry out the notice which I had given.

Mr. NELSON. I want to put a question to the Senator. Was I not sitting here in my seat at the time to which the Senator refers? Was I not sitting here at the time we quit our legislative business, when the motion was made to go into executive session? Would not good faith on the Senator's part have admonished him to say: "Senator NELSON, I intend in this executive session to move to take up this bill from the calendar and make it the unfinished business?"

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the notice had been upon the face of the Calendar of Business for three weeks that I would make that motion as soon as we got through with the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. And just as soon as we got through with that I did make the motion. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have the calendars for the last two or three days and I do not find that notice on the calendar, but I do find that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] gave notice that at the conclusion of the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1 and Senate bill 120—that was the Senator's bill——

Mr. McCUMBER. That was my bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. He would move to take up Senate bill 392. I think probably the notice was omitted from the calendar. I know that the Senator made the suggestion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; the notice was on the calendar for a long time. I do not know that I repeated it every day, but it was understood, and the notices which appeared upon the calendar were to the effect that immediately after the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1 and following the consideration of my bill the Senator from Iowa would move to take up another bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me one further word, I hope this matter will be adjusted amicably. I am of the opinion that when a Senator yields to another Senator ostensibly for a question or perhaps for some observation on the bill that does not give the other Senator the right——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I can not hear what the Senator is saying. I am very anxious to hear him.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was observing that it is my opinion when a Senator occupying the floor yields to another Senator presumably for a question or to make some observation concerning the bill it would not give that Senator the right to move to reconsider any action the Senate had taken. On the other hand, the Senator from North Dakota now proposes to yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. That is equivalent to yielding the floor, and beyond question, in my judgment, if the Senator from Minnesota now got recognition he would be entitled to make his motion.

Mr. McCUMBER. I agree entirely with the first statement made by the Senator, that it is ordinarily understood when one Senator yields to another it is presumably always to ask a question or to make some observation which will explain what he is saying or what he is about to say. However, I have not yielded the floor. I have not yielded it for any purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. But——

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment, if the Senator pleases. When the motion was made by the Senator from Minnesota I had the recognition of the Chair, and with my recognition acknowledged by the Chair the Senator from South Dakota asked me for recognition, and holding the floor I have the authority to grant that recognition to any Senator I see fit. I assume that when I have yielded the floor to him he has a right to go on, and when he gets through I may or I may not take the floor again. That would depend upon whether I would get recognition.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not correct parliamentary procedure. It has been decided over and over again that no Senator can farm out the time of the body, and the idea that a Senator——

Mr. McCUMBER. I made no such claim.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator certainly makes the claim that he can yield the floor to another Senator to discuss the bill, and when that Senator gets through he can resume the floor. If that should be the case he could yield again, again, and again, and occupy the floor for three months, perhaps. I think it is very clear that when a Senator suggests that he yields the floor to another Senator to discuss a bill, he loses his right to the floor at that moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has not disagreed at all with me. I just yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire. I have resumed the floor again. I do not think I have parceled out my time to him in being courteous enough to yield for his suggestion, which is always kindly and a good one, but I have the same right to yield to another Senator who desires to follow me. I am not parceling out the time.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator desires to go on, he can do it or not, as he has a mind to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a minute. I do not say I would have the right to take the floor again after I had yielded to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did suggest that.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, I did not; I said I might or might not take the floor again, that depending upon whether the Chair would recognize me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, this morning I felt disposed to call the attention of the Senate especially to the fact that during executive session a measure had been brought up and made the unfinished business. While possibly the rules allow such a course, my own view is that they ought not to do it. Senators really have a right to suppose that when we went into executive session no important business would be taken in executive session that was necessarily legislative business, and would thereby become the unfinished legislative business. Possibly the rules do allow it, but if they do I think they ought to be corrected.

I agree fully with the Senator from North Dakota that when he yields the floor for an interruption during his speech a motion can not be made and ought not to be made to displace in any way his argument or interfere with his conduct of the subject he has at the time in hand and is presenting to the Senate.

I wanted to make this statement, and now I want to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will consent, during this interruption, that I may offer a motion that we proceed to the consideration of executive business? I will not offer the motion during an interruption accorded to me by the Senator except by his consent.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is always courteous, and I will be glad, of course, to yield to the Senator's request in a moment.

Mr. President, I feel that every step I have taken in this case has been one dictated by honesty of purpose and in exact accordance with the rules and the customs of the Senate. Knowing, as I do, that there is no purpose upon my part to hurry the bill, to ask anything but a vote upon it at some future time, and at a time so that we will be sure to have it voted upon during this session, so that it may be acted upon, at least, by the House during the present session or the early part of the next, I am seeking to get Senators who feel that they want an opportunity to be heard and who are willing to allow this matter to come to a vote to agree with me upon some method of procedure.

Let me call attention to a fact. We have not probably a quorum present. It would take some time to call the roll if we attempted to do that. I am perfectly willing to allow this measure to go over, with an understanding that in the morning, if the Chair holds that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota is in order, we may take a vote and determine whether we will make the bill the unfinished business.

Mr. NELSON. My motion is to reconsider the motion, and I desire to have a vote upon that motion. If the Senator will allow the motion to reconsider to stand as passed, then the question comes up on his motion, and to that course I have no objection, if a quorum of the Senate is present. If the Senator will allow his motion to be reconsidered, I have no objection to that course, I say, because in that case I shall be present and there will be a quorum in the Senate here, and it is for the Senate to determine the question.

But I feel, Mr. President, that an undue advantage was taken of me in this matter last evening. I am willing to agree to anything that is fair and just in this matter; and if an opportunity is given to discuss the bill, I shall not object to a final vote within a reasonable time; but I do not like to have an advantage taken of me, as was taken last evening.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to understand what advantage can be taken of the Senator from Minnesota if he has a full opportunity to discuss the bill in the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. That puts me at the Senator's mercy; it puts me in the attitude of being here to discuss the measure by the Senator's grace.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no, Mr. President. There is no bill at the mercy of any one Senator. The only time a bill is at the mercy of a Senator or a little coterie of Senators is when they get together to prevent a hearing by some method or other of running one bill after another. That is the only way an injustice can be done.

Mr. NELSON. Have I been guilty of any such offense?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not stated that the Senator has. I have stated that the only way Senators can take advantage of one of their colleagues in the matter of getting a bill before the Senate is by pressing some other matter before it, so that it can not get a hearing. I say frankly that that has been quite customary in the Senate of the United States, although it ought never to be.

The Senator says that he wants a vote upon his motion, and the Senator complains that I have not treated him with due consideration in bringing up a motion of which I had given notice and which I had kept before the Senate as well as I could for three weeks.

Mr. NELSON. The notice to which the Senator refers was not on the calendar on that day.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it had been given, and Senators had due notice of it, and I would measure that at any time with the courtesy of a Senator who, taking advantage of a request for an interruption, makes a motion which has the effect of taking the Senator who grants the courtesy off his feet.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to my colleague first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wish to suggest to my colleague that we might obviate any further discussion of this matter by agreeing to take a vote on the bill on April 25, five weeks from to-day. Then the Senator from Minnesota could have the motion reconsidered, the bill could be withdrawn as the unfinished business, and there would be no further controversy over the question.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, that is trying to take an undue advantage. It is insisting that I must submit to this treatment unless I will agree at this time to fix some definite date to vote on the bill; otherwise you insist upon perpetuating this movement, and to that I can not consent. If the Senators from North Dakota want to act in good faith toward me in this matter, it is easy enough for them to do so. Let them consent to the motion to reconsider, and then, when there is a quorum of the Senate present, let them bring up the motion to take up the bill from the calendar and make it the unfinished business. In that way we can have a fair vote on the question, and I shall certainly not be an obstructionist.

Mr. McCUMBER. Evidently the Senator and I differ as to what constitutes good faith and treating the Senator properly. The Senator thinks that good faith on the part of the Senators from North Dakota is to allow their bill now to get out of the Senate again, and to be at the mercy of Senators as to when it may again come up. We who are supporting the bill feel that good faith requires that Senators who oppose it should allow it to remain the unfinished business and should discuss it from time to time as they feel they are prepared to discuss it, and finally to vote on it at some time during the session.

It is evident from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota that he does not wish the bill to remain in the Senate, but wants to get it out of the Senate in order that it may not come, if he can prevent its coming, into the Senate until he gets ready to allow it to come in. I assume that we can not, of course, meet upon any common ground. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 21, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20, 1914.*

COUNSELOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Robert Lansing, of New York, to be Counselor for the Department of State of the United States of America, vice John Bassett Moore, resigned.

SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Cone Johnson, of Texas, to be Solicitor for the Department of State of the United States of America, vice Joseph W. Folk, resigned.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Joseph Winczewski, of Winona, Minn., to be register of the land office at Duluth, Minn., vice Charles F. Hartman. Term expired and resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Second Lieut. Myron Bertman, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from February 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. Daniel I. Sultan, promoted.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 1914.*

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Charles B. Strecker to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Boston, Mass.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Lucius Dills, of Roswell, to be surveyor general of New Mexico.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Felipe Sanchez y Baca to be receiver of public moneys at Tucumcari, N. Mex.

W. G. Cowan to be receiver of public moneys at Roswell, N. Mex.

S. P. Ascarate to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Rome P. Donohoo to be register of the land office at Tucumcari, N. Mex.

Emmett Patton to be register of the land office at Roswell, N. Mex.

John L. Burnside to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

POSTMASTERS.

KENTUCKY.

George R. Hughes, Frankfort.
E. C. K. Robertson, Murray.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Michael W. Hynes, Wayland.
John P. Zilch, Plainville.

MICHIGAN.

Edmund L. Ashworth, Shepherd.
Willis F. Bricker, Belding.
F. S. Byrne, Marquette.
J. W. Budrow, Schoolcraft.
Vincent P. Cash, Alma.
George F. Catton, Constantine.
Percy D. Edsall, Greenville.
J. H. Gallery, Eaton Rapids.
Charles E. Lown, Saginaw.
Amon C. Sprau, Otsego.
Charles E. Utley, Stanton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Stephen E. Bates, Suncook.
William Hayes, Groveton.
Herbert A. Taylor, Winchester.
Eugene M. Ware, Peterboro.

NEW MEXICO.

J. L. Lovelace, Fort Sumner.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Llewellyn Angstadt, Kutztown.
Thomas N. Burke, Mount Carmel.
R. E. Burket, Roaring Spring.
John A. Coonahan, Ogontz.
H. W. Faloon, East Brady.
Reuben E. Gerhart, Souderton.
Fisk Goodyear, Carlisle.
John K. Gorman, Coalport.
Simon P. Geisel, Hooversville.
Alonzo W. Jones, Mount Union.
J. H. McGee, South Bethlehem.
Henry J. Morris, Hatboro.
Annie H. Washburn, Wyncote.
Frank Snyder, Minersville.
W. R. Speer, Everett.
T. B. M. Ward, Laceyville.

RHODE ISLAND.

Daniel G. Coggeshall, Bristol.
Alonzo A. Greenman, Kingston.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *March 20, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the life and light of men, the inspiration of every pure thought, earnest endeavor, and noble life, continue to strive with us until we shall seek only the best in the higher realms of life. Honesty for the sake of honesty, truth for the sake of truth, purity for the sake of purity, righteousness for the sake of righteousness, until we shall have builded a character worthy of Thy love and fatherly care as revealed in the heart of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a preferential motion. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. POU. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the motion of the gentleman from Florida is not in order. I was recognized by the Chair, and made the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole for bills on the Private Calendar. Under the rule that motion is in order to-day, and I respectfully submit that I can not be taken off my feet by the gentleman from Florida.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina was not on his feet after he made the motion. He was through. The gentleman from Florida makes a preferential motion that has been recognized as a preferential motion—I do not know how long, but before my day. It is absolutely necessary, for the proper transaction of the public business, that these appropriation bills should have the right of way. I sympathize with the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Claims, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREGG, chairman of the Committee on War Claims, who is also up to make his motion, because they are the two committees where the hardest work is done with the least chance for display on the floor of the House. [Laughter.] The Chair knows that that is true, because he served on one of those committees two years. Still, for the reason that the public business, which it is absolutely necessary to transact, must be expedited, my predecessors have ruled that the motion which has been made by the gentleman from Florida is a preferential motion. It would take a Speaker of a good deal of assurance to overrule all the rulings of these Speakers.

Mr. POU. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POU. If the motion of the gentleman from Florida to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the river and harbor bill is effective, that will entirely displace the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. For to-day.

Mr. POU. And if such motion continues to be made from time to time it is a question whether or not gentlemen will insist on displacing the Private Calendar indefinitely. I would like to say that there are 61 bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state what he thinks in relation to this matter. There are 14 great appropriation bills. We have already sent 8 of them over to the Senate. This will be the ninth. The chairmen of committees that have these appropriation bills in charge can not keep up that process forever, because they will get through directly, and then the Chair thinks there will be plenty of time to attend to these matters coming from the committees which the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Texas represent.

Mr. POU. The purpose of the rule was—and I was present when it was drawn—to set apart certain Fridays for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. I shall insist on a vote on the gentleman's motion, and the House can do as it pleases.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POU) there were—ayes 45, noes 33.

Mr. POU. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Florida will, when their names are called, answer "aye" and those opposed will answer "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 136, answered "present" 3, not voting 123, as follows:

YEAS—170.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Davis | Kirkpatrick | Rayburn |
| Adamson | Decker | Konop | Reed |
| Aiken | Deitrick | Lafferty | Reilly, Wis. |
| Alexander | Donohoe | La Follette | Rogers |
| Allen | Driscoll | Langham | Sabath |
| Anderson | Dunn | Lazaro | Scully |
| Ansberry | Eagle | Lee, Pa. | Seldomridge |
| Ashbrook | Edwards | Lesher | Sherley |
| Aswell | Esch | Levy | Sims |
| Austin | Evans | Linthicum | Small |
| Avis | Faison | Lloyd | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Bailey | Falconer | Lobeck | Smith, Tex. |
| Baker | Fergusson | Lonergan | Sparkman |
| Baltz | Fitzgerald | McCoy | Stafford |
| Barkley | FitzHenry | McGillicuddy | Steenerson |
| Barton | Floyd, Ark. | McKellar | Stephens, Tex. |
| Bathrick | Foster | McKenzie | Stevens, Minn. |
| Beakes | Francis | McLaughlin | Stevens, N. H. |
| Bell, Cal. | Gallagher | Mahan | Stringer |
| Booher | Gerry | Mann | Sutherland |
| Borchers | Gillmore | Mitchell | Switzer |
| Borland | Gittins | Moon | Taggart |
| Bowdle | Godwin, N. C. | Moore | Taylor, Ark. |
| Britten | Goeke | Morgan, La. | Taylor, Colo. |
| Brockson | Gordon | Morgan, Okla. | Ten Eyck |
| Brodbeck | Goulden | Murray, Mass. | Thacher |
| Brown, N. Y. | Greene, Mass. | Murray, Okla. | Thompson, Okla. |
| Browne, Wis. | Guernsey | Neeley, Kans. | Townsend |
| Brumbaugh | Hamilton, N. Y. | Neely, W. Va. | Treadway. |
| Bulkley | Hammond | Nelson | Tribble |
| Burgess | Hardy | O'Leary | Tuttle |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Hart | Padgett | Underhill |
| Callaway | Haugen | Paige, Mass. | Underwood |
| Cantor | Hay | Palmer | Wallin |
| Caraway | Hinds | Park | Weaver |
| Carew | Hull | Parker | Williams |
| Carr | Humphrey, Wash. | Phelan | Wilson, Fla. |
| Cary | Humphreys, Miss. | Platt | Wingo |
| Casey | Jacoway | Post | Winslow |
| Claypool | Johnson, Wash. | Powers | Witherspoon |
| Clayton | Kennedy, Iowa | Prouty | Young, Tex. |
| Coady | Kennedy, R. I. | Rainey | |
| Crosser | Kindel | Rauch | |

NAYS—136.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ainey | Ferris | Hulings | Quin |
| Anthony | Fess | Igoe | Ragsdale |
| Bartlett | Fields | Johnson, Ky. | Raker |
| Beall, Tex. | Flood, Va. | Johnson, S. C. | Roberts, Mass. |
| Bell, Ga. | Fowler | Johnson, Utah | Rothermel |
| Broussard | Frear | Kahn | Rouse |
| Browning | French | Keating | Rubey |
| Bryan | Garner | Keister | Rucker |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Garrett, Tenn. | Kelley, Mich. | Rupley |
| Burke, Wis. | Garrett, Tex. | Kelly, Pa. | Russell |
| Butler | George | Key, Ohio | Scott |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Glass | Kiess, Pa. | Sells |
| Campbell | Gorman | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Shreve |
| Candler, Miss. | Graham, Ill. | Kitchin | Sinnot |
| Cantrill | Graham, Pa. | Knowland, J. R. | Sisson |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Green, Iowa | Lee, Ga. | Sloan |
| Church | Greene, Vt. | Lenroot | Smith, Minn. |
| Collier | Gregg | Lewis, Pa. | Stephens, Cal. |
| Connelly, Kans. | Hamlin | McAndrews | Stephens, Miss. |
| Curry | Harrison | McDermott | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Danforth | Hawley | MacDonald | Stone |
| Dent | Hayden | Maguire, Nebr. | Stout |
| Dershem | Hayes | Mapes | Tavenner |
| Dickinson | Helgesen | Miller | Thomas |
| Donovan | Helm | Mondell | Thomson, Ill. |
| Doolittle | Helvering | Mott | Vollmer |
| Doremus | Henry | Murdock | Volstead |
| Doughton | Hensley | Nolan, J. I. | Walters |
| Dupré | Hill | Norton | Watkins |
| Dyer | Hinebaugh | O'Hair | Watson |
| Edmonds | Holland | Page, N. C. | Webb |
| Elder | Houston | Peters, Me. | Willis |
| Estopinal | Howell | Plumley | Woodruff |
| Fairchild | Hughes, Ga. | Pou | Young, N. Dak. |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hughes, W. Va. | Madden | Payne |

NOT VOTING—123.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adair | Clark, Fla. | Dillon | Griffin |
| Barchfeld | Cline | Dixon | Gudger |
| Barnhart | Connolly, Iowa | Dooling | Hamill |
| Bartholdt | Conry | Eagan | Hamilton, Mich. |
| Blackmon | Cooper | Farr | Hardwick |
| Brown, W. Va. | Copley | Finley | Heflin |
| Bruckner | Covington | Fordney | Hobson |
| Buchanan, Tex. | Cox | Gard | Howard |
| Burke, Pa. | Cramton | Gardner | Hoxworth |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Crisp | Gillett | Jones |
| Burnett | Cullop | Goldfogle | Kennedy, Conn. |
| Calder | Dale | Good | Kent |
| Carlin | Davenport | Goodwin, Ark. | Kettner |
| Carter | Dies | Gray | Kinkead, N. J. |
| Clancy | Difenderfer | Griest | Korbly |
| Kreider | Metz | Richardson | Talbott, Md. |
| Langley | Montague | Riordan | Talcott, N. Y. |
| L'Engle | Morin | Roberts, Nev. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Lever | Morrison | Saunders | Taylor, N. Y. |
| Lewis, Md. | Moss, Ind. | Shackleford | Temple |
| Lieb | Moss, W. Va. | Sharp | Towner |
| Lindbergh | O'Brien | Sherwood | Vare |
| Lindquist | Oglesby | Slayden | Vaughan |
| Loft | Oldfield | Slemp | Walker |
| Logue | O'Shaunessy | Smith, Idaho | Walsh |
| McClellan | Patten, N. Y. | Smith, J. M. C. | Whaley |
| McGuire, Okla. | Patton, Pa. | Smith, Md. | Whitacre |
| Maher | Peters, Mass. | Smith, N. Y. | White |
| Manahan | Peterson | Stanley | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Martin | Porter | Stedman | Woods |
| Merritt | Reilly, Conn. | Sumners | |

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. FARR.

Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas with Mr. MADDEN (transferable).

Mr. SMITH of Maryland with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DILLON.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. DIXON with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. PETERSON with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. LINDBERGH.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. DIES with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. PORTER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13811, the river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CALLAWAY.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to prelude what I say on this rivers and harbors bill by stating that I am not against legitimate appropriations for rivers that are really navigable and for possible harbors, but I believe an expenditure should be made by the Government only when the project is conclusively shown to be feasible from an engineering standpoint and when the probable reduction in the freight rate will be sufficient to pay the cost of operating the project, with a reasonable allowance for interest on the expenditure. In most of the river and harbor projects the question of deterioration does not enter, but in lock and dam projects that should also be taken into consideration, because the locks will in time have to be replaced.

The elements that should enter into the consideration are the original cost, the cost of maintenance, the cost of operation, the percentage of deterioration, the tonnage that probably will be carried, and the difference in the actual cost of carrying it by the proposed route and the available means of transportation. When these things are considered, and honestly considered, and it is found that it would be a profitable and economical investment, then Congress should make an appropriation to complete the project, provided, however, that the public will receive the benefit, and not some private concern or concerns.

There is but one way for this House to determine whether a project conforms to this test, and that is to require the

committee when it brings in a new project to show in its report to the House these facts. We have no right to assume that the committee has exercised judgment, caution, and fearless impartiality on each project. If we were as cautious, wise, and economical as we should be, we should assume nothing, but should look into every new thing proposed. There is nothing sacred about these committee reports. Look how the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is made up. The members are not selected because of their capacity to judge fairly and disinterestedly of the merits of the different projects submitted, but they really get themselves selected because of their particular interest in procuring appropriations through the committee for projects in their own districts.

Take the make-up of the committee—and I mean no reflection on any member of it; I only insist that they are human and subject to all the frailties and weaknesses of mortals. I heard the Speaker of this House say a short while ago that most things had changed since Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden, but one thing had remained unchanged, and that was human nature, which would likely remain unchanged for the balance of time. Those interested in the projects in their districts work up sentiment, bring pressure to bear, logroll, and campaign to get themselves put on this Rivers and Harbors Committee in order that they may do something for their respective districts. They get on the committee, where one member of the committee can not oppose the project of another because the other would oppose his project, and the consequence is they get thicker than thieves and all defend each and each defend all. The gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND] says there is no politics in this committee; that they all work together in harmony toward a mutual end and distribute the appropriations without reference to party or locality. That is true. They have an interest that outweighs any local prejudice or partisan bias.

Mr. SPARKMAN, the chairman, comes from Florida's west coast. His district has 300 miles of ocean front. Mr. BURGESS, of Texas, is on Aransas Pass, and has in his district a section of the intercoastal canal with which this committee is paralleling the ocean from Boston to the Rio Grande, going to put in a narrow, crooked canal from 5 to 25 feet deep and compete with the open ocean. Mr. TAYLOR, of Alabama, is on Mobile Bay, Mr. HUMPHREYS, of Mississippi, represents a district which runs for a hundred and fifty miles along the Mississippi River—he wants $63,000,000 out of the Treasury—and Mr. EDWARDS, of Georgia, is on the Atlantic coast at Savannah. Mr. SMALL, of North Carolina, is specially interested in trying to develop commerce between Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort, S. C., by taking over and spending millions deepening a canal which is now 10 feet deep and has two little gasoline launches on it that draw 5 feet of water and make one round trip a week, carrying about as much freight at a load as a big box car. Mr. DONOHOE, of Philadelphia, asserts boastfully that he has got more appropriations for his district than any Republican predecessor. Mr. SCULLY, of New Jersey, has succeeded in having $1,229,000 shoveled out to that little State, which is nearly as big as a Texas ranch. Mr. DAISCOLL is from Buffalo, N. Y. His governor wants the Federal Government to spend as much on the Hudson River as has been spent on Red River—$183 for each ton of freight carried. Mr. GALLAGHER is from Chicago, the home of the river and harbor boosters. Mr. BOOHER, of Missouri, is interested in the Missouri above Kansas City, and from the best estimate I can get each ton of through freight carried from Kansas City to St. Louis will cost the Government about $200. Mr. MURRAY, of Massachusetts, came to Congress trying to burglarize the Treasury with a river and harbor key. Mr. LIEB, of Indiana, is from the Ohio River, on which this committee is appropriating for a project estimated to cost $63,000,000. Mr. KETTNER, of California, is the only Democratic Member of Congress from that State who has any coast line in his district.

Then comes the Republican membership of this committee—Mr. HUMPHREY, of Seattle, Wash., who regards each day lost that he fails to get something out of the Treasury; Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, one side of whose district is bounded by the Mississippi River, which gets seven millions in this bill; Mr. BARCHFELD, from Pittsburgh, Pa., the place from which they are going to start the coal and iron down the Ohio to pass through $63,000,000 worth of Government locks and dams; Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, who comes from the fifth district, which is almost surrounded by rivers more navigable than the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers of South Carolina; Mr. SWITZER, from the tenth Ohio district, on the Ohio River, with a consequent interest in that $63,000,000 appropriation; and Mr. POWERS, of Kentucky, and Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts. I failed to find from the map or from looking to the bill any direct interest Mr. POWERS would have; but he came to my rescue on March 19 by stating (RECORD, p. 5481):

> The rivers and harbors bill now under consideration carries a provision of much interest and great importance to the whole State of Kentucky, and especially to that portion of Kentucky which lies in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. TREADWAY, according to his statement (RECORD, p. 5485), is "watchfully waiting" and hoping that the Treasury will make deep water on the Connecticut River.

This is the jury to whom the evidence is to be submitted on the feasibility of these projects, the estimated cost of them, the cost of maintenance when completed, the amount of freight carried, the cost of carrying it, and the value of such transportation to the public. This interested jury not only hears the evidence, but largely determines what evidence shall come before them, and more than that largely furnish the evidence themselves; and they then pass on it to determine whether the expenditure shall be made, render the verdict to the House of Representatives, and then lead the House in entering the judgment on the verdict. What show has the Treasury with such an interested organization? What show has the interest of the people when tried before a tribunal so organized?

I have been sitting here for three days listening to the members of this committee, the chairman among them, discuss this bill which shovels out forty-three millions of the people's money. I have waited patiently and listened earnestly to hear some man actually give or attempt to give a reasonable justification for a single appropriation in the bill. I have not heard it. The chairman of this committee told what an enormous increase there had been in water transportation. He said the tonnage of water-borne commerce had increased from 625,901,653 tons in 1910 to 1,002,759,355 tons in 1913. He ought to have told this House how much the traffic of this country had been increased by the appropriations for rivers and harbors. That is what we are interested in. We want to know, and should know, what return we are getting on this outlay of money. I asked him whether he had reference to all of the traffic on the rivers, canals, and the ocean, or to the traffic on the projects that were provided for in this bill, and he said all the traffic, ocean-going vessels and all. That information is worse than useless. The ocean traffic is in no way affected by these appropriations, nor can it be. These appropriations should in no way be affected by the ocean traffic.

The river and canal traffic is not increasing, but, on the contrary, is decreasing, and has been for years. This is the traffic affected by these appropriations, and all the traffic that can be affected by them. The facts about this traffic are indicated clearly by the fact that we have abandoned 2,444 miles of canals, more than half we have. These abandoned canals cost us $81,000,000, and as a further evidence we have the failure of the Erie Canal, running from Buffalo, N. Y., to the Hudson River. It is a 7-foot lock canal, and was very efficient as a freight carrier before the railroads became efficient enough and cheap enough to drive the canal out of business. It ran down until in 1906 it carried only 3 per cent of the freight. The railroads carried the remaining 97 per cent of it. New York State has given it up as a complete failure as a 7-foot lock canal.

If a 7-foot lock canal is a failure between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, where there is such a great demand for transportation facilities, is not that proof conclusive that a 7-foot lock canal any place is a failure? Can we hope for a canalized river 7 feet deep to do business when a 7-foot lock canal under the most favorable conditions has failed? In the Erie, it was not a matter of original investment or improvement to get a 7-foot lock canal; it was already built; it was already improved; it had been a prosperous means of transportation. It carried, in 1889, 18 per cent of the freight, but as railroad facilities improved it declined, until it has been abandoned as a 7-foot canal.

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to say that we are now enlarging the Erie Canal and making it a 3,000-ton barge canal instead of a 250-ton barge canal. We fully realized that it had ceased to pay under the old, antiquated, obsolete system, but it paid formerly, and it is going to pay again on the 3,000-ton barge system, and is going to pay well, both to the State of New York and to the country at large.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Oh, that is propheey. We are enlarging the Little Pedee River and the Trinity River on prophecies.

Mr. SMALL. I want to ask the gentleman if he knows that the issuing of bonds for $130,000,000 for the improvement of the Erie Canal had been submitted to a referendum in New York State and adopted by an overwhelming majority?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes; and the people may have had the thing misrepresented to them as the people of this country have had this river and harbor proposition generally misrepresented

to them. The benefits to be derived from it may have been misrepresented to them, and that may be the reason why New York voted as it did.

Mr. GOULDEN. The people of New York knew what they were voting for, that they were paying the bill, amounting, all told, to $130,000,000, and, permit me to say, have no regrets to express.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The canals of this country have proven a complete failure. As I stated a moment ago, we have abandoned 2,444 miles of canals, which cost $81,000,000, and this does not include canalized rivers. I could nowhere find out the number of miles of canalized rivers which we have abandoned. The Mississippi River has lost 85 per cent of the freight it carried in 1889. The whole Mississippi River system had lost in 1906—the last available statistics—72 per cent of the freight it carried in 1889.

Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, in discussing this thing yesterday, said:

I submit that the method in vogue is as nearly just and equitable as can be made. All proposed projects are first considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and, if seemingly meritorious, an examination and survey are ordered. These are made by the experts of the War Department entirely on basis of merit from the scientific standpoint of engineers. The results are submitted to Congress and placed in the hands of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Hearings are held, and the committee, having this testimony and the scientific opinions of the Board of Engineers, are certainly in a position to pass impartial judgment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS, of Mississippi, a member of the committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, a member of the committee, state that these projects are all based on surveys ordered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the reports made by scientific engineers after such surveys, and are appropriated for justly and fairly according to the judgment of the committee. Now, going on the assumption that one of the projects in this bill is as good and as meritorious as another, as these two members of the committee have stated, I am going to take up only a few of these projects and discuss them. I can not discuss all of them. There are nearly a thousand in all.

Mr. Chairman, if Mr. TREADWAY is right, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] correct, one project is as good and economical and reasonable and just an expenditure as any other in the bill. They are based on scientfic investigations made by engineers after they are ordered by the committee. I will take the Trinity River project as an example. It is infinitely a better proposition than many of them, and the committee and the engineers so recognize it, because they select the most feasible first, and this project was selected in 1902, while many projects in this bill have only just been selected at a date 12 years later. The man responsible for the initiation of this project is as honest, high-minded, and clean a man as I have ever dealt with. A revelation of the facts shows that it is due, not to the character of any man, but to the system practiced here, which men are drawn into by these continuous raids on the Treasury. I have as much respect for the man most interested in this project, for his judgment, for his statesmanship, and for his integrity, as I have for any man in Congress, and as stated above the project itself is infinitely more meritorious than many that are carried in this bill. He goes after this outlay of money in his district because everybody else is doing it.

In the light of these facts, then, let us look at this project, taking the engineers' reports for our basis of fact and reasoning about it. Here is what the report says:

The appropriations which have been made so far by the Congress for the Trinity River seem to indicate the intention to provide locks and dams.

There has been appropriated $2,229,142.93, and that is what the engineers' report for 1913, part 2, page 2293, says about it:

The appropriations seem to indicate an intention.

What, after more than $2,000,000 has been appropriated for it, after more than half what the engineers said in the original estimate would be the cost has been appropriated, they say:

The appropriations seem to indicate an intention to provide locks and dams.

This same engineer's report further says:

There is no commerce on this river, and none can be developed until the entire river is canalized.

The original estimate on this project was $4,000,000; but the engineers have changed that, and now say it will have to be increased to $10,000,000; and the project will have to be entirely completed before any commerce can be developed on it.

Now, let us reason a little on this project for which $2,229,142.93 have been appropriated. This bill carries $205,000 for this project. I think two hundred thousand was appropriated last year. That indicates that $200,000 per year is what they intend to put into this project. If they do continue at that rate in appropriating for this project it will take 40 years to finish it. Two hundred thousand dollars per year would be a million in five years, and eight million, the amount necessary to finish the project, in 40 years. They have been working on this project since 1902, and they have up to this time spent two and a quarter millions. What this committee has done for the last 12 years should be taken as fairly indicative of what they will do in the future. The engineers say in their report that "no commerce can develop on this river until the project is completed." That will be 40 years yet; 52 years from the time it was started. Can any mortal be so credulous as to believe the engineers or the committtee or the Members of this House sincerely think that project will ever be completed? These are not my statements; they are logical and inevitable deductions drawn from the engineers' reports and the amount of the annual appropriations made by this committee.

What is the inevitable conclusion? It is that they do not intend to complete these projects. If they did, they would not each year add a lot of new projects while continuing to drag along on the old ones at the same slow rate. They say money is limited and they can not afford more for this project. This is acquiesced in by the representatives of the different projects, and yet the committee added last year 21 new projects, and this year 76. What further evidence is needed to show to any reasoning mind that there is no intention of ever completing this project?

Mr. Chairman, there is another project in my State which has been dragging along about the same as the Trinity, and that is the Brazos River project. They have been working on it for about the same length of time, have spent $2,302,135.65, and have about the same hope for the future, judging from the engineer's reports.

Now, here is a North Carolina project. I am going to read from the engineer's report on which they base their expenditure. This is the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers, in North Carolina, House Document 138, Sixty-third Congress, first session.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before the gentleman leaves the question of the Trinity River, will he yield for a question?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. The gentleman made a statement that he wished to call attention to certain projects in the districts of various members of this committee. That would naturally leave the impression that the Trinity River was in the district of some member of the committee. Is that true or not?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No. I never said that. I said that I would show that every member of the committee had a special interest in the appropriations, and then I would call attention to some specific projects carried in the bill, assuming that Mr. TREADWAY's statement and Mr. HUMPHREYS's statements were correct, and that one of these projects was as good and as meritorious as another; and then I would proceed to make the argument that the whole thing ought to be kicked out through the roof if that was true.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask a further question. In point of fact, is the Trinity River in the district of any member of this Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No.

Mr. HARDY. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this navigation of the Trinity stops just before it gets to the gentleman's district?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes. It stops, in fact, before it starts. [Laughter.] Your question shows that men here are expected to be influenced by their interest. I have no direct interest in this appropriation and am therefore against it, is what your question implies. I have as much interest in it as any man ought to have who is to pass on expenditures of public money on it. I have a public interest in it.

Mr. GREGG. Will the gentleman yield a minute?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. I want to say to the gentleman that the old landing point of Magnolia is 8 miles from my town, and there are men living now who have seen five or six boats at the wharf there at one time.

Mr. CALLAWAY. They are evidently very old men.

Mr. GREGG. They are men who have been born since the war.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I suppose they ran flatboats and skiffs——

Mr. GREGG. No; boats carrying large quantities of cotton and bringing up all the produce and all the merchandise we controlled in our portion of the country.

Mr. CALLAWAY. They ran small vessels, skiffs, and flatboats, and pole-push boats on many rivers before we had railroad facilities, but that played out when the railroads came in,

because it was such an improvement on our old mode of transportation.

The report on the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers says that—

An examination made in December, 1909, shows that there were about 50 localities where the depth was less than 18 inches and several where it was but 5 to 6 inches.

I take this from House Document No. 862, Sixty-first Congress, second session. And they are trying to make the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers navigable!

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman. [Laughter and applause]——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In view of the applause on my taking the floor, I want to say that I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman. I want to call his attention to the fact that he was doing the State of North Carolina an injustice. Every foot of the Pedee River that is navigable is in the State of South Carolina and not in North Carolina.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman for the correction. The interests wanting this expenditure made the argument if any boats could ply it at all—and that is the general argument made by the people throughout the country who favor these projects—their railroad rates would be reduced and this outlay of money would have the effect of reducing the railroad rates. That argument is rotten, and there is no man in this House but knows it.

Mr. MURDOCK. They ought to disinfect that argument.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It needs disinfecting.

Mr. FOWLER. The bill or the argument?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Both. The report discussing the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers says: "The improvement is desired to enable the merchants to obtain lower railroad rates." Then it further says: "Experience has shown that unless energetic use is made of the improved river, the railroads will refuse to lower their rates," showing to be fallacious the argument that any transportation by water will reduce freight rates.

Here is a North Carolina project, the Northeast Cape Fear River. The Engineers' report, House Document No. 1356, third session Sixty-second Congress, says——

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption before he goes to the discussion of another project?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman did not state that the appropriation here carried was only $2,000 and that the appropriation was based upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Bixby—a very strong recommendation, reciting the reasons for it on the Little Pedee and Lumber Rivers in North and South Carolina. However, the part improved is, as may colleague [Mr. PAGE] said, entirely in South Carolina.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The question is not the amount spent; the question is the attempt to navigate 5 inches of water.

The engineers' report as to the Northeast Cape Fear River says:

The proposed improvement extends about 1½ miles above the present deep-water project in front of the city of Wilmington. He [the engineer] believes that if the channel suggested by the district officer, at a cost of $50,000 is provided, its eventual cost may double that sum. From the information now available it appears that the three fertilizer industries located about a mile above the head of the deep-water project at Wilmington have a considerable tonnage that would be affected by a more commodious channel, and that such a channel would result in a material saving in the handling of their heavier commodities. The improvement is very largely in the interest of these concerns.

Here is a New Jersey project, Mattawan Creek. I am reading from the engineers' report:

The adopted project provides for a channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the mouth to Winkson Creek, and thence 80 feet wide to the railroad bridge at Mattawan—estimated to cost $72,000.

There has been already spent on this project $65,647.96, and it is estimated that it will cost after it is completed $5,000 annually to keep it up. "The navigable part of this stream extends up to the bridge of the New York & Long Branch Railroad at Mattawan, about 2 miles." Here is an outlay of $137,647.96 for 2 miles of 8-foot deep waterway, which is to cost $2,500 a mile annually to keep up.

Here is a Florida project on the Kissimmee River. It is in the State of the chairman of this committee. It is, the engineers say, dry for a part of the year. There has been spent on it heretofore $32,852, and this bill carries $47,000 for it. I will read from the engineers' report concerning it:

With reference to the Kissimmee River, it appears that the project depth of 3 feet has not been maintained and that it will be impracticable to do so unless the work is prosecuted more vigorously than it has been in the past. * * * The board therefore recommends the authorization of a 3-foot channel from Kissimmee to Lake Okechobee, at an estimated cost of $35,000 for the construction of a dredge, $12,000 for the first year's work, and $6,000 a year, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for subsequent operations. It seems probable that after the channel has been constructed and maintained for a few years the cost of maintenance may be considerably reduced. If not, the project should be reexamined with a view to determining the advisability of its discontinuance. The first appropriation should be $47,000.

After we have spent $79,852 on it and have maintained it for a while, it "should be reexamined with a view to determining the advisability of its discontinuance."

Mr. Chairman, these are samples taken from the various States, and they are of varied character and illustrate the worthlessness and lack of merit of the projects in this bill. They show how the public money is wasted. Can any intelligent mortal believe that an individual would so spend his money? If not, how can we account for this committee pouring out these millions on such foolishness?

A fellow in Texas was being tried for stealing a cow. When the evidence was in and the attorney had closed the argument for the State, the attorney for the defendant did not see that anything could be said for his client. The evidence conclusively showed his guilt. His client asked him if he was not going to make some defense. The attorney told him he did not see that there was any defense. The defendant insisted on his saying something, and he talked a few minutes, avoiding the facts as much as he could. The jury went out and returned in a few minutes with a verdict of "not guilty." The attorney asked his client what that meant—said he could not understand the verdict, when the evidence was conclusive against him. The defendant replied, "You see, 11 of those men helped me eat the cow." [Laughter and applause.] Here is a jury worse stocked than that, for every one of them helps eat the cow.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to call attention to an engineers' report discussing the Ohio River, signed by C. L. Potter, lieutenant colonel; F. R. Shunk, lieutenant colonel; and E. D. Peck, captain. This is an engineers' report on the Ohio River as a coal carrier. The report says:

In 1889 the river receipts were about 59,000 tons and the rail receipts were 21,000 tons, or 26 per cent of the freight carried. In 1906 the river receipts were about 36,000 tons and the rail receipts about 85,000 tons, or 70 per cent of the freight carried. The actual amount carried by river in 1906 was only 60 per cent of that carried in 1889. The greatest coal river in the world is being driven out of the coal-carrying business by the railroads.

The traffic has been driven off of this great open waterway by the railroads. We recognized that and are now building locks and dams on that river at a cost of $63,000,000, and for what? Out of the very nature of things commerce can not be as cheap on that river with locks and dams as on the open river. The cheapest river transportation is on an open river in barges in fleets. When the fleets must be broken up to pass each lock, there is time lost and danger of smash-ups.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], will it?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes. Acting for him in his absence temporarily, I am controlling the time on this side.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows that Lock and Dam 37 in the Ohio River has formed a pool in front of the city of Cincinnati 20 miles long, of 9 feet depth at the shallowest point, which has enabled them to move boats in the harbor and transfer coal and merchandise up and down in front of the city every day in the year for the past two years, thereby providing a great convenience to the commerce and saving an immense amount of money in transportation?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am reading from the engineers' report.

Mr. ALLEN. I am stating a fact that I am familiar with from personal observation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I supposed the engineers were stating the facts and were entirely informed, and they are scientific men. These appropriations are supposedly based on their reports. We ought to be able to rely on them. What I am discussing is freight up and down the river, and not simply a turning basin in front of Cincinnati, which, if Cincinnati needs, she ought to provide at her own expense. It is general traffic we should look to.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to read from the report of the Board of Engineers, showing the way the river freight has fallen off:

*Freight shipments by Mississippi River system.*

| | Tons carried. | | Loss. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1889 | 1906 | |
| | | | *Per cent.* |
| Upper Mississippi | 3,947,364 | 595,885 | 85 |
| Illinois River | 180,204 | 105,826 | 41 |
| Missouri and tributaries above St. Louis | 2,132,820 | 1,056,390 | 50 |
| Total upper river | 6,360,448 | 1,758,101 | 72 |
| Ohio River | 15,796,968 | 15,226,805 | 4 |
| Lower Mississippi | 6,232,087 | 2,546,187 | 59 |
| Total Mississippi River | 28,289,503 | 19,531,093 | 31 |

Next I want to read from the report of the Commissioner of Corporations for 1909, transportation by water in the United States, part 1, page 126. There is a table given here, but I will read the summary only:

The table just given shows a decrease in the total gross tonnage of the western rivers of 61,748 tons, or 20 per cent, on June 30, 1907, as compared with June 30, 1888.

I will read further from the same report (p. 359, vol. 1), showing the effect of the insurance rate on the commerce of those rivers:

A packet line which operates on the Ohio River claims that the insurance rate has practically driven it out of business.

Another line whose vessels ply the waters of the upper Mississippi reports that "the cost of insurance on many articles of merchandise is more than the cost of carrying the freight from St. Louis to St. Paul."

One vessel owner estimates that the insurance on vessels and cargoes affected his business to the extent of 33⅓ per cent.

This same report says that the time of transportation on a barge canal such as the Erie is about three and a half times as long as by rail, and the inconvenience suffered from such delay and the interest and insurance on freight while in transit must be considered, and when all is considered—

The canal can not compete with the railroad rate; it can not give better service, and it can not relieve the congestion in large crop seasons.

This same statement will apply with equal force to canalized rivers as a means of transportation.

The Engineer's report, from which I am reading further, says:

It is not appreciated by those advocates of canals that there is a vast difference between moving many thousand tons of one cargo over a wide, deep, direct, and level waterway and taking the same commodities in small barges through a narrow, unduly long, and shallow waterway. There can be no cheap rate over such a waterway.

Advocates of this policy of pouring out millions and millions of dollars in an ostensible effort to improve our inland waterways for purposes of navigation urge, as the great argument in its favor, that it will result in a lowering of freight rates on the railroads. We have State and Interstate Commerce Commissions, whose duty it is under the law to make the freight rates reasonable; that is, as low as they can be made. Nobody advocates confiscating the railroad property.

You may state that water competition will make them reduce the rates at competing points below the rate fixed by the commissions as reasonable. If that be true, the rate at the competing points will be below what is reasonable, or the rate at noncompeting points will be above what is reasonable; and your argument amounts to a statement that the commissions are not doing, and will not do, their duty. You have been claiming that the commissions could not get at the facts; but we have sought to remedy that by putting hundreds of men in the field to make physical valuations of the railroads in order that the Interstate Commerce Commission may have the information on which to base the rate.

Should water competition reduce the rate at the competitive points below the actual cost of transportation by rail, the railroads would have to make up that loss by making the rate higher than reasonable at the interior points, and the result would be that you would have saddled the burdens on the interior of developing your water competition for the benefit of competitive points, and also the burden of making up the loss to the railroads which they suffer because of having to reduce their rates below cost at the competitive points. That might appeal to the greed and avarice of the competitive points. It might appeal to a Congressman who wanted to favor some locality at the expense of the general public; but it would not appeal to a fair-minded patriot who saw and understood, *and it would not appeal to the people at interior points who would be forced to bear this double burden of constructing projects at immense cost in order to raise their own freight rates.*

The argument that you are intending to develop water competition on these intermittent streams for the purpose of reducing general freight rates is the merest drivel and the public ought not longer to be buncoed by such obviously fraudulent claims. The insincerity and ridiculousness of it all is demonstrated conclusively by the fact that while you are working through Congress and getting up to the White House for the President's final approval this bill appropriating $43,000,000 of the people's hard-earned money, presumably for the purpose of forcing lower freight rates, the administration is quoted in all the big daily papers as in favor of allowing the railroads to raise their freight rates 5 per cent.

In our platform of 1896 we said:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which benefits a democratic Government.

The appropriation for that year was $457,088,344.72.

In our plateform of 1904 we said:

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality.

That year the Republicans appropriated $736,578,402.76.

In our platform of 1908 we said:

We denounce the needless waste of the people's money as no less than a crime—

and that year the Republicans appropriated $918,362,329.07. In 1912 we denounced the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation, while according to the estimates submitted this year by a Democratic administration we will be called on to appropriate $1,250,000,000. Did we mean what we said in our repeated platform declarations? If so, let us do it. We can make a start on this bill.

I shall make a motion when this bill is read to cut out $39,000,000 of it, that being everything except the maintenance items, which amount to only $4,000,000. If that motion should carry, we will maintain every project we now have in its present condition and save more than nine-tenths of the money wasted in this bill. No man can say it will not be a waste. Commerce has left these rivers and canals. We realized that and appropriated a half a million dollars for a commission to make an investigation to see if any craft could be devised that could economically carry the traffic on these waters. That was an admission that we are in the woods at present and do not know that any commerce will be developed by these expenditures. That commission has not yet reported. Let us stop this until we know what we are doing. That is the only way to deal honestly with the public, and we ought to deal honestly with those whose money we are spending. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McCOY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13612) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1914 and for prior years, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13091. An act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes;

H. R. 13771. An act extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.;

H. R. 11751. An act authorizing the sale of certain land to the county of San Diego, State of California, for public watering purposes; and

H. R. 12594. An act to authorize the county commissioners of Skagit County, Wash., to construct a bridge across Swinomish Slough opposite the town of La Conner.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I guess there is a good deal of human nature in men, just as my colleague from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] says there is, and I guess there is some truth in his statement that those gentlemen who are interested largely in river and harbor improvements throughout the country are persons who have been brought closely into relation with the

matter. If I had doubted that that was applicable to all Members of Congress, including the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I could have learned it from the situation of my colleague from Texas, who, as we all know, represents a district without ports or the prospect of navigable streams. The fact about the business is that this question, like every other question that agitates the minds and affairs of men, can be carried to an extreme. The truth lies between the extremes. If one would take the statements of my colleague and believe them to be sound, no canal, no river, no harbor is worth improving.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I stated in the outset that if you could show that on the outlay the freight carried would be a profitable investment I did not object to it, and no man would object to it; but no expenditure ought to be made unless you could estimate it as you would your private business and show that there was a real profit on the investment.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I happen to live in a part of the country where for many years the people thought they had good river and harbor propositions. They wanted the Government to take it up. Men who believed and spoke as my colleague believes and speaks said that it was worthless and impractical. We wanted them to improve what is now known as the port of Port Arthur. We could not get a Government engineer to recommend it, and we could not get the ear of a Member of Congress to listen to the scheme or to believe that it was feasible. We finally succeeded in getting a lot of Dutch capital from Holland to build the canal. It cost a million of dollars, and later on, I may say, was presented by its owners as a gracious gift to the Government of the United States.

When that canal was built the entire tonnage from that section of the State that passed through Sabine Pass was less than 300,000 tons in 12 months. To-day it is greater than 3,000,000 tons. The value then of the product that passed through was less than $3,000,000, and to-day, if I recall the figures correctly, it is more than $60,000,000. There was a port which they said was not worth improving, and which to-day figures about the tenth greatest in the entire United States, and to-day this little canal, that men scoffed and laughed at as my colleague laughed and scoffed to-day, bears upon its surface 2,050,000 tons every 12 months, and they can not get wharfage and facilities fast enough to accommodate the business that is accumulating there. He speaks somewhat slightingly of the intercoastal canal. For one I believe it will be demonstrated to be a boon to the entire Atlantic coast, to the entire Gulf coast, and to the great and rich country which lies tributary to it. The intercoastal canal will prove to that entire section what this little Port Arthur Canal has proved to the more limited section. [Applause.] If this intercoastal-canal improvement is foolish and chimerical, how does it fall out that it has been advocated as far back as the days of James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, the latter of whom sent a message to Congress pointing with great pride to the fact that this intercoastal canal had been surveyed and that he hoped for its speedy construction? I feel I ought to say, Mr. Chairman, that Texas has the proud distinction of having upon the Rivers and Harbors Committee the author of this intercoastal-canal proposition. We are proud of GEORGE BURGESS. Back in the old days, in 1824 and 1829, efforts were made, it is true, by many other gentlemen to have the Government do this great work, but it remained for a Texas Representative on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Hon. GEORGE F. BURGESS, to give this matter practical and concrete shape. [Applause.] So that to-day the intercoastal canal is a thing which we look upon as a reality. Why, in the great State of Texas not one acre in 10 of our broad domain is in a state of cultivation. To-day in Texas of all the things we need the most urgent is transportation by rail, by dirt road, and by water. As I said, the city of Port Arthur can not accommodate the vessels which come there to load with cotton, with oil, with lumber, with grain, and the products of the farms of Texas and the Southwest. Tell me that this great intercoastal canal that connects the Atlantic seaboard with the Rio Grande River, touching the great rivers along its way, will not benefit Texas and will not benefit the entire South and the entire country when it is constructed!

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I will.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Talking about the little canal at Port Arthur, that is simply a harbor that leads from the Gulf of Mexico to a general railroad distributing point, is it not?

Mr. DIES. It is less than 12 miles long, I believe.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It is not a canal for the carrying of freight.

Mr. DIES. I presume that canals lead to water. [Laughter.] All canals lead to some place where boats can go out, because you could not get a boat out if the canal did not lead to water. Port Arthur leads out to the Gulf of Mexico, and when we built that canal with private capital we demonstrated the errors of false prophets, and when the intercoastal canal is completed it will also realize our hopes and disprove the criticisms made against it.

Mr. Chairman, after private capital had built the Port Arthur Canal and demonstrated the feasibility of the undertaking the Government was induced to construct what is known as the Sabine-Neches Canal, connecting the Port Arthur Canal with the Sabine and Neches Rivers. The citizens of the enterprising cities of Beaumont and Orange, located, respectively, on the Neches and Sabine Rivers, were anxious to connect with deep water. The estimated cost of this work was about $1,200,000. To show their faith in the work, the people of those two cities and the surrounding country contributed one-half of the cost of the work, and to-day the Government is bringing to completion this great work. Our people have contributed more than a million and a half of dollars from their local funds. They are in dead earnest, and at last we have secured the ear of Congress, and the end is not yet. The greatest chain of deep-water ports in the world will be along the Port Arthur Canal, the Sabine-Neches Canal, and the Sabine and Neches Rivers. Why, do you know, if GEORGE BURGESS were to remain in Congress the balance of his life he could never do a greater work for Texas than the construction of this great waterway. It will remain as a monument to his memory, more enduring than brass and marble, for it will aid greatly in opening up the fairest part of that fair country.

Mr. Chairman, those who think the intercoastal canal a worthless project are no doubt sincere, but they have learned only half the truth. They say it parallels the ocean and the Gulf and is therefore needless. Why, sir, the experience of those who navigate the Atlantic and the Gulf is that these great waters can not be relied upon for the moving of barges and other frail or light craft which could safely and economically use the canal. Only a few months ago a shipowner at Port Arthur lost an oil vessel costing almost a million dollars which would have been safe in the canal. Along this intercoastal canal are the greatest sulphur mines in the world, the greatest salt deposits, and near it are the great iron ore deposits of Cherokee and other eastern Texas counties. In this territory is to be found a wealth of timber, oil, cotton, rice, lumber, and other valuable commerce. We need to exchange these products for the coal and structural steel of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Alabama. With this connection with the great coal fields at a cheap freight rate our section will come forward as a great manufacturing section. Cheap coal is the one thing needful. This canal will give us cheap coal.

I know, Mr. Chairman, it is easy to make fun of these propositions, and, as I said in the beginning, there is nothing good in this world but what, carried to an extreme, becomes an evil. It may be that there have been in the past very great objections to matters contained in the rivers and harbors bill, but I want to state to my colleague from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] that if he ever has the trouble getting an item into the rivers and harbors bill that I have had and that other gentlemen have had—first to go to the local engineers and then to the district engineers, then to the Board of Engineers, and finally to the board of review here—I am persuaded to think that he will believe that you have a pretty hard proposition in going up all the avenues which you have to travel in order to get Uncle Sam's appropriation. [Applause.]

I regret, of course, that there has been any reference made as to Texas' share in this bill. Texas has a tremendously long coast line. As I said a moment ago, about 90 per cent of all the lands in Texas are in a state of nature. Tributary to this intercoastal canal there lie the broad forests, the cut-over pine lands, the broad acres of coastal prairie plains, practically untouched by the hand of man, lying in an idle state of nature. I do not want Texas to get more than her share. I hope I have grown to be broad enough to want every section of our glorious Union to prosper along with every other section. But surely, if there is a need for improved harbors, for improved shipping facilities, improved rivers and waterways, and railway and dirt-road transportation, a State with 90 per cent of its lands untouched by the hand of the husbandman makes a strong appeal to you patriotic men from New England and the central West, where you have great development. We have this great State here that shall yet contain a population of 50,000,000 of people, that shall yet be able to supply the world with 20,000,000 bales of cotton a year, and it is no time now for a man from New England or any other section of the country to say that we are

getting more than we ought to have out of this river and harbor bill.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Perhaps the gentleman would permit me to state here that the rivers tributary to the Gulf, not including the Mississippi and its tributaries, are 53 in number, having a navigable mileage of 5,212 miles, all of which extend into this intercoastal waterway along the Gulf.

Mr. DIES. And many of them shoal, Mr. Chairman, and become unnavigable when they reach the salt water of the Gulf or the ocean. I believe it is the almost universal experience and an actual fact with regard to most rivers, where they flow into the Lakes or into the ocean, that they shoal at their mouth. This intercoastal canal will intersect them at navigable points, and will be a great saving to the Government, no doubt, in the matter of making these rivers navigable, without reference to the canal itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to what my colleague from North Carolina has stated, by saying that the completion of this intercoastal system will mean that it will add 27,000 miles of waterways.

Mr. DIES. I do not doubt it. In my district are rivers 40 feet in depth, many miles from the Gulf, that are not navigable from the Gulf because they are shoal at their mouth.

The gentleman from Florida says 27,000 miles of navigable river waterway will be added by the construction of this canal. It is too large an affair, Mr. Chairman, to be laughed into disrepute before the country. I hope that those who are the friends of the rivers and harbors and of this great work of navigation upon good streams at good ports, for the development of the commerce of this country, will not suffer this great work to be laughed out of countenance before the country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. DIES. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to add to what these other gentlemen have said, that the number of disasters along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts from 1900 to 1910 was 5,700; that $40,000,000 worth of property was lost; that 2,200 lives went down, and that many of those lives and much of that business could have been saved through the intercoastal waterway if it had been completed.

Mr. DIES. I think the experience of a shipowner in my district, who lost $960,000 in one vessel, would tend to confirm all and more than the gentleman says.

Mr. Chairman, it is well for those who feel unfriendly to rivers and harbors to go very thoroughly and very fully into the facts in this matter. I feel like saying, and I shall say, that there is no man in this Congress for whom I have a greater affection and admiration than for my colleague [Mr. CALLAWAY]. I regard him as one of the ablest and most courageous men in Congress. I know he is true as steel and as honest as he is true; but he does not look at this question with his usual breadth of vision. This is a great national undertaking, and if my colleague lives as long as I would have him he will behold all his prophecies concerning it fail.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to ask if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] has any streams in his district capable of being made navigable.

Mr. DIES. I do not think there are any such streams in the district of my colleague.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that completes what I had to say in regard to this matter. I can only speak with assurance about conditions in my own immediate section; but if the balance of the criticism against the bill is based upon no better foundation than that directed at the intercoastal canal, it will no doubt fall to pieces when the entire matter is discussed and understood. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, on February 27, 1912, I made some remarks concerning the public-land laws and their administration, calling attention to the difficulties experienced by the homesteader and the relief that should be given him. He is a most useful citizen, and his efforts to make profitable use of our unoccupied lands should be furthered in every legitimate way. Since that date some legislation has been enacted of a beneficial character. At this time it is my purpose to call attention to three things only in which further legislation is greatly needed.

CULTIVATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE THREE-YEAR HOMESTEAD LAW.

This provision was inserted in the three-year homestead bill by the conferees after it had passed both House and Senate, and of course under the rules was not subject to amendment.

This insertion of new matter by conferees is a practice against which there is much complaint. The appointment of conferees is for the purpose of adjusting the disagreement between the two Houses on matters that each House has considered. But where the conferees add new matter, which under the rules can not be amended, they do what it was never intended they should do. I never favored the cultivation requirements of the three-year homestead law, or believed they were proper, for a wooded country, and had opportunity been given I would have offered an amendment similar to the provisions of the bill I now propose.

The cultivation requirement works a hardship on homesteaders in a wooded country. To clear 20 acres for the plow is in a great many instances practically impossible, and if it were feasible is a useless waste of effort and money. Homesteaders distant from market, where there are no roads or where roads are poor, or if the roads are passable there is no market within a distance to which products can be profitably hauled, should not be required to cultivate grain crops, but should be allowed to make other forms of improvement. Their good faith can be shown just as clearly, for instance, by clearing for meadow or forage crops and by raising stock, which can be driven to market and which will be profitable to the settler and to the country. To make this possible I have introduced H. R. 10535, which is a modification of the bill introduced by Senator BORAH. My bill makes it possible for a settler to engage in a work profitable to him, and it seems to be quite generally believed that the modifications I have proposed will aid in the passage of this legislation and be of great benefit to western homesteaders.

Since the passage of the three-year homestead law I have been collecting information in support of the amendment I now propose. Settlers are widely scattered in the West, mails and means of information sometimes infrequent, and to get an expression of opinion from any considerable proportion of them is difficult and takes time. But by the assistance of public-spirited citizens and the public press, to whom my thanks are due, and by means of inquiries by letter and in person, I have collected the opinions of hundreds of men and women now actually engaged in making homes in good faith on the public domain in support of this bill. The proposed modification of the law is as follows:

*Provided further*, That the entryman shall, in order to comply with the requirements of cultivation herein provided for, cultivate not less than one-sixteenth of the area of his entry, beginning with the second year of the entry, and not less than one-eighth, beginning with the third year of the entry, and until final proof, except that in the case of entries under section 6 of the enlarged-homestead law double the area of cultivation herein provided shall be required: *Provided*, That the entryman in lieu of cultivation required herein may make improvements upon his entry by constructing fences or buildings, by slashing, clearing, or in other ways preparing the land for cultivation, for meadow, for pasture, or for grazing purposes, or by planting orchard, or by otherwise making the homestead habitable or capable of production, or of enabling the entryman to obtain means of livelihood from the homestead, said improvements to aggregate in value an amount each year of not less than $1.50 per acre, except that in cases of entries under section 6 of the enlarged-homestead law the amount of improvements shall not be less in value than 75 cents per acre: *Provided*, That the term "cultivation" shall be held to include also the growing of grasses, or other crops, for pasturage purposes or for making hay: *Provided further*, That the above provision as to cultivation shall not apply to entries under the act of April 28, 1904, commonly known as the Kinkaid Act, or entries under the act of June 17, 1902, commonly known as the reclamation act, and that the provisions of this section relative to the homestead period shall apply to all unperfected entries as well as entries hereafter made upon which residence is required.

In lieu of requiring that 10 acres be cultivated in the second year and 20 acres in the third year in a homestead of 160 acres, as required by the three-year homestead act, the bill I propose allows the homesteader to be given credit for necessary improvements. This bill also provides that "cultivation" shall include the growing of native or tame grasses and hay crops, as well as the growing of crops that necessitate the plowing of the soil, and encourages stock raising.

This is a practical and reasonable solution of the difficulties which settlers are complaining of in the cultivation requirements of the present law, and does not mean that the homesteaders shall not exhibit good faith. Raising stock, for instance, is just as useful work as raising large quantities of grain or potatoes on homesteads far from the market, and is more profitable to the homesteader, and therefore makes his homestead more valuable to him. The growing of cultivated crops will follow in due course of time, and there will naturally be garden cultivation and growing of some grain from the beginning.

The information I desired from the homesteader covers these points:

First. Can you clear 20 acres of your land in three years and have it ready for the plow without hiring extra labor or buying expensive machinery or explosives? If you can not, please state why.

Second. If you raised grain or potatoes or other cultivated crops on the 20 acres, could you sell them? If you can not, please state why.

Third. What kind of a road is there to your homestead?

Fourth. How far would you have to haul grain or other crops to market them?

Fifth. Will the bill proposed above meet the difficulties you are experiencing under the present law?

Sixth. Have you any suggestions for further amendment?

Any additional information will be gladly received.

The purpose was to get the views of as many homesteaders as possible, so that in the passage of this homestead bill all proper opportunity and relief should be given to those who make homes on the public domain.

The largest number of replies were from homesteaders in wooded areas, although some were from settlers on more open lands. Practically all the former replied in the negative to the first question.

The replies were generally in the negative to the second question. The people were too far from market and the roads were, as it were, in a state of nature. The last statement answers the third question.

On the fourth, the distances ran up to as many as 40 miles, and in nearly every instance the length of haul would be prohibitive, even if the roads were better.

The answers to question 5 were in the affirmative with few exceptions. The homesteaders expressed an earnest wish to comply with the laws in good faith, but said the requirements should be reasonable and practicable; that instead of a rigid rule for all sections, irrespective of their physical characteristics, alternative requirements suited to the varying conditions should be provided, and that the requirements should be such that in complying with them the settler would be doing work of practical benefit to himself.

The replies number hundreds, and I expect to lay the contents of them before the Committee on the Public Lands of the House.

I collected this data, not from any lack of information on my part but for the reason that I wished the homesteaders to come, as it were, in person and state the difficulties they experience under the cultivation requirement of the three-year homestead law and the modification needed to give them relief which should be at the same time proper and legitimate. I find a sentiment very favorable to this legislation. I have taken the matter up with other Members of the House from districts in which the settlers are situated similarly to those in Oregon, and I hope soon to have the bill, or some measure which will afford relief equally well, reported to the House and passed.

OPENING THE FOREST RESERVES TO ENTRY.

The recent exclusion from the forest reserves in Oregon of several hundred thousands of acres and their restoration to homestead entry emphasizes what I have so often said on the floor of the House, that in the hasty formation of the forest reserves, especially in Oregon, millions of acres of lands suitable for homesteads were included that never should have been. I have constantly urged that they should be made available for entry, and this is being done, although slowly. To promote the elimination of agricultural lands, to aid in determining what lands are such, and to make it possible for homesteaders to secure them without unnecessary difficulty and delay, I have favored the appropriation of moneys to enable this work to be done; and the Agriculture appropriation bill, as it passed the House on Saturday last, contained an item of $100,000 for the selection, classification, and segregation of lands within the boundaries of the national forests and to open them to homestead settlement and entry; an item of $85,000 for the survey and platting of lands valuable for agriculture within the forest reserves; and $20,000 for the use of the Bureau of Soils in examining and classifying agricultural lands in the forest reserves in cases where the agricultural character and value of the land is in dispute. All of these appropriations I have earnestly worked for, and I hope to see them increased and the opening of lands in the national forests hastened. This bill also contains appropriations for road and trail construction in the forests, which will aid in making them more accessible to the homesteader.

GIVE THE HOMESTEADER A RIGHT OF APPEAL TO THE COURTS.

In my remarks of February 27, 1912, I called the attention of the House and country to a use then being made of secret reports by special agents, a use, in my judgment, highly improper. At this time I do not intend to go into the subject further than to say that as a result of my protest the practice of the department has been greatly modified, as the following statements from a letter which I received from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, under date of February 2, 1914, indicates:

With reference to that portion of your letter requesting a copy of the special agent's report in the case, in order that your constituent may be afforded an opportunity to submit evidence to disprove the charges therein, I have to advise you that the department has heretofore promulgated an order to the effect that special agent's reports will not be considered by the department in connection with cases pending on appeal, wherein the claimant, after a copy of charges had been served upon him, has denied the charges, applied for a hearing, and appeared and submitted testimony in support of his claim. In accordance with the foregoing instructions the Commissioner of the General Land Office, in forwarding your constituent's case to the department upon appeal, retained in the files of that office the special agent's report.

There still exist practices which ought to be modified in part and in part abandoned, of which I expect to speak at a later date. I hold that the Government should consider no report as secret or confidential, and nothing should be included in the record which the entryman or his attorney can not fully examine and have adequate opportunity to reply to.

The entryman on the public lands should have, under a properly enacted statute, a right to appeal to the courts before he can be ousted from his entry and be deprived of the work of years. Under the present practice he is practically in the hands of the special agent, whose report is called "confidential," and whose statement, unsworn to, is held to be worthy of more credence than the sworn testimony of reputable citizens, as has happened in cases coming under my notice; the settler is subject to the vices of a bureaucracy. The civil service ought to promote efficiency and fair-mindedness, and not incompetency, bias, and prejudice. The settler is the only man whose property and means of livelihood can be taken away without due process of law in the courts, and it is time that these "strong-arm" methods were abandoned and the homesteader given his day in court; in the open courts of his country, where justice and juries sit. The secret process of deciding on a citizen's rights, condemned in Magna Charta, has no place in this age, and if it could be dragged out into the light of day it would die. It could not stand publicity.

The long delays after final proof is made and before issuance of patent should not occur. The homesteader can not be expected to pit his slender means against the inexhaustible resources of the Government, and "wearing out" a man who persists in maintaining his rights is an abuse of power.

I wish again to emphasize what I said in my remarks on February 27, 1912, in the House. All of the legislation I advocated is salutary and for the common good. Further experience and consideration emphasizes its importance and justice. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by a constituent of mine on the conservation of flood waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the speech named. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

A BIG, PRACTICAL NATIONAL PROPOSITION OF DIRECT BENEFIT TO THE POPULATION OF THE ENTIRE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY, NAMELY, CONSERVING THE RAINFALL—FLOOD AND DROUGHT TWO GREAT FACTORS IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY, EACH THE CAUSE OF THE LOSS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ANNUALLY.

The song of the flood waters was heard in the land last year and many years heretofore—water, water everywhere. Damage to property, loss of lives, millions of dollars in property lost and thousands of lives destroyed. And later the drought, drought everywhere, and crops are withered, well streams and rivers are dried up, thousands of cattle are marketed, business is vitally affected. In many States for a great many it was a serious problem to provide the necessaries of life.

Yet there is a big, practical solution of the entire difficulty, a regulator of drought and floods. It is national, yet individual; by national the Government can direct, the individual can accomplish. The Government superintends, engineers the project, the individual accomplishes the task. The Government policy to conserve the timber, the mineral, the water power, and assist agriculture with big irrigation projects, with immense outlay of money, is all right, and the individual and company irrigation plans, whether by wells, reservoirs, and ditches, are good; but over and above all, and for all, is a plan that will unite the Government and individual in a task that will immeasurably outclass any world's work ever attempted, without issuance of bonds, levy of taxes, or other means, except to pay Government employees, viz, conserving the rainfall will avoid the damage from both drought and flood. Not by condemning large areas for big reservoirs, but without condemning a single acre for reservoir purposes.

In Missouri for many years—fifteen or more—a farmer has been reclaiming the rocky ravines on his farm by damming up the ravine at the line of his field; a sewer pipe through the dam with an elbow at the upper end holds back the flood water from rains and allows the wash from the soil to settle in the bottom of the ravine, the excess water flowing through the sewer pipe. Two things are accomplished, the wash from the fields is saved to make a new meadow in a waste place and the flood waters are retarded in their flow. The task is accomplished by the cost of a few lengths of sewer pipe and the labor with team and scraper to be found on every farm.

Now, this little task can be enlarged upon and a comprehensive plan developed to embrace every farm and ranch in the Mississippi Valley.

My father lived over 70 years on a farm in Illinois. This farm in my boyhood days was full of sloughs and ponds. We plowed as far as we could into these sloughs and ponds and planted to corn then; as the season progressed we plowed further and sowed to millet. My grandfather first made mole drains through the soil to drain wet places. Very few will understand what these mole drains are. The instrument was a simple round piece of iron attached to a thin strip of iron dragged through the soil about 2½ or three feet under the surface with ox teams. At that time this round iron made a hole only 2 or 3 inches in diameter, and, no doubt, helped some to drain the subsoil. In later years my father placed tile drains throughout the farm, which had increased to 48 acres, and when my father sold this farm only a few years ago there was not a slough or pond on the entire farm and no open ditches and less than half a mile of rocky ravine, which could not be improved by a tile drain; but this rocky ravine can be dammed at a very nominal cost to hold thousands of tons of flood water, as the ravine crosses the line of the farm between narrow perpendicular walls of solid rock. This same ravine is already dammed below this farm for park and boating purposes.

Throughout Illinois and adjacent States a well-tiled farm will absorb an immense amount of rainfall, and the ravines will hold untold tons of water without damage, but rather a benefit to the farm, as the wash will build new meadows in the ravines.

But take Nebraska, with her boundless prairies, hills, and canyon lands. For years every effort has been made to ditch the swamps and low places, straighten out the creeks and rivers, until one-half to three-fourths of the rain water runs off like a shot to swell the rising floods of the Missouri and Mississippi, causing millions of dollars' damage and loss of life, with thousands of acres of idle land in Mississippi, for fear the levee may break and flood the crops. The wash from the farm is carried by creek and stream to the muddy Missouri and Mississippi, until the State of Mississippi has been filled in hundreds of feet in places with soil from all over the Mississippi Valley. And since levees were made to keep the great river within bounds, it has been a struggle on the part of the river to deposit sediment in its channel, and thus raise the bed of the river year by year faster than the people can build levees to outrise the stream. Thus the mighty river mounts higher and higher above the surrounding land. I do not have the figures to give the Government data regarding the height of flood water at New Orleans, but my recollection is that the height of the flood two years ago was eighty-some feet as against some 50 feet only 10 years ago.

Two years ago the Government spent (estimated) three million of dollars for levee work and aid to people along the Mississippi on account of flood, and this year, I am told, at the time of the great flood in Ohio, the Government ordered in Pittsburgh steel rails to be made to be transported to New Orleans by freight to be used in ripraping the levees before the flood waters should arrive; the course of the Mississippi being so tortuous and the fall so slight that it took the flood waters weeks to reach the Gulf. (The estimated damage in the town of Hamilton, Ohio, alone from flood water during 1913 was $10,000,000.)

But return to Nebraska. A small part of the money spent by the Government for protection and aid to flood sufferers would hire competent district engineers under a national bureau to plan and oversee the work of conserving the rainfall of the entire Mississippi Valley. I have in mind a Nebraska ranch of 680 acres from which there need not a single drop of water run off during any rain or flood season, and that, too, can be accomplished by the expenditure of material and labor and of a very few hundred dollars, and if you eliminate the labor, which this ranch owner will gladly furnish, the material (cement) for building culverts with headgates would be a very small item—very small, indeed—compared with the value that will accrue to the ranch.

This Nebraska ranch of 680 acres is about half smooth, nearly level farm land. The other half is rolling to rough grazing land. Three-fourths of this ranch is drained by a draw or canyon from 100 to 200 feet in width and averaging 10 to 12 feet in depth and nearly 1 mile long, with smooth farm land on either side. Another fine hay canyon crosses another part of the farm land that drains probably a section of hill and pasture land. A series of dams in these draws or canyons will hold all the water coming into them. These dams, of course, should be built with cement culverts and headgates, so that the water can be let out or held, to suit occasion. The water accumulating in the upper part of this draw can be brought down and distributed in ditches on the farm land, and thus the rainfall is made to supplement itself on the cultivated land; and, again, this draw, after emptied of water, either by the water flowing down on lower land or pumped for irrigating purposes, can be plowed and sown to cane or millet in July and an immense crop raised, three or four times greater than without the storage of water, hence no loss of land by reason of reservoir.

What would be the effect in central and western Nebraska alone if all the rain water that falls on the land was conserved as outlined on this ranch? And I am of the conviction that it can be done.

Now, we do not stop to look from whence comes the rainfall. Most people never look beyond the clouds, and very few follow the source to the Gulf of Mexico. What think you of a people that receive their rain from a thousand miles away, and when it is poured down in torrents on the land standing by and see one-half to three-fourths of it flow away to damage property and destroy life? And then in a few days wish it would rain again, and as weeks pass by they look anxiously for rain, and when the drought is severe they bewail their lot.

Now, we all know what goes up must come down, and when I said our rains come from the Gulf of Mexico I did not take into consideration water evaporated from the soil, lakes, streams, and irrigating ditches. All the vapor that rises must be condensed and fall in rain or snow somewhere, some time. And I maintain that if central and western Nebraska was filled with lakes the rainfall would be increased in accordance with the amount of evaporation. If the ground is damp and is giving off large quantities of vapor, it is easy to rain, but if the ground is dry and no appreciable vapor arising, very little rain falls.

I think the question of rainfall, its conservation and distribution, is the biggest and most practical problem the Government can engage in. It is not for infants, it is for master minds. The field for investigation is great and the avenues for the investigator are long. But no one thing, to my mind, can be made of greater material benefit than the conservation of water—the rainfall.

WILLIS CADWELL,
*Broken Bow, Nebr.*

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, the rightful committee that ought to have a hearing was defeated here this morning, and I think it is up to the successful committee to keep a quorum in this House. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one gentlemen are present—a quorum. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that I am going to insist on a quorum being here. They voted out the Claims Committee this morning, and they have got to keep a full attendance here. I am entitled to 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, we must say that for fair play and for an honorable way of doing, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors probably takes rank with no other committee of this House. [Laughter.] They arranged at the outset to divide the time entirely on one side. Surely, amongst fair men that was an unfair move. The opposition was to be left without a moment—another fair move from fair men. [Laughter.]

In my opinion there was a reason for the fact that the opposition should not have been allowed to have anything to say. I can see the reason why the leader of the committee minority [Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington], in having an hour to speak here, should say not a word about the measure under discussion, a measure carrying $40,000,000. As in the case of the framers of other measures of a similar character, they need elements of strength from both sides—entre nous; that is to say, they must secure the cooperation of the recipients of the benefits carried by the act in order to pass it. The most vicious bill that ever passed any legislative body passed with only 5 dissenting votes. Many measures that will not bear criticism are the same.

We spend, I think, about $20,000 to educate one of these Army engineers. After he is educated we give him a life position. At another period we retire him on a fine salary as a pensioner.

In the State of Connecticut two harbor projects were authorized by the act of July 25, 1912. Now, this Board of Engineers reported only one of these projects. In one of those harbors it is shown by Government reports that the Treasury collected half a million dollars receipts from commercial business. At the other harbor the total receipts were some $2,200, and the amount paid to officials for collection was $4,900, entailing a loss to the Government of $2,700. There is an authorization in the bill for both places, but this Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the Board of Engineers recommended the expenditure of $170,000 for improvements in the place that has no commerce, and the board and the committee recommended not one dollar for the other place where they were taking in half a million dollars of revenue. The place of no commerce is the rendezvous, yes, and to some extent, the home, of the idle rich. It is the harbor of the yachts of the rich and the summer residence of the idle rich. An appropriation of $170,000 is recommended for those.

The other place, which receives nothing, is a manufacturing city, with over 100,000 people, where not one of those manufacturers can sell a dollar's worth of his goods except in competition; they must excel in value, they must excel in texture, they must excel in their pliability. But to help the poor manufacturer or to help the working classes is not one of the dicta of the Board of Engineers, and, in the present circumstances, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Now, let us see. In Connecticut we give this Government how much? We pay to the Federal Government a little over $4,000,000 annually. This great committee, in its wisdom, turned into Texas from this bill $3,675,000. The same committee existed last year; and the appropriation of last year used up and exceeded by $200,000 the total receipts from Texas; so that Texas to-day does not contribute a dollar toward the pay of the Army or the pay of the Navy or to the payment of any other administrative expenses of the Government, because the amount of her receipts is all given back to her in river and harbor improvements and $200,000 additional.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit in all fairness, where is your doctrine of fair play in collecting that money from one State and spending it in another?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. DONOVAN. No; the gentleman would not give me a moment of time, and he is committing a crime if he takes away time from me now. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, let it go.

Mr. DONOVAN. This explains the attitude of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who, too, refused to give me any time. He represents a State not exceeding mine in population and wealth. What did they do for his State? The States of Oregon and Washington get in this bill $2,948,000.

Now, Oregon and Washington received last year—just think of it, gentlemen—$7,095,000. What did they pay into the Government Treasury? In the two years covering the life of this committee they paid $10,057,034, and in those two years they received half a hundred thousand dollars more than they paid into the United States Treasury, so that those two States received more for river and harbor appropriations than the total amount of taxes paid in customs duties, internal revenue, and corporation taxes by $50,000. If we all did the same, where would the Nation come out?

Now, I say that to take from the State of Connecticut over $3,500,000 for the benefit of that great State of Texas and for the benefit of the States of Washington and Oregon, Mr. Chairman, is unfair in the extreme. Is it any wonder that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]—and he is not here—should spend all his time in talking about shingles [laughter] and not say a word about rivers and harbors? He ought to have told you that the Washington shingle mills close down in the winter in order to make the poor fellows hungry, so that they will work cheap in the spring. [Laughter.] If he would tell you the truth, he would tell you that the factory owner in Bridgeport, Conn., when the winter comes, draws his check for 10 per cent of the workingmen's wages for the whole year and tosses it to them as a Christmas gift. That manufacturer or his city does not receive one dollar in this bill, but you give half a million to your country in Texas. That manufacturer did not appear before the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for duties that he might sell his wares. He sells his wares on the quality of the goods and sells them all over the world. From his ability to manufacture he employs thousands of people.

For a little arm of Long Island Sound it was asked this board of engineers that the channel be widened, so that it would have a depth of 12 feet for 200 feet in width instead of 100 feet, but it did not get an inch. But what do we do in Texas? Why, we widen it up to 1,200 feet and 30 feet in depth. Why not? It did not cost them anything. Connecticut pays for it.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. What did they do when they gave $170,000 to that society harbor, the harbor of the idle rich, which has already 25 feet of water?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DONOVAN. I had hard work to get 15 minutes' time, and I say that if these legislative sharks try to take part of it away from me they are imposing on me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. I will say to the gentleman that I helped him to get his 15 minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. If there is anybody who is fair it is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], but he is a professional and I am an amateur. He will get time here and he will make me look like the proverbial 30 cents as an orator. [Laughter.]

Now, let me tell you why the shingle talker from Washington kept still. He had his hand in the pork barrel. Just think of it; on a bill carrying a shade less than $40,000,000, how much do you think three of them on the committee got? Just guess. Just guess how much they got.

Mr. CANTOR. Fifteen million dollars?

Mr. ANSBERRY. One-third?

Mr. DONOVAN. They did not go hungry. Our shingle friend from Washington got $2,500,000. Our friend from Washington, our friend from Florida, and our friend from Texas, together, the three of them, garnered $7,004,500.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he has overlooked some of the Washington items.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, our manufacturer of wooden shingles, to whom this country has been paying a tribute of from 50 cents to $1.50 per thousand for years, is bewailing the fact that that is not going to continue, but he continues in this bill all right. For the fiscal year 1911 he garnered $4,600,000; for the fiscal year 1912, $1,800,000; for 1913, $7,095,000. Pretty good for that district.

Now, Texas has done pretty well. Texas and Florida for the fiscal year 1913 got $7,671,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the gentleman why he puts Florida in there?

Mr. DONOVAN. You New York people are not getting $1 for every $100 that you are putting into the Treasury.

Mr. GOULDEN. We know that.

Mr. DONOVAN. In order to be fair, I ought to tell how much little Oregon gets. She does pretty well—$827,000; and, taking all kinds of taxes, she pays $1,500,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am sorry that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] has not seen fit to remain here with us throughout this discussion. Like a good many other gentlemen he has gotten into his mind a number of unrelated, misunderstood, and thoroughly undigested facts, from which he draws the conclusion that the money spent in the improvement of our rivers and harbors is wasted.

Mr. Chairman, if I can have order I want to state some dry, though instructive, facts. I assume that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] is in favor of the construction of the Panama Canal. I assume that the gentleman is in favor of the appropriations we have expended in the improvement of the Great Lakes. It is estimated by Mr. Emory Johnson, the expert who appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and gave his testimony as to the probable amount of tonnage that would go through the Panama Canal—and it was upon his estimate that the tolls were fixed—that there will be 10,500,000 tons, coastwise and everything included, go through the canal the first year. Last year 18,000,000 tons went through the Suez Canal. The tonnage borne on the rivers provided for in this bill was last year 369,000,000 tons. Think of those figures, gentlemen. Ten and one-half million tons to go through the Panama Canal, 18,000,000 tons through the Suez Canal, and the rivers that are provided for in this bill floated 369,000,000 tons last year.

Mr. MURDOCK. What proportion of that is coastwise tonnage?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MURDOCK. What proportion of the amount going through the rivers appropriated for in this bill is coastwise tonnage?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That does not include coastwise tonnage. This is river tonnage. Including the harbors, the coastwise and foreign traffic handled in our harbors, the total tonnage carried by the projects appropriated for in this bill is more than 1,000,000,000 tons.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does that include the tonnage carried on the Lakes?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What would be the river tonnage alone, outside of the Great Lakes?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The river tonnage, not including the rivers connecting the Great Lakes, is 204,000,000 tons. So when gentlemen take this floor, which gives them the country as an audience, and assail the committees of the House and assail Congress for its appropriations they ought at least to devote enough time beforehand to the study of the figures which they have collated to digest them properly. It is impossible to understand figures unless you compare them with other figures which you do understand. So I have stated this river tonnage in comparison with the tonnage which it is estimated will go through the Panama Canl. The total tonnage which it is estimated was carried from coast to coast by the railroads was 3,000,000 tons; that is, carried from points on the coast that would naturally use the canal. The traffic across the country on the railroads, as estimated by Mr. Emory Johnson, was 3,000,000 tons.

Mr. MOORE. That is not the total tonnage, that is the through tonnage.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Through tonnage from coast to coast, 3,000,000 tons. The tonnage estimated to go through the canal from coast to coast is 1,250,000 tons. Now, think of that as compared with the tonnage borne on the rivers for which we provide in this bill, 369,000,000 tons, and you see how indefensible is a general assault.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. When the gentleman speaks of 369,000,000 tons of river tonnage he means registered tonnage.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; actual freight carried.

Mr. MOORE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to what undoubtedly he is aware of but may not have brought out, that there is a tremendous unregistered tonnage, not recorded in any engineer's office or in any customhouse, of which we can obtain no account. That should be added.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to say that the engineers get up these statistics as best they can; they go into the community and get the amount of trade, and so forth, and make the best estimate they can.

Mr. MOORE. But on many tributaries and small rivers the tonnage is unaccounted for, and there is a tremendous volume of it of which there is no register. Therefore no account of it is kept, and it is not in the figures given by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That is the observation of every Member here. Now listen. If we depend on the railroads to carry this freight, see what an equipment it would take. A freight train on an average consists of 30 loaded box cars of 60,000 pounds each, which is a big average. It would require 5,000 locomotives pulling 5,000 loaded trains 24 hours in the day, every day in the year, to move the tonnage floating on our rivers 100 miles. That is assuming that they can move 100 miles in a day, but we have the testimony before our committee by the highest expert traffic authority perhaps in this country, Mr. James J. Hill, who stated that they could not move on an average more than 20 miles a day. But multiply that by 5, and it would require 5,000 locomotives, each bearing 30 loaded box cars of 60,000 pounds capacity each, running every day in the year, 24 hours in the day, to move that tonnage 100 miles.

Now, that being true, how unjustifiable it is for gentlemen to make such assaults as we have heard made here to-day on our rivers and harbors and charge that we are distributing the public funds as a matter of pork.

That is a reflection on all your constituents. It is assuming that the people we represent have not more than half sense. How could you gain favor at home by spending the people's tax-raised money on little insignificant projects, where the money was being wasted? Who above all others would know that it was wasted but the people who live on the banks of the creek and the banks of the river? And yet it is their votes that we are supposed to be purchasing by the gentlemen who denounce this as a pork barrel.

The inland commerce of the United States exceeds in value the aggregate value of the international commerce of all the nations of the world combined. I am glad to see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] has returned to the Chamber. I am sorry he has missed this instructive address; but he is in time, however, to hear this: Gentlemen who go out on the high seas and embark in the enterprise of destroying the commerce of the ocean are called pirates, and they are hung at the yardarm. What shall we say, then, of the distinguished gentlemen who come here on the floor of this House in an effort to destroy the inland commerce of the United States, or at least to seriously injure it?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. All the robbers, if they could, would kill a policeman at every crack. I am sure these Treasury robbers will hang me if they can. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not say that my distinguished friend from Texas is a pirate. I would not say that, not because he is not guilty, but because I love him. [Laughter.] I would rather call him an angel, but a destroying angel, who stands with his sword of flame across the path to beat back progress and the industrial development of his own country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I really took the floor to discuss an entirely different subject than the one to which I have addressed my remarks. I have said this much in reply to the criticism that has been offered, in justification of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Mississippi has made one assertion and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] has made another. I want the gentleman to reconcile them. How does he explain the statement of the gentleman from Texas that the tonnage moved on the Ohio River would cost $23 a ton? The gentleman from Mississippi heard the gentleman from Texas make that statement; now, how does he reconcile it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will have to answer that as the gentleman from Texas answered the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY], who asked him to reconcile the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. ROGERS. It is irreconcilable; it is not the fact, in my opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then what has the poor layman who has not a navigable river in his district to do?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will say this: I have seen one boat come down the Ohio River, pass my town——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just let me say that the gentleman is correct in saying that the gentleman from Texas is mistaken, because the tonnage on the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the mouth is 10,000,000 tons per annum.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. As I was saying, I have seen one boat bearing 58,000 tons in one cargo——

Mr. FREAR. Let me ask the gentleman from Mississippi if it is not the Ohio River that he has in mind instead of this system of locks and dams which was shown to be in existence only 54 days in the year, to which the gentleman from Texas alluded? Are not the figures of the engineer correct as given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I must confess that I did not hear the figures given by the gentleman from Texas. I possibly may have been out of the Hall. I do not know what figures the gentleman refers to. I was going to say that this boat I speak of that passed my town had a cargo of 58,000 tons of coal, which was carried to New Orleans at a cost of $18,000, or about 30 cents a ton. The railroad freight rate from Pittsburgh to New Orleans on coal at that time was $3 a ton, which would have been $180,000 instead of $18,000. It is unreasonable for anyone to think you can carry freight as cheaply on a railroad as you can float it on a navigable stream. The purpose of the canalization of the Ohio River is to make that river navigable all the while. Of course under the situation now these barges come out only when the river is flowing at a high stage. What this improvement will result in I do not know. More than a hundred million tons of freight, however, are created at Pittsburgh every year. There is more tonnage created at Pittsburgh than in any other three places on the face of the earth. Think of Pittsburgh here being compelled to ship all of that freight to the seaboard by railroads without potential competition of the river, when it is possible by the expenditure of a very reasonable sum to secure navigable water from Pittsburgh down to the Gulf. Just look at the map I have here. I think it will convince anyone of the wisdom of the expenditure of that money. There is more tonnage on the Ohio River than it is estimated will be at the Panama Canal, and all of it is American tonnage—more American tonnage on the Ohio River to-day, in fact, than we estimate will go through the Panama Canal, domestic and foreign combined.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, could it not be reasonably expected that if boats were assured of navigation in the Ohio River the year around that tonnage would double in a reasonable length of time?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Personally, I think there is little doubt about that. Then we have now just secured a 9-foot depth from the mouth of the Ohio River out to the ocean. The old through traffic from the upper reaches of the Ohio River down the Mississippi to New Orleans has ceased. The only traffic along the lower Mississippi, south of Cairo, practically all of it now—or, at any rate, from Cincinnati down the Ohio and then down the Mississippi—is local traffic. There is very little through traffic left; but when this canalization is completed, which will be in a few years, the Ohio River, running through the busiest valley in the world, with more tonnage created than in any other equal territory on the face of the earth, it is not assuming too much to believe that that traffic will revive.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The Mississippi River now does not carry through tonnage between St. Louis and New Orleans.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Not between St. Louis and New Orleans, but from Cairo.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Between Cairo and New Orleans it does not carry it now. There is no through freight boat on the Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that at Prophet Island, 140 miles from New Orleans, they take gravel out of the bed of the river to use in concrete work and other business in New Orleans, float it across the river, and load it onto railroad cars, and then carry it to New Orleans?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have heard that statement made; but there must be some special reason for it, if it is true. It is possible they take gravel out of the river at Prophet Island, just as they do at Greenville. I can testify to that. They take gravel out at Greenville with hydraulic pumps, which simply load it directly onto a freight car.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Instead of floating it down the river, it goes down on a railroad car?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; because you would first have to load it onto a barge, and then unload that and put it again onto a car. This way it is taken directly out of the

river and loaded onto a freight car, and then taken to New Orleans, which saves an extra loading. It is not contemplated that we are going to take very much tonnage out of the bottom of the river by hydraulic dredges.

Mr. CALLAWAY. One further question.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Very well.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that the Ohio River now is losing tonnage?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think not.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do not the engineers' reports show that?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; the tendency is not that way. One year it may be a little lower than another, but that is all.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two about the map he has in front of him. What does the map pretend to show?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This is a map of the navigable rivers of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the Missouri River navigable up as far as that shows, to Fort Benton?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; theoretically.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do we appropriate for the Missouri River up that far?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; we are appropriating for the Missouri River up to Sioux City, but I will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] to answer that.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, $150,000 is appropriated for the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City, and $150,000 from Sioux City to Fort Benton.

Mr. MURDOCK. So we do appropriate money clear up to Fort Benton?

Mr. BOOHER. We do, for doing snagging work and some bank-protection work and things of that kind; but the river from Kansas City to the mouth is a separate project, and there is appropriated for that, under a 10 years' contract, $2,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer for a moment to the Mississippi.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not a fact that if the railroads are prohibited from cutthroat competition, reducing their rates below the cost at water-competitive points, the water-borne freight of inland waters will be greatly increased?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Well, I understand that is true in other countries of the world. But now——

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Then is it not almost necessary that railroads should have increased freight rates in order to allow more traffic——

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I have no information about that.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman allow me to remark——

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Not right now.

Mr. PLATT. To make a remark in regard to the coal traffic?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like very much to explain this map about the Mississippi River, and then I will yield to the gentleman. I have only a very few minutes left. The improvement of the Mississippi River as contemplated by this map, which has been in progress for a number of years, is by the construction of levees and work of bank revetment to prevent caving. Now, it is immaterial whether we favor the improvement of the Mississippi River for the purpose of facilitating interstate commerce or for the purpose of preventing overflows of riparian land. I say it is immaterial, for this reason: That the engineers, after a long series of years of full investigation—in fact, after having subjected the Mississippi River to a more critical study than any river in the history of the world has ever been subjected to—have all agreed that, whether we improve the river for the purpose of interstate commerce or whether we improve it for the purpose of protecting its own valley from overflows, we must adopt the same identical method—levees and revetment. It is a very common belief that the construction of levees causes the bed of the river to fill, and it is a very curious fact that so many people have that idea, and equally curious that when a man once gets it into his head it is practically impossible ever to induce him to abandon the belief; but it is not true. The Mississippi River Commission for 30 years have measured the bottom of the Mississippi River and compared the measurements with a fixed datum plane established in 1882. They have taken innumerable soundings. In one stretch of the river along the front of my district, 200 miles in length, they have taken 41,000 soundings in different years to establish the fact whether or not the bed of the river was rising, and they have concluded, as a matter of fact, it has been depressed on an average of something more than a foot. Now, I have drawn this map here without regard to any scale——

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. Does the gentleman mean that the bottom does not fill up if the levee is broken?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I mean to say, when the levee is not broken. Of course, if the levee is broken it will fill.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is at least built up higher than the surrounding country.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is not; it is just the opposite.

Mr. MURDOCK. It looks so when you are on the ground.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Is not the bed of the river higher than the surrounding country?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, no; I do not think that is true of any river in the world.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I refer to where the levees are, at the lower end.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. At the lower end in the neighborhood of New Orleans? At New Orleans the river is 200 feet deep. How can you have the bottom of the river 200 feet deep and yet higher than the adjacent country? Now, listen, there is no reason in the world why it should be true, it is not true of any other river in the world. No river on the face of the earth running through alluvial country which has been leveed has ever filled up its bottom on account of the levees. All the leveed rivers have been subjected to absolute tests and measurements by scientific engineers and the reports agree except as to one river, and that is the Yellow River in China, and the only reason we can not refute the statement in regard to the Yellow River is that it is so far out of the beaten path of the world that nobody knows anything about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, when you confine the water to a given area you then create a channel which cuts to a depth where the current will control itself.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly. Now, I want the gentleman from Kansas to listen. Here is a section of the Mississippi River, with levees on either side. There is the low-water level, which is 40 feet deep, and the average spring rise is 40 feet, coming here to the top of the bank, but does not overflow. Now, in extremely high water it goes 12 feet above that, almost to the top of the levees. Now, I submit to the gentleman if a flood confined between banks were going to fill the bed of the river with silt, this spring rise which comes out of the Missouri River, which is the only tributary to the Mississippi that contributes any silt, would do it. We find, however, that in the course of the ages and cycles it has not filled it up. It is confined between the banks——

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. In a second. Now, why by building levees up 12 feet higher, why would that 12 feet additional cause the bed of the river to silt up when 40 does not?

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi I do not believe the construction of the levees would do it, but it seems to me at places the Mississippi River has built itself up above the surrounding country. That is merely an observation from having traveled down the river.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Now, the gentleman understands that from the low-water level to the top of the banks it is about 40 feet?

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. And then the river averages about 40 feet deep. So that in order for the surrounding country to be lower than the river bed there must be a declivity here of more than 80 feet. Well, now, there is not any such thing existing there.

Mr. MURDOCK. Probably not where the river is 40 or 80 feet deep.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to have the gentleman go on and tell us about the flood relief there.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Now, as to the subject of revetment—to revet the banks and keep them from caving. This [indicating] represents the cross section at a point right in here. Where the water runs around it digs deep on one side

and is shallow on this side. This bend begins to cave there. They take a willow mattress here at the low-water level, and it is floated out three or four hundred feet on the level of the river, and it sinks and conforms to the contour of the bank below low water. Now, that is made of willow trees and never is exposed to the air. The rule is that it is permanent and will last as long as any other human structure will last. That prevents the levees from caving in the river and prevents the banks from caving in and prevents these sand bars.

Another subject that I want to explain is the proposition to cut the bends out of the river. The river is very crooked. This [indicating] is a stretch just above the town in which I live in Mississippi which is one of the most tortuous sections of the river. From this point [indicating] down to the city of Greenville is about 8 miles in a direct line, and yet by river it is about 35 miles. Now, the river falls about 6 inches to the mile, so that in that 35 miles there is a fall of some 17½ feet. Now, if the river is permitted to cut the bend out and straighten it out, you will see exactly what will happen. We would have a fall of 17½ feet through this alluvial land in a distance of 8 miles, which means utter destruction. There is no work of man that could be placed there that could hold that current, and the result would be that it would accelerate the current for 40 or 50 miles above and 40 or 50 miles below, and would wash out any revetment work that could possibly be there, and tumble the levees in, and what would be the final result? It would eat into this bank here and eat in that way, and in the course of years would form another bend just as long as it is now. In other words, it would establish the equilibrium it has established through all the years of time.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman tell the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] how much land passes into the Mississippi River from the Missouri each year from Sioux City, Iowa, to its mouth?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Ten thousand four hundred and ninety acres cave into the Missouri River annually. There is enough land which caves into the Mississippi River every year to fill its banks full for a distance of 30 miles.

Mr. MURDOCK. That soil is not carried out to sea?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Here is the bottom of the river [indicating].

Mr. MURDOCK. What becomes of that soil?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It goes simply to the next bend below. It tumbles in and is carried down and forms these bars here [indicating]. This represents the bottom of the river. It is simply a series of hills. If you wanted to travel down the bottom of the Mississippi River you would travel between two high hills. I have discussed the matter in the report fully. These bars which are formed have run the steamboat traffic off of the river. Then, when the flood comes, it is controlled there by levees and revetments, and the current washes the top of this off [indicating], and it flows down that side, and the flood carries it down 20 miles maybe, and in the course of human events it goes out to sea. Five hundred million tons go into the sea every year, and about that much comes into the river from the Missouri River and its other tributaries.

So the great bars that are formed on the river, as a matter of fact, are formed by the caving in of the banks into the river. Now, if that can be prevented by revetment, we will have a navigable channel from Cairo down to the Gulf. No engineer, civil or military, has estimated less than 14 feet, and we have had the best in the country. Mr. Cooley thinks 20 feet would be right. Some engineers have estimated, among them Maj. Dabney, of my district, who is one of the most distinguished engineers in the country, 25 feet. If we could have a great channel from Cairo to the Gulf, 25 feet deep, that would maintain itself forever, and the work would be as permanent as any work of man can be made.

I am sorry I have not more time, but I suppose you are glad. At a later day I will have more to say on this project in its relation to flood control. However, I thank you very much indeed for the attention you have given me. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, public moneys appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors must be paid from taxes collected directly or indirectly from the producing citizenship of our country. All the moneys paid out for foreign products that come in competition with our own and which products would have been supplied at home is just so much economic waste and becomes a permanent loss to this Nation. Money so expended goes to benefit the people of foreign countries and contributes to the improvement of their rivers and harbors instead of our own.

Mr. Chairman, on February 25 this year the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, in a speech before the Chamber of Commerce of Hamilton, Ohio, is reported as having said:

> The first and foremost influence of the new tariff law has been to add to our food supply. For example, take the last three months of 1912 and the last three months of 1913.
>
> In the former we imported 112,000 cattle; in the latter 341,000. In the former we brought in 253,000 bushels of corn; in the latter 4,450,000 bushels. In the former 13,600 bushels of oats; in the latter 13,230,000 bushels. In the same period of 1912, 41,000 bushels of potatoes; in 1913, 2,800,000 bushels.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss—in fact, I utterly fail—to grasp the angle from which the Secretary, Mr. Redfield, views this increased importation of foodstuffs. I am loath to believe that he was so mistaken in facts as to believe for one minute that there was a short supply in the United States of any of the articles he mentioned or that the increased importations were needed to take care of any shortage. On the contrary, we had a normal supply of all of the articles enumerated and have made exportations from this country during the period mentioned of some of all these commodities.

There can be but one interpretation placed upon the Secretary's remarks at Hamilton, and that is that he felt the country was to be congratulated on this increased food supply as a competitive method to reduce the price being paid to the American farmer for like products. The Democratic Party had promised reduced cost of living to the American people, and Secretary Redfield evidently tried to impress his audience that the increased importations he mentioned were proof positive that their promises were being kept, but alack and alas! Along comes the Department of Labor and very inconsiderately gives statistics that show a general increase in the cost of living in the United States since the passage of the act, the average increase per month for the three months mentioned by Mr. Redfield on 15 of the principal articles of consumption in the United States above that of the corresponding three months in 1912 being 8.1 per cent, a very substantial increase despite the increased supply of foodstuffs on which the Secretary dwelt so enthusiastically. The figures compiled by the Department of Labor go to prove absolutely the contention of gentlemen on this side of the Chamber when the tariff bill was under discussion that an increased importation would have the effect of lowering prices paid to the producer, but would not lower cost to the consumer until his purchasing power was reduced to a minimum, and then prices would be relatively higher to him than before, as the cheapest article is high, indeed, to those who have no money with which to buy.

Mr. Chairman, the purchasing abroad of the commodities enumerated by Mr. Redfield in his Hamilton speech drained from the purchasing power of our own people, conservatively estimated, not less than $15,000,000, gone to enrich the people of other lands, to make prosperous the foreign farmer and poorer the American farmer, to encourage the former and discourage the latter. I think our American farmers will soon appreciate to the full limit the "new freedom" they inherited with this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I wish again to emphasize what I have said before on this floor—woe to the country that tries to make its people prosperous and happy at the expense of its agricultural classes, because on their welfare depends the welfare of all. Reduce the purchasing power of the farmer and you immediately to that extent injure and decrease the purchasing power of every city, town, and village in the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party in its platform at Baltimore had this to say of the high cost of living:

> The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home. The Republican Party in its platform attempts to escape from responsibility for present conditions by denying that they are due to a protective tariff. We take issue with them on this subject and charge that excessive prices result in a large measure from the high-tariff laws enacted and maintained by the Republican Party, and from trusts and commercial conspiracies fostered and encouraged by such laws, and we assert that no substantial relief can be secured for the people without import duties on the necessaries of life are materially reduced and these criminal conspiracies are broken up.

Then, in conformity to your platform, you proceeded to materially reduce them by practically placing everything the farmer produces on the free list. The words "materially reduce" in your platform you construed as meaning total elimination in your bill, and passed your bill under that construction, placing the necessities of life produced by the farmer on the free list.

Your law has been on the statute books for almost six months. Imports of the necessities have largely increased, as you intended they should; prices paid to the American farmer have decreased at wholesale, as you evidently intended they should;

but where is the "saving in every American home" that you promised? The cost of living has steadily increased. Your own Department of Labor admits it by its statistics, thereby substantiating the Republican Party's claims that the high cost of living was not due to the tariff. Mr. Chairman, the American corn raisers, on account of the more than 7,000,000 bushels imported into this country since the enactment of your tariff law—followed by the importations of Argentina corn—have been compelled to take 10 cents a bushel less for their corn. Yet there has been no reduction in the prices of corn products to the American consumer.

Your tariff reductions on farm products have simply been used as a club to knock down the wholesale prices to the farmer, with no corresponding reduction to the consuming public. The same may be truthfully stated of most of the commodities affected by this tariff enactment.

It has led to increased importations, to the closing of American manufacturing establishments, and the curtailing of American production, decreasing the number of employed, and in many cases to a lower wage being paid. Yet the cost of living has steadily advanced or remained stationary. With our purchasing power reduced by exactly the amount of our increased imports, with a fast depleting Treasury, we are to-day paying as high or higher prices for everything we buy as at any time in our country's history. In the Spokesman-Review, a newspaper published in Spokane, which is in my district, there appeared on March 14 the following significant editorial:

UNITED STATES BUYS 95 PER CENT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA SHINGLES.

In this State 15,000 wage earners are dependent on the shingle industry of western Washington. Not many of them will vote the Democratic ticket next November.

Not grasping the economic effect of free trade in shingles, these men went on strike last January. Their employers told them they could not grant their demands; that free shingles from British Columbia had put them up against the hardest sort of competition, and the business simply could not bear the weight of better terms to labor. The employers said they would like to pay better wages and grant a shorter day, but could not go on operating their plants at a loss.

The hard facts have made an impression on the strikers' minds, for they have called off the strike and agreed to return to work on the open-shop conditions laid down by the mill operators immediately following the strike.

If any lingering doubt remained that the mill owners spoke the truth, it would disappear before the terse, uncolored news item in the Nelson (British Columbia) Daily News:

"VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, *March 8*.

"Most of the shingle mills in British Columbia are said to be shipping almost their entire output to the United States. Prominent shingle manufacturers say that 95 per cent of the shingles now made in British Columbia are being shipped across the border to meet demands which have been gradually increasing since the removal of the duty under the new United States tariff revision last autumn. Eighty per cent of the shingle mills in British Columbia are now in operation, and the provincial product is being given preference in all the United States. The spring trade has hardly opened yet, but the demand is looked upon as auguring well for the industry during the coming summer."

The British Columbia manufacturer enjoys now a double advantage in cheaper stumpage and low-priced Hindu, Chinese, and Japanese labor. He will have another advantage if the canal is opened to British coastwise ships on the same terms given to American ships, for the British ships can carry British Columbia shingles to the markets of the United States at lower freight rates than the American ships, required to carry larger crews, pay higher wages, and higher port charges, can quote.

Mr. Chairman, the shingle factories of my State put out more than $18,000,000 worth of shingles in 1913, selling them f. o. b. manufacturing points at an average price of $1.81 per thousand, a price, I submit, that should not impress anybody as being excessive and that gave only a fair return above the cost of production. The shingle industry was formerly protected at the rate of 50 cents per thousand, and even then Canada shipped quite a number of shingles into this country. Under the present law shingles are free, and prominent shingle manufacturers of British Columbia say that 95 per cent of their output is being shipped across the border into the United States. Like on all other tariff-reduced articles the British Columbia shipper and his consignee in this country will divide the profits, and the consumer will pay the same old prices. With this difference there will be several millions of dollars that formerly were put into circulation in my State to pay labor, help build our schoolhouses and roads, and contribute to our general welfare, including our rivers and harbors improvements, will go to a foreign country that contributes not 1 cent to our institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I think it can be truthfully said of all commodities affected by this tariff law that the general public has as yet received no benefits in lower prices nor will they, as I said before, until their purchasing power has been reduced to the lowest ebb, and their benefit will only be the aftermath of what has been a curse to them, brought on through tariff tinkering followed by lack of confidence, shrinkage of values, and nation-wide depression, a disease fittingly described by the words "too much paralysis Democraticus." [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman consume?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington use some of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield some time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I will yield 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY]. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] yields five minutes in addition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington yields to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] 5 minutes and the gentleman from Florida yields him 10 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will give the gentleman five minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is needless for me to say as one of the men whose privilege it was to make up this bill that I, of course, shall vote for it to final passage.

I have been referred to, Mr. Chairman, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] as one of the interested parties who make up the jury that has compiled this report for submission to the House of Representatives. I am glad to say that I am one of the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but the extent of my interest, I hope, will not be measured by the extent of the appropriations recommended in this bill for that section of the country from which I come. Surely, Mr. Chairman, I should be ashamed of myself if my interest in this bill were determined by the extent of the appropriations recommended in it for the New England States.

I supposed it was my duty as the only Democratic member on the committee from New England to give attention to the claims of my colleagues from New England for appropriations for rivers and harbors in that section. But let me assert, Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of my remarks that no member of that committee, from the chairman down to the newest member of it, has shown any consideration of sectionalism during any meeting of the committee which I was permitted to attend.

Mr. Chairman, let me assert the further fact that in the consideration of this measure there was no difference of party and there was no difference of members from different sections of the country, but Republicans and Democrats alike were invited to come to every meeting, both open and executive, of the committee. This bill does not come in to-day as the result of any collusion on the part of a few men on the committee nor on the part of a few men who represent a particular section or a particular party, but it comes in here as the result of the intelligence, the application, and the wisdom of 21 men who were designated by this House of Representatives to attend to the business of making up a river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, these are familiar truths to the men who compose this committee and to the men who compose the House of Representatives; but in view of a speech that was made, I regret to say, by a colleague of mine from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] on the 10th day of February in this Chamber, it is pertinent to set these things forth with clear and unmistakable emphasis. My colleague of Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] said in a speech that he delivered in this House under date of February 10, 1914, that two Southern States, Texas and Florida, were getting an inordinate share of the appropriation for river and harbor work. I paid but little attention to the speech at the time it was made, because it was largely a compilation of figures that are familiar to most of us who served in the Sixty-second Congress. But since I have seen that speech under a cleverly set forth caption, published in great numbers, with the legend upon it, "The South is in the Saddle," it has occurred to me that it was made not for the purpose of presenting facts that we all know but rather for the purpose of circularizing in the close districts in Massachusetts and other parts of the country during the coming congressional campaign.

Mr. Chairman, it is not true that the South is in the saddle in any wrongful sense, either in this Congress or in the executive departments of this Government. The South is in the saddle, perhaps, in the Navy Department of the Government, because there is, I am happy to say, a splendid southern gentleman who presides as Secretary of the Navy. There was a clear-cut issue presented a short time ago as to whether a southern shipbuilding company or a northern navy yard should be given a contract for a great amount of work. There was a clear-cut issue over the building of a supply ship by the navy yard under a contract involving an expenditure of probably a million

and a half dollars of the money of the people of the United States. The navy yard in the district which I have the honor to represent was a competitor for that work. A southern shipbuilding company, at Newport News, Va., was also a competitor for that work.

The State of Virginia is ably represented at the other end of this Capitol by two Senators of great weight and long experience. The State of Virginia is represented in the House, as you all know, by many men of great ability, long experience, and great worth, and of the same political party as the gentleman who is Secretary of the Navy.. We of Massachusetts have no Democratic Senators. We of Massachusetts have no delegation of Representatives in Congress who have served long terms here, who could go unitedly to that Secretary of the Navy with our appeal for that work for the Boston Navy Yard. But, Mr. Chairman, the South was in the saddle, and with characteristic Southern fairness and with characteristic Southern decency, the Secretary of the Navy took action whereby the navy yard at Boston will build that supply ship for the Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

Let me remind my colleague [Mr. ROGERS] that for several years we had a Massachusetts man as Secretary of the Navy. No one likes him personally more than I do. No one has greater respect for his gentlemanly qualities than I have; but, Mr. Chairman, our appeal to equip the Boston Navy Yard for shipbuilding purposes fell upon deaf ears when we addressed that appeal to the Republican Secretary of the Navy, a Massachusetts citizen, George von Lengerke Meyer. It remained for a Democratic Secretary of the Navy, and it remained for a Democratic Committee on Naval Affairs, to frame an item in the naval appropriation bill that is pending to equip the Boston Navy Yard for shipbuilding purposes.

So much, then, for that department. I might go on if I had the time and cite other instances where thoroughly Southern-controlled executive departments have not practiced discrimination against us of the North.

Now, is it true that we have been unfairly treated in the matter of appropriations for river and harbor work?

Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. ROGERS] took the appropriations of the Sixty-second Congress. I think it was terribly unfair to take the appropriations of any single Congress, whether the Sixty-second, the Fifty-second, or the Forty-second, or any other single Congress, for the purpose of making any criticism of the sort that he made. I cite his attention to Senate Document 382 of the Sixty-second Congress, second session, which is a comprehensive report of expenditures on rivers and harbors, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting information in response to a Senate resolution of December 7, 1911, relative to expenditures for rivers and harbors. Mr. Chairman, that document was compiled, not by a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, but by Mr. Franklin MacVeagh, the honorable gentleman who was the Secretary of the Treasury under the administration of former President Taft. That compilation shows that three States received more money than Massachusetts from the Federal Government. Michigan leads the list with $43,494,495.87, New York is second with $41,925,351.80, Texas is third with $24,382,529.60, and Massachusetts is next with $17,284,638.53. It is interesting to note that Ohio is close behind Massachusetts. And from this compilation it is clear that the millions have gone from the Federal Treasury for river and harbor improvement not to Texas and Florida but to Michigan and New York in the first instance and to Texas after these. And even Georgia and Wisconsin come before Florida in the list.

Mr. Chairman, it was pointed out to-day by a gentleman who criticizes this bill that Texas is a State great in extent and of very great area. I have been told by Members from Texas who are serving in this Congress that single congressional districts in that State have almost as much acreage in them as the entire area of the Commonwealth which I, in part, represent. We are a small State, so far as area goes, and while we prize our rivers and harbors and think our claims are worthy of the consideration of the National Government, our streams are not so numerous nor so great in the extent over which they flow as the rivers and harbors of the great State of Texas. I have been in Florida twice—first in 1898, when I was in the Army of the United States, and again in 1911–12, when I was privileged to go with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to be present at the dedication of the over-sea railroad down to Key West. There were rivers and harbors on every side. In fact, it was frequently pointed out that one trouble with the great State of Florida is that much of its land is under water. And so it goes. When any comparison is made as to appropriations for these States it seems to me to be fair and just and right to include in the estimate something of the character of the States in question, and something of the extent of the rivers, harbors, and tidal waters that may require appropriations of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I have said these things, not because they seem to me to be especially important in the consideration of this bill, but in order that there may be some answer made in the place where the charge was made, which answer can be refuted if it is not sound, if it is not based on the facts in the case.

I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that there is no appropriation in this bill for the improvement of Boston Harbor to the depth of 40 feet. There are those, on the one hand, who say that this bill is made up by a committee of interested parties. What will those persons who make that charge say when I point to the fact that the State of Massachusetts is represented on this Rivers and Harbors Committee not by one man of one party but is represented by two members. Out of the 21 members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors who made up this bill 2 are from the State of Massachusetts, because my worthy colleague [Mr. TREADWAY] and myself have each had an equal share with any other member in the make-up of this report. If it were a matter of favor, if it were a matter of influence, if it were a matter of distribution of "pork," as is frequently charged, do you suppose that we should have failed to receive a large share for the meritorious proposition of deepening Boston Harbor? Certainly we could have done so, and in doing so we should not have obtained appropriations for any wrongful purpose, because, measured by every test, the harbor of Boston may well be improved. Men say that some places are improved that have no commerce. Certainly no such statement can be made as to Boston Harbor, because the value of the commerce of Boston of foreign imports and exports is fixed at $216,310,889.

The men who have preceded us in this Congress knew it was wise to make appropriations for the development of the port of Boston, and they passed more than one measure for its improvement.

More than 20 years ago they put through the project of 1892 for a 27-foot channel; in the year after the Spanish War they fixed the project of 1899 for a 30-foot channel; and in a few years after that time they established the project of 1902 for a 35-foot channel.

The total of Federal appropriations for Boston Harbor up to June 30, 1913, was $12,187,947, more for a single harbor than half the total for all Texas.

Let me say a word right here in appreciation of the work of a Massachusetts man, who is not now a Member of this House, but who served for many years on the Rivers and Harbors Committee and surely did not neglect the interests and the welfare of his native State. I refer to my former colleague, Hon. George P. Lawrence. [Applause.]

Mr. Lawrence lived not in Boston, but he led the progressive movement to develop Boston Harbor, and I am most anxious to carry on the splendid work he did during his service in this House.

I had been hopeful right up to the minute when this bill was reported that we might include in it an item for a 40-foot channel in Boston Harbor.

Everybody will concede that the amount of commerce flowing into Boston Harbor certainly would justify any generous appropriation that could be made at this time; yet we have no such appropriation, and the only item in this bill with respect to Boston Harbor is an item of $200,000 for maintenance, not for any new improvements, but simply for maintenance of the 35-foot channel which was authorized long ago.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why we have not any large appropriation in this bill for Boston Harbor is clear to any man who is familiar with the methods by which this committee does its work. Men seem to think that all one needs to do to get a large appropriation for his home district is to have membership on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and to have friendship and fellowship with his colleagues on that committee. Mr. Chairman, it is not so.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Let me develop this thought for a moment. When the survey is authorized the district engineer officer in the district where the river or harbor may be located is charged with the duty and responsibility of making a report upon the proposition. After that report of his investigation is made by him it is reviewed by a division engineer officer who is usually of higher rank than the district officer and whose responsibility extends not only over a single district but over such districts as may be included in the division whose engineer officer he is. And after the division engineer has passed upon the report of his district officer he sends it forward with an indorsement, giving his opinion as an expert on the propo-

sition that may be in contemplation. That report goes forward to the Chief Engineer, and, under the law, must be referred to the Board of Engineers for River and Harbor Improvements. Now, that Board of Engineers for River and Harbor Improvements is a board that sits here in Washington, no member of which is less in grade than a lieutenant colonel of Engineers, and a board presided over by a colonel of Engineers of the United States Army; and when that Board of Engineers has passed upon the thing it is reviewed by the Chief of Engineers, and then it is submitted to Congress through the proper military channels and finds its way to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House or to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes; but I will first yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman does not undertake to say that the engineers are responsible for the appropriations in this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. In the first instance, I say I do not know how you could get any appropriation through the committee except with a favorable report from the Engineer officers, and the members of this committee will bear me out. You can not walk in and get the money; you must have a favorable report from the engineers, whom I have outlined to you, in order to have a standing before the committee, because it is a fixed rule of the committee that no consideration will be given to appeals for appropriations unless there is first a favorable report from the United States engineers.

Mr. GORDON. But you have to vote for the other fellow's appropriation, so that he will vote for yours.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Oh, no; that is all wrong; and if the gentleman analyzes it a minute he will see that it is. Of what committee is the gentleman a member?

Mr. GORDON. The Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Well, you are appropriating twice as much money as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GORDON. But not as much as they did last year.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Neither are we. I am not entirely certain of that; but how are you spending your hundred million dollars? You are appropriating it on reports of men charged with the responsibility under the law to make estimates and reports. It is the custom of your committee, which has the force of law, and to all intents and purposes has the binding of law. I suppose some men might say that you and your colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee are terribly extravagant because you spend a lot of money on Cavalry regiments. I remember that we had a fight here to reduce the number of Cavalry regiments on the theory and with the idea that Cavalry regiments were no longer useful in time of war and that they had gone by. The arguments were made that any expenditure of money on a Cavalry regiment was a useless appropriation. Now, how did the appropriation for Cavalry regiments and other things get in? On the word of an individual Congressman? Not at all. On the word of men supposed to be, and who in fact were, experts on the given proposition that was under contemplation by your committee, namely, the men of the General Staff of the Army, whose sworn duty it was to present estimates, and your committee and Congress considered it solely upon those representations and estimates. In the same way the Engineer officers are called upon, not only by the law but by the custom of the committee, to give their estimates and report upon different projects.

I asked the Chief of Engineers to give me a statement in regard to the Boston Harbor appropriation. I have received a statement saying:

> With regard to the survey of Boston Harbor authorized by the act of July 25, 1912, I have to inform you that the district officer submitted a partial report on the survey under date of February 12, 1914, which, in accordance with law, was referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Under date of the 11th instant the board returned this report with a statement to the effect that it did not consider it advisable to submit a partial report on the broad subject of the improvement of the entrance to Boston Harbor, as the improvement determined upon at any part of the harbor must necessarily have a bearing upon that which may be needed in another. You will understand that the survey referred to calls for an investigation, not only of the broad sound channel but also with a view to providing deep-water connection, with such suitable terminals as may be established by the directors of the port of Boston. The question of the depth in broad sound channel bears such an intimate relation to the facilities to be provided in the inner harbor that I consider the board was fully justified in not acting upon the partial report.
>
> It will hardly be possible to complete the survey of the inner harbor and give to this subject the consideration which a project of this character must have in time for submission of the report to Congress with a view to the inclusion of the new project in the pending river and harbor bill.

That is signed by Dan C. Kingman, Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

Mr. Chairman, let me say one word in regard to this appropriation and in regard to the desire and the hope of the people of Massachusetts that a 40-foot channel may be speedily established in Boston Harbor. The surest indication that the people of the State are interested is the fact that the officers of the State, acting for the people, have already made large appropriations for the development of Boston Harbor.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from 1870 to December 1, 1913—the end of the fiscal year—has actually expended in Boston main harbor $7,929,876.44, not including $336,313.44 spent by the State in improving small harbors and secondary channels within the limits of the port of Boston.

On December 1, 1913, there were balances of appropriations available for immediate expenditure of $7,285,098.99, all of which is in actual process of expenditure under projects which are all expected to be complete in three years.

The total amount expended by the State plus the amount available for immediate expenditure is $15,214,975.43. Recent improvements include the following:

Commonwealth Pier 5: The largest and best-equipped terminal that exists for large passenger and freight steamships; 1,200 feet long, 400 feet wide, costing, with appurtenances, over $3,000,000; the approaches and docks are dredged by the State to 40 feet; half of this terminal has been in operation since May, 1913; to be fully completed this summer.

Commonwealth Pier 6 (the fish pier): Representing an investment of $3,000,000, of which $1,000,000 is furnished by the State, supplemented by private investment of $2,000,000; 1,200 feet long by 300 feet wide; without an equal in the world.

The largest dry dock yet projected; 1,200 feet long; designed under the supervision of a Navy engineer detailed by the Navy Department; to cost over $3,000,000. The work of preparing the site begun in September last and is well under way. It is designed to take the largest warships or merchant vessels built or likely to be built for many years to come.

Another large pier has been started; to be 900 feet long, with 40 feet of water in the docks and approaches.

Two and one-half million feet of flats have recently been acquired to supplement some 25,000,000 feet already owned by the State; to be reclaimed as required for future terminal development.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these things in order that it may be seen that the people of Massachusetts and Boston are active and alert in the matter of taking advantage of the harbor we have at the port of Boston, and I hope to point during the course of the debate on this bill to some of the results of appropriation and authorization that have been made by the Federal and the State Governments; some of the plans we have for the development of our port. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 25 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say this, that what I wish to put in the RECORD is a list of Democrats who are Members of the present House who voted for the present Panama Canal act. I asked unanimous consent twice for permission to do this, and on each occasion some of my Democratic friends objected to this being done. But I shall not only put in the RECORD the names of the Democrats of the House who voted for the present law, but I shall supplement that by putting in the RECORD the names of the Democratic Senators who so voted. The question in regard to the Panama Canal tolls in the Senate came up on an amendment offered by Senator BURTON on August 7, 1912. That amendment was to strike from the bill the provision for free tolls that the President now asks to have stricken out. Upon a roll call not a single Democratic Senator voted for that amendment. Every Democrat who voted, voted against it, and I will put a list of those who voted against the Burton amendment in the RECORD and a list of those who are recorded as not voting at all. I think this becomes very interesting at this time. I believe that the country wishes to know the list of Democrats who have been requested by the President of the United States to repudiate the Democratic platform declarations and to surrender their judgment, their conscience, their patriotism, and their intellectual integrity into his care and keeping.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I understand the gentleman desires to introduce that as a part of his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CANTOR. I reserve the right to object, in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is too late to object now.

Mr. CANTOR. I do not think so. The gentleman asked an opportunity to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and I now object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. The Chair put the request, and there was no objection.

Mr. CANTOR. But I object to his incorporating that in his statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But it is too late, because I would have read it in any way. I well understand why some gentlemen on that side do not desire this to be done.

Mr. CANTOR. I do not understand why he does not print the Republican list as well, and, further than that, may I ask the gentleman this question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange performance by that side of the House in objecting to the publication of this list. I wonder if anyone can tell why? I never knew a man who did a thing of which he was proud that he especially wished to conceal it. I never knew a man who did a thing of which he was ashamed that he desired it given wide publicity. Why do the Democrats want to keep from the public their record on this question? Are they ashamed of what they have done or ashamed of what they expect to do?

The names of the Democrats who are Members of the present House who voted for the present law permitting American ships engaged in the coastwise trade to pass through the Panama Canal without the payment of tolls, and the names of those who were paired in favor of it, and also the attitude of the three members of the President's Cabinet upon the proposition is shown by the following list:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Fitzgerald | Linthicum | Stone |
| Borland | Garner | Lloyd | Taggart |
| Broussard | George | Lobeck | Talbott, Md. |
| Burnett | Goldfogle | McGillicuddy | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Clayton | Gregg | Maher | Taylor, Ala. |
| Connell | Hamill | Murray | Taylor, Colo. |
| Conry | Hammond | Neeley, Kans. | Tribble |
| Covington | Harrison | Padgett | Tuttle |
| Difenderfer | Hayden | Patten, N. Y. | Underhill |
| Donohoe | Heflin | Peters | Underwood |
| Doremus | Hobson | Raker | Watkins |
| Dupré | Kinkead, N. J. | Rothermel | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Estopinal | Lee, Pa | Small | |
| Fergusson | Lewis, Md. | Smith, N. Y. | |

Paired for the present law:

Mr. Saunders.
Mr. Scully.

Cabinet members, attitude on the present law:

Mr. Burleson (against).
Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (for).
Mr. Redfield (paired for).

This is the attitude of the present Democratic Members of the House and the members of the Cabinet who were then Members of the House. On roll call 54 Members of the present House and two members of the present Cabinet voted for the present law.

What of the record of the Democratic Senators who are now asked to support the President in the repeal of the present law. The last record vote on the tolls question in the Senate was on August 7, 1912. Senator BURTON offered an amendment to the canal bill, which was then pending, to strike out the free-toll provision, exactly what the President now proposes to do. Upon roll call not a single Democrat voted to eliminate this proposition that gave American ships in the coastwise trade the right to pass through the canal without the payment of tolls. The Democrats who voted against the Burton amendment and against the present proposition of the President are:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Martin, Va. | Shively | Swanson |
| Bryan | Martine, N. J. | Simmons | Thornton |
| Chamberlain | Newlands | Smith, Ariz. | Williams |
| Fletcher | Overman | Smith, Ga. | |
| Johnson | Pomerene | Smith, S. C. | |
| Kern | Reed | Stone | |

The following Democrats are recorded as not voting:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bankhead | Culberson | Lea, Tenn. | Tillman |
| Chilton | Gore | Myers | |
| Clarke, Ark. | Hitchcock | Owen | |

The Burton amendment was overwhelmingly beaten, not a single Democrat recording his vote in favor of it.

It might be well to call attention to the members of the present Cabinet who were then Members of Congress.

Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, voted for the present law. Mr. Burleson, Postmaster General, voted against it. Mr. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce, was paired in favor of the present law.

The list of names of the men who voted for the present law is a list of the men of highest courage and intelligence and patriotism. This list is a roll of honor. It contains the names of those who placed their country's interests first, above prejudice and above party. It is my pleasure to know most of these men well. I have served in Congress with them all. I do not believe that many of these men will vote according to Executive order. The country will be surprised and humiliated if many of these distinguished Members of this body now change their votes on this great question. The fact should be emphasized that not a single Democratic Senator on roll call voted to sustain the exact position now urged by the President. Can it be possible that Senators and Representatives change their opinions on great public questions completely within a few days owing to a mere statement from the White House that their former position was a mistaken economic policy and that some unmentioned situation of "nearer consequence" demands that it be done.

With whatever arguments the gentlemen who change their views may use as a solace and comfort to themselves, the plain fact is that the people of the country will believe that every man who changes his vote now was either influenced by the hope of patronage or by political fear if he opposed the President.

The people will never believe that Members of Congress change their political convictions on great public questions in a few days from patriotic motives alone. The people of the country are intensely interested in the way that the men named in these lists will now vote. The people will look upon that vote as a fair measure of the courage and patriotism of this body. The people will believe that their votes will largely measure the power of patronage; that their votes will largely measure the triumph of partisanship over patriotism. The people of this country will never believe that the men who voted in favor of the present law will repudiate their political platform and follow the President entirely from conscientious convictions.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] a moment ago, in stating the precautions which were exercised with reference to items in the river and harbor bill, stated that first there was the district officer reporting, then the division officer reporting, and then the Army Board of Engineers reporting. I am under the impression that there is still a fourth step, namely, that the Chief of Engineers has to again report, and that under the law, even where Congress directs a survey to be made of a project, that does not mean that the survey will be made. Preliminary to the survey there must be an investigation and report as to the probable value of the survey and the commerce. Every precaution, as it seems to me, which human ingenuity in a legislative sense can devise has been used to prevent the river and harbor bill being made a pork-barrel bill, so long as it is made up in the present manner. Yet the city of Chicago, which has a commerce second only to that of New York City, and which has great need of river and harbor improvements, was left off the map when this bill was made up. I do not criticize the committee in regard to that. It was not the fault of the committee and not the fault of the member from Chicago on the committee, Mr. GALLAGHER, a Member of great ability and high standing in the House. We ordered a comprehensive survey of the Chicago lake front made a few years ago. In the course of time the district engineer made an elaborate report, which was only recently available, because it was delayed on account of the maps. The subject was too exhaustive for the division engineer, and so it was easier to turn it down than to pass it. It was too complicated for the Board of Engineers, and so it was easier to say they thought that was not the thing instead of determining what was the thing. It was too complicated for anyone else connected with the engineers, and I do not know whether we are any further along now after having directed the engineers to make the survey, after having the survey and the report made by the district engineer, than we were before we began, but I suppose the committee could not do otherwise than leave us to stew in our own juice until we find out what we are going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel called upon to defend the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, especially in view of the fact that Chicago has nothing in this bill. The biennial river and harbor appropriation bills a few years ago were considered very large if they got up to thirty or forty millions of dollars, even when they carried items for the city of Chicago. Now they are considered very small when they carry an amount of over

$40,000,000 a year in the House, which will mean $50,000,000 or more in the law, without Chicago items in it. So I do not feel under any obligation to defend the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and yet it is inevitable that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will be made up in the main of gentlemen who desire improvements for their districts. Where would you select the committee from? I helped to make up the committee in this Congress and in the last Congress. Does anyone suppose that you can get to serve on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors Members from South Dakota, from Wyoming, from Montana, from Utah, from Colorado, and several other States which are not interested in the subject of river and harbor improvements within their own boundaries? Manifestly gentlemen do not undertake such work. So what is the natural result? The distinguished chairman of this committee comes from the State where you can put some kind of a river and harbor improvement in almost every square mile. That may be a slight exaggeration, and yet not very much. The ranking member on the Democratic side comes from a State which is so immense that you could spend all of the money in the Treasury making improvements in rivers and harbors and then have some unimproved left over. And the ranking Republican comes from a State—which in this case means he represents the coast, so far as the minority is concerned—on the Pacific coast with a great commerce and great commercial possibilities and with great need for improvement. So that we are spending now, through the aid of those gentlemen, very large sums of money annually. And what for? What good does it do? Everybody knows that the amount of freight carried by water in itself does not justify the river and harbor improvements of the United States. But what is the best reason for improving the rivers and harbors?

The best regulator of freight rates that can be found within or without the law is competition. [Applause.] And the best competition is water competition. The New York Central Railroad parallels the water competition between Buffalo and New York. It carries the most freight. It will always carry the most freight, in my judgment, but it has benefited itself by the enormous amount of business it does because it has been compelled to build up the commerce along its line by the cheap rates caused by the Erie Canal. It made the city of New York, which otherwise now would be second in size and importance to Boston or Philadelphia. This kind of competition has made many places in the country. It has made the West, because of the water competition of the Great Lakes and the Erie Canal carrying freight from Chicago and other lake points to New York and the East, compelling reasonable, fair railroad rates, and without this water competition we never would have had rates nor the development. And yet what are we confronted with now? A proposition that the Government of the United States, having spent $400,000,000 in the construction of a canal, the only economical value of which is in the main regulation of railroad rates across the continent, we are confronted with the proposition that it is economically wrong for us to allow water competition to compete with railroad rates. Those gentlemen who voted for tolls on the Panama Canal put themselves on record as against deep-water competition to regulate railroad rates, and they ought to vote against the river and harbor bill. No conscientious Member of this House ought to vote for the river and harbor bill and against free tolls on the Panama Canal. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. There has been a good deal said about the freight rates on the Panama Canal and the transcontinental railroad lines. Now, the gentleman knows I voted against free tolls on the Panama Canal, and I would like to have my colleague or some one submit some facts on the question of transcontinental rates to show whether or not there is any competition.

Mr. MANN. If my colleague had been in the House with his present attitude of mind, I take it he would have voted against the construction of the Panama Canal at all. First, the construction of the Panama Canal and the opening of it will itself largely reduce the railroad rates or control the transcontinental railroad rates in the United States, and without that being true we ought to fill it up instead of opening it up, and if it be true it is a disgrace. A dollar and a half or a dollar and a quarter a ton makes that much more in the regulation of railroad rates.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. MANN. For a brief question. There is another matter I desire to submit.

Mr. HARDY. I know the gentleman does not intentionally mean anything discourteous, but I think the gentleman is wrong in saying no conscientious Member will vote for this bill.

Mr. MANN. I did not say that. My language is better chosen. I said no conscientious Member "ought" to.

Mr. HARDY. I thought the gentleman said "will."

Mr. MANN. Well, I did not. The gentleman ought to be listening more carefully.

Mr. HARDY. I believe the reporter's notes will show I am right.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the reporter's report will show, but I do not wish to stop and bandy words about it.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think the gentleman intended to say it

Mr. MANN. I did not say it, and there is no need of consuming any more time.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman should not be so contradictory. I thought the gentleman did.

Mr. MANN. Well, I have said that I did not say it, and I think the gentleman ought to be willing to take my word for it.

Mr. HARDY. I do not take the gentleman's word.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is very discourteous to myself, although I have exercised great courtesy toward him.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say——

Mr. MANN. I do not want the gentleman to take up any more of my time. Having expressed himself so very discourteously to me, I do not intend that he shall take up any more of my time.

Mr. HARDY. I just simply wanted to express regret if I have been discourteous.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether the gentleman expresses regret or not.

Mr. HARDY. Well, I do not care either. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy it was not an uncommon thing for boys to say—and I suppose that is still true—that some one thing reminded one of another because it was so different.

Now, I am reminded by recent events in connection with Mexico of an event that took place 10 years ago, about, because it was "so different." I think it may not be a misuse of time to call the attention of the House to a little situation which in its development excited the patriotic pride, I believe, of every American.

On May 19, 1904, the United States consul general at Tangier, Africa, Mr. Gummere, reported to the State Department that on the night of the 18th of May, about 8.30 o'clock, a band of natives, headed by a bandit named Raisuli, who kidnaped Mr. Walter Harris the year previous, broke into the country house of Mr. Perdicaris, a prominent American citizen, and carried away Mr. Perdicaris and his stepson, Mr. Varley, a British subject. On the same day the State Department, through Mr. Loomis—and I quote from the official record as published—informed Mr. Gummere that a war vessel had been ordered to Tangier, but that it might not arrive there for three or four days.

On May 25 Mr. Gummere reports that the negotiations for the release of the captives were most unsatisfactory and the situation at Tangier not reassuring. The arrival of the warship, from which he has so far received no intelligence, is anxiously awaited. On May 29 Mr. Gummere reports that the lives of the captives have been threatened unless Raisuli's terms are granted, and adds that every hour's delay may be serious. On May 30 Mr. Gummere reports the arrival of the American man-of-war *Brooklyn*, and that there have been no further developments. On June 1 Mr. Gummere reports the arrival of Admiral Jewell with the Mediterranean Squadron. On June 9 Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, informs Mr. Gummere that while the President desires everything possible to be done to secure the release of Mr. Perdicaris the United States is not to be put into the position of guaranteeing any concessions made by the Sultan to the bandits. It should be clearly understood that if Mr. Perdicaris should be murdered, the life of the murderer will be demanded, and in no case will the United States be a party to any promise of immunity for his crime. Anything which may be regarded as an encouragement to brigandage or blackmail should be avoided in the negotiations.

On June 21 Mr. Gummere reports that the release of the captives is being delayed and that his position is becoming humiliating. He urges that, in the event of the failure of the effort reported yesterday for an exchange of captives, he may be empowered to present an ultimatum immediately claiming a large indemnity for each day's further delay and threatening to land marines and seize the customs. Such action appears to be necessary to secure the release of the captives and prevent further delay.

On the next day, June 22, Mr. Hay states to Mr. Gummere that this Government "wants Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." [Applause.] Further than this, the least possible complications

with Morocco or other powers is desired. On the next day Mr. Perdicaris returned home. [Applause.]

"This Government wants Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." If we had Andrew Jackson in the White House, that is what he would have said. We did have Theodore Roosevelt in the White House, and that is what he said. [Applause on the Republican side.] Would to God we had either one of them in the White House dealing with the present Mexican situation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has one minute remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WEAVER].

[Mr. WEAVER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire in closing to say only a very few words. After the very courteous remarks made by my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I dislike to contradict, or to seemingly contradict, any statement he may have made. But there is one I can not let go unchallenged, and that is the statement that the improvement of rivers and harbors in this country is not justified by the amount of freight carried on them. I do not know, of course, how much freight would be required as a justification for the expenditures we have made, but as I said the other day, according to the engineer's reports, the tonnage of our water-borne commerce of last year, 1913, was more than a billion tons. If that is not a justification of the money we are expending, for even the forty or fifty millions of dollars we are appropriating every year, I do not know what you would consider a justification.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this tonnage is more than one-half of the entire amount carried by the railroads of the country, and when we consider that the railroads have cost billions, where the rivers and harbors of this country have cost millions, I believe anyone will agree with me that we are abundantly justified in the expenditures we are making for waterway improvement.

Now, a word or two with reference to the remarks made by my friend from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN]. He seemed to proceed upon the theory that the money for river and harbor work is expended in accordance with State lines, or for the several States as such. Nothing is further from the truth. Money is not expended nor appropriations made for the improvement of our rivers and harbors on the theory that a single State is to be benefited, nor are the taxes collected for the support of the Government paid on that theory. Federal taxes are levied for the benefit of all the people. That money is collected at a single port or in a given State makes it none the less the money of the whole people, and when we expend it we presumably use it for the whole country. Why, sir, in river and harbor work we justify the expenditure on the constitutional provision which gives Congress power to deal with interstate and foreign commerce. The expenditure is not made in the interest of any State.

Another remark—or perhaps I should say an insinuation—was a very unfair one, and yet I am responsible to the extent of one vote, at least, on the Rivers and Harbors Committee for the action of the committee. He undertook to link my State up with the State of Texas, and the reason was very obvious. Of the appropriations made in the bill, more will be expended in the State of Texas than in the State of Florida. There are few States, Mr. Chairman, if State lines are to be considered, that have received less in this river and harbor bill than the State of Florida. The district that I represent gets $75,200 for the river and harbors wholly within the district.

In addition to those there is a river, the Oklawaha, partly in my district and partly in the district represented by my colleague [Mr. CLARK of Florida], which receives $175,000. Half of it is properly chargeable to the district which I have the honor to represent here, making the amount altogether only $162,700 for the entire district. The entire State of Florida has in the bill only about $800,000, of which the St. Johns River and the western part of the State receive the bulk. In other words, by far the greater part goes to the districts represented by other gentlemen than myself.

I desire to call attention to only one other matter, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] referred, among other things, to the Ohio River, and commented on the small amount of freight, as he intended to express it, I suppose, accommodated by that stream. Why, Mr. Chairman, there are 10,000,000 tons of commerce floated up and down that river every year; and it is expected when this great work is completed and a 9-foot stage is furnished the year round that the amount will grow to much greater proportions. I have no doubt of this. And when we consider that a 9-foot stage will be given every day in the year from Pittsburgh to New Orleans, I consider the expenditure is abundantly justifiable, even though it reach the sum of $63,000,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the committee, I frankly rise to hark back to a proceeding that occurred just before the delivery of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] was on the floor and asked, in accordance with the usual formula, permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD. The Chair, by the ordinary process, discovered that the House did not object to his extending his remarks in the RECORD, and then the gentleman from Washington proceeded to make a statement, violating several of the rules, mentioning, for instance, occurrences in the Senate, which the rules direct him not to mention; but the Chair, in his discretion and good nature, did not call the gentleman from Washington to order on that. Then the gentleman from Washington declared, after having received unanimous consent to extend his remarks, that he was going to print certain portions of a vote, and thereupon my colleague from New York [Mr. CANTOR] arose and objected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, frankly, I turn this into a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Washington, having secured unanimous consent to insert something in the RECORD through the usual formula, to which no one pays attention, then proceeds to state his intention of turning into the RECORD certain garbled or unfinished or partial reports of a vote. Why was not the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] entitled to object to this unexpected development of the request of the gentleman from Washington?

I will say, Mr. Chairman, with some feeling of regret, that this side of the House has been without a certain amount of watchful care of our interests for some time. It has been manifest to everyone here who has been on the floor of this House during the last two or three weeks that the very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has conducted, to his own entire satisfaction, all the proceedings of this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I led up with great care to that period, because I anticipated and hoped to have that applause [laughter], which emphasizes exactly what I wanted to emphasize, namely, that for some time gentlemen on this side, modest Members, young Members in terms, have been endeavoring to procure opportunity to forward legitimate legislation and have been without that care and protection and guidance which they were entitled to expect.

Now I return, Mr. Chairman, if you please, to my parliamentary inquiry: Why the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] was not entitled to object to the proposal of the gentleman from Washington to insert something in the RECORD under the circumstances that I have detailed?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask the Chair that question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I inquire of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee gave the gentleman from Washington leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. There was no limitation on the leave granted. He did not advise the committee of what he intended to extend in the RECORD. He then proceeded to read a memorandum of a vote in the House and Senate on some proposition which he had the right to read in his own time, and it was not for the Chair to say that he was not in order in doing so.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] did make a statement, asking leave of the House to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and then proceeded to state what those remarks were. It was then that I made my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The leave had already been granted, and the gentleman from Washington had the right to read in his own time what he proposed to put in the RECORD if he chose to do so.

Mr. CANTOR. Then the gentleman from Washington took advantage of the opportunity?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not for the Chair to say as to that.

Mr. MANN. It was not so.

Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the construction, completion, repair, and preservation of the public works hereinafter named.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say in reply to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] that I was proceeding perfectly in order. I am very sorry if I disturbed the gentleman from New Jersey. I had my own time, I was proceeding in my own time, and it was perfectly in order for me to state whatever I might desire.

Now, I am very sorry, indeed, that my Democratic friends are so much disturbed because I have seen fit to place in the RECORD the names of the gentlemen who voted for the exemption of American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls through the Panama Canal—those who voted for the present law. If they are ashamed of it, that is not my fault. I did not make that record. If they want to crawl away from that record, they themselves are entirely to blame for its making.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say to the gentleman that I voted against free Panama Canal tolls, so that I am not interested in concealing my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and that is why I can not understand why the gentleman is so much agitated on this question. I had endeavored twice before to insert the vote in the RECORD by unanimous consent, and gentlemen on that side, very much to my pleasure, objected. But that is what I expected them to do. In fact, that is what I wanted them to do. After that I proceeded to put it in the RECORD. It is a very good thing to put that in the RECORD. I think the people throughout the country ought to know the names of the gentlemen who a short time ago voted upon that tolls question. The country wants to know how many men on that side of the House are going to change their votes now and repudiate their platform—the platform upon which they were elected—simply because the mandate comes from the White House to do so.

I have been asked by the newspapers to furnish this record in a convenient form. I received two letters yesterday asking me to furnish that record. The people are interested in it. We want to know and the country wants to know how many Democrats there are upon that side who still control their own vote, and I should think that every man upon that side of the House who voted that way in the interest of his own country would be proud of the fact and would want the country to know it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will understand that I have no objection whatever to his printing in the RECORD, and I think the gentleman fully understands the purpose for which I have risen.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly; but the gentleman attempted to criticize me for proceeding out of order, when he was entirely wrong himself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary in order to obtain the floor, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, within the next few days gentlemen upon that side of the aisle will be arguing against the free use of the Panama Canal by American ships in the coastwise trade upon the ground that it is economically wrong and that it is in the nature of a subsidy to permit American coastwise vessels to use an American canal without paying the same tolls that the ships of other nations pay. These gentlemen, in order to be consistent, I submit, ought to argue against the bill now under consideration and to vote against it, because if it is in the nature of a subsidy to make a canal and to permit American vessels to use it free, it is in the nature of a subsidy to improve our rivers and harbors and to permit American vessels to use them under similar circumstances. Every dollar that has been appropriated for the improvement of our rivers and harbors has been appropriated for the purpose of making easier the navigation of our rivers and making terminal facilities for the ships carrying our coastwise trade and over-sea commerce of the country. The railroads have to furnish their own terminal facilities in all cities of the country, but the United States furnishes terminal facilities at New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Charleston, New Orleans, and all harbors of the country for every ton of freight that is carried upon ships. But gentlemen do not use the same argument against that sort of subsidy that they will use next week to show that it is a subsidy of $1.25 a ton to permit the coastwise commerce of the United States to be carried in our own ships through our own canal.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Does not the gentleman make a distinction between the improvements of our rivers and harbors and the building of the Panama Canal, because of our treaty obligations?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not at all. We have a canal on our north that is free to the commerce of the country. Our canal on the south ought to be free to the commerce of our country. The canal on the south is on our own soil under our own flag. We built it. We own it. It ought to be under our control, and I submit to the gentleman that the treaty which we shall discuss next week does not prevent the use of that canal by American coastwise trade, as we may direct.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. We improve our rivers and harbors without making a treaty with a foreign nation, do we not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We do; and while we have entered into treaties with foreign countries with regard to the use of our harbors, and notwithstanding those treaties, American coastwise ships use these harbors practically free, and foreign nations do not object. We have the same rights to the use of the canal that we have to the use of our harbors at Charleston and New Orleans and other seaports.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; I have only just a moment. I am sorry I can not. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Gentlemen will argue that there is a distinction, but they will fail to convince the country where that distinction lies, or what is the difference between giving to the coastwise shipping of the United States the harbors of the United States on the mainland and the use of the canal on the Canal Zone, all being American territory, all being under the control of the American Congress and American laws. I say the gentleman will have considerable difficulty in convincing the country that there is an economic question involved that rises high enough or is of sufficient importance to deprive the American people of the right to control their own canal and fix such reasonable rates of charges as they shall think proper to impose on the commerce of the rest of the world for the use of that canal. Every man in the United States who gives the subject a single moment's consideration knows that there is no difference in principle between the use of the harbors of the mainland for our coastwise trade and the use of the Panama Canal in our coastwise trade.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out from line 5, page 1, the words "to be immediately available," and to further add to line 9, page 1, the following: "*Provided*, That one half of each separate appropriation hereinafter specifically named shall be available whenever there shall be contributed by any State, county, city, or locality, or localities an amount equal to one half of such appropriation, which amount so raised shall be placed to the order of the Secretary of War and shall be expended by him pursuant to the report of the United States engineers on such project: *Provided further*, That the remaining half of each appropriation hereinafter provided shall be retained in the Treasury, subject to the order of the Secretary of War, and to be used by him whenever needed in the completion of the project for which such appropriation is made."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I endeavored to get 15 minutes' time in which to make some inquiries, but failed to get the time because the 9 hours were consumed in the discussion of various other subjects.

It occurs to me there are many things in this bill that ought to be understood by the Members, and it is for that reason I desire to make some inquiries.

I find that the only way to ascertain the facts is by the introduction of amendments. This amendment meets a crying need at this time, judging from the remarks of men who are far more familiar with the subject than I am. The suggestion contained in the proposed amendment is not new with me, and it seems to me if you have any project that deserves aid, it ought to call for some return service from those who are receiving the particular aid. I wish briefly to call attention to the fact that this report contains only 7 pages and pretends to cover a bill of 66 pages, appropriating $43,289,000. This is a very large amount, and we should know the facts in regard to these separate items of appropriation. The chairman of the committee made a short speech, but he withholds it from the RECORD, and we have nothing but 7 small pages of this report to indicate what the facts are.

That being true, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to read briefly from the report a statement, because it is of interest to every Member here to know what these proposed projects are. I have heard inquiry from different Members as to what is covered by the report and what are its recommendations. I read from page 5:

The new projects were selected from a list of 93 reported by the engineers mainly within the last two years, and requiring for completion about $92,500,000. But the committee, feeling that it could not take care of all of them in the present bill, selected what it deemed the most urgent, expecting, of course, to give consideration to the remaining projects, and others which may be reported later, in the next and subsequent bills. These additions make the aggregate of the adopted projects, including those in the present bill, about $305,500,000.

If the Members of the House have read this understandingly, there is no further suggestion to be had. It occurs to me, however, that we all ought to know what is contained in every one of the different projects, and this ought to be set forth in a report of 70 pages, or 700 pages if need be, instead of in this brief leaflet, which contains no information whatever.

On page 9 there are two suggestions which seem to me are very valuable. One is in regard to Oyster Channel, Va., where it says:

That local interests contribute one-half of the cost of the original work, $11,250, prior to the commencement of operations by the United States.

Again, in reference to Northeast Cape Fear River, N. C.:

That local or other interests contribute one-half the cost of first construction.

Now, why is not that a good, reasonable proposition to present as a condition for any project we have here. I am asking for information, because I desire some further information in regard to the bill before we get through. Why is it not advisable to ask aid from every community where we are considering a proposition that is for their particular benefit? That is the reason of the amendment offered, which provides that before any of the appropriation is used one-half shall be contributed by the various communities especially benefited.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman offering the amendment has asked his questions in good faith, and in the same spirit I desire to reply. Of course the House, in my judgment, should not adopt any such amendment, because, while the proposition in reality might be good in some cases, it could not apply to all. Some places and localities on account of special benefits accruing to them not shared by the public should contribute in one way or another to the work, but it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule. We could not in every case require local aid, and it ought not to be done in the majority of cases. Some go so far as to say it ought not to be done in any case; that if the Government should do the work at all it ought to pay for the whole of it. In some instances the locality makes the offer. Finding or fearing that the engineers will turn the proposition down, they say to them, "If you will recommend the work, we will put up so much money." I can give an illustration in my own district. The people of the locality, or some of them, appeared before the engineers and said, "If you will recommend the project—which was in that case to cost about $20,000—we will put up half of the money." And the report was made with that condition attached. That is done in many cases and in many places. Sometimes there is no proposition at all, and the engineers, considering the special advantages that may accrue to a locality, perhaps to only two or three individuals and not entirely for the general commerce of the country, say to those especially favored, if you will put up so much money—50 or 75 per cent, as the case may be—or do certain other things, we will recommend the project.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. Why is it not a fair proposition when you are proposing to benefit a limited community, and they are the only ones to receive the direct benefit, to ask them for some aid?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do that in this bill in many instances.

Mr. FREAR. In only the two instances that I have referred to.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; Beverly, Mass., is another.

Mr. FREAR. I was referring to rivers.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he will inform the committee how much contribution is carried for the dredging of the Connecticut River?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I will refer the gentleman to my colleague [Mr. TREADWAY], who is on the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to answer the question.

Mr. TREADWAY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that the bill makes available the fund heretofore appropriated and not expended for dredging the Connecticut River. Can the gentleman inform us how much of that amount is unexpended?

Mr. TREADWAY. Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. My direct query is, How much was contributed by the State, either Massachusetts or Connecticut, for the maintenance of the river?

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman refer to the direct item on page 5?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. There has been nothing contributed by the State of Connecticut or Massachusetts, so far as I know, under that special item. That item was included in the river and harbor bill of 1912 in order to remove certain wing walls from the river which had been constructed some years previous and now interfere with navigation. That was the idea of the appropriation of the meager amount of $25,000. Last year an effort was made to let contracts under that appropriation, but it was found that it did not accomplish the direct purpose which was desired by those interested in the project of navigation. The actual work that we wanted to have accomplished was clearing the channel for the small amount of navigation that now uses the river. So that under that appropriation no money has ever been expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, will the gentleman permit me to finish my inquiry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand how Congress and the committee could approve of the removal of permanent obstructions in a navigable stream, but I would like to have some explanation to justify the keeping of a stream entirely in a State in a navigable condition by dredging. There are many rivers in the State of Wisconsin that carry interstate traffic, but the maintenance of those streams is borne by the municipalities and localities and not by the National Government. Why should the National Government undertake the burden of maintaining this stream in a navigable condition? Why should not that be borne by the localities themselves?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would name some of those rivers in Wisconsin of which he speaks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, the Milwaukee River, the Racine, the Menominee, the Manitowoc, the Sheboygan—any number of them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the question to be why the National Government should improve a stream wholly within one State?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; my question was not for the purpose of improving the streams, but why should the Government seek to maintain navigable a stream after the Government has put it into a condition of navigability, as in the case of the Connecticut River?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that anyone who is at all familiar with this class of work would understand why that is done. When the Government puts up any amount of money, no matter what it is, for any stream, it certainly ought not to let the work deteriorate. It ought to maintain it, so that the work will not have to be done over again. That is why we have this maintenance account running into something like $4,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not that maintenance account limited to streams which are interstate; that is, a stream between two or more States, and over which the States themselves have no jurisdiction?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it makes no difference whether it is interstate or entirely in one State, the principle is exactly the same. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, there are many streams we are improving that are wholly within a State, wholly within one county. I know some in Florida, for instance—and they are typical—wholly within one county, and yet a commerce originates on the banks of those streams which is carried on their waters to railroad wharves or steamship landings, and carried thence coastwise by water or by railroad to all parts of the country, some to foreign countries. These streams come just as much under the commerce clause of the Constitution as if they ran through half a dozen States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest, would it not be more economical for the Government to build a railroad and operate it than to carry on some of the projects the gentleman has named?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not think so. I know that suggestion has been often made, but there is little in it.

Mr. FREAR. I mean as a matter of dollars and cents and cost of maintenance?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say I believe that in days gone by some money—not a great deal, relatively speaking—has been thrown away on a few rivers and perhaps a few harbors. It would be very strange if in the improvement of hundreds of rivers and harbors, with the expenditure of more than $700,000,000, extending over a period of 100 years, mistakes had not been made; but there have been very few, in my judgment.

Mr. FREAR. Does the gentleman believe it is a proper thing to endeavor to create a commerce in navigation where it does not now exist?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, most assuredly, at times. That is the theory, for instance, on which we build canals.

Mr. FREAR. Then where will be the limit, in the gentleman's judgment, in making these extensions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The people can place a limit on it whenever they desire.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not the committee that places the limit?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; not finally.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true, as the gentleman from Illinois said, that it is impossible to secure the addition of an amendment to this bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is for the House to say. So far as we are concerned, we might curtail or stop the work at any time, but if we came into this House with a measure that did not take care of the commercial demands of the country, I do not think we would get very far with it, and if Congress should pass such a measure I believe the people would resent the action.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this House recently voted to make an appropriation for the improvement of good roads and for the maintenance of good roads. If a good road is once constructed under the auspices of the Government, would the gentleman think it the duty of the Government to keep that road in repair and otherwise provide for its maintenance from year to year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think it ought to be kept in repair by somebody.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the same principle apply to a waterway? Does not a waterway need repair just as a good road?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out from line 5, page 1, the words "to be immediately available," and, further, add to line 5, page 1, the following:

"*Provided*, That if the President and Secretary of War shall upon investigation ascertain and determine that any project or projects hereinafter provided for are not of material value to the public they may, in their discretion, withhold such specific appropriation until further action by Congress."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment follows the other in natural sequence. I took it for granted that the House would not support the other, although I believe eventually it will become the law in years to come. As far as my investigation goes, these engineer reports, as was stated by the gentleman from Illinois, begin first with the district and division engineers and then a board passes upon their recommendations, and eventually the Chief of Engineers determines everything, and the reports show that the chief himself frequently overturns his subordinates' reports.

As was well said a few moments ago by the gentleman from Illinois, there is a grave doubt whether many of these appropriations are justified so far as their effect on the navigability of waters is concerned. In fact, my interest was first aroused when I recently read an exhaustive speech in which it was stated by an eminent authority at the other end of the Capitol that only one dollar out of ten is wisely expended for rivers and harbors.

Mr. MADDEN. Yet they increase these appropriations when the bill gets over there.

Mr. FREAR. Undoubtedly they will do so, because they always have a majority in favor of the bill large enough to do it. There is no doubt about that. I agree with the gentleman. In view of the uncertainty as to the determination of the judgment of engineers and the criticisms that have been urged against a committee that has a personal interest in the bill as a whole I believe this amendment should be agreed to. Why would it not be well to allow the President of the United States, a man whom we all trust, no matter who he may be, together with the Secretary of War, to withhold the appropriation, providing they should believe a project ought not to be advanced because it is of purely local interest? Why would it not be well to allow them some control, acting together, with some latitude after knowing what the facts are?

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman know that now the Secretary of War has approved every single project in this bill?

Mr. FREAR. I know this, that the Secretary of War in many of these projects knows little more than we do, and that he is largely obliged to depend upon the reports of engineers, which are often contradictory in terms, as the gentleman knows. There comes in a report from the division following the district report, and they often contradict each other. Now, the probability is, in every case, I presume, that the Secretary of War would follow the report of the district engineers——

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FREAR. Pardon me for a moment. And the district engineer and other engineers have been influenced no doubt by the same sentiments that have been expressed here by Members themselves.

Mr. BOOHER. Allow me to say to the gentleman that the Secretary of War frequently turns down the Chief of Engineers, and he frequently turns down the engineering board.

Mr. FREAR. That may be true, but there is not a particle of danger that any abuse will result from this amendment——

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman invoke the principle here that this House yield our power and right to appropriate money to do a certain work to the President of the United States and the Secretary of War?

Mr. FREAR. Not by any means, but I would try to meet the declaration that this is purely a pork-barrel appropriation, an opinion which is spread abroad throughout the country year after year and which comes from Members themselves upon this floor and at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman permit one other question? That same declaration has been made in reference to public buildings. Would the gentleman put on the same clause in reference to public buildings?

Mr. FREAR. Not necessarily. There is a great distinction, in my judgment. You are securing a permanent establishment when you have a public building. You are securing a building that is eventually going to serve many useful purposes in years to come. It is a permanent investment. The projects in this bill are changing year after year and constantly costing the Government more and more money for maintenance, and, as I stated before, it would seem there ought to be some supervision and check against waste or mistaken information in addition to that which already exists.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, if I correctly understood the force of the gentleman's argument, it is to the effect that after this Congress has passed a law appropriating certain moneys for the canalization of certain rivers and certain harbors, then that is to be left to the discretion of the Secretary of War as to whether or not that money should be expended. The gentleman in one breath made the statement that neither the President nor the Secretary of War could possibly know anything about the merits of any particular proposition and that they would have to depend upon the Engineers of the Army for information, just exactly as it is done now.

Mr. FREAR. There is this to be considered, Mr. Chairman: Any question raised would be raised after the bill became a law, and the Secretary of War and the President's attention being then called to the specific items, they could then make an investigation in the specific case. For instance, take the gentleman's own district. The gentleman congratulated himself yesterday upon what he had secured for his district. It would be well that the Government should have supervision of projects by gentlemen who are disinterested and avoid criticism otherwise invited apart from the protection thus afforded public interests.

Mr. POWERS. I do not yield for a speech.

It is the business of this House, Mr. Chairman, to determine whether or not a certain appropriation is meritorious, and if it is not meritorious it is the business of this House to defeat it and not to surrender the powers of this House to legislate into the hands of the President or the Secretary of War.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some wandering from the bill, and I therefore ask indulgence of the committee to permit me to wander a little.

I want to say, in reference to the colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a few minutes ago, that I started out with the endeavor to be in the utmost degree courteous. I wish to say now that there is one expression in that colloquy that I want to explain, because I still desire to be courteous. This language was used:

I do not take the gentleman's word.

That was said in reply to a statement from the gentleman that I ought to take his word as to what he said. I want to say I did not intend or mean by that statement to impugn the gentleman's veracity or to say that I doubted his truthfulness, but I did mean to say that I thought he was mistaken about what he said, and that my recollection of what he said was correct. The fact is, I am unable just to swallow, contrary to my own recollection, somebody else's statement of an event which occurred in my hearing, and that was the extent of what I intended to say, for I endeavored to be very courteous to the gentleman. Now, I want to say, furthermore, as to what was said, as furnished by the Reporter's notes, that perhaps I was not so far wrong as to its substance, although the word "will" was not used and the word "ought" was used by the gentleman, as he declared in our colloquy. According to the notes, the gentleman made this statement:

Those gentlemen who voted for tolls on the Panama Canal put themselves on record as against deep-water competition to regulate railroad rates, and they ought to vote against the river and harbor bill. No conscientious Member of this House ought to vote for the river and harbor bill and against free tolls on the Panama Canal.

Emphasizing the word "conscientious," if you put that sentence in that way, it will mean almost the same as if you said "will." It impressed me as a statement that no conscientious Member would vote for this bill and against the other. If the statement had been that no Member ought to vote for this bill and against free tolls there would have been no inference that conscience should determine one's vote against this bill and free tolls both, or for this bill and for free tolls both. The truth is the insertion of that word makes the sentence mean nearly the same as if the word "ought" had been "will."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention further to the fact that this is the skirmish line of the fighting on free tolls. Every opponent of tolls for the coastwise trade uses every opportunity to inject into this debate all that he can against the charging of our coastwise ships tolls for going through the canal. Another reason for my interpretation of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois was that it seems to me every advocate of free tolls is vociferous and active, attempting to browbeat, to intimidate men into voting for free tolls for our coastwise ships. They charge men with a want of conscientious performance of their duty because they may vote against free tolls. By insinuation and by direct statement they are repeatedly saying, as has been said here to-day, that men will bury their conscience and bow to the weight of authority of somebody higher up.

Now, I want to say that this free-tolls question can be argued on its merit, if there is any merit in it, and that it will not be determined by innuendo or insinuation. And I do not believe the gentlemen on the other side will make one vote for free tolls to the coastwise trade by any attempted intimidations or by any insinuations against the honesty, the integrity, the manliness, or courage of any man on this side. I have enough respect for the Members of the House to believe that 95 per cent of them vote their convictions on all public questions. But I want to say one thing in reference to all these charges, namely, that they are the cheap change of petty politics. The man who can not argue a question without impugning the motives of somebody or attacking the courage of somebody as being intimidated by somebody else has not a good case to present.

Now, if I may have a little more time I want to just answer my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], because those of us who are opposed to free tolls have sat silent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY. May I ask for the indulgence of five minutes more?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say something in reference to free tolls. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] made an argument which I apprehend he thought was of great force, that because, forsooth, we deepen the waters of our harbors and pay immense sums to clean out our rivers, therefore we ought to make a discriminating rule in favor of our coastwise trade going through the canal. He forgot that every harbor on our coast is open upon exactly the same terms to the ships of every nation of the earth as they are to ours. Does any vessel from England pay toll or any tonnage dues that our vessels do not pay when they enter the harbor of New York, or San Francisco, or Seattle, or New Orleans? Does any vessel plying the waters of the Mississippi have any advantage over any other vessel plying those waters? Why, gentlemen, I leave out the question of treaty. I say that when you start into this question of discriminating duties by levying a tonnage upon foreign vessels and not upon our own——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does not the gentleman know that the State of Texas makes pilotage charges against foreign vessels which it does not make against vessels plying in the coastwise trade?

Mr. HARDY. Not that I ever heard of.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think if the gentleman will look up the pilotage laws of his own State, he will find that they provide for a pilotage charge against vessels doing an over-seas business and make no such charges for American vessels in the coastwise trade.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say that the pilotage question is a question regulated by State laws, and I am not familiar with all of them; but if you find in the Code of the United States any law that makes a discrimination between our vessels and vessels of other nations as to tonnage duties——

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was asking the gentleman about his own harbors.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman was referring to something that I was not discussing. I am discussing discriminating duties levied by the United States.

Now, if the gentleman will allow me—I have but five minutes—I want to take care of that matter regarding discriminating duties just a little now, although I intend to discuss it later at greater length. I want to say that the history of this country shows that discriminatory duties were a practice adopted by all nations in years gone by, and that discriminatory duties have now been abandoned by all the great nations of the earth, and therefore for us now to start with the Panama Canal to levy discriminating duties upon the vessels of foreign countries would be going back to a practice that has been discredited and antiquated for more than a generation.

Our country under former administrations found that discriminating duties were a species of commercial warfare, and commercial warfare, like any other warfare, is an injury to both nations concerned in it. They adopted a system of free ports and equal duties to the vessels of all nations as tending toward the forwarding of commerce for the benefit of all nations, and we have only lately developed a few people in this country who are disposed to go back to the old system.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. How about the discriminating duty under the recent Democratic tariff bill?

Mr. HARDY. It was wrong.

Mr. GORDON. And it was knocked out, too.

Mr. SWITZER. The gentleman from Texas says it was wrong?

Mr. HARDY. Surely it was wrong. But I will say that no party is perfect. There was a little 5 per cent wee baby of discriminating duty in it, and it died early, thank the Lord. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that no thorough student of the history of this country in its early struggles to strengthen its merchant marine and in its levying of discriminating duties on foreign shipping will ever for one moment want to go back again to that policy of discriminating duties. But recently some people who have not studied the former situation and have not studied the early history of our country have begun to hanker after discriminating duties in order to build up our merchant marine. Why, if we want to build up our merchant marine, and believe we can do it by discriminating duties, then we ought to give the free tolls, not to our coastwise ships but to our foreign-trade ships, because our coastwise ships and our coastwise trade are all ours under our law, that absolutely excludes all foreign ships from that trade.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. No; I am sorry I have not the time. I say our coastwise ships are all ours, anyway. Let me finish this statement. If we were going to give favor for the benefit of our merchant marine to any part of our shipping, it ought to be to those ships engaged in the foreign trade, because they meet the foreign competition. But as for our coastwise trade, it is a monopoly and can not be participated in by foreign nations. It is not only a monopoly, but a powerful one, that needs no aid and deserves no favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to occupy a moment or two to correct the impression that I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] may have made when he made the statement that our harbors are used by foreign ships on the same terms as our own. In that statement he is mistaken. Our harbors do not as a general proposition charge our vessels engaged in the coastwise trade for coming into them or using them. They do charge foreign vessels for that privilege. To make absolutely certain about the matter, I had an argument a few moments ago with one of the distinguished gentlemen on this side of the House, and it has not been over eight minutes since I talked with the Commissioner of Navigation, in order to make sure that I was right about it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is referring to a conversation that he and I just had with the Commissioner of Navigation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is right in his statement, except that American vessels in the foreign trade pay the same as foreign vessels in the foreign trade but not in the coastwise trade.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes. The coastwise vessels using our rivers and harbors as a general proposition pay nothing, and exactly the same principle would apply to the Panama Canal.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman says our coastwise vessels pay nothing for the use of our harbors?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As a rule.

Mr. HARDY. Do our own vessels, flying our own flag, though engaged in the foreign trade, pay something where the coastwise vessels do not?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman has a distinction that is new to me. I shall have to investigate it. I do not doubt the gentleman's good faith in making the statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washingon. You take a vessel engaged in the foreign trade, so far as Government regulations are concerned, and it pays the same as foreign vessels; but American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade do not pay for the use of our rivers and harbors as a general rule. There may be an exception here and there.

Mr. LENROOT. The Federal Government makes no discrimination?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Federal Government makes no discrimination. And that principle applies, so far as the Panama Canal is concerned, in my judgment. We have attempted there to apply the same rule with respect to coastwise vessels of the United States as we do in other American waters, and I am unable to understand that there is any difference, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a case that came up from the State of Texas—from the State of the gentleman who has just been speaking [Mr. HARDY]. Chief Justice White decided in that case that Texas had the right to levy a different pilotage duty against a foreign vessel from that charged an American vessel in the coastwise trade, and that it in no wise violated our treaty with foreign countries. It was based on this theory, that the foreign vessel could not engage in the domestic trade under any circumstances, and, not being permitted to engage in the domestic trade, it was impossible for it to be discriminated against, no matter what the Government might do. The Supreme Court therefore held that it was no violation of the treaty to favor American coasting vessels.

That is all I wish to say, Mr. Chairman. I did not think the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] ought to go uncontradicted.

Mr. BURGESS. I will suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we shall have plenty of time for debate on the Panama Canal later. Let us go on with this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I doubt that.

Mr. BURGESS. I object to having the question debated on this bill, whether the gentleman doubts it or not.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, in order to have this matter correct in the RECORD, I want to say that, as I have been told, 6 cents a ton is charged on every vessel, American or foreign, in the way of tonnage dues, provided those vessels, American or foreign, come from a European or Asiatic port. Two cents a ton, I think, is charged on all vessels, American or foreign, if those vessels come from a Canadian port or from a port of the West Indies. Nothing per ton is charged upon any vessel, foreign or American, if it comes from a port of the United States; in other words, if it is engaged in our coastwise trade. Inasmuch as foreign vessels are not admitted into our coastwise trade, there is an apparent differentiation, which is not a differentiation in principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can not let pass the statement of my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. HARDY] without throwing a sweet kiss at him. He and I could not quarrel if we wanted to, and then we do not want to. I am sorry that after proving by the record of the Official Reporter, which he got and which I did not take the trouble to look up at all, that I was right in my statement, and that he was wrong in his, the gentleman should proceed to read a lecture, as though he was lecturing me for what I had said. I have always avoided making reflections upon the motives of Members of the House. I never undertake to determine how other honest men shall vote or to determine the honesty of a man by his opinions or his votes. Hence I knew that I had not used the language which the gentleman thought I had used. Perhaps I ought not to have used the word "conscientious," although I think adding the word "conscientious" to the description of a Member of Congress does not restrict the number at all. I think they are all conscientious.

Mr. BUTLER. He said 90 per cent.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a very courteous interruption?

Mr. MANN. I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say that my knowledge of the gentleman's usual accuracy in the use of words made me inclined, when he asked me if I would take his recollection of what he had said, to say yes; but my recollection was so positive that I wanted to see which of us was right.

Mr. BUTLER. This is the most beautiful reconciliation I ever saw. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I have great respect for the gentleman's recollection. One unfortunate thing I have is a very accurate memory. I sometimes wish I could forget. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. It was not wrong in this case, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported again. We have been discussing the Panama Canal and everything except my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by striking out from line 5, page 1, the words "to be immediately available," and further, by adding to line 9, page 1, the following:

"*Provided*, That if the President and Secretary of War shall upon investigation ascertain and determine that any project or projects hereinafter provided for are not of material value to the public, they may in their discretion withhold such specific appropriation until further action by Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURDOCK) there were—ayes 10, noes 77.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Tenants Harbor, Me.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee document No. 12, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $12,500.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was desirous, and I am sure many other gentlemen on this floor were desirous, of going ahead until about 6 o'clock; but out of deference to the newspapers, there being a reception at the Press Club, which many

Members desire to attend, I move that the committee do now rise. [Applause.]

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we will be reading the bill to-morrow under the five-minute rule. Certainly six hours of that is a long time. If we meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, when does the gentleman expect to quit?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had not thought anything about that, I will say frankly to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13091. An act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes.

DANIEL THEW WRIGHT.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia rises to a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. PARK. By virtue of my office as a Member of the House of Representatives, I impeach Daniel Thew Wright, an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, of high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point or order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I move a call of the House, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Oh, no; let us get a quorum.

Mr. MANN. This ought not to be brought up so late at night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 52, nays 22.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The request is withdrawn. The motion to adjourn is agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, March 21, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3403) to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 420), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2316) authorizing leave of absence to homestead settlers upon unsurveyed lands, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 421), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10832) to amend section 2 of an act approved March 2, 1907, entitled "An act providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 422), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14189) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 424), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 656) granting to the trustees of the diocese of Montana of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the benefit of "Christ Church on the Hill," at Poplar, Mont., lots 5, 6, and 7, in block 30, town site of Poplar, State of Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 425), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 657) to authorize the reservation of public lands for country parks and community centers within reclamation projects in the State of Montana, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 426), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14229) for the relief of Henry La Roque, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 423), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 14865) suspending the patent and copyright laws of the United States when a patent or copyright or any article or product protected by patent or copyright is wholly owned, used, or leased by any trust or monopoly in violation of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and all acts amendatory thereto"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 14866) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14867) to increase the limit of cost of Federal building at Alliance, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 14868) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Dunkirk, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14869) authorizing the Shoshone Tribe of Indians residing on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 14870) to make effective the provisions of an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14871) granting a pension to Jethrow Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14872) granting a pension to Bertha Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14873) granting a pension to Caroline Bloom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 14874) granting a pension to Carson E. Newhard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14875) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 14876) granting an increase of pension to Ada Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14877) granting an increase of pension to Mary Corcoran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 14878) granting a pension to Herman W. Breuel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14879) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shrider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 14880) granting a pension to Frank Bachmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14881) granting a pension to John Gibbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 14882) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Nickles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14883) granting an increase of pension to John F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14884) granting an increase of pension to Madison B. Hayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14885) granting a pension to Allen R. Vickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 14886) granting a pension to Roxiana Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolutions from the Memorial Seventh-day Adventist Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring amendment forbidding polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the German-Irish Alliance of Perth Amboy, N. J., against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of 1,256 citizens of Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of the First Congregational Church of St. Charles, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition signed by William Kline and 78 other citizens of Gilboa, Ohio, in support of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 21 citizens of Mount Vernon, Ohio, in favor of Nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of West Virginia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of sundry citizens and churches of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Camden, N. J., favoring Hamill retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition signed by Borchert Malting Co., Froedtert Malting Co., Interstate Malt Co., The Kurth Co., Lodish Stoppenbach Co., Milwaukee Malting Co., Milwaukee Western Co., D. D. Weschler & Sons, Badger State Malt Co., Chilton Malting Co., Konrad Bros. & Werner, W. G. Laubenstein, Manitowoc Malting Co., Portz Bros. Malt & Grain Co., M. H. Pettit Malting Co., Rubison Malting Co., Wm. Rahr Sons Co., Konrad Schreier Co., L. Rosenheimer Malt & Grain Co., Wisconsin Malt & Grain Co., and the Westbend Malting Co., all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against any and all bills now before Congress or introduced in the future which prohibit or tend to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, and sale or importation or use of malt, vinous, spiritous, or alcoholic beverages or liquors in and throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Western Malt Co. and sundry citizens of Wisconsin, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Brooklyn Standard-Union Chapel of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the customs guards at port of New York, favoring the bill to raise salaries in that branch of the Government service (H. R. 7217); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Sons of Veterans, of Hoboken, N. J., favoring increased compensation to letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, favoring Lindquist pure-fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of various labor organizations on Isthmus of Panama, relative to labor conditions in Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of various merchants of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 13723; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of various churches and citizens of Ohio favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to appointment of clerks to the United States courts by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of various churches of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of the Minnesota Turnbezirk, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the United Mine Workers of America, favoring Federal intervention in strike conditions in Colorado; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of H. E. Cook, C. H. Stockwell, Philip Fine, Theodore Gerke, William Scherffius, Henry C. Murphy, John A. Koch, William Heyns, W. W. Halloran, John W. Heyns, August Glesige, E. P. Hahn, M. G. O'Brien, Ben Lambers, and Newton Kelsay, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of F. L. Silva, Frank Thomas, and J. N. Kindelos, of New Britain, Conn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the North & Judd Manufacturing Co., of New Britain, Conn., favoring Newlands river-regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Young Ladies' Bible Class of Woodlawn Park Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Michigan against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Michigan against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of Gustave F. Pohlmann, jr., and 22 other citizens of the city of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88 relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Mattei, of Malaga, Cal., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POST: Petitions of various churches and citizens of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of various churches of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., against making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Municipal League of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Federal child-labor bill (H. R. 12292); to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 14885) granting a pension to Allen R. Vickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 86 citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of 173 citizens of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Josephine M. Bushong and 60 other members of the Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to Eugene Reynolds Post, No. 441, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellefontaine, Ohio, in opposition to any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of various banks of Brooklyn, N. Y., against interlocking directorate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. M. Crouch, of New York City, favoring repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
NOV 13 1914

